

RECEIVED
OCT 10 2024
BY: [Signature] SCANNED

COMMUNITY PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

9611 SE 36TH STREET | MERCER ISLAND, WA 98040
206.275.7605 | www.mercerisland.gov



PUBLIC NOTICE OF APPLICATION

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN for the application described below:

File No.: CAO24-015
Permit Type: Type III
Description of Request: A request for a critical area review 2 to install a new retaining wall, pavers, and railing on a site with geological hazardous areas.
Applicant/Owner: Sergiy Ovsyichuk / Abhishek and Shweta Sharma
Location of Property: 7905 W Mercer Way, Mercer Island WA 98040
King County Assessor tax parcel number: 545130-0005
SEPA Compliance:
The project is exempt from SEPA Review pursuant to [WAC 197-11-800](#).

Project Documents: <https://mieplan.mercergov.org/public/CAO24-015>

Written Comments: This may be the only opportunity to comment on this proposal. Written comments on this proposal may be submitted to the City of Mercer Island either by email, in person, or by mail to the City of Mercer Island, 9611 SE 36th Street, Mercer Island, WA 98040-3732. Anyone may comment on the application, receive notice, and request a copy of the decision once made. Only those persons who submit written comments or participate at the public hearing (if a hearing is required) will be parties of record; and only parties of record will have the right to appeal.

Public Hearing and Public Meeting: Pursuant to [MICC 19.15.030](#) Tables A and B, a public hearing is not required for Type I-III permits.

Applicable Development Regulations Applications for critical area review 2 are required to be processed as Type III land use reviews pursuant to Mercer Island City Code (MICC) 19.15.030. Processing requirements for Type III land use reviews are further detailed in MICC 19.15.030. The city's subdivision requirements are contained in [Chapter 19.08 MICC](#).

Other Associated Permits: Permit No(s):2404-213; SHL24-009

Environmental Documents: Copies of all studies and/or environmental documents are available through the above project documents link.

Application Process Information:

Date of Application:	April 24, 2024
Determined to Be Complete:	September 13, 2024
Weekly Permit Bulletin Notice:	September 23, 2024
Date Mailed:	September 23, 2024
Date Posted on Site:	September 23, 2024
Comment Period Ends:	5:00PM on October 23, 2024

CITY OF MERCER ISLAND

COMMUNITY PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT
9611 SE 36TH STREET | MERCER ISLAND, WA 98040
PHONE: 206.275.7605 | www.mercergov.org



Notice of Violation & Civil Penalties

Pursuant to MICC 6.10.050,
this Notice of Violation and Civil Penalties
is issued as follows:

Date of Notice Issuance: February 14th, 2024

Location(s): 7905 West Mercer Way, Mercer Island WA 98040

Subject Property: 7905 West Mercer Way, Mercer Island WA 98040

King County Tax Parcel # 545130-0005

City of Mercer Island Compliance Case#: CE23-0035

Notification is being given to the following responsible person or persons:

1. Abhishek Sharma, Shweta Sharma, a married couple, owner(s)

7905 West Mercer Way

Mercer Island, WA. 98040

2. Wise Choice Constrction LLC, contractor.

11204 SE 234TH ST

KENT, WA 98031

3. Sviatoslav M Pylypiak, Julia Pylypiak, Governor contractor.

11204 SE 234TH ST

KENT, WA 98031

One or more of the responsible persons named above are believed to be responsible for the following violations that have occurred or are occurring at the location(s) identified above:

- 1) **Violation of MICC 17.14.010(105.1)- 105.1 Required.** Any owner or authorized agent who intends to construct, enlarge, alter, repair, move, demolish, or change the occupancy of a

building or structure, or to erect, install, enlarge, alter, repair, remove, convert or replace any electrical, gas, mechanical or plumbing system, the installation of which is regulated by the construction codes and the Construction Administrative Code, or to cause any such work to be done, shall first make application to the building official and obtain the required permit.

2) Violation of MICC 19.07.160 - Geologically hazardous areas.

A. Designation and typing. Geologically hazardous areas are lands that are susceptible to erosion, landslides, seismic events, or other factors as identified by WAC 365-190-120. These areas may not be suited for development activities because they may pose a threat to public health and safety. Areas susceptible to one or more of the following types of hazards shall be designated as geologically hazardous areas: landslide hazard areas, seismic hazard areas, and erosion hazard areas.

B. General review requirements. Alteration within geologically hazardous areas or associated buffers is required to meet the standards in this section, unless the scope of work is exempt pursuant to section 19.07.120, exemptions, or a critical area review 1 approval has been obtained pursuant to section 19.07.090(A).

1. When an alteration within a landslide hazard area, seismic hazard area or buffer associated with those hazards is proposed, the applicant must submit a critical area study concluding that the proposal can effectively mitigate risks of the hazard. The study shall recommend appropriate design and development measures to mitigate such hazards. The code official may waive the requirement for a critical area study and the requirements of subsections (B)(2) and (B)(3) of this section when he or she determines that the proposed development is minor in nature and will not increase the risk of landslide, erosion, or harm from seismic activity, or that the development site does not meet the definition of a geologically hazardous area.

2. Alteration of landslide hazard areas and seismic hazard areas and associated buffers may occur if the critical area study documents find that the proposed alteration:

- a. Will not adversely impact other critical areas;
- b. Will not adversely impact the subject property or adjacent properties;
- c. Will mitigate impacts to the geologically hazardous area consistent with best available science to the maximum extent reasonably possible such that the site is determined to be safe; and
- d. Includes the landscaping of all disturbed areas outside of building footprints and installation of hardcape prior to final inspection.

concluding that:

- i. Geotechnical slope stability concerns, erosion and sedimentation impacts can be effectively controlled on site consistent with adopted storm water standards; and
 - ii. The proposed construction work will not subject people or property, including areas off site, to an increased risk of associated impacts.
- b. As a condition of the waiver, the code official may require erosion control measures, restoration plans, an indemnification, a release agreement and/or performance bond.
 - c. If site activities result in erosion impacts or threaten water quality standards, the city may suspend further work on the site and/or require remedial action.
 - d. Failure to comply with the conditions of an approved waiver shall subject the applicant to code compliance pursuant to chapter 6.10, code compliance, including but not limited to civil penalties and permit suspension.

3) Violation of MICC 19.07.090(B) - Critical area reviews.

B. Critical area review 2.

1. The purpose of a critical area review 2 is to review critical area studies and mitigation plans in support of proposed buffer averaging and reduction of wetland and watercourse buffers.

2. Review timing and sequence.

a. When development and/or activity within a wetland, watercourse, fish and wildlife habitat conservation area or buffer associated with these critical area types is proposed, a critical area review 2 is required to be reviewed and approved prior to construction authorization.

b. When development and/or activity is proposed on a site containing only geologically hazardous areas, an applicant has the option of either:

- i. Applying for a critical area review 2 in advance of construction permits, using the procedures required for a Type 3 land use review; or
- ii. Requesting consolidation of the review of geologically hazardous areas together with construction permit review.

c. When development and/or activity is proposed on a site containing geologically hazardous areas and one or more of the critical area types listed in

subsection (B)(2)(a) of this section or the associated buffer of one of those critical areas, a critical area review 2 reviewing all critical areas is required to be reviewed and approved prior to construction authorization, using the procedures required for a Type 3 land use review.

3. Requirements for a complete application include:

- a. A completed development application coversheet;
- b. A critical area study, meeting the requirements of section 19.07.110, critical area study; and
- c. Additional information required by the city to confirm compliance with this title.

4) **Violation of MICC 19.07.110(A) - Critical area study.**

A. A critical area study shall be required when a development proposal will result in an alteration to one or more critical areas or critical area buffers or when required to determine the potential impact to a critical area.

5) **Violation of MICC 19.13.050(A)(B) - Shoreland development standards.**

All development within the shoreline jurisdiction shall be in compliance with all development requirements specified in this chapter.

- A. Standards landward of the OWHM. The standards in Table C shall apply to development located landward of the OHWM:

Table C — Requirements for Development Located Landward from the OHWM		
Setbacks for All Structures (Including Fences over 48 Inches High) and Parking	A*	25 feet from the OHWM and all required setbacks of the development code, except (1) light rail transit facilities and (2) shore access structures less than 30 inches above the existing or finished grade, whichever is lower. If a wetland is adjacent to the shoreline, measure the shoreline setback from the wetland's boundary
Height Limits for All Structures	B	Shall be the same as height limits specified in the development code but shall not exceed a height of 35 feet above average building elevation, except light rail transit facilities

Table C — Requirements for Development Located Landward from the OHWM		
Maximum Hardscape and Lot Coverage	C	10%: between 0 and 25 feet from OHWM
	D	30%: between 25 and 50 feet from OHWM
Minimum Land Area Requirements	E	All semi-private, commercial and noncommercial recreational tracts and areas shall have minimum land area: 200 square feet per family, but not less than 600 square feet, exclusive of driveways or parking areas. Screening of the boundaries with abutting properties
Height Limits for Light Rail Transit Facilities within the Existing I-90 Corridor		The trackway and overhead wires, support poles, and similar features necessary to operate light rail transit facilities may be erected upon and exceed the height of the existing I-90 bridges

B. Bulkheads and shoreline stabilization structures.

1. An existing shoreline stabilization structure may be replaced with a similar structure if there is a demonstrated need to protect principal uses or structures from erosion caused by currents or waves, and the following conditions shall apply:
 - i. The replacement structure should be designed, located, sized, and constructed to assure no net loss of ecological functions.
 - ii. Replacement walls or bulkheads shall not encroach waterward of the ordinary high water mark or existing structure unless the primary structure was occupied prior to January 1, 1992, and there are overriding safety or environmental concerns. In such cases, the replacement structure shall abut the existing shoreline stabilization structure. Soft shoreline stabilization measures that provide restoration of shoreline ecological functions may be permitted waterward of the ordinary high water mark.
 - iii. For purposes of this section standards on shoreline stabilization measures, "replacement" means the construction of a new structure to perform a shoreline stabilization function of an existing structure which can no longer adequately serve its purpose. Additions to or increases in size of existing shoreline stabilization measures shall be considered new structures.

- iv. Construction and maintenance of normal protective bulkhead common to single-family dwellings requires only a shoreline exemption permit, unless a report is required by the code official to ensure compliance with the above conditions; however, if the construction of the bulkhead is undertaken wholly or in part on lands covered by water, such construction shall comply with SEPA mitigation.
2. New structures for existing primary structures. New or enlarged structural shoreline stabilization measures for an existing primary structure, including residences, are not allowed unless there is conclusive evidence, documented by a geotechnical analysis, that the structure is in danger from shoreline erosion caused by currents or waves. Normal sloughing, erosion of steep bluffs, or shoreline erosion itself, without a scientific or geotechnical analysis, is not demonstration of need. The geotechnical analysis should evaluate on-site drainage issues and address drainage problems away from the shoreline edge before considering structural shoreline stabilization. New or enlarged erosion control structure shall not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological functions.
3. New development on steep slopes or bluffs shall be set back sufficiently to ensure that shoreline stabilization is unlikely to be necessary during the life of the structure, as demonstrated by a geotechnical analysis, in compliance with subsection (B)(7) of this section and building and construction codes.
4. New structural stabilization measures in support of water-dependent development shall only be allowed when all of the conditions below apply:
 - i. The erosion is not being caused by upland conditions, such as the loss of vegetation and drainage.
 - ii. Nonstructural measures, planting vegetation, or installing on-site drainage improvements, are not feasible or not sufficient.
 - iii. The need to protect primary structures from damage due to erosion is *demonstrated through a geotechnical report, in compliance with subsection (B)(7) of this section and building and construction codes.*
 - iv. The erosion control structure will not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological functions.
5. New structural stabilization measures to protect projects for the restoration of ecological functions or hazardous substance remediation projects pursuant to RCW Chapter 70.105D shall only be allowed when all of the conditions below apply:
 - i. Nonstructural measures, planting vegetation, or installing on-site drainage improvements, are not feasible or not sufficient.

- ii. The erosion control structure will not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological functions.
6. Bulkheads shall be located generally parallel to the natural shoreline. No filling may be allowed waterward of the ordinary high water mark, unless there has been severe and unusual erosion within two years immediately preceding the application for the bulkhead. In this event the city may allow the placement of the bulkhead to recover the dry land area lost by erosion.
7. Geotechnical reports pursuant to this section that address the need to prevent potential damage to a primary structure shall address the necessity for shoreline stabilization by estimating time frames and rates of erosion and report on the urgency associated with the specific situation. As a general matter, hard armoring solutions should not be authorized except when a report confirms that there is a significant possibility that such a structure will be damaged within three years as a result of shoreline erosion in the absence of such hard armoring measures, or where waiting until the need is that immediate would foreclose the opportunity to use measures that avoid impacts on ecological functions. Thus, where the geotechnical report confirms a need to prevent potential damage to a primary structure, but the need is not as immediate as the three years, that report may still be used to justify more immediate authorization to protect against erosion using soft measures.
8. When any structural shoreline stabilization measures are demonstrated to be necessary, pursuant to above provisions, the following shall apply:
 - i. Limit the size of stabilization measures to the minimum necessary. Use measures designed to assure no net loss of shoreline ecological functions. Soft approaches shall be used unless demonstrated not to be sufficient to protect primary structures, dwellings, and businesses.
 - ii. Ensure that publicly financed or subsidized shoreline erosion control measures do not permanently restrict appropriate public access to the shoreline except where such access is determined to be infeasible because of incompatible uses, safety, security, or harm to ecological functions. See public access provisions: WAC 173-26-221(4). Where feasible, incorporate ecological restoration and public access improvements into the project.
 - iii. Mitigate new erosion control measures, including replacement structures, on feeder bluffs or other actions that affect beach sediment-producing areas to avoid and, if that is not possible, to minimize adverse impacts to sediment conveyance systems. Where sediment

conveyance systems cross jurisdictional boundaries, local governments should coordinate shoreline management efforts. If beach erosion is threatening existing development, local governments should adopt master program provisions for a beach management district or other institutional mechanism to provide comprehensive mitigation for the adverse impacts of erosion control measures.

6) Violation of MICC 19.02.020(F) – Development standards

F. Lot coverage—Single-family dwellings.

1) **Applicability.** This section shall apply to the development of single-family dwellings including, but not limited to, the remodeling of existing single-family dwellings and construction of new single-family dwellings. This section does not apply to regulated improvements.

2) **Landscaping objective.**

- a. To ensure that landscape design reinforces the natural and wooded character of Mercer Island, complements the site, the architecture of site structures and paved areas, while maintaining the visual appearance of the neighborhood.
- b. To ensure that landscape design is based on a strong, unified, coherent, and aesthetically pleasing landscape concept.
- c. To ensure that landscape plantings, earth forms, and outdoor spaces are designed to provide a transition between each other and between the built and natural environment.
- d. To ensure suitable natural vegetation and landforms, particularly mature trees and topography, are preserved where feasible and integrated into the overall landscape design. Large trees and tree stands should be maintained in lieu of using new plantings.
- e. To ensure planting designs include a suitable combination of trees, shrubs, groundcovers, vines, and herbaceous material; include a combination of deciduous and evergreen plant material; emphasize native plant material; provide drought-tolerant species; and exclude invasive species.

3. **Lot coverage—Landscaping required.**

- a. **Minimum area required.** Development proposals for single-family dwellings shall comply with the following standards based on the net lot area:

Lot Slope	Maximum Lot Coverage (house, driving surfaces, and accessory buildings)	Required Landscaping Area
Less than 15%	40%	60%
15% to less than 30%	35%	65%
30% to 50%	30%	70%
Greater than 50% slope	20%	80%

b. Hardscape.

- i. A maximum of nine percent of the net lot area may consist of hardscape improvements including, but not limited to, walkways, decks, etc., and provided:(a)The hardscape for lots with a net lot area of 8,400 square feet or less may be the lesser of 755 square feet or 12 percent of the net lot area.
- ii. Hardscape improvements are also permitted in the maximum lot coverage area established in subsection (F)(3)(a) of this section.

c. Softscape and driveways.

- i. The required landscaping area in subsection (F)(3)(a) of this section shall consist of softscape improvements, except where used for hardscape improvements pursuant to subsection (F)(3)(b) of this section.
- ii. Driveways and other driving surfaces are prohibited within the

landscaping area.

For example, a flat lot with a net area of 10,000 square feet shall provide a minimum 6,000 square feet of landscaped area. Up to 900 square feet of the landscaped area may be used for a walkway, patio, or deck or other hardscape area. The remainder of the area shall be used for softscape improvements, such as landscaping, tree retention, etc.

- d. Development proposals for a new single-family home shall remove Japanese knotweed (*Polygonum cuspidatum*) and Regulated Class A, Regulated Class B, and Regulated Class C weeds identified on the King County Noxious Weed list, as amended, from required landscaping areas established pursuant to subsection (F)(3)(a) of this section. New landscaping associated with new single-family home shall not incorporate any weeds identified on the King County Noxious Weed list, as amended. Provided, that removal shall not be required if the removal will result in increased slope instability or risk of landslide or erosion.
- e. Allowed adjustments. A one-time reduction in required landscaping area and an increase in the maximum lot coverage are allowed, provided:
 - i. The total reduction in the required landscaping area shall not exceed five percentage points, and the total increase in the maximum lot coverage shall not exceed five percentage points; and
 - ii. The reduction in required landscaping area and increase in maximum lot coverage are associated with:
 - (a) A development proposal that will result in a single-story single-family dwelling with a wheelchair accessible entry path, and may also include a single-story accessory building; or
 - (b) A development proposal on a flag lot that, after optimizing driveway routing and minimizing driveway width, requires a driveway that occupies more than 25 percent of the otherwise allowed lot coverage area. The allowed reduction in the required landscaping area and increase in maximum lot coverage shall not exceed five percent, or the area of the driveway in excess of 25 percent of the lot coverage, whichever is less. For example, a development proposal with a driveway that occupies 27 percent of the otherwise allowed lot coverage may increase the total lot coverage by two percent; and
 - iii. A recorded notice on title, covenant, easement, or other documentation in a form approved by the city shall be required. The

within the code is a code violation.

- **On Monday January 15th, 2024**, CCO David Henderson reviewing the case file photos he had taken at the site, city permit records, aerial photographs and archived easement records for subject address, it was determined that the staircase leading down to the water from the main residence, having several landings and going down a steep slope from the uppermost deck to within 50ft of the shoreline (OHW), was done without permit sometime after the year 2000 and identified other recent repair work to the structure *was also recently completed without a permit and the structure appears to be located over a stormwater easement. Failure to obtain all required landuse and building permits in a critical area are violation(s) of city code as follows:*
 - **MICC 17.14.010(105.1)** - The person(s) responsible did not obtain the required land use permit prior to starting work, which constitutes a code violation.
 - **MICC 17.14.010(105.1)** - The person(s) responsible did not obtain the required building permit prior to starting work, which constitutes a code violation.
 - **MICC 19.07.160** - The person(s) responsible did not submit a letter from a licensed geotechnical engineer for city approval for work within a critical area as required by critical areas review 2, which is a code violation.
 - **MICC 19.07.160(F)(2)** – The person(s) responsible did not request or obtain a deviation or waiver from the city to do work on a site subject to the seasonal development limitation (SDL) which is a code violation.
 - **MICC 19.13.050(A) Shoreland development standards** – The person(s) responsible did not follow shoreline development standards for setbacks for structures greater than 30” above grade within 25’ setback and within critical area(s) as required which is a code violation.

The Responsible Person(s) are Ordered to Complete the Corrective Actions as Follows:

- 1) The responsible person(s) shall apply for all required landuse reviews and all required building permit(s). The compliance date for completion of this corrective action is Friday April 12th, 2024.
- 2) The responsible person(s) will have ninety (90) days to obtain all required permits once submittal of both a complete landuse application and complete building permit application have been accepted for review. The responsible person(s) shall obtain the required permits no later than Thursday July 11th, 2024.
- 3) The responsible person(s) shall complete all work and receive final city approval prior to Tuesday October 1st, 2024.

notice on title or other documentation shall describe the basis for the reduced landscaping area and increased lot coverage.

Facts Supporting Violation(s):

- **On Monday, December 4th, 2023**, City of Mercer Island staff responded to a resident requesting code compliance assistance with a question on construction of a retaining wall adjacent to Lake Washington. Compliance Officer (CCO) David Henderson was notified by city staff and started an investigation with limited information.
- **On Tuesday December 5th, 2023**, CCO David Henderson did a site visit and was unable to locate any violation or onsite workers. He performed additional property research and requested additional information from the requestor.
- **On Friday December 8th, 2023**, CCO David Henderson reviewed the case, and received additional clarifying information he had previously requested.
- **On Monday December 11th, 2023**, CCO David Henderson returned to the site and discovered work happening along the shoreline at the subject address, which he deemed a violation of code. Work included but not limited to construction of a fill landscape block retaining wall in a critical shoreline area and on a site known to have steep slope and other geotechnical hazards. Construction of an arbor, a wood retaining wall at the toe of the hillside, as well as around the base of what appeared to be an existing stair were all noted as recent work. **Failure to obtain all required landuse and building permits in a critical area violation(s) of city code as follows:**
 - **MICC 17.14.010(105.1)** - The person(s) responsible did not obtain the required land use permit prior to starting work, which constitutes a code violation.
 - **MICC 17.14.010(105.1)** - The person(s) responsible did not obtain the required building permit prior to starting work, which constitutes a code violation.
 - **MICC 19.07.160** - The person(s) responsible did not submit a letter from a licensed geotechnical engineer for city approval for work within a critical area as required by critical areas review 2, which is a code violation.
 - **MICC 19.07.160(F)(2)** – The person(s) responsible did not request or obtain a deviation or waiver from the city to do work on a site subject to the seasonal development limitation (SDL) which is a code violation.
 - **MICC 19.13.050(A) Shoreland development standards** – The person(s) responsible did not follow shoreline development standards for setbacks for structures greater than 30" above grade within critical area(s) as required which is a code violation.
 - **MICC 19.13.050(A) Shoreland development standards** – The person(s) responsible installed hardscape patio pavers that exceeds the allowed limit within a critical shoreline area located within 25 feet of a shoreline which is a code violation.
 - **MICC 19.02.020(F)** The person(s) responsible for installing additional hardscape on a lot that exceeds the allowable limit for the lot as defined

The compliance date for satisfactory resolution of all Corrective Actions above is **Tuesday October 1stth, 2024**. If the violation is not corrected on or before this date and this notice is not appealed, the determination is final, and penalties are due and additional daily penalties shall begin to accrue, pursuant to MICC 6.10.050, penalties for noncompliance with this Notice and Order shall be as follows:

MICC 6.10.050(D)(1)

D. Civil penalties.

1. Civil penalties. A civil penalty for violation of the terms and conditions of a notice of violation, stop work order or voluntary correction agreement shall be imposed at the rate of \$100.00 per day for each violation, accruing for every day after the compliance date listed in the notice of violation. Thirty days after the compliance date, the penalty will increase to a rate of \$250.00 per day for each violation. Sixty days after the compliance date, the penalty will increase to a rate of \$500.00 per day for each violation, up to a maximum total penalty of \$50,000.00 for each violation.

MICC 6.10.050(D)(2)

D. Civil penalties

2. Priority Violations. In addition to the penalties described in subsection (D)(1) of this section, any person that is responsible for a violation of the provisions of the following regulations will be subject to additional penalties. These penalties for priority violations, as described below, will be assessed one time and will not accrue daily.

Violation		Penalty
Ecological damage in violation of <u>Chapter 19.07</u> MICC		Up to \$25,000.00, plus the cost of remediation.
Failure to meet storm water, erosion control requirements in violation of <u>Chapter 15.09</u> MICC		Up to \$10,000.00, plus the cost of remediation.
Violation of stop work order or voluntary compliance agreement in violation of MICC <u>6.10.060</u> or <u>6.10.070</u>		Up to \$10,000.00.

Under MICC 6.10.050, the City may suspend, revoke, and/or place a hold on future permit applications and/or file a notice with the King County recorder’s office to notify the public of the presence of an unresolved Notice of Violation on the property if the penalty is not paid. Additionally, unpaid penalties will be sent to a collection agency for the purposes of collecting penalties and costs assessed pursuant to MICC 6.10.100 and RCW 19.16.500. The collection agency may add fees or interest charges to the original amount assigned to collections as allowed by law.

Appeal Procedure:

- Pursuant to MICC 6.10.050(B)(5) and MICC 6.10.090, you have the right to appeal this Notice of Violation & Civil Penalties before a hearing examiner. An appeal must be filed with the City Clerk and the appeal fee paid within 14 days of the service of this Notice. Failure to appeal within 14 days shall render this Notice a final determination that the conditions described therein existed and constitute a code violation, that assessed and accrued civil penalties are due, and that the named party or parties is liable as a person responsible. An Appeal form can be found at:
<https://www.mercerisland.gov/cpd/page/appeals>

If you would like to discuss the resolution of this code case or schedule a compliance inspection, please contact me by email at David.Henderson@mercergov.org. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

David Henderson

David Henderson
Code Compliance Officer
City of Mercer Island
Community Planning and Development