
CITY OF MERCER ISLAND

COMMUNITY PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

9611 SE 36TH STREET | MERCER ISLAND, WA 98040

PHONE: 206.275.7605 | www.mercergov.org



STAFF REPORT

CRITICAL AREA REVIEW 2

Project No.:	CAO25-023
Description:	A request for a Critical Area Review 2 for the construction of a new single-family residence with attached garage totaling 5,055 square feet on a lot containing geologically hazardous areas.
Applicant / Owner:	Jacob Young (Citizen Design) / Gill Investment Company LLC
Site Address:	9191 SE 64 th St, Mercer Island, WA 98040; Identified by King County Assessor tax parcel number 302405-9001.
Zoning District:	Single Family Residential (R-15)
Staff Contact:	Madelyn Nelson, Planner
Exhibits:	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Development Application, received by the City of Mercer Island on October 14, 2025.2. Revised Development Plan Set, dated October 14, 2025, and received March 6, 2026.3. Project Narrative, received October 14, 2025.4. Geotechnical Engineering Report prepared by PanGEO, Inc., dated August 27, 2025, and received October 14, 2025.5. Geotechnical Plan Review & Comment Response prepared by PanGEO, Inc., dated March 4, 2026, and received March 6, 2026.6. Wetland and Stream Reconnaissance prepared by Altman Oliver Associates, LLC, dated February 6, 2025, and received October 14, 20257. Bald Eagle Nest Assessment, dated January 14, 2026, received March 6, 2026.8. Disclosure and Notice on Title recorded with the King County Recorder's Office on January 30, 2026, under recording number 20260130000879.9. Hazard Report generated by the City of Mercer Island on April 20, 2026.10. Letter of Complete Application issued by the City of Mercer Island on October 30, 2025.11. Notice of Application, dated November 3, 2025.12. City of Mercer Island Review Letters<ol style="list-style-type: none">12.1. Review Letter 1, dated November 14, 202512.2. Review Letter 2, dated March 20, 2026

13. Applicant Response to City Review Letters
 - 13.1. Applicant Response to Review Letter 1, dated March 6, 2026
 - 13.2. Applicant Response to Review Letter 2, dated March 25, 2026
14. Public Comments
 - 14.1 Public Comment 1
 - 14.2 Public Comment 2
15. Applicant Response to Public Comments
16. Concurrent Review Request

INTRODUCTION

I. Project Description

The applicant has requested approval of a Critical Area Review 2 for the construction of a new single-family residence with attached garage totaling 5,055 square feet on a site containing geologically hazardous areas.

The proposal consists of the following components:

1. A request to construct a new single-family residence within geologically hazardous areas subject to the standards of Mercer Island City Code (MICC) 19.07.160 Environment.

II. Site Description and Context

1. The proposed activity is to occur at 9191 SE 64th St, Mercer Island, WA 98040. The site is designated Single Family Residential (zoned R-15). Adjacent properties are within the R-15 zone and contain residential uses. The subject site contains potential slide, steep slope, seismic, and erosion geologically hazardous areas. The Geotechnical Engineering Report prepared by PanGEO, Inc., confirmed erosion, landslide, seismic, and steep slope hazards were present on site (**Exhibit 4**). The Wetland and Stream Reconnaissance prepared by Altmann Oliver Associates, LLC (**Exhibit 6**) verified the absence of a stream mapped on-site to the northeast which was deemed nonexistent during review. The Wetland and Stream Reconnaissance prepared by Altmann Oliver Associates, LLC (**Exhibit 6**) verified the absence of any wetland on-site. The site lies within a mapped eagle nest buffer. The Bald Eagle Nest Assessment prepared by Altmann Oliver Associates, LLC, assessed the site of the mapped eagle nest and found no eagle nest or presence of eagles (**Exhibit 7**). These reports were prepared by ecologist John Altman, meeting the criteria for a qualified professional.

Findings of Fact & Conclusions of Law

III. Application Procedure

1. The application for a Critical Area Review 2 was received by the City of Mercer Island on October 14, 2025. The application was determined to be incomplete on October 28, 2025, resubmitted on October 30, 2025. The application was determined to be complete on October 30, 2025.
2. Under MICC 19.15.030, Table A, applications for Critical Area Review 2 must undergo Type III review. Type III reviews require notice of application (discussed below). A notice of decision is issued once the project review is complete.
3. The City of Mercer Island provided public notice of application for this Critical Area Review 2 Permit, as set forth in MICC 19.15.090. The comment period for the public notice period lasted for 30 days, from November 3 to November 29, 2025. The following methods were used for the public notice of application:

- 1) A mailing sent to neighboring property owners within 300 feet of the subject parcel.
- 2) A sign posted on the subject parcel.
- 3) A posting in the City of Mercer Island's weekly permit bulletin.

IV. State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA)

The proposal is categorically exempt from SEPA pursuant to WAC 197-11-800(1)(b)(i).

V. Consistency with the Critical Areas Code and Land Development Code

1. MICC 19.07.070 lists requirements for disclosure and notice on title. The applicant shall disclose to the city the presence of critical areas on the development proposal site and any mapped or identifiable critical areas within the distance equal to the largest potential required buffer applicable to the development proposal on the development proposal site.
 - a. The owner of any property containing critical areas and/or buffers on which a development proposal is submitted, except a public right-of-way or the site of a permanent public facility, shall file a notice approved by the city with the records and elections division of King County. The notice shall inform the public of the presence of critical areas, buffers and/or mitigation sites on the property, of the application of the city's critical areas code to the property and that limitations on actions in or affecting such critical areas and/or buffers may exist. The notice shall run with the land in perpetuity.
 - b. The applicant shall submit proof to the city that the notice has been recorded prior to approval of a development proposal for the property or, in the case of subdivisions, short subdivisions, and binding site plans, at or before recording of the final subdivision, short subdivision, or binding site plan.

Staff Analysis: A critical areas Disclosure and Notice on Title was provided on March 6, 2026. It was notarized on January 30, 2026. It was recorded with King County Assessor's office on January 30, 2026, under recording number 20260130000879 (**Exhibit 8**). The Notice informs the public of the presence of critical areas and proposed mitigation due to the proposed development; therefore, this requirement is met.

2. MICC 19.07.090 describes the purpose and procedures by which the city will review and authorize development and verify consistency with this chapter.
 - a. Critical Area Review 2. 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.
 - b. 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 application 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 III 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 on 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 III land use review.

Staff Analysis: The applicant submitted a Concurrent Review Request Form (**Exhibit 16**) requesting consolidation of the review of Critical Area Review 2 and construction permit review under Building Permit No. 2510-150. The application for a Critical Area Review 2 for the alteration of geologically hazardous areas has been submitted in concurrently with the construction permits for the proposed development; therefore, the review timing and sequence requirements have been met.

- 3. MICC 19.07.100 lists requirements for mitigation sequencing. An applicant for a development proposal or activity shall implement the following sequential measures, listed below in order of preference, to avoid, minimize, and mitigate impacts to environmentally critical areas and associated buffers. Applicants shall document how each measure has been addressed before considering and incorporating the next measure in the sequence:
 - a. Avoiding the impact altogether by not taking a certain action or parts of an action. The applicant shall consider reasonable, affirmative steps and make best efforts to avoid critical area impacts. However, avoidance shall not be construed to mean mandatory withdrawal or denial of the development proposal or activity if the proposal or activity is an allowed, permitted, or conditional use in this title. In determining the extent to which the proposal should be redesigned to avoid the impact, the code official may consider the purpose, effectiveness, engineering feasibility, commercial availability of technology, best management practices, safety and cost of the proposal and identified changes to the proposal. Development proposals should seek to avoid, minimize and mitigate overall impacts based on the functions and values of all of the relevant critical areas and based on the recommendations of a critical area study. If impacts cannot be avoided through redesign, use of a setback deviation pursuant to section 19.06.110(C), or because of site conditions or project requirements, the applicant shall then proceed with the sequence of steps in subsections B through E of this section;
 - b. Minimizing impacts by limiting the degree or magnitude of the action and its implementation, using a setback deviation pursuant to section 19.06.110(C), using appropriate technology, or by taking affirmative steps to avoid or reduce impacts;
 - c. Rectifying the impact by repairing, rehabilitating, or restoring the affected environment;
 - d. Reducing or eliminating the impact over time by preservation and maintenance operations during the life of the action;
 - e. Compensating for the impact by replacing, enhancing, or providing substitute resources or environments; and/or
 - f. Monitoring the impact and taking appropriate corrective measures to maintain the integrity of compensating measures.

Staff Analysis: The Geotechnical Plan Review & Comment Response (**Exhibit 5**) prepared by PanGEO, Inc., provides mitigation sequencing for the proposed development. The entire

development site is encumbered by potential slide, steep slope, seismic, and erosion (**Exhibit 9**), therefore avoiding the impact altogether is not possible. The residence was situated along the upper portion of a topographic ridge to minimize the impact to the steep slopes at the site, and a soldier pile wall will reduce the area of excavation and disturbance into the steep slope area. All disturbed areas of the site adjacent to the new development will be repaired and rehabilitated with appropriate vegetation. The proposed retaining walls and structures have been designed to resist the code level earthquake with a return interval of 2,475 years. Furthermore, through the use of soldier piles, the proposed development increases the stability of the sloping portion of the property. Thus, the proposed plan meets the requirement for mitigation sequencing.

4. MICC 19.07.110 lists requirements for a critical area study. A critical area study is required when a development proposal will result in an alteration to one or more critical area buffers or when required to determine the potential impact to a critical area. The critical area study may be waived or modified if the applicant demonstrates that the development proposal will not have an impact on the critical area or its buffer in a manner contrary to the purposes and requirements of this chapter.

Staff Analysis: The Geotechnical Engineering Report prepared by PanGEO, Inc., (**Exhibit 4**) satisfies the requirements of the critical area study per MICC 19.07.110 and mitigation sequencing per MICC 19.07.100.; therefore, this requirement is met.

5. MICC 19.07.160 lists standards for development on sites containing geologically hazardous areas.

- A. 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.

Staff Analysis: The subject property contains potential landslide, steep slope, erosion, and seismic hazard areas (**Exhibit 9**).

- B. 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.

Staff Analysis: The Geotechnical Engineering Report prepared by PanGEO, Inc., (**Exhibit 4**), and the Geotechnical Plan Review & Comment Response (**Exhibit 5**) prepared by PanGEO, Inc., finds that the proposal effectively mitigates the risks of the hazard. The

study includes recommendations for appropriate design and development measures to mitigate the hazards. The Geotechnical Plan Review & Comment Response (**Exhibit 5**) prepared by PanGEO Inc., includes a post-design memorandum that concludes that the proposed development is consistent with the recommendations in the Geotechnical Report.

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 hardscape prior to final inspection.

Staff Analysis: The Geotechnical Engineering Report prepared by PanGEO, Inc., (**Exhibit 4**) finds that the proposed alterations to the potential landslide and seismic hazard areas will not adversely impact other critical areas, the subject property, or adjacent properties.

3. Alteration of landslide hazard areas, seismic hazard areas and associated buffers may occur if the conditions listed in subsection (B)(2) of this section are satisfied and the geotechnical professional provides a statement of risk matching one of the following:
 - a. An evaluation of site-specific subsurface conditions demonstrates that the proposed development is not located in a landslide hazard area or seismic hazard area;
 - b. The landslide hazard area or seismic hazard area will be modified or the development has been designed so that the risk to the site and adjacent property is eliminated or mitigated such that the site is determined to be safe;
 - c. Construction practices are proposed for the alteration that would render the development as safe as if it were not located in a geologically hazardous area and do not adversely impact adjacent properties; or
 - d. The development is so minor as not to pose a threat to the public health, safety and welfare.

Staff Analysis: The Geotechnical Plan Review & Comment Response prepared by PanGEO, Inc., (**Exhibit 5**) provides a statement of risk matching statement (a) and (b) above, provided the project is constructed per the approved plans; therefore, this requirement is met.

- C. Development is allowed within landslide hazard areas and associated buffers, when the following standards are met:
 1. A critical area study shall be required for any alteration of a landslide hazard area or associated buffer;
 2. Buffers shall be applied as follows. When more than one condition applies to a site, the largest buffer shall be applied:

- a. Buffer widths shall be equal to the height of a steep slope, but not more than 75 feet, and applied to the top and toe of slopes;
- b. Shallow landslide hazard areas shall have minimum 25-foot buffers applied in all directions; and
- c. Deep-seated landslide hazard areas shall have 75-foot buffers applied in all directions.

Staff Analysis: The Geotechnical Engineering Report prepared by PanGEO, Inc., (**Exhibit 4**) finds that the proposed development, as currently planned, is feasible from a geotechnical engineering standpoint and will not adversely affect the overall stability of the site or adjacent properties. Per the Geotechnical report, PanGEO stated, “Based on our reconnaissance and our understanding of subsurface conditions at the site, in our opinion a large, deep-seated type of slope failure is unlikely on the subject property. In our opinion, relatively shallow landslides at the site have the potential to occur due to the steep topography.” The subject property is entirely encumbered by a potential landslide hazard area; therefore, buffers cannot be applied from the edge of the landslide hazard area.

D. When development is proposed within a seismic hazard area:

- 1. A critical area study shall be required and shall include an evaluation by a qualified professional for seismic engineering and design, a determination of the magnitude of seismic settling that could occur during a seismic event, and a demonstration that the risk associated with the proposed alteration is within acceptable limits or that appropriate construction methods are provided to mitigate the risk of seismic settlement such that there will be no significant impact to life, health, safety, and property.
- 2. Seismic hazard areas shall be identified by a qualified professional who references and interprets information in the U.S. Geological Survey Active Faults Database, performs on-site evaluations, or applies other techniques according to best available science.
- 3. When development is proposed on a site with an active fault, the follow provisions shall apply:
 - a. A 50-foot minimum buffer shall be applied from latest Quaternary, Holocene, or historical fault rupture traces as identified by the United States Geological Survey or Washington Geological Survey map databases or by site investigations by licensed geologic professionals with specialized knowledge of fault trenching studies; or
 - b. Mitigation sequencing shall be incorporated into the development proposal as recommended based on geotechnical analysis by a qualified professional to prevent increased risk of harm to life and/or property.

Staff Analysis: The Geotechnical Engineering Report prepared by PanGEO, Inc., (**Exhibit 4**) reported the site is underlain by primarily dense silty sand, and a static groundwater level was not encountered in the test borings. Based on these conditions, the liquefaction potential of the soils underlying the site is low, and design considerations related to soil liquefaction are not necessary for this project. However, shallow seismic-induced land sliding were determined to be possible during an earthquake. Special design considerations associated with seismic landslide are found in section 7.1 of the Geotechnical Report.

E. When development is proposed within an erosion hazard area:

1. All development proposals shall demonstrate compliance with chapter 15.09, storm water management program.
2. No development or activity within an erosion hazard area may create a net increase in geological instability on or off site.

Staff Analysis: The Geotechnical Engineering Report prepared by PanGEO, Inc., (**Exhibit 4**) found a moderate susceptibility to erosion on-site. The Geotechnical Report reported the erosion hazards at the site can be effectively mitigated with an appropriate erosion and sediment control plan, including, but not limited to, installing a silt fence at the construction perimeter, placing quarry spalls or hay bales at the disturbed and high traffic areas, covering stockpiled soil or cut slopes with plastic sheets, constructing a temporary drainage pond, if needed, to control surface runoff and trap sediment, and by maintaining a stabilized construction entrance. Permanent erosion control measures were recommended to be applied to the disturbed areas of the site as soon as feasible. Thus, the proposed development was found to not create a net increase in geological instability on or off site.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

1. The project proposal shall be in substantial conformance with **Exhibit 2** and all applicable development standards contained within Mercer Island City Code (MICC) Chapter 19.07.
2. The applicant is responsible for documenting any required changes in the project proposal due to conditions imposed by any applicable local, state and federal government agencies.
3. Construction or substantial progress toward construction of a development for which a permit has been granted must be undertaken within three years after the approval of the permit or the permit shall terminate. The code official shall determine if substantial progress has been made.
4. Landscaping of all disturbed areas outside of building footprints and installation of hardscape is required prior to final inspection of the associated building permit.

DEVELOPMENT REGULATION COMPLIANCE – DISCLOSURE

1. The applicant is responsible for obtaining any required permits or approvals from the appropriate Local, State, and Federal Agencies.
2. All required permits must be obtained prior to the commencement of construction.

DECISION

Based upon the above noted Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, Critical Area Review 2 Permit application **CAO25-023**, as depicted in **Exhibit 2**, is hereby **APPROVED**. This decision is final, unless appealed in writing consistent with adopted appeal procedures, MICC 19.15.130(A), and all other applicable appeal regulations.

Approved this 27 day of April, 2026

Madelyn Nelson

Madelyn Nelson
Planner
Community Planning & Development

