

## CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION

SOUTH COAST AREA  
 45 W. BROADWAY, STE. 380  
 P.O. BOX 1450  
 LONG BEACH, CA 90802-4416  
 (310) 590-5071

Filed: July 30, 1996  
 49th Day: September 17, 1996  
 180th Day: January 26, 1997  
 Staff: John T. Auyong *John*  
 Staff Report: October 24, 1996  
 Hearing Date: November 12-15, 1996  
 Commission Action:

STAFF REPORT: PERMIT EXTENSION REQUEST

**APPLICATION NO.:** 5-92-188E3

**APPLICANT:** Monarch Bay Resort, Inc. **AGENT:** Melissa Holmes

**PROJECT LOCATION:** Located immediately northeast of the intersection of Pacific Coast Highway & Crown Valley Parkway, and west of the Salt Creek Regional Trail.

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** Construction of 111 attached residential units on 14.3 acres. Units will be clustered into 16 two story buildings and 4 three story buildings. For 57 of the units the floor area ranges from 1400 to 2700 square feet. The floor area of 40 units ranges from 2300 to 2900 square feet. Building height of the 3 story buildings is 41 feet. The floor areas of the remaining 14 units would range from 2,750 square feet to 3,200 square feet. Height for the 2 story buildings will be 28 feet. The 2 story units are located on south side of the site near Pacific Coast Highway. The 3 story units are located on the north side of the site. The architectural theme will mimic the character of the Tuscan area of Italy. Grading will consist of approximately 85,000 cubic yards of cut and 33,000 cubic yards of fill.

**LOCAL APPROVALS RECEIVED:** Site Development Permit SDP 91-05, Planning Commission Resolution 92-05-19-34, Vesting Tentative Tract Map VTTM 14605

**SUBSTANTIVE FILE DOCUMENTS:** Coastal Development Permits (including extensions and amendments) 5-92-157, 5-92-168, 5-92-186, 5-92-188, 5-96-006 (Monarch Bay Resort, Inc.); Permit P-79-5539 (AVCO); Monarch Beach Resort Final Specific Plan; City of Dana Point LCP 1-96 Amendment Request

SUMMARY OF STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the Commission find that the extension is consistent with the Coastal Act and allow the permit to be extended for another one-year term.

PROCEDURAL NOTE.

The Commission's regulations provide that permit extension requests shall be reported to the Commission if:

- 1) The Executive Director determines that due to changed circumstances the proposed development may not be consistent with the Coastal Act, or
- 2) Objection is made to the Executive Director's determination of consistency with the Coastal Act.

As required by Section 13169(a)(1), the Executive Director mailed notice of this determination to interested parties on August 6, 1996. Section 13169(a)(1) provides further that if no written objection is received within ten (10) working days of publishing notice, the determination of consistency shall be conclusive.

The 10 working day period ended on August 20, 1996. On August 12, 1996 and August 14, 1996, written objections were received (see Exhibit B). Therefore, pursuant to Section 13169(a)(2) of the California Code of Regulations, this extension request must be reported to the Commission.

Further, Section 13169(a)(2) provides that if three (3) Commissioners object to an extension request on the grounds that the proposed development may not be consistent with the Coastal Act, the application shall be set for a full hearing as though it were a new application. If three objections are not received, the permit will be extended for an additional one-year period.

#### I. STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Commission not object to the Executive Director's decision to extend the permit for another year on the grounds that there are no changed circumstances which could cause the project, as originally approved, to be inconsistent with the Chapter 3 policies of the Coastal Act.

#### II. FINDINGS AND DECLARATIONS

##### A. Project Description/History

The applicant is requesting a one year extension of coastal development permit 5-92-188. The subject extension request is the applicant's third for the subject permit (See Exhibit D for previous extensions). The subject site is located immediately northeast of the intersection of Pacific Coast Highway & Crown Valley Parkway, and west of the Salt Creek Regional Trail.

The permit was originally approved for the construction of 97 attached residential units and a 30,000 square foot golf clubhouse including grill and lounge on 14.3 acres. Units were to be clustered into 11 two story "mansion penthouse" buildings and 4 three story "luxury terrace" buildings. For the 57 units in the "luxury terrace" buildings, the floor area would range from 1400 to 2700 square feet. The floor area of the 40 units in the "mansion penthouse" buildings would range from 2300 to 2900 square feet. The building height of the 3-story "luxury terrace" buildings would 41 feet. Height for the 2-story "mansion penthouse" buildings would be 28 feet. The architectural theme would mimic the character of the Tuscan area of Italy. Grading would consist of approximately 85,000 cubic yards of cut and 33,000 cubic yards of fill. The 2-story units would be located on south side of the site near Pacific Coast Highway. The 3-story units would be located on the north side of the site.

The subject permit approved residential development which is one component of a larger mixed-use development project including improvements to Sea Terrace Park, construction of a new hotel, and construction of residential units (See Exhibit F). The Commission approved the park improvements under coastal development permit 5-92-157, the hotel under coastal development permit 5-92-168, and the residential construction under coastal development permits 5-92-186 and 5-92-188 (the subject permit of this extension request).

On March 14, 1996, the Commission approved a new permit 5-96-006 and amendments to the subject permit and permit 5-92-168 to switch the location of the proposed golf clubhouse on the subject site with residential units at the hotel site. Specifically, the amendment to the subject permit deleted the proposed golf clubhouse and replaced it with 14 residential units (See Exhibit E). However, the amount of grading would not change as a result of this amendment. Permit amendment 5-92-168A deleted 14 residential units from the hotel site. The 14 residential units deleted from the hotel site were replaced with the golf clubhouse which was approved by permit 5-96-006.

As a result, the configurations of the residential units approved by the subject permit changed somewhat with the amendment approved on March 14, 1996 (See Exhibit E). The four 3-story "luxury terrace" buildings would remain unchanged in their same location. However, instead of 11 "mansion penthouse" buildings, there would now be 8 "mansion penthouse" buildings. There would also now be 8 new "mansion villa" buildings. The units in these buildings would be 2-story and range in size from 2,750 square feet to 3,200 square feet. The 2-story "mansion villa" buildings would be similar to the "mansion villa" buildings proposed at the hotel site under permit 5-92-168.

The proposed project was originally known as Clubhouse Village South. The subject site is located westerly of the existing Links at Monarch Beach golf course. The subject site is located adjacent to and southernly of the applicant's related development approved by coastal development permit 5-92-186. Permit 5-92-186 approved residential development known as Clubhouse Village North. However, with the relocation of the golf clubhouse as described above, the clubhouse which would lend it's name to the proposed development would no longer exist nearby. Therefore, the proposed development is now known as Hillside Village South. The adjacent development approved under permit 5-92-186 is now known as Hillside Village North.

## B. Analysis of Objections to the Extension Request

Commission staff received two letters of objection to the requested permit extension (See Exhibit B). The objections raised by the letters are discussed below.

### 1. Standard of Review

The criteria stated in the California Code of Regulations (Section 13169) for extending a coastal development permit is the determination of whether there area any changed circumstances which would affect the consistency of the

proposed development with the Coastal Act. In this case, neither objector has specified any changed circumstances that could affect the consistency of the proposed development with the Coastal Act.

There have been other changed circumstances in the form of the expiration of coastal development permit 5-92-157. However, as discussed later in this report, the expiration of permit 5-92-157 does not constitute a changed circumstance which would affect the consistency of the proposed development with the Coastal Act.

## 2. Time-Shares

In his letter received by the Coastal Commission on August 12, 1996, Marek B. Lepkowski ("objector") objects to extending this permit and permit 5-92-186E3 on the grounds that the permits would allow the applicant ". . . to build over 150 'time share' units (read hotel) in 3 story buildings." (see Exhibit B) Between the 111 units approved under the subject permit as amended and the 55 units approved under permit 5-92-186, the total residential units are 166, approximately the same number as the 150 units mentioned by the objector.

The approved units are not time-share, hotel, or other visitor-serving units as proposed by the applicant. They are residential dwelling units. The applicant has not filed a permit amendment application requesting that the approved units be converted to time-share or hotel units. Therefore, the objection does not raise a changed circumstance. Thus, the Commission finds that the objection does not constitute a changed circumstance which would cause the proposed development to be inconsistent with the Chapter 3 policies of the Coastal Act.

## 3. Phasing Plan

### a. Objection Raised

In his August 12, 1996 letter to Coastal Commission staff, Mr. P.L. Jim Schlegel ("objector") objects to the extension of the subject permit (See Exhibit B). The objector indicates that the City of Dana Point's and Coastal Commission's approval of the subject permit was ". . . contingent upon construction of their planned hotel before any residential real estate development. Inasmuch as they are apparently NOT requesting an extension on the hotel permit, the consideration of these two parcels is mute [sic]."

The subject permit approved residential development which is one component of a larger mixed-use development project including improvements to Sea Terrace Park, construction of a new hotel, and construction of residential units. The Commission approved the park improvements under coastal development permit 5-92-157, the hotel under coastal development permit 5-92-168, and the residential construction under coastal development permits 5-92-186 and 5-92-188 (the subject permit of this extension request).

The City of Dana Point prepared the Monarch Beach Resort Final Specific Plan ("Specific Plan") to address these developments. The Specific Plan requires development to be phased so that the construction of the park improvements approved by coastal development permit 5-92-157 occurs first, the applicant's proposed hotel approved by coastal development permit 5-92-168 occurs second, and lastly the applicant's proposed residential areas approved under coastal development permits 5-92-186 and the subject permit occurs last. This phasing requirement is consistent with Section 30222 of the Coastal Act which gives priority to the development of visitor-serving commercial uses, such as a hotel, over general residential uses. The Specific Plan was not certified as part of the City's local coastal program ("LCP"). However, the Commission imposed on all hotel and residential development permits a special condition requiring adherence to a phasing plan (see Exhibit C, Page 4). This phasing plan was modeled on the Specific Plan's phasing requirements which implements Section 30222 of the Coastal Act.

The objector is concerned that the applicant may be trying to side-step the requirement to build the hotel prior to the residential units, as required by the Specific Plan's phasing requirements and the subject permit's special conditions of approval. In fact, however, the hotel permit was extended by the Executive Director on August 7, 1996. No objections were received and the extension became final on August 20, 1996. Further, the permittee has not submitted a permit amendment request to delete the special condition requiring adherence to the Specific Plan's phasing requirements. The permittee has not given Commission staff any indication that the development approved under the subject permit would proceed inconsistent with the phasing requirements of the permit.

The phasing plan emphasizes public access and recreation opportunities, and gave preference to visitor serving commercial uses (in the form of the hotel) over private residential uses, consistent with Section 30222. The Commission found the proposed residential development, as conditioned to follow the phasing plan, to be consistent with the Chapter 3 policies of the Coastal Act. Since there has been no change to or elimination of the special condition of approval requiring adherence to phasing requirements, and the hotel permit 5-92-168 has been extended, the Commission finds that the objection raised does not constitute a changed circumstance which would cause the proposed project, as conditioned, to be inconsistent with the Chapter 3 policies of the Coastal Act.

b. Expiration of Coastal Development Permit 5-92-157 for Park Improvements

Coastal development permit 5-92-157 expired on August 11, 1996. The permit was for proposed "Phase II" improvements to 16.74-acres of the public Sea Terrace Community Park in the City of Dana Point. The proposed improvements included trails, landscaping, restrooms, bike racks, amphitheater, tot lot, 80 parking spaces, picnic areas, a maintenance building, signage, and 180,000 cubic yards of grading (50,000 cubic yards of cut and 130,000 cubic yards of fill).

Permit 5-92-157 is linked to the subject permit through the subject permit's phasing plan special condition. As described above, the subject permit contains a special condition which requires adherence to a phasing plan which requires the construction of the park improvements approved by coastal development permit 5-92-157 first, the applicant's proposed hotel approved by coastal development permit 5-92-168 second, and lastly the applicant's proposed residential areas approved under both coastal development permit 5-92-186 and the subject permit.


With the expiration of permit 5-92-157, there is no longer a valid approval for the proposed park improvements. The park improvements must be constructed before the permittee can construct the residential units. The expiration of the park permit 5-92-157, however, does not absolutely preclude the possibility of construction of the park improvements. The City can always reapply to the Coastal Commission, or to itself after certification of the LCP for this area, for another permit for the park improvements. The expiration of the park permit suggests that there may be delays in its construction that could result in delays of construction of the hotel and residential units. However, the existence of the permit did not guarantee when the park improvements would be constructed or even that they would be constructed.

In addition, there is no evidence that the City intends not to go forward with the park improvements. The permittee has paid a performance bond to the City of Dana Point which is being held in an account earmarked for the construction of the Sea Terrace Park improvements. Further, the City has submitted the Specific Plan for certification as part of LCP amendment request 1-96. The phasing plan and the park improvements are part of the Specific Plan as submitted. If the Specific Plan is effectively certified with the phasing plan, then the standard of review for future coastal development permits in this area will be the certified LCP, including the Specific Plan and its phasing requirements.

Therefore, the expiration of permit 5-92-157 does not constitute a changed circumstance which would cause the approved project, as conditioned, to be inconsistent with the Chapter 3 policies of the Coastal Act.

### C. Conclusion

Therefore, the Commission finds that the permit extension should be granted because there are no changed circumstances which would cause the proposed development as conditioned to be inconsistent with Chapter 3 of the Coastal Act.



site

OCEAN

PACIFIC

THREE ARCH BAY

5-92-188 E3  
COASTAL COMMISSION  
VICINITY MAP

EXHIBIT # A

PAGE 1 OF 1

NEARBY MAP COMMUNITY STREETS  
ALSO NUMBER AS INDICATED BY OR

- 1 GREEN LANTERN CT
- 2 PALM BEACH DR
- 3 COASTAL DR
- 4 OCEAN DR
- 5 STAR LINE DR
- 6 STAR LINE DR
- 7 STAR LINE DR
- 8 STAR LINE DR
- 9 STAR LINE DR
- 10 STAR LINE DR
- 11 STAR LINE DR
- 12 STAR LINE DR
- 13 STAR LINE DR
- 14 STAR LINE DR
- 15 STAR LINE DR
- 16 STAR LINE DR
- 17 STAR LINE DR
- 18 STAR LINE DR
- 19 STAR LINE DR
- 20 STAR LINE DR

SEE V/ 61

- 1 PALM BEACH DR
- 2 PALM BEACH DR
- 3 PALM BEACH DR
- 4 PALM BEACH DR
- 5 PALM BEACH DR
- 6 PALM BEACH DR
- 7 PALM BEACH DR
- 8 PALM BEACH DR
- 9 PALM BEACH DR
- 10 PALM BEACH DR

SEE V/ 62

- 1 PALM BEACH DR
- 2 PALM BEACH DR
- 3 PALM BEACH DR
- 4 PALM BEACH DR
- 5 PALM BEACH DR
- 6 PALM BEACH DR
- 7 PALM BEACH DR
- 8 PALM BEACH DR
- 9 PALM BEACH DR
- 10 PALM BEACH DR

SEE V/ 63

- 1 PALM BEACH DR
- 2 PALM BEACH DR
- 3 PALM BEACH DR
- 4 PALM BEACH DR
- 5 PALM BEACH DR
- 6 PALM BEACH DR
- 7 PALM BEACH DR
- 8 PALM BEACH DR
- 9 PALM BEACH DR
- 10 PALM BEACH DR

SEE V/ 64

- 1 PALM BEACH DR
- 2 PALM BEACH DR
- 3 PALM BEACH DR
- 4 PALM BEACH DR
- 5 PALM BEACH DR
- 6 PALM BEACH DR
- 7 PALM BEACH DR
- 8 PALM BEACH DR
- 9 PALM BEACH DR
- 10 PALM BEACH DR

SEE V/ 65

- 1 PALM BEACH DR
- 2 PALM BEACH DR
- 3 PALM BEACH DR
- 4 PALM BEACH DR
- 5 PALM BEACH DR
- 6 PALM BEACH DR
- 7 PALM BEACH DR
- 8 PALM BEACH DR
- 9 PALM BEACH DR
- 10 PALM BEACH DR

Marek B. LEPKOWSKI  
23268 Atlantis Way  
Dana Point

RECEIVED  
5-92-186E3

AUG 12 1996

CALIFORNIA  
COASTAL COMMISSION  
SOUTH COAST DISTRICT

5-92-188E3

California Coastal Commission  
PO Box 1450  
Long Beach  
Att J.T. Anyong

Re -  
Extension of  
permit 5-92-186

COASTAL COMMISSION 5-92-188E3  
objection letters

EXHIBIT # B

PAGE 1 OF 2

Dear Sir

I categorically object giving  
-extending permit to Monarch Bay  
Resort which will allow them to  
build over 150 "time share" units  
(read hotel) in 3 story buildings.  
I demand hearing in this respect  
Sincerely

M. Lepkowski

P. L. Jim Schlegel Jr.

P.O. Box 3367  
Princeville, Hi. 96722  
808-826-6434

23288 P  
Monarch B.  
714-246-9000

RECEIVED

John T. Auyong  
Coastal Program Analyst  
CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION  
South Coast Area  
245 W. Broadway, Ste. 380  
P.O.Box 1450  
Long Beach, CA 90802-4416

AUG 14 1996  
CALIFORNIA  
COASTAL COMMISSION  
SOUTH COAST DISTRICT

12 August 1996

Dear Sir:

7464F & 7465F


As an adjacent homeowner to the property in question I am in receipt of two of your 'Notices of Extension Requests for Coastal Development Permit' for Monarch Bay Resort, Inc., dated 6th & 7th of August 1996.

Monarch Bay Resort is wholly owned by a Japanese company which also owns the Princeville Development Corp., Inc on the island of Kauai, Hawaii where my other home is situated. This company has a long history of disregarding local development requirements in both locations, to wit:

The City of Dana Point's approval and perhaps the Coastal Commission's as well, were contingent upon construction of their planned hotel before any residential real estate development. Inasmuch as they are apparently NOT requesting an extension on the hotel permit, the consideration of these two parcels is mute.

I strongly object to foreign companies attempting to gain special approval without fulfilling their agreed to obligations. On the other hand, if they proceed as originally approved, I will be a supporter.

Respectfully,



P.L. Jim Schlegel

5-92-188E3

COASTAL COMMISSION  
Objection Letters

EXHIBIT # B  
PAGE 2 OF 2

CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION

SOUTH COAST AREA

345 W. BROADWAY, STE. 380

P.O. BOX 1480

LONG BEACH, CA 90802-4416

(310) 390-8071

Page 1 of 6

Date: August 19, 1992

Permit Application No. 5-92-188



NOTICE OF INTENT TO ISSUE PERMIT

On August 11, 1992, the California Coastal Commission granted to MONARCH BAY RESORT INC. Permit 5-92-188, subject to the attached conditions, for development consisting of:

The construction of 97 attached residential units and a 30,000 square foot golf clubhouse including grill and lounge on 14.3 acres. This development is part of the Monarch Bay Resort project. The units will be clustered into 20 two story buildings and 4 three story buildings. For 57 of the units, the floor area ranges from 1,400 to 2,700 square feet. The floor area of the remaining 40 units ranges from 2,300 to 2,900 square feet. Overall building height of the three story building height is 41 feet. For the two story structures overall height will be 28 feet. The two story units are located on the southern portion of the site near the Pacific Coast Highway. The four story projects are located in the northern portion of the site. The architectural theme will mimic the character of the Tuscan region of Italy. Grading will consist of approximately 85,000 cubic yards of cut and 33,000 cubic yards of fill. Application 5-92-186 is for a similar project, Clubhouse Village North.

more specifically described in the application file in the Commission offices.

The development is within the coastal zone in Orange County at Immediately northeast of the intersectin of the Pacific Coast Hwy., & Crown Valley Parkway, and west of the Salt Creek Regional Trail.

The actual development permit is being held in the Commission office until fulfillment of the Special Conditions imposed by the Commission. Once these conditions have been fulfilled, the permit will be issued. For your information, all the imposed conditions are attached.

Issued on behalf of the California Coastal Commission on August 11, 1992.

PETER DOUGLAS  
Executive Director

By: [Signature]

Title: Staff Analyst

5-92-188E3  
file copy  
COASTAL COMMISSION  
Original "Notice of Intent"  
EXHIBIT # C  
PAGE 1 OF 6

ACKNOWLEDGMENT:

The undersigned permittee acknowledges receipt of this notice of the California Coastal Commission determination on Permit No. 5-92-188, and fully understands its contents, including all conditions imposed.

\_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_ Permittee \_\_\_\_\_

Please sign and return one copy of this form to the Commission office at the above address.

5-92-188E3  
COASTAL COMMISSION  
Original Notice of Intent to Issue Permit  
EXHIBIT # C  
PAGE 2 OF 6

**COASTAL COMMISSION**

5-92-188E3

**NOTICE OF INTENT TO ISSUE PERMIT**EXHIBIT # CPAGE 3 OF 6Permit Application No. Page 3 of 6  
5-92-188**STANDARD CONDITIONS:**

1. **Notice of Receipt and Acknowledgment.** The permit is not valid and development shall not commence until a copy of the permit, signed by the permittee or authorized agent, acknowledging receipt of the permit and acceptance of the terms and conditions, is returned to the Commission office.
2. **Expiration.** If development has not commenced, the permit will expire two years from the date on which the Commission voted on the application. Development shall be pursued in a diligent manner and completed in a reasonable period of time. Application for extension of the permit must be made prior to the expiration date.
3. **Compliance.** All development must occur in strict compliance with the proposal as set forth in the application for permit, subject to any special conditions set forth below. Any deviation from the approved plans must be reviewed and approved by the staff and may require Commission approval.
4. **Interpretation.** Any questions of intent or interpretation of any condition will be resolved by the Executive Director or the Commission.
5. **Inspections.** The Commission staff shall be allowed to inspect the site and the project during its development, subject to 24-hour advance notice.
6. **Assignment.** The permit may be assigned to any qualified person, provided assignee files with the Commission an affidavit, accepting all terms and conditions of the permit.
7. **Terms and Conditions Run with the Land.** These terms and conditions shall be perpetual, and it is the intention of the Commission and the permittee to bind all future owners and possessors of the subject property to the terms and conditions.

**SPECIAL CONDITIONS:****1. Coastal Access Fund**

Prior to issuance of the coastal development permit, the applicant shall pay a fee of \$545.86 in 1992 dollars (based on the original fee of \$275 in 1979 dollars adjusted according to increases in the Consumer Price Index - U.S. City Average) for each new residential unit. No fee shall be required for each "affordable" unit that is part of an affordable housing program. The fee shall be in renewable Certificates of Deposit, principal and interest payable for recreation and coastal transit or at the direction of the Executive Director of the California Coastal Commission or until such time a Coastal Access Program is established and administered by a separate legal entity. The Certificates of Deposit shall be placed in the possession of the California Coastal Commission for safekeeping.

Upon the execution of a binding legal agreement between the agency implementing and administering the Coastal Access Program and the Coastal Commission and Coastal Conservancy which specifies the limitation on the use of the funds for the provision of coastal recreational transit services or other coastal access purposes in Orange County, the Certificates of Deposit shall then be transferred to that agency for use in implementing the Coastal Access Program.

## 2. Affordable Housing

Prior to issuance of the coastal development permit the applicant will show evidence, subject to the review and approval of the Executive Director that he has complied with the recorded agreement to provide affordable housing pursuant to the Low-Cost and Moderate-Cost Housing condition of the the "Master Permit" P-79-5539. The applicant may submit a permit amendment to propose an alternative method of complying with the affordable housing requirements.

## 3. Phased Development.

# PHASING

Prior to issuance of the coastal development permit, the applicant shall submit to the Executive Director for review and approval a written agreement for recording the following:

Development shall be phased and shall comply with the phasing plan of the Monarch Beach Resort Final Specific Plan. Highest development priority shall be given to public open space uses, parks, trails, and public roads. Second priority shall be given to the hotel, tram, and golf clubhouse. Any changes to the phased development plan shall require the approval of the Executive Director. The agreement shall also include the development of a public beach house consistent with local and Coastal Commission approvals.

## 4. Parking.

Prior to issuance of this permit, the applicant shall submit to the Executive Director, for review and approval a deed restriction which contains the following public parking provisions: The parking spaces for the golf clubhouse shall be available to the general public. The hourly parking fee or total daily fee, for general public use, shall not be greater than the fee charged at the nearest State Beach Park parking facility.

Prior to issuance of the coastal development permit, the applicant shall submit to the Executive Director for review and approval a monitoring plan to gather parking and vehicle occupancy data for the hotel and golf clubhouse. The purpose of this study will be to evaluate the adequacy of parking for both the hotel and golf clubhouse. The monitoring program will collect data for two years, will commence when both the hotel and golf clubhouse are operational, and the applicant shall report annually the results of the study. Should parking prove to be deficient the applicant, through the permit amendment process, shall provide additional onsite parking.

5-92-188E3 Exhibit C p. 4 of 6  
Original Notice of Intent to Issue permit

5. Public Access.

Prior to issuance of the permit the applicant shall submit to the Executive Director for review and approval a deed restriction which contains the following public access provisions:

- a. A minimum of 50% of all recreational facilities time slots of the Hotel Village and the Golf Clubhouse shall be reserved for general fee-paying public use on a daily or hourly basis. If time slots or facilities set aside for non-members are not reserved 24 hours in advance, they may be reserved by members.
- b. General public use (rental) of the meeting rooms.
- c. Public access shall be maintained to all common areas of the development. The deed restriction shall include an exhibit, prepared by the applicant illustrating those area to be maintained open to the general public. Said areas shall include, but not be limited to, the lobby, restaurants, pool areas, landscaped grounds and walkways.

6. Signage Plans.

Prior to the issuance of the permit, the applicant shall submit to the Executive Director for review and approval the following:

- a. A detailed signage plan with signs visible from the Coast Highway and Niguel Road, which invites and encourages public use of the public access opportunities. The plan shall clearly state proposed material and colors to be used, locations of signs, dimensions, and sign text. Appropriate signage for trail heads shall be emphasized. Signs shall invite and encourage public use of access opportunities. Signage shall identify, provide information and direct users to all the key locations. Key locations include: public parking, golf course, golf clubhouse, beach access, tunnels, beach parking, park areas, tram operation, hotel areas, trails and other points of interest.
- b. An implementation plan for a primary visitor information center located at the hotel site which shall provide information about the available public uses throughout the resort complex. This information center shall be fully functional concurrent with the opening of the hotel.

5-92-188E3

COASTAL COMMISSION

Original Notice of Intent to Issue Permit

EXHIBIT # C

PAGE 5 OF 6

7. Future Development.

Prior to the issuance of the coastal development permit, the applicant shall execute and record a document, in a form and content acceptable to the Executive Director, stating that the subject permit is only for the development described in the Coastal Development Permit No. 5-92-188; and that any future improvements to the property or changes to the development plan approved herein will require a new permit or permit amendment from the Coastal Commission or its successor agency. The document shall run with the land, binding all successors and assigns, and shall be recorded free of prior liens.

AFTER YOU HAVE SIGNED AND RETURNED THE DUPLICATE COPY YOU WILL BE RECEIVING THE LEGAL FORMS TO COMPLETE (WITH INSTRUCTIONS) FROM THE SAN FRANCISCO OFFICE. WHEN YOU RECEIVE THE DOCUMENTS IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS, PLEASE CALL THE LEGAL DEPARTMENT AT (415) 904-5200.

SR:tn  
5824E

5-92-188E3  
COASTAL COMMISSION  
*original Notice of Intent to Issue Permit*

EXHIBIT # C  
PAGE 4 OF 5

**CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION**

SOUTH COAST AREA  
245 W. BROADWAY, STE. 380  
P.O. BOX 1450  
LONG BEACH, CA 90802-4416  
(310) 390-5071



COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT EXTENSION

Date: 22 August 1994

Re: Extension Request for Permit No. 5-92-188

Original Permit Expiration Date: 11 August 1994

Extended Permit Expiration Date: 11 August 1995

Dear Monarch Bay Resort, Inc.,

The Executive Director has determined that there are no changed circumstances affecting the conformity of the subject development with the California Coastal Act. No objections to this determination have been received at the Commission office. Therefore, the Executive Director grants an extension of the subject permit, subject to the same conditions approved by the Commission, to expire on the Extended Permit Expiration Date indicated above.

PETER M. DOUGLAS  
Executive Director

By: *[Signature]*

Title: Coastal Program Analyst

*5-92-188E3*  
**COASTAL COMMISSION**  
*previous extensions*  
EXHIBIT # D  
PAGE 1 OF 2

cc: File

SFR:b11

D5: 2603F

## CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION

SOUTH COAST AREA  
 245 W. BROADWAY, STE. 380  
 P.O. BOX 1450  
 LONG BEACH, CA 90802-4416  
 (310) 590-5071

COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT EXTENSIONDate: 12/28/95Re: Extension Request for Permit No. 5-92-188Original Permit Expiration Date: 8/11/94Extended Permit Expiration Date: 8/11/96

Dear: Monarch Bay Resort

The Executive Director has determined that there are no changed circumstances affecting the conformity of the subject development with the California Coastal Act. No objections to this determination have been received at the Commission office. Therefore, the Executive Director grants an extension of the subject permit, subject to the same conditions approved by the Commission, to expire on the Extended Permit Expiration Date indicated above.

PETER M. DOUGLAS  
 Executive Director

By: *P. M. Douglas*Title: Staff Analyst

5-92-188E3

COASTAL COMMISSION

*previous extensions*

cc: File

6055F  
 JA:wr

EXHIBIT # DPAGE 2 OF 2

## CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION

SOUTH COAST AREA  
245 W. BROADWAY, STE. 380  
P.O. BOX 1450  
LONG BEACH, CA 90802-4416  
(310) 390-5071

Page 1 of 5

NOTICE OF INTENT TO ISSUE AMENDMENTTO COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT

On 14 March 1996, the California Coastal Commission granted to Monarch Bay Resort, Inc. an amendment to Permit No. 5-92-188, subject to the conditions attached, for changes to the development or conditions imposed on the existing permit. The development originally approved by the permit consisted of the construction of 97 attached residential units and a 30,000 square foot golf clubhouse including grill and lounge on 14.3 acres. This development is part of the Monarch Bay Resort project. The units will be clustered into 20 two story building and 4 three story buildings. For 57 of the units, the floor area ranges from 1,400 to 2,700 square feet. Overall building height of the three story building is 41 feet. For the two story structures, overall height will be 28 feet. The two story units are located on the southern portion of the site near the Pacific Coast Highway. The four story projects are located in the norther portion of the site. The architectural theme will mimic the character of the Tuscan region of Italy. Grading will consist of approximately 85,000 cubic yards of cut and 33,000 cubic yards of fill.

located immediately northeast of the intersection of the Pacific Coast Highway and Crown Valley Parkway, and west of the Salt Creek Regional Trail.

Changes approved by this amendment consist of

The proposed amendment would delete construction of the golf clubhouse on the site and replace it with 14 two-story residential units, similar to the other two-story residential units proposed.

more specifically described in the application filed in the Commission offices.

Unless changed by the amendment, all conditions attached to the existing permit remain in effect.

The amendment is being held in the Commission office until fulfillment of the Special Conditions of the underlying permit and/or conditions of previous amendments imposed by the Commission. Once these conditions have been fulfilled, the amendment will be issued. For your information, all the imposed conditions are attached.

Issued on behalf of the California Commission on 26 March 1996.

5-92-188E3  
COASTAL COMMISSION

*Amendment (First page) only*

EXHIBIT # E  
PAGE 1 OF 2

PETER M. DOUGLAS  
Executive Director

*John T. Auyong*

By: John T. Auyong  
Title: Coastal Program Analyst

(cont'd)

**STATISTICAL SUMMARY**

5-92-188E3  
file copy  
(from 5-92-188 file)

LOT NO.	CLUBHOUSE	MANSION PENTHOUSE BUILDINGS	LUXURY TERRACE BUILDING	TOTAL D.U.S.
1	1	-	-	-
2	-	5	-	18
3	-	6	-	22
4	-	-	2	33
5	-	-	2	24
6	RECREATION CENTER			
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>97</b>

TOTAL SITE AREA

14.3 ACRES

→ permit 5-92-188  
as originally  
proposed

5-92-188E3  
COASTAL COMMISSION

5-92-188A Amendment  
changes to number of dwelling units

EXHIBIT # E

PAGE 2 OF 2

**STATISTICAL SUMMARY**

LOT NO.	MANSION VILLA BUILDINGS	MANSION PENTHOUSE BUILDINGS	LUXURY TERRACE BUILDINGS	TOTAL D.U.S.
1	3	2	-	15
2	-	3	-	10
3	2	3	-	19
4	-	-	2	33
5	-	-	2	24
6	3	-	-	10
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>111</b>

TOTAL SITE AREA

14.3 ACRES

→ permit 5-92-188A  
(as amended)

5-92-188E3

COASTAL COMMISSION  
Monarch Bay Resort permits

EXHIBIT # F

PAGE 1 OF 1

MONARCH BEACH RESORT  
LAND USE PLAN & STATISTICAL SUMMARY

LAND USE	Acres	Dwelling Units
 Residential 7-24 DU/AC	34.8	236
 Visitor/Recreation / Commercial	89.8	.
 Recreation/Open Space	371.2	.
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>325.8 AC</b>	<b>236 DU</b>

Area covered by permit 5-92-186

Subject permit

Area covered by permit 5-92-188

Sea Terrace Park Phase II Improvements (Permit 5-92-157) expired

Area covered by hotel permit 5-92-168

Sea Terrace Park Phase I Improvements: Permit 5-87-977A1

CITY GENERAL PLAN/LAND USE PLAN

MONARCH BEACH RESORT  
SPECIFIC PLAN

MAY 23 1995 ITEM 8.3

EXHIBIT 14

29