

We 8.5 (a,b,&c)

STATE OF CALIFORNIA -- THE RESOURCES AGENCY

GRAY DAVIS, Governor

CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION

SOUTH CENTRAL COAST AREA
89 SOUTH CALIFORNIA ST., SUITE 200
VENTURA, CA 93001
(805) 641 - 0142

Filed: 3/28/00
49th Day: 5/16/00
180th Day: 9/24/00
Staff: S. Hudson *GD*
Staff Report: 3/30/00
Hearing Date: 4/12/00
Commission Action:



RECORD PACKET COPY

STAFF REPORT: PERMIT AMENDMENT

APPLICATION NOS.: 4-99-146-A2 (Gamma), 4-99-185-A1 (Broad), and 4-99-266-A1 (Daly)

APPLICANTS: Gamma Family Trust; Eli Broad, Trustee of the Broad Revocable Trust; and Nancy M. Daly, Trustee of the Nancy M. Daly Living Trust

PROJECT LOCATION: 22368 (Gamma), 21958 (Broad), 22338 (Daly), and 21704 (Mitigation Site) Pacific Coast Highway, Malibu (Los Angeles County)

DESCRIPTION OF PROJECTS PREVIOUSLY APPROVED: Demolition of six existing single family residences and construction of three new single family residences. In addition, the project also includes an offer to dedicate a lateral public access easement over the southern beachfront portion of each lot as measured from the dripline of the proposed deck to the mean high tide line and the construction of a 6 ft. wide public sidewalk between Pacific Coast Highway and the proposed development on each project site.

DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENTS: Modify Special Conditions 1, 2, and 8 of Coastal Permits 4-99-146 and 4-99-185 and Special Conditions 1, 2, and 9 of Coastal Permit 4-99-266 to allow for offsite mitigation of the required public view corridor on each subject site by provision of public views and public access to the ocean from Pacific Coast Highway over the entire parcel at 21704 Pacific Coast Highway (APN: 4451-003-033). In addition, the amendments also include modifications to the previously approved project plans to allow for new development within the previously identified public view corridors on each project site.

LOCAL APPROVALS RECEIVED: N/A

SUBSTANTIVE FILE DOCUMENTS: Coastal Development Permits 4-99-146 (Gamma), 4-99-185 (Broad), and 4-99-266 (Daly).

SUMMARY OF STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Commission determine that the proposed amendment, subject to three (3) special conditions regarding revised plans, landscaping, and a public view corridor mitigation and public access program, **is consistent** with the requirements of the Coastal Act. The applicants are proposing to modify Special Conditions 1, 2, and 8 of Coastal Permits 4-99-146 (Gamma) [*Note: Gamma Family Trust was previously approved under the name Saban/Alpha Family Trust*] and 4-99-185 (Broad) and Special Conditions 1, 2, and 9 of Coastal Permit 4-99-266 (Daly) to allow for offsite mitigation of the required public view corridor on each subject site by provision of public views and public access to the ocean from Pacific Coast Highway over the entire parcel at 21704 Pacific Coast Highway (APN: 4451-003-033). In addition, the amendments also include modifications to the previously approved project plans to allow for new development within the previously identified public view corridors on each project site.

The proposed amendment involves the deletion of three separate public view corridors (with a combined width of 80 ft.) required by the Commission on portions of three separate project sites. The applicants propose to mitigate the loss of public views resulting from the deletion of the public view corridors on each project site by providing for the protection of public views and public access across a separate 80 ft. wide undeveloped beachfront parcel. The proposed mitigation site will be deed restricted to provide for public views and public access to the ocean from Pacific Coast Highway across the entire 80 ft. wide parcel and ownership of the parcel will be transferred to the California Coastal Conservancy or other appropriate public agency. The proposed offsite mitigation parcel is the same width (80 ft.) as the combined width of the three separate public view corridors previously required by the Commission [CDP 4-99-146 (Gamma) provided for a 24 ft. wide view corridor; CDP 4-99-185 (Broad) provided for a 20 ft. wide view corridor; and CDP 4-99-266 (Daly) provided for a 36 ft. wide view corridor].

The proposed amendment will also allow for the construction of new development within those areas of the original project sites that were previously identified as public view corridors. However, project plans adequate to show the proposed modifications have not been submitted. Therefore, Special Conditions One (1) and Two (2) regarding the submittal of revised project plans and landscaping plans have been required.

To ensure that the applicants' offer to provide for unobstructed public views of the ocean across the entire mitigation site is implemented, and to ensure that adverse effects to public views from the approved development on the original project sites are adequately mitigated, Special Condition Three (3) requires that a deed restriction is recorded which states that the mitigation site shall be maintained as a public view corridor. In addition, to ensure that the applicant's offer to provide public access on the mitigation site is implemented, Special Condition Three (3) also requires that a deed

restriction is recorded which provides that the mitigation site, in its entirety, shall be available for public access.

In addition, an existing chainlink/barbwire fence has been previously installed on the mitigation site along Pacific Coast Highway; which, if not removed, would eliminate all public access to the beach from Pacific Coast Highway; thereby, negating the intent of this amendment to provide public access on the mitigation site. Further, the existing chainlink/barbwire fence is not consistent with the types of fencing previously allowed by the Commission within designated public view corridors (or previously allowed in the required public view corridors on the original project sites) and, in addition to preventing members of the public from accessing the site, will result in adverse effects to public views of the beach and ocean from Pacific Coast Highway. Therefore, Special Condition Three (3) further requires that the existing fence on site be removed prior to the issuance of the coastal permit as amended. However, California Coastal Conservancy staff (as the public agency assuming ownership of the site) have indicated to Commission staff that some type of fencing with a gate on site is necessary to regulate public access. The Commission finds that it is appropriate to allow for controlled access to the site so that public use of the site may be limited to daylight hours. Therefore, to ensure that the proposed mitigation site is consistent with both the requirements of the California Coastal Conservancy and with the provision of public access and public views, Special Condition Three (3) also requires the applicant to submit, for the review and approval of the Executive Director, revised project plans for the construction/installation of a new fence, gate, and signage (indicating the availability of public access) consistent with the provision of public views and public access on the mitigation site. After the revised project plans have been approved by the Executive Director, the fence, gate, and signage must be constructed/installed in accordance with the approved plans within 90 days of issuance of the amended coastal permit.

PROCEDURAL NOTE: The Commission's regulations provide for referral of permit amendment requests to the Commission if:

- 1) *The Executive Director determines that the proposed amendment is a material change,*
- 2) *Objection is made to the Executive Director's determination of immateriality, or*
- 3) *The proposed amendment affects conditions required for the purpose of protecting a coastal resource or coastal access.*

In this case, the proposed amendment will affect a permit condition required for the purpose of protecting a coastal resource. If the applicant or objector so requests, the Commission shall make an independent determination as to whether the proposed amendment is material. 14 Cal. Admin. Code 13166.

I. STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

MOTION: *I move that the Commission approve the proposed amendments to Coastal Development Permit Nos. 4-99-146, 4-99-185, and 4-99-266 pursuant to the staff recommendation.*

STAFF RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL:

Staff recommends a **YES** vote. Passage of this motion will result in approval of the amendments as conditioned and adoption of the following resolution and findings. The motion passes only by affirmative vote of a majority of the Commissioners present.

RESOLUTION TO APPROVE A PERMIT AMENDMENT:

The Commission hereby approves the coastal development permit amendments on the ground that the development as amended and subject to conditions, will be in conformity with the policies of Chapter 3 of the Coastal Act and will not prejudice the ability of the local government having jurisdiction over the area to prepare a Local Coastal Program conforming to the provisions of Chapter 3. Approval of the permit amendment complies with the California Environmental Quality Act because either 1) feasible mitigation measures and/or alternatives have been incorporated to substantially lessen any significant adverse effects of the amended development on the environment, or 2) there are no feasible mitigation measures or alternatives that would substantially lessen any significant adverse impacts of the amended development on the environment.

NOTE: *All standard and special conditions attached to the previously approved permits remain in effect to the extent not otherwise modified herein.*

II. Special Conditions

1. Revised Plans

Special Condition One (1) of Coastal Development Permit 4-99-185 (Broad) and Special Condition One (1) Subpart (b) of Coastal Development Permits 4-99-146 and 4-99-266 regarding the submittal of revised plans to reflect development restrictions within the previously identified public view corridor are modified as follows:

PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF THE COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT, AS AMENDED, the applicant shall submit, for the review and approval of the Executive Director, revised project plans for any new development proposed within the previously identified public view corridor. No new grading, retaining walls, or seawalls shall be allowed (other than the construction of return walls necessary to protect adjacent properties).

2. Landscaping Plan

PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF THE COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMITS, AS AMENDED, the applicants shall submit, for the review and approval of the Executive Director, revised landscaping plans consistent with the following modifications:

Special Condition Two (2) Subparts (a)-(c) of Coastal Permits 4-99-146, 4-99-185, and 4-99-261 are modified as follows:

- (a) The portion of the project site that is not sandy beach (or subject to wave action) located within the ~~public view corridor and~~ portion of the site between the proposed residence and Pacific Coast Highway shall be planted within (60) days of receipt of the certificate of occupancy for the residence. Any portion of the site that is subject to wave action shall be maintained as sandy beach area. To minimize the need for irrigation, all landscaping shall consist primarily of native/drought resistant plants as listed by the California Native Plant Society, Santa Monica Mountains Chapter, in their document entitled Recommended List of Plants for Landscaping in the Santa Monica Mountains, dated October 4, 1994. Such planting shall be adequate to provide 90 percent coverage within two (2) years, and this requirement shall apply to all disturbed soils. Invasive, non-indigenous plant species which tend to supplant native species shall not be used.
- (b) Plantings will be maintained in good growing condition throughout the life of the project and, whenever necessary, shall be replaced with new plant materials to ensure continued compliance with applicable landscape requirements.
- (c) ~~Vegetation within the public view corridor, as consistent with Special Condition Eight (8), shall be limited to low-lying vegetation of no more than 2 ft. in height.~~

3. Public View Corridor Mitigation and Public Access Program

The deed restrictions previously required by Special Condition Eight (8) of Coastal Development Permits 4-99-146 and 4-99-185 and Special Condition Nine (9) of Coastal Development Permit 4-99-266 for the provision of a public view corridor on the subject sites shall be deemed null and void and may be extinguished. Special Condition Eight (8) of Coastal Development Permits 4-99-146 and 4-99-185 and Special Condition Nine (9) of Coastal Development Permit 4-99-266 are replaced in their entirety as follows:

PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF THE COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT, AS AMENDED, and in order to implement the applicant's proposal, the applicant shall submit to the Executive Director, for review and approval, evidence that:

- A. A deed restriction has been recorded, in a form and content acceptable to the Executive Director, for the entire parcel at 21704 Pacific Coast Highway (APN: 4451-003-033) which reflects that:
 - (1) The entire parcel, as measured from the Pacific Coast Highway right-of-way line seaward to the ambulatory mean high tide line, shall be available for public recreation and both vertical and lateral public access to the beach and ocean on and across the entire site. Any future development or improvements on the parcel will require a new coastal development permit and shall be limited to those improvements necessary to provide adequate public recreation and access. New development such as gates, stairs, fences, signs, and locks may be approved, subject to the issuance of a coastal development permit, if the Commission finds that such improvements are appropriate to regulate public access on the site.
 - (2) The entire parcel shall be maintained as a public view corridor from Pacific Coast Highway to the Pacific Ocean. No structures, vegetation, or obstacles which result in an obstruction of public views of the ocean from Pacific Coast Highway shall be permitted on site. Vegetation on site shall be limited to low-lying vegetation of no more than 2 ft. in height. Fencing within the public view corridor shall be limited to visually permeable designs and materials (e.g. wrought iron or non-tinted glass materials). Fencing shall be limited to no more than 6 ft. in height. All bars, beams, or other non-visually permeable materials used in the construction of the proposed fence shall be no more than 1 inch in thickness/width and shall be placed no less than 12 inches in distance apart. Alternative designs may be allowed only if the Executive Director determines that such designs are consistent with the intent of this condition and serve to minimize adverse effects to public views.

- (3) No signs shall be posted on the parcel which (1) explicitly or implicitly indicate that any portion of the subject site (APN: 4451-003-033) is private or (2) contain similar messages that attempt to prohibit public use of this portion of the beach. In no instance shall signs be posted which read "*Private Beach*" or "*Private Property*." In order to effectuate the above prohibitions, prior to the issuance of the coastal permit as amended, the permittee/landowner is required to submit to the Executive Director for review and approval prior to posting, the content of any proposed signs as consistent with Part B of this condition. After the permit has been issued, new signs limiting the time that the subject site is available for public use (such as limiting public access on the site to daylight hours) may be approved, subject to the issuance of a coastal development permit, if the Commission finds that such are appropriate to regulate public access on the site.
 - (4) The document shall run with the land, binding all successors and assigns, and shall be recorded free of prior liens that Executive Director determines may affect the enforceability of the restriction. This deed restriction shall not be removed or changed without a Coastal Commission approved amendment to this coastal development permit unless the Executive Director determines that no amendment is required.
- B. All existing fencing on the subject site has been removed. The applicant shall submit, for the review and approval of the Executive Director, revised project plans for the construction/installation of a new fence and gate consistent with the requirements of Part A, Subparts (1), (2), and (3) of this condition. The plans must also include a time-lock mechanism or other means to allow public access to the site during daylight hours and must be designed in consultation with the California Coastal Conservancy. The revised plans shall also include the provision of signage indicating the availability of public access on the site. The approved signage must be maintained at the site. After the revised project plans have been approved by the Executive Director, the fence, gate, and signage must be constructed/installed in accordance with the approved plans within 90 days of issuance of the Amended Coastal Development Permit.
- C. After recording the deed restriction referred to in Part A above, there has been executed and recorded a grant to the California Coastal Conservancy, or other appropriate entity approved by the Executive Director, of a fee interest in the entire parcel at 21704 Pacific Coast Highway (APN: 4451-003-033) and the Conservancy or other entity has agreed to allow construction of the new fence, gate and signage on the parcel in accordance with the plans approved pursuant to Section B. above.

III. Findings and Declarations

A. Project Description and Background

The applicants are requesting to modify Special Conditions 1, 2, and 8 of Coastal Permits 4-99-146 and 4-99-185 and Special Conditions 1, 2, and 9 of Coastal Permit 4-99-266 to allow for offsite mitigation of the required public view corridor on each subject site by provision of public views and public access to the ocean from Pacific Coast Highway over the entire parcel at 21704 Pacific Coast Highway (APN: 4451-003-033). In addition, the amendments also include modifications to the previously approved project plans to allow for new development within the previously identified public view corridors on each project site.

The three project sites are beachfront lots located on the seaward side of Pacific Coast Highway in the Carbon Beach area in Malibu (Exhibit 1). The proposed mitigation site is a beachfront lot located on the seaward side of Pacific Coast Highway in the La Costa Beach area of Malibu immediately east of Carbon Beach (Exhibit 1). Both Carbon Beach and La Costa Beach are characterized as built-out beachfront areas of Malibu consisting of residential development.

Coastal Development Permits (CDPs) 4-99-146 (Gamma) [*Note: Gamma Family Trust was previously approved under the name Saban/Alpha Family Trust*], 4-99-185 (Broad), and 4-99-266 (Daly) were previously approved by the Commission with special conditions requiring the provision of a public view corridor on each project site. The purpose of the required public view corridors was to provide unobstructed public views of the beach and ocean from Pacific Coast Highway over a portion each project site to mitigate the adverse effects to public views that result from new development along the coast. In addition, Coastal Development Permits 4-99-185 and 4-99-266 specifically provided that the applicants may obtain an amendment to the coastal permit to delete the required public view corridor on site if the applicants provided for offsite mitigation consisting of both a public view corridor and a public vertical accessway across another parcel in the vicinity of Carbon Beach.

The proposed amendments involve the deletion of three separate public view corridors (with a combined width of 80 ft.) previously required by the Commission on portions of three separate project sites. The applicants propose to mitigate the loss of public views resulting from the deletion of the public view corridors on each project site by providing for the protection of public views and public access across a separate 80 ft. wide undeveloped beachfront parcel. The proposed mitigation site will be deed restricted to provide for public views and public access to the ocean from Pacific Coast Highway across the entire 80 ft. wide parcel and ownership of the parcel will be transferred to the California Coastal Conservancy or other appropriate public agency. The proposed offsite mitigation parcel is the same width (80 ft.) as the combined width of the three separate public view corridors previously required by the Commission [CDP 4-99-146 (Gamma) provided for a 24 ft. wide view corridor; CDP 4-99-185 (Broad) provided for a 20 ft. wide view corridor; and CDP 4-99-266 (Daly) provided for a 36 ft. wide view corridor].

B. Visual Resources and Public Access

The Coastal Act requires that new development be sited and designed in order to protect the visual qualities of coastal areas. Section 30251 of the Coastal Act states that:

The scenic and visual qualities of coastal areas shall be considered and protected as a resource of public importance. Permitted development shall be sited and designed to protect views to and along the ocean and scenic coastal areas, to minimize the alteration of natural land forms, to be visually compatible with the character of surrounding areas, and, where feasible, to restore and enhance visual quality in visually degraded areas. New development in highly scenic areas such as those designated in the California Coastline Preservation and Recreation Plan prepared by the Department of Parks and Recreation and by local government shall be subordinated to the character of its setting.

In addition, the Coastal Act mandates the provision of maximum public access and recreational opportunities along the coast. The Coastal Act contains several policies which address the issues of public access and recreation along the coast. Coastal Act Section 30210 states that:

In carrying out the requirement of Section 4 of Article X of the California Constitution, maximum access, which shall be conspicuously posted, and recreational opportunities shall be provided for all the people consistent with public safety needs and the need to protect public rights, rights of private property owners, and natural resource areas from overuse.

Coastal Act Section 30211 states:

Development shall not interfere with the public's right of access to the sea where acquired through use or legislative authorization, including, but not limited to, the use of dry sand and rocky coastal beaches to the first line of terrestrial vegetation.

Coastal Act Section 30212(a) provides that in new shoreline development projects, access to the shoreline and along the coast shall be provided except in specified circumstances, where:

- (1) it is inconsistent with public safety, military security needs, or the protection of fragile coastal resources.*
- (2) adequate access exists nearby, or,*
- (3) agriculture would be adversely affected. Dedicated access shall not be required to be opened to public use until a public agency or private association agrees to accept responsibility for maintenance and liability of the accessway.*

Section 30220 of the Coastal Act states that:

Coastal areas suited for water-oriented recreational activities that cannot readily be provided at inland water areas shall be protected for such use.

Coastal Act Section 30251 requires that visual qualities of coastal areas shall be considered and protected, landform alteration shall be minimized, and where feasible, degraded areas shall be enhanced and restored. In addition, Coastal Act sections 30210 and 30211 mandate that maximum public access and recreational opportunities be provided and that development not interfere with the public's right to access the coast. Likewise, section 30212 of the Coastal Act requires that adequate public access to the sea be provided to allow use of dry sand and rocky coastal beaches.

Further, to assist in the determination of whether a project is consistent with Section 30251 of the Coastal Act, the Commission has, in past Malibu coastal development permit actions, looked to the previously certified Los Angeles County Malibu/Santa Monica Mountains Land Use Plan (LUP) for guidance. The LUP has been found to be consistent with the Coastal Act and provides specific standards for development along the Malibu coast and within the Santa Monica Mountains. For instance, in concert with Section 30251 of the Coastal Act, Policy 138 of the LUP provides that "buildings located on the ocean side of and fronting Pacific Coast Highway shall occupy no more than 80% of the lineal frontage of the site." Policy 141 of the LUP provides that "fencing or walls to be erected on the property shall be designed and constructed to allow for view retention from scenic roadways."

1. Adverse Effects to Visual Resources

The original three project sites are located on Carbon Beach, a built-out area of Malibu primarily consisting of residential development. The Commission notes that the visual quality of the Carbon Beach area in relation to public views from Pacific Coast Highway has been significantly degraded from past residential development. Pacific Coast Highway is a major coastal access route, not only utilized by local residents, but also heavily used by tourists and visitors to access several public beaches located in the surrounding area which are only accessible from Pacific Coast Highway. Public views of the beach and water from Pacific Coast Highway have been substantially reduced, or completely blocked, in many areas by the construction of single family residences, privacy walls, fencing, landscaping, and other residential related development between Pacific Coast Highway and the ocean. Specifically, the Commission notes that when residential structures are located immediately adjacent to each other, or when large individual residential structures are constructed across several contiguous lots, such development creates a wall-like effect when viewed from Pacific Coast Highway. This type of development limits the public's ability to view the coast or ocean to only those few parcels which have not yet been developed. Such development, when viewed on a regional basis, results in potential cumulative adverse effects to public views and to the visual quality of coastal areas.

Therefore, in past permit actions, in order to protect public views of the ocean from public viewing areas and to enhance visual quality along the coast, the Commission has required that new residential development, such as the proposed projects, be

designed consistent with the provision of a public view corridor of no less than 20% of the width of the lineal frontage of the subject site to provide for views of the beach and ocean from Pacific Coast Highway [Montanaro (4-99-154), and Ioki (4-99-153 and 155)]. In this case, the three underlying permit applications, Coastal Development Permits (CDPs) 4-99-146 (Gamma), 4-99-185 (Broad), were previously approved by the Commission with special conditions requiring the provision of a public view corridor on each project site. In addition, CDP Application 4-99-266 (Daly) is scheduled to be heard at the Commission's April 2000 hearing in Long Beach (staff is recommending approval of this related item with the same special condition regarding the provision of a public view corridor on the project site). The intent of the public view corridors required by the Commission was to provide unobstructed public views of the beach and ocean from Pacific Coast Highway over a portion of each site to mitigate the adverse effects to public views that result from new development along the coast. The proposed amendment is intended to provide for offsite mitigation of the previously required public view corridors on the three original subject sites.

2. Offsite Mitigation

The proposed amendment involves the deletion of three separate public view corridors (with a combined width of 80 ft.) required by the Commission on portions of three separate project sites. The applicants propose to mitigate the loss of public views resulting from the deletion of the public view corridors on each project site by providing for the protection of public views and public access across a separate 80 ft. wide undeveloped beachfront parcel. The proposed mitigation site will be deed restricted to provide for public views and public access to the ocean from Pacific Coast Highway across the entire 80 ft. wide parcel and ownership of the parcel will be transferred to the California Coastal Conservancy or other appropriate public agency. The proposed offsite mitigation parcel is the same width (80 ft.) as the combined width of the three separate public view corridors previously required by the Commission [CDP 4-99-146 (Gamma) provided for a 24 ft. wide view corridor; CDP 4-99-185 (Broad) provided for a 20 ft. wide view corridor; and CDP 4-99-266 (Daly) provided for a 36 ft. wide view corridor].

The Commission notes that Special Condition Eight (8) of Coastal Development Permit (CDP) 4-99-185 (Broad) and Special Condition Nine (9) of CDP 4-99-266 (Daly) specifically provided that as an alternative to maintaining a public view corridor on each subject site, the applicant may:

Obtain an amendment to the coastal development permit to be reviewed and approved by the Commission that provides for offsite mitigation of the public view corridor condition by provision of an offsite public view corridor, of the same or greater width than the view corridor required on the subject site, and an offer to dedicate a vertical public access way in the vicinity of Carbon Beach.

As such, the Commission notes that the proposed amendment to mitigate adverse effects to visual resources from the underlying development through the provision of both public views and public access at a separate offsite location is generally consistent with the intent of Special Conditions Eight and Nine of CDPs 4-99-185 and 4-99-266. The Commission further notes that, although CDP 4-99-146 (Gamma) did not specifically include the above referenced language as part of Special Condition Eight (which required the provision of a public view corridor on site), the proposed provision of public views and public access at an offsite location is generally consistent with the intent of Special Condition Eight of CDP 4-99-146 in regards to the protection and provision of public views along the coast and with Commission's previous actions regarding CDPs 4-99-185 and 4-99-266.

The Commission further notes that although the proposed amendment will not serve to protect public views of the ocean along Carbon Beach, this amendment will provide for the protection of public views over a parcel of land equal in size to the combined width to the separate public view corridors. In addition, this amendment will also provide for public vertical access from Pacific Coast Highway to the beach and ocean on the same parcel of land. CDP 4-99-185 (and CDP 4-99-266 as recommended by Staff to be approved at the April 2000 hearing) specifically allowed for the provision of offsite mitigation of the required public view corridor through the provision of both public views and public access on a separate mitigation parcel to be located within the vicinity of the original subject site. As such, the Commission notes that the proposed amendment is consistent with the intent of the conditions of the underlying permits to provide for public views along the coast.

A coastal development permit application has been previously submitted for the construction of a single family residence on the subject site. Coastal Development Permit Application 4-98-310 (Pepperdine University) was submitted in 1998 for the construction of a single family residence on the proposed mitigation site. However, no evidence regarding the location of public tide lands in relation to private land on the subject site was submitted and the application was returned for reasons of incompleteness. In the case of this application, however, the Commission notes that, regardless of what portions of the site are actually private land or public land, the proposed amendment will serve to confer ownership of the entire parcel to a public agency and ensure that the entire site would be available for public views and access.

A minor rocky promontory is located along the coast between Carbon Beach and the proposed mitigation site. Due to the presence of the promontory, access to Carbon Beach from the mitigation site is limited during higher tidal conditions when the passable segment of the beach around the promontory is inundated. However, the proposed mitigation site will provide for vertical public access to La Costa Beach under all tidal conditions. Although the proposed mitigation site is located only approximately 750 ft. west (upcoast) and 0.5 miles east (downcoast) of the nearest public vertical coastal accessways that have been previously offered for dedication by the property owners, the Commission notes that these vertical accessways have not yet been

accepted by any public agency and; therefore, have not been opened for public use. The Commission further notes that the nearest existing public vertical accessways to the beach that are actually open for use by the public are located approximately 1.3 miles west (upcoast) and 1.7 miles east (downcoast) of the proposed mitigation site. As such, the Commission notes that the proposed mitigation site will provide for public vertical access to the beach in an area where such access does not now exist.

The proposed amendment includes the offer to provide for public access and public views of the beach and ocean from Pacific Coast Highway across the entire 80 ft. wide mitigation parcel in order to mitigate for deletion of the three previously required public view corridors (with a combined width of 80 ft.) on the original project sites. Therefore, to ensure that adverse effects to public views on the original project sites are adequately mitigated, Special Condition Three (3) requires that, prior to issuance of the permit as amended, a deed restriction is recorded which states that the mitigation site shall be maintained as a public view corridor from Pacific Coast Highway to the Pacific Ocean. No structures, vegetation, or obstacles which result in an obstruction of public views of the ocean from Pacific Coast Highway shall be permitted on site. Vegetation on site shall be limited to low-lying vegetation of no more than 2 ft. in height.

In addition, the Commission notes that the existing chainlink/barbwire fence on the mitigation site is not consistent with the types of fencing previously allowed by the Commission within designated public view corridors (or previously allowed in the required public view corridors on the original project sites) and that the existing fence, in addition to preventing members of the public from accessing the site, will result in adverse effects to public views of the beach and ocean from Pacific Coast Highway. Therefore, in order to ensure that adverse effects to public views are eliminated, Special Condition Three (3) also requires the applicant to remove the existing chainlink/barbwire fence prior to the issuance of the coastal permit as amended. However, California Coastal Conservancy staff (as the public agency assuming ownership of the site) have indicated to Commission staff that some type of fencing with a gate on site is necessary to regulate public access. The Commission finds that it is appropriate to allow for controlled access to the site so that public use of the site may be limited to daylight hours. Therefore, to ensure that the proposed mitigation site is consistent with both the requirements of the California Coastal Conservancy and with the provision of public views and public access, Special Condition Three (3) also requires the applicant to submit, for the review and approval of the Executive Director, revised project plans for the construction/installation of a new fence, gate, and signage consistent with the requirements of Part A, Subparts (1), (2), and (3) of this condition. The revised plans shall also include the provision of signage indicating the availability of public access on the site. After the revised project plans have been approved by the Executive Director, the fence, gate, and signage shall be constructed/installed within 90 days after issuance of the permit amendments. The placement of new fencing on site shall be limited to visually permeable designs and materials (e.g. wrought iron or non-tinted glass materials) which will not result in an obstruction of public views of the ocean from Pacific Coast Highway.

In addition, as discussed in detail above, the applicants are also proposing to provide for public access (in addition to the protection of public views) to the beach and ocean from Pacific Coast Highway on the mitigation site. Therefore, in order to implement the applicant's offer to provide public access on the mitigation site, Special Condition Three (3) also requires that, prior to issuance of the permit as amended, a deed restriction is recorded which provides that the mitigation site, in its entirety, shall be available for public recreation and both vertical and lateral public access to the beach and ocean on and across the entire site. However, the Commission notes that although the proposed mitigation site is primarily undeveloped, an existing chain link/barbwire fence has been previously installed on site along Pacific Coast Highway. The Commission further notes that the existing chainlink/barbwire fence, if not removed, will eliminate the public's ability to access the beach from Pacific Coast Highway; thereby, negating the intent of this amendment to provide public access on the mitigation site. Therefore, Special Condition Three (3) requires that the existing chainlink/barbwire fence on site be removed prior to the issuance of the coastal permit as amended. However, California Coastal Conservancy staff (as the public agency assuming ownership of the site) have indicated to Commission staff that some type of fencing with a gate on site is necessary to regulate public access. The Commission finds that it is appropriate to allow for controlled access to the site so that public use of the site may be limited to daylight hours. Therefore, to ensure that the proposed mitigation site is consistent with both the requirements of the California Coastal Conservancy and with the provision of public access and public views, Special Condition Three (3) also requires the applicant to submit, for the review and approval of the Executive Director, revised project plans for the construction/installation of a new fence, gate, and signage consistent with the requirements of Part A, Subparts (1), (2), and (3) of this condition. The revised plans shall also include the provision of signage indicating the availability of public access on the site. After the revised project plans have been approved by the Executive Director, the fence, gate, and signage shall be constructed/installed within 90 days after issuance of the permit amendments. The revised plans must also provide for a time-lock mechanism or other means to allow public access to the site during daylight hours and must be designed in consultation with the California Coastal Conservancy. Further, to ensure implementation of the applicant's proposal, Special Condition Three (3) also requires that the applicant submit evidence that ownership of the proposed mitigation site has been transferred to the California Coastal Conservancy or other appropriate agency approved by the Executive Director.

Further, the Commission notes that chronic unauthorized postings of signs illegally attempting to limit, or erroneously noticing restrictions on public access have occurred on beachfront private properties in the Malibu area. These signs have an adverse effect on the ability of the public to access public trust lands. The Commission has determined, therefore, that to ensure that applicants, and all future landowners, clearly understand that such postings are not permitted without a separate coastal development permit, Special Condition Three (3) requires that such signs are not posted on or near the proposed project site. The Commission notes that Special

Condition Three (3) will still allow the applicant to submit, for the review and approval of the Executive Director, revised project plans for the installation of new signs limiting the time that the subject site is available for public use (such as limiting public access to the site to daylight hours) consistent with the requirements of Part A, Subparts (1), (2), and (3) of this condition. After the revised project plans have been approved by the Executive Director, the signage must be installed within 90 days after issuance of the permit amendment. As such, the Commission finds that if implemented, Special Condition Three (3) will protect the public's right of access to the sandy beach on the proposed mitigation site.

The proposed amendment will also allow for the construction of structural improvements (decks and buildings supported on a caisson foundation) within those areas of the original project sites that were previously identified as public view corridors. The applicants have indicated that such improvements are intended as part of this amendment application. However, project plans adequate to show the proposed modifications have not been submitted. Staff notes that Coastal Permit Amendment Applications 4-99-185-A1 and 4-99-266-A1 did not include the submittal of any revised plans and that, although a revised site plan has been submitted as part of Coastal Permit Amendment Application 4-99-146-A2, the plan is not adequate to indicate the extent of the proposed modifications or whether such modifications will be consistent with the findings and applicable previously required conditions of the underlying permit. Therefore, to ensure that the proposed changes to the previously approved plans are consistent with all other applicable previously required conditions, Special Condition One (1) requires the applicant to submit, for the review and approval of the Executive Director, revised project plans for any new development proposed within the previously identified public view corridors. No new grading, retaining walls, or seawalls shall be allowed. In addition, the proposed amendment will also result in changes to the previously approved landscaping plans for the original project sites. Therefore, Special Condition Two (2) has been required to ensure that the applicants submit a revised landscaping plans which reflect all proposed changes to development on site.

As such, the Commission notes that the proposed amendment to provide for public views, in addition to public vertical and lateral access, to and along the beach and ocean from Pacific Coast Highway at the proposed mitigation site will provide adequate mitigation for adverse effects to public views that will result from the approved development. Therefore, for the reasons stated above, the Commission finds that the proposed amendments, as conditioned, will not lessen the intent of any of the special conditions required by Coastal Permits 4-99-146, 4-99-185, and 4-99-266 as originally required, and are consistent with Sections 30251, 30210, 30211, 30212, and 30220 of the Coastal Act.

C. Local Coastal Program

Section 30604 of the Coastal Act states that:

(a) Prior to certification of the local coastal program, a coastal development permit shall be issued if the issuing agency, or the commission on appeal, finds that the proposed development is in conformity with Chapter 3 (commencing with Section 30200) and that the permitted development will not prejudice the ability of the local government to prepare a local coastal program that is in conformity with Chapter 3 (commencing with Section 30200).

Section 30604(a) of the Coastal Act provides that the Commission shall issue a coastal permit only if the project will not prejudice the ability of the local government having jurisdiction to prepare a Local Coastal Program which conforms with Chapter 3 policies of the Coastal Act. The preceding sections provide findings that the proposed project will be in conformity with the provisions of Chapter 3 if certain conditions are incorporated into the project and accepted by the applicant. As conditioned, the proposed development will not create adverse impacts and is found to be consistent with the applicable policies contained in Chapter 3. Therefore, the Commission finds that approval of the proposed amendment, as conditioned, will not prejudice the City of Malibu's ability to prepare a Local Coastal Program for this area of Malibu that is also consistent with the policies of Chapter 3 of the Coastal Act as required by Section 30604(a).

D. California Environmental Quality Act

The Coastal Commission's permit process has been designated as the functional equivalent of CEQA. Section 13096(a) of the California Code of Regulations requires Commission approval of Coastal Development Permit applications to be supported by a finding showing the application, as conditioned by any conditions of approval, to be consistent with any applicable requirements of CEQA. Section 21080.5 (d)(2)(A) of CEQA prohibits a proposed development from being approved if there are feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available that would substantially lessen any significant adverse effects that the activity may have on the environment.

The proposed amendment, as conditioned, will not have significant adverse effects on the environment, within the meaning of the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970. Therefore, the proposed amendment, as conditioned, has been adequately mitigated and is determined to be consistent with CEQA and the policies of the Coastal Act.

SMH-VNT





EXHIBIT 1
CDPs: 4-99-146-A2, 4-99-185-A1, & 4-99-266-A1
Area Map

Project Sites in Relation to Proposed Mitigation Site



Pacific Ocean

- * Un-opened Vertical Access OTDs
- ★ Existing Vertical Accessways
- ~ Blue Line Streams
- Malibu City Boundary




0.8 0 0.8 1.6 Miles

EXHIBIT 2
CDPs: 4-99-146-A2, 4-99-185-A1, & 4-99-266-A1
Location Map

4451 | 3
SCALE 1" = 60'

1992



LAND OF MATTHEW KELLER IN THE RANCHO
TOPANGA MALIBU SEQUIT R.F. 534
PARCEL MAP P.M. 72-75-76

EXHIBIT 3
CDPs: 4-99-146-A2, 4-99-185-A1,
& 4-99-266-A1
Mitigation Site Parcel Map

