

CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION

CENTRAL COAST DISTRICT OFFICE
725 FRONT STREET, SUITE 300
SANTA CRUZ, CA 95060
(831) 427-4863

Th6d

RECORD PACKET COPY

Filed:	10/16/01
180 th day:	04/14/02
Staff:	MW-SC
Staff report:	01/24/02
Hearing date:	02/07/02

COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT APPLICATION

Application number3-01-078, Corrigan

Applicant.....Patrick Corrigan

Project location.....2nd southeast of 3rd on Guadalupe (Block 41, Lot 4), City of Carmel-by-the-Sea, Monterey County (APN 010-023-16). See Exhibits 1 & 1a.

Project descriptionDemolition of existing 832 square foot single-story residence and carport, to facilitate construction of a two-story 1,800 square foot residence and garage.

File documents.....Categorical Exclusion E-77-13 for City of Carmel-by-the-Sea; Design Study, and Design Review: DS 01-14 / RE 01-11.

Staff recommendation ...Denial

Summary: Carmel is a very popular visitor destination as much for the style, scale, and rich history of its residential, commercial, and civic architecture, as for its renowned shopping area, forest canopy and white sand beach. Carmel is made particularly special by the character of the residential development within its City limits. Homes are nestled into the native Monterey pine/Coast live oak forest on a grid of streets that is executed in a way to yield to trees more than to engineering expediency. This is the context for Carmel's community life and its built character.

The proposal raises questions as to whether this project would protect Carmel's special community character consistent with the Coastal Act Section 30253(5). In particular, the project will result in a significant change in size, scale (mass), and character on the site. For example, the existing house is a small single-story cottage, roughly 835 square feet, though of no distinct architectural style. Existing height is 13 feet overall and mass of the structure is estimated at 8,200 cubic feet. The overall floor area ratio (ratio of house size to lot size) is 20%. Estimated total site coverage is roughly 1,743 square feet. By contrast, the proposed replacement structure is a modern two-story, 1,800 square-foot Tudor-revival style residence, with cross-gabled roof, shed dormer windows, heavy wood shank shingles, stucco chimney, and vertical wood plank garage door and main entrance. Overall height of the proposed structure would be greater than 23 feet and the resulting mass estimated at 25,155 cubic feet. The floor area ratio is 45%. Total proposed site coverage would increase to 1,930 square feet. Overall, the proposed new structure represents a 116% increase in square footage and 207% increase in mass over the existing cottage. The proposal also results in a significant increase in height and site coverage. It is



California Coastal Commission

February 7, 2002 Meeting in San Diego

Staff: Michael Watson Approved by: *M.W.* 1/23/02

more than 10 feet greater in height, and roughly 11% greater in site coverage. Although the replacement structure includes offsets and articulations to the house and roof form, because of its size, height, and mass, it will appear large, dominant, and "boxy" from the west, Guadalupe Street, elevation. As a result, the character of this site will be significantly changed.

The cumulative impacts of demolitions like this are also a concern. In the past 16 months, staff has received and processed more than 40 applications for demolitions in Carmel. The Commission continues to receive 2 applications for demolitions in Carmel monthly. By demolishing the subject structure as proposed, its overall contribution to community character will be forever lost. Similarly, because community character has not yet been clearly defined, the overall cumulative effect of demolitions, such as the current project, on Carmel's character is unclear. The project cannot be found to be consistent with section 30253(5) at this time.

Part of the reason for this is that although the elements that define the City's character can be generally described, it has not been determined, for the purposes of the Coastal Act, how these elements interact to make Carmel special. The specific comprehensive planning objectives and standards to protect Carmel's community character are best determined through a community process culminating in a LCP. The City Council recently took action to approve both a Land Use Plan and Implementing Ordinances. On December 20, 2001, the City's LCP was submitted to the Commission's Central Coast office for review and evaluation.

Overall, Staff is recommending that the project be denied because it cannot be found to be consistent with 30253(5), and because it will prejudice the ability of the City to prepare a local coastal program that is in conformity with Chapter 3 of the Coastal Act, inconsistent with Coastal Act Policy 30604(a). The denial would be without prejudice to the proposed project inasmuch as once the City's LCP has been finished, and ultimately certified by the Commission, the proposed project could be held up against the applicable LCP standards and evaluated accordingly at that time. Until that time, however, Staff cannot recommend that the Commission find this application consistent with the Coastal Act.



Staff Report Contents

1. Staff Recommendation on CDP Application.....	3
2. Recommended Findings and Declarations.....	4
A. Project Location and Description.....	4
B. Standard of Review/LCP History.....	4
C. Community Character	5
Carmel’s Community Character	6
Cumulative Community Character Impacts.....	7
Prejudice to LCP Planning Efforts.....	8
Specific Project Impacts and Coastal Act Consistency Analysis.....	10
Conclusion	14
Alternatives	14
D. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)	15
3. Exhibits	
Exhibit 1: Site Maps	
Exhibit 2: Site Photos	
Exhibit 3: Site Plan and Elevations	

1. Staff Recommendation on CDP Application

The staff recommends that the Commission, after public hearing, **deny** a coastal development permit for the proposed development.

Motion. I move that the Commission approve Coastal Development Permit Number 3-01-078 for the development proposed by the Applicants.

Staff Recommendation of Denial. Staff recommends a **no** vote. Failure of this motion will result in denial of the permit and adoption of the following resolution and findings. The motion passes only by affirmative vote of a majority of the Commissioners present.

Resolution to Deny a Coastal Development Permit. The Commission hereby denies a coastal development permit for the proposed development on the grounds that the project will not conform with the policies of Chapter 3 of the Coastal Act, and will 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 would not comply with the California Environmental Quality Act because there are feasible mitigation measures or alternatives that would substantially lessen the significant adverse effects of the development on the environment.



2. Recommended Findings and Declarations

The Commission finds and declares as follows:

A. Project Location and Description

The applicant proposes to demolish an existing single-story residence and carport (832 square feet) and construct in its place, a two-story 1,800 square foot single family residence on a 4,000 square foot lot on the east side of Guadalupe between 3rd & 4th Avenue in the City of Carmel-by-the-Sea. The proposal also includes 688 square feet of driveway, walkways, and patios. Overall height is 23 feet, 2 inches for the proposed structure, slightly below the maximum allowed by City standard. The proposed mass of the structure is estimated to be roughly 25,155 cubic feet. The chimney tower rises to 25 feet. Side yard setbacks are 3 feet at both the north and south elevations. The rear yard setback is 11 feet and the front yard setback (Guadalupe Street) is 27 feet. Total site coverage is estimated at about 1,930 square feet. The architecture style of the replacement structure is Tudor-revival, with proposed exterior materials such as stucco walls, stucco chimney, shed dormer windows, and a vertical wood plank front door and garage.

According to the City's staff report, the proposed structure to be demolished was constructed in 1957. It is built of wood and brick with a front facing medium-pitched gabled roof. The structure does not exhibit any particular or distinct architectural style. Though, like most of its contemporaries, it is modest in size, scale (mass), height, and of a generally simple architectural design.

Perhaps more notable are the existing site characteristics, which include a level pad and building envelope and a 20 – 40 percent slope towards the northwest corner of the lot. There are 5 Monterey pines and one oak located within the front yard setback, and two more significant trees located in the unimproved right-of-way on the west frontage adjacent to Guadalupe Street. The project site is located in a developed area within the City and is surrounded by modest sized cottages to the north and south. No trees are proposed for removal.

B. Standard of Review/LCP History

The entire City of Carmel falls within the coastal zone, but the City does not yet have a certified LCP. Approximately twenty years ago, the City submitted the Land Use Plan (LUP) portion of its LCP for review by the Coastal Commission. On April 1, 1981, the Commission certified part of the LUP as submitted and part of the LUP with suggested modifications regarding beach-fronting property. The City resubmitted an amended LUP that addressed the beach-fronting properties provisions, but that omitted the previously certified portion of the document protecting significant buildings within the City. On April 27, 1984, the Commission certified the amended LUP with suggested modifications to reinstate provisions for protecting significant structures. However, the City never accepted the Commission's suggested modifications and so the LUP remains uncertified.



The LCP zoning or Implementation Plan (IP) was certified by the Commission with suggested modifications on April 27, 1984. However, the City did not accept the suggested modifications and so the IP, too, remains uncertified.

Predating the City's LCP planning efforts, the Commission authorized a broad-ranging categorical exclusion within the City of Carmel in 1977 (Categorical Exclusion E-77-13). E-77-13 excludes most types of development not located along the beach and beach frontage of the City from coastal permitting requirements. Demolitions, though, such as that proposed in this case, are not excluded.

The City is currently working on a new LCP submittal (both LUP and IP), funded in part by an LCP completion grant awarded by the Commission. This current City effort is focused on protecting the significant coastal resources found in Carmel, including the spectacular public beach and recreational amenities along the City's frontage, the urban forest that uniquely identifies Carmel as the City within the trees, the substantial riparian and habitat areas (such as Mission Trails Nature Preserve and Pescadero Canyon), and the unique community and visual character of Carmel as exhibited by the style, scale, and rich history of its residential, commercial, and civic architecture. Taken as a whole, these resources combine to form the special character of Carmel; a character that is separately a significant coastal resource worthy of protection in its own right. The City submitted its LCP to the Commission on December 20, 2002. Staff is in the process of reviewing the submittal and filing it for formal Commission action.

Unless and until the Commission has certified any future City LCP submittals, the Commission retains coastal permitting authority over non-excluded development within the City. As a result, although the City's current ordinances and policies can provide context and guidance, the standard of review for this application is the Coastal Act.

C. Community Character

The current project raises doubts about its consistency with Coastal Act Section 30253(5), which protects and preserves the character of special communities and neighborhoods. Coastal Act Section 30253(5) states:

Section 30253(5). New development shall where appropriate, protect special communities and neighborhoods which, because of their unique characteristics, are popular visitor destination points for recreational uses.

Sections 30251 of the Coastal Act adds further protection to the scenic and view qualities of coastal areas:

Section 30251. 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 on 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 subordinate to the character of its setting.

Carmel's Community Character

Carmel, of course, is a very popular visitor destination, known as much for the style, scale, and rich history of its residential, commercial, and civic architecture, as for its renowned shopping area, forest canopy and white sand beach. The City is considered a "special community" under the Coastal Act due to its unique architectural and visual character. It is often stated that Carmel, along with such other special coastal communities as the town of Mendocino, is one of the special communities for which Coastal Act Section 30253(5) was written. Indeed, Carmel has been, and remains today, a spectacular coastal resource known the world over as an outstanding visitor destination.

In particular, as a primarily residential community, the web of residential development in Carmel plays a key role in defining the special character of the City, as various architectural styles present reflect the historical influences that have existed over time. Carmel is distinctly recognized for its many small, well-crafted cottages. These modest, sometimes quaint residences are associated with the era in which Carmel was known for its resident artists and writers, and functioned as a retreat for university professors and other notables. These little homes were nestled into the native Monterey pine/Coast live oak forest, on a grid of streets that was executed in a way that yielded to trees more than to engineering expediency. This was the context for Carmel's community life and its built character.

The demolition and replacement of existing residential buildings in Carmel, such as this project, have great potential to alter this special community character protected by the Coastal Act. In particular, these projects raise questions as to (1) whether or not an existing house represents the historical, architectural, scale, and environmental character of Carmel; and (2) if a replacement house detracts from Carmel's character because of a modern design, tree removal, proposed house size, or other characteristics.

The impacts of a residential demolition on community character can depend on a variety of factors. For example, there are a number of cases where a house or houses were demolished and a single, much larger house was constructed on the site. In other instances, a single house straddling a lot line has been demolished and two new, smaller houses were constructed. In either of these types of instances, the character of Carmel may or may not be preserved, depending on the context, but it is certainly changed, either through the increase in residential density or a change in mass and scale. The size of a house is one aspect of Carmel's character, but not all existing houses in Carmel are small. However, because the lots are almost all relatively small, about 4000 square feet, the general pattern of development is one of smaller houses.

The architectural style of houses in Carmel is another aspect of the City's character. Many of the houses were built in the first quarter of the century in the Craftsman style; others resemble houses that might be found in an English village. Modern style houses, while they do exist, are not prevalent in Carmel. A



residential demolition and rebuild project can both remove a structure that expresses the community character, and result in a new structure that may not reflect the surrounding neighborhood character.

A third aspect of Carmel's character is the pine and oak dominated landscape. Although the forest landscape is not all natural – there has been enhancement over the years by tree planting – it pervades the City and is a defining characteristic of Carmel. Demolition often can result in tree damage and/or removal. New construction after demolition also may result in the loss of trees, especially if a new structure is built out to the maximum allowed by the zoning. And, the potential for the growth of the next generation of trees is reduced in proportion to the increase in hardscape because there is less room for seedlings to get started.

The historic resource value of a structure is another important factor to consider when evaluating impacts to community character. In general, structures greater than 50 years old may be considered historic, depending on the results of a specific historic resource assessment. In some cases, depending on the persons associated with a structure, or the significance of a structure to Carmel's local history, a building may be deemed to be a historic resource by the City, the State Office of Historic Preservation, or other public agency. The Carmel Preservation Society also may have identified a structure as an historic structure, or a structure may be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR), particularly if it is found to be a contributing element of the potential District One historical district in Carmel. (One consideration in the City's development of its LCP is the creation of historic districts. The City is assessing the viability of establishing a historic district where a critical mass of historical structures are known to exist. Structures located within one of these districts would be preserved and recognized for their contribution to the historical character of Carmel.) Finally, individual structures may be historically significant because they convey the design principles of a distinctive artistic or architectural style, such as the Arts and Crafts movement, which is typical in Carmel. The landscaping of a site may also be part of such a style.

Cumulative Community Character Impacts

Recent trends in demolitions also raise concerns about the cumulative impacts of individual projects on Carmel's community character. It is important, therefore, that the effect of this particular demolition/rebuild be evaluated within the context of the larger pattern of demolition and rebuild over the years in Carmel.

Over time, the character of Carmel has been changing as its older housing and commercial stock makes way for new, usually larger in size and scale, developments. According to the Commission's permit tracking database, approximately 650 projects involving development have received coastal development permit authorization in Carmel since 1973. The overwhelming majority of these involved residential development of one sort or another ranging from complete demolition and rebuild to small additions to existing structures. It is likely that this number undercounts this trend inasmuch as the Commission's database was created in 1993 and, while every effort was made to capture archival actions, the database may not reflect every single such action taken. In addition, due in part to the City's categorical exclusion, it is not clear how many projects involving substantial remodel (but not complete



demolition) have taken place over the years.

In contrast, the Commission's database for the period since 1990 is fairly robust. Since 1990, there have been roughly 185 coastal permit applications in Carmel. Of these, approximately 150 projects (or over 80%) involve some form of demolition, rebuilding and/or substantial alteration of residential housing stock in Carmel. This comes out to roughly 14 such residentially related projects per year since 1990; nearly all of these have been approved. Other than the three year period from 1992 – 1994 when a total of 13 applications were received, the number of development proposals in Carmel had been fairly constant until 2000. However, in the year 2000 alone, the Commission had received 44 applications; a full quarter of all applications received by the Commission for development in Carmel in the last decade. Of these 44 applications received in the year 2000, 33 of these involved some form of demolition, rebuilding and/or substantial alteration of residential structures. Thus far, in 2001, 24 applications have been received; 16 of these involved residential demolitions/alterations. Clearly the trend for demolition/rebuild/substantial remodel has been magnified in current years as demand for Carmel properties has outstripped the limited supply represented by the approximately 3,200 parcels within the boundaries of this small town. As this trend has continued, it has become increasingly difficult to conclude that the demolition of residential structures is not significantly changing the unique character of Carmel.

Prejudice to LCP Planning Efforts

In addition to the direct concerns with whether a particular demolition is consistent with Coastal Act Section 30253(5), there is real concern that the individual and cumulative impact of changes in community character, primarily through the approval of residential demolitions, in the City of Carmel-by-the-Sea may prejudice the City's efforts to prepare and complete a certified LCP that is consistent with the Coastal Act. The Coastal Act provides in Section 30604(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). A denial of a coastal development permit on grounds it would prejudice the ability of the local government to prepare a local coastal program that is in conformity with Chapter 3 (commencing with Section 30200) shall be accompanied by a specific finding which sets forth the basis for that conclusion.

It is not entirely clear whether and to what extent the history of demolition/rebuild/remodel has altered the special community character aesthetic of Carmel that is protected by the Coastal Act. The Commission has not undertaken a formal cumulative impact assessment of such a trend to date. There is little doubt that structures within the City have generally been getting larger, and that many structures of at least some individual historical and other value have been demolished. The difficulty is that the Commission cannot necessarily ensure that continuation of residential demolitions and rebuilds will protect Carmel's community character. In other words, such projects may be prejudicing the City's



completion of an LCP that is consistent with the Coastal Act.

Part of the reason for this is that although the elements that define the City's community character can be generally described (as discussed above; e.g., "the City in the forest", architectural style, historic value, scale, etc.), there has yet to be completed a comprehensive assessment and articulation of how all of these factors interact to define Carmel's character. Although individual projects may raise many concerns, depending on the facts of the structure, the nature of the proposal, the context of the development, etc., there are no planning standards and ordinances that provide a clear framework for whether a project meets the requirements of the Coastal Act – i.e., to protect the special community character of Carmel.

To implement the community character protection requirements of the Coastal Act, the Commission has always emphasized the importance of having local communities define their community character through a local planning process, so that a Local Coastal Program, when certified, will meet both the community's vision and understanding of its character, and the requirements of the Coastal Act. Although the Coastal Act provides a more general statewide policy framework for protecting community character, the details, for example, of whether particular types of structures should be deemed to be historic, or whether certain architectural styles reflect the character of a community, need to be developed through a local planning process such as that provided by the LCP process of the Coastal Act.

As mentioned earlier, the City of Carmel is currently finishing up a community planning process to determine, among other things, the basis for defining Carmel's community character, and ways to protect and preserve that character consistent with the Coastal Act. On December 20, 2001, the City's LCP was submitted to the Commission's Central Coast office for review and evaluation. However, until the LCP has been certified, Coastal Act Section 30253 requires that individual projects not have direct or cumulative adverse impacts on Carmel's character; and Section 30604 requires that individual projects not raise significant concerns about consistency with Section 30253, lest they prejudice the completion of an LCP consistent with the Coastal Act. As discussed above, the cumulative residential demolition trend in Carmel has made it increasingly difficult to conclude that these projects are not significantly changing the special community character of Carmel. Although each project must be judged on its individual circumstances, the cumulative context necessarily shapes these judgements, precisely because the community character of a place is in part the sum total of its parts.

Because the more specific features that define Carmel's character, as well as their relative significance, is yet to be decided, it is important to focus on measures of significant change to community character so that the completion of an LCP consistent with the Coastal Act is not prejudiced. Thus, the Commission can be assured that projects that do *not* result in significant changes in the various features of Carmel's community character, will not prejudice the completion of an LCP consistent with section 30253. Examples of such measures of change in community character include the following types of questions:

Would the proposed project:

- Result in a 10% or greater increase in the gross square footage, height, or footprint (site coverage)



from that which is currently present (the 10% measure reflects the standards of the Coastal Act for evaluating replacements of structures destroyed by a disaster (section 30610))?

- Result in the removal of any significant (i.e., 6" or greater in diameter) native pine, willow, cypress, or oak trees? Or, even if no trees are removed, involve sufficient limb removal to be a significant loss of forest canopy?
- Involve a structure greater than 50 years old for which the City has not performed a historic resource assessment (i.e., the potential historic value of the structure is uncertain)?
- Modify a structure deemed to be a historic resource by the City, the State Office of Historic Preservation, the Carmel Preservation Society, or other public agency or knowledgeable entity (since the value of the historic resource within the context of the community has not yet been defined, the demolition of such structures may prejudice the LCP)?
- Not identify a City-approved replacement structure (i.e., the project is a "speculative" demolition and thus by definition has an uncertain impact on community character)?
- Facilitate an increase in residential density (a common type of application is to demolish one house that straddles two parcels, to allow a replacement house on each parcel)?
- Facilitate replacement of traditional architecture style in favor of contemporary or modernistic styles (from the visitor's perspective, rustic cottage and Craftsman styles are those most likely representative of Carmel's architectural traditions)?

Specific Project Impacts and Coastal Act Consistency Analysis

As discussed below, the proposed demolition and rebuild raises significant concerns about consistency with Coastal Act section 30253(5). Because it will result in a number of significant changes to aspects of Carmel's community character, it must be denied at this time.

The c. 1957 structure is a modest Carmel cottage made of wood and brick. It has no distinct architectural design or style. The size, scale, and height of the existing structure are consistent with the general trends of the City's residential structures of the time and are well below the City's current allowable maximum standards (not certified by the Commission). The homes immediately adjacent to the existing structure are also made of wood and are generally small in scale and unpretentious. The dominant features of the site are an elevated yet level building envelope towards the rear half of the lot, the moderate slope at the front of the lot, and the mature trees growing on the property and in the City right-of-way. The site supports several trees considered by the City to be valuable for the neighborhood forest including six Monterey pines ranging from 28" to 10" and two coast live oaks - a 6" and an 8". No trees are slated for removal. Existing setbacks at this site are 33' at the west (Guadalupe Street) elevation, 28' at the east (rear) elevation, 11' at the north and 12' at the south elevations respectively. No evidence has been submitted to suggest that the house is uninhabitable or in a state of disrepair.



As alluded to above, the structure does not qualify as a historical resource under state or federal criteria for Historic Preservation, because it does not meet the minimum requirement for age (i.e., >50 yrs.). Moreover, the structure does not exhibit any distinct architectural style or design. It is a small home made of natural materials. See Exhibit 2. The structure blends in with, and is subordinate to, the dominant site features rather than attempting to override them. It is modest in size. The house and carport are 835 square feet. Mass is estimated at 8,200 cubic feet. To soften the appearance of the structure on the elevated building envelope, the existing structure is designed as a diminutive single-story, just 13 feet at its apex. The floor area ratio is 21% and total site coverage is 43% (includes other impervious materials). In so doing, the existing structure does not stand out or detract from the natural features of the site. Nor does it appear dominant over the adjacent small cottages to the north and south. It has a significant amount of site coverage, but most of it is decking and walkways with very little massing of structures.

Demolition of the existing house will almost certainly lead to a change in character at this site, particularly when considered in light of the proposed replacement structure that will be facilitated by the demolition. In addition, when the cumulative impacts of demolitions such as that proposed here are considered, particularly the more recent increase in residential demolitions, it is difficult to conclude that this project would not significantly change the community character of Carmel. As mentioned above, the demolition will not involve a structure that qualifies as a historical resource. Secondly, the project does not require the removal of any significant trees or vegetation. The project does involve a City-approved replacement structure and will not increase residential density. However, the proposed development will result in a 10% or greater increase in square footage, scale, and height. Further, though the demolition will not facilitate the replacement of a traditional architectural structure, it does result in the elimination of another small rustic cottage in favor of a large modern / contemporary residence. Thus, although the proposed replacement structure is technically excluded from direct CDP review, several aspects of replacement structures that are facilitated by demolition projects are important to evaluating the community character impacts of such demolitions. These include the architectural design and style, size and height of the replacement structure, and impacts to neighborhood character.

The applicant proposes to construct a new 1,800 square foot, two-story house with attached garage. The architectural design of the replacement structure is modern Tudor-revival style residence, with cross-gabled roof, shed dormer windows, heavy wood shank shingles, stucco chimney, and vertical wood plank garage door and main entrance. The proposal also results in a significant increase in height, mass, and site coverage. The overall height of the proposed structure would be greater than 23 feet, more than 10 feet higher than existing. The chimney tower rises to 25'. Estimated mass of the replacement structure is 25,155 cubic feet, three times the amount existing on site. The floor area ratio is more than doubled to 45% and the total proposed site coverage is increased to 1,930 square feet or roughly 11% greater. Overall, the proposed new structure is more than twice as large (116% greater) in square footage and three times as massive (207% greater) over the existing cottage. Side yard setbacks are reduced at each elevation, including reduction of 8 and 9 feet at the north and south elevations, 17 feet at the rear yard elevation and 6 feet at the front yard setback (Guadalupe Street). Table 1 illustrates the differences in the existing and proposed site characteristics. Thus, though the replacement structure includes offsets and



articulations to the house and roof form, because of its size, height, mass, and design, it will appear large, dominant, and generally, "boxy" from the west, Guadalupe Street, elevation. As proposed, the replacement project represents an 11% increase in site coverage and a corresponding 207% increase in mass.

TABLE 1

Lot Area (4,000sf)	Existing Structure	Proposed Structure	Difference
Floor Area*	832 sf	1,800 sf	116%
Height	13 ft	23+ ft	10+ ft
Mass**	8,200 cu ft	25,155 cu ft	207%
Site Coverage	1,743 sf	1,930 sf	11%
Setbacks			
Front (Torres Street)	33 ft	27 ft	-6 ft
Rear (East)	28 ft	11 ft	-17 ft
North	11 ft	3 ft	-8 ft
South	12 ft	3 ft	-9 ft

*Includes both house and carport / garage.

** Mass calculations are estimates only.

As noted above, the proposed architectural design is modern and eclectic, substantially different and certainly larger from that currently existing on site. See Exhibit 3. The City of Carmel-by-the-Sea Planning Commission, concerned with the design treatment of replacement homes, requires findings be made that the project is consistent with Design Study Findings of its Municipal Code. Although these Code Findings are not certified by the Commission, they do provide important context for understanding the potential community character impacts of the project. In particular, Section 17.18.170, *Findings Required For Design Study Approval*, require that City evaluate whether the submitted plans support adoption of the findings. Those findings include, in part:



1. *The design is sensitive to site features including topography, slope, access, vegetation, and the site's relationship to adjoining properties.*
3. *All improvements are designed to a human scale and a residential character, and the improvements will not appear excessively massive or dominating, as viewed from adjoining properties or from any public right-of-way.*
9. *The design is compatible with the character of the neighborhood and would not provide an incentive for construction on other sites that would be inconsistent with neighborhood character or the intent of the residential design objectives.*
10. *The proposed design is consistent with the General Plan, the Local Coastal Plan and the purpose and intent of the residential design guidelines.*

Although, the Planning Commission (PC) ultimately approved the design of the project, in each case, there was enough uncertainty regarding the proposed project design that the PC could not answer unequivocally, YES. The City Planning Commission answered MAYBE to each of the four findings listed above suggesting that the proposal may not be in line with the character of neighborhood / community or consistent with the City's GP and residential design guidelines.

Commission staff has had an opportunity to evaluate the application materials submitted for review and has similar concerns to those expressed in the findings of the City. Staff reviewed the broader context of the surroundings as well as the investigating the structures immediately adjacent to the proposed development to evaluate whether the proposed structure would deviate significantly from the character of the neighborhood. In its findings, the City described the neighborhood context as follows: "from first to Fifth Avenues there are a number of one-story residences punctuated by some two-story that front onto Guadalupe Street." The house immediately south of this site is single-story and though it rests on a slightly higher finished grade elevation, it would still be four to five feet below the roofline of the proposed project. The house immediately to the north is one and one-half stories but rests at a lower finished grade elevation. Given the raised building envelope and two-story design, the roofline of the proposed project would be between ten to eleven feet higher than the roofline of the neighboring property to the north. Accordingly, the proposed development appears much larger and dominant from Guadalupe Street and is not compatible with its immediate surroundings.

Additionally, the increase in height and square footage increase the mass of the structure dramatically. Accordingly, the additional size necessitates a reduction in the existing setbacks. This is particularly noticeable on the side yard elevations where the proposed setback is 3 feet versus existing setbacks of 11 and 12 feet, exacerbating the overly large and boxy appearance from Guadalupe Street. Thus, the new structure will appear substantially larger, "boxy" and of a distinctly different genre than the two modest cottages on either side. The proposed design does not necessarily compliment the current site conditions and may detract from them. As a result, the development will be the dominant feature of the site and will dominate the immediate surroundings of this neighborhood. See Exhibit 3.



Conclusion

Overall, as proposed, the demolition of the existing structure to facilitate construction of the new two-story residence will result in a significant change to the neighborhood's special character. Section 30253(5) of the Coastal Act requires that new development protect the character of special communities and neighborhoods. Whether or not this "change" is appropriate, has yet to be defined by the City of Carmel and the local community through the LCP process. The critical point is that there would be a significant change in community character with this project. If there were no significant changes in the various aspects that together make up community character in Carmel, the project might otherwise be approvable. (For example, the Winterbotham remodel (3-01-081) represented an increase in the size and scale from the old to new building. However, the proposed design incorporated the architectural styling of the existing structure in combination with varied offsets and rooflines to soften the appearance of the larger structure as viewed from the street.) Moreover, when the cumulative trend of increasing residential demolitions in Carmel is considered, it is difficult to conclude that this project does not result in significant impacts to community character. As such, the project as currently proposed cannot be found to be consistent with Section 30253(5) of the Coastal Act, either individually or cumulatively, because of uncertainties about what exactly would protect Carmel's character, consistent with 30253(5). Therefore, the project must be denied.

Further, by demolishing the subject structure now, its overall contribution to community character will be forever altered; replaced in some way by the structure meant to take its place at this location. Because community character has not yet been clearly defined, the effect of such a demolition on Carmel's character is unclear. Because it cannot be guaranteed that such a demolition would protect Carmel's community character, consistent with 30253(5), the project will prejudice the ability of the local government to prepare a local coastal program that is in conformity with Chapter 3, and is thus inconsistent with Coastal Act Policy 30604(a) and must be denied. This denial is without prejudice to the proposed project inasmuch as once the City's LCP has been finished, and ultimately certified by the Commission, the proposed project could be held up against the applicable LCP standards and evaluated accordingly at that time. Until that time, however, the Commission cannot find this application consistent with the Coastal Act.

Alternatives

As discussed above, the project must be denied because it cannot be found to be consistent with Coastal Act Section 30253(5) and is inconsistent with 30604(a). The Coastal Act also requires that any action by the Commission not adversely impact or result in a take or damage of private property rights. Coastal Act Section 30010 specifically states:

Section 30010. The Legislature hereby finds and declares that this division is not intended, and shall not be construed as authorizing the commission, port governing body, or local government acting pursuant to this division to exercise their power to grant or deny a permit in a manner which will take or damage private property for public use, without the payment of just compensation therefor. This section is not intended to increase or decrease the rights of any



owner of property under the Constitution of the State of California or the United States.

In this case, the Applicant proposes to demolish an existing residence and replace it with another residence of different size and architectural style. Though denial of such a project is inconsistent with plans of the permittee, there are alternatives that would allow for a reasonable economic use of the site.

The first alternative is the "no project" alternative. The current development proposal may have significant adverse effects on community character and/or prejudice the City's ability to prepare and complete an LCP. As an alternative to demolishing the existing home and reconstructing a new house on site, the applicant can live in the existing structure. There was no information provided to suggest that the structure was uninhabitable or in a state of disrepair. Living in the existing house will maintain the existing character of the neighborhood and have no affect on the City's ability to prepare an LCP.

A second alternative would be to submit an application for a structure of similar size, height, and volume as the existing structure. The design would also emphasize traditional architectural styles similar to the craftsman-type structures immediately adjacent to the subject property and seen elsewhere in the neighborhood. If a larger home is desired, a single story residence that steps-up from the front of the building envelope and back from the Guadalupe Street frontage, minimizing overall height, could also be considered.

The applicant may also choose to wait until the City's LCP is complete. The alternative would be to withdraw the current application and keep the existing use with the expectation that the applicant will resubmit to the City's after the LCP has been certified. Once the City has a certified LCP in place, the application for a CDP (demolition and reconstruction) would be evaluated by the City for consistency with the LCP. The City Council approved a final draft of the LCP and submitted it to the Commission for review and evaluation on December 20, 2001.

Thus, though the current project proposal is not consistent with the Chapter 3 policies of the Coastal Act, there are feasible alternatives that would protect against the loss of community character and that would not prejudice the City's ability to prepare and complete its LCP.

D. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)


Section 13096 of the California Code of Regulations requires that a specific finding be made in conjunction with coastal development permit applications showing the application 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 effect that the activity may have on the environment.

The Coastal Commission's review and analysis of land use proposals has been certified by the Secretary of Resources as being the functional equivalent of environmental review under CEQA. Notwithstanding the City's adopted CEQA document, the Commission's findings above (incorporated herein by



reference) have documented that the proposed project could lead to significant adverse effects to Carmel's community character protected by the Coastal Act, impacts that cannot be adequately evaluated without completion of the City's LCP. Approval of the proposed project in the face of this uncertainty would prejudice the City's LCP planning efforts. All public comments received relevant to this application have been addressed either in these findings or in other correspondence. As such, the Commission finds that the proposed demolition would result in significant adverse effects on the environment within the meaning of CEQA, and that at least two alternatives to the project are available. Accordingly, the proposed project is not approvable under CEQA and is denied.





LEGEND

FREEWAY ACCESS ROUTES SHOWN

INTERSTATE 68 101

ALL STREETS CITY STREETS

UNIMPROVED STREETS

RAILROADS

WATER

1000' 2000'


0 Kilometers 500m

© Copyright MEMPHIS Edition of 1987
Compass Maps, Inc., 1175 Kestrel Avenue
Mountain View, CA 94039 - ALL RIGHTS RESERVED


Reproduction or copying of these maps, in whole or in part, by any manner, is absolutely prohibited without written permission of copyright owner, Compass Maps, P.O. Box 4388, Modesto, CA 95352. To do so is a violation of the United States Copyright Laws.

EXHIBIT NO. /
APPLICATION NO.
3-01-078
Site Map


9-14




9-14



9-13




9-16




CARPENTER ST.

2ND AVE



SANTA RITA ST.



SANTA FE ST


10

TAX CODE AREA 1-00

ASSESSOR'S MAP
BOOK 12 PAGE 02


9-16

3RD AVE.



4TH AVE.

3



CARMEL CITY
BLOCKS 15, 16, 17, &

9

EXHIBIT NO.	1
APPLICATION NO.	3-01-078
Site Map	



Site View




Front Elevation



Rear Elevation

Exhibit 2
Site Photographs
3-01-078
Corrigan Demolition

GUADALUPE STREET
(A 60 FOOT WIDE CITY STREET)



PROJECT DATA


(B) SITE DATA	
TOTAL FLOOR AREA	500 SQ FT
TOTAL PERMITS	100 SQ FT
PROPOSED BUILDINGS	
NO. OF BUILDINGS	1
TOTAL FLOOR AREA PROPOSED	500 SQ FT
TOTAL PERMITS PROPOSED	100 SQ FT
PROPOSED PERMITS	100 SQ FT
Labels: LOT 1, BLOCK 41 NORTH OF CORNER LOT 1 SOUTH OF CORNER LOT 1 WEST OF CORNER LOT 1 EAST OF CORNER LOT 1	
OWNER: PAT CORRIGAN ARCHITECT: CASE ASSOCIATES ARCHITECTURE 1001 W. 17th STREET, SUITE 100 DENVER, CO 80202-1000	

SITE PLAN


A NEW RESIDENCE
FOR **PAT CORRIGAN**
2ND SE GUADALUPE and 5RD

+ CASE ASSOCIATES
architecture
1001 W. 17th STREET, SUITE 100
DENVER, CO 80202-1000
TEL: 303-733-1000


EXHIBIT NO. 3
APPLICATION NO. 3-07-078
Site Plans
P 1 of 4




EAST



NORTH



WEST
FACED STREET



SOUTH

A NEW RESIDENCE
FOR PAT CORRIGAN
2ND SE GUADALUPE and 3RD


+ CASE ASSOCIATES
architecture
ONE CALLE PRINCIPAL
ROCKFORD, CA 95960
TEL 925-434-3410 FAX 925-434-3411

EXHIBIT NO. 3

APPLICATION NO.
3-01-078

Site Plans

page of 4





STREET ELEVATION
1/8" = 1'-0"

EXHIBIT NO. 3
APPLICATION NO. 3-01-078
Site Plans
p 3 of 4

- NOTES:**
1. EXISTING LOT LINES SHOWN BY DASHED LINES AND THE CENTER OF A 60 FOOT WIDE CITY STREET IS SHOWN BY A DASHED LINE WITH THE NUMBER 60. ALL DIMENSIONS ARE TAKEN FROM THE EXISTING LOT LINES UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.
 2. EXISTING LOT LINES AND CENTER OF CITY STREET SHOWN BY DASHED LINES. ALL DIMENSIONS ARE TAKEN FROM THE EXISTING LOT LINES UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.
 3. EXISTING LOT LINES AND CENTER OF CITY STREET SHOWN BY DASHED LINES. ALL DIMENSIONS ARE TAKEN FROM THE EXISTING LOT LINES UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.
 4. SEE SHEET 3-07-078-1
 5. EXISTING LOT LINES AND CENTER OF CITY STREET SHOWN BY DASHED LINES. ALL DIMENSIONS ARE TAKEN FROM THE EXISTING LOT LINES UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.
- LEGEND:**
- 1. EXISTING LOT LINES
 - 2. EXISTING CENTER OF CITY STREET
 - 3. EXISTING LOT LINES AND CENTER OF CITY STREET
 - 4. EXISTING LOT LINES AND CENTER OF CITY STREET
 - 5. EXISTING LOT LINES AND CENTER OF CITY STREET
 - 6. EXISTING LOT LINES AND CENTER OF CITY STREET
 - 7. EXISTING LOT LINES AND CENTER OF CITY STREET
 - 8. EXISTING LOT LINES AND CENTER OF CITY STREET
 - 9. EXISTING LOT LINES AND CENTER OF CITY STREET
 - 10. EXISTING LOT LINES AND CENTER OF CITY STREET

GUADALUPE STREET
(A 60 FOOT WIDE CITY STREET)



EXISTING
SITE
PLAN

A NEW RESIDENCE
FOR **PAT CORRIGAN**
2ND SE GUADALUPE and 3RD

+ CASE
ASSOCIATES
architecture
491 CALLE PRINCIPAL
POWHEENY, GA. 30140
866-888-2810 FAX: 866-888-3414

EXHIBIT NO. 3

APPLICATION NO.
3-07-078

Site Plans

P 1 of 4

