

CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION

South Coast Area Office
200 Oceangate, Suite 1000
Long Beach, CA 90802-4302
(562) 590-5071



W23e

ADDENDUM

June 5, 2017

TO: Coastal Commissioners and Interested Parties

FROM: South Coast District Staff

SUBJECT: **ADDENDUM TO ITEM W23E, APPEAL NO. A-5-VEN-17-0018 (HARBAUGH & COURT) FOR THE COMMISSION MEETING OF WEDNESDAY, JUNE 7, 2017.**

The purpose of this addendum is to attach two (2) letters from appellant Sue Kaplan and property owner Carollee Howes, demonstrating opposition for staff's recommendation of a finding of no substantial issue on the grounds for which the appeal was filed. Staff would note that most of the issues raised in the submittal are addressed in the staff report. However, additional concerns are raised by and are addressed by staff below. No changes to the staff report are recommended.

- 1. Rear setback from the alley and configuration of the garage:** The lot is 40 feet wide. Twenty-four feet of the rear property line has a five-foot setback (the driveway), and 16 feet of the rear property line has a fence on it with no setback. The new attached garage is set back five feet, as stated in the summary of the staff report. The new ground floor room next to the garage is setback eight feet from the alley, but the entire eight-foot setback area is occupied by an exterior stairway that is partially enclosed by a fence that already exists on the rear property line. Ms. Kaplan states that saying the structure is set back eight feet from the rear property line is misleading, however the staff report is clear that the garage has a five-foot setback and the stairway has a zero-foot setback.

Ms. Kaplan expressed concern regarding the whether or not the garage is attached to the residence. The new garage is an "attached garage." The demolished garage is not attached. The report does not indicate that it is not an attached garage and/or the garage is not a part of the overall structure. The report does make a point that the local coastal development permit for the project includes replacing the old garage with a new garage.

- 2. Amount of demolition:** Ms. Kaplan expressed concern regarding the amount of demolition of the existing structures on the site in order to determine if the project should

be considered a minor or major remodel and questioned if the 58 feet of the demolition of the existing detached garage is included in the calculation. The amount of demolition is not addressed in the appeal or the staff report (only in Exhibit #4 which is the applicant's statement). Staff expects that more than 50% of the structures on the site will be demolished; however this project has obtained a coastal development permit (CDP) from the City of Los Angeles for a substantial remodel. Because the appeal did not raise the amount of demolition as an issue and the applicants obtained a CDP from the City, the staff report does not attempt to quantify the amount of demolition. Additionally, the reduced rear setback allows for the extra-large front yard setback that the applicant proposes in order to preserve a very large old palm. If the project were to be considered a demo/rebuild, the City may have required the one additional parking space on the driveway because the LUP does require a third parking space on 40-foot wide lots, but parking was not raised in the appeal.

3. **Project plans:** Ms. Kaplan states that the project plans are difficult to read. The plans are not that difficult to read, and the setbacks are legible. The on-line exhibits can be enlarged.
4. **Clarification:** Ms. Kaplan states that the second sentence in the second paragraph on page eight of the staff report staff report is confusing and asks for clarification. That sentence means that in this case, it is appropriate to use the certified LUP policies as guidance when interpreting the Chapter 3 policies of the Coastal Act.