

CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION

SAN DIEGO AREA
 7575 METROPOLITAN DRIVE, SUITE 103
 SAN DIEGO, CA 92108-4421
 (619) 767-2370

**W16a**

Staff: K. Carney-SD
 Staff Report: 8/24/17
 Hearing Date: 9/13/17

REVISED CONDITIONS AND FINDINGS

Application No.: 6-15-0333-A1

Applicant: Nick Haggar

Agent: Alan Block

Location: 873 Palomar Street, Chula Vista, San Diego County
(APN No: 622-011-27)

Original Project Description: Construction of a 20-ft. high canopy and 4,435 sq. ft. gas station with 1,000 sq. ft. carwash and a 20-ft. high 4,000 sq. ft. foodmart/restaurant building on a 43,201 sq. ft. vacant lot.

Proposed Amendment: Construct a 20-ft.tall tower addition to the previously approved building and install a 45-ft. tall freestanding pole sign.

Staff Recommendation: ~~Denial~~ Approval with Conditions

STAFF NOTES

Staff recommends the Commission adopt the following revised findings in support of the Commission's action on May 11, 2017. In its action, the Commission approved the permit amendment with conditions to limit signage on the site and remove the proposed 45-foot tall freestanding pole sign. The Commission found that the community character and visual resources would not be significantly impacted by the construction of the proposed tower addition. The freestanding pole sign was not approved.

Commissioners on prevailing side: Commissioners Bochco, Brownsey, Cox, Groom, Howell, Luevano, Peskin, Sundberg, Turnbull-Sanders, Uranga, Vargas.

SUMMARY OF STAFF RECOMMENDATION
SUMMARY OF COMMISSION ACTION

The applicant proposes to construct a 20-foot tall tower addition on top of the existing 20-foot high food mart/restaurant building and install a 45-foot high freestanding pole sign. ~~Approval of this amendment would result in a development that was previously deemed inconsistent with the Coastal Act and required to be revised by the Commission.~~ In November 2011, the Commission approved Coastal Development Permit (CDP) No. 6-11-60 for the construction of an approximately 5,200 sq. ft., 6-island gas station, car wash, and food mart/restaurant building. That project included construction of a 40-foot high tower as part of the food mart building. However, the Commission found at that time that the tower element would result in unacceptable impacts to public views, community character, and the scenic quality of the area, and required the project to be redesigned to limit the building's height to no more than 20 feet. A one-year extension of the permit was granted in November 2013; however, the permit lapsed in November 2014. The applicant applied for a new permit, and in May 2015, the Commission approved CDP No. 6-15-0333 for the construction of a 20-foot high canopy, a 4,435 sq. ft. gas station with a 1,000 sq. ft. car wash, and a 20-foot tall, 4,000 sq. ft. food mart/restaurant building. The project proposed with that application was the same project previously approved by the Commission via CDP No. 6-11-60 and conformed to the Commission's prior conditions of approval.

The ~~subject approved amendment proposal~~ consists of the previously rejected 40-foot high tower as well as an additional 45-foot high freestanding pole sign. A similar 45-foot high freestanding pole sign was originally proposed for CDP No. 6-11-60, however, consultation with staff resulted in removal of the pole sign from the project before Commission action.

The major coastal act issues associated with the project include direct blockage of scenic resources and bulk, scale, and community character inconsistencies. In this particular case, the Commission found that the tower would have minimal impacts on public views and community character. ~~The Commission found that the proposed amendment would result in a decorative tower sign and freestanding pole sign would be that is incompatible with the surrounding community character, would cause direct impacts to scenic resources, would be inconsistent with the intent of the City's LCP in terms of signage, and would set an adverse precedent for the construction of tall buildings and freeway signs. A large, bulky, 40-foot high tower with commercial signage is not the appropriate scale of development for this scenic area adjacent to and overlooking San Diego Bay and is inconsistent with the surrounding community character. As the community transitions from residential and industrial to commercial retail, light industrial, and office, the development of this site is expected to set the pattern of development of the surrounding area.~~ There are no similar freeway signs in the Coastal Zone in Chula Vista at this time, and allowing the subject sign to go forward would likely result in a request for similar signs, both in and out of the Coastal Zone. For example, there is an existing gas station on the east side of the freeway, just north side of Palomar Street that does not have a freeway sign at this time; allowing a new freeway sign for the subject business could result in surrounding businesses requesting the same to remain competitive, resulting in a proliferation of freeway signs. The City of Chula Vista

does not have a certified LCP for this area and allowing the proposed freestanding pole sign development would set an adverse precedent for development and signage and could prejudice the ability of the City of Chula Vista to adopt a certified LCP for the subject area.

The applicant states that the tower addition and signage are necessary for the viability of the existing business; however, in the years since prior Commission action on this site, no changed circumstances have arisen, including progress on a certified LCP for this area or approval of any neighboring buildings or signage similar to what is currently proposed. The applicant developed the site fully aware of the conditions and the Commission's restrictions to preserve coastal resources. Nevertheless, because of the limited impact this particular tower on this site would have on coastal views, the Commission determined that the tower would not result in significant impacts. **Special Condition No. 1** requires the submittal of revised final plans that do not include the freestanding pole sign and **Special Condition No. 5** requires the submittal of a sign program that does not include any roof signs or freestanding pole signs or monument signs greater than 8 feet in height. **Special Condition 6** requires the applicant to record a deed restriction against the property that imposes the conditions of the permit for the purpose of providing notice to future property owners. Only as conditioned can the amendment be found to be consistent with Chapter 3 of the Coastal Act. Thus, the proposed amendment is not consistent with Chapter 3 of the Coastal Act, as well as the record and intent of the Commission's past actions, and staff recommends denial.

The standard of review is Chapter 3 of the Coastal Act.

~~Commission staff recommends **denial** of coastal development permit amendment 6-15-0333-A1.~~

Commission staff recommends **adoption** of the revised findings for coastal development permit amendment 6-15-0333-A1.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. MOTION AND RESOLUTION	5
<u>II. SPECIAL CONDITIONS</u>	5
<u>III. H. FINDINGS AND DECLARATIONS</u>	6
A. AMENDMENT PROJECT DESCRIPTION	7
B. ORIGINAL PROJECT DESCRIPTION/HISTORY	8
C. SCENIC AND VISUAL QUALITY	9
D. LOCAL COASTAL PLANNING.....	14
E. CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT	15

APPENDICES

Appendix A – Conditions of Approval

Appendix B – Substantive File Documents

EXHIBITS

[Exhibit 1 – Vicinity Map/Aerial Photo](#)

[Exhibit 2 – Site Plan](#)

[Exhibit 3 – Proposed tower/signage](#)

[Exhibit 4 – Bay & Salt Works Views](#)

[Exhibit 5 – Visual simulations](#)

[Exhibit 6 – Underlying permit view corridor](#)

[Exhibit 7 – Approximate View Blockage](#)

I. MOTION AND RESOLUTION

Motion:

I move that the Commission adopt the revised findings in support of the Commission's action on May 11, 2017, concerning approval of Coastal Development Permit No. 6-15-0333-A1.

Staff recommends a YES vote on the foregoing motion. Passage of this motion will result in adoption of revised findings as set forth in this staff report. The motion requires a majority vote of the members from the prevailing side present at the revised findings hearing, with at least three of the prevailing members voting. Only those Commissioners on the prevailing side of the Commission's action are eligible to vote on the revised findings. The Commissioners eligible to vote are:

Commissioners Bochco, Brownsey, Cox, Groom, Howell, Luevano, Peskin, Sundberg, Turnbull-Sanders, Uranga, Vargas.

Resolution:

The Commission hereby adopts the findings set forth below for Coastal Development Permit 6-15-0333-A1 on the grounds that the findings support the Commission's decision on May 11, 2017, and accurately reflect the reasons for it.

Motion:

I move that the Commission **approve** the proposed amendment to Coastal Development Permit Application No. 6-15-0333-A1 subject to the conditions set forth in the staff recommendation.

Staff recommends a NO vote on the foregoing motion. Passage of this motion will result in denial of the permit amendment and adoption of the following resolution and findings. The motion passes only by affirmative vote of a majority of the Commissioners present.

Resolution:

The Commission hereby denies coastal development permit 6-15-0333-A1 and adopts the findings set forth below on grounds that the development as conditioned will not be in conformity 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 either 1) feasible mitigation measures and/or alternatives have not been incorporated to substantially lessen any significant

adverse effects of the development on the environment, or 2) there are further feasible mitigation measures or alternatives that would substantially lessen any significant adverse impacts of the development on the environment.

II. SPECIAL CONDITIONS

This permit is granted subject to the following special conditions:

NOTE: Appendix A, attached, includes all standard and special conditions that apply to this permit, as approved by the Commission in its original action and modified and/or supplemented by all subsequent amendments, including this amendment no. 6-15-0333-A1. All of the Commission's adopted special conditions and any changes in the project description proposed by the applicant and approved by the Commission in this or previous actions continue to apply in their most recently approved form unless explicitly changed in this action. New conditions and modifications to existing conditions imposed in this action on amendment no. 6-15-0333-A1 are shown in the following section in double strikeout/double underline format. Within Appendix A, changes to the previously approved special conditions are shown in strikeout/underline format. This will result in one set of adopted special conditions.

1. Revised Final Plans.

PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF THE COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT, the applicant shall submit for review and written approval by the Executive Director, final plans approved by the City of Chula Vista that are in substantial conformance with the plans received by Gary Engineering on November 16, 2016 ~~April 20, 2015~~, but revised to include the following:

A. No tall, freestanding pole signs shall be allowed.

The applicant shall undertake development in accordance with the approved plans. Any proposed changes to the approved plans shall be reported to the Executive Director. No changes to the plans shall occur without a Coastal Commission-approved amendment to this coastal development permit unless the Executive Director determines that no amendment is legally required.

2. [Special Condition No. 2 of CDP No. 6-15-0333 remains unchanged and in effect]

3. [Special Condition No. 3 of CDP No. 6-15-0333 remains unchanged and in effect]

4. [Special Condition No. 4 of CDP No. 6-15-0333 remains unchanged and in effect]

5. Sign Program.

PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF THE COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT, the applicant shall submit to the Executive Director for review and written approval, a comprehensive sign program approved by the City of Chula Vista, documenting that only monument signs, not to exceed eight (8) feet in height, or façade signs are proposed. No tall, freestanding pole or roof signs shall be allowed.

The applicant shall undertake development in accordance with the approved program. Any proposed changes to the approved plans shall be reported to the Executive Director. No changes to the plans shall occur without a Coastal Commission-approved amendment to this coastal development permit unless the Executive Director determines that no amendment is legally required.

6. PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF THIS COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT AMENDMENT (6-15-0333-A1), the applicant shall submit to the Executive Director for review and approval documentation demonstrating that the landowner has executed and recorded against the parcel(s) governed by this permit amendment a deed restriction, in a form and content acceptable to the Executive Director: (1) indicating that, pursuant to this permit amendment, the California Coastal Commission has authorized development on the subject property, subject to terms and conditions that restrict the use and enjoyment of that property; and (2) imposing the Special Conditions of this permit amendment, as covenants, conditions and restrictions on the use and enjoyment of the Property. The deed restriction shall include a legal description of the entire parcel or parcels governed by this permit amendment. The deed restriction shall also indicate that, in the event of an extinguishment or termination of the deed restriction for any reason, the terms and conditions of this permit amendment, shall continue to restrict the use and enjoyment of the subject property so long as either this permit or the development it authorizes, or any part, modification, or amendment thereof, remains in existence on or with respect to the subject property.

III H. FINDINGS AND DECLARATIONS

A. AMENDMENT PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The subject site is currently developed with a gas station, car wash, and an approximately 4,000 sq. ft. foodmart/restaurant building. The existing restaurant building is 20 feet high, and the canopy over the gas station is approximately 20 feet high. The proposed amendment would allow construction of a 20-foot tall, 750 sq. ft. decorative tower addition on top of the eastern portion of the existing food mart/restaurant building and installation of a new 45-foot tall, freestanding pole sign located on the northeastern portion of the property ([Exhibit 2 & 3](#)).

The subject site is located in the southern portion of the City of Chula Vista, just west of Interstate 5, approximately 500 feet inland of San Diego Bay and the South San Diego Bay salt ponds ([Exhibit 1](#)). The area is within the boundaries of the City of Chula Vista as

a result of the 1985 Montgomery Annexation, but is not part of the City's certified LCP. It is assumed that the City's certified LCP will eventually be amended to include this area; until that time, Chapter 3 of the Coastal Act is the standard of review.

B. ORIGINAL PROJECT DESCRIPTION/HISTORY

Development of the subject site was first approved on November 4, 2011 under CDP No. 6-11-60. This CDP allowed for the construction of an approximately 5,200 sq. ft., 6-island gas station, car wash, and food mart/restaurant building on a vacant lot. At that time, the applicant was proposing to include the same 20-foot tall, 750 sq. ft. decorative tower element on the restaurant building that is the subject of this amendment, resulting in a 40-foot tall building. The applicant had originally included construction of a freestanding pole sign as well, but after discussions with staff, the applicant removed this element from the project.

The Commission approved the development with special conditions requiring the project to be redesigned to remove the 20-foot high tower such that no portion of the building would be over 20 feet in height. In its approval, the Commission found that even at 20 feet in height, the proposed new buildings would encroach into existing public views of San Diego Bay, but because the structures on the site had been sited in a manner such that direct view blockage would be limited, these impacts could be minimized to a level less than significant with conditions requiring establishment of a view corridor where structures and landscaping are limited. However, the 40-foot high decorative tower element proposed was found to be out of scale and inconsistent with the character of the community, which then and now consists of one- and two-story buildings. Further, given that there are many vacant lots in the area surrounding the subject site, the Commission found that it would set an adverse precedent for future development to allow development on this site with the bulk, scale, and height of a 40-foot high tower. The Commission determined that only as revised to limit the height of the building to 20 feet and proposed landscaping in the northern portion of the site to no higher than 5 feet, could the project be found consistent with the visual protection policies of the Coastal Act. To further protect visual quality, the permit also limited signage on the site to only monument signs, not to exceed eight feet in height, or facade signs. No tall, freestanding pole or roof signs were allowed.

A one-year time extension (CDP No. 6-11-60-E1) was granted in November 2013, but the permit subsequently expired on November 4, 2014.

In 2015, the applicant applied for a new permit and proposed the same development that was previously approved by the Commission, including a revised project design that conformed to the Commission's prior conditions of approval (CDP No. 6-15-0333). This permit allowed for the construction of a 20-foot high canopy and 4,435 sq. ft. gas station, with a 1,000 sq. ft. car wash and a 20-foot high, 4,000 sq. ft. food mart/restaurant building. The Commission found that because the building height would not exceed 20 feet, and no freestanding pole signs or other signs exceeding eight feet in height were proposed, the project could be found consistent with the visual protection policies of the Coastal Act. While the underlying permit includes a special condition requiring the

submittal of final plans, it does not explicitly limit the maximum allowed height of the building because the project as proposed would not exceed 20 feet in height. The permit was released and the development was constructed in 2016.

C. SCENIC AND VISUAL QUALITY

Section 30251 of the Coastal Act states:

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 landforms, to be visually compatible with the character of surrounding areas,...

The certified Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan LCP, certified by the Commission in 2012, states:

19.85.005 Sign regulations.

The size, location, and design of all signs in the LCP Planning Area shall be subject to the following:

A. No freestanding sign shall be greater than eight feet in height and signs shall be subject to the regulations of Chapter 19.60 CVMC, Signs, incorporated herein by reference, unless modified by the provisions of this Bayfront Specific Plan.

The subject site is located at the southwestern corner of the on-ramp to Interstate 5 (I-5) and Palomar Street. It is located well above freeway elevation and most development on the site is not visible from the freeway. The Palomar Street bridge crossing over I-5 (just northeast of the site) is a high point in the vicinity. From west of I-5, the overcrossing and the intersection with the southbound I-5 off-ramp, and the northbound I-5 on-ramp, there are existing brief but expansive views across the northern portion of the subject site of the bay, the salt ponds and the historic South Bay Western Salt Works building and its salt “mountains.” ([Exhibit 4](#))

Direct View Blockage

In its approval of the original project, the Commission acknowledged that some existing views of the Western salt works facilities and San Diego Bay would inevitably be impacted by development of the site. However, the siting of the buildings and canopy minimized those impacts. The bay views are primarily across the northern portion of the site, and the development was designed so that the bulk of the structures are located on the southern portion of the lot. Some unobstructed bay views still exist across the northernmost portion of the site, and some views towards the bay also remain under the existing 20-foot high gas station canopy.

Thus, the siting of the existing development minimizes direct encroachment on bay views to the extent feasible. To further protect and preserve views across the site from the sidewalk and public streets, conditions on the existing permit establish a view corridor along the northern portion of the site and limit vegetation within the view corridor to plants maintained at a height of no more than five feet. ([Exhibit 6](#)) The applicant asserts that views across the subject site are interrupted by a series of elements, “including but not limited to existing buildings, trees, and topography,” and thus, views across the site are not worthy of protection. However, the Commission’s previous action both identified the views across the site as valuable and acknowledged that the approved development would block some of the views across the then-vacant site. In order to minimize the impacts the development would have on public views, the Commission required that the tower element be removed, that a view corridor be established and protected across the site, and that signage be limited to monument signs no greater than 8 feet in height.

In terms of the subject amendment, while the proposed tower addition and freestanding pole sign would not block water views of the bay, the tower would block views of the historic Western Salt Works building and adjacent salt “mountains.” ([Exhibit 4](#)) While the applicant contends that the proposed tower addition will not block views of the Salt Works building, views of the building are expected to be blocked by the tower addition as shown on Exhibit 7. Exhibit 7 depicts a rough approximation of the expected view blockage and shows how existing views of the building and associated salt “mountains” are expected to be impacted. The applicant has indicated that the design of the proposed tower addition was required by the City of Chula Vista (in its approval of the original development, before the project was revised and constructed consistent with the Commission’s action) to suggest the form of the Western Salt Works building and to help offset the loss of views of the actual Salt Works building resulting from the proposed construction. In the City’s approval of the tower associated with the original project, City staff indicated that the design represents an attempt to incorporate building elements that express the history of the area. The City also stated that the building tower incorporates and preserves the history of the area and contributes to fulfilling the vision of the Chula Vista General Plan, which calls for the incorporation of elements related to the historical architecture and structures in the area. The City previously indicated that the site is considered a gateway to the city and requires the incorporation of landmark architectural elements.

The Western Salt Works is an iconic facility that has been located on south San Diego Bay since the 1870s. Both the building and the salt “mountains” are important features of the community, and preserving views of the Salt Works operations is important for preserving the scenic and visual quality of the area. ~~A building design that echoes some of the features of the Salt Works is a poor substitute for preserving views of the facility itself. The City approved the existing structure in its current form and is not requiring construction of the proposed tower or sign; however, if further “landmark architectural elements” are desired, they should be ones that do not require blocking views of the historical architecture and structures in the area.~~ In addition, the Commission agrees the site is a gateway to the bayfront, and as such, it is critical that development on it consider and protect existing bay views. However, on this particular site, the critical views are the unobstructed bay views across the northern portion of the site in the established view

corridor. The proposed tower addition located on the southern portion of the site would not impact those views. Therefore, the Commission finds that because the tower is sited outside of the view corridor, the tower addition will minimize impacts on views to the maximum extent feasible.

Bulk, Scale, and Community Character

The proposed amendment would allow construction of a 20-foot high, 750 sq. ft., barn-shaped tower on top of the existing 20-foot high food mart/restaurant building, increasing the total building height to 40 feet. As noted, it would be identical to the tower that was proposed but not permitted under CDP No. 6-11-60. The tower would be entirely decorative signage, and would not have any usable internal floor area. The project is intended to make the existing gas station and associated commercial uses more visible, as the proposed tower would be the tallest structure in the vicinity, and could potentially be used as a surface for highly visible signage.

The subject site is located south of Palomar Street between Interstate 5 and the salt ponds in an area known as the Montgomery Area, a formerly unincorporated community of San Diego County that the City of Chula Vista annexed in 1985. The area was previously zoned in the County of San Diego as Limited Impact Industrial (M-52) and designated for Mixed-Use Commercial in the County LCP, which was approved by the Commission but never became effectively certified. The area is planned for mixed commercial uses in the City's General Plan; however, the area has never been incorporated into the City's LCP.

The area is currently characterized by a mix of commercial, residential, and industrial uses, with a number of vacant lots. According to the City, the neighborhood has changed over time due to the construction of I-5 from a predominately residential neighborhood with a few businesses, to a transitional area of mixed commercial, industrial, and older single-family residential uses. Most of the existing development in the area south of Palomar Street and west of I-5 is low-scale, one or two stories in height. Thus the pattern of development for the region is historically much less than 40 feet in height.

Just across the street, the area north of Palomar Street is within the City's permit jurisdiction and is covered by the Bayfront Master Plan LCP. The existing LCP allows for heights of up to 44 feet north of Palomar Street. ~~However~~ At this time, this area is mostly already developed with newer warehouse/retail buildings approximately 20 feet in height.

Through the amendment application process, the applicant has pointed to the "Grainger" building as evidence of a Commission-approved building in this area approved over 20-foot high (CDP No. 6-96-11). This building is located just north of Palomar Street, west of the subject site, and along the bayfront at 1150 Bay Boulevard. The existing Grainger building was approved by the Commission in 1996 with a height of 30 feet. However, the area north of Palomar Street is a traditionally industrial area that has historically included other large structures and industrial uses such as the South Bay power plant. In contrast, the subject area south of Palomar Street has been developed with mostly low-scale, one and two-story structures and is more sensitive to development because of its immediate adjacency to the Salt Works and salt mountains, as well as the bay.

Another distinction between the subject proposal and the Grainger building is that the additional height of the Grainger building was based on functionality of the permitted use, as the building is a large industrial warehouse with an interior mezzanine. As previously discussed, the proposed tower is a non-functional decorative sign element. The existing gas station ~~can~~ could continue to function and is functioning without the proposed tower and freeway sign. As discussed in more detail below under **Signage**, the applicant has suggested that the business is not as successful as it could be without these elements, and thus, they are necessary for the functioning of the site. However, while every commercial business would like to enjoy the competitive advantage of having the highest, most prominent building in the area, allowing exceptions to the general pattern of development on a case-by-case basis may result in a pattern of development that is not consistent with maintaining the visual quality and compatibility of a community.

However, in this particular case, allowing construction of the proposed tower would not significantly impact community character. While the building is visible from I-5, because of the topography of the area, the site sits somewhat below Palomar Street elevation, lessening the impact the proposed additional height would have on neighboring areas.

The area south of Palomar Street appears to be ripe for redevelopment, with many older buildings and vacant lots. The subject site was one of the first sites to be redeveloped in many years. Thus, it is important to ensure that visual quality and community character are prioritized when considering new development. As the Commission noted in both its 2011 and 2015 findings, if it is the City's intention to allow exceptions to the general pattern of low-profile structures in this area for various architectural features, then it should develop land use plan policies for certification by the Commission that establish guidelines and parameters for view preservation, bulk and scale, and community character that describe when, where, and what variations from typical height requirements may be permitted. At this time, ~~In the absence of these constraints and considerations,~~ allowing a this particular 40-foot high tower would not set an adverse precedent for development in the region, ~~and could prejudice the ability of the City to adopt a Land Use plan for the subject area.~~ because the site is topographically distinct in such ways as to limit any negative impacts associated with the proposed height and the tower has been sited so as to not block views of the bay.

~~The area south of Palomar Street appears to be ripe for redevelopment, with many older buildings and vacant lots. The subject site was one of the first sites to be redeveloped in many years, and the development on this site could establish the pattern for future redevelopment of the region. Thus, it is important to ensure that visual quality and community character are prioritized when considering new development. Given the prime location between I-5 and the bay, the existing bay views in the region, and the existing pattern of development, the Commission finds that the appropriate scale of development on the subject site and the surrounding area is lower profile structures that preserve open sky and water views.~~

Signage

~~In addition to being one of the tallest structures in the area, the new tower would effectively function as a 40-foot high façade sign. Allowing non-functional design elements with commercial signage is contrary to the intent of the Commission's sign policies, which is to limit large signs in scenic coastal areas, particularly where they would block views of the bay (or in this case a historic structure associated with the bay). The Commission had and still has concerns that the "historical element" approach could be, and has been used in this case, to create "architectural features" that are essentially large billboards for commercial signage.~~

In addition to the new tower, the amendment would allow installation of a 45-foot high freestanding pole sign. While the existing building is visible from the freeway, it is not visible until past the Palomar Street north or southbound off-ramps. The applicant states that since the gas station opened on July 1, 2016, it has drawn considerably less business than anticipated because of the lack of visibility from the freeway and Palomar Street east of I-5. This lack of visibility has also prevented the applicant from attracting a restaurant tenant for the site. Therefore, the applicant contends that the pole sign and tower addition are necessary for the viability of the business to direct motorists to the subject site, and has provided visual simulations of the proposed freeway sign ([Exhibit 5](#)). These simulations indicate that the freestanding pole sign will be visible from the I-5 offramps (both north and south bound); however, they do not show how the sign would be visible from the area of the freeway before the offramp, which is necessary if a motorist is going to have time to exit the freeway. The pole sign would be visible from Palomar Street, east of the I-5, where additional gas stations currently exist. These simulations also demonstrate just how incompatible a ~~tower sign and~~ freestanding pole sign would be in this area.

However, the restrictions on signage were in place when the applicant undertook development. The Commission has traditionally restricted the size, number, and extent of commercial and industrial signage to avoid adverse visual impacts. Throughout San Diego County, including Chula Vista, most jurisdictions limit commercial signage in the Coastal Zone to only façade signs and monument signs less than 8 feet in height. As noted above, the subject site is not located within the area covered by the Bayfront Master Plan LCP, but the plan does apply to the area north of Palomar Street, immediately across the street to the north of the subject site and in that area, freestanding pole signs greater than eight feet would not be permitted. The applicant asserts that there are other buildings in the "same general area of the subject property" that have freestanding pole signs and has noted several specific sites. However, the Shell station at 1128 S 28th Street is approximately nine miles away and the Chevron station located at 3774 (not 374 as stated in the applicant's May 4 letter) Main Street is also approximately nine miles from the subject site. The Good Nite Inn is not "within a mile of the subject property" as the applicant states, but is almost three miles away, and its sign is a non-conforming structure inconsistent with the certified LCP. Lastly, the Arco station at 2209 Coronado Avenue is two miles south of the site and is not in the Coastal Zone. Therefore, there are no similar freeway signs in the Coastal Zone in Chula Vista at this time, and allowing the subject sign to go forward would likely result in a request for others, both in and out of the Coastal Zone. For example, there is an existing gas station on the east side

of the freeway, just north side of Palomar Street that does not have a freeway sign at this time; allowing a new freeway sign for the subject business could result in surrounding businesses requesting the same to remain competitive, resulting in the proliferation of freeway signs.

The applicant has also noted that the Chula Vista Bayfront Specific Plan allows tall structures of up to 200 feet. However, that particular area of the City is a planned downtown-like environment and policies have been developed to allow higher structures while still maintaining public views. In addition, freeway signs are prohibited in that area and allowing the subject sign would be a significant departure for the region.

Furthermore, there are additional ways to attract motorists to the gas station without the construction of the ~~tower addition or~~ freestanding pole sign; visibility of the physical building is not the only way for motorists to find the gas station. Today, many motorists find businesses through the use of maps and other applications on their mobile devices or in their cars. In addition, the applicant has indicated that it may be possible to secure a Caltrans Specific Service (Business Logo) Sign along the freeway advertising the gas station. The applicant states that there is an approximate wait time of three years, which is unacceptable for the viability of the business.

In summary, the proposed amendment would result in a ~~large, decorative tower sign and freestanding pole sign that is incompatible with the surrounding community character, would cause direct impacts to scenic resources,~~ would be inconsistent with intent of the City's LCP in terms of signage, and would set an adverse precedent for the construction of freeway signs. Therefore, the Commission finds that the proposed project ~~is not the can only be found to be~~ consistent with the visual resource protection policies of the Coastal Act as conditioned by Special Condition 1 to remove the freestanding pole sign from the project description and final project plans, and must be denied. In addition, the Commission imposes Special Condition 5 which requires the submittal of a signage plan that depicts all signage proposed for the site and also does not include any freestanding pole signs or monument signs greater than 8 feet in height. Lastly, Special Condition 6 requires recordation of the permit conditions against the property to ensure future property owners are aware of the above mentioned protections and conditions.

D. LOCAL COASTAL PLANNING

Section 30604(a) also requires that a coastal development permit shall be issued only if the Commission finds that the permitted development will not prejudice the ability of the local government to prepare a Local Coastal Program (LCP) in conformity with the provisions of Chapter 3 of the Coastal Act. In this case, such a finding can ~~cannot~~ be made.

The subject site is located within the City of Chula Vista, which has a certified local Coastal Program. This site was previously within the County of San Diego's County Islands segment Local Coastal Program jurisdiction, but it is now within the boundaries of the City of Chula Vista as a result of the 1985 Montgomery Annexation, however, it has never been incorporated into the City's certified LCP. It is assumed that eventually

the City's certified LCP will be amended to include this area. Until that time, Chapter 3 of the Coastal Act is the standard of review.

As described above, approval of the proposed amendment, including the freestanding pole sign, would be inconsistent with the Chapter 3 policies of the Coastal Act, ~~as the proposed new tall structures would be incompatible with the character of the surrounding community, would not protect views or visual quality, and as such, could~~ Only as conditioned to remove the freestanding pole sign, would the amendment not prejudice the ability of the City of Chula Vista to complete a certifiable local coastal program. ~~The alternative of keeping the existing gas station in its current form is feasible and would avoid these impacts. Therefore, the amendment must be denied.~~

E. CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT

Section 13096 of the Commission's Code of Regulations requires Commission approval of Coastal Development Permits to be supported by a finding showing the permit amendment, as conditioned, to be consistent with any applicable requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (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 which would substantially lessen any significant adverse effect which the activity may have on the environment. The City of Chula Vista found that the proposed amendment would be covered by the original project's Mitigated Negative Declaration from February 2011.

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. The preceding coastal development permit findings in this staff report have discussed the relevant coastal resource issues with the proposal, and identify alternatives that avoid and/or lessen the adverse impacts to said resources. The Commission incorporates these findings as if set forth here in full. As conditioned, ~~t~~The proposed project would not ~~may~~ result in unmitigated adverse environmental impacts to public access and public recreation. Therefore, the Commission finds that the proposed project is ~~not~~ the least environmentally-damaging feasible alternative and is ~~not~~ consistent with the requirements of CEQA.

Appendix A – Conditions of Approval

Permit No. 6-15-0333

II. STANDARD CONDITIONS

1. **Notice of Receipt and Acknowledgment.** The permit is not valid and development shall not commence until a copy of the permit, signed by the permittee or authorized agent, acknowledging receipt of the permit and acceptance of the terms and conditions, is returned to the Commission office.
2. **Expiration.** If development has not commenced, the permit will expire two years from the date on which the Commission voted on the application. Development shall be pursued in a diligent manner and completed in a reasonable period of time. Application for extension of the permit must be made prior to the expiration date.
3. **Interpretation.** Any questions of intent of interpretation of any condition will be resolved by the Executive Director or the Commission.
4. **Assignment.** The permit may be assigned to any qualified person, provided assignee files with the Commission an affidavit accepting all terms and conditions of the permit.
5. **Terms and Conditions Run with the Land.** These terms and conditions shall be perpetual, and it is the intention of the Commission and the permittee to bind all future owners and possessors of the subject property to the terms and conditions.

III. SPECIAL CONDITIONS

This permit is granted subject to the following special conditions:

1. **Final Plans.**

PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF THE COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT, the applicant shall submit for review and written approval by the Executive Director, final plans approved by the City of Chula Vista that are in substantial conformance with the plans received by Gary Engineering on April 20, 2015.

The applicant shall undertake development in accordance with the approved plans. Any proposed changes to the approved plans shall be reported to the Executive Director. No changes to the plans shall occur without a Coastal Commission approved amendment to this coastal development permit unless the Executive Director determines that no amendment is legally required.

2. Final Revised Landscape Plans.

PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF THE COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT, the applicant shall submit to the Executive Director for review and written approval, final landscaping plans approved by the City of Chula Vista. The plans shall be in substantial conformance with the landscape plans received on April 20, 2015, to reflect the following:

- a. A view corridor on the northern portion of the lot as shown on Exhibit 5 attached to this permit shall be preserved. All proposed landscaping in the view corridor shall be maintained at a height of five feet or lower to preserve views from the street toward the bay. In addition, all landscape materials within the identified view corridor shall be species with a growth potential not expected to exceed five feet at maturity.
- b. All landscaping shall be (1) drought-tolerant and native or (2) non-invasive plant species. No plant species listed as problematic or invasive by the California Native Plant Society, the California Exotic Pest Plant Council, or as may be identified from time to time by the State of California shall be employed or allowed to naturalize or persist on the site. No plant species listed as 'noxious weed' by the State of California or the U.S. Federal Government shall be utilized within the property.
- c. A written commitment by the applicant that five years from the date of the issuance of the coastal development permit for the commercial project, the applicant will submit for the review and written approval of the Executive Director, a landscape monitoring report, prepared by a licensed Landscape Architect or qualified Resource Specialist, that certifies whether the on-site landscaping is in conformance with the landscape plan approved pursuant to this Special Condition. The monitoring report shall include photographic documentation of plant species and plant coverage.
- d. If using potable water for irrigation, only drip or micro spray irrigation systems may be used.

The applicant shall undertake the development in accordance with the approved landscape plans. Any proposed changes to the approved plans shall be reported to the Executive Director. No changes to the plans shall occur without a Commission-approved amendment to the permit unless the Executive Director determines that no such amendment is legally required.

3. Future Development Restriction.

This permit is only for the development described in coastal development permit (CDP) #6-15-0333. Except as provided in Public Resources Code section 30610 and applicable regulations, any future development as defined in PRC section 30106, including, but not limited to, a change in the density or intensity of use land, shall require an amendment to

CDP #6-15-0333 from the California Coastal Commission or shall require an additional coastal development permit from the California Coastal Commission or from the applicable certified local government.

4. **Hydrology and Water Quality Mitigation and Monitoring Requirements.**

The applicant shall comply with and implement all of the conditions, recommendations, and project features included in the Mitigated Negative Declaration dated February 14, 2011, approved by the City of Chula Vista.

The applicant shall undertake the development in accordance with the approved plans. Any proposed changes to the approved plans shall be reported to the Executive Director. No changes to the plans shall occur without a Coastal Commission approved amendment to this coastal development permit unless the Executive Director determines that no amendment is legally required.

Permit No. 6-15-0333-A1

1. **Revised Final Plans.**

PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF THE COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT, the applicant shall submit for review and written approval by the Executive Director, final plans approved by the City of Chula Vista that are in substantial conformance with the plans received by Gary Engineering on November 16, 2016 April 20, 2015, but revised to include the following:

A. No tall, freestanding pole signs shall be allowed.

The applicant shall undertake development in accordance with the approved plans. Any proposed changes to the approved plans shall be reported to the Executive Director. No changes to the plans shall occur without a Coastal Commission-approved amendment to this coastal development permit unless the Executive Director determines that no amendment is legally required.

2. [Special Condition No. 2 of CDP No. 6-15-0333 remains unchanged and in effect]
3. [Special Condition No. 3 of CDP No. 6-15-0333 remains unchanged and in effect]
4. [Special Condition No. 4 of CDP No. 6-15-0333 remains unchanged and in effect]

5. **Sign Program.**

PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF THE COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT, the applicant shall submit to the Executive Director for review and written approval, a comprehensive sign program approved by the City of Chula Vista, documenting that only monument

signs, not to exceed eight (8) feet in height, or façade signs are proposed. No tall, freestanding pole or roof signs shall be allowed.

The applicant shall undertake development in accordance with the approved program. Any proposed changes to the approved plans shall be reported to the Executive Director. No changes to the plans shall occur without a Coastal Commission-approved amendment to this coastal development permit unless the Executive Director determines that no amendment is legally required.

6. PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF THIS COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT

AMENDMENT (6-15-0333-A1), the applicant shall submit to the Executive Director for review and approval documentation demonstrating that the landowner has executed and recorded against the parcel(s) governed by this permit amendment a deed restriction, in a form and content acceptable to the Executive Director: (1) indicating that, pursuant to this permit amendment, the California Coastal Commission has authorized development on the subject property, subject to terms and conditions that restrict the use and enjoyment of that property; and (2) imposing the Special Conditions of this permit amendment, as covenants, conditions and restrictions on the use and enjoyment of the Property. The deed restriction shall include a legal description of the entire parcel or parcels governed by this permit amendment. The deed restriction shall also indicate that, in the event of an extinguishment or termination of the deed restriction for any reason, the terms and conditions of this permit amendment, shall continue to restrict the use and enjoyment of the subject property so long as either this permit or the development it authorizes, or any part, modification, or amendment thereof, remains in existence on or with respect to the subject property.

6-15-0333-A1 (Haggar)

APPENDIX B – SUBSTANTIVE FILE DOCUMENTS

- City of Chula Vista Certified LCP
- Coastal Development Permit No. 6-11-60
- Coastal Development Permit No. 6-15-0333