

**CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION**

South Coast Area Office  
301 E. Ocean Boulevard, Suite 300  
Long Beach, CA 90802-4416  
Voice and TDD (562) 590-5071  
Fax (562) 590-5084

# Th15b



## ADDENDUM

December 9, 2019

TO: Coastal Commissioners and Interested Parties

FROM: South Coast District Staff

SUBJECT: **APPEAL – DE NOVO NO. A-5-NPB-18-0006, FOR THE COMMISSION MEETING OF THURSDAY, DECEMBER 12, 2019.**

---

### **I. CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED AND STAFF RESPONSE**

The Commission has received ten emails and one letter from the public in opposition to staff's recommendation of approval of the proposed project, which are included in the [Correspondence file](#). These emails raise concerns about the project's consistency with the scenic and visual resource policies, landform alteration policies, variance approval policies, and public access policies of the City's LCP. Staff report Section C addressed all concerns related to visual resources and Section D addressed all concerns related to public access. As conditioned, the proposed project will minimize impacts to scenic and visual resources, and will improve and protect public access, consistent with the City's LCP.

Additional concerns have also been raised by the location of the hearing and offer of the applicant to donate \$50,000 to the City to help improve public access in the Coastal Zone. The public hearing scheduled in Calabasas is considered a local hearing and was chosen to ensure that concerns from the public could be addressed locally. Regarding the applicant's donation of \$50,000 to the City to help improve public access in the Coastal Zone, page 27 of the staff report does states that this donation was not required as a condition of approval of the City's permit and it is not being required by the Coastal Commission as mitigation for public access impacts. As conditioned for removal of private development on public land, the project will improve public access. The applicant's donation will merely allow the City to invest in public improvements to the land which the City already owns.

One of the emails also raised concern regarding a protective device on an unstable bluff. As already discussed on page 30 of the staff report, the applicant's geotechnical investigation has determined that the gross stability of the bluff is considered favorable. As such, the bluff is stable and the existing retaining walls and proposed caissons are not necessary to protect or stabilize the bluff, as they are only needed to accommodate the construction of the residential floors and the structural framing elements on the steep slope generally under the envelope of the residence. These caissons are not located horizontally across the bluff in a manner that would retain the entire slope and sediment. The proposed development is located in a highly developed

area where development is permitted on the bluff face, so long as natural landform alteration is minimized, which the applicant has done by designing the residence to be built into the bluff face and also by utilizing some of the existing retaining walls. One member of the public expressed concerns about the stability of a retaining wall, but did not specify which retaining wall. Special Condition No. 1 requires the applicant to submit final foundation plans prior to issuance of the permit and Special Condition No. 5 requires the applicant to implement construction best management plans to ensure that debris does not spill over from the project site during construction.

As stated in the staff report, this report is for the De Novo portion of the hearing on the appeal. Substantial issue was found on August 10, 2018 and the issues raised in the appeal have been addressed in the De Novo staff report.