

**CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION**

SOUTH COAST DISTRICT OFFICE  
301 E. OCEAN BLVD, SUITE 300  
LONG BEACH, CA 90802-4325  
VOICE (562) 590-5071  
FAX (562) 590-5084



# W13d

## ADDENDUM

DATE: November 15, 2022

TO: Coastal Commissioners and Interested Parties

FROM: South Coast District Staff

SUBJECT: **ADDENDUM TO ITEM W13d, CDP NO. 5-22-0599 FOR THE COMMISSION MEETING ON WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 16, 2022.**

---

This addendum is designed to achieve the following objectives. First, in Section I, Commission staff updates the record by supplementing it with correspondence that was received after publication of the staff report. This section also provides responses to issues raised in the recent correspondence. Section II provides corrections and modifications to the staff report in light of the correspondence received.

### **I. CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED AND RESPONSE TO COMMENTS**

After publication of the staff report dated November 3, 2022, the Commission has received one (1) letter in opposition of the proposed project from a nearby homeowner. The letter in opposition asserts the following: 1) that the development is sited in a highly hazardous area; 2) that aspects of the proposed development would exacerbate bluff erosion, such as a basement, caissons, swimming pool, and spa; and 3) that the nature of the borings on July 1, 2022 is misrepresented in the staff report.

The staff report dated November 3, 2022, included some inaccuracies that were identified in the correspondence received. Commission staff would like to correct the record and incorporate additional findings into the staff report, including the exact nature of the geotechnical boring conducted on July 1, 2022.

As for the other assertions related to the scope of the proposed project and the geologic stability of the site, the Commission's staff report fully addresses the concerns raised in the correspondence received. Staff would note that the basement and caissons have been eliminated from the applicant's proposal, and thus the associated grading will consist of 44 cu. yds. rather than the originally proposed 760 cu. yds. Finally, the applicant is responsible for undertaking development using standard construction protocols and methods in order to avoid offsite impacts.

## II. REVISIONS TO THE STAFF REPORT

The following modifications and corrections are made to the staff report dated November 3, 2022. Language to be added is shown in underlined text, and language to be deleted is identified by ~~strikethrough~~.

- a) Modify the Hearing Date on page 1 as follows:

Filed:	8/19/2022
180th Day:	1/16/2023 <del>2</del>
Staff:	S. Amitay – LB
Staff Report:	11/3/2022
Hearing Date:	11/16/2022

- b) Delete the last complete paragraph on page 20 in Bluff/Canyon Edge Determination.

~~On July 1, 2022, the applicant undertook additional extensive subsurface investigation (i.e., drilling of numerous borings across the site) necessary for a clearer understanding of the location of the natural bluff and canyon features buried beneath the fill. Accordingly, the geotechnical consultant's geologic hazards analyses and setback recommendations use both the natural bluff edge and canyon edge for such purposes (see the geologic cross-section provided in Exhibit 2).~~

- c) Modify the second complete paragraph on page 24 in Geologic Stability – Present Day Conditions follows:

At the time of application, the applicant was proposing a two-tiered caisson foundation supported in bedrock with basement retaining walls and structural slab floors. The caissons were specifically proposed to be widely spaced as to not alter the stability of the bluff, and to mainly provide vertical member support for the basement that was proposed to be placed in artificial fill. However, in light of Coastal Act Section 30253, with the San Clemente certified LUP policies serving as guidance, the Commission has previously taken issue with the use of caissons located seaward of the 1.5 (static)/1.1 (seismic) factor of safety for failures within the fill/natural bluff material (ref: CDP 5-20-0476, Tanner). In the original project submittal, the applicant's geotechnical consultant used a conservatively low shear strength as an input for the slope stability analysis model runs, and as such the model yielded a 1.5/1.1 factor of safety line transecting the proposed development pad. Since the embedded caissons in bedrock as part of the foundation system proved to be a constraint on the home design, Geofirm conducted an additional exploratory borings on July 1, 2022 to collect a more complete dataset with representative bedrock shear strengths.