

CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION

South Coast District Office
301 E Ocean Blvd., Suite 300
Long Beach, CA 90802-4302
(562) 590-5071



Th12a

Appeal Filed: 6/1/22
SI Found: 07/13/22
Staff: BW-LB
Staff Report: 02/24/23
Hearing Date: 03/09/23

STAFF REPORT: APPEAL – DE NOVO

Appeal No.: A-5-LGB-22-0025

Applicant: Mike and Lori Gray

Agent: Steve Kaufmann

Appellants: Mark and Sharon Fudge

Location: 1007 Gaviota Drive, Laguna Beach, Orange County
(Local Government Permit Number: 22-0121)

Project Description: Demolish majority of existing structure; construct a new, 3,552 square-foot single-family dwelling and attached 489 square-foot garage; and construct walls, lighting, hardscape, and landscape within the Anita Street and Gaviota public rights-of-way, pursuant to a revocable encroachment permit (No. 22-0123).

Staff Recommendation: Approval with conditions.

SUMMARY OF STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The applicants propose to demolish the majority of an existing structure and construct a new single-family home atop a 5,181-square-foot, rectangular, ocean-fronting, blufftop lot at 1007 Gaviota Drive in Laguna Beach. The City of Laguna Beach approved a local CDP for the project, it was appealed to the Commission, and on July 13, 2022, the Commission found that the appeal raised a substantial issue because the City's findings

that the development is consistent with the provisions of the certified LCP regarding new development on a bluff were not adequately supported by documents in the record or the local CDP's findings. Specifically, there were substantial issues as to: (1) whether the bluff edge was properly identified and consequently whether the bluff edge setbacks were appropriately applied; (2) the perpetuation of potentially obsolete bluff retention structures onsite; (3) the encroachment of fenced-in private yard area into the public right-of-way, and (4) the potential reduction in residential density onsite. Further information was required to determine whether the proposed development complies with or may be conditionally approved consistent with the relevant policies of the LCP and the public access policies of the Coastal Act.

The City of Laguna Beach Local Coastal Program (LCP) was certified by the Commission on January 13, 1993 (except for the areas of deferred certification: Three Arch Bay, Hobo Canyon, and Irvine Cove). The subject site falls within the City's certified LCP jurisdiction. Therefore, the standard of review for projects in this part of the City that are heard on appeal by the Coastal Commission is the City's certified Local Coastal Program. In addition, because this project is located between the sea and the first public road parallel to the sea, the public access and public recreation policies of the Coastal Act also serve as part of the standard of review.

Where proposed development is undertaken under the auspice of 'repair and maintenance,' a 'remodel' or 'remodel-addition,' it is important to determine the nature, extent, and location of work that is occurring on the existing structure to determine whether the scope of the development goes beyond repair and maintenance and whether the resulting product actually constitutes a replacement structure, which requires the applicant to eliminate any heretofore existing legal non-conformities with the certified LCP, such as inadequate or absent bluff edge setbacks, and the public access policies of the Coastal Act, to ensure that the entire proposed development complies with the certified LCP. The Commission often uses the term "redeveloped" or "redevelopment" to refer to such extensive projects, or refers to them as "major remodels." The Laguna Beach LCP also references these terms, sometimes interchangeably.

In previous appeal actions in Laguna Beach, the Commission has found that a structure is considered redeveloped and, therefore, new development, if one of the following takes place: 1) 50% or more of the major structural components are replaced; 2) there is a 50% or greater increase in gross floor area; 3) replacement of less than 50% of a major structural component results in cumulative alterations exceeding 50% or more of that major structural component (taking into account previous replacement work on the same structure); and/or 4) less than a 50% increase in floor area where the alteration would result in a cumulative addition of 50% or more of the floor area, taking into account previous additions to the structure. These decisions do not necessarily mean that any less extensive remodeling would not also result in a new structure, but only that remodeling that does reach any of these levels must be considered new development. Furthermore, Policy 7.3.10 of the Land Use Element (LUE) component of the certified LCP states that with regard to oceanfront and oceanfront bluff homes, commercial structures, or other principal structures, that are legally nonconforming as to

A-5-LGB-22-0025 (Gray)
Appeal – De Novo

the oceanfront and/or oceanfront bluff edge setback, improvements that increase the size or degree of an existing nonconformity shall cause the nonconforming structure to be brought into conformity with the LCP.

The proposed plans indicate that the project consists of alterations to major structural components of the primary structure. The square footage of livable area would be increased by 815.3 square feet. Alteration percentages provided by the applicant include demolition of 100% of the roof area, 59% of the main level area, 100% of the upper-level area, and 80% of the total exterior walls. Some of the demolition work has already taken place and was stopped by the City because it exceeded the scope of a building permit that was granted for repair and maintenance. Based on the available evidence, the proposed development constitutes a major remodel, and would result in a replacement structure. As such, the entire resulting structure must be brought into conformity with the existing standards. The proposed actions would also increase the size and degree of the existing onsite nonconformities and therefore would require the entire structure to come into conformity with the LCP pursuant to LUE Policy 7.3.10 as well.

The applicant's initial bluff edge determination did not adhere to the LCP definition included in the certified LUE, which is part of the LCP standard of review of any project determined to be a major remodel. The Commission's staff geologist, Dr. Joseph Street, has determined the bluff edge consistent with the LUE definition to be located at the edge of the natural upper bluff deposits, partially buried by artificial fill, at an elevation of approximately 52 - 53 feet above mean sea level (MSL). On the central portion of the lot, the LUE bluff edge is approximately 10 ft landward of the top of the uppermost retaining wall ([Exhibit 4](#)).

Therefore, staff recommends that the Commission **APPROVE** coastal development permit application A-5-LGB-22-0025 with ten special conditions requiring the applicant to: 1) submit revised final plans to adhere to the LUE-defined bluff edge, setting the home back 25 feet from the bluff edge; 2) agree that the existing seawall/retaining wall system fronting the subject site may not be retained to protect the subject new blufftop residence and shall be removed when adjacent legally permitted structures no longer rely on the retaining wall for protection; 3) obtain an amendment to this CDP or a new CDP for any future development; 4) use drought-tolerant and native or non-invasive plant species for landscaping; 5) provide a Laguna Beach Building Department job card to verify the degree of alterations undertaken for the project; 6) adhere to construction best management practices in order to protect water quality; 7) assume the risks of injury and damage from hazards in connection to the property and permitted development; 8) waive rights to future shoreline protective devices; 9) agree that this permit shall not constitute a waiver of any public rights on the property; and 10) record a deed restriction to memorialize the special conditions of approval. The motion is on Page 5 of the staff report.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. MOTION AND RESOLUTION 5

II. STANDARD CONDITIONS 5

III. SPECIAL CONDITIONS 6

IV. FINDINGS AND DECLARATIONS 11

 A. Project Description 11

 B. Standard of Review 12

 C. Development 14

 D. Public Access and Recreation 22

 E. Visual Resources 24

 F. Marine Resources and Water Quality 26

 G. Deed Restriction 29

 H. Local Coastal Program (LCP) 29

 I. California Environmental Quality Act 30

APPENDIX A – SUBSTANTIVE FILE DOCUMENTS 31

EXHIBITS

[Exhibit 1 – Vicinity Map](#)

[Exhibit 2 – Proposed Project Plans](#)

[Exhibit 3- Existing Retaining Walls](#)

[Exhibit 4 – Coastal Commission Bluff Edge Exhibit](#)

[Exhibit 5 – Bluff Edge and Geologic Setback Review Memorandum](#)

MOTION AND RESOLUTION

Motion:

I move that the Commission approve Coastal Development Permit A-5-LGB-22-0025 pursuant to the staff recommendation.

Staff recommends a **YES** vote on the foregoing motion. Passage of this motion will result in approval of the permit as conditioned and adoption of the following resolution and findings. The motion passes only by affirmative vote of a majority of Commissioners present.

Resolution:

The Commission hereby approves Coastal Development Permit A-5-LGB-22-0025 and adopts the findings set forth below on grounds that the development as conditioned will be in conformity with the certified Local Coastal Program and the public access and recreation policies of the Coastal Act. Approval of the permit complies with the California Environmental Quality Act because either 1) feasible mitigation measures and/or alternatives have been incorporated to substantially lessen any significant adverse effects of the development on the environment, or 2) there are no further feasible mitigation measures or alternatives that would substantially lessen any significant adverse impacts of the development on the environment.

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 applicant 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 applicant to bind

all future owners and possessors of the subject property to the terms and conditions.

SPECIAL CONDITIONS

1. Revised Final Plans. PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF THE COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT, the applicants shall submit for review and written approval of the Executive Director, revised final plans in substantial conformance with the proposed plans provided in [Exhibit 2](#) of the staff report dated February 24, 2023, except that all foundation and structural elements shall be revised to be set back 25 feet from the bluff edge identified in [Exhibit 4](#) and all accessory structures without foundations shall be set back a minimum of ten feet from the bluff edge identified in [Exhibit 4](#). The revised final plans shall be approved by the City of Laguna Beach and shall include the following:

- a) The foundation of the proposed home shall be located at least 25 feet landward of the LCP-defined bluff edge of the site identified in [Exhibit 4](#).
- b) Accessory structures such as decks, patios and walkways that do not require structural foundations shall not be less than 10 feet from the bluff edge of the site identified in [Exhibit 4](#). Accessory structures shall be removed or relocated landward when threatened by erosion, geologic instability or other coastal hazards.
- c) Native landscaping shall be provided in areas within ten feet of the bluff edge that are currently covered by non-conforming accessory structures, including portions of the existing patio. Temporary irrigation may be installed in this area but no temporary or permanent irrigation shall be installed seaward of the bluff edge.
- c) The residence may include a reduced front yard setback along Gaviota, if approved pursuant to a variance from the City of Laguna Beach. The City approved plans and associated variance and/or encroachment permit shall be submitted to the Executive Director for review and approval. No amendment to the subject permit would be required for a project revision that includes relocating or expanding the structure to accommodate a reduced front yard setback, consistent with all other policies of the certified LCP including height, density, and public view corridors.
- d) Grading and excavation shall be prohibited within 25 feet of the bluff edge of the site identified in [Exhibit 4](#). Construction necessary to remove existing accessory structures and debris adjacent to the bluff edge shall be identified on the plans.
- e) All runoff from impervious surfaces on the top of the bluff shall be collected and directed away from the bluff edge towards the street. Drainage elements shall be identified on the plans.
- f) The final site plan shall identify the proposed public improvements within the public right-of-way identified on [Exhibit 2](#), page 1 including but not limited to a vehicle drop off location for beachgoers, bike racks, a concrete bench, beach

access safety signs, and walls, irrigation, and public walkways within the public right-of-way. The applicant shall also provide the final City of Laguna Beach issued revocable encroachment permit and any variances required for development along Anita Street and Gaviota for the review and written approval of the Executive Director.

The applicants 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.

2. Coastal Armoring. By acceptance of this permit, the applicants agree, on behalf of themselves and all successors and assigns, that the existing retaining walls on the upper, middle, and lower bluff identified in [Exhibit 3](#) of the staff report dated 2/24/23 fronting the subject site may not be retained to protect the blufftop residence and shall be removed when no longer required to protect adjacent blufftop structures with rights to shoreline armoring under Public Resources Code Section 30235 or under the certified Laguna Beach LCP. By acceptance of this Permit, the applicants hereby waive, on behalf of themselves and all successors and assigns, any rights to retain the existing retaining wall fronting the subject site to protect the blufftop residence that may exist under Public Resources Code Section 30235 or under the certified Laguna Beach LUP.

3. Future Improvements. This permit is only for the development described in coastal development permit No. A-5-LGB-22-0025. Pursuant to Title 14 California Code of Regulations (CCR) Section 13250(b)(6), and LCP Section 25.07.008, the exemptions otherwise provided in Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 30610(a) shall not apply to the development governed by coastal development permit No. A-5-LGB-22-0025. Accordingly, any future improvements to the permitted single family residence and/or guest house authorized by this permit, including but not limited to repair and maintenance identified as requiring a permit in PRC Section 30610(d) and Title 14 CCR Sections 13252(a)-(b), shall require an amendment to coastal development permit No. A-5-LGB-22-0025 from the Commission or shall require an additional coastal development permit from the Commission or from the applicable certified local government.

4. Landscaping – Drought tolerant, Non-Invasive Plants.

A. Vegetated landscaped areas shall only consist of native plants or non-native drought tolerant plants that are non-invasive. No plant species listed as problematic and/or invasive by the California Native Plant Society (<http://www.CNPS.org/>), the California Invasive Plant Council (formerly the California Exotic Pest Plant Council) (<http://www.cal-ipc.org/>), 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 a “noxious weed” by the State of California or the U.S. Federal Government shall be utilized within the property. All plants shall be low water use plants as identified by California

Department of Water Resources (See:
<http://ucanr.edu/sites/WUCOLS/files/183488.pdf>).

B. Use of reclaimed water for irrigation is encouraged. If using potable water for irrigation, only drip or microspray irrigation systems may be used. Other water conservation measures shall be considered, such as weather based irrigation controllers

5. Confirmation of the Extent of Demolition, Removal, and/or Replacement. After demolition, removal, and/or replacement of all primary and accessory structures on the property has been completed, the applicant shall provide the Executive Director, for review and approval, a certified copy of the City of Laguna Beach Building Department job card showing that such work has been performed pursuant to the plans approved under this coastal development permit.

6. Storage of Construction Materials, Mechanized Equipment and Removal of Construction Debris. By acceptance of the permit, the permittee agrees to comply with the following construction-related requirements and shall do so in a manner that complies with all relevant local, state, and federal laws applicable to each requirement:

- i. No construction materials, debris, or waste shall be placed or stored where it may be subject to wave, wind, rain, or tidal erosion and dispersion;
- ii. Any and all debris resulting from construction activities shall be removed from the project site within 24 hours of completion of the project;
- iii. Construction debris and sediment shall be removed from construction areas each day that construction occurs to prevent the accumulation of sediment and other debris which may be discharged into coastal waters;
- iv. Erosion control/sedimentation Best Management Practices (BMP's) shall be used to control dust and sedimentation impacts to coastal waters during construction. BMP's shall include, but are not limited to: placement of sand bags around drainage inlets to prevent runoff/sediment transport into coastal waters; and
- v. All construction materials, excluding lumber, shall be covered and enclosed on all sides, and as far away from a storm drain inlet and receiving waters as possible.

Best Management Practices (BMP's) designed to prevent spillage and/or runoff of construction-related materials, sediment, or contaminants associated with construction activity shall be implemented prior to the onset of such activity. Selected BMP's shall be maintained in a functional condition throughout the duration of the project. By acceptance of the permit, the permittee agrees that the following measures shall be used during construction:

- vi. The permittee shall ensure the proper handling, storage, and application of petroleum products and other construction materials. These shall include a designated fueling and vehicle maintenance area with appropriate berms and

protection to prevent any spillage of gasoline or related petroleum products or contact with runoff. It shall be located as far away from the receiving waters and storm drain inlets as possible;

vii. The permittee shall develop and implement spill prevention and control measures;

viii. The permittee shall maintain and wash equipment and machinery in confined areas specifically designed to control runoff. Thinners or solvents shall not be discharged into sanitary or storm sewer systems. Washout from concrete trucks shall be disposed of at a location not subject to runoff and more than 50 feet away from a storm drain, open ditch or surface water; and

ix. The permittee shall provide adequate disposal facilities for solid waste, including excess concrete, produced during construction.

7. Assumption of Risk. By acceptance of this permit, the applicant acknowledges and agrees (i) that the site may be subject to hazards, including but not limited to waves, storms, flooding, landslide, bluff retreat, erosion, and earth movement, many of which will worsen with future sea level rise; (ii) to assume the risks to the permittee and the property that is the subject of this permit of injury and damage from such hazards in connection with this permitted development; (iii) to unconditionally waive any claim of damage or liability against the Commission, its officers, agents, and employees for injury or damage from such hazards; and (iv) to indemnify and hold harmless the Commission, its officers, agents, and employees with respect to the Commission's approval of the project against any and all liability, claims, demands, damages, costs (including costs and fees incurred in defense of such claims), expenses, and amounts paid in settlement arising from any injury or damage due to such hazards

8. No Future Shoreline Protective Device(s).

A. By acceptance of this permit, the permittee agrees, on behalf of themselves and any successors and assigns, that no shoreline protective device(s) shall ever be constructed to protect the development approved pursuant to CDP No. A-5-LGB-22-0025 including, but not limited to, the residential structures, accessory structures, and foundations in the event that the development is threatened with damage or destruction from waves, erosion, storm conditions, liquefaction, flooding, sea level rise, or any other natural hazards in the future. By acceptance of this permit, the permittee hereby waives, on behalf of themselves and all successors and assigns, any rights to construct such devices that may exist under Public Resources Code Section 30235, any similar provision of a certified LCP, or any applicable law.

B. By acceptance of this permit, the permittee further agrees, on behalf of themselves and all successors and assigns, that they are required to remove all or a portion of the development authorized by this permit and restore the site, if:

- i. The City or any government agency with jurisdiction has issued a final order, not overturned through any appeal or writ proceedings, determining that the structures are currently and permanently unsafe for occupancy or use due to damage or destruction from waves, erosion, storm conditions, liquefaction, flooding, sea level rise, or other natural hazards related to coastal processes, and that there are no feasible measures that could make the structure suitable for habitation or use without the use of bluff or shoreline protective devices;
- ii. Essential services to the site (e.g. utilities, roads) can no longer feasibly be maintained due to the coastal hazards listed above;
- iii. Removal is required pursuant to LCP policies for sea level rise adaptation planning; or
- iv. The development requires new or augmented shoreline protective devices that conflict with applicable LCP or Coastal Act policies.

Approval of CDP No. CDP A-5-LGB-22-0025 does not allow encroachment onto public trust lands. Any future encroachment onto public trust lands shall be removed unless authorized by the Coastal Commission. Additionally, encroachment onto public trust lands is subject to approval by the State Lands Commission or other designated trustee agency.

9. Public Rights and Public Trust. The Coastal Commission's approval of this permit shall not constitute a waiver of any public rights that exist or may exist on the property. The permittee shall not use this permit as evidence of a waiver of any public rights that exist or may exist on the property now or in the future. Because the boundary between public land (tidelands) and private land may shift with rising seas, the structure may currently or eventually be located on public trust lands. This development approval does not permit encroachment onto public trust land; any current or future encroachment must be addressed through an amendment to this permit such that the Coastal Commission may determine whether the encroachment is legally permissible pursuant to the Coastal Act. Further, any existing or future encroachment would also be subject to the State Lands Commission's (or other trustee agency's) review and approval.

10. Deed Restriction. PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF THE COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT, 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 a deed restriction, in a form and content acceptable to the Executive Director: (1) indicating that, pursuant to this permit, 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 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. 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 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.

FINDINGS AND DECLARATIONS

A. Project Description

The subject property is a 5,181-square-foot rectangular ocean-fronting bluff lot at 1007 Gaviota Drive in the City of Laguna Beach, Orange County ([Exhibit 1](#)). The subject lot is located at the corner of Gaviota Drive between the first public road (South Coast Highway) and the sea (Anita Street Beach). There is a public beach access stairway at Anita Street approximately 30 feet north of the site. The existing 2,737-square-foot, 30-foot-high residential structure has been substantially demolished (more than 50%) but some remaining components of the structure are proposed to be retained and converted to a single family home. Some of the demolition work has already taken place and was stopped by the City because it exceeded the scope of a building permit that was granted for repair and maintenance. The site is zoned R-2 (Residential Medium Density) and is surrounded by a mix of single-family residences and duplexes.

Project History

On April 28, 2022, the City of Laguna Beach Design Review Board (“DRB”) held a public hearing for consideration and subsequent conditional approval of a new local CDP (No. 22-0121), Design Review No. 22-0120, Variance No. 22-0122, Revocable Encroachment Permit No. 22-0123, and a Mitigated Negative Declaration pursuant to CEQA, authorizing the applicant’s request to construct a new 3,552 square-foot single-family dwelling and attached 489 square-foot garage; a variance to encroach into the front setback and additional building setback; and a revocable encroachment permit to construct walls, lighting, hardscape, and landscape within the public rights-of-way along Anita Street and Gaviota.

On May 18, 2022, the Coastal Commission received the City’s Notice of Final Action for the approval of local CDP 22-0121 and opened a 10-working-day appeal period. On June 1, 2022, Mark and Sharon Fudge filed an appeal to the Commission during the appeal period which raised the following concerns with the City-approved development:

- 1) The approved development does not comply with the public access requirements of Section 30210 of Chapter 3 of the Coastal Act such that the proposed development does not provide maximum access.
- 2) Review of the proposed development did not consider the certified LCP’s Land Use Element Glossary Entry 101 definition of a bluff edge and the proposed development does not comply with the LCP’s setback requirements from the correct bluff edge.
- 3) The three retaining walls are obsolete since new development cannot rely on existing protective devices per LUE Action 7.3.9 and must be removed per LUE Action 7.3.8.

- 4) Shoreline or bluff protective devices are limited to protecting existing development and not accessory structures per LUE Action 7.3.13. As such, the rear patio supported by the retaining wall and fill slope system is obsolete and must be removed.
- 5) The CDP did not address the (unpermitted) demolition of a pre-existing duplex.
- 6) The proposed development is inconsistent with SB330 and the LCP because it replaces an existing duplex with a single-family residence.

On July 13, 2022, the Commission held a hearing and found that the appeal raised a substantial issue because the City's findings that the development is consistent with the provisions of the certified LCP regarding new development on a bluff were not adequately supported by documents in the record or the local CDP's findings. In addition, there were substantial issues as to whether the bluff edge was accurately identified and consequently whether the bluff edge setbacks were appropriately applied; the perpetuation of potentially obsolete bluff retention structures onsite; the encroachment of private yard area into the public right-of-way, and the potential reduction in residential density onsite. Further information was required to determine whether the proposed development complies with or may be conditionally approved consistent with the relevant policies of the LCP and the public access policies of the Coastal Act.

Because the Commission found that a substantial issue existed based on the grounds on which the appeal was filed, the Commission's action voided the local coastal development permit, and the Commission must review the merits of the project.

B. Standard of Review

Section 30604(b) of the Coastal Act states:

(b) After 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 the certified local coastal program.

In addition, Section 30604(c) of the Coastal Act states:

(c) Every coastal development permit issued for any development between the nearest public road and the sea or the shoreline of any body of water located within the coastal zone shall include a specific finding that the development is in conformity with the public access and public recreation policies of Chapter 3 (commencing with Section 30200).

The standard of review for projects heard on appeal by the Coastal Commission that are located between the first public road and the sea, like this one, are the City's certified Local Coastal Program (LCP) and the public access and public recreation policies of the Coastal Act. The City of Laguna Beach LCP was certified by the Commission on January 13, 1993 (except for the areas of deferred certification: Three

A-5-LGB-22-0025 (Gray)
Appeal – De Novo

Arch Bay, Hobo Canyon, and Irvine Cove). The subject site falls within the City's certified LCP jurisdiction. The City's LCP Land Use Plan portion is comprised of a variety of planning documents including the Land Use Element (LUE), Open Space/Conservation Element (OS/C Element), and the Coastal Technical Appendix. The Implementation Plan portion of the LCP is comprised of a number of documents including Title 25, Zoning.

Both the City's certified Local Coastal Program (LCP) and the Coastal Act require a coastal development permit for new development. The City's certified LCP Implementation Plan (IP) Title 25 Zoning, Section 25.07.006(D), which basically tracks the Coastal Act definition of development, defines "development" as follows:

"[t]he placement or erection of any solid material or structure on land or in or under water; the discharge or disposal of any dredged material or of any gaseous, liquid, solid or thermal waste; the grading, removing, dredging, mining or extraction of any materials; a change in the density or intensity of use of land including, but not limited to, the subdivision of land pursuant to the Subdivision Map Act (commencing with Section 66410 of the Government Code) and any other division of land, including lot splits; change in the intensity of use of water, or of access, thereto; the construction, reconstruction, demolition or alteration of the size of any structure, including any facility of any private, public or municipal utility; and the removal or harvesting of major vegetation other than for agricultural purposes; and kelp harvesting."

Certain improvements to single family residences are exempt from Coastal Act or LCP review because they constitute improvements or repair and maintenance without risk of adverse impacts to coastal resources. However, the City's certified Local Coastal Program (LCP) and the Coastal Act require a coastal development permit for improvements located on a beach or within 50 feet of the bluff edge. Section 25.07.008(A) of the certified IP states, in relevant part, that "improvements to any structure where the structure or the improvement is located on a beach, in a wetland or stream, seaward of the mean high tide line, within fifty feet of a coastal bluff edge, in an environmentally sensitive habitat area, and/or in an area designated as highly scenic in the certified Land Use Plan" require a coastal development permit.

As discussed below, in Subsection D, Development, the Commission has found that a structure is considered redevelopment, or a major remodel, if 50% or more of the major structural components are replaced. The proposed plans indicate that the project consists of alterations to major structural components of the primary structure. The square footage of livable area would be increased by 815.3 square feet. Alteration percentages provided by the applicant include demolition of 100% of the roof area, 59% of the main level area, 100% of the upper-level area, and 80% of the total exterior wall. Some of the demolition work has already taken place and was stopped by the City because it exceeded the scope of a building permit that was granted for repair and maintenance. Based on the available evidence, the proposed development constitutes a major remodel, and would result in replacement structure(s). As such, the entire resulting structure must be brought into conformity with the existing standards. The

proposed actions would also increase the size and degree of the existing onsite nonconformities, and it therefore would require the entire structure to come into conformity with the LCP pursuant to LUE Policy 7.3.10, as well

Thus, the proposed project, which is a major remodel and additional accessory, hardscape, and landscape improvements within fifty feet of a coastal bluff edge, constitutes non-exempt development and requires approval of a coastal development permit consistent with the policies of the certified LCP and the public access and recreation policies of the Coastal Act.

C. Coastal Hazards

An updated preliminary geotechnical investigation report was prepared for the proposed development by Geofirm., dated July 17, 2019. Following the appeal and finding of substantial issue, the applicant also submitted a revised slope stability analysis by Geofirm, dated October 3, 2022. The slope stability analysis indicates a determination of the 1.5/1.1 Factor of Safety line to be projected onto the building pad to address slope stability with respect to the siting of the residence. The Commission's staff geologist, Dr. Joseph Street, has reviewed all submitted reports, confirmed the statements discussed herein, and identified the bluff edge consistent with the certified LCP ([Exhibit 4](#)). Dr. Street's more detailed review of the bluff edge and coastal hazards issues, supporting these findings, can be found in [Exhibit 5](#).

The City's certified LCP includes the following policies regarding development (emphasis added):

Action 7.3.8 states: On oceanfront bluff sites, require applications where applicable, to identify and remove all unpermitted and/or obsolete structures, including but not limited to protective devices, fences, walkways, and stairways, which encroach into oceanfront bluffs.

Action 7.3.10 of the Land Use Element (LUE) states: Allow oceanfront and oceanfront bluff homes, commercial structures, or other principal structures, that are legally nonconforming as to the oceanfront and/or oceanfront bluff edge setback, to be maintained and repaired; however, improvements that increase the size or degree of nonconformity, including but not limited to development that is classified as a major remodel pursuant to the definition in the Land Use Element Glossary, shall constitute new development and cause the pre-existing nonconforming oceanfront or oceanfront bluff structure to be brought into conformity with the LCP.

Action 10.2.6 Require all new development located on an oceanfront bluff top to be setback from the oceanfront bluff edge a sufficient distance to ensure stability, ensure that it will not be endangered by erosion, and to avoid the need for protective devices during the economic life of the structure (75 years). Such setbacks must take into consideration expected long-term bluff retreat over the next 75 years, as well as slope stability. The predicted bluff retreat shall be evaluated

considering not only historical bluff retreat data, but also acceleration of bluff retreat made possible by continued and accelerated sea level rise, future increase in storm or El Nino events, and any known site-specific conditions. To assure stability, the development must maintain a minimum factor of safety against landsliding of 1.5 (static) or 1.2 (pseudostatic, k=0.15 or determined through analysis by the geotechnical engineer) for the economic life of the structure.

Action 10.2.7 states: Require all new development located on oceanfront bluffs to be sited in accordance with the stringline but not less than 25 feet from the bluff edge. This requirement shall apply to the principal structure and major accessory structures such as guesthouses and pools that require a structural foundation. The setback shall be increased where necessary to ensure geologic safety and stability of the development.

Action 10.2.8 states: On oceanfront bluffs, require new minor accessory structures such as decks, patios and walkways that do not require structural foundations to be sited in accordance with stringline but not less than 10 feet from the bluff edge. Require accessory structures to be removed or relocated landward when threatened by erosion, geologic instability or other coastal hazards.

IP Section 25.50.004(B)(4)(d) states:

(i) Balconies, patios or decks in excess of thirty inches above the finished grade, including patio deck covers, and other similar architectural features may project a maximum of five feet beyond the applicable building setback or to the applicable deck stringline, whichever is least restrictive. In no case shall such projections be closer than ten feet to the top of an oceanfront bluff.

(ii) Decks, patios and other similar improvements that are thirty inches or less above finished grade shall not encroach closer than ten feet to the top of an oceanfront bluff.

LUE Actions 10.2.7 and 10.2.8 require bluff top residences to observe a 25 foot minimum setback for primary structures and a 10 foot minimum setback for accessory structures (such as decks and landscaping) that do not require foundations. The applicant's bluff edge determination shows that the existing residence does not conform with the LUP's blufftop setback requirements.

Because the proposed development includes such extensive alterations to the existing structure that it would constitute a major remodel as described above, Action 7.3.10, quoted above, requires that "the pre-existing nonconforming oceanfront or oceanfront bluff structure to be brought into conformity with the LCP." In other words, the portions of the home extending seaward of the required bluff edge setback line need to be removed and the structure made to conform with the LCP's current bluff edge setback standards, as referenced above. The bluff edge and the depicted setback have been reviewed and revised as described herein by the Commission's staff geologist. As

described below, the extent of work proposed rises to the level of major remodel. Therefore, the proposed property is required to remove existing non-conformities.

The applicant's bluff edge determination did not adhere to the LCP definition included in the certified LUE, which serves as the standard of review and applies even to pre-existing portions of projects determined to be a major remodel. The applicant identified the bluff edge in the approximate location of an existing retaining wall permitted by the Commission in its approval of CDP # A-80-7442. However, that retaining wall was not identified as the exact bluff edge by the Commission in its prior action: one wall was to be "at the top of the bluff," but the Commission findings and exhibits did not identify the bluff edge. The location of the second wall was not described at all, and the third was merely described as being "the most seaward." Additionally, bluffs are dynamic landforms which change over time in response to natural conditions and human intervention. Finally, the standard of review has changed because the LCP was not certified in 1980.

Determining the correct location of the bluff edge is critical to knowing what special conditions should be applied to a project to ensure safety and stability and eliminate the need for future shoreline armoring. Dr. Street's analysis ([Exhibit 5](#)) identifies the coastal bluff edge as defined in the certified LUE as the seaward edge of the natural upper bluff terrace deposits, which would exclude the added fill and rely explicitly on the natural bluff edge ([Exhibit 4](#)). On the central portion of the site (along cross-section A-A'), this would locate the bluff edge approximately 10 feet landward of the top of the uppermost retaining wall ([Exhibit 4](#)). As such, **Special Condition 1** requires the applicant to provide revised final plans which set back the home 25 feet from the LUE bluff edge, which will be consistent with the LCP standard of review and, as discussed further below, would ensure stability and account for future erosion of the bluff seaward of the home over the economic life of the proposed development, consistent with the certified LCP.

The recommended setback is approximately 10 feet landward of the applicant's proposed setback for the new home, depending on the specific location of the proposed setback along the bluff, and would not allow the applicant to construct the proposed 3,552 square foot home and attached 489 square foot garage as proposed. However, it would allow sufficient area on the site to build a reasonably sized home that would conform to the LCP setback policies, assure stability for 75 years without relying on new bluff or shoreline protection measures, and would be consistent with the hazard policies of the LCP. With this setback, and a reduced front yard setback which the City has applied, the applicant could construct the home on an approximately 1,500 square foot area on the blufftop portion of the parcel. This would allow for approximately 3,000 square feet of home and garage area, which is a reduction of about 1,000 square feet from what the applicant proposes. This estimate was made by subtracting the surface area of the home that surpasses the 25 feet bluff edge setback on the first floor. Based on the development footprint identified on the project plans, applying the LUE-defined 25-foot bluff edge setback identified in [Exhibit 4](#), the new home subject to the revised final plans required by **Special Condition 1** can be developed on an approximately 48 feet by 32 feet of area of the lot, although there are some gradient deviations that that

may effect the final dimensions, and the City's variance may allow for additional development within the front setback adjacent to Gaviota.

In addition to requiring that new principal development on bluff tops be set back a minimum of 25 feet from the bluff edge, the City LCP requires that this setback be increased where necessary to ensure geologic stability, and that the setback be sufficiently large to ensure stability and avoid endangerment by erosion, without the need for protective devices, over a 75-year economic life. As a standard of stability, Action 10.2.6 further specifies that development must maintain a 1.5 (static) factor of safety against landsliding, and requires that assessments of bluff erosion potential consider the effects of sea level rise. Thus, it is also necessary to evaluate whether the minimum 25-foot bluff top setback must be increased at the project site to address the potential for instability and erosion hazards over the next 75 years, without relying on shoreline protective devices.

The applicant's revised slope stability analysis indicates that, if the effects of the existing retaining walls are discounted, a 1.5 (static) factor of safety against landsliding is achieved approximately 14 feet landward of the top of the upper retaining wall, which under present conditions represents the edge of the landform (i.e., the edge of the artificial fill placed on the bluff face in 1980), though not the LUE bluff edge. As described in greater detail in [Exhibit 5](#), Dr. Street has reviewed this analysis and concurs with its conclusions. The applicant's coastal hazards report indicated that the proposed new development would be safe from wave runup hazards over the next 75 years, including the effects of SLR, but in Dr. Street's estimation did not provide an adequate analysis of the potential for bluff erosion and retreat in the absence of shoreline protection, and thus did not support a conclusion that the proposed setback would ensure stability and protect against bluff erosion for 75 years, consistent with LCP standards. In estimating a historical bluff erosion rate of zero feet per year, the applicant's analysis did not account for clear evidence of past landslide activity and bluff edge retreat in the years leading up to the construction of the existing retaining wall system, and furthermore did not evaluate the potential for future erosion and retreat, including the effects of SLR. As discussed in [Exhibit 5](#), Dr. Street estimates that if the known past landsliding activity is accounted for, the average annualized bluff retreat rate prior to the construction of the retaining walls was approximately 0.2 feet per year.

Combined with the 14 foot setback needed to achieve a 1.5 factor of safety against landsliding, and making some allowance for accelerated erosion in the future due to sea level rise, Dr. Street estimates that a total setback of more than 30 feet would be necessary to ensure the stability of new development for 75 years without relying on shoreline protection. However, it is crucial to note that at the project site, future bluff erosion -- in the absence of armoring -- would initiate not at the natural bluff edge, but rather in the mantle of fill material that covers the bluff face and provides an additional buffer against bluff erosion. As shown in [Exhibit 4](#), the LCP-required 25-foot setback from the natural bluff edge is (in part due to the irregularities in the bluff edge line) equivalent to a 40- to 50-foot setback from the edge of the fill (i.e., top of the upper retaining wall) along the seaward-facing portion of the subject lot. Dr. Street has concluded that a geologic setback of this size would ensure stability and protect against

future erosion over a 75-year economic life of the project. For these reasons, the proposed development is not expected to be threatened by coastal hazards and thus is not expected to need shoreline protection over the life of the development, and the project can be found to conform with the hazards policies of the LCP.

However, given the dynamic nature of coastal beaches, as well as the Commission's review of data indicating that the property could be impacted by sea level rise at some point in the future, it is important to ensure that the risks of developing on these inland lots are borne by the applicant, not the public at large. The LCP prohibits new development that would require construction of a protective device that would substantially alter natural landforms along bluffs or cliffs.

LUE Action 7.3.9 Ensure that new development, major remodels and additions to existing structures on oceanfront and oceanfront bluff sites do not rely on existing or future bluff/shoreline protection devices to establish geologic stability or protection from coastal hazards. A condition of the permit for all such new development on bluff property shall expressly require waiver of any such rights to a new bluff/shoreline protection device in the future and recording of said waiver on the title of the property as a deed restriction.

Here, the applicant has not proposed to construct a shoreline protection device and no shoreline protection would be authorized by this permit; however, the site currently contains three retaining walls on the upper, middle, and lower (toe) of the bluff seaward side of the home that overlap the project site and the neighboring property (1021 Gaviota) to the south; the lower wall (seawall) is a single structure that spans both properties. The existing retaining walls provide support for the neighboring property and could not be removed without causing instability and potential property damage, or else requiring the construction of new, additional stabilization structures. However, because the project site is a major remodel and therefore required to comply with the certified LUE, the project site shall not rely on coastal armoring or retain coastal armoring for the protection of the proposed blufftop residence.

In recent decisions, in addition to requiring properties undergoing major remodels in the Coastal Zone to eliminate reliability on coastal armoring structures, the Commission has also required special conditions on blufftop properties to remove shared coastal armoring structures, such as seawalls, when no longer required to protect adjacent blufftop structures (6-15-1717, Mark and Felicia Barr; A-6-ENC-16-0060, Gary and Bella Martin). As such, **Special Condition 2** requires that the existing retaining walls fronting the subject site shall not be retained to protect the blufftop residence and shall be removed when no longer required to protect adjacent blufftop structures, namely the neighboring property to the south.

As discussed above, with the required 25-foot setback from the bluff edge (a 40 to 50 foot setback from the edge of the fill slope), the proposed development is not expected to be threatened by coastal hazards and thus is not expected to need shoreline protection over the life of the development, the project can be found to conform with the hazards policies of the Coastal Act. However, given the dynamic nature of coastal

beaches, as well as the Commission's review of data indicating that the property could be impacted by sea level rise at some point in the future, it is important to ensure that the risks of developing on the site are borne by the applicant, not the public at large.

The Coastal Act Section 30253(a) and related certified LUP policies, prohibits approval of new development that would require armoring to be safe. Therefore, **Special Condition 8** requires that if any part of the proposed development becomes threatened by coastal hazards in the future, the threatened proposed development shall waive the right to use coastal armoring for protection and the development must be removed rather than protected in place. This condition recognizes that predictions of the future cannot be made with certainty, thereby allowing for development that is currently safe and expected to be safe for the life of the development, but ensuring that the future risks of property damage or loss arising from sea level rise or other changed circumstances are borne by the applicant enjoying the benefits of new development, and not the public.

The Commission also finds that due to the possibility of future bluff erosion and instability hazards, if the applicant chooses to build in this location despite those risks, they should assume the risks of development in a hazardous area as a condition of project approval. Because this risk of harm cannot be eliminated, the Commission requires the applicant to waive any claim of liability against the Commission for damage to life or property that may occur as a result of the permitted development. The applicant's Assumption of Risk, Waiver of Liability and Indemnity, as required by **Special Condition 7**, will ensure that the applicant is aware of and understands the nature of the hazards which exist on the site, and that may adversely affect the stability or safety of the subject development, and will effectuate the necessary assumption of those risks by the applicant.

Since coastal processes are dynamic and structural development may alter the natural environment, future development adjacent to the beach could adversely affect future shoreline conditions if not properly evaluated. For this reason, the Commission imposes **Special Condition 3**, which states that any future improvements to structure, including but not limited to repair and maintenance identified as requiring a permit in Public Resources Section 30610(d) and Title 14 California Code of Regulations Sections 13253(b)(6) shall require an amendment from the Commission or shall require an additional coastal development permit from the Commission or from the applicable certified local government. This condition ensures that any future development on this site that may affect shoreline processes, structural stability, or elevate cumulative development to a major remodel receives review under the Coastal Act (or future certified LCP) by the appropriate regulatory body.

To ensure that any prospective future owner of the property is made aware of the applicability of the conditions of this permit, the Commission imposes **Special Condition 10**, which requires the property owner record a deed restriction against the property, referencing all of the above special conditions of this permit and imposing them as covenants, conditions and restrictions on the use and enjoyment of the Property. Thus, as conditioned, any prospective future owner will receive actual notice of the restrictions and/or obligations imposed on the use and enjoyment of the land

including the risks of the development and/or hazards to which the site is subject, and the Commission's immunity from liability

As proposed and conditioned, the project is consistent with the hazards policies of the certified LCP.

D. Development

Major/Minor Remodel

Where proposed development is undertaken under the auspice of 'repair and maintenance,' a 'remodel' or 'remodel-addition', it is important to determine the nature, extent, and location of work that is occurring on the existing structure. This assessment is necessary in order to determine the scope of the development—i.e., whether the extent of the development is such that the resulting structure actually constitutes a replacement structure that requires the applicant to address all heretofore existing non-conformities with the certified LCP, such as inadequate or absent bluff edge setbacks, and the public access policies of the Coastal Act to ensure that the entire proposed development complies with the certified LCP. "New development" or redevelopment requires a permit and must comply with all of the certified LCP policies—and, hence, include sufficient setbacks from the bluff edge.

While the dividing line between an improvement (or repair and maintenance) and "redevelopment" is not always clear, at a certain point, substantial alterations to a home can no longer be considered minor improvements, but instead must be considered to have resulted in a new structure. The City's certified Land Use Element defines "major remodel" as:

"Alteration of or an addition to an existing building or structure that increases the square footage of the existing building or structure by 50% or more; or demolition, removal, replacement and/or reconstruction of 50% or more of the existing structure; greater specificity shall be provided in the Laguna Beach Municipal Code."

In previous appeal actions in Laguna Beach, the Commission has found that a structure is considered redeveloped and, therefore, new development, if one of the following takes place: 1) 50% or more of the major structural components are replaced; 2) there is a 50% or greater increase in gross floor area; 3) replacement of less than 50% of a major structural component results in cumulative alterations exceeding 50% or more of that major structural component (taking into account previous replacement work on the same structure); and/or 4) less than a 50% increase in floor area where the alteration would result in a cumulative addition of 50% or more of the floor area, taking into account previous additions to the structure. These decisions do not necessarily mean that any less extensive remodeling would not also result in a new structure, but only that remodeling that does reach these levels must be considered to new development. Furthermore, Policy 7.3.10 of the LUE states with regard to oceanfront and oceanfront bluff homes, commercial structures, or other principal structures, that are legally

nonconforming as to the oceanfront and/or oceanfront bluff edge setback, improvements that increase the size or degree of an existing nonconformity shall cause the nonconforming structure to be brought into conformity with the LCP.

Moreover, LUE Action 7.3.8 of the LUE (cited above) requires, where applicable, that applications for new development (e.g., redevelopment of a site) on oceanfront bluff sites identify and remove all unpermitted or obsolete structures which encroach into oceanfront bluffs. The subject application does not rise to the level of a major remodel or new development, and the existing decks and stairway (which have been verified to be pre-coastal structures through a review of the original 1968 plans) are legally non-conforming structures. There are no identified unpermitted or obsolete structures on the property.

Here, the applicant has submitted information regarding the extent of proposed alterations to the existing residence. The proposed plans indicate that the project consists of alterations to major structural components of the primary structure. The square footage of livable area would be increased by 815.3 square feet. Alteration percentages include demolition of 100% of the roof area, 59% of the main level area, 100% of the upper-level area, and 80% of the total exterior wall.

Based on the available evidence, the proposed development constitutes a major remodel, and would result in replacement structure(s). The proposed repair and maintenance actions would increase the size and degree of the existing onsite nonconformities and therefore would be considered new development that would require the entire structure to come into conformity with the LCP pursuant to LUE Policy 7.3.10. Furthermore, as detailed below, extra precautions should be taken to ensure that approved development maintains consistency with the applicant's proposal.

The Commission typically looks at cumulative development over time when determining whether or not a project constitutes redevelopment. Even small improvements that may not ordinarily need a CDP (such as replacing doors and/or windows or other small additions) could add to the total alterations to the primary structural elements over time and push the alteration total of one or more elements over the 50 percent threshold. To ensure that any future improvements to the development are consistent with the LCP and relevant Coastal Act policies, the Commission imposes **Special Condition 3**. This condition requires a new CDP or amendment for all future improvements, including repair and maintenance actions that would ordinarily not require a permit.

Additional conditions must be imposed to assure that the quantity and location of alterations to the existing residence occur in the manner proposed. First, the Commission imposes **Special Condition 1**, which requires the applicant to undertake development only in accordance with the Commission-approved final plans, which apply the 25-foot bluff edge setback consistent with the LCP, based on the bluff edge identified in [Exhibit 4](#). Any changes to the approved plans would require an amendment to the CDP, unless the Executive Director finds that an amendment is not required. Should the quantity or location of alterations actually carried out substantially differ from that which is proposed and identified specifically by the Commission-approved plans,

the Commission may establish requirements for the project to be reassessed based on the revised alteration/demolition plan. The Commission therefore imposes **Special Condition 5**, which requires that the applicant submit a copy of the City Building Department job card after any proposed alterations are complete. The City's job card would verify the extent of work and the condition of the residence remaining. The job card will also enable the Executive Director to verify that additional work is not taking place seaward of the Commission identified building setbacks and verify that public amenities proposed on the City right of way are completed consistent with the approved plans.

Residential Density

The appellants contend that the CDP did not address the unpermitted demolition of a pre-existing duplex, further stating that the proposed development is inconsistent with SB330 and the LCP because of the replacement of an existing duplex with a single-family residence. The City of Laguna Beach is responsible for implementing SB330 and the City found that the a legal duplex did not exist at the site, despite the applicants assertions and evidence that the site had been marketed as having two units in the past. The LCP allows for single family homes as well as duplexes in the subject R-2 zone (Residential Medium Density); thus, the proposed single family home is consistent with the LCP which is the standard of review for the coastal development permit application.

E. Public Access and Recreation

Projects located between the sea and the first public road paralleling the sea, such as the subject site, must be consistent with the public access policies of the Coastal Act.

Section 30210 of the Coastal Act states:

In carrying out the requirement of Section 4 of Article X of the California Constitution, maximum access, which shall be conspicuously posted, and recreational opportunities shall be provided for all the people consistent with public safety needs and the need to protect public rights, rights of private property owners, and natural resource areas from overuse.

Section 30214 of the Coastal Act states, in relevant part:

(a) The public access policies of this article shall be implemented in a manner that takes into account the need to regulate the time, place, and manner of public access depending on the facts and circumstances in each case including, but not limited to, the following: ...

(3) The appropriateness of limiting public access to the right to pass and repass depending on such factors as the fragility of the natural resources in the area and the proximity of the access area to adjacent residential uses.

- (4) The need to provide for the management of access areas so as to protect the privacy of adjacent property owners and to protect the aesthetic values of the area by providing for the collection of litter.

In addition, regarding public access, Section 25.07.012 (F) of the certified IP states, in relevant part:

Review Criteria. To ensure compliance with the Certified Local Coastal Program, the following criteria shall be incorporated into the review of all applications for coastal development permits:

- (1) The proposed development will not encroach upon any existing physical accessway legally utilized by the public or any proposed public accessway identified in the adopted local coastal program land use plan...
- (3) The proposed development will not adversely affect recreational or visitor-serving facilities or coastal scenic resources...

The project that was appealed included reference on the plans to a fence in the public right-of-way installed in 2013 without a CDP. Further, the property has historically used the public right of way adjacent to the fence to the north as a private driveway and entrance to the garage without acquisition of a Revocable Encroachment Permit. The applicant and the City have since revised the plans and proposed encroachment permit (which has not yet been issued) so that the property line will meet the driveway for the new home and the fence will be removed. Through the proposed encroachment permit, aside from native landscaping and retention of an existing mature tree, there would be no private development approved within the public right-of-way to the north of the site. The project as currently proposed includes substantial public improvements within the public right-of-way and to aid beach-goers using the nearby beach stairway, such as a vehicle drop off location for beachgoers, bike racks, a concrete bench, beach access safety signs, and walls, irrigation, and public walkways within the public right-of-way ([Exhibit 2](#)). Additionally, all improvements approved under the revocable encroachment permit within the public right-of-way may be revoked by the City should the underlying land area be needed for future public improvements. The City is currently developing an expanded public stairway just north of the site and landings to support an improved sewer lift station, which increases the footprint of public infrastructure adjacent to the home, and will be complimented by the public vehicle drop off area and native landscaping in an area currently covered by the non-conforming private driveway.

The project must be found consistent with both the public access and recreation policies of Chapter 3 of the Coastal Act and the LCP policies. In this case, the proposed project would not have any adverse impacts on the Anita Street beach accessway, and would remove most existing encroachments into the adjacent right-of-way. The proposed project would not encroach further down the bluff face and would therefore not obstruct access to or across the sandy beach below. The proposed home, accessory structures with foundations, and fencing would all be located on the applicant's property. The proposed new driveway would be relocated further from the public beach accessway

and would front Gaviota and include hardscape and native landscaping in the front yard area and a portion of the public street, which is consistent with the pattern of existing residential development.

The permit the Commission previously granted for construction of the existing retaining walls on the bluff face (CDP A-80-7442, Langman) included a special condition requiring the applicant to record a document, in a form and content approved by the Executive Director, offering to dedicate a public access easement over the area between the seaward bulkhead and the mean high tide line to a public agency or private association approved by the Executive Director. A document was recorded by the original permittee and the sandy beach area is used by the public today. The subject CDP would have no effect on the existing retaining walls or the public's use of the sandy beach area. If the retaining walls are proposed to be improved in the future, or are required to be removed pursuant to **Special Condition 2**, a follow up CDP will be required and public access impacts will be analyzed and mitigated through that permit action.

If existing or proposed development is determined to be not on the applicant's property, either now or in the future, then it must be evaluated under the Coastal Act in order to protect the public's right to access public Tidelands. In order to ensure that private development does not preclude the public from using the public Tidelands, **Special Condition 9** requires that the Coastal Commission's approval of this permit shall not constitute a waiver of any public rights that exist or may exist on the property, the permittee shall not use this permit as evidence of a waiver of any public rights that may exist on the property now or in the future, and that this development approval does not permit encroachment onto public trust land; any current or future encroachment must be addressed through an amendment to this permit such that the Coastal Commission may determine whether the encroachment is legally permissible pursuant to the Coastal Act. Additionally, **Special Condition 10** requires the applicant to record a deed restriction against the property identifying the conditions of this permit.

F. Visual Resources

The City's certified LCP includes the following visual resource policies:

Laguna Beach Land Use Element:

Policy 2.8 states, in relevant part:

Require building design and siting to be compatible and integrated with natural topographic features, minimize significant alteration of topography and/or other significant onsite resources, and protect public views...

Policy 2.10 states:

Maximize the preservation of coastal and canyon views (consistent with the principle of view equity) from existing properties and minimize blockage of existing public and private views. Best efforts should be made to site new development in locations that

minimize adverse impacts on views from public locations (e.g. roads, bluff top trails, visitor serving facilities, etc.)

Policy 3.10 states:

Require building design and siting to be compatible and integrated with natural topographic features, minimize significant alteration of natural topography or other significant on-site resources, and protect public views as specified in the Design Guidelines and Landscape and Scenic Highways Resource Document by maintaining the low-profile character of structures. Require use of appropriate landscaping, special architectural treatments, and siting considerations for projects visible from major highways and arterial streets. Best efforts should be made to site new development in locations that minimize adverse impacts on views from public locations (e.g., roads, bluff-top trails, visitor-serving facilities, etc.).

Policy 7.3 states:

Design and site new development to protect natural and environmental sensitive resources, such as areas of unique scenic quality, public views, and visual compatibility with surrounding uses and to minimize natural landform alterations.

Action 7.3.5 states: Prohibit development on oceanfront bluff faces, except public improvements providing public access, protecting coastal resources, or providing for public safety. Permit such improvements only when no feasible alternative exists and when designed and constructed to minimize landform alteration of the oceanfront bluff face, to not contribute to further erosion of the oceanfront bluff face and to be visually compatible with the surrounding area to the maximum extent feasible.

Policy 10.2 states:

Design and site new development to protect natural and environmentally sensitive resources such as areas of unique scenic quality, public views, and visual compatibility with surrounding uses and to minimize landform alterations. (Same as Policy 7.3)

Open Space/Conservation Element:

Policy 7-A states:

Preserve to the maximum extent feasible the quality of public views from the hillsides and along the city's shoreline.

Policy 7-M states:

New development along Pacific Coast Highway shall preserve existing views where feasible and, where topography allows, new development shall be terraced below the grad[e] of Pacific Coast Highway. [sic]

LUE Policy 2.10, and OSCE Policies 7-A and 7-K require that public scenic and visual qualities of coastal areas be preserved to the maximum extent feasible as resources of public importance, including views of coastal bluffs and canyons from along the City's

shoreline. In addition, LUE Policies 2.8, 2.9, 3.10, 7.3, 10.2, and Action 7.3.5 and OSCE Policy 7-M require, in part, that development be designed and sited in a manner that is visually compatible with surrounding uses and is protective of natural resources including public visual resources and to minimize natural landform alterations.

The project site is highly visible from the public beach. However, the coastal bluff on which the subject home is built is marked with the development of multiple single-family and multi-family residences. The proposed new structure would not significantly or adversely affect the natural character of the bluff face and beach because the addition would be adequately set back from the beach and its approximate 3,000 square foot size would be consistent with the pattern of existing development. In addition, the proposed addition would not impede public coastal views from Coast Highway because the subject duplex is not visible from PCH.

In this case, the proposed project is not anticipated to have negative impacts on the public coastal views and visual resources and is consistent with the visual resources policies of the LCP.

G. Marine Resources and Water Quality

Regarding protection of water quality, the City's certified LCP includes the following policies:

Policy 7.7 states:

Protect marine resources by implementing methods to minimize runoff from building sites and streets to the City's storm drain system (e.g., on-site water retention). (Same as Policy 10.7.)

Open Space/Conservation Element:

Policy 1-C states:

Require the installation of rain gutters and other water transport devices as a condition of approval on blufftop development, in order to convey water to the street (away from the bluff side). When this is impractical, all water shall be piped to the base of the bluff.

Policy 4-A states:

Development Planning and Design Best Management Practices (BMPs) Ensure that development plans and designs incorporate appropriate Site Design, Source Control and Structural Treatment Control Best Management Practices (BMPs), where feasible, to reduce to the maximum extent practicable, pollutants and runoff from the proposed development. Structural Treatment Control BMPs shall be implemented when a combination of Site Design and Source Control BMPs are not sufficient to protect water quality.

Policy 4-B states:

Ensure that development minimizes the creation of impervious surfaces, especially contiguously connected impervious areas, or minimizes the area of existing impervious surfaces where feasible.

Policy 4-C states:

Ensure that development is designed and managed to minimize the volume and velocity of runoff (including both stormwater and dry weather runoff) to the maximum extent practicable, to avoid excessive erosion and sedimentation.

Policy 4-D states:

Ensure that development and existing land uses and associated operational practices minimize the introduction of pollutants into coastal waters (including the ocean, estuaries, wetlands, rivers and lakes) to the maximum extent practicable.

Policy 4-E states:

Ensure that development is sited and designed to limit disturbances and to preserve the infiltration, purification, retention and conveyance functions of natural drainage systems that exist on the site to the maximum extent practicable.

Policy 4-I states:

Promote the protection and restoration of offshore, coastal, lake, stream or wetland waters and habitats and preserve them to the maximum extent practicable in their natural state. Oppose activities that may degrade the quality of offshore, coastal, lake, stream or wetland waters and habitat and promote the rehabilitation of impaired waters and habitat

Policy 4-J states:

Promote infiltration of both storm water and dry weather runoff, as feasible, to protect natural hydrologic conditions.

Policy 7-K states:

Preserve as much as possible the natural character of the landscape (including coastal bluffs, hillsides and ridgelines) by requiring proposed development plans to preserve and enhance scenic and conservation values to the maximum extent possible, to minimize impacts on soil mantle, vegetation cover, water resources, physiographic features, erosion problems, and require re-contouring and replanting where the natural landscape has been disturbed.

Policy 9-I states:

Require new development projects to control the increase in volume, velocity and sediment load of runoff from the greatest development areas at or near the source of increase to the greatest extent feasible.

Policy 9-K states:

Promote preservation and enhancement of the natural drainage of Laguna Beach.

Title 25 of the certified Implementation Plan (IP):

Section 25.07.012 (F) states, in relevant part:

Review Criteria. To ensure compliance with the Certified Local Coastal Program, the following criteria shall be incorporated into the review of all applications for coastal development permits: ...

(2) The proposed development will not adversely affect marine resources, environmentally sensitive areas, or archaeological or paleontological resources...

...

(8) The proposed development will be provided with adequate utilities, access roads, drainage and other necessary facilities; ...

LUE Policy 7.7 and OSCE Policies 4-A, 4-D, 4-E, 4-I, 4-J, 7-K, and 9-K require the protection of marine resources and other water resources, and OSCE Policies 1-B, 1-C, 1-D, 4-B, 4-C, and 9-I require that measures be implemented to reduce onsite runoff. Section 25.07.012(F) of the certified IP also requires that the proposed development not adversely affect marine resources and that adequate drainage be provided onsite.

Although the proposed development is not anticipated to adversely affect marine resources or other water resources, since the subject site is adjacent to the ocean, the proposed development still has the potential to discharge polluted runoff from the project site into a geologically sensitive coastal bluff, and/or beach, and into coastal waters, either directly or via the community's storm drains, which ultimately flows to the sea. Furthermore, storage or placement of construction materials, debris, or waste in a location subject to erosion and dispersion or which may be discharged into coastal water via rain or wind would result in adverse impacts upon the marine environment that could reduce the biological productivity of coastal waters. For instance, construction debris entering coastal waters may cover and displace soft bottom habitat. Sediment discharged into coastal waters may cause turbidity, which can shade and reduce the productivity of foraging avian and marine species' ability to see food in the water column.

In order to avoid adverse construction-related impacts upon marine resources, the Commission imposes **Special Condition 6**, which outlines construction-related requirements to provide for the safe storage of construction materials and the safe

disposal of construction debris. This condition requires the applicant to remove any and all debris resulting from construction activities within 24 hours of completion of the project. In addition, all construction materials, excluding lumber, shall be covered and enclosed on all sides, and as far away from a storm drain inlet and receiving waters as possible.

Therefore, the Commission finds that the proposed development, as conditioned, is consistent with the certified LCP regarding the protection of water quality to promote the biological productivity of coastal waters and to protect human health.

H. Deed Restriction

To ensure that any prospective future owners of the property are made aware of the applicability of the conditions of this permit, the Commission imposes **Special Condition 10** requiring that the property owner record a deed restriction against the property, referencing all of the above special conditions of this permit and imposing them as covenants, conditions and restrictions on the use and enjoyment of the Property. Thus, as conditioned, this permit ensures that any prospective future owner will receive actual notice of the restrictions and/or obligations imposed on the use and enjoyment of the land in connection with the authorized development, including the risks of the development and/or hazards to which the site is subject, and the Commission's immunity from liability.

I. Local Coastal Program (LCP)

Section 30604 (a) of the Coastal Act states:

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 the provisions of Chapter 3 (commencing with Section

30200) of this division 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 the provisions of Chapter 3 (commencing with Section 30200).

The City of Laguna Beach Local Coastal Program (LCP) was certified with suggested modifications, except for the areas of deferred certification, in July 1992. In February 1993 the Commission concurred with the Executive Director's determination that the suggested modification had been properly accepted and the City assumed permit issuing authority at that time. The Land Use Plan of the LCP consists of the Coastal Land Use Element, Open Space/Conservation Element, Coastal Technical Appendix, and Fuel Modification Guidelines (of the Safety Element of the City's General Plan as adopted by Resolution 89.104). The Coastal Land Use Element of the LCP was updated and replaced in its entirety via LCPA 1-10 in 2012. The certified Implementation Plan of the LCP is comprised of a number of different documents, but the main document is the City's Title 25 Zoning Code. The Open Space/Conservation

Element and Title 25 have been amended a number of times since original certification. Laguna Beach has a certified Local Coastal Program (LCP), but there are four areas of deferred certification in the City: Irvine Cove, Blue Lagoon, Hobo Canyon, and Three Arch Bay.

The proposed development that is subject to this permit application (CDP No. A-5-LGB-22-0025) is located within the City of Laguna Beach's certified jurisdiction. As discussed above, the proposed development, as conditioned, will not adversely impact coastal resources and public access. Therefore, the Commission finds that approval of this project, as conditioned, is consistent with the City's certified LCP and would not prejudice the ability of the City of Laguna Beach to prepare a Local Coastal Program for the areas of deferred certification that conforms with and is adequate to carry out the Chapter 3 policies of the Coastal Act.

J. California Environmental Quality Act

Section 13096(a) of the Commission's administrative regulations requires Commission approval of Coastal Development Permit applications to be supported by a finding showing the application, as conditioned by any conditions of approval, 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 Laguna Beach is the lead agency responsible for certifying that the proposed project is in conformance with the California Environmentally Quality Act (CEQA). The City's Design Review Board determined that in accordance with CEQA, the project is Exempt from Provisions of CEQA citing Section 15301, Class 1(a) (existing facilities) and Section 15303, Class 3 (New Construction), which "allows repair, maintenance, permitting, or minor alteration of existing public or private structures, mechanical equipment involving negligible or no expansion of use beyond that existing at the time of determination." However, Section 13096(a) of the Commission's administrative regulations requires Commission approval of coastal development permit applications to be supported by a finding showing the application, as conditioned by any conditions of approval, to be consistent with any applicable requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

The proposed project has been conditioned in order to be found consistent with the certified LCP and the Coastal Act Chapter 3 public access and recreation policies. As conditioned, there are no feasible alternatives or additional feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen any significant adverse effect which the activity may have on the environment. Therefore, the Commission finds that the proposed project, as conditioned to mitigate the identified impacts, is the least environmentally damaging feasible alternative and complies with the applicable requirements of the Coastal Act to conform to CEQA.

A-5-LGB-22-0025 (Gray)
Appeal – De Novo

APPENDIX A – SUBSTANTIVE FILE DOCUMENTS

Appeal No. A-5-LGB-22-0025 and associated file documents.