### CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION

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



### A-5-LGB-22-0025 (Gray) June 14, 2024

### **EXHIBITS**

### **Table of Contents**

- Exhibit 1 Project Location
- Exhibit 2 Project Plans
- Exhibit 3 Existing Retaining Walls
- Exhibit 4 Bluff Edge Determination

#### Exhibit 5 - Bluff Edge and Geologic Setback Review Memorandum

Exhibit 6 – 2014 Building Permit and Stop Work Order

# Exhibit 1 – Project Location





California Coastal Commission A-5-LGB-22-0025 Exhibit 1 Page 1 of 2



### Exhibit 2 – Project Plans

Mike and Lori Gray Residence

1007 Gaviota Drive Laguna Beach, CA 92651



31742 SOUTH COAST HIGHWAY LAGUNA BEACH CA 92651 TEL 949-307-0002 Seal / Sinnature:



California Coastal Commission A-5-LGB-22-0025 Exhibit 2 Page 1 of 7



SITE-TOPO

-0 SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0" 04.22.24

California Coastal Commission A-5-LGB-22-0025 Exhibit 2 Page 2 of 7



California Coastal Commission A-5-LGB-22-0025 Exhibit 2 Page 3 of 7

### lohrbach



UPPER LEVEL DEMO PLAN



A-0.3

Sheet No.:

California Coastal Commission A-5-LGB-22-0025 Exhibit 2 Page 4 of 7

### lohrbach



Exhibit 2 Page 5 of 7

![](_page_8_Figure_0.jpeg)

Exhibit 2 Page 6 of 7

![](_page_9_Figure_0.jpeg)

California Coastal Commission A-5-LGB-22-0025 Exhibit 2 Page 7 of 7

![](_page_10_Picture_1.jpeg)

California Coastal Commission A-5-LGB-22-0025 Exhibit 3 Page 1 of 1

## Exhibit 4 – Bluff Edge Determination

![](_page_11_Figure_1.jpeg)

California Coastal Commission A-5-LGB-22-0025 Exhibit 4 Page 1 of 1 STATE OF CALIFORNIA – CALIFORNIA NATURAL RESOURCES AGENCY

GAVIN NEWSOM, GOVERNOR

CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION 455 MARKET STREET, SUITE 228 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105-2219 VOICE (415) 904-5200 FAX (415) 904-5400

May 30, 2024

#### SUPPLEMENTAL BLUFF EDGE MEMORANDUM

To: Jeffrey Palm, Coastal Program Analyst

Joseph Street

From: Joseph Street, Ph.D., P.G., Senior Environmental Scientist - Supervisory

Re: 1007 Gaviota Dr., Laguna Beach (Gray Residence) Appeal No. A-5-LGB-22-0025

I am providing this supplemental memo to confirm my concurrence with the revised bluff edge delineation contained in the letter report, dated February 8, 2024, submitted by the applicant's geotechnical consultant:

 Stoney Miller and Geofirm Consultants, Inc., 2024, "Revised Bluff Edge Location", 1007 Gaviota Drive, Laguna Beach, California", February 8, 2024, signed by K. A. Trigg.

As described in my previous review memoranda (see attached) and the references therein, the bluff landform at this site has been modified by past grading, fill placement and development, chiefly during the installation of the existing bluff retaining walls following an episode of landsliding in 1980. These alterations to the natural landform have greatly complicated the delineation of the coastal bluff edge pursuant to the definition contained in the City of Laguna Beach's certified Local Coastal Program Land Use Element (LUE). My March 30, 2023, memo delineated the LUE bluff edge across much of the site as the top edge of a backfilled temporary grading cut made during the construction of the upper retaining wall in 1981. Later, at Commission staff's request, I provided an estimate of the bluff edge location as it existed in 1980, prior to the temporary cut and subsequent fill placement associated with the installation of the upper retaining wall (see attached memo dated December 1, 2023). This delineation of the 1980 natural bluff edge – following the mapped contact between the natural upper bluff terrace deposits and artificial fill extant at the time -- was based on the site plan and cross-section contained in a geologic report dating from May 1980 (Geofirm 1980; Ref. 1 in prior memos), and supported by the discussion provided in a more recent report (Stoney Miller & Geofirm 2023, Ref. 14 in prior memos).

In subsequent discussions with Kevin Trigg, the applicant's geologist, Mr. Trigg noted that the surface mapping of this geologic contact was uncertain, lacking supporting subsurface data, and very likely represented a "best guess" on the part of the project geologist in 1980. I agreed with this assessment, but in the absence of further information, did not see a basis for changing my evaluation of the natural bluff edge location in 1980. Mr. Trigg then proposed to collect additional subsurface borings at the site to better constrain the location of the contact between the natural bluff materials and the artificial fill; in other words, new data would be collected to test and refine the geologic interpretations from 1980, and if warranted, revised the delineation of the natural bluff edge prior to bluff face development.

For practical purposes, it was agreed that the subsurface investigation should focus on the open, unpaved/undeveloped area on the northwest flank of the subject property.

As discussed by Stoney Miller/Geofirm in its recent report (Ref. 17), the most seaward of the new subsurface borings (HA-1), collected on the upper bluff face at an elevation of approximately +50 ft above mean sea level (MSL), showed that the geologic contact between the natural bluff materials and the artificial fill at this location occurs at an elevation of approximately +43 ft MSL, or about 6 - 7 feet below the ground surface. Even projected conservatively as a flat plane between the location of the boring and the bluff face, the elevation of this contact indicates that the location of this contact (the natural bluff edge) is significantly seaward of the estimate provided by Geofirm (Ref. 1) in 1980.

As noted above, no new borings were collected on the central and southern (downcoast) portions of the subject site due to the presence of existing development (i.e., house, patio, and retaining walls). In the absence of new data, Stoney Miller/Geofirm made an estimate of the 1980 natural bluff edge location that is consistent with the subsurface data from HA-1, but also takes into account estimates of the bluff edge location for the neighboring site (1021 Gaviota Dr.), a prior estimate of the natural bluff edge location at 1007 Gaviota Dr. in 1964 based on aerial photographs (GeoSoils 2022; Ref. 11 in previous memos), and the 1980 geologic site plan (Geofirm 1980; Ref. 1). The actual location of the terrace deposit – fill contact on the central - southern portion of the site in 1980 is probably unrecoverable (due to landform alteration); however, Mr. Trigg's revised bluff edge delineation provides a reasonable estimate that balances the available information and remains fairly consistent with the 1980 geologic site plan.

Based on my review of the new subsurface information and discussion provided by Stoney Miller/Geofirm, and my prior review of other geologic reports and information pertinent to the site, I agree that the "geologic bluff edge" shown on Plate 1 of the February 9, 2024, report (Ref. 17) provides an acceptable estimate of the natural bluff edge in 1980, prior to the construction of the retaining wall. Additionally, the 25-foot setback line shown in this figure appears to be accurate.

#### References

Geofirm, Inc. and E. J. Miller, Inc., 1980, "Limited Geotechnical Investigation, Slope Instability and Remedial Design Recommendations, 1021 and 1031 Gaviota Street, Laguna Beach, California", May 30, 1980, signed by H. Lawrence and E. J. Miller.

GeoSoils, Inc., 2022, "Final Coastal Bluff Edge Evaluation, 1007 Gaviota Drive, Laguna Beach, Orange County, California 92651", dated February 22, 2022, signed by J. P. Franklin and D. W. Skelly.

Stoney Miller and Geofirm Consultants, Inc., 2023, "Response to Bluff Edge & Geologic Setback Review Memorandum dated February 24, 2023, Exhibit 5 to De Novo Appeal A-5-LGB-22-0025, 1007 Gaviota Drive, Laguna Beach, California", dated March 3, 2023, signed by K. A. Trigg.

#### Attachments:

#### December 1, 2023, Supplemental Bluff Edge Memorandum (& Figures)

#### March 30, 2023, Revised Bluff Edge and Geologic Review Memo (& Figures)

#### CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION 455 MARKET STREET, SUITE 228 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105-2219 VOICE (415) 904-5200 FAX (415) 904-5400

![](_page_14_Picture_3.jpeg)

ATTACHMENT

See 5/30/2024 memo for current bluff edge delination

December 1, 2023

#### SUPPLEMENTAL BLUFF EDGE MEMORANDUM

To: Jeffrey Palm, Coastal Program Analyst

From: Joseph Street, Ph.D., P.G., Staff Geologist

Joseph Street

Re: 1007 Gaviota Dr., Laguna Beach (Gray Residence) Appeal No. A-5-LGB-22-0025

This supplemental memo describes an alternate approach to delineating the coastal bluff edge pursuant to the City of Laguna Beach's certified Local Coastal Program Land Use Element (LUE). My prior bluff edge and geologic review memo (Exhibit 5 to the 3/30/2023 staff report; attached here for reference) delineated the LUE bluff edge across much of the site as the top edge of a backfilled temporary grading cut made during the construction of the upper retaining wall in 1981. In the current memo, I evaluate the bluff edge as it existed in 1980, prior to the temporary cut, based on a site plan and cross-section dating from May 1980 (Geofirm 1980; Ref. 1 in prior memo). These plans provide a snapshot of the bluff under relatively unaltered conditions, prior to the retaining wall project and associated grading. My delineation of this 1980 natural bluff edge, following the geologic contact between natural terrace deposits and fill present on the site at the time, is shown in **Figures 3 – 5** (numbering continued from prior memo).

#### 1980 Bluff Edge Delineation

In the months since the previous staff report was released, I have reviewed two additional submittals from the applicant's consultants providing new analysis and arguments related to the bluff edge delineation at this site:

- 15) Stoney Miller and Geofirm Consultants, Inc., 2023, "Discussion Regarding Bluff Edge Location, 1007 Gaviota Drive, Laguna Beach, California", dated September 19, 2023, signed by K. A. Trigg.
- 16) Trigg, K. and D.W. Skelly, 2023, "Response to 1007 Graphics", e-mail to Joseph Street, dated 10/20/2023.

Ref. 15<sup>1</sup> interpretated of the bluff geology as shown in the 1980 cross-section (Geofirm 1980, Ref. 1):

The cross section depicts the bluff consisting of sedimentary bedrock, overlain by a terrace sand deposit at an approximate elevation of 33 feet (orange highlight). The terrace is capped at

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> I have continued the reference numbering convention from the March 30, 2023 memo (see attached). California Coastal Commission A-5-LGB-22-0025 Exhibit 5 Page 3 of 20

the pad by a small wedge of fill material. The profile of the terrace surface under the fill (the fillterrace contact) is queried but reflects the interpreted but typical natural terrace profile that extends toward and along the grade of lower Anita Street. It appears that the exposed terrace surface seaward of the fill deposit is rounded toward the shore to the angle of the descending bluff, interrupted by two step-like breaks in slope above the lower landslide. Based on the configuration depicted, the seaward limit of the fill-terrace deposit contact would reflect the natural bluff edge.

On the 1980 site plan, the location of the surface contact between the fill wedge and natural terrace deposits is shown as a line traversing the bluff face between the 42-foot and 44-foot elevation contours. Ref. 15 concluded that this mapped contact line is "the best and most accurate representation we have of the natural bluff edge at the property prior to the grading." Based on my review of the historical information available for the site, I agree with this conclusion. The 1980 site plan and cross-section are provided here as **Fig. 3**, with the natural bluff edge (fill – terrace deposit contact) highlighted.

Recent Commission staff discussion has centered on the interpretation of the coastal bluff edge definition contained in the City LUE,<sup>2</sup> specifically language indicating that grading cuts are among the processes that cause a bluff edge to retreat over time. The applicant's geologist has previously noted (Stoney Miller &Geofirm 2023, Ref. 14) that the cut associated with the wall installation was temporary, and was immediately backfilled once construction was completed. In this way, the previous cut into the natural upper bluff at the site is distinguishable from permanent grading cuts that are maintained over time or used to facilitate further development, such as the more seaward placement of buildings that "step down" the bluff face. Additionally, the temporary cut was a necessary preliminary step for installing the upper retaining wall, which was permitted by the Commission in 1980. Based on these considerations, there is a reasonable argument that, in this case, the previous grading cut can be discounted when applying the LUE bluff edge definition. Applying this interpretation, I would conclude that the fill – terrace contact line (the natural bluff edge) shown in the 1980 plans and cross-section represents the LUE bluff edge.

This 1980 bluff edge line is shown on the 1980 site plan in **Fig. 3**. The bluff edge line has been transposed to present-day site plans, using the parcel boundaries as points of reference, in **Figs. 4** – **5**.

#### Top of Wall

In Ref. 16, the applicant's consultants reiterated the argument that the top of the upper retaining wall was designated as the bluff edge as part of the Commission's 1980 CDP approval. This argument is largely non-technical in nature, and is addressed in the staff report (see section C, Coastal Hazards). However, I note that using the top of wall as the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> The Land Use Element (LUE) of the City of Laguna Beach's certified Local Coastal Program includes the following definition of "Oceanfront Bluff Edge or Coastal Bluff Edge" (Glossary Definition 101) [emphasis added]:

The California Coastal Act and Regulations define the oceanfront bluff edge as the upper termination of a bluff, cliff or seacliff. In cases where the top edge of the bluff is rounded away from the face of the bluff, the bluff edge shall be defined as that point nearest the bluff face beyond which a downward gradient is maintained continuously to the base of the bluff. In a case where there is a step like feature at the top of the bluff, the landward edge of the topmost riser shall be considered the bluff edge. **Bluff edges typically retreat over time because of erosional processes**, **landslides, development of gullies, or by grading (cut)**. In areas where fill has been placed near or over the bluff edge, the original bluff edge, even if buried beneath fill, shall be taken to be the bluff edge.

bluff edge would appear to conflict with the currently-applicable LUE bluff edge definition (see footnote 2), specifically the language directing that fill placed near or over the bluff edge be discounted and the "original", pre-fill bluff edge identified.

#### Bluff Edge in 1963 Aerial Photographs

As noted in Ref. 16 and discussed in my 3/20/2023 memo, a prior bluff edge analysis (GeoSoils 2022, Ref. 11), used an 1963 aerial photograph to delineate the historical bluff edge in a location coincident with the top of the upper retaining wall. As shown in **Fig. 4**, this 1963 bluff edge line occurs seaward of the natural bluff edge as interpreted from the 1980 site plans, especially on the northern (upcoast) part of the site, where it occurs well down the modern bluff slope. The reasons for this difference are not clear, but could possibly be related to inaccuracies in the 1980 site survey, measurement errors in the aerial photograph analysis, or physical changes (i.e., erosion) at the site between 1963 – 1980. Another potential explanation is that the bluff edge identified in the 1963 aerial photograph (using stereoscopic methods) represents one of the slope breaks, noted in Ref. 15 and apparent on the 1980 cross-section, that occur seaward of the 1980 natural bluff edge (fill-terrace deposit contact).

#### Bluff Top Setback

The City of Laguna Beach LCP requires new principal development to be set back a minimum of 25 feet from the coastal bluff edge (LUE Action 10.2.7), with additional provisions that the setback be increased as necessary to address coastal hazards. Specifically, LUE Action 10.2.6 requires the setback be "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)." The policy further specifies that the development must *maintain* a minimum factor of safety against landsliding of 1.5 (static) or 1.2 (pseudostatic) over this timeframe, taking into account future bluff retreat and, among other things, the effects of sea level rise. My 3/20/2023 memo reviewed the available geologic information about the site in order to estimate a safe setback distance for new development that would not rely on protective devices, including the existing retaining walls.

The applicant previously provided (i) a slope stability analysis indicating that a 1.5 static factor of safety is achieved approximately 14 feet landward of the top of the upper retaining wall (Section A-A') (Stoney Miller & Geofirm 2022, Ref. 12), and (ii) several assessments of bluff erosion potential concluding that little significant bluff retreat had occurred at the site historically (Geofirm 1980, Ref. 1; Geofirm 2019, Ref. 7; GeoSoils 2021, Ref.9). My analysis in the 3/30/2023 memo added an allowance for more substantial bluff erosion in the future (i.e., with potential sea level rise) and estimated that a total setback of 18 - 30 feet could be necessary to protect new development at the site over 75 years, without relying on existing or new shoreline protection, but noted significant uncertainty in projecting future bluff erosion at this site.

As shown in **Fig. 4**, a 25-foot setback from the 1980 bluff edge would result in somewhat larger setbacks – on the order of 30 feet – from the top of the existing fill slope (i.e., top of the upper retaining wall), which extends seaward of the natural bluff face, across most of the subject lot. The 30-foot geologic setback that would result from applying the default 25-foot *bluff edge* setback would provide a substantial buffer against future increases in the

bluff erosion rate due to SLR. For these reasons, I believe that a development setback of 25 feet from the 1980 bluff edge, as illustrated in **Figs. 4 - 5**, is likely to ensure the safety and stability of new development at the site over a 75-year economic life, without reliance on shoreline protection. However, given the uncertainties involved, it would still be prudent to include special conditions to further minimize hazards, such as a deed restriction and assumption of risk provision to make the permittee and future owners aware of the hazards inherent to this location, and a requirement that the new development be removed or relocated if it is threatened by erosion in the future.

#### References

Geofirm, Inc. and E. J. Miller, Inc., 1980, "Limited Geotechnical Investigation, Slope Instability and Remedial Design Recommendations, 1021 and 1031 Gaviota Street, Laguna Beach, California", May 30, 1980, signed by H. Lawrence and E. J. Miller.

Geofirm, Inc., 2019b, "Updated Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation For Residence Remodel and Additions and Response to Review Dated June 17, 2019, 1007 Gaviota Dr., Laguna Beach, California", July 16, 2019, signed by K. A. Trigg and Z. Wang.

GeoSoils, Inc., 2021, "Discussion of Coastal Hazards and Wave Runup, 1007 Gaviota Drive, City of Laguna Beach, Orange County, California", October 8, 2021, signed by D. W. Skelly.

GeoSoils, Inc., 2022, "Final Coastal Bluff Edge Evaluation, 1007 Gaviota Drive, Laguna Beach, Orange County, California 92651", dated February 22, 2022, signed by J. P. Franklin and D. W. Skelly.

Stoney Miller and Geofirm Consultants, Inc., 2022, "Review of Revised Residence Plans and Slope Stability, Response to Coastal Commission Comments, 1007 Gaviota Dr., Laguna Beach, California", October 3, 2022, signed by K. A. Trigg and H. H. Richter.

Stoney Miller and Geofirm Consultants, Inc., 2023, "Response to Bluff Edge & Geologic Setback Review Memorandum dated February 24, 2023, Exhibit 5 to De Novo Appeal A-5-LGB-22-0025, 1007 Gaviota Drive, Laguna Beach, California", dated March 3, 2023, signed by K. A. Trigg.

#### Attachments:

Figures 3 – 5

March 30, 2023 Revised Bluff Edge and Geologic Review Memo & Figures 1 - 2

![](_page_18_Figure_0.jpeg)

Figure 3a: 1980 Geologic Site Plan and Natural Bluff Edge interpretation (Geofirm 1980; Ref. 1)

California Coastal Commission A-5-LGB-22-0025 Exhibit 5 Page 7 of 20

![](_page_19_Figure_0.jpeg)

Figure 3b: 1980 bluff cross-section (Geofirm 1980; Ref. 1)

California Coastal Commission A-5-LGB-22-0025 Exhibit 5 Page 8 of 20

![](_page_20_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_20_Figure_1.jpeg)

California Coastal Commission A-5-LGB-22-0025 Exhibit 5 Page 9 of 20

![](_page_21_Figure_0.jpeg)

California Coastal Commission A-5-LGB-22-0025 Exhibit 5 Page 10 of 20

#### CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION 455 MARKET STREET, SUITE 228 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105-2219 VOICE (415) 904-5200

![](_page_22_Picture_3.jpeg)

ATTACHMENT 95 5/30/2024 See 12/1/2023 Supplemental Memo

for current bluff edge determination

March 30, 2023

FAX (415) 904-5400

### **REVISED BLUFF EDGE & GEOLOGIC REVIEW MEMORANDUM**

To: Bailey Warren, Coastal Program Analyst

From: Joseph Street, Ph.D., P.G., Staff Geologist

Re: 1007 Gaviota Dr., Laguna Beach (Gray Residence) Appeal No. A-5-LGB-22-0025

This memorandum is an update to the review memo included as Exhibit 5 to the previously published staff recommendation on this appeal, both dated February 24, 2023. The current memo reviews new information provided by the applicant and recovered from City and Commission records, and revises several of the conclusions reached in my earlier review. However, my recommendation as to the location of the bluff edge remains unchanged.

The purpose of this memorandum is to (a) determine the position of the bluff edge, consistent with the City of Laguna Beach Local Coastal Program (LCP) definition, on the subject property; and (b) evaluate the bluff top setback necessary to ensure the stability of the new development over its economic life without reliance on shoreline protection. To this end, I have reviewed the following documents provided by the applicant or otherwise directly addressing conditions on the site:

- Geofirm, Inc. and E. J. Miller, Inc., 1980, "Limited Geotechnical Investigation, Slope Instability and Remedial Design Recommendations, 1021 and 1031 Gaviota Street, Laguna Beach, California", May 30, 1980, signed by H. Lawrence and E. J. Miller.
- E. J. Miller, Inc., 1980, "Proposed Design Scheme for Stabilizing the Failed Slope on the Seaward Side of the Residence at 1007 Gaviota Drive, Laguna Beach, California", October 23, 1980, signed by E. J. Miller.
- E. J. Miller, Inc., 1981, "Final Report of Observations and Tests during Repair of the Slope on the Seaward Side of the Residence at 1007 Gaviota Drive, Laguna Beach, California", May 19, 1981, signed by E. J. Miller.
- 4) Geofirm, Inc., 2015, "Geotechnical Bluff Top Evaluation, 1007 Gaviota Dr., Laguna Beach, California", May 8, 2015, signed by H. H. Richter and K. A. Trigg.
- 5) Geofirm, Inc., 2016, "Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation For Residence Remodel and Additions, 1007 Gaviota Dr., Laguna Beach, California", July 20, 2016, signed by E. Hilde and E. J. Aldrich.
- 6) Geofirm, Inc., 2019a, "Geotechnical Slope Stability Determination, 1007 Gaviota Dr., Laguna Beach, California", April 8, 2019, signed by Z. Wang and K. A. Trigg.

- Geofirm, Inc., 2019b, "Updated Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation For Residence Remodel and Additions and Response to Review Dated June 17, 2019, 1007 Gaviota Dr., Laguna Beach, California", July 16, 2019, signed by K. A. Trigg and Z. Wang.
- 8) Geofirm, Inc., 2019c, "Clarification of Bluff Edge Determination, 1007 Gaviota Dr., Laguna Beach, California", September 18, 2019, signed by K. A. Trigg.
- GeoSoils, Inc., 2021, "Discussion of Coastal Hazards and Wave Runup, 1007 Gaviota Drive, City of Laguna Beach, Orange County, California", October 8, 2021, signed by D. W. Skelly.
- 10) Geofirm, Inc., 2021, "Review of Slope Retaining Walls and Bluff Edge Determination, 1007 Gaviota Dr., Laguna Beach, California", October 22, 2021, signed by K. A. Trigg.
- GeoSoils, Inc., 2022, "Final Coastal Bluff Edge Evaluation, 1007 Gaviota Drive, Laguna Beach, Orange County, California 92651", dated February 22, 2022, signed by J. P. Franklin and D. W. Skelly.
- 12) Stoney Miller and Geofirm Consultants, Inc., 2022, "Review of Revised Residence Plans and Slope Stability, Response to Coastal Commission Comments, 1007 Gaviota Dr., Laguna Beach, California", October 3, 2022, signed by K. A. Trigg and H. H. Richter.
- Stoney Miller and Geofirm Consultants, Inc., 2023, "Response to Coastal Commission Email dated January 4, 2023, 1007 Gaviota Dr., Laguna Beach, California", January 13, 2023, signed by K. A. Trigg.
- 14) Stoney Miller and Geofirm Consultants, Inc., 2023, "Response to Bluff Edge & Geologic Setback Review Memorandum dated February 24, 2023, Exhibit 5 to De Novo Appeal A-5-LGB-22-0025, 1007 Gaviota Drive, Laguna Beach, California", dated March 3, 2023, signed by K. A. Trigg.

I have also consulted oblique aerial photographs of the site provided by the California Coastal Records Project (<u>https://www.californiacoastline.org</u>) and historical overhead aerial photographs of the site from the University of California Santa Barbara Library archive (<u>https://mil.library.ucsb.edu/ap\_indexes/FrameFinder/</u>, accessed January 27, 2023). I have also viewed the bluff and project site from the beach on several occasions, most recently on February 18, 2020.

#### **Site Description**

As described in the geotechnical investigations provided by Geofirm (Refs. 5, 7), the coastal bluff at the site is composed of Topanga Formation siltstone and sandstone bedrock overlain unconformably by geologically recent, sandy marine and non-marine terrace deposits. The exterior face of the bluff is largely composed of artificial fill supported by a masonry wall at the bluff toe and two upper bluff retaining walls (Figs. 1, 2). The stabilization system also includes a zone of buried concrete that provides a footing for the upper retaining walls. The fill slope and retaining wall system was constructed in 1980-81 (under Coastal Development Permit No. A-80-7442), in response to bluff erosion and instability affecting both the 1007 Gaviota Dr. property and the neighboring lot to the south (1021 Gaviota Dr.). Ref. 1 described landslides underlying the westernmost portion of the 1007 Gaviota Dr. property, the sewer lift station at the end of Anita St. (neighboring site to the north) the bluff seaward of 1021 Gaviota Dr.:

The landslides involve the movement of bedrock downslope along bedding in clay-rich shale strata which has an out-of-slope dip component. Movement has been triggered primarily by removal of downslope stratigraphic support due to general seacliff retreat. Failure of the bedrock promoted concomitant slumping of upslope terrace deposits. Such failure was

probably also promoted by high groundwater pore pressures resulting from the infiltration of dispersed precipitation upon the slope and general region coupled with concentrated discharge from the deck area ...

Ref. 14 indicates that the landslides occurred during the rainy winter of 1980. Refs. 5 and 7 suggest that some previous sliding and bluff erosion may have been triggered by heavy rains during the winter of 1969.

#### ATTACHMENT

Based the information contained in the Geofirm reports (Refs. 1, 4, 7, 8), the subject site extends from an elevation of approximately 10 feet above mean sea level (MSL) at the back of the beach to about +60 feet MSL at Gaviota Dr. (Figs. 1, 2). The edge of the rearyard patio (i.e., the top of the uppermost retaining wall and edge of the fill slope) occurs at an elevation of about +52 feet MSL, and the geologic reports (e.g., Refs. 5, 7, 13, 14) indicate that the natural marine terrace deposits behind the fill also extend to this elevation. In its current state, including the fill and retaining walls, the bluff (along Section A-A', Fig. 2) has an average slope of about 48 degrees (or about 1:1 horizontal to vertical, h:v). Cross-sections in Refs. 1, 5 and 7 indicate that the natural bluff beneath may have an average slope of 40 - 42 degrees, but with steeper sections of 65 - 80 degrees.

#### **Coastal Bluff Edge Determination**

The Land Use Element (LUE) of the City of Laguna Beach's certified Local Coastal Program includes the following definition of "Oceanfront Bluff Edge or Coastal Bluff Edge" (Glossary Definition 101) [emphasis added]:

The California Coastal Act and Regulations define the oceanfront bluff edge as the upper termination of a bluff, cliff or seacliff. In cases where the top edge of the bluff is rounded away from the face of the bluff, the bluff edge shall be defined as that point nearest the bluff face beyond which a downward gradient is maintained continuously to the base of the bluff. In a case where there is a step like feature at the top of the bluff, the landward edge of the topmost riser shall be considered the bluff edge. **Bluff edges typically retreat over time because of erosional processes, landslides, development of gullies, or by grading (cut). In areas where fill has been placed near or over the bluff edge, the original bluff edge, even if buried beneath fill, shall be taken to be the bluff edge.** 

This definition is similar, though not identical to the definition of "bluff edge" contained in the Coastal Commission's regulations (Cal. Code Reg. Title 14, §13577(h)).<sup>1</sup> Notably, the LUE definition specifies that grading cuts act as an erosional process that cause the bluff edge to retreat, while artificial fill placed near or over the bluff edge is to be discounted and the edge of the buried natural bluff materials used as the bluff edge. The LUE (in Definition 102) further clarifies that a coastal bluff encompasses the entire slope between the upland area and the beach, and not just the steepest portion of the slope:

**Oceanfront Bluff/Coastal Bluff** – A bluff overlooking a beach or shoreline or that is subject to marine erosion. Many oceanfront bluffs consist of a gently sloping upper bluff and a steeper lower bluff or sea cliff. The term "oceanfront bluff" or "coastal bluff" refers to the entire

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Section 13577(h)(2) of the Commission's regulations defines the "bluff edge" as follows:

Bluff line or edge shall be defined as the upper termination of a bluff, cliff or seacliff. In cases where the top edge of the cliff is rounded away from the face of the cliff as a result of erosional processes related to the presence of the steep cliff face, the bluff line or edge shall be defined as that point nearest the cliff beyond which the downward gradient of the surfaces increases more or less continuously until it reaches the general gradient of the cliff. In a case where there is a steplike feature at the top of the cliff face, the landward edge of the topmost rise shall be taken as the cliff edge.

slope between a marine terrace or upland area and the sea. The term "sea cliff" refers to the lower, near vertical portion of an oceanfront bluff.<sup>2</sup>

At the project site, a bluff edge determination pursuant to the LUE definition must take into consideration both the grading cuts and placement of fill on the bluff associated with the 1980-81 slope repairs and wall installation, which first modified and then obscured the bluff edge. ATTACHMENT

The applicant's earlier bluff edge evaluations (see Refs. 4, 5, 7, 8, 10) posed two basic arguments. The first was that seaward facing slope at the site does not constitute a coastal or oceanfront bluff under the LCP because the average slope of the natural (pre-stabilization) bluff is less than 45 degrees, and thus does not meet the threshold in the Municipal Code definition (Sec. 25.50.004(a)). This argument is incorrect for several reasons. First, while I agree that the average slope of the natural bluff face, behind the fill and retaining walls, is slightly less than 45 degrees, it also appears to have multiple steeper sections with slopes exceeding 45 degrees. Thus, the bluff here would appear to be a bluff with irregular slope or "multiple slope condition" under Section 25.50.004(a)(i), with a bluff edge at the "most inland 45 degree or greater slope", which at the subject site occurs at the upper edge of the marine terrace deposits at an elevation of approximately 52 feet MSL. Second, and more importantly, the coastal bluff and bluff edge definitions in the LUE, which are determinative in this case, contain no slope-based restrictions on what qualifies as an "oceanfront bluff". The seaward facing slope at this site qualifies as a coastal bluff under the LCP.

The second argument presented, that the Commission has already delineated the bluff edge as the top of the uppermost retaining wall approved under the 1980 CDP, is non-technical in nature and is addressed in the staff report (see section C, Coastal Hazards).

In a later applicant submittal, the GeoSoils "Final Coastal Bluff Edge Evaluation" (Ref. 11), the coastal bluff edge as it existed historically, prior to the 1980-81 stabilization work, was evaluated using stereoscopic analysis of overhead aerial photographs dating from 1947 and 1963. GeoSoils reported that the position of the bluff edge did not change between these two dates, and that the historical bluff edge line was coincident with the top of the uppermost retaining wall across much of the subject site (Fig. 1). This is a useful study, as it provides an estimate of the bluff edge position prior to both the 1980 landslide and the grading cuts and fill placement associated with the construction of the retaining walls. However, the applicant's bluff edge line does not represent the bluff edge under the LUE definition because it does not account for the bluff edge retreat that resulted from grading cuts during the upper retaining wall construction in 1980-81 (described in Refs. 3 and 14).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> The Laguna Beach Municipal Code Section 25.50.004 contains a somewhat different definition of a coastal/oceanfront bluff and coastal bluff edge:

<sup>(</sup>a) An "oceanfront bluff" is an oceanfront landform having a slope of forty-five degrees or greater from horizontal whose top is ten or more feet above mean sea level.

<sup>(</sup>i) In cases where an oceanfront bluff possesses an irregular or multiple slope condition, the setback will be taken from the most inland forty-five degree or greater slope.

<sup>(</sup>ii) In cases where the landform constitutes an oceanfront bluff whose slope is less than forty-five degrees, a determination as to whether or not the specific landform is subject to this provision shall be made by the director of community development.

However, the Municipal Code definitions predate the certification of the 2012 Land Use Element, and the Commission has through numerous prior actions found that the LUE coastal bluff and bluff edge definitions supersede the older definitions in cases where they conflict.

Rather, Ref. 11 posits a bluff edge line that longer existed (or had been substantially altered) by the time walls were constructed.

The construction of the existing retaining wall system at 1007 and 1021 Gaviota Dr. required significant excavation and grading on the bluff face to install the wall footings (Refs. 3, 14). At the top of the bluff, the installation of the upper wall involved a significant cut (8-10 feet wide, up to 12-14 feet deep) into the native opper built materials. This cut removed the pre-existing bluff edge, and along the central portion of the site (section A-A', Fig. 2), retreated the bluff edge (the top edge of the natural marine terrace deposits) approximately 10 feet landward. Once the wall and footings were installed, the cut was backfilled with sandy fill.

Ref. 14 notes that the cuts associated with the wall installation were temporary, lasting only as long as the construction effort, and were backfilled to restore the bluff to near its former position. While recognizing the validity of these statements, I do not see that they change the bluff edge delineation under the LUE definition. The LUE definition explicitly recognizes that "[b]luff edges typically retreat over time because of erosional processes, landslides, development of gullies, or by grading (cut)", and does not make a distinction between situations in which a cut is backfilled or left open. To the contrary, the LUE definition provides specific direction that fill be discounted when delineating the bluff edge. In the present context, the most logical interpretation of the phrase "original bluff edge" cited in the definition is the bluff edge as it existed immediately prior to the fill placement, i.e., the edge of recently cut natural upper bluff materials. Otherwise, the phrase "original bluff edge" could be taken to mean the bluff edge at any arbitrary past point in time.

With these considerations in mind, the coastal bluff edge on the subject lot, as defined in the LUE, occurs at the seaward edge of the natural marine terrace deposits where they contact the artificial fill. This is the remnant edge of the cut described in Ref. 3. Along cross-section A-A', across the central portion of lot, the LUE bluff edge occurs about 10 feet landward of the top of the upper retaining wall (i.e., the seaward edge of the fill), at an elevation of about +52 feet MSL (Fig. 2). Geofirm (Refs. 5, 7, 13, 14) has traced the location of this geologic contact (between fill, "Af", and upper bluff marine and non-marine terrace deposits, "Qtm" and "Qtn", respectively) across the site in its plan view figures (see Fig. 1). Along the northwestern flank of the site, on the lot immediately upcoast, the contact between the fill and non-marine terrace deposits appears to curve seaward (downslope), such that the upper portion of the bluff consists of natural terrace deposits rather than fill. In this area, the bluff edge is taken to be the top of the slope, approximately following the +53 ft MSL contour (Fig. 1).

#### **Bluff Top Setback**

The City of Laguna Beach LCP requires new principal development to be set back a minimum of 25 feet from the coastal bluff edge (LUE Action 10.2.7), with additional provisions that the setback be increased as necessary to address coastal hazards. Specifically, LUE Action 10.2.6 requires the setback be "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)." The policy further specifies that the development must *maintain* a minimum factor of safety against landsliding of 1.5 (static) or 1.2 (pseudostatic) over this timeframe, taking into account future bluff retreat and, among other things, the effects of sea level rise. In order to

conform to this policy, it is necessary to estimate a safe setback distance without relying on existing or future protective devices, including the existing retaining walls.

#### **Bluff Stability**

As noted above, the project site has experienced landsliding and bluff instability in the past, likely occurring along inclined strata in the Topanga Formation bedrock and triggered by (i) marine erosion at the bluff toe over time and (ii) saturation of upper bluff materials during winter storms (Refs. 1, 5, 7, 14). Without the protection and support provided by the existing wall system, similar bluff erosion and instability would be likely to recur in the future. The applicant's initial slope stability analyses (Refs. 5 - 7), relying on relatively conservative assumptions about the shear strengths of the bluff materials (and the bedrock strata in particular), indicated the need for a large setback (about 59 feet from the top of the upper retaining wall) in order to achieve a 1.5 (static) factor of safety; based on this analysis, use of a lateral stability caisson array was recommended to increase bluff stability and allow for the proposed redevelopment, which at that point involved a larger, more seaward-located structure. Ref. 12, submitted in support of the current project proposal, included a revised slope stability analysis using a higher along-bedding shear strength value for the Topanga Formation strata. This revision was based on newly recovered, site-specific information contained in the engineering design reports for the existing retaining wall system (Ref. 3). The revised analysis indicated that, in the absence of the retaining wall system, a 1.5 factor of safety against landsliding was achieved approximately 14 feet landward of the top of the uppermost retaining wall (Section A-A').

The use of greater along-bedding shear strength values for the Topanga Formation rock appears to be justified by prior data, indicating that the revised slope stability analysis is valid. However, it is worth noting that though the retaining wall system was excluded from the analysis, the buried concrete fill that provides foundation support for the walls was not, and thus the analysis may not represent a completely "unprotected" bluff condition. This concrete fill is integrated into the existing bluff face and could not be removed without significant excavation and damage to the natural bluff, and in my view the revised analysis in Ref. 12 provides a reasonably realistic snapshot of bluff stability if the primary protective structures – the exterior walls -- were absent.

#### **Bluff Retreat**

Assessing the amount of future bluff erosion and retreat that could occur at the project site in the absence of the shoreline protection is complicated by the fact that the existing wall system has been in place for the last 40 years, and has effectively halted natural erosion processes at the site over that time period. As a result there is only limited historical information, and no recent evidence, on which to base future retreat estimates. The applicant's coastal hazards analysis (Ref. 9) does not address this issue directly, simply noting that there is little visual evidence of bedrock or upper bluff erosion or beach narrowing in the area in a comparison of recent (March 2020) and historical (February 1963) aerial photographs, and estimating an erosion rate of 0 ft/yr. over this period. Ref. 9 does not discuss the prior landsliding at the site or the large amount of fill that was placed on the bluff during the 1980-81 stabilization work, which would have obscured any visual evidence of bluff erosion that occurred between 1963 – 1980 (Refs. 1, 5, 7, 14). Ref. 9 also makes no allowance for the possibility that future sea level rise could increase bluff erosion at the site. The geologic reports by Geofirm provide more information about historical bluff erosion at the site, generally concluding that past erosion episodes have been relatively minor. Past rates of erosion and retreat at the bluff toe, pre-dating the lower seawall, appear to have been low, consistent with the relatively resistant nature of the Topanga Formation bedrock. Ref. 1 reports a bedrock erosion rate of 0.5 - 1 inch/year (0.04 - 0.08 ft/yr.) from a prior study. Ref. 7, based on examination of historical aerial photographs dating to 1931, finds no evidence of bluff toe erosion but indicates that some upper bluff erosion may have occurred between 1964 and 1970:

In addition, the yard area backing the residence appears significantly reduced on the seaward edge in the images from 1970. It appears some material was lost at the top, possibly following the winter of 1969. The 1970 toe of the slope appears to be in the same location as 1931 and 1964, suggesting the material loss is not associated with a gross failure. It is our interpretation the upper portion of the slope, possibly within the terrace sand, failed after increased saturation and flowed along the terrace bedrock contact following the heavy rainfall season.

However, the amount of bluff edge retreat thought to have occurred in 1969 was not quantified. As noted above, additional landsliding occurred at the site during the rainy winter of 1980 and provided the impetus for the construction the existing retaining wall system (Refs. 1 - 3, 14). However, cross-sections of the 1007 and 1021 Gaviota sites attached to Ref. 1 (newly recovered from Commission files) indicate that the landsliding was more severe on the 1021 Gaviota lot, and that bluff erosion at the 1007 Gaviota site was confined to the bluff face, with little or no retreat of the bluff edge. As described above, most or all of the bluff edge retreat that occurred in 1980-81 was due to grading cuts during the installation of the upper wall rather than natural erosion.

The available evidence suggests that significant bluff erosion at the site occurred only infrequently in the past, typically in conjunction with extreme rainfall events, but does not provide a strong basis for estimating future bluff retreat over the next 75 years. This is particularly true due to the potential for significant sea level rise over this period. By driving shoreline retreat, narrowing beaches, and increasing the frequency and energy of wave attack at the base of coastal bluffs, sea level rise is expected to increase rates of bluff erosion. Relying on historical observations alone risks underestimating future bluff retreat. The applicant's coastal hazards report (Ref. 9) discounts the potential for sea level rise to increase bluff erosion at the site. Nonetheless, the wave runup analysis contained in this study does indicate that storm waves can reach and overtop the lower seawall, and would reach progressively higher elevations on the bluff face in the future with sea level rise (SLR). Particularly in the absence of armoring, this would be expected to trigger new episodes of bluff erosion, potentially at rates higher than observed historically.

In order to get a rough sense of how much bluff retreat could occur at the site in the future, I have consulted the USGS CoSMoS bluff retreat tool (Barnard et al. 2018), which includes bluff retreat projections for several transects in the immediate project area, for several different sea level rise scenarios. The direct CoSMoS projections are less useful in the Laguna Beach area because one of the key model inputs, the historical bluff retreat rate, tends to be inaccurate due to the low resolution of the historical maps used in estimating these rates. To partially circumvent this weakness, I have instead (a) used the CoSMoS projections to calculate the factor by which bluff retreat is projected to increase, above the initial rate, for a given amount of SLR (in 2100), and (b) applied this factor to several estimates of the historical bluff retreat rate to generate future bluff retreat projections for several SLR scenarios. For the historical bluff retreat rate, I used the range cited by Ref. 1

(0.04 - 0.08 ft/yr.), along with an average rate (0.24 ft/yr.) provided by USGS for the four CoSMoS transects nearest the project site. For SLR scenarios of 1 - 2 m (3.3 - 6.6 ft) by 2100, CoSMoS projects that average bluff erosion rates (for the period 2016 - 2100) in the project vicinity could increase by factors of 1.3 - 2 (130 - 200%) above the historical baseline. Applied to the historical retreat rates from Ref. 1, these factors of increase in the rate of bluff erosion would result in 4 - 16 feet of bluff retreat over the next 75 years. Using the higher USGS historical retreat rate, the projections increase to 23 - 48 ft over the next 75 years.

#### **Total Setback (No Armoring Condition)**

Combined with the 14-foot setback needed to assure a 1.5 (static) factor of safety under present day conditions, the above bluff retreat projections suggest the need for a total geologic setback on the order of 18 - 30 feet (for the more realistic historical bluff retreat rates from Ref. 1) or 37 - 62 feet (for the higher USGS retreat rates), without relying on shoreline protection. Based on the relatively resistant bedrock present at the bluff toe, and the low frequency of significant bluff retreat projections are more realistic, even for the relatively high sea level rise scenarios examined in my rough analysis. Nonetheless, the large range in the bluff retreat projections underscores the high level of uncertainty in predicting the bluff erosion response to future conditions.

The City LCP requires a minimum 25-foot development setback from the bluff edge for new principal development. As shown in Fig. 1, a 25-ft setback from the LUE bluff edge, would result in larger setbacks – on the order of 40 – 50 feet from the top of the existing fill slope (i.e., top of the upper retaining wall), which extends seaward of the natural bluff face, across most of the subject lot. The 40 – 50-foot geologic setbacks that would result from applying the default 25-foot *bluff edge* setback<sup>3</sup> would provide a substantial buffer against future increases in the bluff erosion rate due to SLR. For these reasons, I believe that a development setback of 25 feet from the coastal bluff edge, as defined in the City's certified LUE and illustrated in Fig. 1, is likely to ensure the safety and stability of new development at the site over a 75-year economic life, without reliance on shoreline protection. However, given the uncertainties involved, it would still be prudent to include special conditions to further minimize hazards, such as a deed restriction and assumption of risk provision to make the permittee and future owners aware of the hazards inherent to this location, and a requirement that the new development be removed or relocated if it is threatened by erosion in the future.

#### Attachments: Figures 1, 2

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> These relatively large distances result in part from measuring the 25-ft setback from all points and at all angles on the irregular bluff edge line (see Fig. 1).

![](_page_30_Figure_0.jpeg)

(modified from Refcation)ia Coastal Commission A-5-LGB-22-0025 Exhibit 5 Page 19 of 20

### Figure 2: Site Cross-Section (A-A')

![](_page_31_Figure_1.jpeg)

(b) Cross-section with LUE bluff edge position (modified from Ref. 13)

![](_page_31_Figure_3.jpeg)

ELEVATION (FEET)

# Exhibit 6 – 2014 Building Permit and Stop Work Order

								ZPC 14	1-110	74
CITY OF L	AGUNA BEACI	1 DEPA	RTMENT OF CON	MUNITY DEVEL	OPMENT 5	00 FOREST	AVENUE LA	GUNA BEACH CA	ALIFOPNIA	92651
DEVELOPMENT REVIEW APPLICATION										
Please completely fill-in the top hair of side one										
PROJECT			RESS 102	JF GA	NOTA	Y DI	ZIVE			
VALUATIO	ON OF WOF		18,000		LOT	SIZE	O'XIE	51.48 AU	in=6	647
ASSESSO	OR S PARCE	EL NO	644-6	76-01			<u> </u>			
DESCRIB	E IN DETAI		PE OF WORK	HERE, 12	2111 BE	INTE	RIOR 1	ZEWODEL	Work	KONL
(1) CON	VERTIE	0.64	FOFCE	400 504	CE TO O	GARAG	Er WIT	H NEW F	2ETAI	DING (
wher	ATAI	DAT	ON OF. TY	E BAY	AND	EASTS	NOE O	FCRAWL	-5DA	CE-
2)6	200ND F	roa	2 LIVING	- RECO	NFIGU	ine e	FISTIN	G BATHIZE	some	,#3
44	tND Clo	SET	TO NGW	BATTHE	som m	NO ST	TOWER		3 54	
3)	IN FLO	or 1	AVING -	RECONF	IGURE	E EXI	STING	KITCHEN	/DE	N
AND 1	BATH \$	<u>ì</u> N	TO NEW	Kitch	ZN/4	LUNDP	4 AND	POWDER	BA	TH-
RECON	JFIGUR	ĒĒ	XISTING	MASTE	2 BATH	1/Close	ET/BP	TH#1 A	VO B	EO-
loom	#1 IN	170	NEW MA	STER B	ATHAN	jo Cie	SET-	MAIN FUR	- REN	LODEL
BF 6	2 <del>38.5</del> F				<b>,</b>					
		FLOOR APEA	GARAGE AREA	DECKAF	REA CRAC	ULSPACE	TOTAL REMODEL AREA	NO O	STORIES	
EXIS	TING BUILDING	;	2,638	478.	3 322	-8 2	29 1	980 SF	: 2	-
NEW CONSTRUCTION CONVERT CPAWLSOACE		ø	+150.4	, <i>ф</i>	. <-	150.67				
	TOTALS	<b>.</b>	2638	629	312	.8	78.4	980cc	2	-
The	remainder	of side	one is for stat	fluse only	See other s	side for re	quired cer	tificates and si	gnatures	] S
	PEICATION	FFF	DATE	APPLICATION			DATE APPR	OVED / DENIED		
PRE APPLICA	TION SITE			NUMBER		N E	IOA/DRB	PC	C	:C
	СНЕСК	 						<u> </u>		
ESIG REVIE	Ev									
COASTAL DEV	ELOPMENT							· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	_\	
APIANCE				·						
UBDIVISION		l 		 						l
2EQ~					!					
				l						
				PY BUILDINC	HEH SHOW N	GHTS	- cı	FARANCE	BY	DATE
~~°DJ -RO ~		0110								{
RICHT SIDE		1				<u> </u>	ZONI JG P	LAN CHECK		
EFT SIDE					S OPE	HEIGHT	LONNST			
≥EAR		·		~ l			STRUCTURAL PLAN CHECK			
DISTANCE BETWEEN BUILDINGS						FINAL CHE	EC+			
)evelopmen	Category	_ Local _ Coas _ Cateo _ Exem	Coastal Developm al Commission Per orical Exclusion pt (Li t Code Secti	Coas al De ent Permit is req mit is required	evelopment Pe uired and it s	ermit is not	appealab	ele to Coastal Comm	nssion	

# PERMIT DETAILED REPORT (RBP-2014-1270)

Permit Type	Building - Residential	Project:		Ann Datas	07/14/2014
Work Class:	Minor Remodel	District:	None	App Date:	08/06/2014
Status:	Issued	Square Feet:	: 0.00	Exp Date:	02/02/2015
Description:	Remodel an existing SFR: Convert 151 sq ft storage area to expand garage with new retaining wall at the rear east elevation; Remodel 980 sq ft. Lower Level - Reconfigure bathroom #3 and #4, add closet and shower to new bathroom. Main Level - Reconfigure existing kitchen, den and bathroom #2 into new kitchen, laundry and powder bathroom; Reconfigure existing master bathroom; closet, bedroom and bathroom #1 into a new master bath and closet. Includes grading of 38 cu vis	Valuation:	\$ 173,039.10	Final Date:	NOT FINALED

cut in garage area only per approved plans.

Parcel: 644-076-01 Main Address: 1007 C		7 Gaviota Dr Main una Beach, CA 92651	Zone: R2 (Residential Me	ne: R2 (Residential Medium Density)					
Owner 1007 Gaviota Drive Laguna Beach, CA 92651 Home:		Contractor		Applicant John Mcinnes					
		21761 Herm Trabuco Car Home:	osa Ln Iyon, CA 92679	933 Coast S Highway Laguna Beach, CA 92651 Home:					
Business: 949-	-500-0166	Business: 9	49-589-5999	Business: 949-494-0476					
Mobile: Mobile: 949-584-1000		Mobile: 949-338-2848							
Activity Type		Activity Numb	er Name	User	Crea	ted On			
E-mail		PMACT-001949-07-DEY - Ready		Melinda Dao	Cev 7/31/	7/31/2014 0:46:43044			
Requirements F	Prior to Permit	ISSEMART-00104	8.07.14V		(131)	113172014 9.46.43AM			
	the to t officia	100001100104	0-07-141	Melinda Dad	cey 7/31/	2014 9:00:41AM			
Type of Hold		Created By		Date Created	Comments	Active			
Code Ent Alert		Maria I	Ring	12/18/2014 8:27:54AM	Construction Deviation	Yes			
Invoice No.	Fee				Fee Amount	Amount Paid			
00011270	Electrical Appliance Fee				\$35.00	\$35.00			
	Document Retention Fee				\$95.17	\$95.17			
	Electrical Fixtures Fee				\$35.00	\$35.00			
	SMIP Fee -	Residential (Cate	gory 1)		\$22.50	\$22.50			
	Plumbing Permit Base Fee				\$32.00	\$32.00			
	Electrical Outlets Fee				\$23.00	523.00			
	Building Permit Fee				\$2,180.47	\$2 180 47			
	Water Heater and/or Vent				\$5.00	\$5.00			
	Fixture, trap, or set of fixtures on 1 trap				\$70.00	\$70.00			
	Electrical Permit Base Fee				\$32.00	\$32.00			
	Building Sewer				\$32.00	\$32.00			
	Mechanical Permit Base Fee				\$32.00	\$32.00			
	Building Permit Plan Check Fee				\$1,417,31	\$1 417 31			
	SB1473-CBSC				\$7.00	\$7.00			
	Furnace or Burner up to 100,000 BTU				\$32.00	\$32.00			
	Water Piping and/or Water Treating Equipment				\$70.00	\$70.00			
	Exnaust Hood				\$16.00	\$16.00			
	Additional Appliance Vents				\$88.00	\$88.00			
	Vent Fan Connected to Single Duct				\$77.00	\$77.00			
	New Subpanel				\$21.00	\$21.00			
	Gas Piping, 1-5 Outlets				\$25.00	\$25.00			
				Total for Invoice 0001127	70 \$4,347.45	\$4,347.45			
				Crond Tatal Sa D					

December 22, 2014

Page 1 of 1

California Coastal Commission A-5-LGB-22-0025 Exhibit 6 Page 2 of 7

**CITY OF LAGUNA BEACH BUILDING DIVISION CORRECTION NOTICE** INC то <u>С</u> PERMIT N ADDRESS DATE -1270 014 4 O2 FRATION PLEASE MAKE CORRECTIONS AND CALL FOR REINSPECTION REINSPECTION FEE REQUIRED

INSPECTOR

INSPECTORS OFFICE HOURS 8 00 9 00 A M DAILY AND 4 30 5 00 PM MON FRI

2121

Cit	y of Laguna I	Beach - Stop V	Vork
Address ] Date: 12- Permit # _	007 GA	107A :3:32	_a.m.p.m.
CONST THE B BGQ'D Inspector	Reason for t EMCADN REMOVED P FOR A WB.	he work order Wans, Pu NEW S.F Complaint	etono ans R

California Coastal Commission A-5-LGB-22-0025 Exhibit 6 Page 3 of 7

![](_page_35_Picture_0.jpeg)

12/18/14

California Coastal Commission A-5-LGB-22-0025 Exhibit 6 Page 4 of 7

1007 Gaviota

![](_page_36_Picture_0.jpeg)

1007 Gaviota

12/18/14 California Coastal Commission A-5-LGB-22-0025 Exhibit 6 Page 5 of 7

![](_page_37_Picture_0.jpeg)

1007 Gaviota

12/18/14

California Coastal Commission A-5-LGB-22-0025 Exhibit 6 Page 6 of 7

![](_page_38_Picture_0.jpeg)

1007 Gaviota

12/18/14

California Coastal Commission A-5-LGB-22-0025 Exhibit 6 Page 7 of 7