CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION
NORTH COAST DISTRICT OFFICE
1385 8TH STREET SUITE 130
ARCATA, CA 95521
(707) 826-8950

W11i

Prepared January 16, 2026 for the February 7, 2026 Hearing

TO: Coastal Commissioners and Interested Persons

FROM: Shana Gray, Deputy Director
Melissa B. Kraemer, District Manager
Robert Yuwiler, Coastal Program Analyst

SUBJECT: City of Fort Bragg LCP Amendment No. LCP-1-FTB-25-0064-1 Part G (Outdoor Dining Update)

SUMMARY OF STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Commission staff recommends that the Commission **approve** proposed City of Fort Bragg Implementation Plan Amendment No. LCP-1-FTB-25-0064-1 Part G as submitted, because as submitted, the proposed amendment conforms with and is adequate to carry out the policies of the City's certified Land Use Plan.

The City of Fort Bragg (City) is proposing to amend the City's certified Implementation Plan (IP, Coastal Land Use & Development Code) to establish permit requirements, development standards, and design criteria for outdoor dining facilities. The amendment is an outgrowth of temporary outdoor dining allowances implemented during the Covid-19 pandemic. As the City found that outdoor dining contributed positively to the vitality of coastal commercial areas, the City decided to formally update its certified IP to establish permanent standards that allow outdoor dining.

The amendment amends the Land Use and Permit tables (Tables 2-1 and 2-6) of Chapters 17.21.030 (Residential Zoning Districts) and 17.22.030 (Commercial Zoning District) to add "Outdoor Dining Facilities" as use accessory allowed where there are existing restaurants in operation. Outdoor Dining is allowed in the following zone districts, all of which already allow for restaurants under the certified LCP: CN (Neighborhood Commercial), CG (General Commercial), CO (Office Commercial), CH (Highway and Visitor Commercial), CBD (Central Business District), RL (Low Density Residential), RM (Medium Density Residential), RH (High Density Residential); RVH (Very High Density Residential). The proposed amendment also adds a definition of "Outdoor Dining Facility" to Chapter 17.1 (Glossary) as follows "*Outdoor dining may*

consist of a defined area with tables and chairs for dining with or without a temporary pavilion, tent, and/or umbrellas, and adjacent to and on the same parcel and serviced by a restaurant with an indoor dining component. If the outdoor dining structure requires a building permit, it is not considered outdoor dining. Outdoor bars are not outdoor dining facilities."

The proposed amendment adds standards for outdoor dining to the existing certified IP chapter on Restaurants (Chapter 17.42.190) address design, size, setbacks from ESHA, stormwater management, public right-of-way encroachment, design review, and other standards. Allowing outdoor dining uses in existing areas where restaurants are allowed will encourage increased pedestrian activity and serve visitors to the coast, particularly in the Central Business District where many existing restaurants are located. Provisions within the amendment address design standards for the color of tents and pavilions to be compatible with the restaurant building, require lighting to be downcast and dark-sky compliant, and require protection of public views. The amendment further requires new outdoor dining facilities to be located on previously developed area such as parking lots, sidewalks, or other hardscape and landscaped areas and to be set back from ESHA a minimum of 50 feet, which conforms with LUP buffer requirements. As the affected lands under this amendment do not include the Mill Site or the lands around Noyo Harbor (both of which area areas between the sea and the first public road parallelling the sea), the new outdoor dining uses will be separated from most of the areas that are directly fronting the coast and where coastal access points are located. Thus, even though no parking is required for an outdoor dining use beyond parking already required for restaurants with indoor dining, the City has adequate parking in the Coastal Zone for public access and dedicated coastal trail and coastal park parking lots at the available access points.

Therefore, staff recommends that the Commission find that the City's proposed amendments to the Implementation Plan, as submitted, conform with and are adequate to carry out the provisions of the certified Land Use Plan and approve LCP-1-FTB-25-0064-1 Part G **as submitted.**

The motion to accomplish this recommendation is found on **Page 4** of this staff report.

DEADLINE FOR COMMISSION ACTION

The City transmitted LCP-1-FTB-25-0064-1 Part to the Commission on November 18, 2025. The amendment proposal was deemed complete on November 18, 2025. The deadline for Commission action on the proposed IP amendment application is February 18, 2026.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

For further information, please contact Robert Yuwiler at the Commission's North Coast District Office in Arcata at Robert.Yuwiler@coastal.ca.gov. If you wish to provide written comments, please do so via regular mail (directed to the North Coast District Office) or email (by emailing NorthCoast@coastal.ca.gov). Commission staff will distribute to the Commissioners any copies of written materials received from interested parties by 5:00 pm on the Friday before the scheduled Commission meeting.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. MOTION AND RESOLUTION 4
II. PROCEDURAL ISSUES 4
A. Standard of Review 4
B. Public Participation 4
C. Procedural Requirements 5
III. FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL OF THE IP AMENDMENT AS SUBMITTED .. 5
A. Amendment Description & Background 5
B. Consistency Analysis 7
IV. CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT 13

APPENDICES

Appendix A-Substantive file documents
Appendix B- Excerpts from the City's Certified LUP

EXHIBITS

Exhibit 1 – Zoning Map
Exhibit 2 – Adopted Ordinance with Proposed LCP Amendment Text

I. Motion and Resolution

Staff recommends that the Commission, after public hearing, approve the Implementation Plan amendment as submitted.

Staff recommends a **NO** vote on the foregoing motion. Failure of this motion will result in certification of the Implementation Plan Amendment No. LCP-1-FTB-25-0064-1-Part G as submitted and the adoption of the following resolution and findings. The motion passes only by an affirmative vote of a majority of the Commissioners present.

Motion:

I move that the Commission reject Implementation Plan Amendment No. LCP-1-FTB-25-0064-1 Part G as submitted by the City of Fort Bragg.

Resolution to certify the implementation plan amendment as submitted:

The Commission hereby certifies the City of Fort Bragg Implementation Plan Amendment LCP-1-FTB-25-0064-1 Part G as submitted and adopts the findings set forth below on grounds that the Implementation Plan amendment conforms with, and is adequate to carry out, the provisions of the certified Land Use Plan. Certification of the Implementation Plan amendment will meet the requirements of 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 Implementation Plan amendment on the environment, or 2) there are no further feasible alternatives and mitigation measures that would substantially lessen any significant adverse impacts on the environment.

II. Procedural Issues

A. Standard of Review

The standard of review for the proposed amendment to the Implementation Plan (Coastal Land Use & Development Code) of the City of Fort Bragg certified Local Coastal Program (LCP), pursuant to section 30513 and 30514 (regarding LCP amendments) of the Coastal Act, is whether the Implementation Plan as amended would be in conformance with, and adequate to carry out, the provisions of the certified Land Use Plan.

B. Public Participation

Section 30503 of the Coastal Act requires public input in preparation, approval, certification, and amendment of any LCP. Fort Bragg's Planning Commission held public hearings on the proposed amendment on May 17, 2023, January 10 and 31,

2024. The City Council held a public hearing on the proposed amendment on February 24, 2025, and adopted the ordinance on the amendment on March 24, 2025. All hearings were noticed to the public consistent with Sections 13551 and 13552 of Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations. Notice of the subject amendment has been distributed to all known interested parties.

C. Procedural Requirements

Pursuant to section 13544(b)(2) of Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations, if the Commission certifies the LCP amendment as submitted, no further City action will be necessary for the LCP amendment to take effect. Should the Commission certify the LCP amendment subject to modifications, final approval by the City and a determination by the Executive Director of compliance with section 13544 of the Commission's regulations will be required for the amendment to take effect. Should the Commission deny the LCP amendment as submitted without suggested modifications, no further action is required by either the Commission or the City, and the proposed LCP amendment will not become effective.

III. Findings for approval of the IP amendment as submitted

The following findings support the Commission's approval of the proposed Implementation Plan Amendment as submitted. The Commission hereby finds and declares as follows:

A. Amendment Description & Background

The City is proposing LCP Amendment (LCPA) Application No. LCP-1-FTB-25-0064-1-Part G, which would amend the IP portion of the City of Fort Bragg's certified LCP (Coastal Land Use & Development Code) to establish permit requirements, development standards, and design criteria for outdoor dining facilities. The amendment is an outgrowth of temporary outdoor dining allowances implemented during the Covid-19 pandemic. During the Covid-19 pandemic, many businesses adapted to the changing conditions, including in Fort Bragg. In May of 2020, the City adopted an amendment to the Municipal Code that gave the Director of Emergency Services (the City Manager), the power: "To waive zoning requirements and/or standards to facilitate business operations of established businesses affected by public health orders of the federal, state, or county government, to the extent that such waivers would not result in an increase in general intensity of use beyond what is otherwise allowed, as applicable to zoning district." With that newly expressed authority, the City Manager waived parking requirements and capacity fee charges and allowed for restaurants to move tables outdoors and set up open-air dining. Since the related public health orders have been lifted at the federal, state, and county level, the City Manager no longer has the authority to allow these outdoor dining facilities. As the City found that outdoor dining contributed positively to the vitality of coastal commercial areas, the City decided to formally update its certified IP to establish permanent standards that allow outdoor dining. The proposed regulations for outdoor dining encompass standards related to

location, size limits, design standards, and operational standards. The various IP changes are summarized below. The City's adopted ordinance with all proposed text changes is included as **Exhibit 2**.

1. Amendments to Chapter 17.42.190 "Restaurants" and Land Use Tables

First, the amendment amends the Land Use and Permit tables (Tables 2-1 and 2-6) of Chapters 17.21.030 (Residential Zoning Districts) and 17.22.030 (Commercial Zoning District) to add "Outdoor Dining Facilities" as use accessory allowed where there are existing restaurants in operation or where restaurants are allowed. Outdoor Dining is allowed in the following zoning districts, all of which already allow for restaurants under the certified LCP: CN (Neighborhood Commercial), CG (General Commercial), CO (Office Commercial), CH (Highway and Visitor Commercial), CBD (Central Business District), RL (Low Density Residential), RM (Medium Density Residential), RH (High Density Residential); RVH (Very High Density Residential).

Currently restaurants are allowed as either permitted or conditional uses in the above-listed zoning districts. These allowances would remain, and outdoor dining would be allowed either as a permitted use, or with a minor use permit ("MUP"), as specified in table 2-1 – *Allowed Land Uses and Permit Requirements for Residencial Zoning Districts* (chapter 17.21.030) and 2-6 *Allowed Land Uses and Permit Requirements for Commercial Zoning Districts* (chapter 17.22.030). Outdoor dining facilities are principally permitted in in the listed commercial districts and will require a minor use permit in the allowed residential zoning districts.

Second, Chapter 17.42.190, which specifies regulations for Restaurants, is amended to add new standards for Outdoor Dining. Standards address design, size, setbacks from ESHA, stormwater management, public right-of-way encroachment, design review, and other standards. Standards include, but are not limited to:

- Outdoor dining must be associated with a restaurant that has indoor seating; entirely outdoor dining restaurants are not permitted;
- A CDP is required to establish an outdoor dining use;
- No additional parking is required (the amendment also includes a change to chapter 17.36.040 to align with this requirement);
- Proposed outdoor dining that exceeds 1300 square feet requires a minor use permit;
- Outdoor dining must be set back at least 50 feet from ESHA;
- Outdoor dining facilities shall not add to stormwater runoff volume or peak runoff rates
- Outdoor dining facilities shall not impact scenic views;
- Outdoor dining is subject to administrative design review that considers lighting, ADA accessibility, fencing, and pavilion and tent colors.

2. New Definition added to Chapter 17.1

In addition to adding the new Outdoor Dining Facility use to 17.21.030 and 17.22.030, the proposed amendment adds a definition of "Outdoor Dining Facility" to Chapter 17.1. The text of the proposed definition reads as follows "*Outdoor dining may consist of a defined area with tables and chairs for dining with or without a temporary pavilion, tent, and/or umbrellas, and adjacent to and on the same parcel and serviced by a restaurant with an indoor dining component. If the outdoor dining structure requires a building permit, it is not considered outdoor dining. Outdoor bars are not outdoor dining facilities*."

B. Consistency Analysis

To approve the amendments to the implementation plan (IP), the Commission must find the IP, as amended, conforms with, and is adequate to carry out, the provisions of the land use plan (LUP) pursuant to Section 30513 of the Coastal Act. As explained in the Findings below, the proposed IP amendment is in full conformity with, and would adequately carry out, the policies of the LUP.

1. Compatibility with Land Use Designations & Protection of Priority Uses

Applicable LUP policies:

> **Policy CD-3.2** Pedestrian Activity: Encourage increased pedestrian movement and activity in the Central Business District.
>
> **Policy CD-3.3** Economic Vitality: Continue to support the economic diversity and vitality of downtown businesses.

The City of Fort Bragg's Land Use Element establishes policies and programs to maintain the existing pattern of land uses within the City while anticipating and providing for further growth and development. The standards for Outdoor Dining that the City proposes to add to the certified IP will allow for this use in commercial and residential zoning districts where the existing certified IP already allows for the establishment of restaurants. New stand-alone outdoor dining facilities will not be allowed, and outdoor dining only will be allowed in tandem with a restaurant that offers indoor dining or where there's an existing indoor-dining restaurant proposing to add an outdoor dining component.

Commercial land uses in the City are located primarily along the Highway One (Main Street) and Franklin Street corridors. The Central Business District (the portion of the district within the coastal zone) comprises a four-block area along Main Street that includes that portion of the historic downtown between Pine Street to the north and Oak Street to the south and one block west to the eastern boundary of the former Georgia-Pacific Mill Site (the inland boundary of the coastal zone boundary in this area is the inland edge of Main Street, but the CBD zoning district extends inland of the coastal zone boundary another two blocks). There are several existing businesses, including many restaurants, within this CBD area. Additional commercial lands in the City's coastal zone extend along Main Street north and south of the CBD. Industrial lands in

the City's coastal zone are located west and southwest of the CBD area on the 300+ acre former Georgia-Pacific mill site property west of Highway One. Residential neighborhoods are located east of the commercial core, north and south of the mill site, and in southeastern portion of the City's coastal zone north of Noyo Harbor. The lands directly around Noyo Harbor (where several existing restaurants are located) are not within the City limits so also are unaffected by this LCP amendment.

As previously described, restaurant facilities are allowed under the existing certified IP as permitted uses in most commercial districts (Central Business district (CBD), Neighborhood Commercial (CN), General Commercial (CG), Office Commercial (CO), and Highway Visitor Commercial (CH)) outright, and they're also allowed in residential zoning districts (excluding rural residential) with a use permit. Restaurants are not currently allowed on the mill site, which is planned and zoned for Timber Resources Industrial, Open Space, Public Recreation, and Public Facility uses. The purposes of the land use designations (as described in the existing certified LUP) that each zoning district implements are described in Appendix C. As the proposed amendment as submitted does not propose to add outdoor dining to any areas where existing restaurants aren't already allowed, the amendments to land use and permit table 2-1 and 2-6 conform with the land use allowances under the certified LUP .

Restaurants provide a visitor serving function, as well as serving local communities and providing economic opportunities for existing businesses. Consistent with the above-cited LUP policies, allowing outdoor dining uses in existing areas where restaurants are allowed will encourage increased pedestrian activity, particularly in the Central Business District where many existing restaurants are located, and will support the economic diversity and vitality of downtown businesses.

2. Visual Resources

The City's certified LUP includes a number of policies related to protecting community and character as well as preserving the cultural and economic life the downtown's Central Business District. Various other policies protect visual resources generally, as cited below:

CD-1.1 Permitted development shall be designed and sited to protect views to and along the ocean and scenic coastal areas, to minimize the alteration of natural landforms, to be visually compatible with the character of surrounding areas, and, where feasible, to restore and enhance scenic views to visually degraded areas.

CD-1.4 New development shall be sited and designed to minimize adverse impacts on scenic areas visible from scenic roads or public viewing areas to the maximum feasible extent.

CD-1.9 Exterior lighting shall be minimized, restricted to low intensity fixtures, and shielded so that no light shines beyond the boundary of the property.

CD-2.5 Ensure that development does not adversely impact scenic views and resources as seen from a road and other public right-of-way.

CD-2.1 Design Review: All development that has the potential to affect visual resources shall be subject to Design Review, unless otherwise exempt from Design Review pursuant to Coastal Land Use & Development Code Section 17.71.050. Design Review approval requirements shall not replace, supersede or otherwise modify the independent requirement for a coastal development permit approved pursuant to the applicable policies and standards of the certified LCP. Ensure that development is constructed in a manner consistent with the Citywide Design Guidelines.

The proposed amendment as submitted reiterates the policy directives of the LUP regarding CD-2.5, CD-1.4, and CD-2.1. The proposed amendment as submitted includes development standards addressing height, materials, and lighting for outdoor dining facilities and includes language under the Location, Setback, and Height Limits section that prohibits locating an outdoor dining facility in a location that would impact scenic views or resources as seen from the public right of way. Provisions within the amendment address design standards for the color of tents and pavilions to be compatible with the restaurant building, protecting the character of the neighborhood. The proposed regulations also encourage a smaller size of pavilions (1,300 square feet) by requiring a minor use permit for outdoor dining facilities larger in size. Additionally, the amendment requires lighting to be dark-sky compliant and allows for only downcast lighting. These standards will help preserve the scenic quality of the coast from public vantage points consistent with LUP policy requirements.

3. ESHA and Water Quality

Existing certified LCP policies that address environmentally sensitive habitat areas (ESHA) and water quality include, but are not limited to, the following:

Policy OS-1.1: Definition of ESHA. “Environmentally sensitive habitat area" means any area in which plant or animal life or their habitats are either rare or especially valuable because of their special nature or role in an ecosystem and which could be easily disturbed or degraded by human activities and developments.

Protection of environmentally sensitive habitat areas is one of the essential aspects of the Coastal Act. Fort Bragg has several environmentally sensitive habitat areas including, but not limited to, portions of coastal bluffs, biologically rich tide pools, nesting grounds, kelp beds, wetlands, riparian habitats, and rare, threatened, or endangered plants or plant communities.

Areas that may contain environmentally sensitive habitat areas include, but are not limited to, areas indicated by Map 0S-1: Open Space and Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas. The environmentally sensitive habitat areas shown on Map 0S-1 are based on the best information available at the time mapping was done. The boundaries of environmentally sensitive habitat areas identified in Map 0S-1 are not intended to be definitive, but to identify the general location of sensitive environmental resources. Detailed locations and boundaries of these resources shall be obtained by the preparation of biological reports described in Policy OS-1.7.

Policy OS-1.7 Development in areas adjacent to Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas shall be sited and designed to prevent impacts which would significantly degrade such areas, and shall be compatible with the continuance of such habitat areas.

Policy OS-1.8: Development adjacent to ESHA shall provide buffer areas to serve as transitional habitat and provide distance and physical barriers to human intrusion. The purpose of this buffer area is to provide for a sufficient area to protect environmentally sensitive habitats from significant degradation resulting from future development. Buffers shall be of a sufficient size to ensure the biological integrity and preservation of the ESHA they are designed to protect. The width of the buffer area shall be a minimum of 100 feet, unless an applicant can demonstrate, after consultation with the California Department of Fish and Game, other relevant resource agencies, and the City, that 100 feet is not necessary to protect the resources of that particular habitat area and the adjacent upland transitional habitat function of the buffer from possible significant disruption caused by the proposed development. The buffer area shall be measured from the outside edge of the environmentally sensitive habitat areas and in no event shall be less than 30 feet in width.

Policy OS-1.12: Drainage and Erosion Control Plan. Permissible development on all properties containing environmentally sensitive habitat, including but not limited to those areas identified as ESHA Habitat Areas on Map OS-1, shall prepare a drainage and erosion control plan for approval by the City. The plan shall include measures to minimize erosion during project construction, and to minimize erosive runoff from the site after the project is completed. Any changes in runoff volume, velocity, or duration that may affect sensitive plant and animal populations, habitats, or buffer areas for those populations or habitats, shall be reviewed by a qualified biologist to ensure that there will not be adverse hydrologic ~~or~~, erosion, or sedimentation impacts on sensitive species or habitats. Mitigation measures shall be identified and adopted to minimize potential adverse runoff impacts. All projects resulting in new runoff to any streams in the City or to the ocean shall be designed to minimize the

transport of pollutants from roads, parking lots, and other impermeable surfaces of the project.

Policy OS-5.1 Native Species: Preserve native plant and animal species and their habitat.

Policy OS-5.4: Condition development projects, requiring discretionary approval to prohibit the planting of any species of broom, pampas grass, gorse, or other species of invasive non-native plants deemed undesirable by the City.

Policy OS-9.1: Minimize Introduction of Pollutants. Development shall be designed and managed to minimize the introduction of pollutants into coastal waters (including the ocean, estuaries, wetlands, rivers, streams, and lakes) to the extent feasible.

Policy OS-9.2: Minimize Increases in Stormwater Runoff. Development shall be designed and managed to minimize post-project increases in stormwater runoff volume and peak runoff rate, to the extent feasible, to avoid adverse impacts to coastal waters.

The proposed amendment as submitted will require outdoor dining to be restricted to areas where indoor dining is either already established or proposed to be established, and in both cases, a Coastal Development Permit would be required for the new outdoor dining development. With the required CDP review, the facility will be reviewed for consistency with all applicable LCP policies, including those related to ESHA and water quality cited above (among others). Additionally, the amendment requires new outdoor dining facilities to be located on previously developed area such as parking lots, sidewalks, or other hardscape and landscaped areas and to be set back from ESHA a minimum of 50 feet, which exceeds the minimum setback requirement of 30 feet specified by LUP policy OS-1.8 (assuming review and approval from California Department of Fish and Wildlife is obtained for the setback reduction). With regard to water quality, existing certified IP standards for restaurants address grease traps and washing of floor mats and exhaust filters, requiring measures to be taken to ensure wash areas drain to the sanitary sewer and conformance with the City's Food Service Establishment Wastewater Discharge Permit. A new standard is added for outdoor dining facilities requiring that facilities not add to stormwater runoff volume or peak runoff rates. Therefore, this proposed amendment as submitted conforms with and is adequate to carry out the ESHA and water quality protection policies of the certified LUP.

4. Public Access

In addition to the Coastal Act policies protecting public access (which apply to the City's CDP review in areas between the first public road and the sea), the following LUP policy is relevant to the proposed IP amendment:

> **Policy CD-3.4** Parking: Improve the availability of public parking facilities in the Central Business District and other commercial areas

The amendment will require that Outdoor Dining Facilities be located on previously developed areas such as parking lots or public sidewalks, this may pose a conflict with available parking. However, as previously discussed, new outdoor facilities only will be allowed in tandem with existing or new restaurants with indoor dining, and a CDP will be required for outdoor dining development (as well as for a new restaurant with indoor and outdoor dining elements). Thus, project consistency with the public access policies of the Coastal Act and LCP as applicable will be considered in all cases, including consideration of whether the outdoor dining will impact public access such as by displacing parking in areas used by the public for public access to the coast.

In much of the City, Main Street is the first public road paralleling the sea, and many of the lands along Main Street are planned and zoned for commercial uses (Central Business District, General Commercial, and Neighborhood Commercial). Popular visitor-serving coastal access points in the City west of Main Street include Glass Beach Headlands near the north end of town and Noyo Point Headlands near the southern end of the City. As previously discussed, this LCP amendment does not apply to Mill Site lands at this time (currently zoned primarily Timber Resources Industrial and Open Space) or lands around Noyo Harbor (which are outside of the City limits). Thus, new outdoor dining uses will be separated from most of the areas that are directly fronting the coast and where coastal access points are located (such as the coastal trail, Noyo Headlands, Pomo Bluffs, Glass Beach, and Noyo Harbor).

The City has adequate parking in the Coastal Zone for public access and has secured this through designated coastal trail and coastal park parking lots at the available access points. Additionally, the City is in the process of altering parking requirements for many areas around the City, including the Central Business District, as well as establishing minimum and maximum parking requirements. The City used the experience from the Covid era outdoor dining to determine that provision of new parking would not be needed for new outdoor dining facilities.

Thus, even though the proposed IP amendment as submitted requires no additional parking for a new outdoor dining facility, most of the lands where restaurants are located or could be located have little overlap with public access areas. The City's Coastal Trail has dedicated parking areas and falls outside of the downtown's Central Business District, where the majority of restaurants are located, and the lands around Noyo Harbor are within the County's jurisdiction for coastal permitting.

5. Conclusion

In conclusion, the proposed IP amendment codifies standards for Outdoor Dining Facilities that have been in use in the City for the past five years. The amendment proposes to add an Outdoor Dining use type to zoning districts that currently allow for restaurants and cafes. The development of outdoor dining facilities will require a Coastal Development Permit, and facilities are limited in location, size, objective, and operational standards. These standards conform with and are adequate to carry out the

coastal resources protection policies of the certified LCP with respect to ESHA protection, water quality protection, protecting public rights of way, and protection of visual resources and community character.

IV. California Environmental Quality Act

As set forth in section 21080.9 of the California Public Resources Code, CEQA exempts local government from the requirement of preparing an environmental impact report (EIR) in connection with its activities and approvals necessary for the preparation and adoption of an LCP. Instead, the CEQA responsibilities are assigned to the Coastal Commission, and the Commission's LCP review and approval program has been found by the Resources Agency to be the functional equivalent of the environmental review required by CEQA, pursuant to CEQA Section 21080.5. Therefore, the Commission is relieved of the responsibility to prepare an EIR for each LCP.

Nevertheless, the Commission is required in approving an LCP amendment to find that approval of the proposed LCP as amended, does conform with CEQA provisions, including the requirement in CEQA Section 21080.5(d)(2)(A) that the amended LCP will not be approved or adopted as proposed if there are feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available that would substantially lessen any significant adverse impact which the activity may have on the environment [14 CCR §§13542(a), 13540(f), and 13555(b)].

The City’s LCP amendment consists of an IP amendment. The Commission incorporates its findings on Coastal Act and LUP conformity into this CEQA finding as if set forth in full herein. As discussed throughout the staff report and hereby incorporated by reference, the IP amendment conforms with and is adequate to carry out the policies of the certified LUP. The Commission finds that approval of the IP amendment will not result in significant adverse environmental impacts within the meaning of CEQA. Therefore, the Commission finds that there are no other feasible alternatives or mitigation measures which would substantially lessen any significant adverse impact, either individual or cumulatively, which the activity may have on the environment [14 CCR §§ 13542(a), 13540(f), and 13555(b)].