CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION
SOUTH COAST DISTRICT OFFICE
301 E. OCEAN BLVD., SUITE 300
LONG BEACH, CALIFORNIA 90802-4830
(562) 590-5071 FAX
WWW.COASTAL.CA.GOV

Th18

Prepared June 01, 2026 (for the June 11, 2026 Hearing) REVISED June 04, 2026

To: Commissioners and Interested Parties
From: Steve Hudson, South Coast District Deputy Director
Subject: **South Coast District Deputy Director's Report for Los Angeles County for June 2026**

The following coastal development permit (CDP) waivers, immaterial CDP amendments, CDP extensions, and emergency CDPs for the South Coast District Office are being reported to the Commission on June 11, 2026. Pursuant to the Commission's procedures, each item has been appropriately noticed as required, and each item is also available for review at the Commission's South Coast District Office in Long Beach. Staff is asking for the Commission's concurrence on the items in the South Coast District Deputy Director's report, and will report any objections received and any other relevant information on these items to the Commission when it considers the report on June 11th.

With respect to the June 11th hearing, interested persons may sign up to address the Commission on items contained in this report prior to the Commission's consideration of this report. The Commission can overturn staff's noticed determinations for some categories of items subject to certain criteria in each case (see individual notices for specific requirements).

Items being reported on June 11, 2026 (see attached)

CDP Waivers [Correction made to 5-26-0078]

- 5-25-0427-W, Gispan, Two new ADU as a detached, two-story structure (Santa Monica)
- 5-26-0016-W, Saghari, ADU conversion of attached 3-garage (City of Los Angeles, Venice)
- 5-26-0055-W, Sasco Hill Views, LLC, New attached ADU (City of Los Angeles, Pacific Palisades)
- 5-26-0069-W, MAL LOMA, LLC, Demo duplex, construct 4 condominiums on 2 lots (Hermosa Beach)
- 5-26-0078-W, 220 29th Street LP, Remodel/addition to existing SFR (Hermosa Beach)
- 5-26-0206-W, Ramras, ADU conversion of existing basement level (City of Los Angeles, Venice)
- 5-26-0224-W, Swedelson, ADU conversion of detached rec room, (City of Los Angeles, Venice)
- 5-26-0228-W, Walker, ADU conversion of detached structure (City of Los Angeles, Pacific Palisades)
- 5-26-0322-W, Ortega, ADU conversion of 2-car garage & minor addition (City of Los Angeles, Venice)
- 5-26-0325-W, Lis, Demo garage, construct new 2-story, detached ADU (City of Los Angeles, Venice)

CDP Immaterial Extensions

- 5-18-0885-E4, BK-Arno LLC, Demo SFR and construct new SFR (City of Los Angeles, Pacific Palisades)

Response to Objections to E.D. Determination on CDP Extensions

- 5-21-0139-E3 and 5-21-0785-E3, Ocean Avenue, LLC (Santa Monica)

Emergency Permits

- G-5-26-0016, Levine Residence (Rancho Palos Verdes)

CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION
SOUTH COAST DISTRICT OFFICE
301 E. OCEAN BLVD., SUITE 300
LONG BEACH, CALIFORNIA 90802-4830
PH (562) 590-5071
WWW.COASTAL.CA.GOV

May 26, 2026

Coastal Development Permit De Minimis Waiver
Coastal Act Section 30624.7

Based on the project plans and information provided in your permit application for the development described below, the Executive Director of the Coastal Commission hereby waives the requirement for a Coastal Development Permit pursuant to Section 13238.1, Title 14, California Code of Regulations. If, at a later date, this information is found to be incorrect or the plans revised, this decision will become invalid; and, any development occurring must cease until a coastal development permit is obtained or any discrepancy is resolved in writing.

Waiver: 5-25-0427-W

Applicant: Moral Gispan

Location: 726 Pier Avenue, Santa Monica (Los Angeles County)
(APN: 4287-030-006)

Proposed Development: Construction of two 795 sq. ft. Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) as a detached, two-story structure with 737 sq. ft. roof deck, to the rear of an existing 1,623 three-unit multi-family residence.

Rationale: The project site is in an urbanized residential neighborhood, within one half mile of a major transit stop, approximately a half mile from the inland extent of the beach, and is not located between the first public road and the sea. The lot is designated as O.P.—Low Density Multiple Residential in the City of Santa Monica's certified Land Use Plan (LUP). The proposed development is consistent with the land use and development standards of the certified Santa Monica LUP. The proposed development does not include any work to the existing three-unit principal structure, nor would it result in loss of the one existing on-site parking space. The subject site is located within a half mile of multiple bus stops on Lincoln Blvd. and Rose Ave., thus, impacts to public access are not anticipated. The proposed development will not adversely impact coastal resources, coastal views, public access, or public recreation opportunities, and is consistent with past Commission actions in the area and Chapter Three policies of the Coastal Act.

This waiver will not become effective until reported to the Commission at its **June 10-11, 2026** meeting and the site of the proposed development has been appropriately

Coastal Development Permit De Minimis Waiver
5-25-0427-W

noticed, pursuant to 13054(b) of the California Code of Regulations. The Notice of Pending Permit shall remain posted at the site until the waiver has been validated and no less than seven days prior to the Commission hearing. If four (4) Commissioners object to this waiver of permit requirements, a coastal development permit will be required.

Sincerely,

Kate Huckelbridge, PhD
Executive Director

Seth Villanueva
Coastal Program Analyst

cc: Commissioners/File

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

May 27, 2026

Coastal Development Permit De Minimis Waiver
Coastal Act Section 30624.7

Based on the project plans and information provided in your permit application for the development described below, the Executive Director of the Coastal Commission hereby waives the requirement for a Coastal Development Permit pursuant to Section 13238.1, Title 14, California Code of Regulations. If, at a later date, this information is found to be incorrect or the plans revised, this decision will become invalid; and, any development occurring must cease until a coastal development permit is obtained or any discrepancy is resolved in writing.

Waiver: 5-26-0016-W **Applicant**: Amirsaeed & Solmaz Saghari

Location: 728 E Vernon Ave, Venice, City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles County (APN: 4239-004-007)

Proposed Development: Convert an existing attached 552 sq. ft., 3-car garage into an Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) within an existing 2,004 sq. ft., 4-unit multi-family residence on a 4,802 sq. ft. inland lot.

Rationale: The project site is in an urbanized residential neighborhood located 0.8 mile inland of the ocean, and is not located between the first public road and the sea. The lot is designated as Multiple Family Residential-Low Medium II in the City of Los Angeles' Venice segment certified Land Use Plan (LUP). The proposed ADU development is consistent with the land use and development standards of the certified Venice LUP. The proposed development would not result in any changes to the height of the existing structure or to the existing residential units. One on-site parking space will remain in front of the ADU. Due to changes in state law, replacement parking is not required for the principal residences and the proposed ADU due to the site's proximity within one half mile of a major transit stop. The proposed development will not result in adverse impacts to coastal resources, coastal views, coastal access, or public recreation opportunities, and is consistent with past Commission actions in the area and Chapter Three policies of the Coastal Act.

This waiver will not become effective until reported to the Commission at its **June 10-11, 2026** meeting and the site of the proposed development has been appropriately noticed, pursuant to 13054(b) of the California Code of Regulations. The Notice of Pending Permit shall remain posted at the site until the waiver has been validated and no less than seven days prior to the Commission hearing. If four (4) Commissioners object to this waiver of permit requirements, a coastal development permit will be required.

Dr. Kate Huckelbridge
Executive Director

Vince Lee
Coastal Program Analyst

cc: Commissioners/File

CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION
SOUTH COAST DISTRICT OFFICE
301 E. OCEAN BLVD., SUITE 300
LONG BEACH, CALIFORNIA 90802-4830
PH (562) 590-5071
WWW.COASTAL.CA.GOV

May 26, 2026

Coastal Development Permit De Minimis Waiver
Coastal Act Section 30624.7

Based on the project plans and information provided in your permit application for the development described below, the Executive Director of the Coastal Commission hereby waives the requirement for a Coastal Development Permit pursuant to Section 13238.1, Title 14, California Code of Regulations. If, at a later date, this information is found to be incorrect or the plans revised, this decision will become invalid; and, any development occurring must cease until a coastal development permit is obtained or any discrepancy is resolved in writing.

Waiver: 5-26-0055-W

Applicant: Sasco Hill Views, LLC, s/o: Timothy Stuart

Location: 95 Ocean Way, Pacific Palisades, Los Angeles (Los Angeles County) (APN: 4410-006-041)

Proposed Development: Conversion of a portion of an existing lower-level, covered terrace of an existing 2,313 sq. ft., two-story single-family residence into a 486 sq. ft. Accessory Dwelly Unit (ADU).

Rationale: The project site is in an urbanized residential neighborhood, within 200 feet of the inland extent of Will Rogers State Beach and is not located between the first public road and the sea. The lot is designated as R1 One-Family Zone in the City of Los Angeles' uncertified zoning code. The proposed conversion of a portion of the lower-level open terrace to a 486 sq. ft. ADU would not involve any modification to the internal habitable area of the two-story single-family residence, nor would it result in any loss of the two existing on-site parking spaces. The proposed development will not adversely impact coastal resources, coastal views, public access, or public recreation opportunities, and is consistent with past Commission actions in the area and Chapter Three policies of the Coastal Act.

This waiver will not become effective until reported to the Commission at its **June 10-11, 2026** meeting and the site of the proposed development has been appropriately noticed, pursuant to 13054(b) of the California Code of Regulations. The Notice of Pending Permit shall remain posted at the site until the waiver has been validated and no less than seven days prior to the Commission hearing. If four (4) Commissioners

object to this waiver of permit requirements, a coastal development permit will be required.

Sincerely,

Kate Huckelbridge, PhD
Executive Director

Seth Villanueva
Coastal Program Analyst

cc: Commissioners/File

CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION
SOUTH COAST DISTRICT OFFICE
301 E. OCEAN BLVD., SUITE 300
LONG BEACH, CALIFORNIA 90802-4830
PH (562) 590-5071
WWW.COASTAL.CA.GOV

May 27, 2026

Coastal Development Permit De Minimis Waiver
Coastal Act Section 30624.7

Based on the project plans and information provided in your permit application for the development described below, the Executive Director of the Coastal Commission hereby waives the requirement for a Coastal Development Permit pursuant to Section 13238.1, Title 14, California Code of Regulations. If, at a later date, this information is found to be incorrect or the plans revised, this decision will become invalid; and, any development occurring must cease until a coastal development permit is obtained or any discrepancy is resolved in writing.

Waiver: 5-26-0069-W **Applicant**: MAL LOMA, LLC

Location: 714 and 722 Loma Drive, Hermosa Beach, Los Angeles County (APNs: 4187-030-011, 4187-030-012)

Proposed Development: Demolition of an existing duplex and construction of a 2,748 sq. ft. condominium and a 2,790 sq. ft. condominium at 714 Loma Drive providing 5 parking spaces onsite and demolition of an existing single-family residence and construction of a 2,748 sq. ft. condominium and a 2,790 sq. ft. condominium at 722 Loma Drive providing 5 parking spaces onsite including 809 cubic yards of cut and approval of tentative parcel map no. 84793 for condominium purposes.

Rationale: The project site is located on two adjacent developed 3,965 sq. ft. lots located approximately 1,500 ft. inland of the public beach, landward of the first public road parallel to the sea, and in an urbanized residential neighborhood. The lots are zoned R-2 residential by the City and the proposed project conforms to the permitted use for the R-2 zone. The proposed project would provide 5 parking spaces on each lot for a total of 10 parking spaces, which is consistent with the certified LUP's parking requirements. The proposed project will also create new publicly available street parking through construction of a new sidewalk and curb. The proposed water runoff control measures to infiltrate stormwater runoff onsite and proposed low-water use plantings are consistent with the marine/water quality protection policies of the Coastal Act. The proposed development will not adversely impact coastal resources, public access, or public recreation opportunities, and is consistent with past Commission actions in the area and Chapter Three policies of the Coastal Act. In addition, the project would not prejudice the ability of the City of Hermosa Beach to develop a Local Coastal Program that is consistent with the Coastal Act Chapter 3 policies.

Coastal Development Permit De Minimis Waiver

5-26-0069-W

This waiver will not become effective until reported to the Commission at its **June 10-11, 2026** meeting and the site of the proposed development has been appropriately noticed, pursuant to 13054(b) of the California Code of Regulations. The Notice of Pending Permit shall remain posted at the site until the waiver has been validated and no less than seven days prior to the Commission hearing. If four (4) Commissioners object to this waiver of permit requirements, a coastal development permit will be required.

Sincerely,

Kate Huckelbridge, PhD
Executive Director

Jeffrey Palm
Coastal Program Analyst

cc: Commissioners/File

CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION
SOUTH COAST AREA OFFICE
301 E. OCEAN BLVD., SUITE 300
LONG BEACH, CA 90802-4830
PH (562) 590-5071 FAX (562) 590-5084
WWW.COASTAL.CA.GOV

May 27, 2026

CORRECTED Coastal Development Permit
De Minimis Waiver Coastal Act Section 30624.7

Based on the project plans and information provided in your permit application for the development described below, the Executive Director of the Coastal Commission hereby waives the requirement for a Coastal Development Permit pursuant to Section 13238.1, Title 14, California Code of Regulations. If, at a later date, this information is found to be incorrect or the plans revised, this decision will become invalid; and, any development occurring must cease until a coastal development permit is obtained or any discrepancy is resolved in writing.

Waiver: 5-26-0078-W **Applicant**: ~~220 29th Street LP~~ Eric J. Jackson & Nadine J. Jackson

Location: 201 34th Street, Hermosa Beach, Los Angeles County (APN: 4181-015-015)

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT: Remodel and 688 sq. ft. addition to an existing 1,760 sq. ft., 23.51 ft. high single-family residence, resulting in a 2,448 sq. ft., 29.96 ft. high single-family residence. The project includes a 538 sq. ft. third floor, a 543 sq. ft. deck accessed from the third floor, a 25 sq. ft. stair addition, and conversion of 125 sq. ft. of garage space to livable area. Additional improvements include replacement of three nonconforming parking spaces with two conforming spaces, 450 sq. ft. of new landscaping, a sump pump and water filtration drainage system, and 53 cu. yds. of fill imported from outside the Coastal Zone. Off-site improvements include installation of new sidewalk, curb gutter, and street repaving.

RATIONALE: The project site is a developed 2,257 sq. ft. lot located seaward of Pacific Coast Highway, approximately 650 ft. from Longfellow Beach, in an urbanized residential neighborhood. The lot is designated R-2 in the City of Hermosa Beach's certified Land Use Plan and zoned R-2 Two Family Residential in the City's uncertified zoning code; the proposed project conforms to the permitted uses and development standards for the zoning code. While the project increases building height from 23.51 ft. to 29.96 ft., which is above the certified LUP standard of 25 ft. for single-family residences, this height is consistent with surrounding residential development and any effect on public views of the ocean is minimal. Proposed landscaping is limited to drought-tolerant, noninvasive species, and the new drainage system will treat and convey stormwater to public drains, avoiding any impacts to water quality or biological resources. The two proposed onsite parking sites conforms with LUP requirements, thus will not have any impact on public access. None of the proposed public improvements are anticipated to result in permanent impacts on public access and no private development is proposed in any public right-of-way. The project is consistent with prior Commission actions in the area and with the Chapter 3 policies of the Coastal Act.

Coastal Development Permit De Minimis Waiver

5-26-0078-W

This waiver will not become effective until reported to the Commission at its **June 10-11, 2026** meeting and the site has been appropriately noticed pursuant to Section 13054(b) of the California Code of Regulations. The Notice of Pending Permit shall remain posted at the site until the waiver has been validated and no less than seven days prior to the Commission hearing. If four (4) Commissioners object to this waiver of permit requirements, a coastal development permit will be required.

Dr. Kate Huckelbridge
Executive Director

Willie Rounaghi
Coastal Program Analyst

cc: Commissioners/File

CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION
SOUTH COAST DISTRICT OFFICE
301 E. OCEAN BLVD., SUITE 300
LONG BEACH, CALIFORNIA 90802-4830
PH (562) 590-5071
WWW.COASTAL.CA.GOV

May 26, 2026

Coastal Development Permit De Minimis Waiver
Coastal Act Section 30624.7

Based on the project plans and information provided in your permit application for the development described below, the Executive Director of the Coastal Commission hereby waives the requirement for a Coastal Development Permit pursuant to Section 13238.1, Title 14, California Code of Regulations. If, at a later date, this information is found to be incorrect or the plans revised, this decision will become invalid; and, any development occurring must cease until a coastal development permit is obtained or any discrepancy is resolved in writing.

Waiver: 5-26-0206-W

Applicant: Jay B. Ramras, Trustee of the Jay Ramras Revocable Trust, dated September 2, 2016

Location: 2510 Pacific Ave, Venice, Los Angeles (Los Angeles County) (APN: 4227-010-004)

Proposed Development: Conversion of an existing 592.66 sq. ft. daylighting basement-level attached storage room into an Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) and new window openings on the side yard walls of the proposed ADU on a 2,660 sq. ft. lot developed with a 3,476 sq. ft. three-story multi-family building with basement level storage, laundry, electrical and five parking spaces, and four residential units on the two upper levels. The proposed ADU would include dual function flood vents and a dual function pedestrian entry door that operates as a flood barrier.

Rationale: The project site is in an urbanized residential neighborhood, within 200 ft. from the inland extent of the Venice Canals and within 600 ft. from the inland extent of the beach, and is not located between the first public road and the sea. The lot is designated as Multiple Family Residential-Low Medium II in the City of Los Angeles' Venice segment certified Land Use Plan (LUP). The proposed development is consistent with the land use and development standards of the certified Venice LUP. The proposed development would not result in any changes to the height of the existing structure, the existing residential units, or to the existing five on-site parking spaces. No new parking is required for the proposed ADU conversion, due to the site's proximity within one half mile of a transit stop. All construction materials would be stored indoors, and any nearby storm drain inlets would be protected during construction activities. Dry

Coastal Development Permit De Minimis Waiver
5-26-0206-W

clean up methods would be used along with any necessary on-site spill prevention and control measures. The proposed development will not result in adverse impacts to coastal resources, coastal views, coastal access, or public recreation opportunities, and is consistent with past Commission actions in the area and Chapter Three policies of the Coastal Act.

This waiver will not become effective until reported to the Commission at its **June 10-11, 2026** meeting and the site of the proposed development has been appropriately noticed, pursuant to 13054(b) of the California Code of Regulations. The Notice of Pending Permit shall remain posted at the site until the waiver has been validated and no less than seven days prior to the Commission hearing. If four (4) Commissioners object to this waiver of permit requirements, a coastal development permit will be required.

Sincerely,

Kate Huckelbridge, PhD
Executive Director

Emily Greer
Coastal Program Analyst

cc: Commissioners/File

CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION
SOUTH COAST DISTRICT OFFICE
301 E. OCEAN BLVD., SUITE 300
LONG BEACH, CALIFORNIA 90802-4830
PH (562) 590-5071
WWW.COASTAL.CA.GOV

May 26, 2026

Coastal Development Permit De Minimis Waiver
Coastal Act Section 30624.7

Based on the project plans and information provided in your permit application for the development described below, the Executive Director of the Coastal Commission hereby waives the requirement for a Coastal Development Permit pursuant to Section 13238.1, Title 14, California Code of Regulations. If, at a later date, this information is found to be incorrect or the plans revised, this decision will become invalid; and, any development occurring must cease until a coastal development permit is obtained or any discrepancy is resolved in writing.

Waiver: 5-26-0224-W

Applicant: Joshua and Allison Swedelson

Location: 666 Marr St, Venice (Los Angeles County) (APN(s): 4229011006)

Proposed Development: Conversion of an existing 344 sq. ft. rec room on the second story of a detached garage into an ADU.

Rationale: The proposed project is located on a developed 2,613 sq. ft. residential lot located approximately 4,500 feet inland of the beach and approximately 1,370 feet inland of the Marina Del Rey harbor in an urbanized residential neighborhood within the Single Permit Jurisdiction of the City of Los Angeles. The lot is zoned R-1 and designated as Single Family Residential Low in the Venice LUP. The project consists of converting a recreation room located above an existing detached garage into an ADU. The conversion of a recreation room on the second story of a detached garage to an ADU will not result in any changes to the existing landscaping on site, will not result in any ground disturbance or changes to public views. Parking would not be required for the new ADU due to proximity to existing transit stops. Public access to the beach is located approximately 4,500 ft. west of the site at Venice Beach.

The proposed development will not adversely impact coastal resources, public access, or public recreation opportunities, and is consistent with past Commission actions in the area and Chapter Three policies of the Coastal Act.

This waiver will not become effective until reported to the Commission at its **June 10-11, 2026** meeting and the site of the proposed development has been appropriately noticed, pursuant to 13054(b) of the California Code of Regulations. The Notice of Pending

Coastal Development Permit De Minimis Waiver

5-26-0224

Permit shall remain posted at the site until the waiver has been validated and no less than seven days prior to the Commission hearing. If four (4) Commissioners object to this waiver of permit requirements, a coastal development permit will be required.

Sincerely,

Kate Huckelbridge, PhD
Executive Director

Original on File signed by:

Colby Gonzalez
Coastal Program Analyst

cc: Commissioners/File

CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION
SOUTH COAST DISTRICT OFFICE
301 E. OCEAN BLVD., SUITE 300
LONG BEACH, CALIFORNIA 90802-4830
PH (562) 590-5071
WWW.COASTAL.CA.GOV

May 27, 2026

Coastal Development Permit De Minimis Waiver
Coastal Act Section 30624.7

Based on the project plans and information provided in your permit application for the development described below, the Executive Director of the Coastal Commission hereby waives the requirement for a Coastal Development Permit pursuant to Section 13238.1, Title 14, California Code of Regulations. If, at a later date, this information is found to be incorrect or the plans revised, this decision will become invalid; and, any development occurring must cease until a coastal development permit is obtained or any discrepancy is resolved in writing.

Waiver: 5-26-0228-W **Applicant**: Greg Walker

Location: 329 N Sycamore Road, Los Angeles (Los Angeles County)
(APN: 4410-018-019)

Proposed Development: Conversion of an existing permitted habitable structure into a new detached Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU), including a 275 sq. ft. addition to the structure. No grading is proposed.

Rationale: The proposed project is located on a 6,179 sq. ft. residential lot with an existing 1,102 sq. ft. single-family residence, 756 sq. ft. detached habitable structure and 328 sq. ft. garage. The lot is zoned R1-1 and designated as Low Residential in the uncertified Brentwood-Pacific Palisades Community Plan. The project consists of converting the existing habitable structure, permitted in 1926, into an ADU, including a 275 sq. ft. addition which will require minor ground disturbance for the foundation. The proposed development will not result in any changes to the existing landscaping on site and will not result in changes to public views. Stormwater runoff from the addition will be directed to existing area drains. The proposed development will not adversely impact coastal resources, coastal views, coastal access, or public recreation opportunities, and is consistent with past Commission actions in the area and Chapter Three policies of the Coastal Act.

This waiver will not become effective until reported to the Commission at its **June 10-11, 2026** meeting and the site of the proposed development has been appropriately noticed, pursuant to 13054(b) of the California Code of Regulations. The Notice of Pending Permit shall remain posted at the site until the waiver has been validated and no less than seven days prior to the Commission hearing. If four (4) Commissioners

Coastal Development Permit De Minimis Waiver
5-26-0228-W

object to this waiver of permit requirements, a coastal development permit will be required.

Kate Huckelbridge, PhD
Executive Director

Willie Rounaghi
Coastal Program Analyst

cc: Commissioners/File

CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION
SOUTH COAST DISTRICT OFFICE
301 E. OCEAN BLVD., SUITE 300
LONG BEACH, CALIFORNIA 90802-4830
PH (562) 590-5071
WWW.COASTAL.CA.GOV

May 27, 2026

Coastal Development Permit De Minimis Waiver
Coastal Act Section 30624.7

Based on the project plans and information provided in your permit application for the development described below, the Executive Director of the Coastal Commission hereby waives the requirement for a Coastal Development Permit pursuant to Section 13238.1, Title 14, California Code of Regulations. If, at a later date, this information is found to be incorrect or the plans revised, this decision will become invalid; and, any development occurring must cease until a coastal development permit is obtained or any discrepancy is resolved in writing.

Waiver: 5-26-0322-W

Applicant: Eddie Ortega

Location: 226 Ruth Ave, Venice (Los Angeles County) (APN: 4240-002-013)

Proposed Development: Conversion of an existing 12-foot tall, 360 sq. ft. two-car garage into an Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU), along with a ground floor 150 sq. ft. addition and associated minor grading for raised foundation, for a total ADU area of 510 sq. ft.

Rationale: The subject site is a 4,232 sq. ft. lot located in an urban neighborhood roughly 0.6 miles inland of the sandy beach. The proposed development is consistent with the residential density and land uses allowed by the relevant 'Low Medium II-Multiple Family Residential' designation and RD2, "Restricted Density" zoning in the City's certified Land Use Plan and uncertified Municipal Code, respectively. The project received approval in concept from the City of Los Angeles on April 17, 2026. No height increases are proposed. The subject site is located 453-feet of a major transit stop, therefore, no additional parking for the ADU is required. The project is consistent with the character and scale of the surrounding neighborhood. The proposed development will not adversely impact coastal resources, public access, or public recreation opportunities, and is consistent with past Commission actions in the area and Chapter Three policies of the Coastal Act. In addition, the proposed development will not prejudice the City's ability to prepare a certified Local Coastal Program that is consistent with the Chapter 3 policies of the Coastal Act.

This waiver will not become effective until reported to the Commission at its **June 10-11, 2026**, meeting and the site of the proposed development has been appropriately

Coastal Development Permit De Minimis Waiver
5-26-0322

noticed, pursuant to 13054(b) of the California Code of Regulations. The Notice of Pending Permit shall remain posted at the site until the waiver has been validated and no less than seven days prior to the Commission hearing. If four (4) Commissioners object to this waiver of permit requirements, a coastal development permit will be required.

Sincerely,

Kate Huckelbridge, PhD
Executive Director

Original on File signed by:

Dulce Cortez
Dulce Cortez
Coastal Program Analyst

cc: Commissioners/File

CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION
SOUTH COAST DISTRICT OFFICE
301 E. OCEAN BLVD., SUITE 300
LONG BEACH, CALIFORNIA 90802-4830
PH (562) 590-5071
WWW.COASTAL.CA.GOV

May 26, 2026

Coastal Development Permit De Minimis Waiver
Coastal Act Section 30624.7

Based on the project plans and information provided in your permit application for the development described below, the Executive Director of the Coastal Commission hereby waives the requirement for a Coastal Development Permit pursuant to Section 13238.1, Title 14, California Code of Regulations. If, at a later date, this information is found to be incorrect or the plans revised, this decision will become invalid; and, any development occurring must cease until a coastal development permit is obtained or any discrepancy is resolved in writing.

Waiver: 5-26-0325-W

Applicant: Aurelian & Simone Lis

Location: 524 Sunset Avenue, Venice, Los Angeles (Los Angeles County) (APN: 4240-014-013)

Proposed Development: Demolition of an existing 400 sq. ft. detached garage to the rear of an existing 1402 sq. ft., one-story, single-family residence and construction of a detached 660 sq. ft., two-story Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU). The project does not propose grading or changes to landscaping.

Rationale: The project site is in an urbanized residential neighborhood, within one half mile of a major transit stop, approximately a half mile from the inland extent of the beach, and is not located between the first public road and the sea. The lot is designated as Multiple Family Residential-Low Medium II in the City of Los Angeles' Venice segment certified Land Use Plan (LUP). The proposed development is consistent with the land use and development standards of the certified Venice LUP. The proposed demolition of an existing two-car garage and construction of a 660 sq. ft. ADU in its place would not involve any modification to the existing single-family residence. Due to changes in state law, replacement parking is not required for the principal residence because the subject site is located within a half mile of multiple bus stops on Main St., Rose Ave., and Sunset Ave., thus, impacts to public access are not anticipated. The proposed development will not adversely impact coastal resources, coastal views, public access, or public recreation opportunities, and is consistent with past Commission actions in the area and Chapter Three policies of the Coastal Act.

Coastal Development Permit De Minimis Waiver

5-26-0325-W

This waiver will not become effective until reported to the Commission at its **June 10-11, 2026** meeting and the site of the proposed development has been appropriately noticed, pursuant to 13054(b) of the California Code of Regulations. The Notice of Pending Permit shall remain posted at the site until the waiver has been validated and no less than seven days prior to the Commission hearing. If four (4) Commissioners object to this waiver of permit requirements, a coastal development permit will be required.

Sincerely,

Kate Huckelbridge, PhD
Executive Director

Seth Villanueva
Coastal Program Analyst

cc: Commissioners/File

CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION
SOUTH COAST DISTRICT OFFICE
301 E. OCEAN BLVD., SUITE 300
LONG BEACH, CALIFORNIA 90802-4830
VOICE (562) 590-5071
WWW.COASTAL.CA.GOV

May 26, 2026

NOTICE OF EXTENSION REQUEST FOR COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT

Notice is hereby given that BK Arno Investments, LLC has applied for a fourth one year extension of Coastal Development Permit No. 5-18-0885 granted by the California Coastal Commission on November 13, 2019.

for: Demolition of a one-story, 1,585 sq. ft. single-family residence and construction of a 28-ft. high, two-story, 10,114 sq. ft., single-family home with a basement, attached garage, retaining walls, and swimming pool on a caisson grade beam foundation, on an 11,897 sq. ft. lot, including approximately 3,000 cu. yds. of grading.

at: 230 Arno Way, Pacific Palisades, City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles County (APN(s): 4415029002)

Pursuant to Section 13169 of the Commission Regulations, the Executive Director has determined that there are no changed circumstances affecting the proposed development's consistency with the Coastal Act. The Commission Regulations state that "if no objection is received at the Commission office within ten (10) working days of publishing notice, this determination of consistency shall be conclusive… and the Executive Director shall issue the extension." If an objection is received, the extension application shall be reported to the Commission for possible hearing.

Persons wishing to object or having questions concerning this extension application should contact the district office of the Commission at the above address or phone number.

Sincerely,

Kate Huckelbridge, PhD
Executive Director

Colby Gonzalez
Coastal Program Analyst

cc: Commissioners/File

CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION
South Coast District Office
301 E Ocean Blvd., Suite 300
Long Beach, CA 90802-4830
(562) 590-5071

Th18

RESPONSE TO OBJECTIONS RECEIVED TO EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S DETERMINATION

DATE: May 27, 2026

TO: Commissioners and Interested Parties

FROM: South Coast District Staff

SUBJECT: Objection to Executive Director's Determination Regarding Coastal Development Permit (CDP) Extension No. 5-21-0139-E3 and CDP Extension No. 5-21-0785-E3

On January 30, 2026, the applicant, Ocean Avenue, LLC, applied for a third one-year Time Extension to Coastal Development Permit (CDP) No. 5-21-0139. The permit was previously approved by the Coastal Commission on March 10, 2022, and authorized:

> **Redevelopment of existing, 262,284 sq.ft., 301-room luxury hotel with 103 onsite parking spaces into new, 502,157 sq.ft., mixed-use development with 312 hotel rooms, 60 condominium units, and 428 onsite parking spaces. Proposed 131,075 cy. of cut and 3,375 cy. of fill on 4.5 acre lot.**

at: 1133 Ocean Ave, Santa Monica (Los Angeles County) (APN: 429-202-8001)

On January 30, 2026, the applicant, Ocean Avenue, LLC and Community Corporation of Santa Monica, applied for a third one-year Time Extension to Coastal Development Permit (CDP) No. 5-21-0785. The permit was previously approved by the Coastal Commission on March 10, 2022, and authorized:

> **Demolition of existing 14,984 sq.ft., 64-space parking lot and construction of 5-story, 55-ft. tall, 40,583 sq.ft. multi-family residence with 42 low-income housing units and 39 parking spaces. Proposed 7,344 cy. of cut and no fill, on 14,984 total sq.ft. lots.**

at: 1127- 1129 Ocean Front Walk, Santa Monica (Los Angeles County) (APNs: 429-202-1009 & 429-202-1010)

On April 30, 2026, the Executive Director determined that there were no changed circumstances affecting the consistency of the approved developments with the Coastal Act. Notice of this determination was posted at the project site and emailed to all known interested parties. A copy of the notice was provided in the Deputy Director's Report for the May 2026 Hearing. Pursuant to the Commission's regulations, Division 5.5 of Title 14, Section 13169(c) of the California Code of Regulations (CCR):

> **If the executive director received a written objection to his or her determination but concludes that the objection does not identify changed circumstances that may affect the consistency of the development with the Coastal Act or a certified local coastal program, if applicable, the executive director shall report this conclusion to the commission at the same time that the executive director reports the determination to the commission in accordance with subsection (b) above. The executive director shall provide a copy of the letter(s) of objection to the commission with the report. If three commissioners object to the extension on grounds that there may be changed circumstances that affect consistency, the executive director shall schedule the extension for hearing(s) in accordance with subsection (d) below. If three commissioners do not object to the extension, the time for commencement of development shall be extended for one year from the expiration date of the permit.**

Within ten (10) working-days of the mailed notices, the South Coast District Office received six (6) objection letters to the above two extension requests. One letter, dated April 27, 2026, is from attorney Eric Johnson, on behalf of his anonymous client (Exhibit 1). The second letter, dated May 6, 2026, is from Burr Leonard (Exhibit 2). The third letter, dated May 4, 2026, is from Ann Maggio (Exhibit 3). The fifth is from Mark Sandelson is dated May 4, 2026 (Exhibit 4). The fifth, dated May 5, 2026, is from Laura Marucs (Exhibit 5), and the sixth, dated May 8, 2026, is from Philip Schwartz (Exhibit 6).

The anonymous letter submitted through counsel objects to the extension Coastal Development Permit No. 5-21-0139. The commenter, a longtime Santa Monica resident and regular patron of the Fairmont Miramar, states that current hotel management is imposing arbitrary and retaliatory exclusions that deny members of the public access to facilities and publicly accessible areas required to remain open under the permit and the Coastal Act. The commenter reports being barred from the entire property without any identified lawful basis, despite being permitted at other Fairmont properties, and describes being threatened with legal action, including criminal trespass, if they post anything about the Miramar online. The letter asserts that these actions violate public access requirements, raise serious concerns about suppression of public participation and speech, and may deter others from submitting comments.

Additionally, the commenter argues that a third time extension is inappropriate in light of materially changed coastal conditions, including regional fire recovery, ongoing rebuilding efforts, and the approaching 2028 Olympics, all of which heighten the need to maximize coastal access. Due to what the commenter describes as "a pattern of retaliation and legal intimidation" by the applicant, the objection is submitted anonymously through counsel. The letter requests that the Commission deny the permit extension.

The letter from Burr Leonard objects to granting a one-year extension of Coastal Development Permit No. 5-21-0139. The letter argues that the proposed redevelopment would replace the historic 103-year-old Miramar Hotel with a structure that is significantly larger, approximately 25% taller and nearly double the existing size. The commenter states that the project's proposed parking supply of 103 onsite spaces[1] for 312 hotel rooms and 60 condominium units would leave insufficient parking for visitors, contributing to long-standing congestion on Ocean Avenue. The letter further asserts that construction would generate toxic air emissions, excessive noise, and years of traffic delays, worsening already overcrowded conditions. The commenter describes the proposal as an oversized "megastructure" including multiple restaurants and retail shops that Santa Monica's streets and infrastructure cannot support. The letter concludes by requesting that the Commission deny any extension for the project.

The letter from Ann Maggio objects to the extension requests for Coastal Development Permit Nos. 5-21-0139 and 5-21-0785. The commenter questions the applicant's stated financial and timing constraints related to the recent fires and expresses concerns regarding overdevelopment, environmental conditions in Santa Monica, traffic, pollution, and the inclusion of residential condominium units within the approved project. The letter also asserts that the applicant has already had sufficient time to commence development and requests that the Commission deny the extensions.

The letter from Laura Marcus objects to the extension requests for Coastal Development Permit Nos. 5-21-0139 and 5-21-0785 based on concerns regarding the scale and intensity of the approved development, including potential traffic, noise, air quality, infrastructure, and greenhouse gas impacts. The commenter states that the project is incompatible with the surrounding residential character of the area and expresses concern that the development would adversely affect community character, coastal access, environmental quality, and quality of life in Santa Monica. The letter requests that the Commission reconsider allowing the project to proceed as approved.

The letter from Mark Sandelson objects to the third one-year extension of CDP No. 5-21-0139, asserting that the project is outdated and must undergo a new or substantially amended review. He argues that the approved 130-foot mixed-use development represents an excessive intensification of use that would significantly alter the low-scale visual character of Ocean Avenue. The letter cites construction and operational effects; including

[1] Staff notes that the Commission-approved project includes 428 onsite subterranean parking spaces, 49 valet spaces, and continued access to 60 offsite spaces.

noise, air pollution, traffic, and coastal access impacts, as well as cumulative precedential concerns. He requests that the Commission deny the extension or require a new application.

The letter from Philip Schwartz objects to the extension of CDP No. 5-21-0139, opposing the construction of another large hotel at 1133 Ocean Avenue. He notes that the project would double the square footage of the existing structure and argues it would worsen traffic and create additional public inconvenience in the surrounding area.

Staff Response
The anonymous objection letter submitted through counsel objects to the extension request for Coastal Development Permit No. 5-21-0139 based on concerns regarding alleged restrictions on public access at the existing Miramar Hotel property, as well as broader concerns regarding regional recovery efforts and future coastal access demands associated with the 2028 Olympics.

To note, the extension request before the Commission concerns whether changed circumstances have arisen that affect the approved redevelopment project's consistency with the Chapter 3 policies of the Coastal Act. The Commission previously evaluated the approved project's public access, visitor-serving uses, and coastal resource protections when it approved CDP No. 5-21-0139, and the permit includes special conditions to ensure continued public access and visitor-serving accommodations. The upcoming referenced temporary events and fire recovery are not changed circumstances that affect the approved development. Additionally, the broader regional conditions identified in the objection do not alter the Commission's prior findings regarding the approved project's consistency with Chapter 3 policies of the Coastal Act.

The concerns raised regarding current hotel management practices involve operational issues at the existing facility and do not constitute changed circumstances affecting the approved redevelopment project's consistency with the Coastal Act. This information will be forwarded to the Enforcement Division for additional consideration.

As such, the issues raised in the letter do not constitute changed circumstances affecting the approved project's consistency with the Coastal Act.

The letter from Burr Leonard objects to the extension request for Coastal Development Permit No. 5-21-0139 based on concerns regarding the scale of the approved redevelopment project, parking supply, traffic congestion, construction impacts, noise, and air quality.

The Commission previously evaluated the approved project's scale, height, circulation, parking program, construction impacts, and visual compatibility when it approved CDP No. 5-21-0139. The permit includes multiple special conditions addressing transportation demand management, construction best management practices, landscaping, and public access protections, and the project was found consistent with the Chapter 3 policies of the Coastal Act.

The letter from Ann Maggio objects to the extension requests for Coastal Development Permit Nos. 5-21-0139 and 5-21-0785 based on concerns regarding project timing, environmental conditions in Santa Monica, overdevelopment, traffic, pollution, and the inclusion of residential condominium units within the approved project.

The Commission previously evaluated the approved projects' scale, land uses, circulation impacts, environmental effects, and consistency with Coastal Act policies when it approved CDP Nos. 5-21-0139 and 5-21-0785. As conditioned, the projects were found consistent with the Chapter 3 policies of the Coastal Act and include multiple public benefits, including affordable housing, lower-cost accommodations mitigation, and visitor-serving uses.

The objection also raises concerns regarding the applicant's delay in commencing development. However, the Commission's regulations expressly authorize one-year permit extensions where no changed circumstances affecting Coastal Act consistency have been identified.

The letter from Laura Marcus objects to the extension requests for Coastal Development Permit Nos. 5-21-0139 and 5-21-0785 based on concerns regarding project scale, traffic, noise, air quality, infrastructure demands, greenhouse gas emissions, and compatibility with the surrounding residential neighborhood.

The Commission previously evaluated the approved projects' scale, circulation impacts, environmental effects, visual character, and consistency with Coastal Act policies when it approved CDP Nos. 5-21-0139 and 5-21-0785. The projects were found consistent with the Chapter 3 policies of the Coastal Act and include multiple special conditions addressing transportation demand management, construction best management practices, landscaping, and public access protections.

The letter from Mark Sandelson objects to the third one-year extension request for Coastal Development Permit No. 5-21-0139 based on concerns regarding project scale, visual character, traffic, construction impacts, cumulative development effects, and repeated permit extensions.

The Commission previously evaluated the approved project's height, scale, visual character, circulation impacts, and consistency with Coastal Act policies when it approved CDP No. 5-21-0139. The Commission found the project, as conditioned, consistent with the Chapter 3 policies of the Coastal Act, including policies governing visual resources, public access, and visitor-serving development.

The objection also raises concerns regarding repeated permit extensions. However, the Commission's regulations expressly authorize one-year permit extensions where no changed circumstances affecting Coastal Act consistency have been identified.

The letter from Philip Schwartz objects to the extension request for Coastal Development Permit No. 5-21-0139 based on concerns regarding the size of the approved redevelopment project and potential traffic impacts.

The Commission previously evaluated the approved project's scale, circulation impacts, and consistency with Coastal Act policies when it approved CDP No. 5-21-0139. The project was found consistent with the Chapter 3 policies of the Coastal Act.
As such, the concerns raised in all of the objection letters reflect issues considered during the Commission's original review of the project and do not constitute changed circumstances affecting the project's consistency with the Coastal Act.

Applicant Response to Objection Letters

By letter dated May 20, 2026, the applicant submitted a response to the objection letters received regarding the extension requests for CDP Nos. 5-21-0139-E3 and 5-21-0785-E3. The applicant asserts that none of the objection letters identify changed circumstances affecting the approved projects' consistency with the Chapter 3 policies of the Coastal Act. The applicant further states that the majority of the issues raised in the objections, including concerns regarding project scale, traffic, parking, visual resources, and environmental impacts, were evaluated by the Commission during its original review and approval of the projects.

The applicant also notes that the approved Miramar redevelopment project and associated affordable housing project remain linked components of the overall development program and identifies continued public benefits associated with the approved projects, including affordable housing, lower-cost accommodations mitigation, visitor-serving accommodations, and public open space improvements. Staff has reviewed the applicant's response letter and, for the reasons discussed above, continues to conclude that the objection letters do not identify changed circumstances affecting the approved projects' consistency with the Coastal Act.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the issues raised in the objection letters do not identify changed circumstances that would affect either development's consistency with the Chapter 3 policies of the Coastal Act. For the reasons stated above, the Executive Director has determined that there are no changed circumstances affecting either approved development's conformity with the Coastal Act. As required by Section 13169(c) of Division 5.5 of Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations, the Executive Director is reporting this conclusion to the Commission together with copies of the objection letters.

If three Commissioners object to the extensions on the grounds that there may be changed circumstances affecting either development's consistency with the Coastal Act, the Executive Director shall schedule the extension requests for public hearing pursuant to Section 13169(d) of Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations. If three Commissioners do not object, the time for commencement of development shall be extended for one additional year from the current expiration date of the permits.
If you have any questions about this determination, please contact Dulce Cortez at dulce.cortez@coastal.ca.gov.

Exhibit 1: Objection Letter from Anonymous Member of Public
Exhibit 2: Objection Letter from Burr Leonard
Exhibit 3: Objection Letter from Ann Maggio
Exhibit 4: Objection Letter from Laura Marcus
Exhibit 5: Objection Letter from Mark Sandelson
Exhibit 6: Objection Letter from Philip Schwartz
Exhibit 7: Applicants Response to the Objections Received

California Coastal Commission
301 E Ocean Blvd., Suite 300
Long Beach Ca 90802-4830

Re: CDP 5-21-0139-E3 OBJECTION TO PERMIT RENEWAL
Dear Coastal Commissioners:

I am a 20-year resident of Santa Monica and regular patron of the Fairmont Miramar. I am writing to formally object to the pending permit renewal 5-21-0139-E3 firstly on the basis that current management is engaged in arbitrary and retaliatory exclusion of the public from facilities that are expressly required to be open to the general public as well as public access areas and easements. It is my understanding that in arbitrarily denying anybody this access, the Miramar is in violation of this permit.

There may be other violations but I can only personally speak about my own exclusion from the entirety of the Miramar property. No legally cognizable reason for my exclusion from this coastal public accommodation, which also contains publicly accessible areas on the property including the Miramar Fig Tree, has ever been identified to me.
Underscoring the arbitrary nature of this exclusion to the entire property is the fact that I am explicitly allowed to visit any or every other Fairmont property. I was also ordered not to post online about the Fairmont in any capacity, positive or negative and threatened with causes of action including criminal trespass if I post anything about the Fairmont.

The point is not my personal predicament—it is the violation of the public access mandates of the Coastal Act and this permit, which bind all future owners and possessors and are not subject to this management's discretion. In addition, suppression of speech about the Miramar calls into question the fairness of any public forum such as the emails and letters this Commission might, or might not receive if others have been similarly intimidated and silenced.

For clarity, I would have objected to this renewal independently of the above. The Commission should also weigh whether a third extension is appropriate given materially changed coastal conditions including regional fire recovery, ongoing rebuilding, and the 2028 Olympics. All of this makes maximizing public coastal access more urgent, not less.
I am submitting anonymously through my counsel, to whom questions may be directed, due to a documented pattern of retaliation and legal intimidation by the applicant.

Thank you to the Commissioners for taking the above into account and denying the permit extension.

Outlook

Objections to 5-20-039 & 5-21-785

From Ann Maggio <annmaggio@gmail.com>
Date Thu 5/21/2026 3:12 PM
To Cortez, Dulce@Coastal <dulce.cortez@coastal.ca.gov>

[You don't often get email from annmaggio@gmail.com. Learn why this is important at https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification]

Dear CA Coastal Commissioners,

As a nearby neighbor to these projects I strongly object to these extensions. The premise that they lack funds due the fires is false and is just another delay to knock the commission's good work out of Santa Monica.

Have these developers also been behind Zbur's bill that carves out my city?

Have they been meeting with over zealous city staff and city council members who are funded by or directly paid by pro development offices?
These are the very same people responsible for ensuring our beaches are safe for residents and visitors yet our pier beach ranks among the 10 most polluted beaches in California! Not just this year, but for ten consecutive years including 2026!

Our environment deserves better! The public deserves better!

We never needed 60 condos on top of a hotel then and we don't need those now. They had their opportunity to get going BEFORE asking for the last extension with the fake excuse. As the saying goes, " You snooze, you loose. "

Please deny an extension for these projects.

Thank you,

Ann MT
1012 7th Street
90403

Outlook

Objection to the extension of 5-21-0139

From Burr Leonard <burrleonard01@gmail.com>
Date Wed 5/6/2026 1:57 PM
To Cortez, Dulce@Coastal <dulce.cortez@coastal.ca.gov>

You don't often get email from burrleonard01@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

May 6, 2026

Dulce Cortez
California Coastal Commission
South Coast District Office
301 E. Ocean Blvd., Suite 300
Long Beach, CA 90802-4830

Dear Ms Cortez,

I am emailing to object to the California Coastal Commission giving a one-year extension of 5-21-0139 – or any extension at all – to Ocean Avenue LLC to construct an enormous eyesore that is 25% taller and almost twice the size of the historic 103-year-old Miramar hotel that it would replace. Ocean LLC's plan to provide only 103 onsite parking spaces for 312 hotel rooms and 60 condominiums, leaving no parking available for shoppers and restaurant goers, would guarantee ongoing gridlock up and down Ocean Avenue.

On top of the impracticality of such a project, its construction would pollute Santa Monica with toxic air and excessive noise and cause its residents and visitors to suffer years of traffic congestion. Ocean Avenue is overcrowded enough now and would become permanently more so with addition of a megastructure that includes four restaurants and up to ten retail shops. The city does not have the resources or road access to support what would be a small city on a two-way street.

Please deny Ocean Avenue LLC a one-year extension on this misguided project.

Sincerely,

Burr Leonard
101 California Avenue Unit 704
Santa Monica, CA 90403
415-299-0013
burrleonard01@gmail.com

Outlook

Fwd: Objection to APN: 429-202-8001, 429-202-1009 and 429-202-1010

From Laura Marcus <laurajillmarcus@gmail.com>
Date Thu 5/21/2026 5:24 PM
To Cortez, Dulce@Coastal <dulce.cortez@coastal.ca.gov>

You don't often get email from laurajillmarcus@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

Hi Dulce,

I received your message. This is the objection that I sent a few weeks ago. Please let me know if you need anything else.

Thanks.

Laura

Begin forwarded message:

From: Laura Marcus <laurajillmarcus@gmail.com>
Subject: Objection to APN: 429-202-8001, 429-202-1009 and 429-202-1010
Date: May 5, 2026 at 12:37:25 PM PDT
To: ExecutiveStaff@coastal.ca.gov
Cc: letters@smdp.com, Leslie.Lambert@smgov.net, joshua.hamilton@smgov.net, shawn.landres@smgov.net, nina.fresco@smgov.net, planningcommennt@smgov.net

Hello,

I just received a notice in the mail about renewing permits for development at 1133 Ocean Avenue and 1127 and 1129 2nd Street, Santa Monica, previously known was the Miramar development project and I would like to object to the permit renewal, which never should have been granted the first time.

I would like to express my deep concern about the proposed project, as I think the scope of the project is detrimental to the neighborhood on every level.

I am highly concerned about the traffic and noise pollution this will bring to the community. Unlike further south, where there is a great deal of development and commercialization, this part of Santa Monica is part of a residential neighborhood, which still values its relative quite, unobstructed access to the bike path and can views without the overwhelming shadow of a monstrous development in its midst. Santa Monica currently enjoys some of the best air quality in the city, with the ability to walk and bike everywhere.

There is enough gridlock-causing traffic and pollution around the downtown business district, decimated though it may be. We don't need more. In fact, how about redeveloping the Third Street Promenade and business area along Wilshire Blvd? There are many vacant buildings which can be refurbished and upgraded without adding an additional complex which will drain and detract from the natural resources we have in the city. WE DON'T NEED ANY MORE MIXED USE SPACE.

We don't need the traffic, the fumes, the garbage, the sewage and the additional strain on the power grid. I am also concerned about the greenhouse effect. The proposed development's proximity to the ocean, in which we surf and win, is of particular concern. Santa Monica, a once sleep, beach community is being overrun with over and unthoughtful development. Someone needs to say enough before we turn this city into Miami Beach or worse—New York-by-the-Sea. Quality of life and health should count for something, especially in this day and age. Certainly, residents aren't getting real and needed community benefits that would compensate for the many significant entitlements to the developer. Please reconsider allowing this project to proceed as planned.

Sincerely,

Laura Marcus

Laura

FORMAL OBJECTION LETTER (DATED)

Mark Sandelson
328 21st Street
Santa Monica, CA 90402
May 4, 2026

Dr. Kate Huckelbridge, PhD
Executive Director
California Coastal Commission
301 E. Ocean Blvd., Suite 300
Long Beach, CA 90802

RE: FORMAL LEGAL OBJECTION TO THIRD ONE-YEAR EXTENSION

Coastal Development Permit No. 5-21-0139
1133 Ocean Avenue, Santa Monica (APN: 429-202-8001)

I. INTRODUCTION AND RELIEF REQUESTED

This submission constitutes a **formal legal objection** to the proposed third one-year extension of Coastal Development Permit No. 5-21-0139 (the "Permit").

The undersigned respectfully requests that the California Coastal Commission (the "Commission") **deny the requested extension** or, alternatively, require a **new or materially amended coastal development permit application subject to full review under current standards of the California Coastal Act**.

After nearly a decade since the project's inception, continued extensions raise serious concerns regarding **procedural integrity, changed circumstances, cumulative impacts, and consistency with Coastal Act policies**.

II. PROJECT SCALE AND COMMUNITY IMPACT

The proposed **130-foot mixed-use development**—including 312 hotel rooms, 60 residential units, retail, restaurants, and 428 parking spaces—represents a **dramatic intensification of use and scale** along Ocean Avenue.

Ocean Avenue is characterized by:

- Relatively **modest building heights**
- A **human-scale pedestrian environment**
- Visual openness tied to the **coastal setting**

This project threatens to fundamentally alter that character and erode the **quiet and charm** long associated with this area of Santa Monica.

III. COASTAL COMMISSION DOCKET PRECEDENT

Commission precedent demonstrates a consistent pattern of **denying, scaling back, or requiring redesign** of projects inconsistent with Coastal Act policies:

- **CDP No. 4-06-300 (Malibu)** – Required redesign due to **visual dominance**
- **CDP No. 5-11-061 (Venice)** – Reduced **height and massing** despite zoning allowances
- **CDP No. 4-13-0653 (Santa Monica)** – Scrutinized **hotel scale and visitor-serving balance**
- **CDP No. 4-17-0231 (Malibu)** – Required **updated review due to changed conditions**

These precedents confirm that the Commission:

- Does not permit projects that violate **§30251 visual standards**
- Requires **current consistency**, not reliance on outdated approvals
- Treats permits as **time-sensitive entitlements**, not indefinite rights

---

IV. TRAFFIC, CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS, AND POLLUTION

Construction Phase

- Years of **heavy truck traffic and staging**
- Persistent **noise and disruption**
- **Air pollution** (particulates and diesel emissions)
- Significant **greenhouse gas output**

Operational Phase

- Substantial increase in **vehicle trips and congestion**
- Strain on **Ocean Avenue and nearby residential streets**
- Impediments to **coastal access (§30210)** due to traffic

Environmental Effects

- Increased **emissions, energy use, and urban intensity**
- Long-term degradation of **coastal environmental quality**

V. CUMULATIVE AND PRECEDENT IMPACTS (§30250)

Approval risks triggering:

- A **wave of similar large-scale developments**
- Transformation of Ocean Avenue into a **dense hotel corridor**
- Loss of the **existing low-scale coastal character**

VI. UNWARRANTED EXTENSIONS AND PROCEDURAL CONCERNS

A third extension raises fundamental issues:

- Can the Commission make **current findings (§30604)** based on outdated conditions?
- Do repeated extensions allow projects to **avoid modern scrutiny**?
- Does this create **inequitable advantages** for certain developers?

At some point, continued extensions become a **circumvention of the Coastal Act's intent**.

VII. CONCLUSION

The Coastal Act and Commission precedent require that:

- Development be **visually compatible (§30251)**
- Provide **meaningful public benefit**
- Be evaluated under **current conditions**

Accordingly, the Commission should:

1. **DENY the requested extension**, or
2. Require a **new or revised application subject to full review**

The stakes are significant: this decision will directly impact the **character, livability, and environmental integrity of Ocean Avenue and Santa Monica's coastline**.

Respectfully submitted,
Mark Sandelson

---

cc: North of Montana Association (NOMA)

Outlook

FW: Extension 5-21-0139

From SouthCoast@Coastal <SouthCoast@coastal.ca.gov>
Date Fri 5/8/2026 3:10 PM
To Cortez, Dulce@Coastal <dulce.cortez@coastal.ca.gov>

Hi there,
Please see public comment for review.

From: Philip Schwartz <philschwartzdp@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, May 8, 2026 3:06 PM
To: SouthCoast@Coastal <SouthCoast@coastal.ca.gov>
Subject: Extension 5-21-0139

You don't often get email from philschwartzdp@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

I wish to go on record as ***OBJECTING to this extension.*** I am not in favor of yet another huge hotel at 1133 Ocean Ave in Santa Monica. This would DOUBLE the square footage of the existing structure, and only add to further traffic and inconvenience to the public in this area.

Respectfully,
Philip D Schwartz, Treasurer
909-911 Arizona Ave HOA
Santa Monica, CA 90401

RAND|PASTER|NELSON

5820 Canoga Avenue
Suite 300
Woodland Hills, CA 91367
213.557.7222
www.rpnllp.com

Sherman L. Stacey
213.374.2409
sherman@rpnllp.com

May 28, 2026

VIA EMAIL

Dulce Cortez
Coastal Program Analyst
California Coastal Commission
301 East Ocean Boulevard, #300
Long Beach, CA 90802

Re: Application for Extensions for CDP 5-21-0139-E3 and 5-21-0785-E3
Response to written objections

Dear Dulce:

I am writing to you on behalf of Ocean Avenue, LLC, Applicant for CDP 5-21-0139-E3 and CDP 5-21-0785-E3. The Commission's Executive Director had determined that there were no changed circumstances that may affect the consistency of the development with the Chapter 3 policies of the Coastal Act. The Deputy District Director for the South Coast District had reported the extension requests to the Commission under Item 15 on May 13, 2026. Prior to that date, written objections to the extension of CDP 5-21-0139-E3 were received and the extension was removed from the Deputy District Director Report. As CDP 5-21-0785-E3 is connected to extension of CDP 5-21-0139-E3, the extension of CDP 5-21-0785-E3 was also removed from the Deputy District Director Report on May 13, 2026. I ask that both extensions be reported to the Commission on the same date.

In addition to the approval of CDP 5-21-0139, the Commission approved (i) City of Santa Monica LCP Amendment LCP-5-SNM-21-0020-1 finding that a height limit of 130 feet and an FAR of 2.6 at the Fairmont Miramar property were consistent with the Chapter 3 policies of the Coastal Act; (ii) a Development Agreement between the City of Santa Monica and Ocean Avenue, LLC which provides that the Project could be undertaken at any time up to 15 years from November 12, 2020[1]; and (iii) CDP 5-21-0785 for a 42 unit low income housing project to be built at 1127 and 1129 Second Street. This housing project is contingent upon the redevelopment of the Fairmont Miramar authorized by CDP 5-21-0139.

Extension of permits is governed by California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Section 13169. Section 13169(c) provides as follows:

[1] The 15 year term of the Development Agreement does not govern the term of CDP 5-21-0139 which Commission regulations require be extended for one year periods.

> (c) If the executive director received a written objection to his or her determination but concludes that **the objection does not identify changed circumstances that may affect the consistency of the development with the Coastal Act or a certified local coastal program, if applicable**, the executive director shall report this conclusion to the commission at the same time that the executive director reports the determination to the commission in accordance with subsection (b) above. The executive director shall provide a copy of the letter(s) of objection to the commission with the report. If three commissioners object to the extension on grounds that there may be changed circumstances that affect consistency, the executive director shall schedule the extension for hearing(s) in accordance with subsection (d) below. If three commissioners do not object to the extension, the time for commencement of development shall be extended for one year from the expiration date of the permit.

There were 4 written communications objecting to CDP 5-21-0139: (1) Anonymous; (2) Mark Sandelson; (3) Burr Leonard; and (4) Phillip Schwartz. None of the written communications identify any changed circumstances that may affect the consistency of the development with the Coastal Act or a certified local coastal program. I will discuss each objection below.

1. Anonymous.

The letter from "Anonymous" was sent from the office of attorney Eric Brian Johnson. Johnson represents a Santa Monica resident who patronized the Fairmont Miramar bars and restaurants. Anonymous developed a relationship with one bartender who would provide Anonymous with free alcoholic beverages in violation of Fairmont Miramar policy. As a result, the bartender's employment was terminated.[2] Due to the bartender's termination, Anonymous has chosen to unreasonably annoy and harass other Fairmont Miramar employees, both on the premises and by telephone. For these reasons and others, management of Fairmont Miramar notified Anonymous that it was unacceptable behavior and instructed Anonymous that entry to the property was prohibited.

As a private property owner, Fairmont Miramar has the right to prevent unreasonable and disruptive behavior on its property. The prohibition on a single individual for cause is not a violation of public access. The public access policies in Chapter 3[3] address access to the shoreline, not access to private businesses. Fairmont Miramar is not on the beach. The public is welcome to enter the Fairmont Miramar and use its restaurants, bars, and shops. But any person who would display the behavior of Anonymous would be barred from entry to the property.

Anonymous' objection is primarily focused on this individual prohibition on entry to the Fairmont Miramar property. Fairmont Miramar is a pre-Coastal Act hotel. Anonymous claims that the personal prohibition on entry violates a Special Condition on CDP 5-21-0139. CDP 5-21-0139 applies to the

[2] Fairmont Miramar is a union hotel with a collective bargaining agreement with Unite Here Local 11. The union supported the approval of CDP 5-21-0139. Any employment disputes are governed under that collective bargaining agreement and by the California Department of Industrial Relations. No Coastal Act issue is raised by Anonymous' exclusion from the property.

[3] See Public Resources Code Sections 30210-30214.

redeveloped hotel, not to the existing hotel. Even so, Special Condition 2 to CDP 5-21-0139 (which will apply to the redeveloped hotel) requires "hotel food, beverage, and retail facilities shall be open to the general public consistent with typical hotel operations."[4] Typical hotel operations include regulating behavior on the premises by limiting or prohibiting use of hotel facilities on an individual basis. Public access under the Coastal Act does not contemplate that individuals who seek to harm the business and reputation of Fairmont Miramar[5] on its premises must be tolerated. Anonymous has Johnson as counsel and the dispute is a civil matter, not a violation of any Coastal Act policy. Johnson has notified Fairmont Miramar of his intent to file a lawsuit against Fairmont Miramar.

Anonymous states that regional fire recovery, ongoing rebuilding, and the 2028 Olympics are changed circumstances. No evidence is offered to connect these events to any policy within Chapter 3. The exclusion of Anonymous from the property, fire recovery in Pacific Palisades, and the 2028 Olympics are not changed circumstances that affect the consistency of the Fairmont Miramar project with the Coastal Act.

2. Mark Sandelson.

The objections of Mark Sandelson state no changed circumstances. Sandelson claims "procedural integrity, changed circumstances, cumulative impacts, and consistency with Coastal Act policies" are the grounds to oppose the extension request. Few facts are cited by Sandelson to support these assertions. Some alleged facts are untrue.

The first claim made by Sandelson is that the Project "represents a dramatic intensification of use and scale along Ocean Avenue". The Commission fully evaluated the consistency of the Project (and of the accompanying LCP Amendment) with Public Resources Code 30251 regarding visual quality. Rather than the "[r]elatively modest building heights" claimed by Sandelson, the Commission found that "[b]uildings with significantly higher heights and FARs may be found on each street surrounding the subject site, including a 300-ft. tall, 12.89 FAR building at 100 Wilshire Boulevard; a 150-ft tall, 6.24 FAR building at 101 California Avenue; and a 160-ft. tall, 8.13 FAR building at 1111 Second Street."[6] At 130 feet and 2.6 FAR, the Project is modest compared to surrounding uses.[7] The Commission findings concluded that "[t]he proposed project is visually compatible with the surrounding neighborhood with regard to height, mass, and scale." (Ibid.) Sandelson identifies no changed circumstances which would affect this finding of fact.

---

[4] Findings for CDP 5-21-0139, p. 10.

[5] The irrelevant and unsubstantiated objections advanced by Anonymous are consistent with Anonymous' past efforts to harm the business and reputation of Fairmont Miramar. This objector has elected to be "anonymous". I do not identify Anonymous by name as the objections have no merit.

[6] Findings for CDP 5-21-0139, p. 44.

[7] The 21 story building at 100 Wilshire Boulevard has 285,379 square feet (Loopnet.com, 100 Wilshire Boulevard) on a 0.517 acre lot while Fairmont Miramar proposes 262,284 square feet on 4.5 acres. Sandelson's description of Santa Monica is simply untrue.

Sandelson claims that there will be traffic congestion, construction impacts and pollution. No evidence is offered that these elements constitute changed circumstances. The Commission considered these issues and found that the Project was consistent with all relevant Chapter 3 policies. After considerable discussion of traffic impacts, the Commission found as follows:

> The project's re-designed entryways/exits and EV charging stations, as well as the incentive program to achieve the target average vehicle ridership, allow the new development to reduce the VMT and energy consumption consistent with Section 30253(d) of the Coastal Act. By reducing project-related congestion on Ocean Avenue through redesigned entrances and exits, the project also provides maximum access consistent with public safety needs. The proposed project also provides more than the minimum number of vehicle and bicycle parking spaces, ensuring the new development will not put added strain on the surrounding stock of coastal zone parking consistent with sections 30210 and 30252 of the Coastal Act, as well as Policy 20 of the certified LUP.[8]

These findings were amply supported by a traffic study and in the City's certified Final Environmental Impact Report. Sandelson offers no evidence of any changed circumstances which would affect the Commission's findings.

As to the claims of "pollution", this was addressed in the City's extensive EIR. Sandelson makes assertions without evidence. Further, under Coastal Act Section 30414, the State Air Resources Board and air pollution control districts "are the principal public agencies responsible for the establishment of ambient air quality and emission standards and air pollution control programs".[9] No changed circumstances are identified.

Finally, Sandelson claims that there are no meaningful public benefits from the Fairmont Miramar project. The Fairmont Miramar project also includes the construction of 42 low-income rental units at 1127-1129 Second Street, Santa Monica under CDP 5-21-0785. In addition, between the Commission and the City, more than $10,000,000 will be paid for numerous public benefit programs.

3. Burr Leonard.

Burr Leonard offers no evidence of changed circumstances. He claims the Fairmont Miramar project would be an eyesore and cause pollution, noise, and traffic congestion. These bare allegations repeat Sandelson's complaints. The Commission made findings which rejected these complaints at the Commission's original hearing.

Leonard does state a fact which is untrue. Leonard claims that the Fairmont Miramar project will have 103 parking spaces. The Fairmont Miramar project will have 428 onsite spaces within a subterranean

---

[8] Findings for CDP 5-21-0139, p. 41.

[9] Public Resources Code Section 30414(a).

garage in addition to 49 surface spaces in the valet aisle parking at the hotel entrance and 60 offsite spaces on evenings and weekends at 120 Wilshire Boulevard.[10]

4. Philip D. Schwartz.

Philip D. Schwartz cites the size of the Fairmont Miramar and claims of traffic impacts. As described above, the Commission findings disagree with Schwartz's claims. Schwartz does not identify any changed circumstances.

5. Conclusion.

None of the objectors to CDP 5-21-0139 have identified any changed circumstances that may affect the consistency of the Fairmont Miramar project with the Coastal Act or a certified local coastal program. The complaints of the 4 objectors were made by others before the original decision of the Commission. There is no reason for the Executive Director to change the recommendation that extension of CDP 5-21-0135 and CDP 5-21-0785 be approved.

Sincerely,

Sherman L. Stacey

Sherman L. Stacey
Partner
of RAND PASTER & NELSON, LLP

SLS/tdp

cc: Ellis O'Connor
Katie Kennelly
Paula Larmore, Esq.

[10] Findings for CDP 5-21-0139, p. 38.

CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION
SOUTH COAST DISTRICT OFFICE
301 E. OCEAN BLVD., SUITE 300
LONG BEACH, CALIFORNIA 90802-4830
PHONE: (562) 590-5071
FAX: (562) 590-5084
WEB: WWW.COASTAL.CA.GOV

EMERGENCY COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT

Emergency CDP G-5-26-0016 (Levine Residence)

Issue Date: May 1, 2026

Permittee: Michael Levine

Emergency Location: 45 Marguerite Dr., Rancho Palos Verdes, CA 90275

Emergency Description: On September 27, 2025, a bluff failure occurred along the rear yard of three homes located on Marguerite Drive in Rancho Palos Verdes. The bluff failure resulted in the destruction and destabilization of the rear yard at 45 Marguerite Dr. A significant portion of the rear yard slid down to the toe of the bluff and onto the beach, leaving an existing storm drain that runs seaward of the homes along Marguerite Dr. vulnerable to collapse. According to the geotechnical engineer, the failure scarp/top of the failure area is as close as 15 ft. from the storm drain and "appears to still be unstable and creeping landward", approximately 1.25 ft. per month since October 2025. The report further notes that the collapse of the storm drain "would have significant impact on the entire community." The collapse of the storm drain may result in improper drainage and presents as a danger through further bluff collapse to the existing home and/or adjacent bluff-top lots.

Emergency Development: Installation of an approximately 100-foot-long caisson-tieback system across the rear yard, approximately 10 feet seaward of the storm drain, with a single row of caissons at least 10 ft. from the existing storm drain and a five-foot-high 18-inch-thick continuous anchor block parallel to the storm drain to support the tieback anchors. Excavation will occur during the installation of the anchor block, and backfilling will occur after the tiebacks are constructed.

Executive Director's Determination
The Executive Director of the California Coastal Commission hereby finds that: (a) a sudden unexpected occurrence demanding immediate action to prevent or mitigate loss or damage to life, health, property or essential public services exists (i.e., an "emergency" (see Title 14 California Code of Regulations Section 13009 and California Coastal Act (Public Resources Code) Section 30624); (b) the emergency requires action more quickly than allowed by the procedures for regular CDPs; (c) the emergency development can and will be completed within 30 days unless otherwise specified by the terms of this ECDP; (d) the emergency development carried out under this ECDP is considered temporary work done in an emergency situation to abate an emergency and is undertaken at Permittee risk; (e) a regular CDP must be obtained for the emergency development to become more than temporary emergency abatement and/or if the Permittee wishes to expand the scope of work beyond that authorized by this ECDP; (f) absent obtaining a regular CDP, the emergency development shall be

Enclosure: ECDP Acceptance Form

cc: (via email): Mike Levine (Property Owner)

removed and the affected area restored; and (g) Commission staff will review public comment on the proposed emergency development as time allows.

The emergency development is hereby approved, subject to the conditions listed below.

DocuSigned by:
Steve Hudson
14EBFBFD71A84CC...

Steve Hudson, South Coast District Director, for Dr. Kate Huckelbridge, Executive Director

Conditions of Approval

1. The enclosed ECDP acceptance form must be signed by the Permittee and returned to the California Coastal Commission's South Coast District Office **within 15 days** of the date of this ECDP (i.e., by **May 16, 2026**). This ECDP is not valid unless and until the acceptance form has been received in the South Coast District Office.

2. All emergency development shall be limited in scale and scope to that specifically identified in the Emergency Permit Application Form received by the Commission's South Coast District Office on April 30, 2026, with supplemental information, including a revised location of the caisson-tieback system further inland, received on May 1, 2026. Only that emergency development specifically described in this ECDP and for the specific location listed above is authorized. Any other development requires separate authorization from the Executive Director or the Commission, as applicable.

3. The emergency development authorized on a temporary basis by this ECDP must be completed **within 30 days** of ECDP issuance (i.e., by **May 31, 2026**), which may be extended by the Executive Director for good cause.

4. This ECDP does not obviate the need to obtain necessary authorizations and/or permits from other agencies (e.g., City of Rancho Palos Verdes, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, etc.). The Permittee shall submit to the Executive Director copies of all such authorizations and/or permits upon their issuance.

5. By exercising this ECDP, Permittee acknowledges and agrees that: (a) the emergency development is temporary, is designed to temporarily abate the emergency, and shall be removed unless and until a regular CDP authorizing the work is approved, and provided the Permittee adheres to such regular CDP's terms and conditions; and (b) a regular CDP is subject to all of the provisions of the California Coastal Act (as codified in Sections 30000 to 30900 of the Public Resources Code) and any applicable Local Coastal Program (LCP) policies and may be conditioned accordingly to avoid and/or to offset coastal resource impacts consistent with the Coastal Act (and LCP as applicable) (including but not limited to requirements for public access provisions (such as offers to dedicate, easements, in-lieu fees, etc.), assumption/disclosure of risks (including deed restrictions), triggers for relocation/removal, offsetting mitigations, etc.). The Permittee acknowledges that review of the CDP application to determine consistency with the Coastal Act (and LCP as applicable) will be based on the conditions the property was legally in prior

to initiation of the temporary emergency development that is the subject of this ECDP.

6. By exercising this ECDP, the Permittee acknowledges and agrees in relation to this ECDP and the emergency development that it authorizes: (a) to assume all risks (including all coastal hazard risks, that include but are not limited to episodic and long-term shoreline retreat and coastal erosion, high seas, ocean waves, tidal scour, storms, tsunami, coastal flooding, landslide, earth movement, and the interaction of all of these, many of which will worsen with future sea level rise); (b) to unconditionally waive any claim of damage and/or liability against the Commission and/or its officers, employees, agents, successors and/or assigns; (c) to indemnify and hold harmless the Commission and its officers, employees, agents, successors and/or assigns 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, including as it relates to any damages to public and/or private properties and/or personal injury; (d) that any adverse effects to property or people caused by the emergency development shall be fully the responsibility of the Permittee.

7. The Permittee shall reimburse the Commission in full for all Commission costs and attorneys' fees (including but not limited to such costs/fees that are: (a) charged by the Office of the Attorney General; and/or (b) required by a court) that the Commission incurs in connection with the defense of any action brought by a party other than the Permittee against the Commission, its officers, employees, agents, successors and/or assigns challenging the approval or issuance of this ECDP, the interpretation and/or enforcement of ECDP terms and conditions, or any other matter related to this ECDP. The Permittee shall reimburse the Commission within 60 days of being informed by the Executive Director of the amount of such costs/fees. The Commission retains complete authority to conduct and direct the defense of any such action against the Coastal Commission, its officers, employees, agents, successors and/or assigns.

8. **Within 90 days** of ECDP issuance (i.e., by **July 30, 2026**), the Permittee shall either: (a) remove all of the materials placed or installed in connection with the emergency development, and restore all affected areas to their prior condition or better, all subject to Executive Director review and approval (and, in some cases, if directed by the Executive Director, subject to a regular CDP); ***or*** (b) submit a complete application (i.e., satisfying the requirements of Title 14 California Code of Regulations Section 13056) for a regular CDP through the City of Rancho Palos Verdes for development located in the City's permit jurisdiction and a separate regular CDP through the Commission for development located in the Commission's permit jurisdiction to authorize the emergency development (or for a different project designed to address the emergency development), including submitting all information and materials requested, and as directed, by the Executive Director if/when the Executive Director determines that such application is incomplete. If such regular follow-up CDP application is withdrawn by the Permittee, or is denied by the Commission or denied by the City, or if it remains incomplete for a period of 120 days after the application is deemed incomplete, then all of the materials placed

and/or installed in connection with the emergency development shall be removed, and all affected areas shall be restored to their prior condition or better. Any restoration or removal of development shall be subject to Executive Director review and approval (and, in some cases, if directed by the Executive Director, subject to a regular CDP).

9. Failure to meet any of the applicable requirements of Condition 8 above shall constitute a knowing and intentional violation of the Coastal Act and may result in formal enforcement action by the Executive Director and/or the Commission. Such formal action may include: recordation of a Notice of Violation on the Permittee's property; the issuance of a Cease and Desist Order and/or a Restoration Order; imposition of administrative penalties of up to $11,250 per day per violation; a civil lawsuit (that may result in the imposition of monetary penalties, including daily penalties of up to $15,000 per violation per day); and/or other applicable penalties and relief pursuant to Coastal Act Chapter 9. In addition, failure to follow and meet all terms and conditions of this ECDP shall also constitute a knowing and intentional Coastal Act violation to which the same actions above may be applied.

10. All emergency development shall be limited to the least amount necessary to temporarily abate the emergency, and shall be undertaken in a time and manner that avoids any and all coastal resource impacts as much as possible, including avoiding impacts to public access. The Permittee shall keep the Executive Director informed regarding emergency development progress, including in terms of any issues encountered that may require adjustment.

11. A licensed civil engineer with experience in coastal structures and processes shall oversee all construction activities and shall ensure that all emergency development is limited to the least amount necessary to temporarily abate the emergency consistent with the terms and conditions of this ECDP.

12. All emergency construction activities shall limit impacts to coastal resources (including public recreational access and the Pacific Ocean) to the maximum extent feasible including by, at a minimum, adhering to the following construction requirements:

13. Construction activities shall be limited to no more than a total of 30 days, and shall take place on non-holiday weekdays to the maximum extent feasible.

14. All construction activities shall take place during daylight hours (i.e., from one-hour before sunrise to one-hour after sunset). Lighting of the beach and/or intertidal area is prohibited.

15. The construction site shall maintain good construction site housekeeping controls and procedures (e.g., clean up all leaks, drips, and other spills immediately; keep equipment covered and out of the rain; dispose of all wastes properly, place trash receptacles on site for that purpose, and cover open trash receptacles during wet weather; remove all construction debris from the beach; etc.).

16. All construction activities that result in discharge of materials, polluted runoff, or

wastes into the waterway or the adjacent marine environment shall be prohibited. Equipment washing, refueling, and/or servicing shall not take place adjacent to the waterway. Any erosion and sediment controls used shall be in place prior to the commencement of construction as well as at the end of each workday.

17. All contractors shall ensure that work crews are carefully briefed on the importance of observing the construction precautions given the sensitive work environment. Construction contracts shall contain appropriate penalty provisions sufficient to offset the cost of retrieval/cleanup of foreign materials not properly contained and/or remediation to ensure compliance with this ECDP otherwise.

18. The Permittee shall notify planning staff of the Coastal Commission's South Coast District Office immediately upon completion of construction. If planning staff should identify reasonable restoration measures, such measures shall be implemented immediately.

19. Copies of this ECDP shall be maintained in a conspicuous location at the construction job site at all times, and such copies shall be available for public review on request. All persons involved with the construction shall be briefed on the content and meaning of this ECDP, and the public review requirements applicable to it, prior to commencement of construction.

20. Within 30 days of completion of construction authorized by this ECDP, the Permittee shall submit site plans and cross sections to the Executive Director clearly identifying all development completed under this emergency authorization (comparing the legal pre-emergency development condition to both the emergency condition and to the post-emergency development condition), and a narrative description of all emergency development activities undertaken pursuant to this ECDP. Photos showing the project site before the emergency (if available), during emergency development construction activities, and after the work authorized by this ECDP is complete shall be provided with the site plans and cross sections.

21. A construction coordinator shall be designated to be contacted during construction should questions arise regarding the construction (in case of both regular inquiries and emergencies), and the construction coordinator's contact information (i.e., address, email, phone numbers, etc.) including, at a minimum, an email address and a telephone number (with voice mail capabilities) that will be made available 24 hours a day for the duration of construction, shall be conspicuously posted at the job site where such contact information is readily visible from public viewing areas, along with indication that the construction coordinator should be contacted in the case of questions regarding the construction (in case of both regular inquiries and emergencies). The construction coordinator shall record the contact information (e.g., name, address, email, phone number, etc.) and nature of all complaints received regarding the construction, and shall investigate complaints and take remedial action, if necessary, within 24 hours of receipt of the complaint or inquiry. The Permittee shall submit the record of complaints/inquiries and actions taken in response to the Executive Director on a weekly basis, and upon completion of construction activities.

22. Minor adjustments to the requirements above, including deadline adjustments, may be allowed by the Executive Director if the Executive Director determines that such adjustments: (a) are deemed reasonable and necessary to help to temporarily abate the identified emergency, including as emergency conditions may change; (b) are designed to avoid coastal resource impacts (and limit those that are unavoidable) as much as possible; and (c) in the case of deadline extension adjustments, are appropriate in light of circumstances, including that the Permittee has shown diligence in pursuing the emergency development and meeting all ECDP terms and conditions.

23. By exercising this ECDP, Permittee acknowledges and agrees that this ECDP shall not constitute evidence against and/or a waiver of any public rights which may exist on the property.

24. The Permittee shall disclose this ECDP, including all of its terms and conditions, to any prospective buyer of the affected property during the period of time that any development that is the subject of this ECDP remains on such property.

25. Failure to comply with the terms and conditions of this ECDP may result in enforcement action under the provisions of Coastal Act Chapter 9. The issuance of this ECDP does not constitute admission as to the legality of any development undertaken on the property without a CDP and shall be without prejudice to the California Coastal Commission’s ability to pursue any remedy under Coastal Act Chapter 9.

26. By acceptance of this permit, the permittee agrees to enter into a monitoring contract with a Native American tribe listed on the NAHC contact list for Los Angeles County prior to commencement of construction to monitor all ground disturbance, grading, drilling, etc. Construction may be paused by the monitor for a short period of time to evaluate any resources. The permittee shall notify the Executive Director of the Coastal Commission within 24 hours if any tribal cultural resources are found and shall defer to the tribal government on the appropriate treatment method. The permittee will comply with all applicable laws and procedures if human remains are found. Final monitoring reports shall be submitted to the Coastal Commission within 48 hours of the conclusion of tribal monitoring. If tribal resources are impacted, mitigation may be required by the follow-up CDP.

If you have any questions about the provisions of this ECDP, please contact the Commission's South Coast District Office at 301 E. Ocean Blvd., Suite 300, Long Beach, CA 90802, (562) 590-5071.

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

EMERGENCY PERMIT ACCEPTANCE FORM

TO: CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISISON
South Coast Area Office
301 E. Ocean Blvd., Suite 300
Long Beach, CA 90802-4416

RE: Emergency Coastal Development Permit No. G-5-26-0016

INSTRUCTIONS:

After reading the attached Emergency Permit, please sign this form and return to the South Coast District Office within 15 working days from the permit's date.

I hereby understand all of the conditions of the emergency permit being issued to me and agree to abide by them.

I also understand that the emergency work is TEMPORARY and that a regular Coastal Permit is necessary to make it a permanent installation. I agree to apply for a regular Coastal Permit within 90 days of the date of the emergency permit (i.e., by July 30, 2026), OR I will remove the emergency work authorized by such permit in its entirety within 90 days of the date of the emergency permit (i.e., by July 30, 2026).

_____
Signature of Property Owner or
Authorized Representative

_____
Name

_____
Address

_____

_____

_____
Date