

**Before the Zoning Administrator
in and for the County of Monterey, State of California**

In the matter of the application of:

SEA LA VIE CARMEL LLC (PLN210102)

RESOLUTION NO. 23-008

Resolution by the Monterey County Zoning
Administrator:

- 1) Finding that project, which is an addition to an existing single-family dwelling, qualifies for a Class 1 Categorical Exemption pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15301, and none of the exceptions from section 15300.2 apply; and
- 2) Approving a Combined Development Permit consisting of:
 - a) a Coastal Administrative Permit and Design Approval to allow a 556 square foot addition to an existing single family home, replacement of an existing 125 square foot shed with a 250 square foot shed, and associated site improvements including replacements of existing decks and stairs;
 - b) a Coastal Development Permit to allow development within 100 feet of environmentally sensitive habitat area (coastal bluff scrub);
 - c) a Coastal Development Permit to allow development within 750 feet of known archaeological resources;
 - d) a Coastal Development Permit to allow development within 50 feet of a coastal bluff; and
 - e) a Coastal Development permit to allow removal of 3 Monterey cypress trees, and 2 landmark size Eucalyptus trees.

[PLN210102 SEA LA VIE CARMEL LLC, 30590
Aurora Del Mar, Carmel (APN: 243-331-004-000)]

The Sea La Vie Carmel LLC application (PLN210102) came on for a public hearing before the Monterey County Zoning Administrator on February 9, 2023. Having considered all the written and documentary evidence, the administrative record, the staff report, oral testimony, and other evidence presented, the County of Monterey Zoning Administrator finds and decides as follows:

FINDINGS

1. **FINDING:** **CONSISTENCY** – The Project, as conditioned, is consistent with the applicable plans and policies which designate this area as appropriate for development.

- EVIDENCE:** a) During the course of review of this application, the project has been reviewed for consistency with the text, policies, and regulations in:
- the 1982 Monterey County General Plan;
 - Big Sur Coast Land Use Plan (BSC LUP);
 - Monterey County Coastal Implementation Plan (CIP), Part 3, Regulations for Development in the Big Sur Coast Land Use Plan Area; and
 - Monterey County Zoning Ordinance (Title 20)

No conflicts were found to exist. No communications were received during the course of review of the project indicating any inconsistencies with the text, policies, and regulations in these documents.

- b) Allowed Use. The property is located at 30590 Aurora Del Mar, Carmel (APN: 243-331-004-000). The property is zoned Rural Density Residential, 40 Acres per Unit with a Design Control overlay in the Coastal Zone, or “RDR/40-D(CZ)”, which allows the first single-family dwelling per legal lot of record and non-habitable accessory structures such as garages and sheds subject to a Coastal Administrative Permit (Title 20 sections 20.16.040.A. and 20.16.040.E.). The project proposes:
- a 312 square foot addition to the single-family home and 244 square foot addition to the existing attached garage, totaling 556 square feet;
 - Re-roofing the residence;
 - An increase in height above the game room, to add a clerestory window;
 - Replacing the wood deck by the entry;
 - Replacing the spiral staircase on the deck by the master bedroom;
 - Replacing the deck southeast of the residence, pulling it further from the bluff edge and installing a spa on it;
 - Replacing the stone curb on the north of the driveway;
 - Installing a new retaining wall and pedestrian stairs on the south of the driveway;
 - Removing an existing 125 square foot shed;
 - Constructing a new 250 square foot shed;
 - Replacing existing flatwork; and
 - Installing a wood board walk connecting the roof of the residence, spa area, and shed.

Therefore, all proposed uses are allowable.

- c) Lot Legality. The property is shown in its present configuration as Lot 4 of the final map “Map of Tract No. 588 Carmel Sur”, in Volume 10 Cities & Towns Page 6. Therefore, the County recognizes it as a legal lot of record.
- d) Design/Scenic Resources. The project is consistent with the applicable policies and regulations governing design and Scenic Resources, as discussed in Finding No. 7.
- e) Development Standards. The development standards for the RDR zoning are located in Title 20 section 20.16.060, which has standards for

minimum setbacks, maximum structure height, and building site coverage. The setback section indicates that the minimum setback may be superseded by the setbacks shown on the subdivision final map. In this case the final map, "Map of Tract No. 588 Carmel Sur" filed in Volume 10 Cities and Towns Page 6 indicates a minimum front setback of 50 feet, which applies to both the main and accessory structures. Both the home and proposed shed comply with this setback. The project is consistent with all the applicable development standards:

- The required side and rear setbacks for main structures are 20 feet. The proposed side and rear setbacks for the main home are not dimensioned on the plan set, but are approximately 30 feet (side) and 25 feet (rear).
- The required side and rear setbacks for non-habitable accessory structures are 6 feet (side) and 1 foot (rear). The proposed side is 14 feet, and while the rear setback is not dimensioned on the plan set, is greater than 70 feet.
- The maximum allowable height is 30 feet for main structures, and 15 feet for non-habitable accessory structures. The proposed heights are 16 feet for the home and 11 foot and 6 inches for the shed, in conformance with these requirements.
- The maximum allowable building site coverage is 25% (12,140 square feet), and the proposed coverage is 8% (3,898 square feet).

- f) Cultural Resources. The site is in an area mapped as having a high sensitivity for the presence of archaeological resources, and is within 750 feet of known archaeological resources. In 2013, an archaeological report (LIB150426) prepared by Mary Doane identified scattered abalone shell near the edge of the bluff, but no other indicators of cultural resources. The report concluded that the "project area" (a new entry staircase considered in 2013 with an undefined footprint) did not contain evidence of archaeological resources. As the information in this previous report didn't conclusively assess the current project area, in accordance with CIP section 20.145.120.B, an archaeological report (LIB220162) was prepared by Dana E. Supernowicz to further evaluate the potential of development on the site to impact archaeological resources. The report included archival research, surface reconnaissance, and limited shovel test units and surface scrapes. The report concluded that the cove below the house was likely used by native people to access marine species for food, but did not identify evidence of archaeological resources in the development area. Therefore, the project is not anticipated to impact archaeological resources. The County's standard Condition No. 3 has been applied, which will require the applicant to stop work if any previously unknown resources are encountered.
- g) Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas. The site is within 100 feet of environmentally sensitive habitat area (coastal bluff scrub). Pursuant to CIP section 20.145.040.A., a biological report (LIB220149) was prepared by Nicole Nedeff to evaluate the potential of the project to impact environmentally sensitive habitat areas (ESHA). The report concluded that the coastal bluff scrub located seaward of the landscaping seat wall on the property was environmentally sensitive

habitat; however, no impacts to the ESHA would occur as long as no work or equipment staging occurred seaward of the landscaping wall. The majority of the work, including the additions and the shed are landward of this wall. The deck and stair replacement have their foundations landward of the wall but do slightly cantilever over this wall, and are within close proximity to ESHA. Therefore, in accordance with CIP section 20.145.040.B, to implement the biologist's recommendation condition No. 14 has been applied. This condition requires that a construction management plan be prepared which will denote areas of exclusionary fencing, which shall be installed prior to issuance of building permits and ensure no work or material is staged seaward of the landscaping wall. The construction management plan will include a required note indicating that no debris will be cast off over the bluff. With the incorporation of this condition, the project will not impact ESHA.

- h) Hazardous Areas. The project is consistent with applicable policies and regulations governing development in hazardous geological areas, as discussed in Finding No. 3.
- i) Tree Removal. Three Monterey cypress and 14 Eucalyptus trees (2 of which are greater than 24 inches in diameter, making them landmark trees by definition) are proposed for removal. This removal is consistent with applicable policies protecting both Forest Resources and Scenic Resources, as discussed in Findings No. 5 and 6.
- j) Site Visit. County staff conducted site visits on December 13, 2022 and January 27, 2023 to review the proposed project for consistency with the plans and regulations listed above.
- k) Land Use Advisory Committee (LUAC) Review. The project was referred the Big Sur Land Use Advisory Committee. At a public meeting on December 13, 2022, they voted to recommend approval of the project as proposed 4 – 0 with 1 absent. No members of the public were present or commented on the project. The LUAC suggested replacing the Monterey cypress with trees native to the Big Sur area, such as Toyon's. The LUAC also expressed some concern regarding outdoor lighting illuminating the ocean. Big Sur outdoor lighting plan Condition No. 8 is incorporated, which will require all lighting to be downlit and unobtrusive.
- l) The application, project plans, and related support materials submitted by the project applicant to Monterey County HCD-Planning found in Project File PLN210102.

2. FINDING: **SITE SUITABILITY** – The site is physically suitable for the proposed development and/or use.

EVIDENCE: a) The project has been reviewed for site suitability by the following departments and agencies: HCD-Planning, HCD-Engineering Services, HCD-Environmental Services, the Environmental Health Bureau, and Carmel Highlands FPD. County staff reviewed the application materials and plans to verify that the project on the subject site conforms to the applicable plans and regulations, and there has been no indication from these departments/agencies that the site is not suitable for the development. Conditions recommended have been incorporated.

- b) The following reports have been prepared to address potential impacts to environmentally sensitive habitats, archaeological resources, forest resources, and geologic/geotechnical hazards:
 - “Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area, Moldow property, Otter Cove” (LIB220149) prepared by Nicole Nedeff, Carmel Valley, CA, 19 August 2021.
 - “Phase I and II Archaeological Study of Assessor’s Parcel Number 234-331-004” (LIB220162) prepared by Dana E. Supernowicz, RPA, August 2021.
 - “Tree Assessment / Forest Management Plan” (LIB220241) prepared by Frank Ono, Pacific Grove CA, 28 July 2022 and revised 12 October 2022.
 - “Geotechnical Investigation for Proposed Residential Additions” (LIB220166) prepared by Moses Cuprill, P.E., Watsonville, CA, July 28, 2022.
 - “Geologic and Coastal Bluff Recession Assessment Report” (LIB220166) prepared by Mark Foxx, Watsonville, CA, March 11, 2022.

County staff independently reviewed these reports and concurs with their conclusions. There are no physical or environmental constraints that would indicate that the site is not suitable for the use. All development shall be in accordance with these reports.

- c) Staff conducted a site inspection on December 13, 2022 to review the sites suitability for the use.
- d) The application, project plans, and related support materials submitted by the project applicant to Monterey County HCD-Planning found in Project File PLN210102.

3. FINDING: HEALTH AND SAFETY – The establishment, maintenance, or operation of the project applied for will not under the circumstances of this particular case be detrimental to the health, safety, peace, morals, comfort, and general welfare of persons residing or working in the neighborhood of such proposed use, or be detrimental or injurious to property and improvements in the neighborhood or to the general welfare of the County.

- EVIDENCE:**
- a) The project was reviewed by HCD-Planning, HCD-Engineering Services, HCD-Environmental Services, the Environmental Health Bureau, and Carmel Highlands FPD. The respective agencies have recommended conditions, where appropriate, to ensure that the project will not have an adverse effect on the health, safety, and welfare of persons either residing or working in the neighborhood.
 - b) Necessary public facilities will be provided. The project is served and will continue to be served by the Carmel Riviera Mutual Water Company (MWC) for potable water service, and an Onsite Wastewater Treatment System (OWTS) for wastewater service. The Environmental Health Bureau (EHB) reviewed the application and due to the limited scope did not require an OWTS performance evaluation. Due to the numerous site constraints a replacement or expansion location for the OWTS was not identified, and EHB recommended a condition requiring a deed restriction indicating that any future replacement or expansion of

the OWTS may require use of an alternative OWTS system, subjection to any applicable requirements and the time of permitting. The condition has been incorporated.

- c) The property is mapped as being within a high fire zone. To address this, a fuel management plan was included in the application which includes recommendations for reducing fire fuel loads in sheet 12 of the project plans. The plan incorrectly identifies a 26 inch diameter Monterey cypress for removal. To address this, the fuel management plan has been taken out of the project plans attached to this resolution to prevent confusion.
- d) The project is consistent with Big Sur Coast Land Use Plan (BSC LUP) policies and their implementing regulations in the Monterey County Coastal Implementation Plan (CIP) Part 3 addressing hazardous geological areas, as discussed in subsequent evidence “e” through “h”.
- e) The existing home is within 50 feet of a bluff, was originally permitted in 1978 with California Coastal Commission Resolution No. 78-78, and was constructed between 1979 and 1980. Since then, the site has experienced bluff erosion due to natural environmental factors and wave action, resulting in under-cutting and loss of coastal bluff area, causing a deep seacave to form at the base of the bluff in an area seaward of the home. In 1986, a portion of the seacave’s entrance partially collapsed, resulting in approximately 8-feet of the bluff’s edge to erode. On April 26, 2017, the Monterey County Planning Commission adopted Resolution No. 17-011, which approved PLN150636, allowing the use of rock-bolts to stabilize the bluff and prevent further collapse of the bluff from threatening the home. However, this permit was never acted on and expired three years from the date of issuance in 2020.
- f) Therefore, in accordance with CIP section 20.145.080.A., a coordinated geotechnical and geological report was prepared by Haro, Kasunich, and Associates, Inc. (LIB220166) to assess the potential of geologic hazards, including bluff erosion, to impact the proposed development. The report analyzed historic bluff erosion rates, including a safety factor to account for the potential of sea level rise to accelerate historic bluff retreat, and produced a 75-year coastal erosion setback. The geologist recommended that any new habitable additions or structures be located further than this setback.
- g) The proposed addition to the main home and new shed are sited landward of this 75-year setback, and the geotechnical engineer concluded they were feasible provided the recommendations from the report are followed, which include criteria for grading, foundation design, and drainage. Condition No. 9 is incorporated requiring a notice of report to ensure that the geologists and geotechnical engineers recommendations are adhered to. For the site improvements seaward of the 75-year setback, the geotechnical engineer indicated *“The patios, decks, stairs, and non-habitable shed seaward of the 75-year setback line may be damaged over time and should be considered sacrificial.”* The non-habitable shed has since been re-sited landward of the setback.
- h) Portions of the existing home are within 75 year setback, although no additions are proposed in those areas. While no coastal armoring is proposed or permitted as part of this permit, the geologist concludes,

“At the subject property, we recommend that areas seaward of the RECOMMENDED 75-YEAR BLUFF EROSION AND STABILITY SETBACK shown in Appendix B be considered to be at potential risk in the next 75 years (by 2099).” CIP section 20.145.080.A.2.a.1 requires that development requiring geologic reports and subject to geologic hazards record a deed restriction. This implements BSC LUP policy 3.7.2.4, *“in locations determined to have significant hazards, development permits should include a special condition requiring the owner to record a deed restriction describing the nature of the hazard(s), geotechnical and/or fire suppression mitigations and long-term maintenance requirements.”* Therefore, Condition No. 13 has been incorporated requiring that prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall record a deed restriction which states: "The parcel is located within a geological hazard area and development may be subject to certain restrictions required as per Section 20.145.080.A.2.a.1 of Part 3 of the Monterey County Coastal Implementation Plan and per the standards for development of residential property."

- i) Staff conducted a site inspection on December 13, 2022 to review the sites suitability for the use.
- j) The application, project plans, and related support materials submitted by the project applicant to Monterey County HCD-Planning found in Project File PLN210102.

4. FINDING: **NO VIOLATIONS** – The subject property is in compliance with all rules and regulations pertaining to zoning uses, subdivision, and any other applicable provisions of the County’s zoning ordinance. No violations exist on the property.

- EVIDENCE:**
- a) Staff reviewed Monterey County HCD-Planning and HCD-Building Services records and is not aware of any violations existing on subject property.
 - b) Staff conducted a site inspection on December 13, 2022 and did not identify any violations on the property.
 - c) The application, project plans, and related support materials submitted by the project applicant to Monterey County HCD-Planning found in Project File PLN210102.

5. FINDING: **TREE REMOVAL** – The tree removal is the minimum required under the circumstances and is consistent with the Big Sur Coast Land Use Plan (BSC LUP) Policies protecting Forest Resources, and their implementing regulations in the Monterey County Coastal Implementation Plan (CIP), Part 3.

- EVIDENCE:**
- a) The project proposes removal of 3 Monterey cypress and 14 Eucalyptus trees. The removal is consistent with the above referenced polices and regulations: it’s the minimum amount under the circumstances, the design has been modified to protect a landmark Monterey cypress, and all trees being removed are either planted landscaping trees or exotic/invasive species.
 - b) CIP section 20.145.060.A requires a coastal development permit for tree removal in the Big Sur Coast Land Use Plan, exempting “non-native or planted trees” except landmark trees or where the removal would result

in exposure of structure in the Critical Viewshed. CIP section 20.145.020.ZZ defines a landmark tree as “*are those trees which, are 24 inches or more in diameter when measured at breast height, or a tree which is visually significant, historically significant, exemplary of its species, or more than 1000 years old.*” The CIP also has a definition of native trees, being “*those trees which are native to Monterey County as listed in attachment 2 to this Chapter.*” (CIP section 20.145.020.LLL) Attachment 2 lists Monterey cypress as being a native tree in the Monterey County Coastal Zone.

- c) There are three Monterey cypress between 18 and 20 inches in diameter in the footprint of the shed proposed for removal, ranging from fair to poor health. The trees appear to have been introduced as windbreaks and to denote the boundaries between property lines in the Otter Cove subdivision, and are primarily even-aged. The applicants have submitted a forester’s report and aerial images from 1979 prior to the trees being onsite as evidence of this.
- d) The exemption to allow planted trees to be removed without a Coastal Development Permit appears to be in the CIP to prevent the forest resources standards from being applied to ornamental landscaping, orchards, or timber production. Utilizing it in this case does not appear to be appropriate. While it’s likely that the trees were planted, and that the grove appears to have been introduced after development of the subdivision, at this point we can’t definitively know whether decades old trees were planted, are the off spring of planted trees, etc. Utilizing this exemption would also set a precedent for the evaluation of future applications, as it focuses the analysis not on whether the removal is the minimum amount and how it would affect forest health, but on where the trees come from. Therefore, a Coastal Development Permit to allow the removal of the three cypress is included in the project description. However, the removal of the three Monterey cypress is consistent with the CIP requirements. The siting of the shed has been modified to preserve a landmark Monterey cypress as required by CIP section 20.145.060.D.1, and the removal is the minimum number required for the development per CIP section 20.145.060.D.3. The shed is screened from view from Highway by a hedge running parallel to Aurora Del Mar, and removal of the Monterey cypress would not expose any structures to the Critical Viewshed. The trees shall be replaced on a 1:1 basis as required by Condition No. 10.
- e) While a “native” tree within Monterey County per the definitions in the CIP, the Monterey cypress indigenous range is within Point Lobos and certain areas in the Del Monte Forest, as mapped in the Del Monte Forest Land Use Plan figure 2a. They aren’t native to the Otter Cove area, and the Big Sur LUAC recommended that they be replaced with a tree native to Big Sur. In Big Sur, the Monterey County Coastal Implementation Plan section 20.145.060.D.6 requires that native trees (which includes Monterey cypress by the definitions in the plan) 12 inches or more in diameter be replaced at a rate of one tree of the same variety, “*except where demonstrated in the Forest Management Plan or Amended Plan that this would result in an over-crowded, unhealthy forest environment.*” Incorporating the LUAC’s recommendation and

addressing this CIP section, the tree replacement Condition No. 10 allows the replacement trees to be an alternative tree native to Big Sur if recommended by the project forester that this would increase the health and biodiversity of the forest environment.

- f) A grove of 14 Eucalyptus trees is in front of the residence, parallel to Aurora Del Mar. These are proposed for removal. BSC LUP policy 3.3.3.A.10 encourages restoration of Big Sur's natural environment by removal of exotic plants, including Eucalyptus. Eradication of Eucalyptus is also one of the Forest Management Plan requirements in Attachment 1 to the CIP.
- g) Two of the stems of the Eucalyptus are above the 24 inch diameter to be defined as "landmark trees". However, the decision maker may allow their removal, as long as they are not visually or historically significant, exemplary of their species, or more than 1,000 years old, by finding *"that no alternatives to development (such as resiting, relocation, or reduction in development area) exists whereby the tree removal can be avoided."* (CIP section 20.145.060.D.1) In this case the trees are not visually or historically significant, exemplary of their species, or more than 1,000 years old. Additionally, no alternatives exist which would prevent their removal; they're being removed to promote forest health as encouraged by the LUP rather than for development, so resiting, relocation, etc. would not protect them.
- h) As discussed in Finding No. 6, their removal would make the existing home more visible from Highway 1. However, Condition No. 7 is incorporated, which shall require planting of landscaping screening parallel to the highway to minimize view of the home while not blocking ocean views.
- i) The application, project plans, and related support materials submitted by the project applicant to Monterey County HCD-Planning found in Project File PLN210102.

6. FINDING: **SCENIC RESOURCES** – The project minimizes impacts on Scenic Resources in accordance with the applicable goals, policies, and regulations contained in the Big Sur Coast Land Use Plan (BSC LUP); Monterey County Coastal Implementation Plan (CIP) Part 3, Regulations for Development in the Big Sur Coast Land Use Plan area; and Monterey County Zoning Ordinance (Title 20).

EVIDENCE: a) The property is subject to the Big Sur Coast Land Use Plan (BSC LUP) Scenic Resources protection policies; their implementing regulations within Monterey County Coastal Implementation Plan (CIP) Part 3; and the requirements of the Design Control "D" zoning district, which requires design review to assure protection of public viewshed and neighborhood character. The Scenic Resources Key policy 3.2.1 indicates that due to *"Big Sur coast's outstanding beauty and its great benefit to the people of the State and Nation, it is the County's objective to preserve these scenic resources in perpetuity and to promote the restoration of the natural beauty of visually degraded areas wherever possible..."* which provides an analytical lens for the design review. The LUP defines the Big Sur Critical Viewshed as everything within sight of

Highway 1 and major public viewing areas, and has policies which essentially prohibit development in the Critical Viewshed.

- b) However, while on the ocean side of Highway 1 and viewable from the highway, the property is in the Otter Cove subdivision, which is exempt from the BSC LUP Critical Viewshed standards. Instead, properties in Otter Cove are subject to the standards in CIP section 20.145.030.C.2 and the additional specific standards in CIP section 20.145.030.B.7. As conditioned, the project is consistent with these development standards and maximizes protection of the viewshed.
- c) CIP section 20.145.030.B.7.c. indicates that berming and other measures be used to minimize views of structures without blocking ocean vistas seen from Highway 1. The existing Eucalyptus grove west of the home does provide screening of the residence from the highway; however, it also significantly blocks the public's view of the ocean. The applicants are proposing to remove these trees, which will open up white water views and be a net benefit to the viewshed. To minimize visibility of the residence, pursuant to CIP section 20.145.030.C.2.d a landscaping plan Condition No. 7 is included, which shall require planting of landscaping screening parallel to the highway to minimize view of the home without blocking views of the ocean.
- d) Consistent with CIP section 20.145.030.C.2.c, the colors, materials, and massing of the new development all subordinate to and blend in with the surrounding environment. Per CIP section 20.145.030.B.7.b, the roofing material is natural and earth tone to blend with the environment, being primarily a green roof, with a small section being a green copper standing seam roof. The copper section is angled away from the public viewshed. The existing home is low-lying, being 11 feet and 6 inches in height, and is built into the landscape, extending west from the natural grade and gently sloping down. The only addition in height to the home is a 4 foot 6 inch addition to allow a clerestory window to bring natural light into the game room within the home. The site is significantly downslope of Highway 1, so this increase in height will not significantly alter how the massing of the home is perceived from the public viewshed. The window also includes a black out curtain, which will prevent light pollution. The addition to the front of the home follows the outward extent of the existing walls and encloses areas which are underneath the existing green roof, so it similarly won't materially alter how the massing of the home is perceived. The primary exterior material is an earth tone tan stone veneer, which will be unobtrusive and blend with the natural surroundings.
- e) The application, project plans, and related support materials submitted by the project applicant to Monterey County HCD-Planning found in Project File PLN210102.

7. **FINDING:** **CEQA (Exempt)** – The project is categorically exempt from environmental review and no unusual circumstances were identified to exist for the proposed project.
- EVIDENCE:** a) California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15301 categorically exempts minor alterations to existing structures and

facilities, including additions less than 2,500 square feet or 50% of floor area (approximately 2,000 square feet), whichever is less.

- b) The project proposes a 312 square foot addition to the home, a 244 square foot addition to the garage, and a 250 square foot shed (replacing a 125 square foot shed), totaling 681 square feet in new floor area, consistent with the Class 1 exemption.
- c) None of the exceptions under CEQA Guidelines Section 15300.2 apply to this project, and detailed in subsequent evidences “d” though “i”.
- d) Class 1 exemptions are not qualified by their location.
- e) Successive projects of the same type and in the same place (additions to existing structures within the allowable development standards which do not have significant impacts) would not contribute to a significant cumulative impact.
- f) There are no unusual circumstances related to the project which would create the reasonable possibility of a significant effect.
- g) The project would not result to damage to scenic resources within view of State Scenic Highway. The project is in view of Highway 1 and does propose tree removal; however, the removal of the 3 Monterey cypress trees will not impact the viewshed from the Highway, and the 14 Eucalyptus trees are not considered a scenic resource. Their removal would make the existing residence potentially more viewable from the highway; however, this is addressed by the standard landscaping plan condition No. 7, which implements Monterey County Coastal Implementation Plan sections 20.145.030.B.7.c and 20.145.030.C.2.d, and will ensure that the home is screened and won’t impact the viewshed.
- h) The project is not located on a hazardous waste site included on any list compiled pursuant to Section 65962.5 of the Government code.
- i) The project would not damage any historical resources.
- j) See supporting Finding Nos. 1, 2, 5, and 6. The application, project plans, and related support materials submitted by the project applicant to Monterey County HCD-Planning found in Project File PLN210102.

- 8. FINDING: PUBLIC ACCESS** – The project is in conformance with the public access and recreation policies of the Coastal Act (specifically Chapter 3 of the Coastal Act of 1976, commencing with Section 30200 of the Public Resources Code) and applicable Local Coastal Program, and does not interfere with any form of historic public use or trust rights.
- EVIDENCE:**
- a) No public access is required as part of the project as no substantial adverse impact on access, either individually or cumulatively, as described in Section 20.145.150 of the Monterey County Coastal Implementation Plan can be demonstrated.
 - b) Figure 2, Shoreline Access Plan, of the Big Sur Coastal Land Use Plan (BSC LUP) indicates the subject property is within a “Priority 3” access area. In addition, immediately south of the property is a small beach inlet allowing access to the public for recreational use. Policy No. 6.1.4.2 of the BSC LUP indicates areas suitable for public access should be protected for such use. Implementation of the project would not result in impeding public access to this area. Therefore, the project is found consistent with the Public Access policies of the BSC LUP.

- d) No evidence or documentation has been submitted or found showing the existing of historic public use or trust rights over the property.
- e) The application, project plans, and related support materials submitted by the project applicant to Monterey County HCD-Planning found in Project File PLN210102.

- 9. FINDING: APPEALABILITY** – The decision on this project may be appealed to the Board of Supervisors and the California Coastal Commission.
- EVIDENCE:**
- a) Title 20 Section 20.86.030 allows an appeal to be made to the Board of Supervisors by any public agency or person aggrieved by a decision of an Appropriate Authority other than the Board of Supervisors.
 - b) Title 20 Section 20.86.080.A.1 allows an appeal of a County decision on a coastal development permit application be filed by an applicant or any aggrieved person who has exhausted all County appeals pursuant to this Chapter, or by any two (2) members of the California Coastal Commission, for approved projects between the sea and the first public road paralleling the sea.

DECISION

NOW, THEREFORE, based on the above findings and evidence, the Zoning Administrator does hereby:

1. Find that project, which is an addition to an existing single-family dwelling, qualifies for a Class 1 Categorical Exemption pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15301, and none of the exceptions from section 15300.2 apply; and
2. Approve a Combined Development Permit consisting of:
 - a. a Coastal Administrative Permit and Design Approval to allow a 556 square foot addition to an existing single family home, replacement of an existing 125 square foot shed with a 250 square foot shed, and associated site improvements including replacements of existing decks and stairs;
 - b. a Coastal Development Permit to allow development within 100 feet of environmentally sensitive habitat area (coastal bluff scrub);
 - c. a Coastal Development Permit to allow development within 750 feet of known archaeological resources;
 - d. a Coastal Development Permit to allow development within 50 feet of a coastal bluff; and
 - e. a Coastal Development permit to allow removal of 3 Monterey cypress trees, and 2 landmark size Eucalyptus trees.

All of which are in general conformance with the attached colors and materials and project plans, and subject to the attached conditions, all being attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 9th day of February, 2023.

Mike Novo

Mike Novo, AICP, Zoning Administrator

COPY OF THIS DECISION MAILED TO APPLICANT ON 02/13/2023 .

THIS APPLICATION IS APPEALABLE TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS. IF ANYONE WISHES TO APPEAL THIS DECISION, AN APPEAL FORM MUST BE COMPLETED AND SUBMITTED TO THE CLERK TO THE BOARD ALONG WITH THE APPROPRIATE FILING FEE ON OR BEFORE 02/23/2023 .

THIS PROJECT IS LOCATED IN THE COASTAL ZONE AND IS APPEALABLE TO THE COASTAL COMMISSION. UPON RECEIPT OF NOTIFICATION OF THE FINAL LOCAL ACTION NOTICE (FLAN) STATING THE DECISION BY THE FINAL DECISION MAKING BODY, THE COMMISSION ESTABLISHES A 10 WORKING DAY APPEAL PERIOD. AN APPEAL FORM MUST BE FILED WITH THE COASTAL COMMISSION. FOR FURTHER INFORMATION, CONTACT THE COASTAL COMMISSION AT (831) 427-4863 OR AT 725 FRONT STREET, SUITE 300, SANTA CRUZ, CA.

This decision, if this is the final administrative decision, is subject to judicial review pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure Sections 1094.5 and 1094.6. Any Petition for Writ of Mandate must be filed with the Court no later than the 90th day following the date on which this decision becomes final.

NOTES

1. You will need a building permit and must comply with the Monterey County Building Ordinance in every respect.

Additionally, the Zoning Ordinance provides that no building permit shall be issued, nor any use conducted, otherwise than in accordance with the conditions and terms of the permit granted or until ten days after the mailing of notice of the granting of the permit by the appropriate authority, or after granting of the permit by the Board of Supervisors in the event of appeal.

Do not start any construction or occupy any building until you have obtained the necessary permits and use clearances from Monterey County HCD-Planning and HCD-Building Services Department office in Salinas.

2. This permit expires 3 years after the above date of granting thereof unless construction or use is started within this period.

Form Rev. 1-27-2021

County of Monterey HCD Planning

Conditions of Approval/Implementation Plan/Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan

PLN210102

1. PD001 - SPECIFIC USES ONLY

Responsible Department: RMA-Planning

Condition/Mitigation Monitoring Measure: This Combined Development Permit (PLN210102) allows:

- a) a Coastal Administrative Permit and Design Approval to allow a 556 square foot addition to an existing single family home, replacement of an existing 125 square foot shed with a 250 square foot shed, and associated site improvements including replacements of existing decks and stairs;
- b) a Coastal Development Permit to allow development within 100 feet of environmentally sensitive habitat area (coastal bluff scrub);
- c) a Coastal Development Permit to allow development within 750 feet of known archaeological resources;
- d) a Coastal Development Permit to allow development within 50 feet of a coastal bluff; and
- e) a Coastal Development permit to allow removal of 3 Monterey cypress trees, and 2 landmark size Eucalyptus trees.

The property is located at 30590 Aurora Del Mar, Carmel (Assessor's Parcel Number 243-331-004-000), Big Sur Coast Land Use Plan. This permit was approved in accordance with County ordinances and land use regulations subject to the terms and conditions described in the project file. Neither the uses nor the construction allowed by this permit shall commence unless and until all of the conditions of this permit are met to the satisfaction of the Director of HCD - Planning. Any use or construction not in substantial conformance with the terms and conditions of this permit is a violation of County regulations and may result in modification or revocation of this permit and subsequent legal action. No use or construction other than that specified by this permit is allowed unless additional permits are approved by the appropriate authorities. To the extent that the County has delegated any condition compliance or mitigation monitoring to the Monterey County Water Resources Agency, the Water Resources Agency shall provide all information requested by the County and the County shall bear ultimate responsibility to ensure that conditions and mitigation measures are properly fulfilled. (HCD - Planning)

Compliance or Monitoring Action to be Performed: The Owner/Applicant shall adhere to conditions and uses specified in the permit on an ongoing basis unless otherwise stated.

2. PD002 - NOTICE PERMIT APPROVAL

Responsible Department: RMA-Planning

Condition/Mitigation The applicant shall record a Permit Approval Notice. This notice shall state:

Monitoring Measure: "A Combined Development Permit (Resolution Number 23-008) was approved by the Monterey County Zoning Administrator for Assessor's Parcel Number 243-331-004-000 on February 9, 2023. The permit was granted subject to 16 conditions of approval which run with the land. A copy of the permit is on file with Monterey County HCD - Planning."

Proof of recordation of this notice shall be furnished to the Director of HCD - Planning prior to issuance of grading and building permits, Certificates of Compliance, or commencement of use, whichever occurs first and as applicable. (HCD - Planning)

Compliance or Monitoring Action to be Performed: Prior to the issuance of grading and building permits, certificates of compliance, or commencement of use, whichever occurs first and as applicable, the Owner/Applicant shall provide proof of recordation of this notice to the HCD - Planning.

3. PD003(A) - CULTURAL RESOURCES NEGATIVE ARCHAEOLOGICAL REPORT

Responsible Department: RMA-Planning

Condition/Mitigation If, during the course of construction, cultural, archaeological, historical or paleontological resources are uncovered at the site (surface or subsurface resources) work shall be halted immediately within 50 meters (165 feet) of the find until a qualified professional archaeologist can evaluate it. Monterey County RMA - Planning and a qualified archaeologist (i.e., an archaeologist registered with the Register of Professional Archaeologists) shall be immediately contacted by the responsible individual present on-site. When contacted, the project planner and the archaeologist shall immediately visit the site to determine the extent of the resources and to develop proper mitigation measures required for recovery.
(RMA - Planning)

Compliance or Monitoring Action to be Performed: The Owner/Applicant shall adhere to this condition on an on-going basis.

Prior to the issuance of grading or building permits and/or prior to the recordation of the final/parcel map, whichever occurs first, the Owner/Applicant shall include requirements of this condition as a note on all grading and building plans. The note shall state "Stop work within 50 meters (165 feet) of uncovered resource and contact Monterey County RMA - Planning and a qualified archaeologist immediately if cultural, archaeological, historical or paleontological resources are uncovered."

When contacted, the project planner and the archaeologist shall immediately visit the site to determine the extent of the resources and to develop proper mitigation measures required for the discovery.

4. PD006(A) - CONDITION COMPLIANCE FEE

Responsible Department: RMA-Planning

Condition/Mitigation Monitoring Measure: The Owner/Applicant shall pay the Condition Compliance fee, as set forth in the fee schedule adopted by the Board of Supervisors, for the staff time required to satisfy conditions of approval. The fee in effect at the time of payment shall be paid prior to clearing any conditions of approval.

Compliance or Monitoring Action to be Performed: Prior to clearance of conditions, the Owner/Applicant shall pay the Condition Compliance fee, as set forth in the fee schedule adopted by the Board of Supervisors.

5. PD011 - TREE AND ROOT PROTECTION

Responsible Department: RMA-Planning

Condition/Mitigation Monitoring Measure: Trees which are located close to construction site(s) shall be protected from inadvertent damage from construction equipment by fencing off the canopy driplines and/or critical root zones (whichever is greater) with protective materials, wrapping trunks with protective materials, avoiding fill of any type against the base of the trunks and avoiding an increase in soil depth at the feeding zone or drip-line of the retained trees. Said protection, approved by certified arborist, shall be demonstrated prior to issuance of building permits subject to the approval of HCD - Director of Planning. If there is any potential for damage, all work must stop in the area and a report, with mitigation measures, shall be submitted by certified arborist. Should any additional trees not included in this permit be harmed, during grading or construction activities, in such a way where removal is required, the owner/applicant shall obtain required permits. (HCD - Planning)

Compliance or Monitoring Action to be Performed: Prior to issuance of grading and/or building permits, the Owner/Applicant shall submit evidence of tree protection to HCD - Planning for review and approval.

During construction, the Owner/Applicant/Arborist shall submit on-going evidence that tree protection measures are in place through out grading and construction phases. If damage is possible, submit an interim report prepared by a certified arborist.

Prior to final inspection, the Owner/Applicant shall submit photos of the trees on the property to HCD-Planning after construction to document that tree protection has been successful or if follow-up remediation or additional permits are required.

6. PD011(A) - TREE REMOVAL

Responsible Department: RMA-Planning

Condition/Mitigation Monitoring Measure: Tree removal shall not occur until a construction permit has been issued in conformance with the appropriate stage or phase of development in this permit. Only those trees approved for removal shall be removed. (HCD-Planning)

Compliance or Monitoring Action to be Performed: Prior to tree removal, the Owner/ Applicant/ Tree Removal Contractor shall demonstrate that a construction permit has been issued prior to commencement of tree removal.

7. PD012(F) - LANDSCAPE PLAN & MAINTENANCE (SFD ONLY)

Responsible Department: RMA-Planning

Condition/Mitigation Monitoring Measure: The site shall be landscaped. Prior to the issuance of building permits, a landscaping plan shall be submitted to the Director of HCD - Planning. The landscaping plan shall be in sufficient detail to identify the location, species, and size of the proposed landscaping materials and shall include an irrigation plan. Before final building inspection, landscaping shall be installed. All landscaped areas shall be continuously maintained by the applicant; all plant material shall be continuously maintained in a litter-free, weed-free, healthy, growing condition. The landscaping shall include a low-lying shrub planting screen parallel to Highway 1 to minimize view of the residence, without obstructing views of the ocean. (HCD - Planning)

Compliance or Monitoring Action to be Performed: Prior to issuance of building permits, the Owner/Applicant/Licensed Landscape Contractor/Licensed Landscape Architect shall submit landscape plans to the HCD - Planning for review and approval. Landscaping plans shall include the recommendations from the geotechnical/geological report. All landscape plans shall be signed and stamped by licensed professional under the following statement, "I certify that this landscaping and irrigation plan complies with all Monterey County landscaping requirements including use of native, drought-tolerant, non-invasive species; limited turf; and low-flow, water conserving irrigation fixtures."

Prior to final building inspection, the Owner/Applicant/Licensed Landscape Contractor/Licensed Landscape Architect shall ensure that the landscaping shall be installed.

On an on-going basis, all landscaped areas shall be continuously maintained by the Owner/Applicant; all plant material shall be continuously maintained in a litter-free, weed-free, healthy, growing condition.

8. PD014(C) - LIGHTING-EXTERIOR LIGHTING PLAN (BIG SUR)

Responsible Department: RMA-Planning

Condition/Mitigation Monitoring Measure: All exterior lighting shall be unobtrusive, down-lit, compatible with the local area, and constructed or located so that only intended area is illuminated and off-site glare is fully controlled. Exterior lights shall have recessed lighting elements. Exterior light sources that would be directly visible from critical viewshed viewing areas as defined in Section 20.145.020.V, are prohibited. The applicant shall submit three (3) copies of an exterior lighting plan which shall indicate location, type, and wattage of all light fixtures and include catalog sheets for each fixture. The lighting shall comply with the requirements of the California Energy Code set forth in California Code of Regulations Title 24 Part 6. The exterior lighting plan shall be subject to approval by the Director of HCD - Planning, prior to the issuance of building permits.
(HCD - Planning)

Compliance or Monitoring Action to be Performed: Prior to the issuance of building permits, the Owner/Applicant shall submit three copies of the lighting plans to HCD - Planning for review and approval. Approved lighting plans shall be incorporated into final building plans.

Prior to final/occupancy, staff shall conduct a site visit to ensure that the lighting has been installed according to the approved plan.

On an on-going basis, the Owner/Applicant shall ensure that the lighting is installed and maintained in accordance with the approved plan.

9. PD016 - NOTICE OF REPORT

Responsible Department: RMA-Planning

Condition/Mitigation Monitoring Measure: Prior to issuance of building or grading permits, a notice shall be recorded with the Monterey County Recorder which states:
"A "Geotechnical Investigation for Proposed Residential Additions" and "Geologic and Coastal Bluff Recession Assessment Report" (Library No. LIB220166), were prepared by Moses Cuprill, P.E. and Mark Foxx on July 28, 2022 and March 11, 2022, respectively, and are on file in Monterey County HCD - Planning. All development shall be in accordance with these reports."
(HCD - Planning)

Compliance or Monitoring Action to be Performed: Prior to the issuance of grading and building permits, the Owner/Applicant shall submit proof of recordation of this notice to HCD - Planning.

Prior to final inspection, the Owner/Applicant shall submit proof, for review and approval, that all development has been implemented in accordance with the report to the HCD - Planning.

10. PD048 - TREE REPLACEMENT/RELOCATION

Responsible Department: RMA-Planning

Condition/Mitigation Monitoring Measure: Prior to building final inspection, the applicant shall replace and or relocate each tree approved for removal as follows:

- Three Monterey cypress replacement trees, which shall be a minimum of five-gallon stock. Spacing between trees should be at least 8 feet. An alternative tree native to Big Sur may be used if recommended by the project forester to increase health and biodiversity of the forest environment.
- No replacements are required for the Eucalyptus trees.

Replacement tree(s) shall be located within the same general location as the tree being removed. (HCD - Planning)

Compliance or Monitoring Action to be Performed: The Owner/Applicant shall submit evidence of tree replacement to HCD -Planning for review and approval. Evidence shall be a receipt for the purchase of the replacement tree(s) and photos of the replacement tree(s) being planted.

Six months after the planting of the replacement tree(s), the Owner/Applicant shall submit evidence demonstrating that the replacement tree(s) are in a healthy, growing condition.

One year after the planting of the replacement tree(s), the Owner/Applicant shall submit a letter prepared by a County-approved tree consultant reporting on the health of the replacement tree(s) and whether or not the tree replacement was successful or if follow-up remediation measures or additional permits are required.

11. PD049 - TREE AND ROOT PROTECTION

Responsible Department: RMA-Planning

Condition/Mitigation Monitoring Measure: Prior to beginning any tree removal, trees which are located close to trees approved for removal shall be protected from inadvertent damage from equipment or tree removal activity by fencing off the canopy drip-lines and/or critical root zones (whichever is greater) with protective materials. Any tree protection measures recommended by a County-approved tree consultant, in addition to the standard condition, shall be implemented. (HCD - Planning)

Compliance or Monitoring Action to be Performed: Prior to construction or tree removal, the Owner/Applicant/Tree Removal Contractor submit evidence of tree protection to HCD -Planning for review and approval.

After construction or tree removal, the Owner/Applicant/Tree Removal Contractor shall submit photos of the trees on the property to HCD -Planning to document that the tree protection has been successful or if follow-up remediation measures or additional permits are required.

12. PD050 - RAPTOR/MIGRATORY BIRD NESTING

Responsible Department: RMA-Planning

Condition/Mitigation Monitoring Measure: Any tree removal activity that occurs during the typical bird nesting season (February 22-August 1), the County of Monterey shall require that the project applicant retain a County qualified biologist to perform a nest survey in order to determine if any active raptor or migratory bird nests occur within the project site or within 300 feet of proposed tree removal activity. During the typical nesting season, the survey shall be conducted no more than 30 days prior to ground disturbance or tree removal. If nesting birds are found on the project site, an appropriate buffer plan shall be established by the project biologist. (HCD - Planning)

Compliance or Monitoring Action to be Performed: No more than 30 days prior to ground disturbance or tree removal, the Owner/Applicant/Tree Removal Contractor shall submit to HCD -Planning a nest survey prepared by a County qualified biologist to determine if any active raptor or migratory bird nests occur within the project site or immediate vicinity.

13. PDSP001 - COASTAL HAZARDS DEED RESTRICTION

Responsible Department: RMA-Planning

Condition/Mitigation Monitoring Measure: Prior to the issuance of a building permit the applicant shall record a deed restriction which states: "The parcel is located within a geological hazard area and development may be subject to certain restrictions required as per Section 20.145.080.A.2.a.1 of Part 3 of the Monterey County Coastal Implementation Plan and per the standards for development of residential property."

Compliance or Monitoring Action to be Performed: Prior to issuance of construction permits for grading and/or building, the owner/applicant shall submit proof of recordation of the document to HCD-Planning.

14. PDSP002 - CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT PLAN

Responsible Department: RMA-Planning

Condition/Mitigation Monitoring Measure: The applicant/owner shall submit a Construction Management Plan (CMP) to HCD-Planning for review and approval. All stockpiling and staging areas and construction related activities shall be located outside of identifies Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Areas. The CMP shall illustrate such protected areas and provide details relating to the installation of exclusionary fencing or other protective measures. The CMP shall include the following, at minimum:

- Duration of construction,
- Days and hours of operation,
- Truck routes,
- Estimated number of truck trips that will be generated,
- Number of employees onsite per day,
- Parking areas for equipment, vehicles, and portable toilets
- Staging areas,
- Stockpile areas, and
- Locations which no disturbance or work will occur.
- An exclusionary fence which shall run along the rock wall and preclude construction activity from entering the bluff area.
- A note on the plan which indicates "No rocks, vegetative debris, or construction debris, should be permitted to fall to the waters below at any time during project staging or implementation"
- The construction management plan (submitted in draft form as part of the application) shall be revised to correctly show which cypress trees are approved for removal

Compliance or Monitoring Action to be Performed: Prior to issuance of permits from Building Services, Applicant/Owner shall submit to HCD-Planning a CMP for review and approval and evidence of the installation of exclusionary fencing.

On and on-basis, the Contractor/Applicant/Owner shall ensure that the exclusionary fencing in installed for the duration of construction activities.

15. CC01 INDEMNIFICATION AGREEMENT

Responsible Department: County Counsel-Risk Management

Condition/Mitigation Monitoring Measure: The property owner agrees as a condition and in consideration of approval of this discretionary development permit that it will, pursuant to agreement and/or statutory provisions as applicable, including but not limited to Government Code Section 66474.9, defend, indemnify and hold harmless the County of Monterey or its agents, officers and employees from any claim, action or proceeding against the County or its agents, officers or employees to attack, set aside, void or annul this approval, which action is brought within the time period provided for under law, including but not limited to, Government Code Section 66499.37, as applicable. The property owner will reimburse the County for any court costs and attorney's fees which the County may be required by a court to pay as a result of such action. The County may, at its sole discretion, participate in the defense of such action; but such participation shall not relieve applicant of his/her/its obligations under this condition. An agreement to this effect shall be recorded upon demand of County Counsel or concurrent with the issuance of building permits, use of property, filing of the final map, recordation of the certificates of compliance whichever occurs first and as applicable. The County shall promptly notify the property owner of any such claim, action or proceeding and the County shall cooperate fully in the defense thereof. If the County fails to promptly notify the property owner of any such claim, action or proceeding or fails to cooperate fully in the defense thereof, the property owner shall not thereafter be responsible to defend, indemnify or hold the County harmless. (County Counsel-Risk Management)

Compliance or Monitoring Action to be Performed: Upon demand of County Counsel or concurrent with the issuance of building permits, use of the property, recording of the final/parcel map, or recordation of Certificates of Compliance, whichever occurs first and as applicable, the Owner/Applicant shall submit a signed and notarized Indemnification Agreement to the Office of County Counsel-Risk Management for review and signature by the County.

Proof of recordation of the Indemnification Agreement, as outlined, shall be submitted to the Office of County Counsel-Risk Management


16. EHSP01 – DEED RESTRICTION: FUTURE ONSITE WASTEWATER TREATMENT SYSTEM REQUIREMENTS (NON-STANDA

Responsible Department: Health Department

Condition/Mitigation Monitoring Measure: Owner shall record a deed restriction indicating that any future replacement or expansion of the existing onsite wastewater treatment system on the property may require the installation and ongoing use of an alternative onsite wastewater treatment system. The Property shall be subject to any and all applicable federal, state and/or local laws, regulations and ordinances in effect at the time of permit issuance regarding the permitting, operation and maintenance or monitoring of onsite wastewater treatment systems. The single exception to this term is that an alternative onsite wastewater treatment system will be subject to an annual operating permit from the Monterey County Health Department, Environmental Health Bureau upon adoption of any State or regional regulations and/or any local ordinance authorizing such a permit. Owner agrees to disclose the contents of the Deed Restriction to any potential purchaser of the subject Property and to any person or entity to whom the Property herein described shall be conveyed. Owner is responsible to reimburse EHB for costs associated with preparation of the Deed Restriction.

Compliance or Monitoring Action to be Performed: Prior to issuance of construction permits, the applicant shall provide a legal description for the parcel and a copy of the Grant Deed to the Environmental Health Bureau ("EHB"). The EHB will prepare the deed restriction form.



Prior to final inspection of construction permits, the property owner shall sign and notarize the deed restriction form obtained from the EHB. Record the notarized deed restriction with the Monterey County Recorder. Proof of recordation shall be provided to the EHB.





ADDITIONS & REMODEL TO EXISTING RESIDENCE
CHARLES & LIESL MOLDOW
 30590 AURORA DEL MAR, CARMEL, CA

TERRY LATASA - ARCHITECT
 930 HARRISON STREET, MONTEREY, CALIFORNIA
 (831) 649-1012



8-15-22



PROPOSED MAIN LEVEL PLAN
 1/4" = 1'-0"



PROPOSED LOWER LEVEL PLAN
 1/4" = 1'-0"



EXISTING MAIN LEVEL PLAN

1/4" = 1'-0"

ADDITIONS & REMODEL

CHARLES & LIESL MOLDOW



30590 AURORA DEL MAR, CARMEL, CALIFORNIA

TERRY LATASA ARCHITECT

930 HARRISON STREET, MONTEREY CALIFORNIA
(831) 649-1012


8-15-22

5




EXISTING LOWER LEVEL PLAN

1/4" = 1'-0"



SOUTH ELEVATION

1/8" = 1'-0"




EAST ELEVATION


1/8" = 1'-0"

EXTERIOR MATERIALS



ROOF:	REPLACE EXISTING SOIL ROOF OVER WATERPROOFING
WALLS:	MATCH EXISTING HORIZONTAL WOOD SIDING AND STONE VENEER
WINDOWS:	BRONZE-ANODIZED SASH



NORTH ELEVATION




WEST ELEVATION




ROOF PLAN

1/4" = 1'-0"




SECTION 'A-A'

1/4" = 1'-0"




SECTION 'B-B'

1/4" = 1'-0"




EAST ELEVATION


1/4" = 1'-0"




WEST ELEVATION



WEST ELEVATION



SOUTH ELEVATION



NEW SHED PLAN

1/4" = 1'-0"

EXTERIOR MATERIALS

ROOF: STANDING SEAM COPPER ROOF;


WALLS: STONE VENEER (MATCH EXISTING)

WINDOWS: BRONZE-ANODIZED STEEL (MATCH EXISTING)


COLOR SAMPLES FOR PROJECT FILE NO. PLN. 210102



Materials: SOIL ROOF COPPER ROOF Colors: BROWN/GREEN
Description: ROOF



Materials: STONE Colors: BROWN
Description: VENEER SIDING




Materials: BRONZE-ANODIZED Colors: BROWN/BLACK
Description: WINDOWS

PROJECT FILE NO.

PLN-210102

PHOTOGRAPHS



Date: 5-1-22 Site Address: 30590 AURORA DEL MAR

Description: CARMEL

VIEW OF GARAGE & DRIVEWAY & ROOF
FROM EAST

PROJECT FILE NO.

PHOTOGRAPHS



Date: 5-1-22 Site Address: 30590 AURORA DEL MAR

Description: CARMEL

VIEW OF KITCHEN, GARAGE & DECK FROM SOUTH