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The Laguna Grande/Roberts Lake Local Coastal Program (LUP) was adopted by the
Monterey City Council in 1981. The three parcels shown on the attached Figure 8
PROPOSED LAND USE PLAN (Attachment 1) were in private ownership when the LUP
was adopted in 1981.

The three parcels are now in public ownership. The Planning Commission at its September
26, 2000 meeting recommended to the City Council that the land use designations in the
LUP for the three parcels be changed to “6 OPEN SPACE AREAS” as shown on
Attachment 1 to this Addendum.
275 Roberts Avenue
Change Designation from
1 - VISITOR SERVING COMMERCIAL
to
6 - OPEN SPACE AREAS

465 and 467 English Avenue
Change Designation from
4 - SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL
to
6 - OPEN SPACE AREAS
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This document was prepared with financial assistance provided by the U.S. Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972, administered by the Office of Coastal Zone Management National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.
This final version of the Land Use Plan for the Laguna Grande Local Coastal Program (LCP) of the City of Seaside and the City of Monterey is the product of a process which was initiated in 1978. During the latter half of 1981, a Third Draft Land Use Plan was published and was the subject of Public Hearings in both cities by their respective Planning Commissions and City Councils. The Resolutions passed and adopted by each City Council on the Land Use Plan are included in Appendix D to this text, and the minutes of the Public Hearings are included in Appendix E.

The Third Draft Land Use Plan which was the subject of these Public Hearings and the basis upon which the Cities took official action, was itself the outcome of the Second Draft Land Use Plan, which was prepared and distributed in March of 1979. The Second Draft was considered at study sessions of the City Councils and Planning Commissions of both Cities. The Regional Coastal Commission at its March 29, 1979 meeting provided a preliminary review of the Second Draft as requested by both City Councils.

The Regional Coastal Commission at its Preliminary Review identified a number of significant issues which it felt needed to be resolved before a fully acceptable Land Use Plan could be considered. Following the Commission's Preliminary Review, it was determined by the Cities of Seaside and Monterey in consultation with Regional Commission staff that a Third Draft Land Use Plan should be prepared to resolve the remaining issues. This text represents the culmination of this process in which the Cities have attempted to reflect the Commission's review comments, and to further refine the provisions of the Plan.

It should be noted that after preparation of the Second Draft Land Use Plan, the Cities' Coastal Zone area was significantly reduced by the passage of Assembly Bill 462. As shown in Figure 1, the boundaries of the Coastal Zone were amended to delete most of the area within the City of Seaside's Redevel-
opment parcels, leaving only buffer strips around the shoreline of Laguna Grande and the channel connecting to Roberts Lake. The shopping Center, Roberts Avenue Subarea was also deleted except for the railroad right-of-way and a buffer strip on its sea-ward side. These boundary changes were passed in the Fall of 1979 and following their passage, City staffs incorporated these changes into the Third Draft.

This Land Use Plan reaffirms much of the content of the previous drafts which appeared generally acceptable. As noted above, modifications have been made to reflect the changes made to the Coastal Zone boundary in the Fall of 1979. The Land Use Plan also takes into account several suggestions made by the Coastal Commission and the Department of Fish and Game, and incorporated those suggestions which the Cities of Monterey and Seaside have found to be acceptable.

The Cities of Seaside and Monterey believe that this Land Use Plan has been thoroughly and sensitively re-evaluated and is in conformance with the California Coastal Act of 1976. It should, therefore, be acceptable for certification by the Regional and State Coastal Commissions. It is the Cities' intention to proceed with the preparation of an effective and consistent Implementation Program to carry out the policies of this Land Use Plan.
FIGURE 1
COASTAL ZONE PLANNING AREA

- COASTAL ZONE BOUNDARY
- AREA DELETED FROM COASTAL ZONE BY ASSEMBLY BILL 462

LAGUNA GRANDE LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM
I. INTRODUCTION

This introductory section explains the Local Coastal Program (LCP) planning process, in which the City of Seaside and the City of Monterey have been involved. As explained below, this Land Use Plan is one part of the LCP planning process.

A. LEGISLATIVE MANDATE

The City of Seaside and the City of Monterey are mandated by the California Coastal Act of 1976 to prepare a Local Coastal Program (LCP) for the area of their respective cities which are located within the Coastal Zone boundary shown in Figure 1. The LCP is to consist of City land use plans and land use controls that implement the provisions of the California Coastal Act of 1976. Now that the LCP has been prepared and adopted by the Cities, it is to be submitted to the Coastal Commission for certification. After the LCP has been certified, the Cities will then be able to assume the responsibility for issuing coastal development permits. The only exceptions to this local permit authority are developments proposed on submerged lands, tidelands, and public trust lands. For these exceptions, the Coastal Commission will retain its permit authority.

B. LAGUNA GRANDE LCP JOINT POWERS AGREEMENT

As shown in Figure 1, this LCP includes portions of the Coastal Zones of both the City of Seaside and the City of Monterey. These jurisdictional boundaries represent an artificial separation of the former estuarine complex, composed of Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake, which was formerly a single lagoon with an outlet to the ocean. Since the Cities' coastal zones are contiguous at Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake, and recognizing the interrelationship of the lakes, the Cities agreed to study and plan for this segment of the coastal zone jointly. This decision was formalized in a Joint Powers Agreement (JPA)
which was adopted by the City Councils of both Cities in November 1977. This joint study area is comprised of the Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake Subareas shown in Figure 2. The Beach Subarea shown in Figure 2 and addressed in this Draft lies entirely in the City of Seaside. It is a relatively small area which includes approximately five hundred (500) feet of frontage along the Pacific Ocean. Also excluded from the joint study area is Roberts Avenue Subarea, which has a variety of commercial, industrial and residential land uses.

C. LAND USE PLANNING PROCESS

The materials describing existing conditions, general goals, land use designations and policies, and land use intensity criteria found in this text of the Land Use Plan are the result of a land use planning effort which began in the Spring of 1977. The key elements of this planning effort have been as follows: two technical working papers providing an inventory of existing conditions, and an evaluation of policy alternatives; a First Draft Land Use Plan; a Second Draft Land Use Plan; a Third Draft Land Use Plan; and this Land Use Plan in the form adopted by the two Cities. A summary of significant LCP actions, products, and meetings to date is chronologically listed in Appendix A.

A key element in this LCP process is public participation. Both of the Technical Working Papers have been distributed and reviewed at public workshop meetings. Public hearings on the First Draft Land Use Plan were held by the Planning Commissions of both the City of Seaside and the City of Monterey. Following these public hearings, the First Draft was revised into a Second Draft to reflect public comment received to date. Before proceeding with the Second Draft, the Cities of Seaside and Monterey asked the Regional Coastal Commission for a preliminary review of the Second Draft. This preliminary review was undertaken in the form of a public hearing on March 29, 1979. The Third Draft was prepared in response to Coastal Com-
mission and public comments received at the preliminary review public hearing, and was the subject of Public Hearings by the Planning Commissions and City Councils of Seaside and Monterey. This text reflects the official actions of the City Councils in adopting the Land Use Plan as a consequence of these Public Hearings. This Land Use Plan will now be submitted to the Coastal Commission for review, and following their public hearings, for certification.

A certified Land Use Plan will constitute only half of the Local Coastal Program as defined by the California Coastal Act of 1976. After certification of this Land Use Plan by the Coastal Commission, land use controls are to be prepared following a similar process to that followed with the preparation of this Land Use Plan. Certified land use controls, when combined with this certified Land Use Plan, will represent the Local Coastal Program. With a certified Local Coastal Program, the Cities of Seaside and Monterey will then be able to assume the responsibility for issuing coastal development permits.

D. RELATIONSHIP OF THE LCP TO EXISTING PLANS

The policies, programs, and recommended land uses in the LCP will ultimately be incorporated into the General Plan of each City. For both Seaside and Monterey, the LCP will be adopted as an area plan, and will comprise an element of both Cities' General Plans. As a General Plan Element, the LCP will be used in determining zoning or subdivision consistency when considering individual development proposals. The City of Seaside will amend its Redevelopment Plan to be consistent with the policies of the LCP Land Use Plan. In Monterey, the General Plan and Del Monte Grove Plan will be amended where necessary so as to ensure that they are consistent with the policies of the LCP Land Use Plan. The LCP Land Use Plan will establish land use designations, general development criteria and policies which will regulate development in the Coastal Zone. However, the Plan will not preclude more detailed plans, such as a park master plan, from being developed and adopted separately,
as long as it is consistent with the LCP and the Coastal Act. The implementation of the LCP will require a number of actions. Both Cities will amend their zoning ordinances, zoning districts and development standards to ensure that the policies of this document are implemented. Chapter IV provides a summary of possible implementation actions to be undertaken in the next phase of the LCP.

E. THE ORGANIZATION AND GENERAL GOALS OF THE LAND USE PLAN

The California Coastal Act of 1976 requires local jurisdictions along the California Coast to prepare a Local Coastal Program. The Land Use Plan is a key element of this Local Coastal Program. Land Use Plan is defined in the California Coastal Act of 1976 as follows:

30108.5 "Land use plan" means the relevant portions of a local government's general plan, which are sufficiently detailed to indicate the kinds, location, and intensity of land uses, the applicable resource protection and development policies and, where necessary, a listing of implementing actions.

This Land Use Plan is presented in three sections. The first section, Chapter II, presents policies to protect natural coastal resources. The second section, Chapter III, presents policies to provide for public and coastal-related use and access that are consistent with the natural coastal resource policies in the first chapter. The third section, Chapter IV, sets land use and development policies that are consistent with and will support the policies presented in the first two chapters.

Figure 1 illustrates the Coastal Zone area which this Land Use Plan addresses. This Coastal Zone area is divided into four subareas. In some cases, in the following three chapters, the policy discussion is specifically directed at an individual subarea. Where policies are not specifically directed, they are intended to apply to the entire Coastal Zone area covered in this Plan. It should be noted that two of the subareas, the Laguna Grande Subarea and the Roberts Lake Subarea, are addressed jointly by the
City of Monterey and the City of Seaside. Two other subareas, the Beach Subarea and the Roberts Avenue Subarea, are addressed separately by the City of Seaside.

At the beginning of the Local Coastal Program planning process, a variety of general statements were made by local citizens. These statements express a desired direction for the Local Coastal Program, and they have been summarized in the general goals listed below. The more specific policies in the three chapters that follow have been developed in response to these general goals, while still remaining consistent with Coastal Act policies. The general goals are stated as follows:

- To encourage public access to the lake and beach shorelines, while minimizing adverse impact on dune and marsh habitats, and ensuring public safety from water run-up hazards.

- To maximize, to the extent feasible, the recreational potential of Laguna Grande, Roberts Lake, and the Beach while, at the same time, preventing damage to or minimizing the loss of major natural habitat areas.

- To preserve and encourage low and moderate income housing opportunities where feasible, safe, and healthy.

- To minimize safety hazards and impacts from natural and man-induced hazards.

- To preserve and enhance coastal vistas, views, and view corridors while recognizing the rights of private property owners and the demands for visitor-serving facilities.

- To minimize dredging and filling unrelated to water quality considerations, while recognizing the recreational needs for open space.
• To provide coastal access, visitor-serving facilities and public improvements within the funding constraints of the public sector.

• To allow each property owner an economic return on land owned.

• To allow land uses which respond to the institutional and natural constraints of the land, and which minimize disturbance of the surrounding land area.

• To preserve and enhance the natural resources, environmental quality, and community character of the coastal zone.

• To enhance the long term fiscal returns to local governments yielded by properties within the coastal zone.

• To promote the development of run-off control measures capable of minimizing the further siltation of Laguna Grande.
II. NATURAL COASTAL RESOURCES

A. NATURAL HABITAT AREAS

The content of this section focuses on preservation and enhancement issues. Public access and use are addressed in Chapter II.

1. COASTAL ACT PROVISIONS

The following sections of the California Coastal Act of 1976 pertain to the preservation and enhancement of natural habitat areas:

30230 Marine resources shall be maintained, enhanced, and where feasible, restored. Special protection shall be given to areas and species of special biological or economic significance. Uses of the marine environment shall be carried out in a manner that will sustain the biological productivity of coastal waters and that will maintain healthy populations of all species of marine organisms adequate for long-term commercial, recreational, scientific, and educational purposes.

30231 The biological productivity and the quality of coastal waters, streams, wetlands, estuaries, and lakes appropriate to maintain optimum populations of marine organisms and for the protection of human health shall be maintained and, where feasible, restored through, among other means, minimizing adverse effects of waste water discharges and entrainment, controlling runoff, preventing depletion of ground water supplies and substantial interface with surface waterflow, encouraging waste water reclamation, maintaining natural vegetation buffer areas that protect riparian habitats, and minimizing alteration of natural streams.

30233 (a) The diking, filling, or dredging of open coastal waters, wetlands, estuaries, and lakes shall be permitted in accordance with other applicable provisions of this division, where there is no feasible less environmentally damaging alternative, and where feasible mitigation measures have been provided to minimize adverse environmental effects. (b) Dredging and spoils disposal shall be planned and carried out to avoid significant disruption to marine and wildlife habitats and water circulation. (c) In addition to the other provisions of this section, diking, filling, or dredging in existing estuaries and wetlands shall maintain or enhance the functional capacity of the wetland or estuary.
Environmentally sensitive habitat areas shall be protected against any significant disruption of habitat values, and only uses dependent on such resources shall be allowed within such areas. Development in areas adjacent to environmentally sensitive habitat areas and parks and recreation areas shall be sited and designed to prevent impacts which would significantly degrade such areas, and shall be compatible with the continuance of such habitat areas.

2. EXISTING CONDITIONS

Existing habitat areas in the Coastal Zone planning area are shown in Figure 3 and described below. It should be noted that several plans have previously been prepared and adopted, for the area. A Regional Park Master Plan has been prepared for Laguna Grande. This Master Plan has been developed jointly by the Cities of Monterey and Seaside and the Monterey Peninsula Regional Park District. Due to the recent receipt of grant funds to begin implementation of the Regional Park Master Plan, certain revisions have been made to said Plan. These changes recognize the existence of both valuable marsh and riparian vegetation. The City of Seaside has prepared improvement plans for Roberts Lake and these plans are summarized in Appendix C. The Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) as part of the 20B Water Quality Management Plan conducted a special study of Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake. The existing conditions of the natural habitat areas identified in Figure 3, and the potential impacts upon them of the preexisting plans and studies are described below.

a. Freshwater marshes exist around both Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake, as shown in Figure 3. Tule growth and cattails contribute to a wetland complex that is rich in wildlife. On the southwest side of Laguna Grande is a muck swamp consisting of dried-up tule growth and cattails. Freshwater marsh areas cover approximately 6.8 acres in Laguna Grande and 1.5 acres in Roberts Lake.

Tule growth provides a nesting ground for many species of water fowl. However, tule growth also contributes nitrogen to the water, adding to pollution problems. The 20B Water Quality Management Plan Case Study
recommends removal from Laguna Grande of the majority of the nitrogen producing tule growth, and improving the quality of that portion to remain.

The Laguna Grande Regional Park Master Plan also calls for removal of most of the tule growth as recommended in the 208 Case Study. The Park Plan shows the muck swamp at the southwest edge of Laguna Grande being dredged. Other changes to the marsh area include filling in the area of the peninsula near Virgin Avenue, on the northwest side of Laguna Grande. Also, a small peninsula of landfill would be provided to form a cove for protection of the boat docking facilities just off Canyon Del Rey Boulevard to the east.

The Park Master Plan provides for the retention of a portion of the freshwater marsh as a natural preserve area. This natural preserve area on the southwest side of Laguna Grande, off English Avenue south of Sequoia Avenue, would retain indigenous flora and fauna. Access to and through the preserve is provided, but is to be designed to minimize disturbance. One suggested form is a boardwalk which would serve as a nature walk. Adjoining uses shown in the Master Plan include a passive activities area to the north (turfed area for sitting, viewing, picnicking), and a supervised activities area to the south (turfed area for day camping).

To address the loss of 6.2 acres of waterfowl habit with the removal of the tule growth from Laguna Grande, the Master Plan Environmental Impact Report calls for the addition of 2.8 acres of higher quality waterfowl habitat in Roberts Lake in the form of loafing islands and additional tule growth.

To balance the need to improve water quality in Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake with the need to protect wetland habitat and the wildlife it supports, selective tule removal and dredging is to be undertaken in line with guidelines identified in a Restoration/Enhancement Management Plan to be developed in the LCP Implementation Plan.
b. Riparian vegetation exists near the Laguna Grande shoreline in the areas shown in Figure 3. This riparian vegetation consists of deciduous trees such as cottonwood and sycamore, and has a thick understory of shrubs, herbaceous growth and fallen limbs.

The Laguna Grande Regional Park Master Plan shows portions of this riparian vegetation remaining as part of the natural preserve area on the southwest side of Laguna Grande, off English Avenue south of Sequoia Avenue. The other riparian vegetation areas around Laguna Grande are indicated to be altered for park improvement, specifically the supervised activities area at the south end of Laguna Grande, and the passive activities and multi-use areas on the west side of Laguna Grande.

c. Coastal strand vegetation consists of the vegetation of sandy beaches and dunes, and exists mainly in the Roberts Lake area and the beach area, as shown in Figure 3. This dune vegetation tends to have thick, fleshy leaves, extensive root systems and prostrate growth. Grasses and low growing shrubs also exist with this dune vegetation. A characteristic of this dune vegetation is that it is very fragile. The construction of Highway 1 has degraded much of the dune vegetation around Roberts Lake and heavy use of the beach area has degraded the habitat in that area. A serious problem created by these degraded habitat conditions is that the loss of vegetation allows dune movement by the wind, which in turn contributes to sedimentation and water quality problems in Roberts Lake and Laguna Grande.

d. Grassland consisting of annual grasses and herbaceous annuals is common around Laguna Grande, and serves as a transition area between the freshwater marsh and riparian areas and the wooded areas, as shown in Figure 3. The Laguna Grande Regional Park Master Plan indicates that most of this grassland would be developed as turfed play areas. The City of Monterey has received Coastal Commission approval for a multi-use play area covering the grassland area south of Montecito Avenue, and has proceeded with its development as part of the Laguna Grande Regional Park.
e. The Coast Live Oak area consists of broadleaf evergreen oak trees with an understory of herbaceous annuals. These coastal oak trees climb the steep slopes at the south end of Laguna Grande, primarily on the Seaside, and serve as a habitat for area wildlife. The Laguna Grande Regional Park Master Plan retains these areas of coastal oaks in their existing natural state.

f. Eucalyptus woodlands exist mainly on southeast side of Laguna Grande. Beneath the eucalyptus trees is a sparse understory of herbaceous annuals. Compared with native trees, these eucalyptus are of low habitat value to wildlife. A small church presently exists among the eucalyptus trees, and both the church and trees are shown to be retained in the Laguna Grande Regional Park Master Plan. The Master Plan also proposes the development of a tot lot and restrooms among these eucalyptus trees.

g. Disturbed habitat makes up the remainder of the land habitat in this Coastal Zone Planning area. Disturbed habitat includes areas which have been significantly disrupted by human activities, such as the construction of buildings, roadways, and parking areas, the movement of vehicles and foot traffic, the cultivation of gardens, and the placement of landfill.

h. The Laguna Grande water surface presently covers 12 acres. Laguna Grande is significantly polluted, but it does support some species of warm water fish. The 208 Water Quality Management Plan contains a number of recommendations for improving the water quality of Laguna Grande, including dredging, sealing the bottom, and installing aeration equipment. The Laguna Grande Regional Park Master Plan calls for fishing and non-motorized boats in Laguna Grande.

i. Roberts Lake is also significantly polluted and the 208 Water Quality Management Plan recommends improvements similar to those defined for Laguna Grande. Roberts Lake is presently a very popular location for model boat racing, and is also a popular habitat for a variety of aquatic birds.
3. LCP POLICIES

The following LCP policies address the preservation and enhancement of the diverse natural habitats in the Coastal Zone planning area.

a. Along the slopes at the south end of Laguna Grande, (shown in Figure 3), retain the area of coastal oaks in its natural state as a habitat for area wildlife.

b. On the southwest side of Laguna Grande, off English Avenue south of Sequoia Avenue, (shown in Figure 3), retain the portion of the freshwater marsh as a natural preserve area exhibiting indigenous flora and fauna.

c. Retain the portion of the riparian vegetation near the Laguna Grande shoreline as part of the natural preserve area on the southwest side of Laguna Grande, off English Avenue south of Sequoia Avenue (see also Policy b. above).

d. Proposed filling and dredging of Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake (see also Policies a.1, b.1, b.2 and b.4 under section D.3 of Chapter II, and Policy d.2 under section B.3 of Chapter IV), are to be undertaken in a restorative manner consistent with the enhancement of existing habitat values.

e. Shoreline improvements to both Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake are to be designed so as to encourage use by wildlife (e.g. low, sloping bank).

f. For the coastal strand vegetation areas, require the stabilization of the dunes by planting and maintaining native vegetation as a condition of new development (see also Policy 3, under section B.3.b. of Chapter IV).

g. In the Beach Subarea, development coverage of the dunes area is to be limited to the easterly portion of the area (see also Policy 3, under
section B.3.a. of Chapter IV). The remainder of the dunes area is to be preserved and maintained by the developer as a condition of development. Degraded dune areas shall be restored, and the natural dune habitat managed and protected from damage resulting from human use and access. This maintenance shall include a means of restricting public access to the dunes that does not inhibit public access to the waterfront and which also protects the drainage outlet as it exists from the culvert. If the owner of the property cannot adequately maintain and manage this area, the City of Seaside or other public agency shall enter into an Agreement to perform this service, at the owner's expense.

4. PROPOSED LCP IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS

a. Develop design, management and maintenance guidelines for waterfowl habitat areas proposed to be added to Roberts Lake.

b. Develop use and maintenance guidelines for the natural preserve area proposed as part of the Laguna Grande Regional Park improvements.

c. Develop guidelines for the filling and dredging of Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake.

d. Develop design and maintenance guidelines for shoreline improvement to both Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake.

e. Develop design, use and maintenance guidelines for the stabilization of the dune areas.

Note: All the above Implementation Actions are to be incorporated into a Restoration/Enhancement Management Plan to be developed in the Implementation Phase. (Proposed Implementation Actions under Water Quality are also to be incorporated into this Restoration/Enhancement Management Plan.)
B. COASTAL VISUAL RESOURCES

This section addresses the protection of views to Monterey Bay, and of views to and across Roberts Lake and Laguna Grande.

1. COASTAL ACT PROVISIONS

The following section of the California Coastal Act of 1976 pertains to the protection of coastal views to Monterey Bay, and to and across Roberts Lake and Laguna Grande.

30251 The scenic and visual qualities of coastal areas will be considered and protected as a resource of public importance. Permitted development shall be sited and designed to protect views to and along the ocean and scenic coastal areas, to minimize the alteration of natural land forms, to be visually compatible with the character of surrounding areas, and, where feasible, to restore and enhance visual quality in visually degraded areas. New development in highly scenic areas such as those designated in the California Coastline Preservation and Recreation Plan prepared by the Department of Parks and Recreation and by local government shall be subordinate to the character of its setting.

2. EXISTING CONDITIONS

a. From Highway 1, which is elevated through the study area, one can view Roberts Lake and Laguna Grande to the east and Monterey Bay to the west. These views from Highway 1 allow passersby to experience Roberts Lake, Laguna Grande, and Monterey Bay as an interrelated, although interrupted, ecological system.
b. Views of Roberts Lake and Laguna Grande also presently can be seen from Del Monte Boulevard.

c. On the Monterey side of Laguna Grande where Sequoia and English Avenue meet, there exists an overview point providing sweeping views of Laguna Grande and the dunes in the distance.

d. Significant views to Laguna Grande also exist from Canyon Del Rey Boulevard, specifically the view corridor from Seaside City Hall.

3. LCP POLICIES

The following LCP policies address the preservation and enhancement of existing coastal visual resources while equitably addressing private property rights.

a. Preserve and enhance the coastal overviews from Highway 1 and Del Monte Boulevard to Roberts Lake and Laguna Grande shown in Figure 4 by establishing height limits (see policy a.1. in Development section) and building bulk limits conceptually shown in Figure 4.

b. As part of park improvements proposed for Laguna Grande, provide a viewpoint as shown in Figure 4 where Sequoia and English Avenues meet. Improvements to this viewpoint are to be coordinated by the Regional Park District. This public improvement is to be undertaken as funds identified in the funding program are made available. (Funding program is to be established in the implementation phase – see proposed implementation action on page 19).
c. Preserve and enhance the coastal overviews from Canyon Del Rey to Laguna Grande shown in Figure 4 through the establishment of view corridors conceptually shown by the arrows in Figure 4.

4. PROPOSED LCP IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS

a. Revise Zoning Ordinance to establish sideyard setbacks to preserve and enhance coastal overviews.

b. Develop program for financing public improvements to public viewpoints shown in Figure 4. (Possible means of financing are to include Coastal Conservancy acquisition, development and improvement grants for public accessways.)

C. WATER SUPPLY

This section addresses the management of available water supplies to the area.

1. COASTAL ACT PROVISIONS

The following section of the California Coastal Act of 1976 pertains to water supply.

30254 New or expanded public works facilities shall be designed and limited to accommodate needs generated by development or uses permitted consistent with the provisions of this division; provided, however, that it is the intent of the Legislature that State Highway Route 1 in rural areas of the coastal zone remain a scenic two-lane road. Special districts shall not be formed or expanded except where assessment for and provision of, the service would not induce new development inconsistent with this division. Where existing or planned public works facilities can accommodate only a limited amount of new development, services to coastal-dependent land use, essential public services, and basic industries vital to the economic health of the region, state, or nation, public recreation, commercial recreation, and visitor-serving land uses shall not be precluded by other development.
2. EXISTING CONDITIONS

Existing water supplies will accommodate additional development in the area, but these water supplies cannot be assumed to be unlimited.

a. Water Supply

1) The Coastal Zone planning area is served by the California-American Water Company (Cal/Am). The Public Utilities Commission (PUC) in its order of 8 August 1978 in the matter of Case No. 9530, investigating, among other things, the water available to Cal/Am for service in the Monterey area, found that the maximum total amount of water that can now prudently be produced and delivered by Cal/Am's existing facilities in a normal year is 18,000 acre-feet per year.

2) The PUC regarding Case No. 9530 also noted that Cal/Am has begun procedural work on four new wells in the lower Carmel Valley and a related iron removal plant. The PUC went on to find with this additional supply Cal/Am could produce and deliver 22,000 acre-feet of water annually.

3) The March 1979 Available Water Supply and Demand Report prepared by the Monterey Peninsula Water Management District for the California Coastal Commission found that additional water supply for the Monterey Peninsula could be generated from the following sources: (a) expanded surface supply in the Carmel Valley, (b) imported surface supply, (c) reclaimed wastewater runoff, (d) desalinization and (e) conservation.

b. Water Use-Cal/Am Service Area

1) The PUC in its order of 8 August 1978 in the matter of Case No. 9530, found a reasonable, if not conservative, estimate of the present annual water requirements of existing Cal/Am Monterey Peninsula District customers is 16,565 acre-feet, the normalized usage for 1976.
2) The March 1979 Available Water Supply and Demand Report estimates that demand within the Cal/Am area will be 25,683 acre-feet by the year 2000 and 44,930 acre-feet at full buildout. These estimates are based on each jurisdiction's estimates of potential residential and commercial growth.

3) The Monterey Peninsula Water Management District in a report dated 11 February 1981, titled "Year 2000 Water Projections in the Cal/Am Service Area", based its allocations on a supply of 20,000 acre-feet of water being available at that time.

c. Water Use - City of Monterey

1) Cal/Am's recorded 1976 system delivery to the City of Monterey was 5,352 acre-feet. This 5,352 acre feet figure represents 32.3% of the 1976 16,565 acre-feet normalized use figure for the Cal/Am service area.

(Given the 16,565 acre-feet normalized water use figure for the Cal/Am service area and given the existing 18,000 acre-feet per year production capacity of the Cal/Am system, presently there appears to be 1,435 acre-feet of water per year to serve additional new development in the Cal/Am Service area. Applying the above 32.3% City of Monterey delivery figure to this 1,435 acre-feet of water per year figure, 463.5 acre-feet of water per year would presently appear to be available to serve additional development in the City of Monterey).

(With the four new wells in the Carmel Valley discussed in finding a.2., an additional 4,000 acre-feet per year or a total of 5,435 acre feet of water per year would appear to be available in the future to serve additional new development in the Cal/Am service area. Applying the 32.3% City of Monterey delivery figure to this 5,435 acre-feet of water per year figure, 1,755.5 acre-feet of water per year would appear to be available to serve additional development in the City of Monterey.)
2) The March 1979 Available Water Supply and Demand Report estimated that the Cal/Am water demand within the City of Monterey will be 10,872 acre-feet at full buildout. This 10,872 acre-feet demand figure represents 24.2% of the 44,930 acre-feet full buildout figure discussed in finding b.2. above.

3) The February 1981 report allocates a total of 6,096 acre-feet to the City of Monterey based on estimated demand in the Year 2000, and 6,676 acre-feet based on an extrapolation of 1975 demand. Compared with actual existing consumption in 1979-1980 of 4,300 acre-feet, these allocations would provide an additional supply of 1,796 and 2,376 acre-feet respectively.

d. Water Use - City of Seaside

1) Cal/Am's recorded 1976 system delivery to the City of Seaside was 2,862 acre-feet. This figure represents 14.3% of the 1976 16,565 acre-feet normalized use figure for the Cal/Am service area.

(Given the 16,565 acre-feet normalized water use figure for the Cal/Am service area and given the existing 18,000 acre-feet per year production capacity of the Cal/Am system, there presently appear to be 1,435 acre-feet of water per year to serve additional new development in the Cal/Am service area. Applying the above 14.3% City of Seaside delivery figure to this 1,435 acre-feet of water per year figure, 205 acre-feet of water per year would presently appear to be available to serve additional development in the City of Seaside.)

(With the four new wells in the lower Carmel Valley discussed in finding a.1. an additional 4,000 acre-feet per year or a total of 5,435 acre-feet of water per year would appear to become available to serve additional new development in the Cal/Am service area. Applying the 14.3% City of Seaside delivery figure to this 5,435 acre-feet of water per year figure, 777.2 acre-feet of water per year would appear to be available to serve additional development in the City of Seaside.)
2) The March 1979 Available Water Supply and Demand Report estimated that the Cal/Am water demand within the City of Seaside will be 7,774 acre-feet at full buildout, representing 17.3% of the 44,930 acre-feet full buildout figure discussed in finding b.2. above.

3) The February 1981 report allocates a total of 2,572 acre-feet to the City of Seaside based on estimated demand in the year 2000, or 12.86% of the total volume available, and 2,862 acre-feet (14.31%) based on 1976 demand. Compared with actual existing consumption in 1979-1980 of 2,067 acre-feet, these allocations would provide an additional supply of 505 and 795 acre-feet respectively from Cal/Am. It should be noted this report projects that the City of Seaside will also receive 500 acre-feet from other than Cal/Am sources of supply.

4) As of 1980, approximately 750 residences in the City of Seaside were being served by sources outside of the Cal/Am service area. According to the February, 1981 report, the City of Seaside will receive 500 acre-feet from such sources.

e. Water Use - Coastal Zone Study Area

1) Applying the water use factors shown in Table 1 to existing land uses in the Coastal Zone study area, 12.35 acre-feet per year are presently required to serve the Coastal Zone area.

2) Projected land use intensities for the Coastal Zone area are shown in Table 1. Applying the water use factors shown to these projected land uses, 18.0 additional acre-feet per year will be required to serve this projected new development at full buildout.

f. Water Use - Allocation Ordinances

1) The Monterey Peninsula Water Management District on January 14, 1980 passed to print Ordinance No. 1 which establishes the enabling mechanism to allocate water among local jurisdictions within the District. Ordinance No. 1 defines the process by which new water connections shall be approved or denied. No new water connections will be allowed in a municipal unit which has exceeded its allotment for that water distribution system. Ordinance No. 1 has subsequently been adopted and is now in effect.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visitor-Serving Commercial</th>
<th>Shpg. Cntr. /General Commercial</th>
<th>Heavy Commercial</th>
<th>Residential Units</th>
<th>Park Uses</th>
<th>Total Consumption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hotel, Motel</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 gpd (a/)</td>
<td></td>
<td>50 gpd per 1000 SF</td>
<td>25 gdp per emp.</td>
<td>1 gdp per pets.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Restaurant</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 gpd (b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bar</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 gpd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXISTING USES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intensity of Use</th>
<th>Water Consump., No Conserv.</th>
<th><strong>Water Consump., 25% Conserv.</strong></th>
<th>1400 SF</th>
<th>15 emps</th>
<th>46 units (b/)</th>
<th>11,025</th>
<th>12.349</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>70 gpd</td>
<td>375 gpd</td>
<td>10,580 gpd</td>
<td>8,269</td>
<td>9.262</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FUTURE USES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intensity of Use</th>
<th>Water Consump., No Conserv.</th>
<th><strong>Water Consump., 25% Conserv.</strong></th>
<th>25,400 SF (e/)</th>
<th>45 emps (f/)</th>
<th>400 persons</th>
<th>27,095</th>
<th>30.349</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>7200</td>
<td>5400</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>10,350 gpd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>6250</td>
<td>4688</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>7,762 gpd</td>
<td>20,322</td>
<td>22.763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>25,400 SF (e/)</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>400 persons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

(c) = Gallons per day

(d) = Acre-Feet per year (equal to 325,840 gallons)

(e) = Square Feet of structure area

(a) Assumes 80% occupancy.

(b) Includes 9 cabins in PG&E substation.

(c) Assumes full development if uses designated in Land Use Plan.

(d) Assumed, resulting from water conservation policies.

(e) Assumes 20% site coverage.

(f) Assumes addition of 5 emps in Kolb Ave area, a 15 emps in Roberts Avenue area.
2) The Monterey Peninsula Water Management District on January 14, 1980 adopted Resolution 80-1 which establishes municipal unit allotments. Resolution 80-1 allocates Cal/Am resources based on 1975 water usage in each jurisdiction (system No. 2 in Table No. 2). For water planning purposes, the Water District Board found that 20,000 acre feet of the maximum 22,000 acre feet of water resources available to Cal/Am should be allocated at this time. The Board held 2,000 acre feet of the water resource (10%) in reserve for drought contingency. Resolution 80-1 establishes the District's statement of "fair share" allocation and will be the basis for denial of new connections in municipal units exceeding their allotment when Ordinance No. 1 becomes effective.

9. **Water Use - Existing Water Conservation Policies and Ordinances**

1) The Water Peninsula Water Management District Report to the Coastal Commission also outlines a Water Conservation Ordinance. This Conservation Ordinance incorporates many of the features already adopted by each jurisdiction in 1976 as a result of the water supply problems experienced at that time.

2) The City of Monterey presently has a Water Conservation Ordinance found in the Water Management District report.

3) The City of Seaside has incorporated certain water conservation measures into its new Draft Zoning Ordinance.

3. **LCP POLICIES**

As water supplies on the Monterey Peninsula are limited, policies are needed to ensure that the water demands of development within the Coastal Zone remain within the available water supply constraints. The following policies are to manage water supplies serving the Coastal Zone planning area.

a. Support the allocation procedures of the Monterey Peninsula Water Management Agency and enforce these procedures in the City of Monterey and the City of Seaside.

b. Promote water conservation by requiring the installation of water saving devices (e.g. flow restrictors, low flow toilet tanks, low water use dishwashers, etc.) in all new development.
c. Promote water conservation by requiring non-vegetative or native plant landscaping in all new developments so as to minimize water usage.

4. PROPOSED LCP IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS

a. Develop water conservation ordinances to require water saving devices in new development. (City of Monterey presently has such an ordinance.)

b. Develop ordinances to require landscaping in new development to be non-vegetative or native plant landscaping which minimizes water use.

D. WATER QUALITY

This section addresses the issue of water quality in Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake.

1. COASTAL ACT PROVISIONS

The following section of the California Coastal Act of 1976 pertains to water quality.

30231 The biological productivity and the quality of coastal waters, streams, wetlands, estuaries, and lakes appropriate to maintain optimum populations of marine organisms and for the protection of human health shall be maintained and, where feasible, restored through, among other means, minimizing adverse effects of waste water discharges and entrainment, controlling runoff, preventing depletion of ground water supplies and substantial interface with surface waterflow, encouraging waste water reclamation, maintaining natural vegetation buffer areas that protect riparian habitats, and minimizing alteration of natural streams.

2. EXISTING CONDITIONS

a. As indicated in items h, and i in Section A.2. of Chapter II, both Roberts
Lake and Laguna Grande are significantly polluted.

b. The Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) 208 Water Quality Management Plan Case Study found Laguna Grande's water quality to suffer from siltation, high nutrient levels, low dissolved oxygen, algal blooms and fish kills. Major problem sources were found to be urban run-off, erosion in the watershed, windblown sand from unstabilized sand dunes, and nutrient input from waterfowl. Roberts Lake also suffers from most of these problems.

c. The 208 Case Study also found the extensive tule growth in Laguna Grande contributes nitrogen to the water, adding to pollution problems.

3. LCP POLICIES

a. For Roberts Lake, improve the water quality, thus improving recreational opportunities and preserving and enhancing the habitat value of the lake. To improve the water quality, carry out the following 208 Plan recommendations for Roberts Lake.

1) Dredge Roberts Lake, removing two feet of material.

2) Install aeration equipment to maintain dissolved oxygen levels.

3) Install a stoplog outlet, to make adjustable the invert elevation of the culvert under Roberts Road. This improvement will allow maximum possible water depth and volume in dry seasons without reducing winter flood protection capability.

4) Stabilize dune areas adjacent to Roberts Lake with native vegetation to reduce the natural filling activities caused by aeolian sand and transient dunes (see Policy f. in Natural Habitat Areas section).

b. For Laguna Grande, improve the water quality, thus improving recreational opportunities and preserving and enhancing the habitat value of Laguna
Grande. To improve the water quality, carry out the following 208 Plan recommendation for Laguna Grande.

1) Dredge Laguna Grande, removing four feet of material from the bottom. This dredging is to be undertaken in a restorative manner consistent with the enhancement of existing habitat values.

2) After dredging, apply a bentonite (clay) seal to the bottom of Laguna Grande. This seal is to stop the release of nutrients from the bottom sediments to the water.

3) Install submerged aeration equipment to maintain dissolved oxygen levels in Laguna Grande.

4) Undertake periodic dredging of Laguna Grande to maintain water quality. (Location of sedimentation basin upstream will require less frequent dredging. The Cities of Monterey and Seaside will explore this possibility with other jurisdictions in the watershed).

c. Run-off control and erosion measures will be required as a condition of new development whose drainage is tributary to Laguna Grande. Unbroken, impervious surfaces in the vicinity of Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake shall be minimized.

4. PROPOSED LCP IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS

a. Develop guidelines for the initial dredging of Roberts Lake and Laguna Grande.

b. Develop guidelines for periodic maintenance dredging of Laguna Grande.

c. Develop program for financing water quality improvements to Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake. (Possible means of financing are to include Clean Lakes Program grant, 208 funds, Land and Water Conservation Act funds, and Coastal Bond Act funds.)
d. Develop procedures for the requirement of run-off control measures such as the installation of sediment basins, filters, and sand and grease traps.

e. Develop provisions and procedures to encourage clustering, such as is promoted by the Planned Unit Development process, in order to reduce the impact of surface drainage.

f. Develop an erosion control ordinance.

Note: All the above Implementation Actions are to be incorporated into a Restoration/Enhancement Plan to be developed in the Implementation Phase. (Proposed Implementation Actions under Natural Habitat Areas are also to be incorporated into this Restoration/Enhancement Management Plan.)

E. NATURAL HAZARDS

This section addresses the issues of minimizing risks to life and property and assuring stability and structural integrity.

1. COASTAL ACT PROVISIONS

The following section of the California Coastal Act of 1976 pertains to the protection of life and property.

30253 New development shall:

(1) Minimize risks to life and property in areas of high geologic, flood, and fire hazard.

(2) Assure stability and structural integrity, and neither create nor contribute significantly to erosion, geologic instability, or destruction of the site or surrounding area or in any way require the construction of protective devices that would substantially alter natural landforms along bluffs and cliffs.
2. EXISTING CONDITIONS

a. There are differing opinions on the existence of potentially active fault zones near the site. The USGS issued, in 1974, a "Preliminary Geological Map of the Monterey and Seaside 7.5 Minute Quadrangle, Monterey, California, with Emphasis on Active Faults" indicating an offshore potential fault which roughly aligns with Roberts Lake and Laguna Grande. A recently published Geotechnical Study completed for Monterey County and participating cities by Burkland and Associates indicates a buried fault trace extending through Roberts Lake and Laguna Grande. This potentially active fault is shown in Figure 5.

b. The Zone of Geologic Concern shown in Figure 5 was delineated as a result of a detailed 1981 geologic field investigation to more accurately define the underlying bedrock surface. The study concluded that the risk of fault movement is very low.

c. Filled land areas are also shown in Figure 5, around both Roberts Lake and Laguna Grande. The composition of the soil in these filled areas varies from sand to clay-type soils. The steep, sloped landfill areas at the south end of Laguna Grande are not well compacted and are thus susceptible to landslide and erosion problems. Even when compacted these fills are subject to exaggerated shaking effects during earthquakes.

d. The soil at the westerly edge of Laguna Grande, other than the fill, is Rindge muck, a very poorly drained organic soil with high expansion characteristics.

e. A freshwater marsh currently exists at the southwest corner of Laguna Grande and presents two planning problems: 1) quicksand, which could be a problem to unsuspecting persons in the area; and 2) the dead, dried vegetation which exists in the freshwater marsh presents a potential fire hazard. The area is virtually inaccessible to fire fighting vehicles.
f. Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake lie within a potential flood zone.
A 100-year storm is projected to raise the water level of Laguna Grande
from eight feet above sea level to 12 feet. Portions of the proposed park
would be inundated, and are shown in Figure 6.

3. LCP POLICIES

Although it is not possible to eliminate dangers due to normal hazards, the
following LCP policies attempt to reduce these hazards to acceptable levels.

a. Construction of structures for human habitation is to be prohibited within
70 feet of the probable centerline of the buried fault trace. Proposed
development is to submit proof of structural integrity commensurate with
the actual extent and degree of hazard posed.

b. In all areas of previous landfill (along Del Monte, Canyon del Rey and
west of Roberts Avenue), studies are to be made to ensure the stability
of fill material prior to any construction.

c. Any future filling of Laguna Grande for the purpose of enhancement or
restoration (see Policy d. in Natural Habitat Areas section) is to be
carried out in accordance with standard engineering practices.

d. Steep dunes and steep slope areas are to be stabilized and maintained to
minimize erosion as a condition of new development.

e. Dredge the muck swamp existing in the southwest corner of Laguna Grande.
In addition to water quality improvements (see Policy b.1. in Water
Quality section), this action will also minimize risks to life and pro-

perty as potential fire and personal safety hazards will be eliminated.

f. In the proposed Laguna Grande Regional Park, no habitable structures are
to be allowed at an elevation lower than 12 feet above sea level.
4. PROPOSED LCP IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS

a. Develop guidelines for required geotechnical studies.

b. Develop guidelines for dredging the muck swamp in Laguna Grande.
III. PUBLIC AND COASTAL RELATED USE AND ACCESS

A. PUBLIC ACCESS

This section addresses opportunities to preserve, provide, and enhance public access to and along the shorelines of Monterey Bay, Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake.

1. COASTAL ACT PROVISIONS

The following sections of the California Coastal Act of 1976 pertain to the preservation, provision and enhancement of public access to the shoreline.

30210 In carrying out the requirement of Section 2 of Article XV of the California Constitution, maximum access, which shall be conspicuously posted, and recreational opportunities shall be provided for all the people consistent with public safety and the need to protect public rights, rights of private owners, and natural resource areas from overuse.

30211 Development shall not interfere with the public's right of access to the sea where acquired through use, or legislative authorization, including, but not limited to, the use of dry sand and rocky coastal beaches to the first line of terrestrial vegetation.

30212 Public access from the nearest public roadway to the shoreline and along the coast shall be provided in new development projects except where (1) it is inconsistent with public safety, military security needs, or the protection of fragile coastal resources, (2) adequate access exists nearby, or (3) agriculture would be adversely affected. Dedicated accessway shall not be required to be opened to public use until a public agency or private association agrees to accept responsibility for maintenance and liability of the accessway.

30500 (a) According to the Commission's LCP Regulations, Section 00042, "The public access component ... may be set forth in a separate plan element or it may be comprised of various plan components that are joined together in a text accompanying the submission of the local coastal program. The public access component shall set forth in detail the kinds and intensity of uses, the reservation of public service capacities for recreation purposes where required pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 30254, and specific geographic areas proposed for direct physical access to coastal water areas as required by Public Resources Code, Section 30210-30224 and 30604(c)."
Every coastal development permit issued for any development between the nearest public road and the sea or the shoreline of any body of water located within the coastal zone shall include a specific finding that such development is in conformity with the public access and public recreation policies of Chapter 3 (commencing with Section 30200).

For the purposes of the above sections, Coastal Commission Interpretive Guidelines define access as follows:

1. **Vertical Access** - A recorded dedication or easement granting to the public the privilege and right to pass and repass over dedicator's real property from a public road to the mean high tide line.

2. **Lateral Access** - A recorded dedication or easement granting to the public the right to pass and repass over dedicator's real property generally parallel to, and up to 25 feet inland from, the mean high tide line, but in no case allowing the public the right to pass nearer than five feet to any living unit on the property.

2. EXISTING CONDITIONS

Examination of Laguna Grande, Roberts Lake and the Beach Subarea shows a diversity of existing and potential access points which provide unique access opportunities for both local residents and visitors.

a. Unimproved public access presently exists to and along the shoreline in the Beach Subarea. The City of Seaside owns an easement that is the extension of Canyon Del Rey Boulevard. Privately-owned lands in the area are neither fenced nor posted, and are used by the public. Limited parking exists in the area around the terminus of Canyon Del Rey Boulevard.

b. Access to and around Roberts Lake is presently unimproved and unrestricted. Only one parcel is privately owned and it is not signed nor fenced. There is one paved parking area for 14 vehicles near the northwestern shore. Along the western shore is an unpaved parking area for about 16 vehicles. While not formally designated, vehicles can now also park along Roberts Avenue.
c. There are numerous unimproved and unrestricted access points to and around Laguna Grande. Some single family homes and commercial developments on the Monterey side do serve to restrict access to Laguna Grande. However, this development does not serve to restrict access around Laguna Grande. A similar situation exists with the commercial development on the Seaside side of Laguna Grande.

d. A Regional Park Master Plan has been prepared for Laguna Grande. The Plan is shown in Appendix B and planned improvements including playfields, parking lots, a perimeter lake trail, and a mid-lake bridge will improve access to Laguna Grande. Several park improvements called for in the Master Plan have received Coastal permits. These permits are also shown in Appendix B.

e. The Del Monte Beach portion of the Beach Subarea has been proposed for acquisition by the State of California for use as a park. The City of Seaside has requested by letter that the State not purchase this portion of Del Monte Beach. The City of Seaside has informed the State that it would prefer to see the area developed for visitor-serving commercial uses which, while protecting the dune habitat and access opportunities, would also serve to enhance economic opportunities in the City of Seaside.

3. LCP POLICIES

The means by which public access to the shoreline is afforded include physical access or visual access, and lateral access or vertical access. Physical access is defined as actual access by the public to the shoreline resource (e.g. pedestrian access to Del Monte Beach and the Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake shorelines). This access may also need to be restricted or controlled in sensitive habitat areas, in hazardous areas, and in areas where such access could result in potential damage to private properties. Visual access to the shoreline and the water is provided from viewpoints and coastal overviews.

Vertical access provides the public with access from the nearest public roadway to the coastline. Lateral access can simply be defined as access along
and parallel to the shoreline. These different types of public access rights can be obtained through easements by agreement, through public ownership or lease, or through easements by prescription.

LCP policies for public access to the Del Monte Beach, Roberts Lake, and Laguna Grande shoreline are listed below and shown in Figure 7.

In reviewing the public access policies discussed below, one should continually keep in mind Section 30212 of the Coastal Act which states that dedicated accessway shall not be required to be opened to public use until a public agency or private association agrees to accept responsibility for its maintenance and liability.

a. Beach Subarea/Del Monte Beach (Access for casual visitors, fishermen, and surfers)

1) Require public access easements and access improvements to Del Monte Beach at a minimum of one point as a condition of new development. At the west end, access improvements are to be an 8 to 10 foot-wide walkway from the terminus of Canyon Del Rey Boulevard to the beach to serve fishermen, casual visitors, and surfers.

2) Require a public access and use easement over the area of Del Monte Beach extending back 20 to 25 feet from the mean high line as a condition of new development.

3) Require improvements to and a public access and use easement over a public viewpoint along the shoreline (a minimum of 200 to 300 square feet) adjoining the public accessway to the beach (see Policy a.1 above) as a condition of new development. The access to this viewpoint is conceptually shown in Figure 7, and the viewpoint is shown in Figure 4.

4) Require improvements to and a public access easement for pedestrians from the terminus of Canyon Del Rey Boulevard as a condition of new development.
b. Roberts Lake (Access for casual visitors and model boat racers)

1) Require improvements to and a public access easement (a minimum width of 8 to 10 feet) along private lands adjoining the shoreline as a condition of new development. Where passing through or near the wildlife habitat area to be established in Roberts Lake, this lateral access is to be designed so as to protect the habitat area.

2) For the City owned parcels around Roberts Lake, develop pedestrian access (a minimum width of 10 feet) along lands adjoining the shoreline. Where passing through or near the wildlife habitat area to be established in Roberts Lake, this lateral access is to be designed so as to protect the habitat area.

3) At two to three points on the City owned parcels around Roberts Lake, develop accessways (a minimum width of 8 to 10 feet) from Roberts Avenue to the lateral access trail (see above Policy b.2.).

4) Develop pedestrian rest and picnic areas on City owned lands as shown in Appendix C.

5) Develop the Southern Pacific Railroad right-of-way as part of the proposed transportation corridor (see Policy e. in Parking and Circulation section).

c. Laguna Grande (Access for casual visitors and park users)

1) Require improvements to and a public access easement (a minimum width of 10 feet) along lands adjoining Laguna Grande as a condition of development. For the publicly owned parcels around Laguna Grande, develop pedestrian access (a minimum width of 10 feet) along lands adjoining Laguna Grande. Where feasible, this lateral access is
to be set back a minimum of 10 feet from the inland extent of emergent wetland vegetation. Where passing through or near the wildlife habitat area to be established in Laguna Grande (see Policies b. and c. in Natural Habitat Areas Section), this lateral access is to be designed so as to protect the habitat area.

2) Require public access easements and access improvements (a minimum width of 10 feet) to the lateral access trail (see above Policy c.1.) from the public right-of-way as a condition of new development. These access provisions are shown in Figure 7.

3) At five points on the Monterey side, and at three points on the Seaside side, on the publicly owned parcels around Laguna Grande, develop accessways (a minimum width of 10 feet) from the public right-of-way to the lateral access trail (see above Policy c.1.).

4) Develop the pedestrian/bikeway (a minimum width of 10 feet) shown in Figure 7. Where feasible, said trail shall be set back a minimum of 10 feet as measured from the inland extent of emergent wetland vegetation.

d. Overall Access to the Coastal Zone Planning Area

1) Install access signs at access points shown in Figure 7.

2) Provide support parking for coastal access points (see policies in Parking and Circulation section).

4. PROPOSED LCP IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS

a. Develop access signing program.

b. Revise Zoning Ordinance and development procedures to establish access improvements, easements, and dedications.
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c. Develop design guidelines for access improvements.

d. Develop a program for financing access improvements. (Possible means of financing are to include State Land and Water Conservation Grant Fund Program funds, Coastal Conservancy acquisition, development and improvement grants for public accessways, and potential Coastal Bond Act funds.)

B. PUBLIC RECREATION

This section focuses on recreational opportunities in this Coastal Zone planning area.

1. COASTAL ACT PROVISIONS

The following sections of the California Coastal Act of 1976 pertain to the protection, enhancement, and provision of recreational opportunities:

30212.5 Wherever appropriate and feasible, public facilities including parking areas or facilities, shall be distributed throughout an area so as to mitigate against impacts — social and otherwise — of overcrowding or overuse by the public of any single area.

30213 Lower cost visitor and recreational facilities shall be protected, encouraged, and, where feasible, provided. Developments providing public recreational opportunities are preferred.

30220 Coastal areas suited for water-oriented recreational activities that cannot readily be provided at inland water areas shall be protected for such uses.

30221 Oceanfront land suitable for recreational uses shall be protected for recreational use and development unless present and foreseeable future demand for public or commercial recreational activities that could be accommodated on the property is already adequately provided for the area.

30224 Increased recreational boating use of coastal waters shall be encouraged in accordance with this division by developing dry storage areas, increasing public launch facilities, providing additional berthing space in existing harbors, limiting non-water
dependent land uses that congest access corridors and preclude boating support facilities, providing harbors of refuge, and providing for new boating facilities in natural harbors.

Existing commercial fishing and recreational boating harbor space shall not be reduced unless the demand for those facilities no longer exists or adequate substitute space has been provided.

2. EXISTING CONDITIONS

a. Present recreational activities in the Beach Subarea include walking, jogging, surf fishing, and surfing. The Beach Subarea consists of a section of 500 lineal feet of Del Monte Beach, which extends in its entirety approximately 3 miles from Wharf No. 2 in Monterey through Seaside to Sand City and the Port Ord Military Reservation.

b. The primary recreational use of Roberts Lake is for model boat racing. Viewing and feeding the ducks in the lake are also popular activities in this location.

c. The City of Seaside has plans to improve the recreational facilities at Roberts Lake. Park development plans are shown in Appendix C, and provide for toilet facilities, picnic tables, and additional parking.

d. The Southern Pacific Railroad (SPRR) right-of-way which passes through the planning area is a portion of a section of the right-of-way which has been approved for abandonment. This section runs west from Contra Costa Street in the City of Seaside through Monterey to the end of the line in the Asilomar area of Pacific Grove and Pebble Beach. This abandonment is to take effect by the end of 1981.

The City of Seaside and City of Monterey have received a grant of $2,961,000 from the State Transportation Commission to purchase the portion of the right-of-way west from Contra Costa Street in The City of Seaside to Figueroa Street in downtown Monterey. Use of the right-of-way is proposed by the City of Seaside and the City of Monterey as a transportation corridor for possible future rail passenger service (as part of a link to San Francisco) and for extension of the recreational trail which is proposed to run west from Figueroa Street, through
Pacific Grove to the Asilomar Conference Ground and Beach area.

An appraisal of the value has recently been completed by the City of Seaside and the City of Monterey for the portion of the SPPR right-of-way between Contra Costa Street in the City of Seaside and Figueroa Street in downtown Monterey (of which the portion of the right-of-way in the Laguna Grande Segment is a part). The two Cities are now in preliminary negotiations with Southern Pacific for purchase of the right-of-way.

e. Laguna Grande is basically unimproved and recreational activities are limited to walking, bird watching, and "adventuresome exploration" by neighborhood children.

f. A Regional Park Master Plan has been prepared for Laguna Grande. The Plan is shown in Appendix B. Proposed for the Seaside portion of Laguna Grande are play areas, picnic areas, boat rentals and an amphitheater. On the Monterey side, two elements of the Regional Park Plan have been approved by the Coastal Commission and developed by the City of Monterey. These two park elements are the multi-use play area and playfield south of Montecito Avenue. Still to be developed on the Monterey side are a fishing pier and a natural preserve area. A mid-lake bridge linking a lake perimeter trail is shown in the Regional Park Plan and has been approved in concept by the Regional Coastal Commission.

3. LCP POLICIES

The LCP policies discussed below represent improvements proposed to enhance recreational opportunities in this Coastal Zone planning area. Specifically addressed are recreational opportunities in the Del Monte Beach, Roberts Lake, and Laguna Grande Areas.

a. Beach Subarea/ Del Monte Beach

1) Provide access to Del Monte Beach as discussed in the Public Access section (see Policies a.1), a.2, a.3), and a.4) under Public Access).
b. Roberts Lake

1) Provide access to and around Roberts Lake as discussed in the Public Access section (see Policies b.1., b.2., and b.3. under Public Access).

2) To support model boat racing and casual visitor activity at Roberts Lake, the City of Seaside is to coordinate the provision of restrooms and picnic areas on the City owned land, on the northwest side of the lake as shown in Appendix C.

3) Acquire and develop the Southern Pacific Railroad right-of-way transportation corridor, to be used in part as a recreational trail (see Policy b.5. under Public Access).

4) Use of the south end of Roberts Lake by wildlife shall continue to be provided for by the maintenance of a float line.

C. Laguna Grande

1) Provide access to and around Laguna Grande as discussed in the Public Access section (see Policies c.1., c.2., c.3., and c.4. under Public Access).

2) To provide for water use activities in Laguna Grande, (i.e. non-power boating, fishing, and flycasting), the Monterey Peninsula Regional Park District is to coordinate the provision of the fishing/flycasting pier and paddle boat concession office and docks shown in Appendix B. The boat docks are to serve approximately 10 paddle boats. A small peninsula of landfill is to be provided to form a cove for protection of these boat docking facilities.

3) On a site of approximately three acres off Canyon Del Rey Boulevard, the Monterey Peninsula Regional Park District is to coordinate the provision of a group picnic area. This area shown in Appendix B is to accommodate approximately 50 picnic tables and one large group barbecue pit and several smaller pits.
4) To provide facilities for younger children (to six years of age), the Monterey Peninsula Regional Park District is to coordinate the provision of one tot-lot on the Seaside side of Laguna Grande (to supplement the tot-lot already developed on the Monterey side) as shown in Appendix B. Each tot lot is approximately 1500 square feet in area.

5) To provide for the more active play activities of older children (e.g. touch football, soccer, softball, frisbee and kite flying), the Monterey Peninsula Regional Park District is to coordinate the provision of a multi-use play area on the Seaside side of Laguna Grande.

6) To provide for passive activities (e.g. sitting, viewing, reading, etc.), the Monterey Peninsula Regional Park District is to coordinate the provision of a turfed area off English Avenue on the City of Monterey side of Laguna Grande.

7) On the slope off Fremont Boulevard at Canyon Del Rey Boulevard, the Monterey Peninsula Regional Park District is to coordinate the provision of a group seating area with some 200 seats to serve organized groups including outdoor classes. At the foot of the group seating area and across the channel, a supervised activity area comprised of a turf area to serve supervised day camping and other supervised activities is to be provided. A pedestrian bridge is to connect the group seating and supervised activity areas.

8) The area between the supervised activity area and the passive activity area is to be retained as a natural preserve with indigenous flora and fauna retained. Access to and through this preserve is to be limited to the pedestrian trail that is to be developed around Laguna Grande. The trail which is to accommodate pedestrians and bikes is to be designed to minimize disturbance of the natural preserve, possibly in the form of a boardwalk supported on piles that would bridge the natural terrain.
9) To provide for continuous access around Laguna Grande, the City of Seaside is to coordinate the provision of a pedestrian/bike bridge crossing the channel at Del Monte Boulevard. Routing of this improvement shall be designed so as to minimize disturbance of sensitive habitat areas.

10) To support the recreational activities proposed for the Laguna Grande Regional Park, the Park District is to coordinate the provision of restrooms and support parking (see policies in Parking and Circulation section).

11) All recreational areas along Laguna Grande shall, where feasible, be set back a minimum of 35 feet from the emergent wetlands vegetation.

4. PROPOSED LCP IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS

a. Develop maintenance programs for City and Park District improvements.

b. Develop design guidelines for public recreation improvements discussed in this section.

c. Develop a program for financing and phasing public recreation improvements discussed in this section. (Possible means of financing are to include State Land and Water Conservation Grant Fund Program funds, and potential Coastal Bond Act funds.)
IV. LAND USE AND DEVELOPMENT IN THE COASTAL ZONE

A. LAND USE

This section focuses on the integration of previous findings and policies, and an analysis of land use constraints and opportunities in this Coastal Zone planning area.

1. COASTAL ACT PROVISIONS

The following sections of the California Coastal Act of 1976 pertain to land use in the Coastal Zone.

30213 Lower cost visitor and recreational facilities and housing opportunities for persons of low and moderate income shall be protected, encouraged, and, where feasible, provided. Developments providing public recreational opportunities are preferred. New housing in the coastal zone shall be developed in conformity with standards, policies, and goals of local housing elements adopted in accordance with the requirements of subdivision (c) of Section 65302 of the Government Code.

30221 Oceanfront land suitable for recreational use shall be protected for recreational use and development unless present and foreseeable future demand for public or commercial recreational activities that could be accommodated on the property is already adequately provided for in the area.

30222 The use of private lands suitable for visitor-serving commercial recreational facilities designed to enhance public opportunities for coastal recreation shall have priority over private residential, general industrial, or general commercial development, but not over agricultural or coastal-dependent industry.

30223 Upland areas necessary to support coastal recreational uses shall be reserved for such uses, where feasible.
2. EXISTING CONDITIONS

a. The Beach Subarea lies entirely in the City of Seaside and is somewhat isolated from the rest of Seaside by Highway 1. The area is presently vacant and at one time was being considered for purchase by the State Public Works Board for use as a park. However, the City of Seaside wrote a letter to the State Public Works Board asking that it not acquire any land here as the City believes that Seaside would be better served if this area were used for visitor-serving commercial purposes. This action was predicated on the fact that Seaside's adopted General Plan shows this area as designated for visitor-serving commercial use.

b. The Roberts Lake Subarea lies in both the City of Monterey and the City of Seaside. The parcels between Roberts Avenue and Highway 1 lie in the City of Monterey and are presently vacant.

With the exception of one parcel at the southeast corner of Roberts Lake, the City of Seaside owns in fee title all of the area between the Southern Pacific right-of-way and Roberts Avenue. As discussed in section 2.c. in the Public Recreation section of Chapter III, this area is presently used for recreation purposes and the City of Seaside plans to improve recreational facilities in the area. The one parcel at the southeast corner is vacant, with the exception of a small unused structure.

c. The Southern Pacific right-of-way has recently been abandoned and the Cities of Seaside and Monterey are working to acquire the right-of-way as a transportation corridor for recreational and other purposes (refer to information on existing conditions of the right-of-way presented on page 43, in Public Recreation section).

d. The area on the west side of Laguna Grande lies primarily in the City of Monterey. The vacant parcels along the shoreline are either already publicly owned or are proposed for acquisition as part of the Laguna Grande Regional Park discussed in section 2.f. in the Public Recreation section of Chapter III. Single family dwellings are the primary use in
the remainder of this area with several warehouse uses existing at the southern corner of the area.

e. Revisions to the Coastal Zone boundary have resulted in the retention in the Zone of those portions of the City of Seaside's redevelopment area which are located within 125 feet of the shoreline of Laguna Grande and within 100 feet of the channel connecting Laguna Grande to Roberts Lake. Much of this land is presently vacant. City of Seaside redevelopment plans show this area to be used primarily for visitor-serving commercial uses.

3. LCP POLICIES

The LCP policies required to integrate previous conditions and policies and their implications for land use are described below and are reflected in the Proposed Land Use Plan shown in Figure 8. However, since land use regulations vary somewhat between Monterey and Seaside, the following uses are intended to represent a general, rather than a specific, overview of permitted uses.

a. Visitor-Serving Commercial Uses

Principal permitted visitor-serving commercial uses are to include hotels/motels (including accessory beauty shops, health spas, gift shops and travel agencies), food service establishments, and recreation related commercial uses.

b. Shopping Center/General Commercial Uses

Principal permitted shopping center/general commercial uses are to include furniture and home improvement stores, restaurants, food markets, general merchandise stores, financial institutions, and administrative and professional offices.

c. Heavy Commercial Uses

Principal permitted heavy commercial uses are to include automotive accessory stores, auto repair shops, gasoline stations, printing and
publishing firms, wholesale stores, light manufacturing, utility substations, and warehousing.

d. **Single Family and Multi-Family Residential Uses**

The areas presently designated for single family and multi-family uses on the Monterey side of Laguna Grande are designated to continue in such uses.

e. **Open Space Uses**

Open space uses to protect significant natural habitat are provided for in the areas shown in the Land Use Plan. These public use areas include the sandy beach, accessways, and parks which are publicly owned or over which access easements are to be required as a condition of development.

f. **Transportation Corridor**

The Southern Pacific Railroad right-of-way is shown as a transportation corridor. Uses of this corridor are to include in addition to a possible tram route, recreational trail uses such as hiking, jogging and biking.

4. **PROPOSED LCP IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS**

a. Zoning Ordinance revisions to define and implement land use policies.

b. Use guidelines for conditional uses to define and implement land use policies.

c. Continued coordination with other governmental agencies (e.g. Department of Fish and Game, Monterey Peninsula Regional Park District, AMBAG, etc.) to implement, and refine where necessary, land use policies.
B. DEVELOPMENT

This section focuses on the location and intensity of new development that will respect and be coordinated with the natural resources, visual resources and support systems (i.e. circulation, water, parking, accessways).

1. COASTAL ACT PROVISIONS

The following sections of the California Coastal Act of 1976 pertain to the location and intensity of new development.

30244 Where development would adversely impact archaeological or paleontological resources as identified by the State Historic Preservation Officer, reasonable mitigation measures should be required.

03250 (a) New development, except as otherwise provided in this division, shall be located within, contiguous with, or in close proximity to, existing developed areas able to accommodate it or, where such areas are not able to accommodate it, in other areas with adequate public services and where it would not have significant adverse effects, either individually or cumulatively, on coastal resources. In addition, land divisions, other than leases for agricultural uses, outside existing developed areas shall be permitted only where 50 percent of the usable parcels in the area have been developed and the created parcels would be no smaller than the average size of surrounding parcels.

30252 The location and amount of new development should maintain and enhance public access to the coast by (1) facilitating the provision or extension of transit service, (2) providing commercial facilities within or adjoining residential development or in other areas that will minimize the use of coastal access roads, (3) providing nonautomobile circulation within the development, (4) providing adequate parking facilities or providing substitute means of serving the development with public transportation, (5) assuring the potential for public transit for high intensity uses such as high-rise office buildings, and by (6) assuring that the recreational needs of new residents will not overload nearby coastal recreation areas by correlating the amount of development with local park acquisition and development plans with the provision of on-site recreational facilities to serve the new development.
Coastal-dependent development shall have priority over other developments on or near the shoreline, except as provided elsewhere in this division coastal-dependent development shall not be sited in a wetland.

2. EXISTING CONDITIONS

a. The Beach area, Roberts Lake, and Laguna Grande are coastal resources which possess both habitat and recreational values that have both local and state-wide significance.

b. The Coastal Visual Resources section (II. B) has identified the existence of several locations from which significant views can be obtained both of the area itself and of the surrounding coastal areas.

c. There presently exist a number of vacant parcels in the area that represent important opportunities for public and private development which could enhance the visitor-serving amenities of the area while reinforcing the natural habitat areas found in the study area.

d. This Coastal Zone area is within an already urbanized area having numerous potential sites for coastal recreation, and has potential public works capacity to accommodate increases in both visitor-serving commercial and public uses.

e. Environmental, public use, and visual considerations pose important considerations for private development in the Coastal Zone area.

3. LCP POLICIES

a. Beach Subarea

1) To protect views to Monterey Bay and the dunes area, development on Del Monte Beach is to be directed to the area shown in Figure 8. Further, all new development shall occur primarily in disturbed habitat areas and shall specifically relate to the capacity of the site to accommodate large scale development. In no instance shall a structure be permitted to exceed six stories in height.
2) All access improvements outlined in the Public Access section are to be carried out as a condition of development.

3) As much of the undeveloped portions of the dunes area as possible are to be preserved, as well as maintained by the developer as a condition of development (see Policy g. in Natural Habitat Access section).

b. Roberts Lake Subarea

1) To protect views to Roberts Lake and Laguna Grande, structural development in the Roberts Lake area is to be limited to the areas shown in Figure 8. Building height is not to exceed 25 feet above Roberts Avenue.

2) All access improvements outlined in the Public Access section are to be carried out as a condition of development.

3) The dunes area around Roberts Lake is to be stabilized and maintained as a condition of new development (see Policy f. in Natural Habitat Area section).

c. Laguna Grande Subarea

1) To protect views to Laguna Grande, and Roberts Lake, and to encourage development that is compatible with the proposed Regional Park, structural development is to be clustered and directed to the areas conceptually shown in Figure 8. Further, within the City of Seaside, building height is to be limited to six stories or 72 feet for all new commercial land uses. For the City of Monterey portion of the Coastal Zone around Laguna Grande, the building height for commercial structures is to be limited to 35 feet. For residential structures, building height is to be limited to 30 feet. Wherever possible, construction of new commercial and/or residential buildings near the channel within this area of the Coastal Zone is to be avoided. However, such improvements as parking lots and recreational amenities will not be restricted.

2) All access improvements outlined in the Public Access section are to be carried out as a condition of development.
d. Overall Development in the Coastal Zone Area

1) The design of all new development is to be compatible with surrounding development as determined by the appropriate Architecture Review Committee.

2) Reasonable mitigations are to be required as a condition of development where it would adversely impact any archaeological or paleontological resources as identified by the State Historic Preservation Officer.

3) New development is to be approved only where available supplies of water, parking, and circulation capacities are shown to exist. (See policies under Parking and Circulation, and Water Supply sections.)

4) Each development shall be required to demonstrate compliance with the Land Use Plan policies applicable to the particular project under consideration.

4. PROPOSED LCP IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS

a. Zoning Ordinance revisions to establish maximum heights, sightlines, and building siting criteria and standards.

b. Develop architectural review guidelines for the design of new developments.

C. HOUSING

This section focuses on protection, encouragement, and provision where feasible of housing opportunities, especially those for low and moderate income persons.
1. COASTAL ACT PROVISIONS

The following section of the California Coastal Act of 1976 pertains to the protection of housing opportunities.

30213 "Lower cost visitor and recreational facilities and housing opportunities for persons of low and moderate income shall be protected, encouraged, and, where feasible, provided. Developments providing public recreational opportunities are preferred. New housing in the coastal zone shall be developed in conformity with the standards, policies, and goals of local housing elements adopted in accordance with the requirements subdivision (c) of Section 65302 of the Government Code.

The Revised Coastal Commission Local Coastal Program Manual Section on Housing lists the following measures which should be considered in implementing the housing mandates of Section 30213.

- "Protection". The locality shall provide for the maintenance and preservation of the present housing supply for low and moderate income persons. Where low and moderate cost units are demolished, they should be replaced one-for-one within or in close proximity to the coastal zone. Where units are endangered by blight and delapidation, the locality should consider establishing a rehabilitation program using Marks-Foran bonds, Community Development Block Grant funds, California Housing Finance Agency programs or Section 8 substantial rehabilitation projects to keep units available to low and moderate income households. The Department of Housing and Community Development will assist, on request, in developing appropriate programs and strategies.

- "Encouragement". The locality shall provide an environment that is responsive to the housing needs of low and moderate income households and hospitable to private sector efforts to meet such needs. The locality shall strive to remove constraints to housing opportunity and shall seek to expand such opportunities through the use of appropriate public powers. Such actions may include but are not limited to:
  - application for federal and state funding (i.e. CDBG, Section 8, Section 502, and other assisted housing programs)
  - placement of Article 34 referendum on the ballot
  - zoning for multifamily housing
identification of suitable sites and/or solicitation of sponsors to take advantage of assisted housing construction programs.

formation of or affiliation with a housing authority

land banking

fostering housing cooperatives

write-down to make assisted new housing economically viable

other local concessions and incentives

Localities should specify the number of units approved, but not yet constructed, under Article XXXIV referenda. Localities should also inventory all government owned land which is suitable for residential uses and show how this land or proceeds from its sale could be used for assisted housing under HUD Section 8 or 235 or CHFA programs. Also, areas should be designated which are appropriate for inclusionary-incentive zoning where density bonuses and parking requirement reductions can be implemented for assisted housing.

"Provision where feasible" of low and moderate income housing requires a good faith diligent effort on an on-going basis to expand housing opportunities for low and moderate income households through the use of appropriate public powers. Such activities may include but are not limited to application for state and federal funds, use of redevelopment options, and the use of Marks-Foran and SB 99 bond authority. Local governments should provide an analysis of resource protection and utility capacity constraints on housing opportunities. Equitable development phasing and/or allotment systems for residential development should provide for low and moderate income housing opportunities.

Housing opportunities for low and moderate income persons are defined in the Local Coastal Program Manual Section on Housing as follows:

A "very low income family" is a family whose income does not exceed 50 percent of the median income for the area, as determined by HUD with adjustments for smaller and larger families.

A "low income family" is a family whose income does not exceed 80 percent of the median income for the area, as determined by HUD with adjustments for smaller or larger families, except that income limits higher or lower than 80 percent may be established on the basis of its findings that such variations are necessary because of the prevailing levels of construction costs, usually high or low incomes, or other factors.
A "moderate income family" is a family whose income does not exceed 120 percent of the median income for the area, as determined by HUD with adjustments for smaller and larger families.

For purposes of this section, "family" includes an elderly, handicapped, disabled, or displaced person and the remaining member of a tenant family as defined in Section 201 (a) of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974.

A generally accepted definition of affordable housing is that for which costs do not exceed 25% of the family gross income. Housing costs include rent or mortgage payment, property taxes, insurance, heat and utilities, and maintenance and repairs.

2. EXISTING CONDITIONS

a. Residential uses presently exist in the Del Monte Grove neighborhood lying on the Monterey side of Laguna Grande. There are presently 31 single family residences in the area which in most cases are located on 6,000 square foot lots, and are mostly individually built, owner occupied, less than 20 years old and are structurally sound. The area is zoned single family residential, and only a few vacant lots exist on which new residences could be built. One parcel on the Monterey side of Laguna Grande is zoned for multi-family residential uses. A single family structure used for a commercial business is presently located on this parcel covering approximately 20,000 square feet. A Pacific Gas and Electric sub-station is located within this same area, which contains nine vacation cottages available to Pacific Gas and Electric employees.

b. Six single family dwellings presently exist within the Coastal Zone in the City of Seaside. They are located in the 100 foot buffer strip along the north side of the Southern Pacific Railroad right-of-way east of Canyon del Rey Boulevard. Because of their generally poor structural condition and unappealing location, only minimal rents are justified and thus they do provide low and moderate income housing opportunities. The City of Seaside's recently adopted General Plan designates this area for future Heavy Commercial use.
3. LCP POLICIES

The LCP policies listed below are intended to protect and encourage housing opportunities for low and moderate income persons in the Coastal Zone.

a. Rental housing units for which the rent averaged less than $300 per month for the months of September, October, and November 1976 (1976 Mid-Decade Census survey period) are to be maintained, or replaced on a one-for-one basis on acceptable alternative sites (where necessary) as low and moderate income housing opportunities (as defined by LCP Manual guidelines outlined under Coastal Act Provisions in this section).

b. Owner-occupied housing units are to be replaced on a one-for-one basis where the monthly mortgage payment (based on present appraised value and assuming 20% down payment) is less than present costs representing affordable housing for low and moderate income persons as defined in the LCP Manual.

c. The use of the City of Monterey's Rehabilitation Program and Section 312 funds are to continue to be used as a means of encouraging the rehabilitation of housing opportunities in the City of Monterey's Coastal Zone area.

d. The use of Section 8 rental assistance programs are to continue to be used as a means of encouraging housing opportunities for low and moderate income persons in the Coastal Zone area.

e. One-for-one replacement of the six low and moderate income housing opportunities currently existing in the buffer strip north of the Southern Pacific Railroad right-of-way is to be directed to areas of the City of Seaside having reasonable access to the coast. All replacement units are to be retained for a minimum period of twenty years and shall be provided either through conventional means or through participation in any one of a variety of federally assisted housing programs. The new heavy commercial uses that will occupy the land previously occupied by the displaced housing units are to contribute a fee to the City's land banking fund for the required replacement housing. The one time fee shall be the difference between
the land cost of the subsidized unit and the land cost of a comparable market price unit.

4. PROPOSED LCP IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS

a. Develop procedures for verifying rent or mortgage payments for housing units in the Coastal Zone.

b. Develop procedures for determining a fee to be contributed to the Cities' low/moderate housing and land banking programs in lieu of physical replacement of housing opportunities for low and moderate income persons.

c. Develop procedures for retaining replacement low and moderate income units for a period of 20 years.

D. PARKING AND CIRCULATION

This section focuses on ways to assure adequate parking and circulation capacity to meet average peak demands for parking in the Coastal Zone area.

1. COASTAL ACT PROVISIONS

The following sections of the California Coastal Act of 1976 pertain to the provision of adequate parking and circulation capacity to serve existing and proposed new development.

30212.5 Wherever appropriate and feasible, public facilities, including parking areas or facilities, shall be distributed throughout an area so as to mitigate against the impacts, social and otherwise, of overcrowding or overuse by the public of any single area.

30252 The location and amount of new development should maintain and enhance public access to the coast by (1) facilitating the provision or extension of transit service, (2) providing commercial facilities within or adjoining residential development or in other areas that will minimize the use of coastal access roads, (3) providing nonautomobile circulation within the development, (4) providing adequate parking facilities or providing substitute
means of serving the development with public transportation, (5) assuring the potential for public transit for high intensity uses such as high-rise office buildings, and by (6) assuring that the recreational needs of new residents will not overload nearby coastal recreation areas by correlating the amount of development with local park acquisition and development plans with the provision of onsite recreational facilities to serve the new development.

30254 New or expanded public works facilities shall be designed and limited to accommodate needs generated by development or uses permitted consistent with the provisions of this division; provided, however, that it is the intent of the Legislature that State Highway Route 1 in rural areas of the coastal zone remain a scenic two-lane road. Special districts shall not be formed or expanded except where assessment for, and provision of, the service would not induce new development inconsistent with this division. Where existing or planned public works facilities can accommodate only a limited amount of new development, services to coastal-dependent land use, essential public services, and basic industries vital to the economic health of the region, state, or nation, public recreation, commercial recreation, and visitor-serving land uses shall not be precluded by other development.

2. EXISTING CONDITIONS

a. Parking to serve the Beach Subarea is limited to the area around the terminus of Canyon Del Rey Boulevard. On weekends this limited parking (10 to 15 vehicles) is often fully utilized.

b. The two parking lots at Roberts Lake provide parking for approximately 30 vehicles. While not formally designated, vehicles can now also park along Roberts Avenue. This parking appears adequate to serve existing uses with the exception of those weekends four or five times a year when large regional and national model boat competitions are held on Roberts Lake.

c. Existing uses around Laguna Grande for the most part provide adequate off-street parking. There are numerous vacant parcels around Laguna Grande which provide parking for those visiting Laguna Grande.
d. The proposed Laguna Grande Regional Park is projected to generate a demand for approximately 200 spaces as estimated in the Park Master Plan. Parking to serve the park is planned as follows:

- 50 street spaces along Canyon Del Rey Boulevard.
- 12 space lot adjacent to the Russian Orthodox Church on the east side of Laguna Grande.
- 100 space lot off Fremont Boulevard, and accessible from both Canyon Del Rey Boulevard and Kolb Avenue.
- 6 spaces on the City of Monterey side at Sequoia and English Avenues.
- 20 diagonal spaces off Virgin Avenue between Montecito and Branner Avenues.
- Use of Seaside City Hall and Department of Motor Vehicles parking lots which contain 175 spaces and are virtually vacant on weekends.
- Bicycle parking is proposed to be developed on park property at Canyon Del Rey, Del Monte Boulevard and Montecito Avenue access points.

e. The large shopping center parking lot across from Roberts Lake contains 541 parking spaces and occupancy counts indicate that there are vacant spaces which might serve Roberts Lake during peak use periods.

f. The three major, local thoroughfares in the study area are Fremont Boulevard, Del Monte Boulevard, and Canyon Del Rey Boulevard. Traffic counts for these three thoroughfares and Highway 1 do not indicate any points of significant traffic congestion in the area.
g. The Southern Pacific Railroad right-of-way has recently been abandoned and its use as a transportation corridor is presently being explored by the Cities of Seaside and Monterey.

3. LCP POLICIES

The above findings generally show an adequate supply of parking and adequate circulation capacities to serve existing development in the Coastal Zone area. Only in the Beach Subarea at the terminus of Canyon Del Rey Boulevard does there appear to be a shortage of parking during times of peak use of the beach. Park improvements are proposed for both Roberts Lake and Laguna Grande, and the parking improvements shown appear to be adequate. The policies that follow are to assure continuation of an adequate supply of parking space for projected new development. However, given the fact that two different jurisdictions are represented, the Cities feel it is in their respective best interests to administer separate parking requirements, and there are distinguished below by (M) for City of Monterey and (S) for City of Seaside.

a. Public parking is to be provided for on the lots shown in Figure 9.

b. Existing street spaces in the Beach Subarea at the terminus of Canyon Del Rey Boulevard are to be retained. Space for a passenger loading zone is also to be provided.

c. New developments within the Coastal Zone area are to meet the following parking requirements:

1) For hotels, motels, and motor hotels: (M) one space per hotel unit. (S) one space per hotel unit, plus one space per 5,000 square feet of floor area, and one space for every three employees.

2) For restaurants with table service: (M) one space per 3 restaurant seats. (S) one space per three seats, with a minimum of five spaces.
3) For bars, nightclubs, etc.: (M) one space per 4 seats. (S) one space per 100 square feet of GLA, with a minimum of ten spaces.

4) For visitor-serving retail and general commercial uses: (M) one space per 500 square feet of gross leasable area (GLA). Seaside's regulations are determined on the basis of each individual use (e.g. one space per 400 square feet for Home Improvement Stores).

5) For warehousing, wholesaling, and light manufacturing uses: (M) one space per 1.5 persons employed at any one time in the normal operation of the use. (S) one space per 1,000 square feet of GLA, with a minimum of five spaces.

6) For general public use: (M) and (S) an additional 10 percent of the parking spaces necessary under the above formulae are to be provided for public use in those areas directly abutting or within reasonable proximity to Laguna Grande, Roberts Lake, and the Pacific Ocean. These spaces are to be reserved for public parking and are to be appropriately designated and posted. Use of the other parking spaces by the public during off-peak periods for the use is to be encouraged.

7) For single family residential uses: (M) one space per unit. (S) two covered spaces per dwelling unit for single family detached and two covered spaces per dwelling unit, plus one space for every five units for single family attached units.

8) For multiple family residential uses: (M) for one bedroom units, one space in a carport or garage plus one additional space for each five dwelling units or fraction thereof; for two bedroom units, one space in a carport or garage, plus one-half (1/2) space which may be uncovered; and for three or more bedroom units, one space for each dwelling which shall be in a carport or garage plus one space which may be uncovered. (S) for duplex-triplex-fourplex: 1/4 covered spaces per dwelling unit; multiple family: one covered space per
d. To facilitate circulation movement, develop appropriate directional signing.

e. Develop the Southern Pacific Railroad right-of-way as part of the proposed transportation corridor linking Seaside and downtown Monterey.

f. Support Peninsula area transit within and to the Coastal Zone planning area.

4. PROPOSED LCP IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS

a. Develop a program for financing additional public parking spaces. (Possible means of financing are to include parking rates, assessment district financing, tax increment financing, State Land and Water Conservation Grant Fund Program funds, and potential Coastal Bond Act funds.)

b. Continue to work on the development of a transportation corridor along the Southern Pacific Railroad right-of-way.
APPENDIX A

SIGNIFICANT LCP ACTIONS, PRODUCTS, MEETINGS

(to be attached by the Cities of Seaside
and Monterey at a later date.)
APPENDIX D
RESOLUTION OF CERTIFICATION

CITY OF SEASIDE

440 HARCOURT AVE. SEASIDE, CALIFORNIA 93955 TEL (408) 394-8531

RESOLUTION NO. 81-64

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SEASIDE, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, ADOPTING THE LAND USE PLAN ELEMENT OF THE SEASIDE-MONTEREY LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM

WHEREAS, the California Coastal Act of 1976 requires those jurisdictions within a coastal zone to prepare a Local Coastal Program, and

WHEREAS, the Cities of Seaside and Monterey have agreed to jointly pursue preparation of a Local Coastal Program, and

WHEREAS, through the assistance of the consulting firm of Duncan and Jones, the Land Use Plan Element of the Local Coastal Program, consisting of text and maps, has been prepared, and

WHEREAS, the Land Use Plan Element has been revised so as to reflect several of the suggestions previously made by the Coastal Commission and the Department of Fish and Game, and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission, after holding a series of public hearings on June 10, 1981, June 24, 1981, and July 8, 1981, recommended that the Seaside City Council adopt the Land Use Plan Element of the Seaside-Monterey Local Coastal Program:

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED That the City Council of the City of Seaside, following public hearings held on July 16, 1981, August 6, 1981, August 20, 1981, and September 3, 1981, hereby adopts the Land Use Plan Element of the Seaside-Monterey Local Coastal Program.

PASSED AND ADOPTED at a regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Seaside duly held on the 3rd day of September, 1981, by the following vote:

AYES: COUNCILMEN: Mason, Austin, Houser, and Mayor Olea

NOES: COUNCILMEN: none

ABSENT: COUNCILMEN: Lioi

GLENN OLEA, Mayor

ATTEST:

ROGER L. KEMP, City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

DONALD G. FREEMAN, City Attorney
RESOLUTION OF CERTIFICATION
LAND USE PLAN
LAGUNA GRANDE LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM

RESOLUTION NO. 4517 C.S.

WHEREAS, a public hearing was held by the Council of
the CITY OF MONTEREY on _____________ in the Council Chambers,
City of Monterey, and public comment was received and considered; and

WHEREAS, it is found and determined that the Land Use Plan
of the Local Coastal Program complies with the provisions of the
California Coastal Act of 1976;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY
OF MONTEREY that it hereby certifies that the Land Use Plan of the
Local Coastal Program, including the amendments and addendums thereto,
is intended to be carried out in a manner in full conformity to the
California Coastal Act of 1976 and said plan is hereby adopted.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the City Manager is directed
to submit said plan to the California Coastal Commission with such
additional information as is necessary for their review and approval.

PASSED AND ADOPTED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MONTEREY
this 1st day of December 1981, by the following vote:

AYES: COUNCILMEN: ALBERT, ANDRUS, GOLD
NOES: COUNCILMEN: NONE
ABSENT: COUNCILMEN: HOOKER, FRY

ATTEST:  
/s/ P.L. O'HEARN
PATRICIA L. O'HEARN
City Clerk thereof

APPROVED:
/s/ GERALD T. FRY
Mayor of said City
APPENDIX E
PUBLIC HEARING COMMENTS

EXCERPT FROM MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL
OF THE CITY OF SEASIDE, SEPTEMBER 3, 1981

VII. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. LAND USE PLAN ELEMENT OF SEASIDE'S LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM (RESOLUTION).
Frank Raeon, Chief of Planning, indicated that staff had met with Les Strnad
to review the concerns of the Department of Fish and Game. They have agreed
that there is a need for Management Study. He asked that the Council approve
a restoration and enhancement Management Study. He introduced Les Strnad,
who was in the audience to answer concerns of the Council.

Mayor Olea opened the Public Hearing.

Charles Wilson asked how was it possible for the Naval Postgraduate School
and the City of Monterey to remove tule, but the City of Seaside was unable
to do it.

Les Strnad indicated that is a technical question which will be answered
in the Management Study.

Asa Fleming, 1653 Noche Buena, asked whether the Lake would be treated to
get rid of the mosquitos.

Les Strnad indicated yes, we hope to create a healthy lake.

There being no further comments, Mayor Olea closed the Public Hearing.

Mason/Houser, unanimous for adoption of the Resolution adopting the Land
Use Plan Element of the Seaside - Monterey Coastal Program. (Roll Call Vote:
"Yes" - Mason, Austin, Houser and Mayor Olea. Lioi - Absent.)

PUBLIC HEARINGS

E. CITY OF SEASIDE - Land Use Plan (LUP Element of Seaside's Local Coastal Program) continued from 4/23/80, 5/14/80, 6/11/80, 7/9/80; tabled 8/13/80, and continued from 6/10/81, 6/24/81, allowing necessary revisions thereto.

Mr. Raeon briefly reviewed background of the Land Use Plan Element incorporating existing conditions, Local Coastal Program policies, and proposed implementation actions in compliance with the California Coastal Act of 1976. Highlights of recent public input and Planning Commission discussions were summarized, stressing importance of provisions for public access, improved water quality of Laguna Grande/Roberts Lakes, preservation of wildlife habitat, and land uses and parking standards within the coastal zone areas.

All of these concerns will be addressed in the final LUP Element voted upon by the Council. Mr. Raeon asked the Planning Commission if they had any other areas of concern or would like further clarification of any of the provisions of the Land Use Plan.

Commissioner Sabado asked about improving water quality of Laguna Grande/Roberts Lake with respect to recommendations of Fish and Game. Mr. Raeon stated certain recommendations submitted by Fish and Game suggesting that no dredging of the Lakes be permitted have not been incorporated in the Land Use Plan. However, related thereto, objectives of previously-approved Regional Park Master Plan for Laguna Grande, improvement plans for Roberts Lake, and the 208 Water Quality Management Plan have been identified. Pending certification from the State Coastal Commission, replanting of tule vegetation and/or dredging of the Lakes to achieve water quality improvements goals will be considered, and this will hopefully be coordinated with the Department of Fish and Game as well as the Coastal Commission.

In response to questions of Commissioner Lapham, Mr. Raeon noted that Department of Fish and Game will not object to retention of the float line in Roberts Lake at all times, in order to further enhance the existing wildlife habitat.
Public hearing for additional input declared open. No one wished to further address this matter. Public hearing was declared closed.

Planning Commission Resolution No. 3280 recommending adoption of the Land Use Plan Element of Seaside's Local Coastal Program to City Council was read by Mr. Raeon.

(Motion #10) Moved by Lapham and seconded by Bassett that Planning Commission adopt Resolution No. 3280 as read. Vote was polled; unanimous for approval.
EXEMPLARY FROM MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL
OF THE CITY OF MONTEREY, DECEMBER 1, 1981

Mayor:
   Gerald T. Fry

Council Members:
   Dan Albert
   Alvin Andrus
   Richard Hughett
   Clyde Roberson

City Manager:
   John Dunn

MINUTES OF MEETING:

Following Staff presentation, Mayor Fry opened the Public Hearing. Mr. Les Sternad, California Coastal Commission, Mr. Carl Larson, Sierra Club, and Mr. Paul Dickert, representing Mr. Burton Hancock, property owner, each spoke to various provisions of the Land Use Plan. There being no further speakers, the Hearing was closed. For the record, copies of correspondence received on file in the Office of the City Clerk.

On Motion Hughett, seconded by Andrus and carried by the following Roll Call vote, it was moved the language cited in the Addendum, Page 6, (IV,B, Page 53) be retained as originally proposed and that the words "except where additional height up to a maximum of 35 feet above Roberts Avenue is found by the City's Architecture Review Committee not to impair views from Highway 1 to Laguna Grande and Robers Lake" be deleted.

AYES: COUNCILMEN: ANDRUS, HUGHETT, ROBERSON
NOES: COUNCILMEN: ALBERT, FRY
ABSENT: COUNCILMEN: NONE

Motion of Roberson as seconded by Andrus to have Staff investigate and pursue the acquisition of the privately-owned properties around Roberts Lake for public use was withdrawn.

REGULAR MEETING
MONTEREY CITY COUNCIL
DECEMBER 1, 1981

Council Chambers
Frew Memorial Hall of Records
Monterey, California
7:00 P.M.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Laguna Grande Local Coastal Program
Land Use Plan

Roberts Avenue - Construction not to exceed 25'
On Motion Hughett, seconded by Andrus and carried by the following Roll Call vote, it was moved that the Laguna Grande Local Coastal Program's Land Use Plan be adopted and forwarded to the Coastal Commission and to the City of Seaside with the changes noted, and that the City of Seaside be informed of Monterey's preference 1) that the designated "visitor-serving commercial" strip (buffer zone set up by the Mello legislation) on the Monterey side of Laguna Grande be designated as "Open Space", 2) that parking facilities therein be solely related to the recreational use of the open space, and not to any commercial use, and 3) that the Rappa property near Roberts Lake be restricted to development no higher than 25'.

AYES: COUNCILMEN: ALBERT, ANDRUS, HUGHETT, ROBERSON, FRY

NOES: COUNCILMEN: NONE

ABSENT: COUNCILMEN: NONE

Motion of Roberson as seconded by Hughett that Staff investigate the availability and possible sources of funding for acquisition of the properties in the Roberts Lake area was withdrawn.

On Motion Roberson, seconded by Fry and carried by the following Roll Call vote, it was moved that a Staff Report be prepared indicating possible sources of funding which might be used should the Council want to consider acquisition of Roberts Lakefront properties.

AYES: COUNCILMEN: ALBERT, ANDRUS, HUGHETT, ROBERSON, FRY

NOES: COUNCILMEN: NONE

ABSENT: COUNCILMEN: NONE

RESOLUTION NO. 14,516 C.S. Land Use Plan approved as amended
REVIEW AND RECOMMEND TO CITY COUNCIL

APPLICATION

LAGUNA GRANDE LAND USE PLAN

Review and recommend to City Council Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan for Laguna Grande coastal area.

APPEARANCES

Larry Parent, former Coastal Commissioner; Sam Klenik, property owner; Steve Wilson and Paul Dickert, representing Burton Hancock, property owner;

DISCUSSION

Mr. Norton gave the staff presentation stating that this LUP is a joint effort between the City of Seaside and the City of Monterey. Several drafts have been done over a period of time and amendment made. It has been studied by a citizen's committee and a Planning Commission subcommittee. Mr. Fell emphasized the differences between the heights of buildings to be allowed in Monterey (25'-35') and Seaside (72'). There was discussion about the various sites and uses of the LUP. Mr. Garrod said the Planning Director of Seaside would appreciate the Commission's comments on the plan. Mr. Parent expressed his opinion that the Coastal Commission would reduce the height of buildings and that the City of Monterey need not protest that aspect. Mr. Klenik said the 72' height on the Seaside side of the lake would beneficial for better projects, and no view now exists because of tall electrical lines. Mr. Wilson and Mr. Dickert spoke in opposition to the requirements that all building be done on slopes of less than 14%. Mr. Anastasia asked that a buffer area surrounding the lake be established with no building allowed within that area. Mr. Kelly felt that the sand dune, whether man made in the past, or natural, should be preserved.

MOTION

On motion by Jacoubowsky seconded by Kodama, the following wording was added to Development Policy c.1.: In keeping with the proposed development of the water and wetlands areas of Laguna Grande as a natural resource and recreation area, construction of new commercial and/or residential buildings with 125 feet of Laguna Grande and 100 feet of the channel connecting Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake is to be avoided.

On motion by Wyatt, seconded by Jacoubowsky the following wording was added to Development Policy c.1.: For the City of Monterey portion of the
Coastal Zone around Laguna Grande, the building height for commercial structures is to be limited to 35 feet. For residential structures, building height is to be limited to 30 feet.

On motion by Jacoubowsky, seconded by Pasquinelli, Development Policy b.1. addressing building heights between Highway 1 and Roberts Lake was changed to read as follows: Building height is not to exceed 25 feet above Roberts Avenue except where additional height up to a maximum of 35 feet above Roberts Avenue is found by the City's Architecture Review Committee not to impair views from Highway 1 to Laguna Grande and Roberts Lake. Wording regarding 15% slopes is deleted.

On motion by Jacoubowsky, seconded by Kodama it was recommended to the City Council that the Laguna Grande LUP be adopted as modified, by the following vote:

AYES: 6 COMMISSIONERS: Anastasia, Hudson, Kodama, Jacoubowsky, Pasquinelli, Wyatt.

NOES: 1 COMMISSIONER: Kelly
October 27, 1981

City of Monterey Planning Commission
City Hall
Monterey, Ca. 93940

Re: Burton Hancock property, Roberts Road at Hwy 218
Laguna Grande Land Use Plan

Members of the Planning Commission:

My client is the owner of property within the Laguna Grande study area, Assessor's Parcels 11-424-2 and 11-424-11, bordering Roberts Road, State Highway 1 and Highway 218 in the City of Monterey.

We wish to make the following statements pertaining to this property and the Local Coastal Plan:

1) This site is presently undeveloped. The existing ground topography is not the original configuration, rather the result of substantial regrading which took place during the year 1967 in the process of the construction of the Highway 1 Freeway. After the freeway was completed, an excavation was made in order to obtain sand from the site.

2) Since the existing topography is the result of previous acts of man, not nature, it seems logical that instead of restricting any future development to the relatively flat area left by an equipment operator, a more realistic approach is to view the site with regard to the permitted uses and the appurtenant zoning regulations. Restricting the development to those areas of less than 15% slope (result of haphazard excavation), in favor of a review of the total project scheme does not make sense. Admittedly, if development of areas now sloped does happen, more grading will result, however, a much more efficient project will result, and the overall impact will be predicated on many other factors such as flexibility of building siting, final grading, and landscaping.

3) We concur with the planned zoning of this property. Since this site is surrounded on all sides with road and state highway, a visitor commercial use is certainly warranted, and development will provide a needed facility for the area.

Thank you for this opportunity to express our beliefs.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Steven C. Wilson, Civil Engineer
October 27, 1981

Mr. Haywood Norton
Senior Planner for City
Coastal Planning
City Hall
Monterey, CA 93940

Dear Mr. Norton,

In our meeting with you, Pamela O'Shaughnessy, Esquire, Dennis Pogrebneak, Karl Swanson, A.I.A., and myself, at which time we requested that an inclusion of a 30 foot to 35 foot height limit be considered for the area of Roberts Lake, and you suggested that a 30 foot height limit be proposed. We hope that you will honor our previous request at the meeting this evening, because of the limited exposure we would receive from the highway, from travelers, in either direction, as illustrated by the site studies presented to you at that meeting, and your own on site inspection.

We sincerely appreciate your allowing our last minute in put and understand that you were not aware of our continued legal involvement in property adjacent to Roberts Lake.

In order that we might be kept current with all matters involving this vacinity, please copy us at the following address: 111 Pine Way
Carmel, CA 93923

Thank you for your cooperation and consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

Russ Smelser, Sr.
For PSL Development Co., Inc.
October 27, 1981

City of Monterey City Planning Commission
City Hall,
Monterey, California 93940

Re: Laguna Grande Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan

Dear Commissioners:

The parcel of land on the north side of Roberts Lake which you propose to reserve for visitor-serving uses is owned by me, and I wish to respond to the most recent request, in a letter from Carl Larson of October 19, 1981, to designate this area open space.

First, as Civil Engineer Steve Wilson states in a separate letter, the configuration of sand at this site results from thorough re-grading of the dunes during freeway construction in 1967 and subsequent excavation on the landward side a couple of years later - the work of heavy equipment operators and not any natural process. That freeway and a large hotel complex lie between this site and the coastline. It is no longer part of a "natural seashore ecosystem" and it is not an "environmentally sensitive habitat area" as defined by the Coastal Act.

Second, one of the goals expressed by the Legislature in enacting the Coastal Act was the development of visitor-serving facilities within an orderly balanced overall use of coastal resources so that people will have access to and enjoy this protected coastal zone, and that is the reason the legislators gave this land use priority over all other kinds of development.

It is clear from the limitations in development stipulated by the Planning Commission that this will not be a high density development, certainly nothing remotely like the intensity of development in Cannery Row where 35 foot and 40 foot building heights are common and may reach 60 feet. To maintain a view corridor, the Land Use Plan restricts building at this site to a height of 25 feet above Roberts Road and no further back into the existing sand barrier than to a point where the slope is 15%. As a result more than half of the land that I own will in fact be maintained as open space.

I believe that the visitor-serving designation for this site is particularly appropriate and consistent with the Coastal Act’s stated goal to "maximize public access to and along the coast and maximize public recreational opportunities in the coastal zone consistent with sound resources conservation principles", and I assure the Commission that I will cooperate in that goal.

Very truly yours,

Burton W. Hancock

BURTON W. HANCOCK
CITY OF MONTEREY

LAGUNA GRANDE LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM

CITIZEN'S MEETING MINUTES

October 19, 1981
7:30 P.M.

A Citizen's Meeting to discuss the Laguna Grande Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan Revised Draft was held in the Monterey City Council Chambers, Monterey, California.

STAFF PRESENT: Senior Planner, Haywood Norton

In the audience were Pat Berman of KIDD News, Carl Larson representing the Sierra Club California Coastal Task Force, and eight citizens from the Del Monte Grove Neighborhood.

The meeting was opened by Senior Planner Haywood Norton who outlined the progress made to date on the Laguna Grande Local Coastal Program. Mr. Norton explained that the Seaside City Council had approved the Land Use Plan and was awaiting City of Monterey approval of the Land Use Plan. With approval of the Land Use Plan by both Cities, the Land Use Plan can be forwarded to the California Coastal Commission. Mr. Norton stated that the City of Monterey Planning Commission would be considering the Land Use Plan Revised Draft at its October 27, 1981 meeting. Should the Planning Commission recommend approval of the Land Use Plan at its October 27, 1981 meeting, the Monterey City Council could consider adoption of the Land Use Plan at its November 3 or November 17, 1981 meeting.

Mr. Norton reviewed the land uses provided for in the Revised Draft. For the Monterey side of Laguna Grande, the land uses shown, as in past Drafts, are still basically those land uses shown in the adopted Del Monte Grove Neighborhood Plan and in the adopted Laguna Grande Regional Park Master Plan.

Mr. Norton then explained the significant changes to the earlier Drafts which appear in the Revised Draft. These significant changes are as follows:

1. Earlier Land Use Plan Drafts called for elimination of portions of the riparian and marsh habitat areas in Laguna Grande for the purposes of park and water quality improvements. This habitat was to be replaced in Roberts Lake in the form of loafing islands. The State Department of Fish and Game expressed concern with the proposed extensive elimination of the riparian and marsh habitat area.

The Revised Draft no longer calls for the transfer of habitat area lost in Laguna Grande to Roberts Lake. The Revised Draft now calls for proposed park and water quality improvements to be undertaken in line with a Restoration/Enhancement Management Plan to be developed as part of the Implementation Phase of the
Laguna Grande Local Coastal Program. One significant result of the proposed Management Plan will most likely be that the majority of the existing riparian and marsh habitat areas in the presently unimproved area of the Regional Park between Grant Avenue and Montecito Avenue will be retained and enhanced with all improvements respecting this habitat area. Earlier Drafts showed this area being filled for a turfed play area.

2. Earlier Land Use Plan Drafts, in order to protect views to Laguna Grande and to encourage development that is compatible with the Regional Park, established height limits of 35 feet for commercial uses and a maximum of 2.5 stories not to exceed 30 feet for residential uses.

The Revised Draft as adopted by the City of Seaside for its properties around Laguna Grande, established a height limit of 6 stories or 72 feet for new commercial uses.

3. Earlier Land Use Plan Drafts did not establish specific standards for the setback of improvements from the inland extent of emergent wetland vegetation. The Revised Draft provides for a minimum setback of 10 feet for lateral accessways and 35 feet for recreation areas.

Following Mr. Norton's presentation, citizen's questions and comments regarding the Land Use Plan were entertained. A summary of these questions and comments is as follows:

1. Carl Larson, representing the Sierra Club California Coastal Task Force, commented that it was his understanding that the area of the City of Seaside around Laguna Grande which was not excluded from the Coastal Zone by Assembly Bill 462 was to serve as a buffer zone and no structures were to be developed in this area. Mr. Larson stated that if his understanding was correct, the height limit of 6 stories or 72 feet shown for this buffer zone is inappropriate. Mr. Norton of City staff stated that Les Strand of Coastal Staff had expressed a similar concern in a September 3, 1981 letter to the City of Seaside.

2. Mr. Larson submitted written comments on behalf of the Sierra Club California Coastal Task Force. A copy of Mr. Larson's comments is attached. In summary, the Sierra Club disagrees with the Land Use Plan's designation of the two areas between Roberts Lake and the Freeway for visitor-serving commercial uses. Mr. Norton explained that these parcels were designated as such for the reason that they are in private ownership and funds for public purchase are not available.

3. A number of questions were asked about Phase II of Regional Park Plan on the City of Monterey side of Laguna Grande. Mr. Norton said he would confirm his understanding of the status of Phase II and would report back to the citizens.
Note:

Mr. Norton did meet with the Public Works Department following this citizen's meeting and confirmed the following:

a) Phase II of the Regional Park is going out to bid, but construction is not scheduled to start until after the winter rains. Even if desired, given necessary City contract procedures, construction could not start before early 1982. Phase II construction is not bound to Coastal Commission requirements that construction not take place only during the dry season.

b) Phase II improvements will not include the linking of Virgin Avenue and Branner Avenue.

c) Phase II will not include a tot lot. Also parking improvements are not a part of Phase II.

d) Bathrooms are a part of Phase II and will be a part of the scheduled, upcoming improvements that are going out to bid. (It had been Mr. Norton's thought at the meeting that bathrooms weren't being constructed.)

e) Pedestrian paths in Phase II are to be of decomposed granite like those in Phase I. The bike path, which is in Seaside and is under construction, will have an asphalt surface. While the bike path runs along the Monterey side of Laguna Grande and appears to be in Monterey, it is really in the City of Seaside.

A number of concerns were expressed about speeding traffic in the Del Monte Grove Neighborhood. The possibility of selective stop signs was discussed. Mr. Norton explained that such specifics as stop signs were outside the scope of the Land Use Plan. However, he said he would explore other channels within the City and report back to the citizens regarding his progress.

Mr. Norton of the City staff explained that he would be meeting with the Planning Commission Local Coastal Program Subcommittee on Tuesday, October 20, 1981 and that he would pass along the citizen's comments and concerns to the Subcommittee. Also the Minutes of this meeting would be included in the Subcommittee report on the Land Use Plan to the full Planning Commission when the Commission considered the Land Use Plan at it's October 27, 1981 meeting.

As there was no further discussion, the Meeting was concluded at 9:00 p.m.
re: Laguna Grande Local Coastal Program Land Use Plan, October 19, 1981

In the spirit of the October 13th announcement of this meeting—"...the same land uses adopted...in February 1978..." and "...the same as those land uses shown..."—we also wish to register the same objections as those we have submitted over the past four years.

Specifically, the two sand dunes areas between Roberts Lake and the freeway are zoned for development when in fact they are part and parcel of the Roberts Lake-dunes complex. The commitment of these parcels to visitor serving, or other, commercial development is an urbanization of a natural seashore ecosystem.

It is significant that the Legislature did not delete these parcels from the Coastal Zone in Henry Mello's Assembly Bill 462 which deletions gave the City of Seaside carte blanche to urbanize the roadway sides of Laguna Grande Lake, and to maintain the commercial development in the K-Mart sector.

Inasmuch as these parcels together with Roberts Lake provide a scenic entrance to the City of Monterey; inasmuch as the Legislature retained these parcels in the Coastal Zone; inasmuch as the Legislature retained a scenic, protective sand dunes buffer margin along the freeway through Sand City; inasmuch as the Coastal Act directs the preservation of coastal resources; and inasmuch as the location and size of these two parcels do not seem to support crucial economic or social needs as justification for their conversion to urban development, these parts of the Laguna Grande LUP should be retained as open space.

One of the arguments for the high density development of Cannery Row is that we then can protect the shoreline resources elsewhere in the City of Monterey. Why, then, are we packing tight the development around Roberts Lake?

Carl D. Larson
Monterey County Representative
Sierra Club California Coastal Task Force

To: City of Monterey
   Richard M. Garrod
   Community Development Director