

PROJECT NARRATIVE FOR DANIEL'S RESIDENCE

Location: 495 Sea Court, Shelter Cove, California

Prepared by: Thomas Bond, Architect

Date: October 18, 2025

Following is a narrative of the significant engineering exercises & studies, County & Coastal comments and adjustments in design direction that represent milestones in the design process.

This project commenced in late 2021. A survey of the property was performed by **Kelly-O'Hearn Licensed Surveyors** and a Topographic Map was received in late December. It was clear immediately that the site was significantly constricted by the bluff and a rather exaggerated front setback, leaving little room to build. We contacted the Planning Department and began to explore options to make the site viable including the possibility to relax the front setback requirement. This option was revisited numerous times over the course of the project and was met with a positive response on **all** occasions.

Once it was felt that there were viable options to proceed, **SHN Consulting Engineers & Geologists** was engaged to prepare a Soils Report and ultimately an Addendum to consider alternate foundation options. At this point it was felt that the construction of a residence at this location was feasible and a formal Planning Application was submitted to the County in late October of 2022. Over the course of the next few months we began to address the various design challenges associated with this site.

During that time we engaged **Niaid Biological Consulting** to prepare a required Biological Assessment and a Botanical Report for the site which were subsequently submitted to the County.

In July of 2023 we submitted our Request for a Variance to relax the setback rules due to the rather odd configuration of the road. In September we received specific direction from Public Works as to how to treat the area between the front property line and the edge of the existing roadway. Essentially we were asked to pave the entire area and were informed that it may be used for off-site parking.

In early February of 2024, we received a letter from Planning providing an update as to the project status including comments from the Coastal Commission regarding proximity to the bluff, use of piers and concerns regarding wave up-rush. In response we re-located the residence farther from the bluff further and re-assessed the foundation. We also engaged **Skelly Engineering** to prepare a **Wave Uprush Analysis** that initially indicated that the proposed elevation of the floor slab would be about 5 feet above a maximum wave event. An updated set of plans and the Wave Uprush Analysis was submitted to the County and the Coastal Commission.

Planning also requested an Archaeological Report which was prepared by the **Archaeological Research & Supply Company**, and which was submitted in August 2024.

In June of 2024 we received an email from Coastal stating that they did not concur with our findings and making several recommendations for us to consider. We responded in September 2024 with a letter noting that we did not necessarily agree with the Coastal position, but in the interest of moving forward with the project we would agree to use their analysis of wave uprush to adjust the design as needed. Accordingly, we moved the footprint as far to the east as possible and modified the locations of piers supporting the deck so as to maximize (to the extent feasible) the distance to the bluff. We also raised the structure about 2 feet above grade and redesigned the foundation so as to allow any wave that might exceed the maximum anticipated uprush to flow under the house. (This would also work in reverse in the event of excessive water flowing from the roadway.)

Coastal later advised us that they had accepted our revised design.

In late 2024 the Resort Improvement District (RID) approved a variance to build into the Utility Easement, effectively the same Variance we submitted to the County, and signed an Encroachment Agreement with the Owners of the property.

At this point we believed we had satisfied all of the governing parties, however, Planning advised us that while they approved of the idea of moving the footprint as far east as possible, we now exceeded the building height limitation of 20 feet. This presented a serious challenge. We were, however, able to squeeze the height so as to comply with the height limitation.

The final drawings submitted to the County in July of this year reflect **all** of the adjustments and modifications requested by the various agencies involved.

In conclusion: Over the course of over 4 years, the team of Architects & Engineers have responded to each and every concern passed along from Planning, Public Works and the Coastal Commission. The project in no way violates the rights of any neighboring homeowners or allows this Owner any privileges the existing home owners do not enjoy.

We are aware that the neighbor to the south does not want to see the property developed, but they should be clear that they do not have the right to impede a development that complies with every design rule and engineering consideration that applies.

It is also clear from the initial Survey that the tree which has caused so much concern is clearly on the 495 Sea Court lot, although in recent years it has grown in girth and now projects slightly into the neighboring property. It should also be noted that the fence between 495 Sea Court and the neighbor to the south is located over 6 inches into the 495 Sea Court property, thereby making the tree location appear to encroach into the neighboring property much more than in reality.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas Bond, Architect