

Planning Director Staff Report – Hearing on January 7, 2016

County of Ventura · Resource Management Agency · Planning Division 800 S. Victoria Avenue, Ventura, CA 93009-1740 · (805) 654-2478 · ventura.org/rma/planning

# WRIGHT LA CONCHITA PLANNED DEVELOPMENT (PD) PERMIT AND ADMINISTRATIVE VARIANCE, PL14-0164

# A. PROJECT INFORMATION

- 1. **Request**: The applicant requests approval of a PD Permit for the: (1) demolition of the remaining portion a 634 square foot single-story, single-family dwelling that was partially demolished and reconstructed; and (2) the construction of a new 1,396 square foot, three story, single-family dwelling with an attached 180 square foot tandem (stacked) two-car garage. The applicant also is requesting approval of an administrative variance to allow a tandem parking arrangement using a parking lift in the proposed garage.
- 2. Applicant/Property Owner: Mr. Matthew and Mrs. Rebecca Wright, 782 Acacia Walk, Apt. F, Goleta, CA 93117
- **3. Decision-Making Authority:** Pursuant to the Ventura County Coastal Zoning Ordinance (CZO) (Section 8174-5 and Section 8181-3 *et seq.*), the Planning Director is the decision-maker for the requested PD Permit. Pursuant to the Ventura County CZO (Section 8181-4.4), the Planning Director is the decision-maker for the requested administrative variance.
- 4. Project Site Size, Location, and Parcel Number: The 2,700 square foot project site is located at 6746 Ojai Avenue, Ventura, CA 93001, near the intersection of Ojai Avenue and Surfside Street, in the community of La Conchita, in the unincorporated area of Ventura County. The Tax Assessor's parcel number for the parcel that constitutes the project site is 060-0-077-335 (Exhibit 2).
- 5. Project Site Land Use and Zoning Designations:
  - a. <u>Countywide General Plan Land Use Map Designation</u>: Existing Community (Exhibit 2)
  - b. <u>Coastal Area Plan Land Use Map Designation</u>: Residential High 6.1-36 dwelling units/acre (DU/AC) (Exhibit 2)
  - c. <u>Zoning Designation</u>: RB-3,000 sf (Residential Beach, 3,000 square feet minimum lot size requirement) (Exhibit 2)

1

Location in Relation to the Project Site	Zoning	Land Uses/Development	
North	RB-3,000 sf	Single-family dwelling	
East	RB-3,000 sf	Single-family dwelling	
South	th CR-1 (Coastal Rural, 1 acre Agriculture, keeping of ho minimum lot size requirement)		
West	RB-3,000 sf	Single-family dwelling	

#### 6. Adjacent Zoning and Land Uses/Development (Exhibit 2):

7. History: The existing one-story single-family dwelling was constructed circa 1925 and relocated to the 2,700 square foot subject property. On May 9, 2013, the Resource Management Agency Planning Division issued Zoning Clearance ZC13-0435 for the internal remodel of the existing 634 square foot, one floor, single family dwelling, including the construction of a 104 square foot solid roof porch in the front of the dwelling. On May 15, 2013, the Building and Safety Division issued Building Permit C13-000413 for the interior remodel described above, replacement of windows, and addition of a skylight.

On August 29, 2013, the Resource Management Agency Code Compliance Division issued Violation CV13-0350 for construction outside the scope of work that Zoning Clearance ZC13-0435 and Building Permit C13-000413 permitted. More specifically, the property owner removed the roof and exterior walls of the single-family dwelling, in violation of Ventura County CZO Sections 8174-4.1, 8171.1, 8174-6.3(e) and Ventura County Building Code Section 105.1. The requested PD Permit and administrative variance would abate these violations.

8. Project Description: The applicant is requesting approval of a PD Permit to allow: (1) demolition of the remaining portion of a 634 square foot single-story, single-family dwelling that was partially demolished and reconstructed; and (2) the construction of a new 1,396 square foot, three story, single-family dwelling with an attached 180 square foot tandem (stacked) two-car garage (Ventura County CZO, Section 8174-5 and Section 8172-1, definition of "Dwelling, Single-Family"). The applicant also is requesting approval of an administrative variance to allow a tandem parking arrangement using a parking lift in the proposed garage (Ventura County CZO, Section 8181-4.4, Administrative Variances).

The proposed single-family dwelling will include 1,396 square feet of floor space between three stories, and will have an 857 square foot building footprint. The proposed single-family dwelling will be 28 feet tall as measured from the established base elevation. The attached garage will provide covered parking for two vehicles in a tandem arrangement via a parking lift.

Pursuant to the recommendations set forth in a geological analysis of the project site (Pacific Materials Laboratory, February 18, 2015), the proposed project includes the construction of a 2 to 3 foot high retaining wall along the north and east boundaries of the property, to prevent potential debris from entering the property in the event of a landslide near the project site.

No native vegetation will be removed as part of the proposed project.

The Casitas Municipal Water District will continue to provide water and a new onsite septic system will provide sewage disposal service for the continued residential use of the property. A 20 foot wide, gravel or grassblock driveway to Ojai Avenue will provide access to the site.

## B. CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA) COMPLIANCE

Pursuant to CEQA (Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq.) and the CEQA Guidelines (Title 14, California Code or Regulations, Division 6, Chapter 3, Section 15000 *et seq.*), the subject application is a "project" that is subject to environmental review.

The State Legislature through the Secretary for Resources has found that certain classes of projects are exempt from CEQA environmental impact review because they do not have a significant effect on the environment. These projects are declared to be categorically exempt from the requirement for the preparation of environmental impact documents. The proposed project qualifies for a Class 3 (New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures) and a Class 5 (Minor Alterations in Land Use Limitations) Categorical Exemption pursuant to Sections 15303 and 15305 of the CEQA Guidelines, unless an exception applies to the project, pursuant to Section 15300.2 of the CEQA Guidelines. The Class 3 exemption applies to projects that involve the construction and location of limited numbers of new small facilities or structures. specifically in this case, a single-family dwelling in a residential zone. The Class 5 exemption applies to projects that involve minor alterations in land use limitations which do not result in any changes in land use or density. The requested administrative variance will allow for tandem parking within the proposed garage, but will not change the residential use of, or density of development on, the subject property. None of the exceptions set forth in Section 15300.2 apply to the proposed project. Therefore, this project is categorically exempt pursuant to Sections 15303 and 15305 of the CEQA Guidelines.

# C. CONSISTENCY WITH THE GENERAL PLAN

The Ventura County General Plan Goals, Policies and Programs (2015, page 4) states:

...in the unincorporated area of Ventura County, zoning and any permits issued thereunder, any subdivision of land, any public works project, any public (County, Special District, or Local Government) land acquisition or disposition, and any specific plan, must be consistent with the Ventura County General Plan Goals, Policies and Programs, and where applicable, the adopted Area Plan.

Furthermore, the Ventura County CZO (Section 8181-3.5.a) states that in order to be approved, a Coastal PD Permit must be found consistent with all applicable policies of the Ventura County Coastal Area Plan.

Evaluated below is the consistency of the proposed project with the applicable policies of the General Plan *Goals, Policies and Programs* and Coastal Area Plan.

**1. Resources Policy 1.1.2-1:** All General Plan amendments, zone changes and discretionary development shall be evaluated for their individual and cumulative impacts on resources in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act.

**Resources Policy 1.1.2-2:** Except as otherwise covered by a more restrictive policy within the Resources Chapter, significant adverse impacts on resources identified in environmental assessments and reports shall be mitigated to less than significant levels or, where no feasible mitigation measures are available, a statement of overriding considerations shall be adopted.

As discussed in Section B of this staff report (above), the proposed project's individual impacts and contribution to cumulative impacts on resources have been reviewed by the Lead Agency in compliance with CEQA. The proposed project is categorically exempt from environmental review pursuant to Sections 15303 (New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures) and 15305 (Minor Alterations in Land Use Limitations) of the CEQA Guidelines, and will not create a significant adverse impact to resources.

Based on the discussion above, the proposed project is consistent with Policies 1.1.2-1 and 1.1.2-2.

**2. Resources Policy 1.3.2-4:** Discretionary development shall not significantly impact the quantity or quality of water resources within watersheds, groundwater recharge areas or ground waterbasins.

The proposed project includes the replacement of an existing one-story, singlefamily dwelling with a new three-story, single-family dwelling. The demolition of the existing single-family dwelling and construction of the new single-family dwelling would increase the impermeable surface on the property by 157 square feet, an additional 6 percent of the lot area. The proposed project will be conditioned by the Public Works Agency – Watershed Protection Agency to demonstrate the implementation of best management practices to control storm water runoff during construction (Exhibit 3, Condition 23). Furthermore, Casitas Municipal Water District will continue to provide water for the property. The Environmental Health Division reviewed the design and placement of the proposed septic system and determined it to be adequate to provide sewage disposal to the proposed single-family dwelling while also meeting the required setbacks (e.g., setbacks from property lines and dwellings).

Based on the discussion above, the proposed project is consistent with Policy 1.3.2-4.

**3. Resources Policy 1.8.2-1:** Discretionary developments shall be assessed for potential paleontological and cultural resource impacts, except when exempt

from such requirements by CEQA. Such assessments shall be incorporated into a Countywide paleontological and cultural resource database.

**Resources Policy 1.8.2-5:** During environmental review of discretionary development the reviewing agency shall be responsible for identifying sites having potential archaeological, architectural or historical significance and this information shall be provided to the County Cultural Heritage Board for evaluation.

**Coastal Act Section 30244:** Where development would adversely impact archaeological or paleontological resources as identified by the State Historic Preservation Office, reasonable mitigation measures shall be required.

The subject property is underlain by Quaternary Alluvium which was deposited recently enough that it is unlikely to contain paleontological resources. Therefore, the demolition of the existing single-family dwelling and construction of a new single-family dwelling is unlikely to impact paleontological resources. The subject property is mapped in the Resource Management Agency's GIS as not sensitive for archaeological resources. Furthermore, the project site was previously developed and, therefore, it is unlikely that the new development will encounter previously unknown subsurface resources that might be located on-site. The proposed project will be subject to conditions of approval so that in the event of an unanticipated discovery of paleontological or archaeological resources those resources will be properly collected and deposited, in perpetuity, with an appropriate repository (Exhibit 3, Conditions 17 and 18).

The existing single-family dwelling was originally constructed circa 1925 and relocated to the subject property in 1953. The existing single-family dwelling is not known to have played any significant role in the settlement of La Conchita; is not known to be associated with any notable residents of La Conchita; and is not a representative example of an architectural style, period, or type of construction. Therefore, the existing single-family dwelling is not eligible for National or California Registers. Additionally, the existing, single-family dwelling does not appear to exemplify or reflect special elements of the County's social, aesthetic, engineering, architectural, or natural history; it does not appear to be significantly associated with the lives of persons important to Ventura County; and does not embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represent the work of a master or possess high artistic values. Therefore, the existing single-family dwelling is not eligible for designation as a Ventura County Landmark (San Buenaventura Research Associates, 2014).

Based on the discussion above, the proposed project is consistent with Policies 1.8.2-1 and 1.8.2-5 and Section 30244 of the Coastal Act.

4. Coastal Act Section 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.

Planning Director Staff Report for PL14-0164 Planning Director Hearing on January 7, 2016 Page 6 of 17

The project site is located north of, and separated from the public beach by, Highway 101, railroad tracks, and a residentially-developed lot. The project site is located approximately 350 feet (at the closest point) from the beach. The proposed project site is not located on, or adjacent to, the beach or a planned or existing accessway to the beach. Therefore, the proposed project does not have the potential to interfere with any existing or potential future public access to the sea.

Based on the discussion above, the proposed project is consistent with Section 30211 of the Coastal Act.

#### 5. Coastal Area Plan Section 30253: New development shall:

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

(2) Assure stability and structure 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.

The subject property is not crossed by any mapped faults or mapped fault hazard zones. The subject property is located within an area with potential for liquefaction. A site-specific study of the subject property to evaluate liquefaction potential was prepared by Pacific Materials Laboratory, dated February 18, 2015, which concluded that while potential liquefiable layers are present in the subsurface, there is no potential for liquefaction to occur at the site that would damage the proposed single-family dwelling. Also, see the discussion in Section C.6 of this staff report (below), regarding landslide and mudslide hazards.

As discussed in this staff report (above), the project site is located approximately 350 feet from the beach, and separated from the Pacific Ocean by Highway 101, railroad tracks, and a residentially-developed lot. Therefore, the proposed project does not include or require construction of shoreline protective devices that could substantially alter any natural landforms.

The subject property is located outside of both the mapped 100-year and 500year floodplains. The proposed project does not include the construction of flood protection devices that would affect the surrounding area or alter any natural landforms.

The subject property is located within a designated Hazardous Fire Area. Therefore, pursuant to the recommendations of the Ventura County Fire Protection District, the proposed project will be subject to conditions of approval (Exhibit 4, Condition Nos. 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, and 27) in order to minimize risks to life and property in a Hazardous Fire Area. None of these conditions would require the construction of fire protection devices that would adversely affect the surrounding area or alter any natural landforms.

Based on the discussion above, the proposed project is consistent with Coastal Act Section 30253.

6. Hazards Policy 2.7.2-1: Development in mapped landslide/mudslide hazard areas shall not be permitted unless adequate geotechnical engineering investigations are performed, and appropriate and sufficient safeguards are incorporated into the project design.

**Hazards Policy 2.7.2-2:** In landslide/mudslide hazard areas, there shall be no alteration of the land which is likely to increase the hazard, including concentration of water through drainage, irrigation or septic systems, removal of vegetative cover, and no undercutting of the bases of slopes or other improper grading methods.

The subject property is located within a Geologic Hazard Area for landslides and mudslides. The subject property has been evaluated as part of a State of California funded study pertaining to the La Conchita Landslide area and adjoining community (William Lettis and Associates, August 28, 2009; Alan Kropp and Associates, September 4, 2009). The results of these studies indicate the subject property is outside of the 1995/2005 landslide areas and outside debris flow areas. Furthermore, the review of these reports by Pacific Materials Laboratory (February 18, 2015), indicates that the subject property may be subject to up to 2 feet of slow moving debris as outwash from a design level event. The Pacific Materials Laboratory report concludes that a standard 2 to 3 foot high retaining wall constructed on the north and east boundaries of the property will prevent debris from entering the property. As stated in the project description set forth in this staff report (above), the proposed project includes the construction of this retaining wall.

Based on the discussion above, the proposed project is consistent with Policies 2.7.2-1 and 2.7.2-2.

**7. Hazards Policy 2.13.2-1:** All applicants for discretionary permits shall be required, as a condition of approval, to provide adequate water supply and access for fire protection and evacuation purposes.

As stated in this staff report (above), the Casitas Municipal Water District will continue to provide water to the subject property. The Ventura County Fire Protection District (VCFPD) reviewed the proposed project and determined that the existing water supply and Ojai Avenue are adequate for fire protection purposes.

Based on the discussion above, the proposed project is consistent with Policy 2.13.2-1.

8. Hazards Policy 2.16.2-1: All discretionary development shall be reviewed for noise compatibility with surrounding uses. Noise compatibility shall be determined from a consistent set of criteria based on the standards listed below. An acoustical analysis by a qualified acoustical engineer shall be required of discretionary developments involving noise exposure or noise generation in excess of the established standards. The analysis shall provide documentation of existing and projected noise levels at on-site and off-site receptors, and shall recommend noise control measures for mitigating adverse impacts.

(1) Noise sensitive uses proposed to be located near highways, truck routes, heavy industrial activities and other relatively continuous noise sources shall incorporate noise control measures so that:

- a. Indoor noise levels in habitable rooms do not exceed CNEL 45.
- b. Outdoor noise levels do not exceed CNEL 60 or  $L_{eq}$ 1H of 65 dB(A) during any hour.

(2) Noise sensitive uses proposed to be located near railroads shall incorporate noise control measures so that:

- a. Guidelines (1)a. and (1)b. above are adhered to.
- b. Outdoor noise levels do not exceed  $L_{10}$  of 60 dB(A).

(3) Noise sensitive uses proposed to be located near airports.

- a. Shall be prohibited if they are in a CNEL 65 or greater, noise contour.
- b. Shall be permitted in the CNEL 60 to CNEL 65 noise contour are only if means will be taken to ensure interior noise levels of CNEL 45 or less.

(4) Noise generators, proposed to be located near any noise sensitive use, shall incorporate noise measures so that ongoing outdoor noise levels received by the noise sensitive receptor, measured at the exterior wall of the building, does not exceed any of the following standards:

- a. L<sub>eq</sub>1H of 55 dB(A) or ambient noise level plus 3dB(A), whichever is greater, during any hour from 6:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m.
- b. Leq1H of 50 dB(A) or ambient noise level plus 3dB(A), whichever is greater, during any hour from 7:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m.
- c. Leq1H of 45 dB(A) or ambient noise level plus 3 dB(A), whichever is greater, during any hour from 10:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m.

Section 2.16.2-1(4) is not applicable to increase traffic noise along any of the roads identified within the 2020 Regional Roadway Network. In addition, State and Federal highways, all railroad line operations, aircraft in flight, and public utility facilities are noise generators having Federal and State regulations that preempt local regulations.

(5) Construction noise shall be evaluated and, if necessary, mitigated in accordance with the County Construction Noise Threshold Criteria and Control Plan.

The proposed project is a noise sensitive use that is located within approximately 215 feet of Highway 101 and approximately 170 feet from the Union Pacific Railroad tracks. The Resource Management Agency GIS lists vehicles on the highway as the primary contributor to the existing ambient noise level. Typical highway noise is 70 dB(A) at 50 feet as described by the Federal Highway Administration. Sound levels generally attenuate across level ground per the inverse square law, or approximately 6 dB(A) per distance doubling. Given that

Planning Director Staff Report for PL14-0164 Planning Director Hearing on January 7, 2016 Page 9 of 17

the subject property is 215 feet from the edge of Highway 101, the 70 dB(A) at 50 feet noise level of the highway would attenuate to approximately 57 dB(A) at the subject property. This outside sound level does not take into account any potential shielding effects that the nearest neighboring structure between the subject property and Highway 101 that would further reduce highway noise levels at the subject property. In order to meet Ventura County General Plan noise policy limits, the permit will be subject to a condition of approval (Exhibit 4, Condition No. 16), in order to ensure that noise-attenuating features including double-paned windows and sound insulation will be installed in the proposed single-family dwelling.

The residential use of the property is not considered a noise generator that will adversely affect any nearby noise sensitive use (e.g., existing residences). However, the proposed project will involve noise-generating construction activities that have the potential to adversely affect surrounding residential uses. Therefore, pursuant to the requirements of the *Ventura County Construction Noise Threshold Criteria and Control Plan*, the proposed project will be subject to a condition of approval to limit noise-generating activities to the days and times when construction noise is least likely to adversely affect surrounding residential uses (Exhibit 4, Condition No. 16).

Based on the discussion above, the proposed project is consistent with Policy 2.16.2-1.

**9. Land Use Policy 3.1.2-7**: Nonconforming Parcel Size: The use or development of a parcel which is a legal lot for the purposes of the County Subdivision Ordinance, but which fails to meet the minimum parcel size requirements of the applicable land use category, shall not be prohibited solely by reason of such failure. However, this policy shall not be construed to permit the subdivision of any parcel into two or more lots if any of the new lots fails to meet the minimum parcel size requirements.

The subject property is 2,700 square feet in size, which is smaller than the 3,000 square feet lot size required for a single-family dwelling in the RB-3,000 sf zone. However the subject property consists of a legal lot created in compliance with the Subdivision Map Act, pursuant to the La Conchita Del Mar subdivision map recorded in May 1924. The subject property consists of the entirety of Lot 12, La Conchita Del Mar Subdivision No. 2 recorded in Book 12, Page 31 of Miscellaneous Records. Therefore, the proposed use and development of the subject property may be permitted.

Based on the discussion above, the proposed project is consistent with Policy 3.1.2-7.

**10. Public Facilities and Services Policy 4.1.2-1:** Discretionary development shall be conditioned to contribute land, improvements or funds toward the cost of needed public improvements and services related to the proposed development.

Planning Director Staff Report for PL14-0164 Planning Director Hearing on January 7, 2016 Page 10 of 17

**Public Facilities and Services Policy 4.1.2-2:** Development shall only be permitted in those locations where adequate public services are available (functional), under physical construction or will be available in the near future.

No expansion of public facilities is required in order to allow the proposed demolition of the existing single-family dwelling and construction of the proposed new single-family dwelling, since: (1) the proposed project will not result in a net increase in demand for public services; and (2) existing public services are adequate and available to serve the continued residential use of the subject property. As discussed in this staff report (above), the Casitas Municipal Water District will continue to provide water and a proposed on-site septic system will provide sewage disposal for the subject property. Furthermore, a proposed project will not generate a net increase in traffic on public roadways located within proximity to the project site.

Based on the discussion above, the proposed project is consistent with Policies 4.1.2-1 and 4.1.2-2.

**11. Public Facilities and Services Policy 4.3.2-1:** Development that requires potable water shall be provided a permanent potable water supply of adequate quantity and quality that complies with applicable County and State water regulations. Water systems operated by or receiving water from Casitas Municipal Water District, the Calleguas Municipal Water District or the United Water Conservation District will be considered permanent supplies unless an Urban Water Management Plan (prepared pursuant to Part 2.6 of Division 6 of the Water Code) or a water supply and demand assessment (prepared pursuant to Part 2.10 of Division 6 of the Water Code) demonstrates that there is insufficient water supply to serve cumulative development within the district's service area. When the proposed water supply is to be drawn exclusively from wells in areas where groundwater supplies have been determined by the Environmental Health Division or the Public Works Agency to be questionable or inadequate, the developer shall be required to demonstrate the availability of a permanent potable water supply for the life of the project.

The Casitas Municipal Water District will continue to provide water to the subject property. Therefore, the subject property is considered to have a permanent potable water supply of adequate quantity and quality.

Based on the discussion above, the proposed project is consistent with Policy 4.3.2-1.

**12. Public Facilities and Services Policy 4.4.2-1:** Community sewage treatment facilities and solid waste disposal sites shall be deemed consistent with the General Plan only if they are designated on the Public Facilities Map. On-site septic systems (i.e., individual sewage disposal systems), on-site wastewater treatment facilities, waste transfer stations, off-site waste treatment facilities and on-site storage facilities are consistent with the General Plan if they conform to the goals, policies, and programs of the General Plan.

**Public Facilities and Services Policy 4.4.2-2:** Any subdivision, or discretionary change in land use having a direct effect upon the volume of sewage, shall be required to connect to a public sewer system. Exceptions to this policy to allow the use of septic systems may be granted in accordance with County Sewer Policy. Installation and maintenance of septic systems shall be regulated by the County Environmental Health Division in accordance with the County's Sewer Policy, County Building Code, and County Service Area 32.

The proposed project consists of the demolition and replacement of a singlefamily dwelling including the installation of a new on-site wastewater treatment system. The proposed project would not have a direct effect upon the volume of sewage as there would no new connections to external sewer systems. Furthermore, the Resource Management Agency, Environmental Health Division staff reviewed the proposed project and determined that the proposed on-site wastewater treatment system would be adequate to serve the proposed singlefamily dwelling.

Based on the discussion above, the proposed project is consistent with Policy 4.4.2-2.

**13. Public Facilities and Service Policy 4.8.2-1:** Discretionary development shall be permitted only if adequate water supply, access and response time for fire protections can be made available.

As discussed in this staff report (above), the Casitas Municipal Water District will continue to provide water to the project site. The nearest full-time fire station to the project site is Ventura County Fire Station No. 25 which is located approximately 2.2 miles away from the project site via Highway 101. VCFPD reviewed the proposed project and found that adequate water supply, access, and response time exist to serve the proposed project.

Based on the discussion above, the proposed project is consistent with Policy 4.8.2-1.

### D. ZONING ORDINANCE COMPLIANCE

The proposed project is subject to the requirements of the Ventura County CZO.

Pursuant to the Ventura County CZO (Section 8174-4), the proposed use is allowed in the RB-3,000 sf zone district with the granting of a PD Permit. Upon the granting of the PD Permit, the proposed project will comply with this requirement.

The proposed project includes the construction and use of buildings and structures that are subject to the development standards of the Ventura County CZO (Section 8175-2). Table 1 lists the applicable development standards and a description of whether the proposed project complies with the development standards.

Type of Requirement	Zoning Ordinance Requirement	Complies?	
Minimum Lot Area (Gross)	3,000 square feet	No, the project is nonconforming with respect to required lot size as it is 2,700 square feet rather than at least 3,000 square feet. However, as discussed in Section C.9 of this staff report (above), pursuant to the Ventura County General Plan <i>Goals, Policies and Programs</i> Land Use Policy 3.1.2-7, the subject property is a legal lot and may be developed despite its nonconforming size.	
Maximum Percentage of Building	65 percent	Yes, the proposed project would result in	
Coverage	10.6	43 percent of building coverage	
Front Setback	10 feet	Yes, the front setback is 10 feet	
Side Setback	3 feet	Yes, both side setbacks are 3 feet	
Rear Setback	14 feet	Yes, the rear setback is 47 feet	
Maximum Building Height	28 feet from the base elevation established by Ventura County Public Works Flood Control Division	Yes, the proposed structure is 28 feet tall from established base elevation	
Minimum Parking	2 covered parking spaces	No, the Applicant is seeking an Administrative Variance to allow tandem parking (CZO Section 8181-4.4(d)) using a parking lift.	

#### Table 1 – Development Standards Consistency Analysis

### E. ADMINISTRATIVE VARIANCE FINDINGS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

The Planning Director may approve an administrative variance to allow required parking for a single-family dwelling to be provided in tandem (Ventura County CZO Section 8181-4.4.d), provided that the Planning Director can make certain findings in order to determine that the proposed project is consistent with the administrative approval standards of the Ventura County CZO (Section 8181-4.2 et seq.). The proposed findings and supporting evidence are as follows:

1. There are special circumstances or exceptional characteristics applicable to the subject property with regard to size, topography and location, that do not apply generally to comparable properties in the same vicinity and zone within the coastal zone (Ventura County CZO, Section 8181-4.2.a).

The subject property is 30 feet wide and, as described in Section C.9 of this staff report (above), is nonconforming for lot size based on the zoning designation of the subject property. The 18 properties along Ojai Avenue range in size from 0.056 acre to 0.144 acre, or approximately 2,440 square feet to 6,275 square feet. The average lot size of the properties along Ojai Avenue is 0.092 acre or approximately 4,008 square feet. The subject property is 2,700 square feet and is approximately two-thirds the average lot size for lots located along Ojai Avenue. Additionally, the existing single-family dwelling to be demolished and subject

property does not include any covered parking (e.g., there is no garage on the subject property). The granting of the requested administrative variance will enable the applicant to provide two covered parking spaces on-site, while also allowing for the installation of a septic system that will be adequately sized to serve the proposed single-family dwelling and meet the Environmental Health Division's individual sewage disposal system setback requirements. These setback requirements require the single-family dwelling to be at least five feet from the septic tank and at least eight feet from the leach field. The septic tank must be at least five feet from both the property line and leach fields, and the distribution box must be at least five feet from the leach field.

Therefore, given the smaller size of the subject lot when compared to other lots located in the same vicinity and zone of the subject lot, this finding can be made.

# 2. Granting the requested variance will not confer a special privilege inconsistent with the limitations upon other properties in the same vicinity and zone within the coastal zone (Ventura County CZO, Section 8181-4.2.b).

As stated above, the subject property is nonconforming with regard to the minimum lot size requirement for its zoning designation, and the subject property is approximately two-thirds the average size of lots along Ojai Avenue. Additionally, a survey of single-family dwellings along Ojai Avenue found that five of the eighteen single-family homes along Ojai Avenue have two covered parking spaces. Therefore, the granting of the administrative variance would allow the proposed project to comply with the covered parking requirements in spite of its nonconforming size.

Based on the discussion above, this finding can be made.

3. Strict application of the zoning regulations as they apply to the subject property will result in practical difficulties or unnecessary hardships inconsistent with the general purpose of such regulations (Ventura County CZO, Section 8181-4.2.c).

The subject property is 30 feet wide and, as described in Section C.9 of this staff report (above), is nonconforming for lot size based on the zoning designation of the subject property. The required setbacks and area required for an appropriately sized septic system in the rear of the property pushes the structure to the front of the property, limiting the space available for parking as described in Section E.1 of this staff report (above). Therefore, granting the variance for a parking lift would provide relief from zoning regulations as they apply to the subject property while not affecting neighboring properties or infrastructure.

Based on the discussion above, this finding can be made.

# 4. The granting of such variance will not be detrimental to the public health, safety or general welfare, nor to the use, enjoyment or valuation of neighboring properties (Ventura County CZO, Section 8181-4.2.d).

The single-family dwelling and parking lift poses no threat to public health or welfare. The administrative variance will facilitate parking on-site where currently

no parking exists. Therefore, the administrative variance will reduce the number of vehicles that park along Ojai Avenue.

Furthermore, as discussed in Sections C and D of this staff report (above), the proposed project: will not adversely affect water resources; will be subject to conditions of approval to ensure that it does not create any unusual fire hazards; will not generate new traffic on public roadways; will be subject to a condition of approval to ensure that the construction activities do not generate unacceptable noise levels; and—with the exception of the tandem parking arrangement—will comply with all of the regulations of the Ventura County CZO.

Granting of the variance would not affect the use or value of neighboring properties and would not result in new development that is inconsistent with the General Plan policies that apply to development within the La Conchita neighborhood.

Based on the discussion above, this finding can be made.

5. All development authorized by the variance is consistent with all applicable standards of the LCP (Ventura County CZO, Section 8181-4.2.e).

Based on the information and analysis presented in Sections C and D of this staff report (above), the proposed development is consistent with the intent and provisions of the Count's Certified Local Coastal Program.

Based on the discussion above, this finding can be made.

6. That the granting of a variance in conjunction with a hazardous waste facility will be consistent with the portions of the County's Hazardous Waste Management Plan (CHWMP) that identify specific sites or siting criteria for hazardous waste facilities (Ventura County CZO, Section 8181-4.2.f).

The proposed project does not include a hazardous waste facility. Therefore, this finding does not apply to the proposed project.

### F. PD PERMIT FINDINGS AND SUPPORTING EVIDENCE

The Planning Director must make certain findings in order to determine that the proposed project is consistent with the permit approval standards of the Ventura County CZO (Section 8181-3.5 et seq.). The proposed findings and supporting evidence are as follows:

# 1. The proposed development is consistent with the intent and provisions of the County's Certified Local Coastal Program [Section 8181-3.5.a].

Based on the information and analysis presented in Sections C and D of this staff report, the Planning Director can make the finding that the proposed development is consistent with the intent and provisions of the Count's Certified Local Coastal Program.

# 2. The proposed development is compatible with the character of surrounding development [Section 8181-3.5.b].

The proposed project consists of a request to allow the completion of the demolition of a single-family dwelling, and the construction of a new single-family dwelling, on a lot within the La Conchita area. The immediately surrounding parcels to the north, south, and west are developed with single-family dwellings, whereas the lot that is located to the east of the project site is developed with horse corrals.

As discussed in Section C of this staff report (above) the proposed project does not include a change of use that has the potential to create any new land use conflicts with surrounding residential development, generate new traffic, or introduce physical development that is incompatible with the surrounding, legally established development. Furthermore, as discussed in Section C.8 of this staff report (above)–with adoption of the recommended condition of approval to limit the days and times of noise-generating construction activities—the proposed project will not generate noise that is incompatible with surrounding residential uses. Therefore, the proposed development will be consistent with the character of surrounding, legally established development.

Based on the discussion above, this finding can be made.

# 3. The proposed development, if a conditionally permitted use, is compatible with planned land uses in the general area where the development is to be located [Section 8181-3.5.c].

The proposed project consists of a request for approval of a PD Permit to demolish a single-family dwelling and construct a new single-family dwelling on the subject property. The proposed residential use of the subject property is not a conditionally permitted use and, therefore, the requirement of this finding does not apply to the proposed project.

# 4. The proposed development would not be obnoxious or harmful, or impair the utility of neighboring property or uses [Section 8181-3.5.d].

The proposed demolition of the existing single-family dwelling and construction of a new single-family dwelling will not expand or alter the current permitted use of the subject property. As discussed in Sections C, E.4, and F.2 of this staff report (above), the proposed project will not interfere with surrounding residential uses on other properties located in the vicinity of the subject property. Therefore, the demolition of the existing single-family dwelling and construction of the singlefamily dwelling will not be obnoxious or harmful, or impair the utility of neighboring property or uses. Based on the discussion above, this finding can be made.

# 5. The proposed development would not be detrimental to the public interest, health, safety, convenience, or welfare [Section 8181-3.5.e].

As stated in this staff report (above), the proposed demolition of the existing single-family dwelling and construction of a new single-family dwelling will not expand or alter the current permitted use of the subject property. As discussed in Sections C and E.4 of this staff report, adequate public resources and infrastructure exist to continue to serve the residential use of the subject property. The Casitas Municipal Water District will continue to provide water and an on-site septic system will provide sewage disposal to the subject property. Furthermore, the proposed project will not generate new traffic, and Ojai Avenue and the surrounding public road network are adequate to continue serving the single-family dwelling. Therefore, the proposed demolition of the existing single-family dwelling and construction of the single-family dwelling will not be detrimental to the public interest, health, safety, convenience, or welfare.

Based on the discussion above, this finding can be made.

# F. PLANNING DIRECTOR HEARING NOTICE, PUBLIC COMMENTS, AND JURISDICTIONAL COMMENTS

The Planning Division provided public notice regarding the Planning Director hearing in accordance with the Government Code (Section 65091) and Ventura County CZO (Section 8181-6.2 *et seq.*). The Planning Division mailed notice to owners of property within 300 feet and residents within 100 feet of the property on which the project site is located and placed a legal ad in the *Ventura County Star*. As of the date of this document, the Planning Division has not received any comments regarding the project.

#### G. RECOMMENDED ACTIONS

Based upon the analysis and information provided above, Planning Division Staff recommends that the Planning Director take the following actions:

- 1. **CERTIFY** that the Director has reviewed and considered this staff report and all exhibits thereto, and has considered all comments received during the public comment process;
- FIND that this project is categorically exempt from CEQA pursuant to Sections 15303 and 15305 of the CEQA Guidelines;
- 3. **MAKE** the required findings to grant an administrative variance to allow the required parking for the proposed single-family dwelling to be provided in tandem, pursuant to Section 8181-4.2 et seq. of the Ventura County CZO, and

based on the substantial evidence presented in Section E of this staff report and the entire record;

- 4. **GRANT** the requested administrative variance to allow the required parking for the proposed single-family dwelling to be provided in tandem, subject to the conditions of approval (Exhibit 4);
- 5. **MAKE** the required findings to grant a PD Permit pursuant to Section 8181-3.5 of the Ventura County CZO, based on the substantial evidence presented in Section F of this staff report and the entire record;
- 6. **GRANT** PD Permit Case No. PL14-0164, subject to the conditions of approval (Exhibit 4); and
- 7. **SPECIFY** that the Clerk of the Planning Division is the custodian, and 800 S. Victoria Avenue, Ventura, CA 93009 is the location, of the documents and materials that constitute the record of proceedings upon which this decision is based.

The decision of the Planning Director is final unless appealed to the Planning Commission within 10 calendar days after the permit has been approved, conditionally approved, or denied (or on the following workday if the 10<sup>th</sup> day falls on a weekend or holiday). Any aggrieved person may file an appeal of the decision with the Planning Division. The Planning Division shall then set a hearing date before the Planning Commission to review the matter at the earliest convenient date.

If you have any questions concerning the information presented above, please contact Matt Sauter at (805) 654-2492 or matthew.sauter@ventura.org.

Prepared by:

Matt Sauter, Case Planner Residential Permits Section Ventura County Planning Division

EXHIBITS

Reviewed by:

Dan Klemann, Manager Residential Permits Section Ventura County Planning Division

- Exhibit 2 Aerial Location, General Plan and Zoning Designations, and Land Use Maps
- Exhibit 3 Site Plans
- Exhibit 4 Conditions of Approval
- Exhibit 5 Limited Geotechnical Exploration Report (Pacific Materials Laboratory, Inc.)
- Exhibit 6 On-Site Wastewater Treatment System Reports (Pacific Materials Laboratory, Inc.)
- Exhibit 7 Historic Resources Report (San Buenaventura Research Associates)



Sources: Esri, DeLorme, NAVTEQ, USGS, Intermap, iPC, NRCAN, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), Esri (Thailand), TomTom, 2012



Ventura County, California Resource Management Agency GIS Development & Mapping Services Map created on 12-14-2015



County of Ventura Planning Director Hearing PL14-0164 **Exhibit 2 – Maps** 



Disclaimer: This Map was created by the Ventura County Resource Management Agency, Mapping Services - GIS which is designed and operated soli/for the conventence of the County and related public agencies. The County does no twarrant the accuracy of this mappane no design in working a raik of economic loss or physical righty should be made in reliance thereon.











County of Ventura Planning Director Hearing PL14-0164 **Aerial Photography** 19









**RMA***gis* 

County of Ventura Planning Director Hearing PL14-0164 **General Plan & Zoning Map** 



Disclaimer: This Map was created by the Ventura County Resource Management Agency, Mapping Services - OIS which is designed and operated solely for the convenience of the County and related public agencies. The County does no twarrant the accuracy of this mapand no decision involving a risk of economic loss or physical rightry should be made in reliance tharrow.









Topo Map PL14-0164 APN: 060-0-077-335

ualitite as was u	maational	Geographic	Society, i	-cur
Contract of Contract of Contract				_

500 Feet

Disclaimer: This Map was created by the Ventura County Resource Management Agency, Mapping Services - GIS which is designed and operated solely for the convenience of the County and related public agencies. The County does no twarrant the accuracy of this mapand no decision (involving a fisk of economic loss or physical injury should be made in reliance thereone.

250

0





		335 <b>ON</b>
		PROJECT 6746 Otal Ave
Current Lot Contour: Future Lot Contour: grade aw	Flat with a 5% down grade to the West Flat with 2% ay from foundation	Prepared (
Pavers: Landscaped Area: Leach field Area Landscaped	187 sq. fl 7% 1551 sq. ft 740sq. ft. 811 sq. ft.	ate:
Parking: Developed Lot Coverage: (Iotal hardscape and foundation) Impermeable surface area:	2 covered Required 2 car landem garage proposed 1149 sq R 43% 962 sq R	<b>Dwner and Contac</b> Matthew & Rebecca 1 5746 Ojai Ave. La Conchita, Ca 9300 (805)-450-8878
Single Family Residence Gross Floor Area Building Coverage (Incl. eaves):	1396 sq. ft. 857 sq. ft. 32%	t Wright )1
Total Gross Floor area: Not Building Coverage: Proposed Building Specifics:	753 sq. ft. 992 sq. ft. 37% of lot	<b>Contact</b> Matthew / 782 Acaci Goleta, Ci (805) 450
Building Lot Coverage Storage Shed. (to be moved offer Gross Floor Area Building Lot Coverage	622 sq. fl 99 sq. fl 170 sq. ft	Mright a Walk Aç 93117 -8878
Existing Building Specifics: SFR (to be removed) Gross floor area	854 aq. ft	ц. Ц
Lot Bpecifics APN Lot Area:	060-0-077-335 2700 Sq. fl	
Sile Address: 6746 Ojel Ave. La Conchita, Ca 93001a Zoning Designation: General Plan Area Plen	RB Existing Community Coastal Area Plan	
North Sile Addreas: 6746 Ojal Ave. La Conchita, Ca 93001a		

County of Ventura Planning Director Hearing PL14-0164 **Exhibit 3 – Site Plans** 











# CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL FOR PLANNED DEVELOPMENT (PD) PERMIT AND ADMINISTRATIVE VARIANCE CASE NO. PL14-0164

### **RESOURCE MANAGEMENT AGENCY (RMA) CONDITIONS**

## Planning Division (PL) Conditions

#### 1. Project Description

This Planned Development (PD) Permit and Administrative Variance are based on and limited to compliance with the project description found in this condition below, all County land use hearing exhibits in support of the project marked Exhibits 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7 dated January 7, 2016, and conditions of approval set forth below. Together, these documents describe the Project. Any deviations from the Project must first be reviewed and approved by the County in order to determine if the Project deviations conform to the original approval. Project deviations may require Planning Director approval for changes to the PD Permit and/or Administrative Variance, and/or further California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) environmental review. Any Project deviation that is implemented without requisite County review and approval(s) constitutes a violation of the conditions of this PD Permit and Administrative Variance.

The project description is as follows:

A PD Permit for the: (1) demolition of the remaining portion a 634 square foot single-story, single-family dwelling that was partially demolished and reconstructed; and (2) the construction of a new 1,396 square foot, three story, single-family dwelling with an attached 180 square foot tandem (stacked) two-car garage (Ventura County Coastal Zoning Ordinance (CZO), Section 8174-5 and Section 8172-1, definition of "Dwelling, Single-Family"). An administrative variance will allow a tandem parking arrangement using a parking lift in the garage (CZO, Section 8181-4.4, Administrative Variances).

The single-family dwelling will include 1,396 square feet of floor space between three stories on an 857 square foot footprint. The single-family dwelling will be 28 feet tall as measured from the established base elevation. The attached garage will provide covered parking for two vehicles in a tandem arrangement via a parking lift. Access to the single-family dwelling from Ojai Avenue will be provided by a twenty foot wide, gravel or grassblock driveway. The property is currently occupied by an existing, partially demolished single-family dwelling and no native vegetation is located on-site. The single-family dwelling will be conditioned to not extend beyond the subject property.

The Casitas Municipal Water District will continue to provide water and a new on-site septic system will provided sewage disposal service for the continued residential use of the property. Ojai Avenue will continue to provide access to the site.

The grading, development, use, and maintenance of the property, the size, shape, arrangement, and location of structures, parking areas and landscape areas, and the

County of Ventura Planning Director Hearing PL14-0164 Exhibit 4 –<sub>2</sub>Draft Conditions of Approval protection and preservation of resources shall conform to the Project description above and all approved County land use hearing exhibits in support of the Project and conditions of approval below. (PL-1)

#### 2. <u>Required Improvements for the Project</u>

**Purpose:** To ensure the Project site conforms to the plans approved at the Planning Director hearing in support of the Project.

**Requirement:** The Permittee shall ensure that all required off-site and on-site improvements for the Project, including structures, paving, and parking are completed in conformance with the approved plans stamped as hearing Exhibit 3. The Permittee shall submit all final building and site plans for the County's review and approval in accordance with the approved plans.

**Documentation:** The Permittee shall obtain Planning Division staff's stamped approval on the Project plans and submit them to the County for inclusion in the Project file. The Permittee shall submit additional plans to the Planning Division for review and stamped approval for inclusion in the Project file, as necessary.

**Timing:** Prior to the issuance of a Zoning Clearance for construction the Permittee shall submit all final development plans to the Planning Division for review and approval. Unless the Planning Director and Public Works Agency Director allow the Permittee to provide financial security and a final executed agreement, approved as to form by County Counsel, that ensures completion of such improvements, the Permittee shall complete all required improvements prior to occupancy. The Permittee shall maintain the required improvements for the life of this PD Permit.

**Monitoring and Reporting:** The County Building Inspector, Public Works Agency Grading Inspector, Fire Marshall, and/or Planning Division staff has the authority to conduct periodic site inspections to ensure the Permittee's ongoing compliance with this condition consistent with the requirements of Section 8183-5 of the *Ventura County Coastal Zoning Ordinance*. (PL-3)

#### 3. Site Maintenance

**Purpose:** To ensure that the Project site is maintained in a neat and orderly manner so as not to create any hazardous conditions or unsightly conditions which are visible from outside the Project site.

**Requirement:** The Permittee shall maintain the Project site in compliance with the uses set forth in Condition No. 1 (Project Description). Only equipment and/or materials which the Planning Director determines to substantially comply with Condition No. 1 (Project Description), or which are authorized by any subsequent amendments to this PD Permit and Administrative Variance, shall be stored on the property during the life of the Project.

**Documentation:** Pursuant to Condition No. 1 (Project Description), this PD Permit and Administrative Variance, and any amendments thereto.

**Timing:** Prior to occupancy and for the life of the Project.

**Monitoring and Reporting:** The County Building Inspector, Public Works Agency Grading Inspector, Fire Marshall, and/or Planning Division staff has the authority to conduct periodic site inspections to ensure the Permittee's ongoing compliance with this condition consistent with the requirements of Section 8183-5 of the *Ventura County Coastal Zoning Ordinance*. (PL-4)

#### 4. PD Permit and Administrative Variance Modification

Prior to undertaking any operational or construction-related activity which is not expressly described in these conditions, the Permittee shall first contact the Planning Director to determine if the proposed activity requires a modification of this PD Permit and/or Administrative Variance. The Planning Director may, at the Planning Director's sole discretion, require the Permittee to file a written and/or mapped description of the proposed activity in order to determine if a PD Permit and/or Administrative Variance modification is required. If a PD Permit and/or Administrative Variance modification shall be subject to:

- a. The modification approval standards of the Ventura County Ordinance Code in effect at the time the modification application is acted on by the Planning Director; and
- b. Environmental review, as required pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA; California Public Resources Code, Section 21000-21178) and the State CEQA Guidelines (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Chapter 3, Section 15000-15387), as amended from time to time. (PL-5)

#### 5. Construction Activities

Prior to any construction, the Permittee shall obtain a Zoning Clearance for construction from the Planning Division, and a Building Permit from the Building and Safety Division. Prior to any grading, the Permittee shall obtain a Grading Permit from the Public Works Agency. (PL-6)

### 6. Acceptance of Conditions and Schedule of Enforcement Responses

The Permittee's acceptance of this PD Permit and Administrative Variance, and/or commencement of construction and/or operations under this PD Permit and Administrative Variance, shall constitute the Permittee's formal agreement to comply with all conditions of this PD Permit and Administrative Variance. Failure to abide by and comply with any condition for the granting of this PD Permit and Administrative Variance shall constitute grounds for enforcement action provided in the *Ventura County Coastal Zoning Ordinance* (2012, Article 13), which shall include, but is not limited to, the following:

- a. Public reporting of violations to the Planning Commission and/or Board of Supervisors;
- b. Suspension of the permitted land uses (Condition No. 1);
- c. Modification of the PD Permit and Administrative Variance conditions listed herein;
- d. Recordation of a "Notice of Noncompliance" on the deed to the subject property;

Conditions for Discretionary Entitlement No. PL14-0164 Date of Public Hearing: January 7, 2016 Date of Approval:

Permittee: Matthew and Rebecca Wright Location: 6746 Ojai Ave., La Conchita Page 4 of 16

- e. The imposition of civil administrative penalties; and/or
- f. Revocation of this PD Permit and Administrative Variance.

The Permittee is responsible for being aware of and complying with the PD Permit and Administrative Variance conditions and all applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations. (PL-7)

- 7. <u>Time Limits</u>
  - a. At the conclusion of the local appeal period set forth in the Ventura County Coastal Zoning Ordinance (Section 8181-9.2), or following a final decision on a filed appeal, the Planning Division shall send a Notice of Final Decision to the California Coastal Commission (CCC). The CCC may set another appeal period pursuant to terms and conditions set forth in the California Coastal Act (Pub. Res. Code, Section 30000 *et seq.*). Following the expiration of the CCC's appeal period, and if no appeals are filed, the decision regarding the PD Permit and Administrative Variance will be considered "effective." Once the approval decision becomes effective, the Permittee must obtain a Zoning Clearance for construction in order to conduct the construction activities set forth in Condition No. 1 (Project Description).
  - b. This PD Permit and Administrative Variance shall expire and become null and void if the Permittee fails to obtain a Zoning Clearance for construction within one year from the date the approval decision of this PD Permit and Administrative Variance becomes effective. The Planning Director may grant a one year extension of time to the Permittee in order to obtain the Zoning Clearance for construction if the Permittee can demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Planning Director that the Permittee has made a diligent effort to conduct the construction activities, and the Permittee has requested the time extension in writing at least 30 days prior to the one year expiration date.
  - c. Prior to the issuance of the Zoning Clearance for construction, all fees and charges billed to that date by any County agency, as well as any fines, penalties, and sureties, must be paid in full. After issuance of the Zoning Clearance for construction, any final billed processing fees must be paid within 30 days of the billing date or the County may revoke this PD Permit and Administrative Variance. (PL-8)
- 8. <u>Documentation Verifying Compliance with Other Agencies' Requirements Related to</u> this PD Permit and Administrative Variance

**Purpose:** To ensure compliance with and notification of federal, state, or local government regulatory agencies that have requirements that pertain to the Project (Condition No. 1, above) that is the subject of this PD Permit and Administrative Variance.

**Requirement:** Upon the request of the Planning Director, the Permittee shall provide the Planning Division with documentation (e.g., copies of permits or agreements from other agencies, which are required pursuant to a condition of this PD Permit and Administrative Variance) to verify that the Permittee has obtained or satisfied all applicable federal, state, and local entitlements and conditions that pertain to the Project.

**Documentation:** The Permittee shall provide this documentation to the County Planning Division in the form that is acceptable to the agency issuing the entitlement or clearance, to be included in the Planning Division Project file.

**Timing:** The documentation shall be submitted to the Planning Division prior to the issuance of the Zoning Clearance for construction.

**Monitoring and Reporting:** The Planning Division maintains the documentation provided by the Permittee in the Project file. In the event that the federal, state, or local government regulatory agency prepares new documentation due to changes in the Project or the other agency's requirements, the Permittee shall submit the new documentation within 30 days of receipt of the documentation from the other agency. (PL-9)

9. <u>Notice of PD Permit and Administrative Variance Requirements and Retention of PD</u> Permit and Administrative Variance Conditions On-Site

**Purpose:** To ensure full and proper notice of PD Permit and Administrative Variance requirements and conditions affecting the use of the subject property.

**Requirement:** Unless otherwise required by the Planning Director, the Permittee shall notify, in writing, the Property Owner(s) of record, contractors, and all other parties and vendors regularly dealing with the daily operation of the proposed activities, of the pertinent conditions of this PD Permit and Administrative Variance.

**Documentation:** The Permittee shall maintain a current set of PD Permit and Administrative Variance conditions and exhibits at the Project site.

**Timing:** Prior to issuance of a Zoning Clearance for use inauguration and throughout the life of the Project.

**Monitoring and Reporting:** The Planning Division has the authority to conduct periodic site inspections to ensure ongoing compliance with this condition consistent with the requirements of § 8183-5 of the *Ventura County Coastal Zoning Ordinance*. (PL-10)

#### 10. Financial Responsibility for Compliance Monitoring and Enforcement

a. Cost Responsibilities: The Permittee shall bear the full costs of all County staff time, materials, and County-retained consultants associated with condition compliance review and monitoring, other permit monitoring programs, and enforcement activities, actions, and processes conducted pursuant to the *Ventura County Coastal Zoning Ordinance* (Section 8183-5) related to this PD Permit and Administrative Variance. Such condition compliance review, monitoring and enforcement activities may include but are not limited to: periodic site inspections; preparation, review, and approval of studies and reports; review of PD Permit and Administrative Variance conditions and related records; enforcement hearings and processes; drafting and implementing compliance agreements; and attending to the modification, suspension or revocation of permits. Costs will be billed at the rates set forth in the Planning Division or other applicable County Fee Schedule, and at the

contract rates of County-retained consultants, in effect at the time the costs are incurred.

- b. Billing Process: The Permittee shall pay all Planning Division invoices within 30 days of receipt thereof. Failure to timely pay an invoice shall subject the Permittee to late fees and charges set forth in the Planning Division Fee Schedule, and shall be grounds for suspension, modification, or revocation of this PD Permit and Administrative Variance. The Permittee shall have the right to challenge any charge or penalty prior to payment. (PL-12)
- 11. Defense and Indemnification
  - a. The Permittee shall defend, at the Permittee's sole expense with legal counsel acceptable to the County, against any and all claims, actions, or proceedings against the County, any other public agency with a governing body consisting of the members of the County Board of Supervisors, or any of their respective board members, officials, employees and agents (collectively, "Indemnified Parties") arising out of or in any way related to the County's issuance, administration, or enforcement of this PD Permit and Administrative Variance. The County shall promptly notify the Permittee of any such claim, action or proceeding, and shall cooperate fully in the defense.
  - b. The Permittee shall also indemnify and hold harmless the Indemnified Parties from and against any and all losses, damages, awards, fines, expenses, penalties, judgements, settlements, or liabilities of whatever nature, including but not limited to court costs and attorney fees (collectively, "Liabilities"), arising out of or in any way related to any claim, action or proceeding subject to subpart (a) above, regardless of how a court apportions any such Liabilities as between the Permittee, the County, and/or third parties.
  - c. Except with respect to claims, actions, proceedings, and Liabilities resulting from an Indemnified Party's sole active negligence or intentional misconduct, the Permittee shall also indemnify, defend (at Permittee's sole expense with legal counsel acceptable to County), and hold harmless the Indemnified Parties from and against any and all claims, actions, construction, maintenance, land use, or operations conducted pursuant to this PD Permit and Administrative Variance, regardless of how a court apportions any such Liabilities as between the Permittee, the County, and/or third parties. The County shall promptly notify the Permittee of any such claim, action, or proceeding and shall cooperate fully in the defense.
  - d. Neither the issuance of this PD Permit and Administrative Variance, nor compliance with the conditions hereof, shall relieve the Permittee from any responsibility otherwise imposed by law for damage to persons or property; nor shall the issuance of this PD Permit and Administrative Variance serve to impose any liability upon the Indemnified Parties for injury or damage to persons or property. (PL-13a)

#### 12. Invalidation of Condition(s)

If any of the conditions or limitations of this PD Permit and Administrative Variance are held to be invalid, that holding shall not invalidate any of the remaining PD Permit and

Administrative Variance conditions or limitations. In the event the Planning Director determines that any condition contained herein is in conflict with any other condition contained herein, then where principles of law do not provide to the contrary, the conditions most protective of public health and safety and natural environmental resources shall prevail to the extent feasible.

In the event that any condition imposing a fee, exaction, dedication, or other mitigation measure is challenged by the Permittee in an action filed in a court of law, or threatened to be filed therein, which action is brought in the time period provided for by the *Code of Civil Procedures* (§ 1094.6), or other applicable law, this PD Permit and Administrative Variance shall be allowed to continue in force until the expiration of the limitation period applicable to such action, or until final resolution of such action, provided the Permittee has, in the interim, fully complied with the fee, exaction, dedication, or other mitigation measure being challenged.

If a court of law invalidates any condition, and the invalidation would change the findings and/or the mitigation measures associated with the approval of this PD Permit and Administrative Variance, at the discretion of the Planning Director, the Planning Director may review the Project and impose substitute feasible conditions/mitigation measures to adequately address the subject matter of the invalidated condition. The Planning Director shall make the determination of adequacy. If the Planning Director cannot identify substitute feasible conditions/mitigation measures to replace the invalidated condition, and cannot identify overriding considerations for the significant impacts that are not mitigated to a level of insignificance as a result of the invalidation of the condition, then this PD Permit and Administrative Variance may be revoked. (PL-14)

#### 13. <u>Relationship of PD Permit and Administrative Variance Conditions, Laws, and Other</u> Permits

The Permittee shall design, maintain, and operate the Project site and any facilities thereon in compliance with all applicable requirements and enactments of federal, state, and County authorities. In the event of conflict between various requirements, the more restrictive requirements shall apply. In the event the Planning Director determines that any PD Permit and Administrative Variance condition contained herein is in conflict with any other PD Permit and Administrative Variance condition contained herein, when principles of law do not provide to the contrary, the PD Permit and Administrative Variance condition most protective of public health and safety and environmental resources shall prevail to the extent feasible.

No condition of this PD Permit and Administrative Variance for uses allowed by the Ventura County Ordinance Code shall be interpreted as permitting or requiring any violation of law, lawful rules or regulations, or orders of an authorized governmental agency. Neither the issuance of this PD Permit and Administrative Variance, nor compliance with the conditions of this PD Permit and Administrative Variance, shall relieve the Permittee from any responsibility otherwise imposed by law for damage to persons or property. (PL-16)

## 14. Change of Owner and/or Permittee

**Purpose:** To ensure that the Planning Division is properly and promptly notified of any change of ownership or change of Permittee affecting the Project site.

**Requirement:** The Permittee shall file, as an initial notice with the Planning Director, the new name(s), address(es), telephone/FAX number(s), and email addresses of the new owner(s), lessee(s), operator(s) of the permitted uses, and the company officer(s). The Permittee shall provide the Planning Director with a final notice once the transfer of ownership and/or operational control has occurred.

**Documentation:** The initial notice must be submitted with the new Property Owner's and/or Permittee's contact information. The final notice of transfer must include the effective date and time of the transfer and a letter signed by the new Property Owner(s), lessee(s), and/or operator(s) of the permitted uses acknowledging and agreeing to comply with all conditions of this PD Permit and Administrative Variance.

**Timing:** The Permittee shall provide written notice to the Planning Director 10 calendar days prior to the change of ownership or change of Permittee. The Permittee shall provide the final notice to the Planning Director within 15 calendar days of the effective date of the transfer.

**Monitoring and Reporting:** The Planning Division maintains notices submitted by the Permittee in the Project file and has the authority to periodically confirm the information consistent with the requirements of Section 8183-5 of the *Ventura County Coastal Zoning Ordinance*. (PL-20)

### 15. Construction Noise

**Purpose:** In order for this project to comply with the Ventura County General Plan *Goals, Policies and Programs* (2011) Noise Policy 2.16.2-1(5) and the *County of Ventura Construction Noise Threshold Criteria and Control Plan* (Amended 2010).

**Requirement:** The Permittee shall limit construction activity for site preparation and development to the hours between 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, and from 9:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m., Saturday, Sunday, and State holidays. Construction equipment maintenance shall be limited to the same hours. Non-noise generating construction activities such as interior painting are not subject to these restrictions.

**Documentation:** The Permittee shall post a sign stating these restrictions in a conspicuous on-site location visible to the general public. The sign must provide a telephone number of the site foreman, or other person who controls activities on the jobsite, for use for complaints from the affected public.

**Timing:** The sign shall be installed prior to the issuance of a building permit and throughout grading and construction activities. The Permittee shall maintain a "Complaint Log," noting the date, time, complainant's name, nature of the complaint, and any corrective action taken.

**Monitoring and Reporting:** The Permittee shall provide photo documentation showing posting of the required signage to the Planning Division prior to the commencement of grading or construction activities. (PL-59)

#### 16. Noise Attenuating Features

**Purpose:** In order to ensure interior noise levels do not exceed the maximum acceptable noise levels set forth in the Ventura County General Plan *Goals, Policies, and Programs* Noise Policy 2.16.2-1.

**Requirement:** The Permittee shall install noise attenuation features, including doublepaned windows and sound dampening exterior doors, in the single-family dwelling, in order so that interior noise levels do not exceed the maximum acceptable interior noise levels set forth in the Ventura County General Plan *Goals, Policies, and Programs* Noise Policy 2.16.2-1.

**Documentation:** The Permittee shall submit building plans and any other documentation (e.g., manufacturer's specifications for windows and doors) that specify the noise attenuation features that will be included in the single-family dwelling, and demonstrate compliance with the requirements of Ventura County General Plan *Goals, Policies, and Programs* Noise Policy 2.16.2-1.

**Timing:** Prior to issuance of a Zoning Clearance for construction, the Permittee shall provide the building plans and other documentation (if required) to the Planning Division for review and approval.

**Monitoring and Reporting:** The Planning Division has the authority to conduct inspections to ensure that the specified noise attenuation features are installed and directed.

#### 17. Paleontological Resources Discovered During Grading

**Purpose:** In order to mitigate potential impacts to paleontological resources that may be encountered during ground disturbance or construction activities.

**Requirement:** If any paleontological remains are uncovered during ground disturbance or construction activities, the Permittee shall:

- a. Cease operations and assure the preservation of the area in which the discovery was made;
- b. Notify the Planning Director in writing, within three days of the discovery;
- c. Obtain the services of a paleontological consultant or professional geologist who shall assess the find and provide recommendations on the proper disposition of the site;
- d. Obtain the Planning Director's written concurrence of the recommended disposition of the site before resuming development; and
- e. Implement the agreed upon recommendations.

**Documentation:** The Permittee shall submit the reports prepared by the paleontologist or geologist, to the Planning Division for review and approval. Additional documentation may be required to demonstrate that the Permittee has implemented any recommendations set forth in the paleontological report.

**Timing:** Paleontological reports shall be provided to the Planning Division immediately upon completion.

**Monitoring and Reporting:** The Permittee shall provide any paleontological report prepared for the Project site to the Planning Division to be made part of the Project file. The Permittee shall implement any recommendations made in the paleontological report to the satisfaction of the Planning Director. (PL-56)

#### 18. Archaeological Resources Discovered During Grading

**Purpose:** In order to mitigate potential impacts to archaeological resources discovered during ground disturbance.

**Requirement:** The Permittee shall implement the following procedures:

- a. If any archaeological or historical artifacts are uncovered during ground disturbance or construction activities, the Permittee shall:
  - i. Cease operations and assure the preservation of the area in which the discovery was made;
  - ii. Notify the Planning Director in writing, within three days of the discovery;
  - iii. Obtain the services of a County-approved archaeologist who shall assess the find and provide recommendations on the proper disposition of the site in a written report format;
  - iv. Obtain the Planning Director's written concurrence of the recommended disposition of the site before resuming development; and
  - v. Implement the agreed upon recommendations.
- b. If any human burial remains are encountered during ground disturbance or construction activities, the Permittee shall:
  - i. Cease operations and assure the preservation of the area in which the discovery was made;
  - ii. Immediately notify the County Coroner and the Planning Director;
  - iii. Obtain the services of a County-approved archaeologist and, if necessary, Native American Monitor(s), who shall assess the find and provide recommendations on the proper disposition of the site in a written report format;
  - iv. Obtain the Planning Director's written concurrence of the recommended disposition of the site before resuming development on-site; and
  - v. Implement the agreed upon recommendations.

**Documentation:** If archaeological remains are encountered, the Permittee shall submit a report prepared by a County-approved archaeologist including recommendations for the proper disposition of the site, to the Planning Division for review and approval. Additional documentation may be required to demonstrate that the Permittee has implemented any recommendations set forth in the archaeologist's report.

**Timing:** Archaeologist reports shall be provided to the Planning Division immediately upon completion.

**Monitoring and Reporting:** The Permittee shall provide any archaeologist report prepared for the project site to the Planning Division, to be made a part of the Project file. The Permittee shall implement any recommendations made in the archaeologist's report to the satisfaction of the Planning Director. (PL-59)

#### PUBLIC WORKS AGENCY (PWA) CONDITIONS

#### Engineering Services (ES) Department

#### 19. Grading Permit

**Purpose:** In order to ensure the Permittee performs all grading in compliance with Appendix J of the Ventura County Building Code.

**Requirement:** The Permittee shall submit a grading plan and calculate earthwork quantities. The grading plan must show existing and proposed elevations to the Public Works Agency's Development and Inspection Services Division for review and approval. If a grading permit is required, a State licensed civil engineer must prepare and submit the grading plans to the Development and Inspection Services Division for review and approval. The Permittee must post sufficient surety in order to ensure proper completion of the proposed grading.

**Documentation:** If a grading permit is required, all materials, as detailed on Public Works Agency Form DS-37 and/or DS-44, must be submitted to Development and Inspection Services Division for review and approval.

**Timing:** All applicable documentation, as specified above, must be approved prior to issuance of a Building Permit.

**Monitoring and Reporting:** Public Works Agency engineers will review grading plans and reports for compliance with Ventura County codes, ordinances and standards, as well as state and federal laws. Public Works Agency inspectors will monitor the proposed grading to verify that the work is done in compliance with the approved plans and reports. (ESD-1)

20. <u>Land Development Fee for Flood Control Facilities (AKA: Flood Acreage Fee (FAF))</u> **Purpose:** To address the cumulative adverse impacts of runoff from development on Watershed Protection District Facilities as required by Ordinance No. FC-24.

**Requirement:** The Permittee shall deposit with the PWA – ES Department a FAF in accordance with Ordinance No FC-24 and subsequent resolutions. The fee will be calculated based on the Permittee's information. The Permittee may choose to submit additional information to supplement the information currently provided to establish the amount of the fee.

**Documentation:** The Permittee shall provide a site plan including a calculation of the new impervious surface being created by the Project along with impervious surface for existing construction.

**Timing:** Permittee shall pay the FAF to PWA prior to obtaining the building permit.

**Monitoring and Reporting:** Public Works Agency staff will prepare a quote of the fee amount and provide a receipt when the fee is paid.

## Integrated Waste Management Division (IWMD)

#### 21. Construction and Demolition (C&D) Debris Recycling Plan (Form B)

**Purpose:** Ordinance 4421 requires the Permittee to divert recyclable C&D materials generated by the Project (e.g., wood, metal, greenwaste, soil, concrete, asphalt, paper, and cardboard) from local landfills through recycling, reuse, or salvage. Please review Ordinance 4421 at: www.vcpublicworks.org/ord4421.

**Requirement:** The Permittee must submit a comprehensive recycling plan (Form B – Recycling Plan) to the IWMD for any proposed construction and/or demolition projects that require a building permit.

**Documentation:** The Form B – Recycling Plan must ensure a minimum of 60% of the recyclable C&D debris generated by the Project will be diverted from the landfill by reuse. salvage. Α copy of Form В is available recycling. or at: www.vcpublicworks.org/formsB&C. A comprehensive list of permitted recyclers, County-franchised haulers, and solid waste and recycling facilities in Ventura County is available at: www.vcpublicworks.org/C&D.

A list of local facilities permitted to recycle soil, wood, and greenwaste is available at: www.vcpublicworks.org/greenwaste. A complete list of County-franchised solid waste haulers is available at: www.vcpublicworks.org/commercialhaulers.

**Timing:** Upon Building and Safety Division's issuance of a building permit for the Project, the Permittee must submit a Form B – Recycling Plan to the IWMD for approval.

**Monitoring and Reporting:** The Permittee is required to keep a copy of the approved Form B – Recycling Plan until Building and Safety Division's issuance of a final permit. (IWMD-2).

### 22. <u>C&D Debris Reporting Form (Form C)</u>

**Purpose:** Ordinance 4421 requires the Permittee to divert recyclable C&D materials generated by the Project (e.g., wood, metal, greenwaste, soil, concrete, paper, cardboard, and plastic containers) from local landfills through recycling, reuse, or salvage. Please review Ordinance 4421 at: www.vcpublicworks.org/ord4421.

**Requirement:** The Permittee must submit a Form C - Reporting Form to the IWMD for approval upon issuance of their final Building and Safety Division permit. A copy of Form C - Reporting Form is available at: www.vcpublicworks.org/formsB&C.

**Documentation:** The Permittee must submit original recycling facility receipts and/or documentation of reuse with their Form C – Reporting Form to verify a minimum of 60% of the recyclable C&D debris generated by the Project was diverted from the landfill.

**Timing:** A completed Form C – Reporting Form, with required recycling facility receipts and/or documentation of reuse, must be submitted to the IWMD for approval at the time of Building and Safety Division's issuance of a final permit.

**Monitoring and Reporting:** The Permittee is required to keep a copy of the approved Form C – Reporting Form until Building and Safety Division's issuance of a final permit. (IWMD–3)
# Watershed Protection District - Surface Water Quality Section (SWQS)

# 23. Compliance with Stormwater Development Construction Program

**Purpose:** To ensure compliance with the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Municipal Stormwater Permit No. CAS004002 (Permit) the proposed project will be subject to the construction requirements for surface water quality and storm water runoff in accordance with Part 4.F., "Development Construction Program" of the Permit.

**Requirement:** The construction activities included in the Project shall meet the requirements contained in Part 4.F. "Development Construction Program" of the Permit through the inclusion of effective implementation of the Construction Best Management Practices (BMPs) during all ground disturbing activities.

**Documentation:** The Permittee shall complete and submit to the SWQS for review and approval the SW-1 form (Best Management Practices for Construction Less Than One Acre) which can be found at http://onestoppermit.ventura.org/.

**Timing:** The above listed item shall be submitted to the SWQS for review and approval prior to issuance of a Zoning Clearance for construction.

**Monitoring and Reporting:** SWQS will review the submitted materials for consistency with the Permit. Building and Safety Division Permit Inspectors will conduct inspections during construction to ensure effective installation of the required BMPs. (SWQ-1)

# OTHER VENTURA COUNTY AGENCIES CONDITIONS

# Ventura County Fire Protection District (VCFPD)

# 24. Address Numbers (Single-Family Homes)

**Purpose:** To ensure proper premise identification to expedite emergency response.

**Requirement:** The Permittee shall install a minimum of 4 inch address numbers that are a contrasting color to the background and readily visible at night. Brass or gold plated numbers shall not be used. Where structures are setback more than 150 feet from the street, larger numbers will be required so that they are distinguishable from the street. In the event the structure(s) is not visible from the street, the address number(s) shall be posted adjacent to the driveway entrance on an elevated post.

**Documentation:** A stamped copy of an approved addressing plan or a signed copy of the VCFPD's Form #126 "Requirements for Construction."

**Timing:** The Permittee shall install approved address numbers before final occupancy.

**Monitoring and Reporting:** A copy of the approved addressing plan and/or signed copy of the VCFPD's Form #126 "Requirements for Construction" shall be kept on file with the Fire Prevention Bureau. The Fire Prevention Bureau shall conduct a final inspection to ensure that all structures are addressed according to the approved plans/form. (VCFPD-41a)

# 25. Fire Flow

**Purpose:** To ensure that adequate water supply is available for the Project for firefighting purposes.

**Requirement:** The Permittee shall verify that the water purveyor can provide the required volume and duration at the Project site. The minimum required fire flow shall be determined as specified by the current adopted edition of the Ventura County Fire Code and the applicable Water Manual for the jurisdiction (whichever is more restrictive). Given the present plans and information, the required fire flow is approximately 500 gallons per minute at 20 psi for a minimum 2 hour duration. A minimum flow of 500 gallons per minute shall be provided from any one hydrant.

**Documentation:** A signed copy of the water purveyor's fire flow certification.

**Timing:** The Permittee shall submit a signed copy of the water purveyor's certification to the Fire Prevention Bureau for approval before the issuance of building permits.

**Monitoring and Reporting:** A copy of the fire flow certification shall be kept on file with the Fire Prevention Bureau. (VCFPD-32)

# 26. Fire Sprinklers

**Purpose:** To comply with current California Codes and VCFPD Ordinance.

**Requirement:** The Permittee shall be responsible to have an automatic fire sprinkler system installed in all structures as required by the VCFPD. The fire sprinkler system shall be designed and installed by a properly licensed contractor under California State Law.

**Documentation:** A stamped copy of the approved fire sprinkler plans.

**Timing:** The Permittee shall submit fire sprinkler plans to the Fire Prevention Bureau for approval before the installation of the fire sprinkler system.

**Monitoring and Reporting:** A copy of the approved fire sprinkler plans shall be kept on file with the Fire Prevention Bureau. The Fire Prevention Bureau shall conduct on-site inspections to ensure that the fire sprinkler system is installed according to the approved plans. Unless a modification is approved by the Fire Prevention Bureau, the Permittee, and the Permittee's successors in interest, shall maintain the fire sprinkler system for the life of the development. (VCFPD-40)

# 27. Hazardous Fire Area

**Purpose:** To advise the applicant that the Project site is located within a Hazardous Fire Area and ensure compliance with California Building and Fire Codes.

**Requirement:** The Permittee shall construct all structures to meet hazardous fire area building code requirements.

**Documentation:** A stamped copy of the approved building plans to be retained by the Building and Safety Division.

**Timing:** The Permittee shall submit building plans to the Building and Safety Division for approval before the issuance of building permits.

Conditions for Discretionary Entitlement No. PL14-0164 Date of Public Hearing: January 7, 2016 Date of Approval: Permittee: Matthew and Rebecca Wright Location: 6746 Ojai Ave., La Conchita Page 15 of 16

**Monitoring and Reporting:** The Fire Prevention Bureau shall conduct a final inspection to ensure that the structure is constructed according to the approved hazardous fire area building code requirements. Unless a modification is approved by the Fire Prevention Bureau, the Permittee, and the Permittee's successors in interest, shall maintain the approved construction for the life of the structure. (VCFPD-46)

### 28. Hazard Abatement

**Purpose:** To ensure compliance with VCFPD Ordinance.

**Requirement:** The Permittee shall have all grass or brush adjacent to a structure's footprint cleared for a distance of 100 feet or to the property line if it is less than 100 feet. All grass and brush shall be removed a distance of 10 feet on each side of all access road(s)/driveway(s) within the project.

**Documentation:** A signed copy of the VCFPD's Form #126 "Requirement for Construction" or the "Notice to Abate" issued under the VCFPD's Fire Hazard Reduction Program.

**Timing:** The Permittee shall remove all grass and brush as outlined by the VCFPD's Fire Hazard Reduction Program guidelines before the start of construction on any structure.

**Monitoring and Reporting:** The Fire Prevention Bureau shall conduct on-site inspections to ensure compliance with this condition. (VCFPD-47)

29. Fire Department Clearance

**Purpose:** To provide the Permittee a list of all applicable VCFPD requirements for the Project.

**Requirement:** The Permittee shall obtain VCFPD Form #126 "Requirements for Construction" for any new structures or additions to existing structures before issuance of building permits.

**Documentation:** A signed copy of the VCFPD's Form #126 "Requirements for Construction".

**Timing:** The Permittee shall submit a VCFPD Form #126 application to the Fire Prevention Bureau for approval before issuance of building permits.

**Monitoring and Reporting:** A copy of the completed VCFPD Form #126 shall be kept on file with the Fire Prevention Bureau. The Fire Prevention Bureau will conduct a final on-site inspection of the project to ensure compliance with all conditions and applicable codes/ordinances. (VCFPD-51)

# Air Pollution Control District (APCD)

30. APCD Rules and Regulations for Project Fugitive Dust Emissions

**Purpose:** To ensure that fugitive dust and particulate matter that may result from site preparation, construction activities, and activities on the size are minimized.

**Requirement:** The Permittee shall comply with the provisions of applicable VCAPCD Rules and Regulations, which include but are not limited to, Rule 50 (Opacity), Rule 51 (Nuisance), and Rule 55 (Fugitive Dust).

**Documentation:** The Lead Agency shall ensure compliance with the following provision:

- I. Pre-grading/excavation activities shall include watering the area to be graded or excavated before commencement of grading or excavation operations. Application of water should penetrate sufficiently to minimize fugitive dust during grading activities.
- II. All clearing, grading, earth moving, or excavation activities shall cease during periods of high winds (i.e., wind speed sufficient to cause fugitive dust to impact adjacent properties). During periods of high winds, all clearing, grading, earth moving, and excavation operations shall be curtailed to the degree necessary to prevent fugitive dust created by on-site activities and operations from being a nuisance or hazard, either off-site or on-site.

**Timing:** Throughout project demolition, site preparation and construction.

**Reporting and Monitoring:** The Lead Agency shall monitor all dust control measures during grading activities. (APCD-1)

# 31. Construction Equipment

**Purpose:** In order to ensure that ozone precursor and diesel particulate emissions from mobile construction equipment are reduced to the greatest amount feasible.

**Requirement:** The Permitte shall comply with the provisions of applicable VCAPCD ROC and NOx Construction Mitigation Measures, which include but are not limited to, provisions of Section 7.4.3 of the *Ventura County Air Quality Assessment Guidelines*.

- I. Construction equipment shall not have visible emissions, except when under load.
- II. Construction equipment shall not idle for more than five consecutive minutes. The idling limit does not apply to: (1) idling when queuing; (2) idling to verify that the vehicle is in safe operation condition; (3) idling for testing, servicing, repairing, or diagnostic purposes; (4) idling required to bring the machine system to operating temperature; and (6) idling necessary to ensure safe operation of the vehicle.

**Documentation:** The Lead Agency shall ensure that the applicant informs operators of equipment that idling is limited to five consecutive minutes or less.

Timing: Throughout the construction phase of the project.

**Reporting and Monitoring:** The Lead Agency shall ensure compliance. (APCD-2)

# PACIFIC MATERIALS LABORATORY, INC.

"We Test the Earth"



# LIMITED GEOTECHNICAL EXPLORATION REPORT

Replacement Single Family Residence 6746 Ojai Avenue Ventura, California

### CLIENT

Mr. Matthew Wright 782 Acacia Walk, Unit F Goleta, CA 93117

> March 25, 2014 Lab No. 34862-3 File No. 14-8138-3

150 Wood Road, Suite B •

County of Ventura Planning Director Hearing PL14-0164 Exhibit 5 – Geotech Report ·Fax (805) 445-6551 · Email:

# **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

### Page No.

I.	INTRODUCTION	3
II.	SCOPE OF WORK	3
III.	APPENDICES	4
IV.	VICINITY MAP	4
V.	LIMITED SUBSURFACE EXPLORATION	5
VI.	DOCUMENT REVIEW	6
VII.	LIMITATIOINS	6
VIII.	SUMMARY OF FINDINGS	7
IX.	RECOMMENDATIONS	8
Х.	ROUGH GRADING PREPARATION	8
XI.	FOUNDATION DESIGN	10
	A. CONVENTIONAL FOUNDATION DESIGN	10
	B. POST TENSION SLAB FOUNDATIONS	11
	C. GENERAL FOUNDATION RECOMMENDATIONS	12
	D. LATERAL BUILDING DESIGN LOADS	13
	E. CORROSIVE SOILS TEST SERIES	13
XII.	RETAINING WALLS	15
XIII.	DRAINAGE SYSTEMS	17
XIV	CLOSURE	17
XV.	PLAN REVIEW AND INSPECTIONS	18

### **ATTACHMENTS:**

REFERENCES CITED APPENDIX A: Site Sketch APPENDIX B: Log of Borings APPENDIX C: Field/Laboratory Test Data APPENDIX D: Engineering Calculations

### I. INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to your request and authorization, *Pacific Materials Laboratory, Inc.* has completed a Limited Geotechnical Exploration Report in support of a replacement single family residence currently planned at 6746 Ojai Ave., La Conchita area of Ventura County, California. The subject parcel is a small residential parcel (~30' wide by ~75' deep). The parcel is relatively flat with limited apparent drainage of ~1% trending toward the North to Northwest.

The subject parcel is currently occupied by an existing one (1) story single family residence. It is our current understanding that the existing structure, foundation system, hardscapes, landscaping, onsite wastewater disposal system and utilities will be fully demolished and removed from the parcel prior to the start of new construction.

La Conchita resides within a designated landslide hazard zone. A short discussion of the landslide hazard potential relative to this parcel is discussed in a later section of this report.

The subject property is located in an area long known3 to be at risk from geologic and natural hazards. Most prominent is the knowledge that the "La Conchita" area has a long history of landslide movement and debris flows. The area has been the focus of many studies including recent studies by KROPP 2007/2009 and Lettis 2007 (see References Cited herein for details). It is the opinion of the undersigned that planned improvements will not improve and/or worsen the potential geologic risks and/or hazards associated with the "La Conchita" area relative to this and neighboring parcels. More information relative to hazards associated with the subject property are discussed in Section VI of this report.

Seasonal water elevation differences are anticipated where saturated soils, free or perched water conditions were encountered and/or historical high ground water conditions are known. The encountered free water elevations reported should be used only as an estimate and not relied upon for construction. Actual field conditions should be confirmed by additional borings performed by the project contractor immediately prior to rough grading, excavation and/or construction.

### II. SCOPE OF WORK

The scope of work performed in preparation of this report included:

- Review of available previous geotechnical reports<sup>1</sup>, plans, photographs and maps
- Excavation, logging and sampling of two (2) truck mounted flight auger boring(s)
- Execution of programmed field and laboratory soil mechanics tests
- Determination of 2010 CBC and ASCE-7 site specific seismic design coefficients
- Review of KROPP Reports relative to the subject parcel
- Review of data, synthesis, evaluation and preparation of this report

<sup>1</sup> See References Cited herein for a complete listing of referenced reports.

### III. APPENDICES

- Appendix A: Site Sketch: A sketch of the subject building pad area was prepared in the field based on visual observations and limited measurements using a 100' cloth tape. The sketch is simplistic, however, it does include applicable site configuration, approximate structure locations, test locations and other pertinent information. The sketch is included as **Enclosure A**.
- Appendix B: Log of Borings: Test borings were logged in the field. Laboratory test data were then added. The profiles were then interpreted by the undersigned registered engineer, finalized and included herein as Enclosures B-1 and B-2.
- Appendix C: Field/Laboratory Test Data: Field and laboratory test data performed during this study are included in this appendix. Test data include maximum density optimum moisture determination, expansion index, relative compaction, graphically displayed insitu consolidation, a graphical interpretation of direct shear testing, sieve and hydrometer analysis, UCSC classification and near surface soil corrosive series test data.
- **Appendix D:** Engineering Calculations: Calculations provided herein include allowable shallow footing bearing capacities, active and passive soil pressures and coefficient of sliding friction determination.

### IV. VICINITY MAP

To aid and simply review of this report the subject property has been approximately located on a copy of Bing Maps, 2010 Microsoft Corp., 2010 NAVTEQ and Image Courtesy of USGS. The subject property is indicated by an arrow incorporating the word "SITE" pointing to the property.



FIGURE 1 - Vicinity Map

### V. LIMITED SUBSURFACE EXPLORATION

The soil mechanics and engineering properties of surface and shallow subsurface soils, which are anticipated to be of primary influence to the planned improvements, were explored by a total of two (2) truck mounted, hollow stem, helical flight auger borings excavated to a maximum depth of thirty (30) feet below the present ground surface. The drilling method employed is consistent with ASTM D1452 procedures.

During excavation insitu and bulk soil samples were obtained at regular programmed intervals. The purpose of sampling is for engineering identification and laboratory testing including but not necessarily limited to:

	(ASTM D 2488)	Description and identification of soils
÷.	(ASTM D 2487)	Classification of soils for engineering purposes
*	(ASTM D 1586)	Penetration test and split-barrel sampling of soils
8	(ASTM D 421)	Dry preparation of soil samples
	(ASTM D 2216)	Moisture content determination
÷	(ASTM D 1556)	Density and unit weight (sandcone method)
	(ASTM D 1557)	Laboratory compaction characteristics of soil
*	(ASTM D 422)	Mechanical and hydrometer analysis
	(ASTM D 4829)	Expansion potential and classification
۲	(ASTM D 2435)	One dimensional consolidation
*	(ASTM D 3080)	Direct shear test of soils
٠	(ASTM D4829)	R-value determination
	(ASTM 2487)	Liquid and plastic limits
۲	(ASTM D4992)	рН
•	(CTM 417)	Soluble Sulfates
•	(CTM 422)	Soluble Chloride
•	(ASTM D 4972)	pH
•	(CTM 643)	Resistivity

Soil samples referred herein as insitu, or undisturbed, were obtained in accordance with ASTM D3550 *"Ring-Lined Barrel Sampling of Soils"*. The method uses a 140 pound, in hole sampling hammer free falling, using a mobile Safe-T-Driver wireline drum hoist fitted with a manual release. The hammer falls 30 inches on a 2.5" I.D. x 18" long split barrel sampler fitted with continuous internal brass liners.

Methods presently available for recovery of samples termed insitu, result in some degree of disturbance to the insitu nature of the soil samples. The careful management of these samples, however, provide a useful tool for engineering evaluation of subsurface soil performance. Additional sampling included *Standard Penetration Test(s)* SPT per 1999 ASTM D1586 to aid in determining insitu soil strength, evaluation of the potential of site liquefaction and dynamic settlement. The sampler consists of an 18" long, 1.5" I.D. diameter sampler, with liners, driven by the same 140 lb. hammer described.

Where they appear, blow counts from the 2.5" I.D. sampler were modified to equivalent Standard Penetration Test (*SPT*) blow counts employing procedures by Karol, R.H. (*Soils and Soils Engineering*, *Prentice Hall*, 1964). The resulting factor for adjustment of the field obtained blow counts to N<sub>SPT</sub> equivalent blow counts is ~0.60. The adjusted blow count data from the 2.5" I.D. sampler as well as any SPT blow counts (*from an actual 1.5" I.D. SPT sampler*) are each normalized and corrected in accordance with the procedures included in "Liquefaction Resistance of Soils: Summary Report from the 1996 NCEER and 1999 NCEER/NSF Workshop on Evaluation of Liquefaction Resistance of Soils, Journal of Geotechnical and GeoEnvironmental Engineering dated April, 2001 (*Youd*, *T.L.* & *Idriss*, *I.M.*) employing an energy ratio of 1.0. The field blow counts are denoted as **Nspt**.

### VI. DOCUMENT REVIEW

The subject parcel resides immediate to a well documented geologic hazard area known as the La Conchita "Upcoast Landslide Zone". While all references cited herein contain important information relative to known hazards common to the subject property and should be read and understood by all La Conchita residences and visitors, the August 28, 2009 William Lettis & Associates, Inc. (WLA) Final Report - La Conchita Slope Stabilization Report appears to be the most comprehensive relative to assigned risk assessment.

The WLA Final report (2009) identifies a long history of recurring landslides, debris flows, seismic induced landslides and/or deformation within the greater La Conchita area as well as other damaging naturally occurring potential hazards.

# Per the 2009 WLA report, Figure 8.8, the primary hazard to the subject parcel is the risk of up to two-feet of inundation via debris flow run-out within the next 1000 years. The following hazard probabilities were assigned to the subject property by WLA (2009):

- A possible, although unlikely, potential for structural loss and/or loss of life from inundation debris flow run-out of sediment located upslope of the subject residence.
- <u>Possible</u>, although unlikely, structural damage as a result of liquefaction, dynamically induced settlement and/or lateral spreading during periods of local moderate to severe seismic activity
- <u>Possible</u>, although unlikely, structural damage as a result of fault rupture.
- Inundation, structural damage and possible loss of life as a result of Tsunami.
- Structural loss due to wild fire.

### VII. LIMITATIONS

The data findings and design recommendations provided herein are intended as an instrument of professional service. The scope of work performed in preparation of this report is consistent with the work prescribed by the client and included within *Pacific Materials Laboratory, Inc.* cost proposal and agreement formally executed prior to the start of work on this report. *Pacific Materials Laboratory, Inc.* authorizes use of this document as needed, by the client, his professional representatives or consultants as necessary to further planning, development and construction of the specific project defined, and limited to, the subject of this report. This document is the exclusive property of *Pacific Materials Laboratory, Inc.*, and is not to be used in whole or part for any other use except as defined herein without prior written authorization by *Pacific Materials Laboratory, Inc.* 

All building sites are subject to elements of risk which cannot be wholly identified and/or entirely eliminated. Furthermore, building sites in Southern California are subject to many different types of geotechnical hazard potentials including but not limited to the effects of water infiltration, erosion, inappropriate drainage, static total settlement, static differential settlement, expansive soil movement, chemical alteration, seismic shaking, seismic-induced ground and slope deformation, seismic-induced settlement, liquefaction, hydroconsolidation, mud flow, and landsliding. Some, but not all the listed potential geotechnical hazards may be evaluated within the scope of this report. Accordingly, the subject project may be at *risk* from some geotechnical hazard as of yet not evaluated.

Acceptable long term performance is highly dependent on the property owner properly maintaining the site (*such as repair and maintenance of drainage facilities, slopes, etc.*) and by immediately correcting any and all deficiencies discovered throughout stewardship of the property. It is <u>not possible</u> to completely eliminate all hazards or inherent risks. Even with a thorough subsurface exploration and testing program, significant insitu geotechnical variability and latent defects between test locations may exist. Latent defects can be concealed by earth materials, deposition, geologic history and preexisting site improvements. Such defects (*if any*), are beyond the scope of this evaluation. Accordingly, no warranty, expressed or implied, is made or intended in connection with findings, data or recommendations included in this report (*or by any other oral or written statement*) other than the services performed which were

provided within the limits prescribed by and agreed to by the client. *Pacific Materials Laboratory, Inc.* warrants that the services performed in preparation of this report are consistent with the limits prescribed by the client and with generally accepted thoroughness and competence of the geotechnical and geological engineering profession.

The recommendations presented herein should be considered applicable for a period of not greater than 12 months from the date of this document. Reports older than 12 months should not be relied upon for design and/or plan check without a currently dated (not greater than 12 months) site specific soils engineering update report.

It is the responsibility of the client, or of his representative, to ensure that the information and geotechnical recommendations provided herein are conveyed to the project architect(s), engineer(s), contractor(s) and/or building officials and that the intent and spirit of these geotechnical recommendations are incorporated into plans and specifications, and that these recommendations are in turn properly implemented in the field during construction.

Furthermore, it is the sole responsibility of the contractor(s) to employ all necessary safety procedures during construction. *Pacific Materials Laboratory, Inc.* cannot be held responsible for the safety of other than our own personnel on or immediate to the site. The contractor(s) should immediately notify the owner in writing if he considers any of the recommended actions discussed herein to be unsafe. The project contractor(s) should <u>not</u> start or continue any work or service that is considered to be at risk or unsafe by any effected party.

### VIII. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

- 8.1 The subject property resides immediate to an area of severe potential for ongoing and future geologic hazard. Many events have occurred historically. Future hill slope movement resulting in debris flow run-out inundation up to 2' high impacting the subject property is deemed possible within the next 1000 years. (See Section VI of this report entitled "Limited Document Review for more detail.) Should this event occur, the subject occupant's life safety, the structure(s) are potentially at risk (albeit very low) and will remain at risk at this site. Should events exceeding the WLA predicted landslide, slope encroachment, slope deformation, debris flow run-out depths, earthquake induced slope movement, liquefaction, dynamically induced settlement, lateral spreading or Tsunami be realized, the subject property would likely be adversely impacted.
- 8.2 Free ground water was encountered during excavation of both test borings. The free water ranged from 16 feet to 16.5 feet below the present ground surface.
- 8.3. The surface soils (0-3') encountered are classified as slightly expansive, sandy silty clays with an expansion (EI) index of 47.
- 8.4 The insitu relative compaction of the load bearing soils immediate to the existing foundation elements were documented to be ~85% through a depth of ~4'. Materials encountered throughout the boring depth attempted did not appear to firm appreciably.
- 8.5 The insitu soils blow counts (energy to drive undisturbed samples) were classified as moderately loose (Neq SPT <26) through the depth attempted (~14').
- 8.6 The results of consolidation tests indicate *insitu* near surface soils (0-5') are *moderately potentially suspectible* to hydroconsolidation and are *moderately* compressible.
- 8.7 The upper 0 to ~15 feet of existing surface soils are considered *moderately loose* and underlain with moderately firm soils.

- 8.8 The subgrade soils (0-4') are classified as severe with respect to sulfate exposure. As such select concrete should be used to better resist the potential for future sulfate attack. The lack of sulfate safe guards could result in premature concrete deterioration and/or failure. Buried ferrous metal pipe life is also at risk in these materials. Accordingly, PVC or ABS pipe should be employed whenever possible when in contact with native soil. Please see Section XI of corrosive soils and their impact.
- 8.9 An *existing* structure along with accessory elements are located within the proposed *new* building lines. The existing structure is scheduled for removal prior to new construction activity.
- 8.10 Based upon subsurface soils engineering data obtained, tested and reviewed during this exploration, the soil condition is considered suitable for support of the planned improvements when geotechnically prepared as recommended herein. As previously discussed the subject property has been classified as being at risk of several geologic hazards. These risks will not be mitigated and will remain upon completion of planned improvements.

### IX. RECOMMENDATIONS

It is our understanding that a *one (1) and/or two (2) story* single family residence of woodframe construction utilizing concrete slabs on grade is being planned. A moderate cut and fill onsite rough grading operation is anticipated in preparation of a geotechnically suitable building area and access drive.

The following recommendations are based solely upon the afore described mode of construction. The project site, grading and foundation plans should be submitted to *Pacific Materials Laboratory, Inc.*, for review and written comment prior to construction. Any proposed changes in construction mode should also be reviewed by *Pacific Materials Laboratory, Inc.*, and as required, recommendations modified in writing prior to construction.

### X. ROUGH GRADING PREPARATION

- 10.1 All surface vegetation, root structures and debris should be removed from the site prior to the start of rough grading activity.
- 10.2 All existing trees and/or large shrubs *(if any)* residing within the limits of the proposed grading activity should be removed and careful attention should be given to completely removing all root structures. Once cleared the cavity should be observed and approved by a representative of *Pacific Materials Laboratory, Inc.* When approved, the areas should be scarified an additional 6 inches in depth, uniformly brought to optimum moisture content and compacted to 90% relative compaction.
- 10.3 Existing surface soils underlying the proposed building area, secondary structures or areas to receive artificial fill, should be removed to a minimum depth of 48 inches. A representative of *Pacific Materials Laboratory, Inc.*, should be notified to observe and approve the exposed cavity prior to placing artificial fill. Upon approval, the area should then be scarified an additional 12 inches in depth, uniformly brought to near optimum moisture content and compacted to a minimum of 90% relative compaction.

Caution: The materials encountered during the field exploration were found to contain excessive moisture content. Accordingly, the contractor should be prepared to provide mixing and drying as necessary to achieve <u>uniform</u> near optimum moisture content in fill and along the base of excavation.

- 10.4 Area preparation to receive structural artificial fill should extend a minimum of 5 feet beyond proposed artificial fills, artificial fill slopes, exterior building lines, or by the depth of removal, whichever is greater.
- 10.5 The removed soil may be used as backfill providing all deleterious and/or oversized material is removed. Oversized material is defined as 8 inch diameter or larger rock, cobbles or broken concrete. Large diameter material (1.5"-8") should be uniformly distributed throughout the artificial fill material. Concentrations of large diameter material will be removed, remixed and placed until uniformity is achieved. The bulk of materials encountered during the course of this study are considered suitable for use in creation of structural artificial fill.
- 10.6 Actual site conditions may vary from conditions interpreted from this study. Therefore, the final limits/recommendations pertaining to the rough grading activity will be determined by a representative of *Pacific Materials Laboratory, Inc.* during grading progress.
- 10.7 Artificial fill should be placed in *horizontal* layers of *less* than 6 inches in depth, brought to near optimum moisture content and *uniformly* compacted to a minimum of 90% relative compaction prior to placing the next lift of artificial fill.
- 10.8 Compaction should be attained employing a sheepsfoot roller, vibrating sheepsfoot roller or selfpropelled compactor. The use of wheel rolling and/or track walking is not considered appropriate unless reviewed by *Pacific Materials Laboratory, Inc.*, and allowed by test area prior to production rough grading.
- 10.9 The laboratory compaction standard should be performed in accordance with ASTM D1557 procedures. Compaction tests should be performed in accordance with ASTM D1556 (sandcone method) or ASTM D3017 (nuclear method).
- 10.10 All utility trench backfill underlying the proposed structure, asphalt concrete parking, public street section, planned hardscape or other areas considered to be sensitive to settlement should be structurally recompacted up to final grade (90% relative compaction). All utility trench backfill should be tested for compliance by a representative of *Pacific Materials Laboratory, Inc.*, prior to proceeding with the next phase of construction.
- 10.11 Based upon compliance with the recommended site preparatory rough grading activities, the volumetric loss actors presented in **Table-1** are considered appropriate for calculation of grading yardage estimates:

### Building/Artificial fill area preparation:

- Shrinkage –15-25%
- Subsidence 0.25'
- Oversized rock 0%

**Table 1- Rough Grading Volume Losses** 

10.12 Should *import material* be needed to complete planned rough grading activities, the materials should be pre-screended by *Pacific Materials Laboratory, Inc.* prior to import to the subject property. Pre-screening of import materials should conclude the material is of similar soil type(s) and expansion index(es) to the onsite soils. The use of import soils with substantially different qualities than those of onsite soils may require careful handling and blending to assure a near uniform material results within the upper four (4) feet of the finished building pad.

Please Note: In order to provide timely pre-screening of import materials initially only limited soil mechanics testing will be performed. Additional comprehensive testing and analysis will be performed on representative samples of import soils and/or blends after they have been delivered, placed and compacted on the subject project. Accordingly, *Pacific Materials Laboratory, Inc.* reserves the right to modify foundation design recommendations based upon "as-constructed" conditions.

10.13 Upon excavation should the exposed soils at the base of removal be saturated, near saturation, or yield under the load of normal excavation equipment, a stabilization blanket will be necessary. The stabilization blanket should consist of a 18" thick core of 1"+ coarse aggregate completely encircled by Mirafi 600X engineering fabric. All fabric joints should be lapped a minimum of 24" or per the minimum criteria of the manufacturer whichever is greater. A representative of *Pacific Materials Laboratory, Inc.* should observe preparation, excavation and placement of the stabilization blanket and rock.

The first 12" of Class II Base placed over top the engineering fabric should be placed by pushing material ahead of the equipment such that <u>no</u> equipment comes into direct contact with the fabric. The remaining artificial fill placement and recompaction activity should proceed in a conventional manner (6" maximum lifts).

If practical a schedule 40 - 4 inch diameter gravity drain system should be incorporated into the base rock elevation of the stabilization blanket. The drain should be continued by solid water tight piping to an approved drainage area via gravity flow.

- 10.14 Based upon review of the insitu soil moisture contents, considerable air drying, spreading and mixing may be realized in preparation of a uniform near optimum soil condition prior to replacement and recompaction as structural artificial fill.
- 10.15 Materials placed throughout (*both in area and depth*) the proposed graded artificial fill building pad should be comprised of uniform, similar (*physically and expansively*) soils. Thorough mixing of dissimilar artificial fill materials (i.e. *sandstone and claystone*) will be required to achieve a *uniform* artificial fill condition, as to be determined by *Pacific Materials Laboratory, Inc.* during the rough grading activity.

### XI. FOUNDATION DESIGN

The following foundation design criteria is based upon successful completion of recommended rough grading preparation activities and verification that the soils resulting in the finished building pad are consistent in engineering properties with those encountered and tested herein. A final rough grading compaction test report along with a geotechnical review of the subject foundation plans is required prior to the start of foundation excavation and construction. *Final* geotechnical foundation design recommendations will be presented upon conclusion of rough grading based upon the *"as-graded*" geotechnical conditions.

### A. CONVENTIONAL FOUNDATION DESIGN - Slightly Expansive (<u>EI = 21-50</u>)

11.1 All foundation and slab components should be designed by a California Registered Civil or Structural Engineer, experienced with similar structures, including experience with the expansive soils criteria design included in the 2010 Edition of the California Building Code (*CBC*) Division III, Section 1805A.8 (*Design for expansive soils*) and compressible soils while also incorporating (*as a minimum*) the following criteria.

- 11.2 All exterior continuous (*strip*) footings and gradebeams should extend a minimum depth of 15, 18 and 24 inches and all *interior* continuous (strip) footings should extend a minimum of 12, 18 and 24 inches for one, two and three-story construction respectively. Footing depth should be measured from the lowest final adjacent subgrade. All <u>one</u> and <u>two</u>-story continuous footings should be reinforced using a minimum of two (2) No. 4 reinforcing bars, placed one (1) near the top and one (1) a minimum of three (3) inches clear of bottom of the footing. All <u>three</u>-story continuous footings should be reinforced using a minimum of two (2) No. 5 reinforcing bars placed one (1) near the top and one (1) near the bottom of the footing.
- 11.3 All *spread* footings should be excavated to the same minimum depth as continuous *exterior* footings, and should be designed to uniformly distribute the impending loads to the underlying soils. Spread footings should be reinforced using a minimum of one (1) horizontal mat of No. 3 reinforcing bars at 6 inches on center in two (2) perpendicular directions, placed a minimum of three (3) inches above the bottom of the excavation or sized per the requirements of the project structural engineer. The use of isolated footings may be considered however, the performance of a unitary foundation system (*interconnected*) would be superior and result in less cosmetic damage when subjected to seismically induced forces.
- 11.4 <u>All</u> concrete slabs on grade should be a minimum of 6 inches thick. The following reinforcement is recommended based upon satisfying the minimum temperature and shrinkage steel requirements for structural quality slabs and expansive soil requirements. Accordingly, slabs at grade should be reinforced with No. 3 rebar spaced at 16 inches on center each way. <u>All</u> slabs at grade should be underlain with a minimum of six (6) inches of clean compact coarse sand in which two (2) layers of 10-mil visquine or equivalent moisture membrane should be embedded. All laps/edges of the visquine shall be heat bonded to form a vapor/moisture proof joint. A minimum of 1" of compact sand should be provided between the concrete and the moisture membrane. The moisture membrane may be omitted in areas where flooring (*tile, linoleum, carpet*) are <u>not</u> planned. Hardwood floors planned over slabs at grade should incorporate an appropriate secondary vapor barrier and should be placed in <u>strict compliance with manufacturer recommendations to assure acceptable service</u>. (*Many wood flooring products are not intended for use in contact with concrete slabs at grade*).
- 11.5 Clean <u>sand fill</u> exceeding 6 inches in depth to be used for <u>slab support</u> should be mechanically compacted to not less than 90% relative compaction. Sand fill preparation and placement in excess of 6" in depth should be monitored and tested during the process by *Pacific Materials Laboratory, Inc.* Please notify our office a minimum of 48 hours in advance of required site visits.
- 11.6 Utility trench backfill underlying slabs at grade and/or utility trench backfill *crossing* footings should be mechanically compacted slightly above optimum moisture to a minimum of 90% relative compaction. All trench backfill should be tested for compliance and approved by *Pacific Materials Laboratory, Inc.* prior to the placement of concrete. Trenches running *parallel* to footings should be placed no closer than a 1:1 plane extending away from the bottom edge of the footing nor closer than five (5) feet from any portion of the foundation system.

## B. POST TENSION SLAB FOUNDATIONS

As an alternate to *conventional foundation design* an engineered <u>post-tensioned slab</u> at grade system may be considered. All components of the post-tension slab system should be designed by a California Registered Structural Engineer along with appropriate geotechnical parameters included in this section. The design of post-tension slab systems should conform to the minimum requirements of the 2010 CBC - <u>Design of Post-Tensioned Slabs on Grade</u> (based upon design specification of the post tensioning institute).

The project geotechnical data was reviewed and evaluated in preparation of the following post-tension slab system design criteria. The following recommendations are based solely upon the afore described mode of construction. The project site, grading and foundation plans should be submitted to *Pacific Materials Laboratory, Inc.*, for review and written comment prior to construction. Any proposed changes in construction mode should also be reviewed by *Pacific Materials Laboratory, Inc.*, and as required, recommendations modified in writing prior to construction.

11.7 Design of the post-tension slab system should include consideration of site specific expansive soil criteria. For the purpose of design a deepened reinforced <u>continuous perimeter footing</u> should be provided on all post tension slabs. The minimum recommended perimeter footing depth and reinforcement should be consistent with **Table 2 -A** "Deepened Perimeter Footings" requirements. The intent of the deepened perimeter footing is to control and/or prevent significant exterior landscape water migration from affecting the structural foundation system. The perimeter footing may be reinforced by using conventional reinforcing bars, by engineered post tension tendons or by both.

Expansion <u>index</u>	No. of <u>Stories</u>	Exterior Continuous Footing Depth (in.)	Minimum Reinforcement
21-50	1	15	2-#4 rebar; 1 top and 1 bottom
	2	18	2-#4 rebar; 1 top and 1 bottom
	3	24	2-#5 rebar; 1 top and 1 bottom

TABLE 2 - A "Deepened Perimeter Footings"

11.8 The following minimum post-tension slab geotechnical design parameters as outlined in Table 2 – B "Post Tension Slab Design Parameters" below are considered geotechnically appropriate for post-tension slab design.

Item	Post-Tension Design Criteria
Expansion Index Range (UBC Method)	21-50
Edge Moisture Variation Distance (e <sub>m</sub> )	
Edge Lift	2.8'
Center Lift	5.5'
<ul> <li>Maximum Differential Soil Movement (ym)</li> </ul>	
Edge Lift	0.70"
Center Lift	2.9"
<ul> <li>Modulus of Soil Elasticity (Es)</li> </ul>	2,200 psi
Modulus of Subgrade Reaction (Ks)	133 lb/in3

TABL	E 2 ·	- B	"Post	Tension	Slab	Design	Parameters"
------	-------	-----	-------	---------	------	--------	-------------

11.9 Post-tension slab system design calculations and plans should be submitted to *Pacific Materials Laboratory, Inc.* for review and comment prior to the start of construction.

# C. GENERAL FOUNDATION RECOMMENDATIONS - Recommended for <u>all</u> foundation designs.

11.10 This note should appear on the subject foundation plan: The soils underlying all footings and slabs should be presaturated to a minimum moisture content of 120% of optimum moisture content to a minimum depth of 6 inches below the bottom of the footing excavation and 21 inches below the slab subgrade. Written presaturation verification by *Pacific Materials Laboratory, Inc.* should be provided prior to placing concrete.

- 11.11 Final grading should provide positive drainage away from the foundation system and from the lot. Specific permanent drainage recommendations are presented in a later section of this report. Proper drainage should also be established during construction. This is especially important when construction takes place during periods of inclement weather. Proper drainage systems and maintenance is essential to promote acceptable long-term service.
- 11.12 Based upon compliance with these recommendations, an allowable soil bearing value of 2200 psf may be assumed for design of <u>conventional continuous</u> (*strip*) and <u>spread footings</u> extending from 15-24 inches below the adjacent ground surface. An allowable soil bearing value of 1000 psf may be assumed for design of <u>post-tension slabs</u> at the ground surface. The allowable bearing value may be increased by 500 psf per foot of additional footing embedment depth to a maximum of 3000 psf. It should be noted increased footing depth may require increased rough grading removal and recompaction to provide the minimum recommended depth of structural artificial fill below the bottom of the footings. The allowable soil bearing value may also be increased 1/3 when considering wind or seismic forces. The dead load weight of footings may be ignored in design.
- 11.13 Based upon compliance with the above recommendations, the maximum *total* long term static movement is estimated at less than L/150 while the maximum long term static *differential* movement is estimated at less than L/500 where L= the design span (*i.e. column spacing*).

### D. LATERAL BUILDING DESIGN LOADS

As required by Section 1613A of the 2010 CBC "... Every structure and portion thereof, including nonstructural components that are permanently attached to structures and their supports and attachments, shall be designed and constructed to resist the effects of earthquake motions in accordance with ASCE 7..."

Accordingly, based upon the results of subsurface exploration(s) conducted by *Pacific Materials* Laboratory, *Inc.*, the ASCE 7 compliant geotechnical lateral design criteria included in **Table** – 3 below has been assigned to the subject project for use in lateral design by the project structural engineer.

SEISMIC DESIGN CATEGORY	D	CBC SECTION 1613A.5.6
SITE CLASS	D	CBC TABLE 1613A.5.5
S <sub>5</sub>	2.532	USGS Web Site
S <sub>1</sub>	0.896	USGS Web Site
Fa	1.0	CBC TABLE 1613A.5.3.1
Fv	1.5	CBC FIGURE 1613.5.3(2)
Sps	1.688	2/3 * S <sub>s</sub> x F <sub>a</sub>
S <sub>D1</sub>	0.896	2/3 * S <sub>1</sub> x F <sub>v</sub>
Ts	0.106	0.2*Sp1/SpS
Tp	0.531	S <sub>D1</sub> /S <sub>DS</sub>

### TABLE – 3 - 2010 CBC SEISMIC DESIGN PARAMETERS

### E. CORROSIVE SOILS TEST SERIES

Common chemicals found in soil, when combined with water, can lead to adverse chemical reactions impacting hardened concrete, reinforcement and buried metallic piping overtime. In order to assess this potential hazard relative to planned improvements, a preliminary series of chemical tests have been completed on the most common, near surface, soil type. The test results are summarized on **Enclosure C** herein. As a practical matter each soil type in direct contact with hardened concrete and/or buried ferrous metal piping should be tested for corrosive potential. Accordingly, additional testing is strongly recommended during the development phase of construction to insure appropriate mitigation measures are employed. A short discussion of each chemical test performed and its potential impact on the subject project follow:

**<u>pH</u>**- Acidic water (such as acid rain -pH 4.0-4.5) are capable of etching, staining and/or deteriorating concrete surfaces. Prolonged contact with strong acids (such as found in some soils -pH < 4.0) warrant special concrete mix designs and other precautions. Typically lean concrete with a low water to cement ratio (0.45-0.50) coupled with the use of Type II cement and low permeability are more resistant to acid attack.

**Sulfates (S0**<sub>4</sub>) Chemical reaction between hydrated cement and sulfate ions commonly migrating from exterior sources (*such as sulfates carried by way of water and/or water vapor migration from soil into hardened concrete*) can produce expansive forces within hardened concrete. Over time this reaction could result in a progressive loss of strength, progressive loss of concrete mass and ultimately in concrete failure. As a result of this potential risk the California Building Code (*CBC*) and the American Concrete Institute (*ACI*) recommend specialized concrete mix designs to improve concrete performance when subject to sulfate attack.

CBC Section 1904.5 recommends concrete in direct contact with soil comply with ACI 318, Table 4.3.1 requirements. ACI 318, Table 4.3.1 has been reprinted herein and should be applied to all concrete in direct contact with soil. Concrete slabs on grade underlain with clean, chemically neutral fill sand and a 10 mil vapor resistive membrane maybe considered isolated from subgrade soil and concrete for this element are not considered to be at risk from sulfate attack as such they maybe established strictly based upon ACI structural criteria.

Sulfate Exposure	Water-Soluble Sulfate (SO4) in soil, percentage by weight	Sulfate (SO4) in water ppm	Cement Type	Maximum Water- Cementitious materials ratio, by weight, normal- weight, Aggregate Concrete	Minimum f <sup>1</sup> c <sup>1</sup> Normal-weight and Lightweight Aggregate Concrete psi x 0.00689 for MPa
Negligible	0.00010	0-150		- CUMPUS	
Moderate <sup>2</sup>	0.10-0.20	150-1,500	II, IP (MS), IS (MS)	0.5	4,000
Severe	0.20-2.00	1,500-10,000	V	0.45	4,500
Very Severe	Over 2.00	Over 10,000	V plus pozzolan <sup>3</sup>	0.45	4,500

Table 4 – (From ACI 318 Table 4.3.1)

<sup>1</sup> A lower water-cementitious materials ratio or higher strength may be required for low permeability or for protection against corrosion of embedded items or freezing and thawing.

<sup>2</sup> Sea water.

<sup>3</sup> Pozzolan that has been determined by test or service record to improve sulfate resistance when used in concrete containing Type V cement.

<u>Chlorides</u>- Overtime a concentration of soluble chloride can adversely impact reinforcing steel, prestressing cables or other ferrous materials embedded in concrete. When soluble chloride concentrations of 15,000 ppm or more are found in water and/or soils special mitigation measures are needed to protect ferrous metals within the concrete.

**<u>Resistivity</u>-** Electrical resistivity is a common cause of deterioration of ferrous metals in direct contact with soil (*such as buried metal piping*). Generally speaking <u>all</u> soils are, at the very least, mildly corrosive and as a result will shorten the life of buried ferrous metal piping, fence posts, etc. Wherever possible coated metal and/or PVC or ABS piping should be employed to help mitigate this risk.

If ferrous metal piping is employed mitigation is recommended when the soil resistivity is less than 10,000Ohm-Cm (*a moderately corrosive condition*). The following table has been provided as a general guideline for use in determination of the soil resistivity risk.

Soil Resistivity, Ohm-Cm	Corrosivity Category
0-1,000	Severely Corrosive
1,000-2,000	Corrosive
2,000-10,000	Moderately Corrosive
Over 10,000	Mildly Corrosive

**Table 5 - Soil Corrosion Potential** 

### XII. RETAINING WALLS

When possible, all retaining walls should be fully drained using one of the backdrain methods depicted on "*Retaining Wall Backdrain Details*" included herein. If full height, full length effective drainage cannot be provided, retaining structures should be designed for <u>undrained</u> conditions. Non-yielding, or at-rest equivalent fluid pressures should be used as warranted by the structural setting, such as for basement walls. Appropriate retaining wall design criteria is presented in the table below entitled "Retaining Wall Design Criteria" below for retaining walls supported via foundations extending a minimum of 12 inches into firm material.

Design		Equivalent F				
Condition	Level Ba	ackfill (b,g,h)	Sloping I	Backfill <sub>(f,g,h)</sub>	Coefficient of	Allowable Bearing
	Drained (d)	Undrained(e)	Drained <sub>(d)</sub>	Undrained <sub>(e)</sub>	Sliding Friction	Capacity (i) (psf)
Active(a) (pcf)	35	55	48	86	0.37	2500
At-Rest <sub>(c)</sub> (pcf)	85	105	116	120	0.37	2500
Passive(j) (psf/ft)	415	415	100	100		

### Table Notes:

- a. Yielding cantilevered engineered retaining wall design.
- **b.** Level cohesionless compacted (90%) backfill with a sand equivalent >30 and an expansion index = 0
- c. Non-yielding and/or restrained engineered retaining wall design.
- d. A drained condition requires a continuous 4" diameter perforated pipe for runs up to 150' long and a 6" diameter pipe for runs up to 500' long be placed (*perforatons down*) along the intersection of the retaining wall footing and stem prior to placing backfill. The drain shall be placed to achieve a minimum positive flow gradient of 1% normal to the run of the wall. The retaining wall backdrain system shall comply with one of the methods prescribed on "Retaining Wall Backdrain Details" included herein.
- e. Undrained cohesionless backfill design values take into accountwater accumulation in the backfill.
- f. Sloping cohesionless backfill up to a maximum 2:1 slope repose. Appropriate lateral pressure for steeper sloping surcharge and/or geologic conditions provided by *Pacific Materials Laboratory*, *Inc.* specfic geotechnical conditions review.
- g. Wall backfill shall conform it options 1, 2, 3A or 3B as depicted on "<u>Retaining Wall Backdrain Details</u>". Sand backfill shall consist of clean sand conforming to SSPWC 300-3.5.2 "Pervious Backfill". Native soil backfill should be placed in lifts of 6 inches or less and mechanically compacted at optimum moisture content to 90% relative compaction. See "<u>Retaining Wall Backdrain Details</u>" for more detail.
- h. All retaining wall footing excavations, drains, materials and backfill activities should be observed, tested and approved by Pacific Materials Lab gratory, Inc. during the construction process.
- Retaining wall footings should extend not less than 12" below the lowest adjacent ground surface, to the minimum depth required to satisfy foundation depths based upon the CBC Expansion Index (Table-19A) or to the depth required to satisfy CBC setback requirements (CBC Figure 18-1.2), whichever is greater.
- J. When combining the total lateral resistant forces of friction, passive pressure and/or mechanical anchorage the passive pressure shall be reduced by <u>one-third</u>. In addition, lateral resistance should <u>only</u> be applied when the designer is assured that the soil in contact with the embedded structure will remain in contact and provide resistance at all times.

## Table -- 6 -- Retaining Wall Design Criteria



### XIII. DRAINAGE SYSTEMS

- 13.1 The minimum provisions of the 2010 Edition of the California Building Code (*CBC*), Part 2, Section 1804A.3 should be incorporated into plans and construction unless superseded by information contained in this section.
- 13.2 All primary and secondary structures should be fitted with gutters and downspouts which discharge directly into solvent-welded water tight subsurface piping. Redundant use of catch basins, yard drains with solvent-welded, water tight piping should also be provided to capture landscape/hardscape sheetflow or discharge water. All drainage piping should be discharged directly to the street or other approved drainage discharge area.
- 13.3 Positive drainage should be established during construction. This is especially important when construction takes place during the rainy season.
- 13.4 Where practical, landscape planters should be eliminated immediate to foundation systems and replaced with impervious hardscapes. All landscape areas should be designed to positively drain a minimum of 2% to the street or other approved drainage area. All landscaping should drain away from all primary and/or secondary structures.
- 13.5 Positive drainage is defined as:
  - □ Not less than 5% extending a minimum distance of 10 feet away from all foundations systems where landscaping is immediate to the structure.
  - Hardscape or drive areas immediate to foundation systems drained by sheet flow and/or earthen swale (*without deck drains*) should provide a minimum of 2% positive drainage extending a minimum distance of 10 feet away from all foundation systems along with maintaining a minimum 2% positive drainage swale gradient to the street or other approved drainage discharge area.
  - Hardscape or drives employing redundant deck drains may be employed but should provide a minimum 2% positive drainage gradient away from foundation systems for a minimum distance of 10 feet, provided deck drain flow line maintain a minimum 2% gradient and the number and size of the deck drains provided are more than adequate to prevent ponding during severe weather.

### XIV. CLOSURE

As discussed herein, this report is issued and made for the sole use and benefit of the client. *Pacific Materials Laboratory, Inc.* affirms that contents of this report remain applicable for a period of not greater than 12 months from the date of this report. Reports more than 12 months old require written supplemental updating by *Pacific Materials Laboratory, Inc.* to compliment prevailing specifications, building codes and standards of practice.

This report concludes the current contracted agreement between *Pacific Materials Laboratory, Inc.* and the client. The recommendations contained herein are based upon the assumption that *Pacific Materials Laboratory, Inc.* will be requested to provide the necessary testing and observation services which are recommended during rough grading, fine grading and construction. Additional services and associated fees will be necessary to verify the actual soil conditions encountered and to affirm that the plans and construction are consistent with the intent of the recommendations provided herein

A current Schedule of Fees should have already been provided to you prior to the commencement of current services. The Schedule of Fees will be the basis of all further invoices and will be fully itemized as a service to you. If you have not received a current Schedule of Fees it is incumbent to request one at your earliest convenience. If additional geotechnical services are performed by others, only the technical correctness of the actual tests performed can be attested to. Should a separate geotechnical firm assume this project, *Pacific Materials Laboratory, Inc.* will not be responsible for interpretations, opinions, conclusions nor recommendations made by others with regard to fill selection, fill placement, compaction, foundation, slab or hardscape support or any summary of findings, conclusion, recommendation or opinion presented in this report.

### XV. PLAN REVIEW AND INSPECTIONS

### Geotechnical Review:

While *Pacific Materials Laboratory, Inc.* makes every effort to anticipate needs, often times it is necessary to respond to specific issues based upon building official geotechnical reviews of development plans and geotechnical reports. Preparation of follow-up geotechnical response reports "<u>are not normally included within the scope of our contracted works or agreement</u>". The cost associated with follow-up geotechnical report(s) will be based upon our current *Schedule of Laboratory Fees.* Normally responses include registered engineers, staff engineers and clerical hour(s). However, in some cases additional laboratory and/or field testing may be required. Please feel free to contact our office if necessary for details.

Additional geotechnical services are also normally associated with the <u>final review of plans</u> as well as the <u>construction phase</u> of development. The costs associated with these services are <u>not</u> included within the scope of contracted services. Here again, <u>all</u> additional services will be invoiced in accordance with our laboratory schedule fees. Following is a listing of recommended follow-up geotechnical issues.

- Complete sets of final grading, site, foundation and landscape plans should be submitted to Pacific Materials Laboratory, Inc. for geotechnical content review and written comment. Pacific Materials Laboratory, Inc. reserves the right to recommend plan changes and to provide additional recommendations at that time if warranted by the review(s).
- At a minimum, a representative of *Pacific Materials Laboratory, Inc.* should be requested to observe the following phases of construction. *Pacific Materials Laboratory, Inc.* reserves the right to modify (*increase or decrease*) the scope of observations and testing as conditions dictate. *Pacific Materials Laboratory, Inc.* further reserves the right to modify geotechnical recommendations commensurate with the new information, facts, observations or findings as conditions mandate. Supplemental geotechnical recommendations mandate. Supplemental geotechnical conditions during grading activities.
  - · Tree and large shrub removal
  - · Verify vegetation and debris removal
  - Provide grading observation and periodic random compaction testing during the rough grading process including limits of removal(s), building pad subgrade parking/drive hardscape rough grading
  - Foundation excavation
  - Slab subgrade preparation and fill sand observation and testing
  - Critical drainage system construction observation
  - · Periodic observation and random compaction testing of utility trench backfill
  - Periodic observation and random compaction testing of all structural section preparation (subgrade, base and asphalt)

Foundation excavation observations should be made prior to placing reinforcing steel, forms or concrete. It is the responsibility of the owner or the owners representative to coordinate construction timing and to notify *Pacific Materials Laboratory, Inc.* a minimum of 48 hours in advance of the start of or of required observations and testing. Failure to coordinate geotechnical observations and follow-up testing services at the proper construction sequence could result in increased testing costs, construction delays or both.

Thank you for allowing *Pacific Materials Laboratory, Inc.* to be of service. If we may be of further service regarding this or other geotechnical issues, please do not hesitate to call (805) 482-9801, fax (805) 445-6551 or write.

Respectfully Submitted, PACIFIC MATERIALS LABORATORY, INC.

C. Papay, Douglas President



DCP:dkp cc: Addressee (5) Attachments: References Cited Enclosures A, B, C and D

PACIFIC MATERIALS LABORATORY, INC.

59

### **REFERENCES CITED**

- Cal E-M-A La Conchita Hillside Hazard Mitigation letter dated August 10, 2010
- Alan KROPP & Associates Phase 5 Engineering & Risk Management Report and Appendix, Figures dated September 4, 2009
- La Conchita Hillside Hazard Mitigation Group Response Letter dated March 17, 2010
- Alan KROPP & Associates Phase 3 Engineering Risk Assessment Report dated September 4, 2009
- William Lettis & Associates, Inc. Final Report La Conchita Slope Stabilization Project dated August 28, 2009
- William Lettis & Associates, Inc. La Conchita Slope Stability Report Project Geological Study dated September 14, 2007
- Alan KROPP & Associates Phase 1 La Conchita Slope Stabilization Project Report dated September 14, 2007
- 2007 ASTM Annual Book of ASTM Standards, Section 4, Volume 04.08 and 04.09 "Soil and Rock"
- 2007 California Building Code, California Code of Regulation, Title 24, Part 2 (Volumes 1 and 2), 2007
- International Conference of Building Officials (ICBO), Maps of Known Active Fault Near Source Zones in California and Adjacent Portions of Nevada, February, 1998, ISBN 1-58001-008-3
- SCEC Procedures for Implementation of DMG Special Publication 117 Guidelines for Analyzing and Mitigating Landslide hazards in California
- SCEC Published Guidelines "Recommended Procedures for Implementation of DMG Special Publication 117 Guidelines for Analyzing and Mitigating Liquefaction in California
- 2007 California Building Code, California Code of Regulations, Title 24, Part 2 (Volumes 1 & 2)
- 2007 State of California Department of Transportation Laboratory Manual of Test Volumes 1, 2 & 3 Third Edition 1978
- U Ventura County General Plan, Hazards Appendix, dated January 27, 2004

# **APPENDIX** A

- 0



# **APPENDIX B**

#### **BORING LOG LEGEND** SPT -Standard Penetration Split Barrel (1.5"IDx18"Length, with liners), ASTM D1586 Split Barrel Sampler (2.5"ID x 18" length, with liners), ASTM D 1586 **SB** -**TW** -Thin Wall Tube (Shelby) Sampler, ASTM D1587 **SC** -Sand Cone Compaction Test, ASTM D 1556 Result of Standard Penetration Test. N represents the number of blows with a 140 lb. hammer Nsptfalling 30" to drive a SPT sampler 12" into insitu material. Approximately equivalent to Nspt but is based upon the number of blows with a 140 lb. Neg hammer falling 30" to drive a SB sampler 12" into insitu material and calculating an equivalent standard penetration blow count, after R. H. Karol, Soils and Soils Engineering, Pretenice - Hall, Inc. 4/6 Page 23. $\nabla$ -Indicates elevation of free water surface encountered USCS- Unified Soil Classification System - Method of defining soil types Group **USCS - MAJOR DIVISION** DESCRIPTION Symbol . GW Well Graded Gravels . . **Clean Gravley Soils** Gravely Soils With With Little or No Ø **Over 50% of The** GP Poorty Graded Gravels 0 Fines 0 **Coarse Fraction** 10 Silty Gravels Well or Poorly Graded Gravel-GM Sandy Gravely With Sand-Silt Mixtures Larger Than Fines Clayey Gravels Well or Poorty Graded Gravel-No. 4 Sieve Size GC Sand-Clay Mixtures SW Well Graded Sands **Clean Sandy Soils** Sandy Soils With With Little or No Over 50% of the SP Poorly Graded Sands Fines **Coarse Fraction** Sand-Silt, Silty Sands Well or Poorty Graded SM Smaller Than Sandy Soils With Sand-Silt Mixtures No. 4 Sieve Size Fines Clayey Sands Well or Poorty Graded Sand-Clay SC Mixtures Inorganic Silts and Very Fine Sands, Rock Flour, ML Silty or Clayey Fine Sands, or Clayey Silts with Slight Plasticity Silty and Clayey Soils Inorganic Clays of Low to Medium Plasticity, CL Gravely Clays, Sandy Clays, Silty Clays or Lean Clays Liquid Limit Less Than 50% Organic Clays or Organic Silty Clays of Low OL Plasticity Inorganic Silts, Micaceous or Diatomaceous MH Fine Sandy or Silty Soils, or Elastic Silts Silty and Clayey Soils СН Inorganic Clays of High Plasticity, or Fat Clays Liquid Limit Greater Than 50% Organic Clays of Medium to High Plasticity, or ОН Organic silts рт **Highly Organic Soils** Peat or Other Highly Organic Soil

File No. 14-8138-3

Lab No. 34862-3

**Enclosure B-1** 

Drilled : 12/30/13								
l	.ogged by	/: JB						
E	quipment	: Badger	Drilling Mob	ile B-80 Hollo	w Stem F	light Auger	Drill Rig	Boring No. 1
Blow	Count	Type	Dry Density	Content	Depth		USCS	DESCRIPTION
Neq	Nspt		(pcf)	(%)	(ft)	1 10000		
15		SC SB	69.6 76.6	29.8 29.8	-		CL-CH	SOIL: QPu : Upper Peistocene Deposits Brown fine grained sandy silty clay, moist and loose
18 26		SB	84.8	28.2	-		CL-CH	Dark brown fine grained sandy silty clay, moist and moderately loose
20		00	00.0	01.0	• * *		сн	Dark brown clay, very moist and moderately loose
15		SB	81.2	37.0	10 -		СН	Light brown silty clay, moist and moderately loose
					•			
30		SB	* Free	22.7 water	15 - /	11		
					9) 20 1		SM	Formational Unit : TMN-TML : Middle and Lower Miocene Deposits Light brown silty medium to fine grained sand, saturated and moderately firm
	52	SPT	٠	22.7	20 - - -			Same, becoming firm
	55	SPT	*	16.9	25 - -			
							SM	Bedrock: Blue-brown silty fine grained sand, moist and firm
	72	SPT	٠	14.3	30 -			Total depth attempted = 30.0' Freewater encountered @ 16.0' No sidewall caving
* = Sample attempted but not recovered								
			PAC		TERI	ALSL	ABOR	ATORY, INC.

File No. 14-8138-3

Lab. No. 34862-3

**Enclosure B-2** 



# **APPENDIX C**

# LABORATORY TEST DATA

### LABORATORY COMPACTION CHARACTERISTICS (ASTM D1557)

Maximum density optimum moisture data was determined in the laboratory from bulk soil samples using ASTM D1557 procedures. The test uses a 4 or 6 inch diameter mold of 1/30 or 1/56 cft. volume respectively. The soil is moistened to various degrees of saturation and compacted in 5-layers, using a 10-pound hammer falling 18-inches, and 25 or 56 blows per layer for 4 or 6 inch molds respectively. The test results are tabulated below.

				OPTIMUM
			MAXIMUM	MOISTURE
SOIL	ASTM		DRY DENSITY	CONTENT
TYPE	METHOD	SOIL DESCRIPTION	(lbs/cft)	(%)
1	A	Dark brown fine sandy silty clay	94.5	24.5

### **EXPANSION INDEX TEST DATA** (ASTM D 4829)

Expansion index testing was performed on representative near surface soils encountered. The expansion testing was performed in accordance with the ASTM D 4829 Procedures. The test results are tabulated below.

	INITIAL	FINAL			
	MOISTURE	MOISTURE	DRY DENSITY	EXPANSION	EXPANSION
SOIL TYPE	CONTENT (%)	CONTENT (%)	<u>(lbs/cft)</u>	INDEX	<b>POTENTIAL</b>
1	20.5	38.9	80.2	47	Slight

### CORROSIVE SERIES TESTING (ASTM D4972, CTM 417, CTM 422 and CTM 643)

Soil corrosive series testing was performed on bulk soil samples obtained at or near the foundation elevation to identify and mitigate (*if necessary*) the long-term chemical nature of the soils which will be in direct contact with the foundation, slab on-grade or hardscape.

		SOLUBLE	SOLUBLE	
		SULFATES	CHLORIDE	RESISTIVITY
	pН	CTM 417	CTM 422	CTM 643
SOIL TYPE	ASTM D4972	<u>(ppm)</u>	<u>(ppm)</u>	(Ohm-cm)
1	7.1	2,152	208	590

### **MECHANICAL ANALYSIS** (ASTM D422 - Values in Percent Passing)

SIEVE SIZE → LOCATION	<u>1"</u>	<u>3/4"</u>	<u>1/2"</u>	<u>3/8"</u>	<u>No. 4</u>	<u>No. 8</u>	<u>No. 16</u>	<u>No. 30</u>	<u>No. 50</u>	<u>No. 100</u>	<u>No. 200</u>
B-1 @ 1.5' B-1 @ 5.0'			100	99 100	99 100	98 100	98 100	96 99	91 96	84 92	77 88

### HYDROMETER ANALYSES<sup>A</sup> (ASTM D422 & ASTM D2487)

	%	%	%	
LOCATION	SAND	SILT	CLAY	MATERIAL CLASSIFICATION <sup>B</sup>
B-1 @ 1.5'	24	32	44	Sandy silty clay (CL-CH)
B-2 @ 5.0'	14	30	56	Clay (CH)

<sup>A</sup> Hydrometer analysis modified to short method (1 hour), for determination of percentages of sand, silts and clay. <sup>B</sup> Classification per Unified Soils Classification System and ASTM D2487-85

### COMPACTION TEST DATA (ASTM #1556)

All field compaction tests were performed in accordance with ASTM D1556 (Sand cone method) procedures.

			ELEVATION	WATER	DRY	RELATIVE
TEST			OF TEST	CONTENT	DENSITY	COMPACTION
LOCATION	DATE	SOIL TYPE	<u>(ft)</u> <sup>1</sup>	<u>(%)</u>	(pcf)	(%)
B-1 @ 1.5'	12/30/13	1	-1.5'	29.8	69.6	73.7
B-2 @ 1.5'	12/30/13	1	-1.5'	30.7	64.7	68.5

#### DIRECT SHEAR DATA (ASTM D 3080)

One (1) direct shear test was performed on insitu specimens trimmed to 2.4" diameter x 1.5" high, placed under a normal confining load and saturated prior to testing. The reported parameters are peak and residual. The results are presented graphically on **ENCLOSURE SHEAR1**.

### CONSOLIDATION TEST DATA (ASTM D 2435-80)

Two (2) consolidation tests were performed on soil samples considered insitu. The samples were trimmed to 2.4" diameter x 1" high, placed in a floating ring consolidometer, with a confining load of 500 psf, and sequentially increased after completion of primary consolidation to a maximum load of 8000 psf. The load was then reduced to 1000 psf to observe elastic rebound. The test specimen was flooded at 1000 psf to observe the effect of saturation. The test results are presented graphically as **ENCLOSURE CON-1**.









Sample Location: Soil Description:	B-1 @ 3.0' Dark Brown Silty Clay	
Insitu Reverse Shear		
Residual Values: Internal Angle of Friction = Cohesion =	29 467	degrees psf
Peak Values: Internal Angle of Friction = Cohesion =	29 1400	degrees psf

# **APPENDIX D**
### **BEARING CAPACITY OF SHALLOW FOOTINGS**

PROJECT: Wright

SOIL: Dark Brown Sandy Silty Clay

### I. CONTINUOUS STRIP FOOTING

W =	106	pcf	B =	1.3	ft	NC =	27.86
C =	467	psf	d =	2.0	ft	NQ =	16.44
ANGLE =	29	deg.	KW =	1.00		NW =	19.34
FS =	8		Kc =	1.00		KQ =	1.00

allowable bearing capacity = q/FS = (0.5WBKwNW + CKCNC + KqdWNQ)/FS = 2,222 psf

### **II. SPREAD FOOTINGS**

W =	106	pcf	B =	3.0	ft		NC =	27.86	
C =	467	psf	d =	2.0	ft		NQ =	16.44	
ANGLE =	29	deg.	Kw =	0.60			NW =	19.34	
FS =	12		Kc =	1.59			KQ =	1.55	
allowable bearing capacity =	q/FS =	(0.5WBK	wNW + CKCN	C +Kqa	lWNQ)/FS	=		2,583	psf

### **III. LATERAL EARTH PRESSURES AND COEFFICIENT OF FRICTION**

Factor	Soil	Soil	Soil	Allowable	Allowable	Yielding	Non-Yielding	
of	Friction	Cohesion	Unit	Coefficient	Passive	Level Backfill	Level Backfill	
Safety	Angle		Weight	of Sliding	Pressure	Active pressure	Active pressure	
		(psf)	(pcf)	Friction	(psf/ft)	(pcl)	(pcl)	
1.5	29	467	106.0	0.37	415	35	55	

### <u>NOTES :</u>

$\mathbf{L}^{(i)}$	The allowable bearing values above are based upon the GENERAL BEARING CAPACITY FORMULA for						
	shellow footings without consideration of total or differential settlement. Accordingly the design allowable bearing						
	capacity values recommended in this report for design maybe lower than values computed above						
2	Active retaining wall design parameters are based upon the Empirical method of determination of Earth Pressure. Design						
	earth pressures recommended in this report may be higher to account for potential creep (if any).						
3	Non-Yielding condition assumes at rest conditions (no deformation).						

"We Test the Earth"

# PACIFIC MATERIALS LABORATORY, INC.



March 2, 2015 Lab No. 34905-3 File No. 14-8138-3

Mr. Matthew Wright 782 Alacia Walk, Apt. F Goleta, CA 93117-3053

SUBJECT: OWTS Compliant Percolation Test Results (Leach Line Method) Replacement Single Family Residence 6746 Ojai Ave. La Conchita, CA

### Dear Mr. Wright:

Pursuant to your request and authorization, *Pacific Materials Laboratory, Inc.* recently completed leach field method percolation testing in consideration of a replacement single family residence currently being planned on the parcel addressed as 6746 Ojai Ave., Ventura County, California. Leach field percolation testing was performed in three (3) truck mounted, 12" diameter test pits excavated to depths ranging from 36 to 42 inches below the adjacent ground surface. In addition to percolation test locations, a 12" diameter x 102 inch deep observation/percolation test pit was also excavated proximate the leach field test locations in order to evaluate the permeability of the soils a minimum of 60 inches below the planned leach field depth. The testing procedure employed is in compliance with the current Ventura County Environmental Health Division (*EHD*) procedure for evaluation of soil suitability to support the leach line method of onsite wastewater treatment system (*OWTS*). The following Enclosures have been appended to this report as an aid to the reader:

- A sketch of the subject property including test locations is as Enclosure A.
- A log of the observation test pit (including Hydrometer analysis and field moisture content results) Is included as Enclosure OB-1
- Leach field percolation test data is summarized on Enclosures PERC1 and PERC2.

### PERCOLATION TESTING

The appropriate depth for percolation testing was determined based upon discussions with the client coupled with each condition observed relative to the observation test boring. Suitable permeable conditions were observed to exist to a minimum depth of 5 feet below the percolation test pit elevation of 42". The depth to free water was established as  $\sim 16$  feet deep by previous test borings (See Pacific Materials Laboratory, Inc. Limited Geotechnical Exploration Report dated March 25, 2014, Enclosures B-1 and B-2).

Before testing, the sides and bottom of the percolation test borings were scraped and loose soils were removed. Two inches of clean pea-gravel were then placed at the bottom of each test pit to prevent them from sealing off during the performance of percolation testing. Saturation water was then continuously added to each test pit and maintained until testing. The saturation period was continued overnight. The test pits were then refilled to a depth of six inches above the pea-gravel. The absorption rate was then recorded for a period of one (1) hour (as allowed for absorption rates <10 minutes per inch) and/or for four (4) hours (as required for absorption rates >10 minutes per inch). The test results are included herein on Enclosure PERC1 and PERC2.

150 Wood Road, Suite B · Ci

County of Ventura Planning Director Hearing PL14-0164 **Exlifbit 6 – OWTS**  (805) 445-6551 · Email:

As depicted by the results of hydrometer analyses and classification (*data included on Enclosure OB-1*), the soils encountered within the proposed leach field effluent discharge zone were found to contain up to 78% of materials passing the #200 sieve, of which as much as 48% are classified as clays. The subject soils appear to contain a significant amount of diatomaceous earth which appears responsible for the rapid percolation test absorption rates recorded. Never the less, given the amount of fines in the total soil volume, absorption rates may slow over time.

Based upon the percolation test results reported herein, the obtained slowest absorption rate of <u>15-minutes/inch</u> has been selected for use in design of the proposed primary and 100% expansion field. The assigned obtained percolation rate is well within the County of Ventura Environmental Health Division (*EHD*) allowable code criteria for design of leach field disposal systems (<60 minutes/inch).

This report simply demonstrates the feasibility of the site to support the leach field method of effluent disposal. A specific septic system design based upon your final building and site plans is still required. In order to provide you with the necessary information to complete the design, it will be necessary for *Pacific Materials Laboratory, Inc.* to receive architectural floor plans of the proposed residence, a reproducible plot plan, drawn to scale of 1"=50' or larger, which includes the contours of the site; cut and fill slopes, trees, property lines, drainage courses, well points, streams, all other surface features, including features such as artificial fills, slopes or natural ravines which may be present on or within 50 feet of the property. Upon receiving this information, the dimensions and physical location of the disposal field can be determined by *Pacific Materials Laboratory, Inc.* 

No warranty of uniformity of subsurface soil, bedrock or ground water conditions interpreted herein is implied around, between or adjacent to the backhoe pits discussed herein. Substantial material differences in soil or rock types, texture, permeability, moisture content, hardness, and degree of fracture may be present which could substantially alter available absorption capacities and rates of primary septic system elements constructed at locations other than the included test borings or backhoe pits. Such differences may necessitate substantial septic system modifications, redesign, or relocation to meet the minimum environmental health codes. It is the responsibility of the owner and septic system contractor to submit in writing a statement of differences encountered at the time of primary septic system element construction. If the final septic system design requires primary elements of the septic system to be relocated away from test borings included herein, the reader/owner/contractor, shall understand and assume responsibility for the afore stated risks.

Thank you for allowing *Pacific Materials Laboratory, Inc.* to be of service. If we may be of further service regarding this or other geotechnical issues, please do not hesitate to call (805) 482-9801, Fax (805) 445-6551 or write.

Respectfully Submitted, PACIFIC MATERIALS LABORATORY, INC.

DCP:dkp cc: Addressee (5) Attachments: Enclosures A, B, and PERC1 & PERC2 Douglas C. Papay, GE 664 President





File No. 14-8138-3 Lab No. 34905-3

Enclosure - OB-1

Date Logge Equip	LOG OF BORING Date Logged: 04/03/2014 Logged By: JB Equipment : Hand excavated by client - Hand Auger Boring No. 1							
Sand	Silt	Clay	Moisture	Depth	USCS	DESCRIPTION		
(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(ft)				
			29.8	28 161	CL-CH BI	rown fine grained sandy silty clay, moist and loose		
4	18	78	28.2	- 5 -	CL-CH Da	ark brown fine grained sandy silty clay, moist and oderately loose		
					CH Da	ark brown clay, very moist and moderately loose		
22	30	48	31.6		RAPE			
				10 -				
						J		
						3		
					······			

File No. 14-8138-3

------

### PERCOLATION TEST DATA

Cuent:	wright	
Th		C 10 4 4

Project Address: 6746 Ojai Ave, La Concita Date -Sat: 04/02/2014 / 05/05/2014 Date - Test: 04/03/2014 / 05/05/2014

Test Pit Dimension: 12 in. dla.

TEST LOCATION NO. P-1

Tech: CH /JB Temp.: 58 - 65 F

TIME	TIME CHANGE	READING*	DROP	PERC RATE	Slowest
(hrmin)	(min)	(inchda)	(inspair)	(min/jn)	Rate
08:17 AM		26 000			
08.32 AM	15	27 500	1 500	10	
08:47 AM	15	28 500	1 000	15	15
09:02 AM	15	29.500	1 000	15	
09 <del>,</del> 02 AM	15	24,500		refill	
09:17 AM	15	25 500	1 000	15	
09:32 AM	15	26 500	1.000	15	
09:47 AM	15	28,000	1.500	10	
10:02 AM	15	29 000	1 000	15	
10:02 AM	- 20	23.500	1.1	rofil	
10:17 AM	15	24 500	1 000	15	
10:32 AM	15	25.500	1,000	15	
10:47 AM	15	26 500	1.000	15	
11:02 AM	15	27,500	1.000	15	
11:17 AM	15	28.500	1 000	15	
11:17 AM	1.00	23.000	<u>_</u>	rafill	
11.32 AM	15	24.000	1.000	15	
12:02 PM	30	26 000	2 000	15	
13-17 05/	15	27.000	1.000	15	

### TEST LOCATION NO. P-2

TIME (hppin)	TIME CHANGE	READING* (inches)	DROP (inches)	PERC RATE	Slowest
09:13 AM	×.	32,375	120		
09:18 AM	5	34 000	1,625	3	
09:23 AM	5	35 250	1.250	4	
09:23 AM	10	31,000	5.00	refili	
09:28 AM	5	31.875	0.875	6	
09:33 AM	5	32,750	0.875	б	
09:38 AM	5	33 500	0.750	7	
09·43 AM	5	34,250	0.750	7	
09:48 AM	5	35 000	0.750	7	
09:48 AM		31.250		refill	
09:53 AM	5	32.000	0 750	7	
09:58 AM	5	32.750	0.750	7	
003 AM	5	33,500	0 750	7	
MA 80:01	5	34.125	0.625	8	0
10:13 AM	5	34.750	0.625	8	
MA E1:01		31 875	-	refill	
0:18 AM	5	32 625	0 7 50	7	
0:23 AM	5	33 250	0.625	8	
0:28 AM	5	33,875	0.625	8	

#### TEST LOCATION NO. P-3

TIME	TIME CHANGE	READING*	DROP (mohes)	PERC RATE (min/in)	Slowest
09:15 AM	-	32 250	-		
09:20 AM	5	33.750	1.500	3	
09:25 AM	5	34 750	1.000	5	
09:25 AM	2	31 000	×5	refilt	
09:30 AM	5	31 87.5	0 875	6	6
09:35 AM	5	32,875	1.000	5	
09:40 AM	5	34.000	1 125	4	
09:45 AM	5	35 250	1.250	- 4	
09:50 AM	5	36.500	1 250	4	
09:50 AM	*	31,250	5	refill	
09:55 AM	5	32,500	1 250	4	
09:60 AM	5	32 7 50	÷:	selil	
10:05 AM	5	33 625	0 875	б	
10:10 AM	\$	34,750	1_125	4	
10:15 AM	5	35 7 50	1 000	5	
10-15 AM		32,000	-	refill	
10:20 AM	5	33,125	1 125	4	
10:25 AM	5	34,250	1.125	4	
10:30 AM	\$	35.250	1.000	5	

File No. 14-8138-3

### PERCOLATION TEST DATA

Client: Wright Project Address: 6746 Ojai Ave, La Concita Date -Sat: 04/02/2014 / 05/05/2014 Date - Test: 04/03/2014 / 05/05/2014

Test Pit Dimension: 12 in. dia. Tech: CH /JB Temp.: 58 - 65 F

TEST LOCATION NO. P-4

	TIME	TIME CHANGE	READING*	DROP	PERC RATE	Slowest
Ļ	(hermin)	(min)	(inches)	(inchar)	(min/in)	Rate
ľ	09:15 AM		30 750	-	-	
	09:20 AM	5	32 125	1 375	4	
	09:25 AM	5	33.500	1.375	4	
	09:30 AM	5	34 000	0.500	10	
	09:30 AM	3X	30 7 50	8	rofill	
	09:35 AM	5	31 750	1 000	5	
	09:40 AM	5	32.750	1.000	5	
	09:45 AM	5	33.750	1.000	5	
	09:50 AM	5	34,625	0.875	6	
	09:55 AM	5	35 500	0 875	б	
	10:00 AM	5	36,125	0 625	8	8
	10:00 AM		31.750		refill	
	10:05 AM	5	33.125	1 375	4	
	10.10 AM	5	34.125	1.000	5	
	10:15 AM	5	35,000	0.875	6	
	10.20 AM	5	35,875	0 875	6	
	10:20 AM	2	33.250		refill	
	10:25 AM	5	34 000	0 750	7	
	10-78 414	5	34 750	0.750	7	

\* Reading depth has no relationship to overall test pit depth

### TEST LOCATION NO. OB-1

TIME	TIME CHANGE	READING*	DROP (unches)	PERC RATE	Slowest
08-52 AM	12	84,500		*	
09:04 AM	12	86 000	1.500	8	
09:24 AM	20	87,500	1.500	13	
09:44 AM	20	89 000	1_500	13	
09:46 AM	2	83.000		refill	
10:01 AM	15	84 000	1.000	15	15
10:16 AM	15	85 000	1 000	15	
10:31 AM	15	86 000	1 000	15	
10-46 AM	15	87.000	1.000	15	
10:46 AM	24	81.500		refill	
MA 10:11	15	82 500	1_000	15	
11:16 AM	15	83,500	1.000	15	
11:31 AM	15	84.500	1.000	15	
11-46 AM	15	85.500	1.000	15	
12:15 PM	30	87 500	2,000	15	
12:15 PM		82.000		rufiil	
12:45 PM	30	84,000	2 000	15	
01:00 PM	15	85.000	1 000	15	

\* Reading depth has no relationship to overall test pit depth

"We Test the Earth"

# PACIFIC MATERIALS LABORATORY, INC.



February 18, 2015 Lab No. 35006-3 File No. 15-8138-3

Mr. Matthew Wright 782 Acacia Walk, Apt F Goleta, CA 93117

SUBJECT:Onsite Wastewater Treatment System Design (OWTS)Replacement Single Family Residence6746 Ojai Ave.La Conchita, CA

REFERENCE: Pacific Materials Laboratory, Inc. OWTS Compliant Percolation Test Results (*Leach Line Method*) Report dated 5/12/14, Lab No. 34905-3

Dear Mr. Wright:

Pursuant to your request and authorization, this report summarizes an onsite wastewater treatment system (*OWTS*) design (*leach line method*) intended to service the replacement residence located at 6746 Ojai Ave. La Conchita, California.

The OWTS design is based upon the current minimum requirements of the Ventura County Environmental Health Division (EHD) Technical Manual and incorporates percolation test data included in the referenced Pacific Materials Laboratory, Inc. report dated May 12, 2014. The following attachments are attached to this report as required by EHD.

- An OWTS leach line method layout is depicted on a copy of the client provided site plan. The plan has been enhanced to include the primary, and 100% expansion system as well as the percolation test locations. The plan employs a scale of 1" = 20' percolation test. The plan is attached hereto as Enclosure-A.
- The system UPC fixture unit count, septic tank sizing and primary leach line sizing is included on **Enclosure OWTS Design** herein.
- A copy of the referenced percolation test report is attached hereto for reference.

### PERCOLATION TEST RESULTS AND SYSTEM DESIGN

The slowest recorded absorption rate of 15 minutes per inch was used as the basis of system sizing. Based upon a leach line system designed to handle the effluent generated in the one (1) bedroom residence, a minimum of 190 square feet of absorption area is required. This may be accomplished utilizing a total of 50' of primary trench, three feet in width with a gravel component of 18 inches below the perforated inlet drain pipe. Based upon 25 plumbing fixture units, a 1,000 gallon minimum capacity septic tank is required up gradient of the leach line.

The primary leach lines include two -20' long plus one -10' long line to meet EHD requirements. The tight lines exiting the distribution box need to be modified to assure nearly equal flow distribution to each leach line. Accordingly, it is recommended that the tight lined piping exiting the distribution box be 4" diameter pipe for the 20' long lines and reduced to 3" diameter for the first 48" servicing the 10' long line.

All other leach line components shall be constructed per the requirement of the Uniform Plumbing Code and the County of Ventura Environmental Health Division (*EHD*) requirements. If during construction of the individual septic disposal system, deviations or changes from design criteria are encountered, they shall be immediately brought to the attention of *Pacific Materials Laboratory, Inc.* for resolution.

### SEPTIC TANK/DISTRIBUTION BOX LOCATIONS

The septic tank location is depicted within the area of 100% leach line expansion. Based upon statements made by EHD officials, this use is being allowed within very small parcels (*such as this site*) provided owners agree to relocate the septic tank, piping and distribution box to the primary leach line location should the primary system become <u>non-serviceable</u>.

The locations depicted herein for the septic tank and distribution boxes (*if any*) have been selected for simplicity of design. If a more convenient location is identified during system construction, the tank and/or box may be relocated providing they comply with Ventura County EHD setback requirements, Table I (*included herein for your convenience*).

### **DRAIN ROCK**

Please be sure you or your contractor provide drain rock which is: 1.) free of fines and clean; 2.) consist of natural sub-rounded to rounded rock (*not crushed rock*); and 3.) the rock should be 3/4" - 2 1/2" diameter (*not less than 3/4" and no larger than 2 1/2"*). Please be advised that Ventura County EHD has prepared an OWTS *"Permit to Construct"* - information package. *Pacific Materials Laboratory, Inc.* encourages you to pick up a review this packet prior to the start of septic system construction.

### **EXISTING ONSITE SEPTIC SYSTEM**

The existing residence is to be removed prior to the start of new construction. The existing residence reportedly employs an onsite system consisting of a cesspool. The cesspool and all piping should be removed and properly backfilled under direct supervision of *Pacific Materials Laboratory, Inc.* 

### CLOSURE

It should be noted that substantial material differences in soil or rock types, texture, permeability, moisture content, hardness, and degree of fracture may be present which could substantially alter available absorption capacities and rates of primary septic system elements constructed at locations other than the included test borings or backhoe pits. Such differences may necessitate substantial septic system modifications, redesign, or relocation to meet the minimum environmental health codes. It is the responsibility of the owner and septic system contractor to submit in writing a statement of differences encountered at the time of primary septic system element construction. If the final septic system design requires primary elements of the septic system to be relocated away from test borings included herein, the reader/owner/contractor, shall understand and assume responsibility for the afore stated risks.

Page 3

This report as well as the referenced May 12, 2014 Percolation Test Results Report, *Pacific Materials Laboratory, Inc.* must be submitted to and approved by Ventura County EHD prior to the start of system construction. All preparation, installation and construction of the septic system shall conform to the requirements of the County of Ventura Environmental Health, UPC and other prevailing code requirements.

Thank you for allowing *Pacific Materials Laboratory, Inc.* to be of service. If we may be of further service regarding this or other geotechnical issues, please do not hesitate to call (805) 482-9801, Fax (805) 445-6551 or write.

Respectfully Submitted, PACIFIC MATERIALS LABORATORY, INC. Douglas C. Papay, GE **6** President

DCP:dkp cc: Addressee (5) Attachments: Enclosures-A, OWTS Design, Table 1 and a copy of PML 5/12/14 Report



PACIFIC MATERIALS LABORATORY, INC \* Phone:(805) 482-9801 \* 150 Wood Road Suite-B, Camarillo, CA 93010

# **OWTS (Leach Line Method )**

### **Project: Matthew Wright**

6746 Ojai Ave. La Conchita, CA

### System design: Replacement Residence

FIXTURE UNIT SUMMA	RY				
Type of Fixture	Number of	Source	UPC Fixture	Total Fixture	
Kitchen Sinks	1	UPC Table 4-1	2	2	
Bathroom Sinks	3	UPC Table 4-1	1	3	
Laundry Sinks	0	UPC Table 4-1	2	0	
Bar Sinks	0	UPC Table 4-1	1	0	
Toilets	2	UPC Table 4-1	6	12	
Dishwasher	1	UPC Table 4-1	2	2	
Clothes Washer	1	UPC Table 4-1	2	2	
Bathtubs	0	UPC Table 4-1	2	0	
Showers	2	UPC Table 4-1	2	4	
Floor Drain	0	UPC Table 4-1		0	
		Total system fixture u	nits =	25	

Septic Tank Sizing	- ( per Ventura Cou	- ( per Ventura County H75/1 for Single Family Dwellings)		
Total UPC fixture units =	25	; requires a -	1000	gallon capacity septic tank

Leach Line Sizing		
Average Field percolation rate =	15	min/in - (see percolation test data)
Required Absorption Area / Bedroom =	190	sf
Equivalent Number of Bedrooms =	1	
Total Absorption Area Required =	190	sf
Absorption Area / ft. of trench =	4.0	sf.
Total Trench Length Required =	50	ft. (min. 50' required per code)
Primary Leach Line Requirements :		
Primary Leach Line Requirements : Number of Trenches =	2-20' + 1-10'	
Primary Leach Line Requirements : Number of Trenches = Total Length =	2-20' + 1-10' 50	ft.
Primary Leach Line Requirements : Number of Trenches = Total Length = Width =	2-20' + 1-10' 50 36	ft. in.
Primary Leach Line Requirements : Number of Trenches = Total Length = Width = Gravel below drainline =	2-20' + 1-10' 50 36 18	ft. in. in.

### TABLE I

### INDIVIDUAL SEWAGE DISPOSAL SYSTEM SETBACK REQUIREMENTS

Minimum Horizontal Distance in Feet from:	Building Sewer	Septic Tank	Disposal Field	Seepage Pit	Subsurface Sand Filtration System	Mound System
Buildings or Structures <sup>1</sup>	2	5	8	8	8	202
Property line adjoining private property	Clear <sup>3</sup>	5	5	8	8	10
Water supply well on suction line	50 <sup>4</sup>	50	100	150	100 <sup>s</sup>	100
Stream, lakes, tidal waters, or ocean waters	50	50	50	100	100	100
Large Trees		10		10	10	
Seepage pits or cesspools		5	5	12		
Disposal Field		5	4 <sup>6</sup>	5		
Onsite domestic water service line	17	5	5	5	5	5
Distribution Box		-	5	5		
Pressure public water main	10 <sup>8</sup>	10	10	10	10	10

NOTE: When disposal fields and/or seepage pits are installed in sloping ground, the minimum horizontal distance between any part of the leaching system and ground surface shall be fifteen (15) feet.

When facilities are located near tidal or ocean waters, the horizontal distance shall be measured from the historically most landward location of the beach at the mean high tide elevation. Structures or facilities shall be constructed in accordance with Federal, State, and local laws to prevent erosion of the beaches and movement of the mean high tide closer than the horizontal distance specified above.

6/4/99:sam/isds/setback.req

Including porches and steps, whether covered or uncovered; breezeways; roofed port-cocheres; roofed patios; carports; covered walks; covered driveways; and similar appurtenances.

This distance shall be increased to 30 feet when the system is located upslope of the structure.

See UPC, Section 315(c)

The distance may be reduced to not less than twenty-five (25) feet when approved metallic piping is installed. Where special hazards are involved, the distance required shall be increased, as may be directed by the County Health Officer or the Administrative Authority.

This distance shall be increased to 150 feet when seepage pits are used as a component of the system.

Plus two (2) feet for each additional foot of depth in excess of one (1) foot below the bottom of the drain line (See UPC, Section 1-6(i).

See UPC, Section 1108

For parallel construction. For crossings, approval by the Administrative Authority is required.

"We Test the Earth"

# PACIFIC MATERIALS LABORATORY, INC.



March 2, 2015 Lab No. 34905-3 File No. 14-8138-3

Mr. Matthew Wright 782 Alacia Walk, Apt. F Goleta, CA 93117-3053

SUBJECT: OWTS Compliant Percolation Test Results (Leach Line Method) Replacement Single Family Residence 6746 Ojai Ave. La Conchita, CA

### Dear Mr. Wright:

Pursuant to your request and authorization, *Pacific Materials Laboratory, Inc.* recently completed leach field method percolation testing in consideration of a replacement single family residence currently being planned on the parcel addressed as 6746 Ojai Ave., Ventura County, California. Leach field percolation testing was performed in three (3) truck mounted, 12" diameter test pits excavated to depths ranging from 36 to 42 inches below the adjacent ground surface. In addition to percolation test locations, a 12" diameter x 102 inch deep observation/percolation test pit was also excavated proximate the leach field test locations in order to evaluate the permeability of the soils a minimum of 60 inches below the planned leach field depth. The testing procedure employed is in compliance with the current Ventura County Environmental Health Division *(EHD)* procedure for evaluation of soil suitability to support the leach line method of onsite wastewater treatment system *(OWTS)*. The following Enclosures have been appended to this report as an aid to the reader:

- A sketch of the subject property including test locations is as Enclosure A.
- A log of the observation test pit (*including Hydrometer analysis and field moisture content results*) Is included as Enclosure OB-1
- Leach field percolation test data is summarized on Enclosures PERC1 and PERC2.

### **PERCOLATION TESTING**

The appropriate depth for percolation testing was determined based upon discussions with the client coupled with each condition observed relative to the observation test boring. Suitable permeable conditions were observed to exist to a minimum depth of 5 feet below the percolation test pit elevation of 42". The depth to free water was established as  $\sim 16$  feet deep by previous test borings (See Pacific Materials Laboratory, Inc. Limited Geotechnical Exploration Report dated March 25, 2014, Enclosures B-1 and B-2).

Before testing, the sides and bottom of the percolation test borings were scraped and loose soils were removed. Two inches of clean pea-gravel were then placed at the bottom of each test pit to prevent them from sealing off during the performance of percolation testing. Saturation water was then continuously added to each test pit and maintained until testing. The saturation period was continued overnight. The test pits were then refilled to a depth of six inches above the pea-gravel. The absorption rate was then recorded for a period of one (1) hour (as allowed for absorption rates <10 minutes per inch) and/or for four (4) hours (as required for absorption rates >10 minutes per inch). The test results are included herein on **Enclosure PERC1 and PERC2**.



### PERCOLATION TEST DATA

Tech: CH /JB

Cilent:	Wright					
Project	Address:	6746	Ojai	Ave,	La	Concita
Date -S	at: 04/02/2	2014	05/0	5/201	4	

14 Date - Test: 04/03/2014 / 05/05/2014 Test Pit Dimension: 12 In. dia. Temp.: 58 - 65 F

4

TEST LOCATION NO. P-1

TIME	TIME CHANGE	READING*	DROP	PERC RATE	Slowest
(hrmin)	(min)	(inches)	(inches)	(min/in)	Rate
08:17 AM		26.000			
08:32 AM	15	27.500	1.500	10	
08:47 AM	15	28.500	1.000	15	15
09:02 AM	15	29,500	1.000	15	
09:02 AM	15	24.500		rofill	
09:17 AM	15	25.500	1.000	15	
09:32 AM	15	26.500	1.000	15	
09:47 AM	15	28.000	1.500	10	
0:02 AM	15	29.000	1.000	15	
0:02 AM	382	23,500		refill	
10:17 AM	15	24,500	1.000	15	
0:32 AM	15	25,500	1.000	15	
10:47 AM	15	26.500	1.000	15	
1:02 AM	15	27.500	1.000	15	
1:17 AM	15	28,500	1 000	15	
1:17 AM	542	23.000	294	rafill	
1:32 AM	15	24.000	1.000	15	
2:02 PM	30	26.000	2,000	15	
2-17 PM	15	27,000	1.000	15	

### TEST LOCATION NO. P-2

TIME (hemin)	TIME CHANGE	READING*	DROP	PERC RATE (mio/in)	Slowest
09:13 AM		32.375			
09:18 AM	5	34.000	1.625	3	
09:23 AM	5	35,250	1.250	4	
09:23 AM	283	31.000		refill	
09:28 AM	5	31.875	0.875	6	
09:33 AM	5	32.750	0.875	6	
09:38 AM	5	33,500	0.750	7	
09:43 AM	5	34.250	0.750	7	
09:48 AM	5	35,000	0.750	7	
09:48 AM	120	31,250		refitt	
09:53 AM	5	32,000	0.750	7	
09:58 AM	5	32.750	0,750	7	
10:03 AM	5	33.500	0.750	7	
MA 80:01	5	34.125	0.625	8	8
10:13 AM	5	34.750	0.625	8	
10:13 AM	1.	31.875		refill	
10:18 AM	5	32,625	0,750	7	
0:23 AM	5	33.250	0.625	8	
10:28 AM	5	33.875	0.625	8	

### TEST LOCATION NO. P-3

Test Pit Depth = 36" TIME TIME CHANGE READING\* DROP PERC RATE Slowest (inches) (inches) (min) (min/in) Rate (hemin) 32.250 09:15 AM . . -09:20 AM 33,750 1.500 5 3 09:25 AM 5 34.750 1.000 5 09:25 AM 31,000 refili ..... . 09:30 AM 5 31.875 0.875 б 6 1.000 09:35 AM 5 32.875 5 09:40 AM 5 34.000 1.125 4 09:45 AM 35,250 1.250 5 4 09:50 AM 5 36.500 1.250 4 09:50 AM . 31.250 . refill 09:55 AM 5 32.500 1.250 4 09:60 AM 32,750 refill 5 0.875 10:05 AM 5 33,625 б 10:10 AM 5 34,750 1,125 4 10:15 AM 5 35.750 1.000 5 10:15 AM 32,000 refill -1.125 10:20 AM 5 33.125 4 10:25 AM 5 34,250 1.125 4 10-30 AM 35.250 1.000

### PERCOLATION TEST DATA

Client: Wright

Project Address: 6746 Ojal Ave, La Concita		
Date -Sat: 04/02/2014 / 05/05/2014	Test Pit Dimension: 12	2 tn. dia.
Date - Test: 04/03/2014 / 05/05/2014	Tech: CH /JB	Temp.: 58 - 65

5 F

TEST LOCATION NO. P-4

TIME	TIME CHANGE	READING*	DROP	PERC BATE	Slowest
(hemin)	(min)	(inches)	(inches)	(min/in)	Rate
09:15 AM	(. <del></del> )	30.750		5	
09:20 AM	5	32.125	1,375	4	
09:25 AM	5	33.500	1.375	4	
09:30 AM	5	34.000	0.500	10	
09:30 AM		30.750	220	refill	
09:35 AM	5	31.750	1,000	5	
09:40 AM	5	32.750	1,000	5	
09:45 AM	5	33,750	1.000	5	
09:50 AM	5	34.625	0.875	6	
09:55 AM	5	35.500	0,875	6	
10:00 AM	5	36.125	0.625	8	9
10:00 AM	0.000	31.750	387	refill	
10:05 AM	5	33.125	1.375	4	
10:10 AM	5	34.125	1.000	5	
10:15 AM	5	35.000	0,875	6	
10:20 AM	5	35,875	0.875	б	
10:20 AM	1.00	33.250		refill	
10:25 AM	5	34.000	0.750	7	
10:28 AM	5	34,750	0.750	7	

" Reading depth has no relationship to overall test pit depth

### TEST LOCATION NO. OB-1

Slowest Rate	PERC RATE	DROP (inches)	READING*	TIME CHANGE	TIME (hemin)
			84,500	100	08:52 AM
	8	1,500	86.000	12	09:04 AM
	13	1.500	87.500	20	09:24 AM
	13	1.500	89,000	20	09:44 AM
	reful	270	83.000		09:46 AM
15	15	1.000	84,000	15	10:01 AM
	15	1.000	85,000	15	10:16 AM
	15	1,000	86,000	15	10:31 AM
	15	1.000	87,000	15	10:46 AM
	refilt	282	81.500	100	10:46 AM
	15	1.000	82.500	15	11:01 AM
	15	1.000	83.500	15	11:16 AM
	15	1.000	84.500	15	11:31 AM
	15	1,000	B5.500	15	11:46 AM
	15	2.000	87.500	30	12:15 PM
	refill	2 542	82.000	202	12:15 PM
	15	2.000	84.000	30	12:45 PM
	15	1,000	85.000	15	01:00 PM

\* Reading depth has no relationship to overall test pit depth

PACIFIC MATERIALS LABORATORY, INC.

3

"We Test the Earth"

# PACIFIC MATERIALS LABORATORY, INC.



May 12, 2014 Lab No. 34905-3 File No. 14-8138-3

Mr. Matthew Wright 782 Alacia Walk, Apt. F Goleta, CA 93117-3053

SUBJECT: OWTS Compliant Percolation Test Results (Leach Line Method) Replacement Single Family Residence 6746 Ojai Ave. La Conchita, CA

### Dear Mr. Wright:

Pursuant to your request and authorization, *Pacific Materials Laboratory, Inc.* recently completed leach field method percolation testing in consideration of a replacement single family residence currently being planned on the parcel addressed as 6746 Ojai Ave., Ventura County, California. Leach field percolation testing was performed in three (3) truck mounted, 12" diameter test pits excavated to depths ranging from 36 to 42 inches below the adjacent ground surface. In addition to percolation test locations, a 12" diameter x 102 inch deep observation/percolation test pit was also excavated proximate the leach field test locations in order to evaluate the permeability of the soils a minimum of 60 inches below the planned leach field depth. The testing procedure employed is in compliance with the current Ventura County Environmental Health Division (*EHD*) procedure for evaluation of soil suitability to support the leach line method of onsite wastewater treatment system (*OWTS*). The following Enclosures have been appended to this report as an aid to the reader:

- A sketch of the subject property including test locations is as Enclosure A.
- A log of the observation test pit (including Hydrometer analysis and field moisture content results) Is included as Enclosure OB-1
- Leach field percolation test data is summarized on Enclosures PERC1 and PERC2.

### PERCOLATION TESTING

The appropriate depth for percolation testing was determined based upon discussions with the client coupled with each condition observed relative to the observation test boring. Suitable permeable conditions were observed to exist to a minimum depth of 5 feet below the percolation test pit elevation of 42". The depth to free water was established as  $\underline{\sim 16}$  feet deep by previous test borings (See Pacific Materials Laboratory, Inc. Limited Geotechnical Exploration Report dated March 25, 2014, Enclosures B-1 and B-2).

Before testing, the sides and bottom of the percolation test borings were scraped and loose soils were removed. Two inches of clean pea-gravel were then placed at the bottom of each test pit to prevent them from sealing off during the performance of percolation testing. Saturation water was then continuously added to each test pit and maintained until testing. The saturation period was continued overnight. The test pits were then refilled to a depth of six inches above the pea-gravel. The absorption rate was then recorded for a period of one (1) hour (*as allowed for absorption rates <10 minutes per inch*). The test results are included herein on **Enclosure PERC1 and PERC2**.

As depicted by the results of hydrometer analyses and classification (*data included on Enclosure OB-1*), the soils encountered within the proposed leach field effluent discharge zone were found to contain up to 78% of materials passing the #200 sieve, of which as much as 48% are classified as clays. The subject soils appear to contain a significant amount of diatomaceous earth which appears responsible for the rapid percolation test absorption rates recorded. Never the less, given the amount of fines in the total soil volume, absorption rates may slow over time.

Based upon the percolation test results reported herein, the obtained slowest absorption rate of **<u>15-minutes/inch</u>** has been selected for use in design of the proposed primary and 100% expansion field. The assigned obtained percolation rate is well within the County of Ventura Environmental Health Division (*EHD*) allowable code criteria for design of leach field disposal systems (<60 minutes/inch).

This report simply demonstrates the feasibility of the site to support the leach field method of effluent disposal. A specific septic system design based upon your final building and site plans is still required. In order to provide you with the necessary information to complete the design, it will be necessary for *Pacific Materials Laboratory, Inc.* to receive architectural floor plans of the proposed residence, a reproducible plot plan, drawn to scale of 1"=50' or larger, which includes the contours of the site; cut and fill slopes, trees, property lines, drainage courses, well points, streams, all other surface features, including features such as artificial fills, slopes or natural ravines which may be present on or within 50 feet of the property. Upon receiving this information, the dimensions and physical location of the disposal field can be determined by *Pacific Materials Laboratory, Inc.* 

No warranty of uniformity of subsurface soil, bedrock or ground water conditions interpreted herein is implied around, between or adjacent to the backhoe pits discussed herein. Substantial material differences in soil or rock types, texture, permeability, moisture content, hardness, and degree of fracture may be present which could substantially alter available absorption capacities and rates of primary septic system elements constructed at locations other than the included test borings or backhoe pits. Such differences may necessitate substantial septic system modifications, redesign, or relocation to meet the minimum environmental health codes. It is the responsibility of the owner and septic system contractor to submit in writing a statement of differences encountered at the time of primary septic system element construction. If the final septic system design requires primary elements of the septic system to be relocated away from test borings included herein, the reader/owner/contractor, shall understand and assume responsibility for the afore stated risks.

Thank you for allowing *Pacific Materials Laboratory, Inc.* to be of service. If we may be of further service regarding this or other geotechnical issues, please do not hesitate to call (805) 482-9801, Fax (805) 445-6551 or write.

Respectfully Submitted, PACIFIC MATERIALS LABORATORY, INC.

DCP:dkp cc: Addressee (5) Attachments: Enclosures A, B, and PERC1 & PERC2 Bouglas C. Papay, GE 664 President





File No. 14-8138-3 Lab No. 34905-3

Enclosure - OB-1

Date Logge Equip	Logged: 0 ed By: JB ment : Han	4/03/2014 d excavated b	y client - Hand A	LOG C	OF BORING
Sand	Silt	Clay	Moisture	Depth	USCS DESCRIPTION
(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(ft)	
			29.8	•	CL-CH Brown fine grained sandy silty clay, moist and loose
4	18	78	28.2	а ж 5 г	CL-CH Dark brown fine grained sandy silty clay, moist and moderately loose
				8	CH Dark brown clay, very moist and moderately loose
22	30	48	31.6	- 10 -	
					, ,
		PA		TERI	ALS LABORATORY, INC.

## PERCOLATION TEST DATA

ĺ	Client: Wright
	Project Address: 6746 Ojai Ave, La Concita
	Date -Sat: 04/02/2014 / 05/05/2014
	Date - Test: 04/03/2014 / 05/05/2014

Test Pit Dimension: 12 In. dia.

Tech: CH /JB

Temp.: 58 - 65 F

**TEST LOCATION NO. P-1** 

TIME	TIME CHANGE	READING*	DROP	PERC RATE	Slowest
(hrmin)	(min)	(inches)	(inches)	(min/in)	Rate
08:17 AM		26.000			
08:32 AM	15	27,500	1,500	10	
08:47 AM	15	28,500	1.000	15	15
09:02 AM	15	29 500	1 000	15	
09:02 AM	15	24.500		refill	
09:17 AM	15	25,500	1.000	15	
09:32 AM	15	26,500	1.000	15	
09:47 AM	15	28.000	1.500	10	
10:02 AM	15	29.000	1.000	15	
10:02 AM	-	23.500	*	refill	
10:17 AM	15	24.500	1.000	15	
10:32 AM	15	25,500	1.000	15	
10:47 AM	15	26,500	1.000	15	
11:02 AM	15	27,500	1.000	15	
11:17 AM	15	28.500	1.000	15	
11:17 AM	÷	23,000	-	refill	
11:32 AM	15	24,000	1.000	15	
12:02 PM	30	26,000	2,000	15	
12:17 PM	15	27.000	1.000	15	

### TEST LOCATION NO. P-2

TIME	TIME CHANGE	READING*	DROP (inches)	PERC RATE	Slowest
09:13 AM		32.375		623	
09:18 AM	5	34,000	1.625	3	
09:23 AM	5	35 250	1.250	4	
09:23 AM	÷.	31.000	8	refil	
09:28 AM	5	31,875	0.875	6	
09:33 AM	5	32.750	0.875	6	
09:38 AM	5	33 500	0,750	7	
09:43 AM	5	34.250	0.750	7	
09:48 AM	5	35,000	0.750	7	
09;48 AM		31.250		refilt	
09:53 AM	5	32,000	0.750	7	
09:58 AM	5	32,750	0.750	7	
10:03 AM	5	33.500	0.750	7	
10:08 AM	5	34.125	0.625	8	8
10:13 AM	5	34.750	0.625	8	
10:13 AM		31.875	*	refill	
10:18 AM	5	32.625	0.750	7	
10:23 AM	5	33,250	0,625	8	
10:28 AM	5	33.875	0.625	8	

#### TEST LOCATION NO. P-3

Test Pit Depth = 36"

TIME	TIME CHANGE	READING*	DROP	PERC RATE	Slowest
(hrmin)	(min)	(inches)	(inches)	(min/in)	Rate
09:15 AM	2	32.250	*		
09:20 AM	5	33.750	1,500	3	
09:25 AM	5	34,750	1.000	5	
09:25 AM	<b>A</b>	31.000		refill	
09:30 AM	5	31.875	0.875	6	6
09:35 AM	5	32.875	1.000	5	
09:40 AM	5	34.000	1 1 2 5	4	
09:45 AM	5	35.250	1 250	4	
09:50 AM	5	36,500	1 250	4	
09:50 AM	÷.	31.250	30	refill	
09:55 AM	5	32.500	1.250	4	
09:60 AM	5	32,750		refill	
10:05 AM	5	33,625	0.875	6	
10:10 AM	5	34.750	1.125	4	
10:15 AM	5	35,750	1.000	5	
10:15 AM	×	32.000		refill	
10:20 AM	5	33,125	1.125	4	
10:25 AM	5	34,250	1_125	4	
10:30 AM	5	35,250	1.000	5	

# PERCOLATION TEST DATA

Client: Wright

Project Address: 6746 Ojal Ave, La Concita	
Date -Sat: 04/02/2014 / 05/05/2014	Test Pit Dimen
Date - Test: 04/03/2014 / 05/05/2014	Tech: CH /JB

ension: 12 tn. dia. B Temp.: 58 - 65 F

TEST LOCATION NO. P-4

				Test P	t.Donth =
TIME	TIME CHANGE	READING*	DROP	PERC RATE	Slowest
(branin)	(min).	(inches)	(inches)	(min/in)	Rate
09:15 AM		30.750		52	
09:20 AM	5	32.125	1 375	4	
09:25 AM	5	33.500	1.375	4	
09:30 AM	5	34,000	0.500	10	
09:30 AM		30 7 50		rsfill	
09:35 AM	5	31.750	1.000	5	
09:40 AM	5	32.750	1.000	5	
09:45 AM	5	33,750	1,000	5	
09:50 AM	5	34 625	0.875	6	
09:55 AM	5	35.500	0.875	6	
10:00 AM	5	36.125	0.625	8	8
10:00 AM	32	31.750	28	refill	
10:05 AM	5	33,125	1,375	4	
10:10 AM	5	34.125	1.000	5	
10:15 AM	5	35,000	0.875	б	
10:20 AM	5	35.875	0.875	б	
10:20 AM	3	33.250	34	refill	
10:25 AM	5	34.000	0.750	7	
10:28 AM	5	34,750	0.750	7	

\* Reading depth has no relationship to overall test pit depth

### TEST LOCATION NO. OB-1

TIME (brunin)	TIME CHANGE	READING*	DROP (inches)	PERC RATE	Slowest
8:52 AM		84,500		*	
9:04 AM	12	86.000	1.500	8	
9:24 AM	20	87.500	1.500	13	
9:44 AM	20	89.000	1.500	13	
9:46 AM	54	83.000	28	refill	
0:01 AM	15	84.000	1.000	15	15
0:16 AM	15	85.000	000.1	15	
0:31 AM	15	86.000	1 000	15	
0:46 AM	15	87.000	1.000	15	
0:46 AM	14	81 500	3	refill	
1:01 AM	15	82.500	1.000	15	
1:16 AM	15	83.500	1.000	15	
1:31 AM	15	84,500	1,000	15	
1:46 AM	15	85.500	1,000	15	
2:15 PM	30	87.500	2.000	15	
2:15 PM	1.2	82.000	3 8	refilf	
2:45 PM	30	84,000	2 000	15	
M4 00:10	15	85.000	1.000	15	

\* Reading depth has no relationship to overall test pit depth

PACIFIC MATERIALS LABORATORY, INC.

1

# Historic Resources Report 6746 Ojai Avenue La Conchita, CA

**19 February 2014** 

# **Prepared for:**

Matthew and Rebecca Wright 6746 Ojai Avenue La Conchita, CA

# **Prepared by:**



County of Ventura Planning Director Hearing PL14-0164 Exhibit 7 – Historic Resources Report

96

### **Executive Summary**

This report was prepared for the purpose of assisting the County of Ventura in their compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) as it relates to historic resources, in connection with the proposed reconstruction of a residence on a parcel located at 6746 Ojai Avenue, in the unincorporated community of La Conchita (APN 060-0-077-335). [Figure 1]

This report assesses the historical and architectural significance of potentially significant historic properties in accordance with the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) Criteria for Evaluation, and County of Ventura criteria.

This report was prepared by San Buenaventura Research Associates of Santa Paula, California, Judy Triem, Historian; and Mitch Stone, Preservation Planner, for Matthew and Rebecca Wright, and is based on research conducted in February 2014. The conclusions contained herein represent the professional opinions of San Buenaventura Research Associates, and are based on the factual data available at the time of its preparation, the application of the appropriate local, state and federal regulations, and best professional practices.

### Summary of Findings

The property evaluated in this report was found to be ineligible for listing on the NRHP and CRHR, and ineligible for designation as a County of Ventura landmark. Consequently, the property was found to not be a historic resource for purposes of CEQA.

### **Report Contents**

1.	Administrative Setting	1
	Ventura County Landmark Criteria	
	Ventura County Site of Merit Criteria	
2.	Impact Thresholds and Mitigation	3
3.	Historical Setting	4
	General Historical Context	
4.	Potential Historic Resources	6
5.	Eligibility of Historic Resources	7
	National and California Registers: Significance, Eligibility and Integrity	
	Ventura County Landmark Eligibility	
	Conclusion	
6.	Selected Sources	9



Figure 1. Project Location [USGS 7.5' Quadrangle, Pitas Point, CA, 1950 rev 1967]

### 1. Administrative Setting

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires evaluation of project impacts on historic resources, including properties "listed in, or determined eligible for listing in, the California Register of Historical Resources [or] included in a local register of historical resources." A resource is eligible for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources if it meets any of the criteria for listing, which are:

- 1. Associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history or the cultural heritage of California or the United States;
- 2. Associated with the lives of persons important to local, California or national history;
- 3. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region or method of construction or represents the work of a master or possesses high artistic values; or
- 4. Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history. (PRC §5024.1(c))

By definition, the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) also includes all "properties formally determined eligible for, or listed in, the National Register of Historic Places," and certain specified State Historical Landmarks. The majority of formal determinations of NRHP eligibility occur when properties are evaluated by the Office of Historic Preservation in connection with federal environmental review procedures (Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966). Formal determinations of eligibility also occur when properties are nominated to the NRHP, but are not listed due to a lack of owner consent.

The criteria for determining eligibility for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) have been developed by the National Park Service. Eligible properties include districts, sites, buildings and structures,

- A. That are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or
- B. That are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or
- C. That embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
- D. That have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

According to the NRHP standards, in order for a property that is found to be significant under one or more of the criteria to be considered eligible for listing, the "essential physical features" that define the property's significance must be present. The standard for determining if a property's essential physical features exist is known as *integrity*, which is defined for the NRHP as "the ability of a property to convey its significance." The CRHR defines integrity as "the authenticity of a historical resource's physical identity evidenced by the survival of characteristics that existed during the resource's period of significance. Historical resources eligible for listing in the California Register must meet one of the criteria of significance described above and retain enough of their historic character or appearance to be recognizable as historical resources and to convey the reasons for their significance." (National Register Bulletin 15; California OHP Technical Assistance Bulletin 6)

For purposes of both the NRHP and CRHR, an integrity evaluation is broken down into seven "aspects." The seven aspects of integrity are: *Location* (the place where the historic property was constructed or the place where the historic event occurred); *Design* (the combination of elements that create the form, plan, space, structure, and style of a property); *Setting* (the physical environment of a historic property); *Materials* (the physical elements that were combined or deposited during a particular period of time and in a particular pat-

tern or configuration to form a historic property); *Workmanship* (the physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during any given period of history or prehistory); *Feeling* (a property's expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period of time), and; *Association* (the direct link between an important historic event or person and a historic property).

It is not required that significant property possess all aspects of integrity to be eligible; depending upon the NRHP and CRHR criteria under which the property derives its significance, some aspects of integrity might be more relevant than others. For example, a property nominated under NRHP Criterion A and CRHR Criterion 1 (events), would be likely to convey its significance primarily through integrity of location, setting and association. A property nominated solely under NRHP Criterion C and CRHR Criterion 3 (design), would usually rely primarily upon integrity of design, materials and workmanship.

While the NRHP guidelines and the CRHR regulations include similar language with respect to the aspects of integrity, the latter guidelines also state "it is possible that historical resources may not retain sufficient integrity to meet the criteria for listing in the National Register, but they may still be eligible for listing in the California Register." Further, according to the NRHP guidelines, the integrity of a property must be evaluated at the time the evaluation of eligibility is conducted. Integrity assessments cannot be based on speculation with respect to historic fabric and architectural elements that may exist but are not visible to the evaluator, or on restorations that are theoretically possible but which have not occurred. (National Register Bulletin 15; CCR §4852 (c); California OHP Technical Assistance Bulletin 6)

The minimum age criterion for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) is 50 years. Properties less than 50 years old may be eligible for listing on the NRHP if they can be regarded as "exceptional," as defined by the NRHP procedures, or in terms of the CRHR, "if it can be demonstrated that sufficient time has passed to understand its historical importance" (Chapter 11, Title 14, §4842(d)(2))

Historic resources as defined by CEQA also includes properties listed in "local registers" of historic properties. A "local register of historic resources" is broadly defined in §5020.1 (k) of the Public Resources Code, as "a list of properties officially designated or recognized as historically significant by a local government pursuant to a local ordinance or resolution." Local registers of historic properties come essentially in two forms: (1) surveys of historic resources conducted by a local agency in accordance with Office of Historic Preservation procedures and standards, adopted by the local agency and maintained as current, and (2) landmarks designated under local ordinances or resolutions. These properties are "presumed to be historically or culturally significant... unless the preponderance of the evidence demonstrates that the resource is not historically or culturally significant." (PRC §§ 5024.1, 21804.1, 15064.5)

### Ventura County Landmark Criteria

An improvement, natural feature, or site may become a designated landmark if it meets one the following criteria:

- It exemplifies or reflects special elements of the County's social, aesthetic, engineering, architectural or natural history;
- It is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of Ventura County or its cities, regional history, or the cultural heritage of California or the United States;

- 3. It is associated with the lives of persons important to Ventura County or its cities, California, or national history;
- 4. It has yielded, or has the potential to yield, information important to the prehistory or history of Ventura County or its cities, California or the nation;
- 5. It embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of a master or possesses high artistic values;
- 6. Integrity: Establish the authenticity of the resource's physical identity by evidence of lack of deterioration and significant survival of the characteristics that existed during its period of importance. This shall be evaluated with regard to the retention of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship.

### Ventura County Site of Merit Criteria

Sites of Merit satisfy the following criteria:

- 1. Sites of historical, architectural, community or aesthetic merit which have not been designated as landmarks or points of interest, but which are deserving of special recognition; and
- 2. County approved surveyed sites with a National Register status code of 5 or above.

### 2. Impact Thresholds and Mitigation

According to the Public Resources Code, "a project that may cause a substantial change in the significance of an historical resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment." The Public Resources Code broadly defines a threshold for determining if the impacts of a project on an historic property will be significant and adverse. By definition, a substantial adverse change means, "demolition, destruction, relocation, or alterations," such that the significance of an historical resource would be impaired. For purposes of NRHP eligibility, reductions in a property's integrity (the ability of the property to convey its significance) should be regarded as potentially adverse impacts. (PRC §21084.1, §5020.1(6))

Further, according to the CEQA Guidelines, "an historical resource is materially impaired when a project... [d]emolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion in, or eligibility for, inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources [or] that account for its inclusion in a local register of historical resources pursuant to section 5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code or its identification in an historical resources survey meeting the requirements of section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code, unless the public agency reviewing the effects of the project establishes by a preponderance of evidence that the resource is not historically or culturally significant."

The lead agency is responsible for the identification of "potentially feasible measures to mitigate significant adverse changes in the significance of an historical resource." The specified methodology for determining if impacts are mitigated to less than significant levels are the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings (1995), publications of the National Park Service. (CCR §15064.5(b)(3))

### 3. Historical Setting

### General Historical Context

The La Conchita del Mar community (literal translation: "small shell of the sea") is located approximately twelve miles northwest of the City of San Buenaventura (Ventura). This part of the coastline is referred to generally as the Rincon, which translates to "corner" or "nook" in Spanish. The name is likely derived from the Mexican land grant Rancho El Rincon, and from the curves in the coastline formed by the series of points jutting out into the Pacific Ocean, the northernmost being Rincon Point at the Ventura-Santa Barbara county line.

The current community of La Conchita del Mar began in 1923-24, but the settlement of this remote and relatively inaccessible section of Ventura County coastline dates to the 1870s. The public lands on which it is located, sandwiched between the El Rincon, Canada de San Miguelito, and Santa Ana land grants, represented the only land along this part of the coastline available for homestead claims. A record of California land patents shows that Robert A. Callis claimed the southern portion of this coastal property in 1878. Callis was, at one time, foreman to the Hobson Brothers' cattle business, based in Ventura.

Members of the Hobson family and related persons have owned land in the Rincon area since the late 1800s. The first to arrive in Ventura was William Dewey (W.D.) Hobson. He was often referred to as "the father of Ventura County" because of his efforts to separate Ventura from Santa Barbara County. Originally from Illinois, he moved to Northern California during the Gold Rush and then to Ventura County in 1859, where he became involved in construction and cattle ranching. His son Abram Lincoln (A.L.) joined him in business and with sibling William Arthur (W.A.), established the Hobson Brothers Packing Company in 1905. They accumulated large real estate holdings as well. In 1915 the Hobsons donated land to Ventura County to create Hobson County Park, located roughly three miles southeast of La Conchita del Mar. (Gidney, 1917: 744-746)

The northern section of public lands, approximately 141 acres, including the future site of La Conchita del Mar, was claimed during the same period by Levi G. Stanchfield. In 1874 and 1875 Stanchfield sold the property to Charles E. and Isabel Ablett. Charles Ablett served as the postmaster at Punta Gorda during the late 1880s, succeeded by his son, Henry. In 1907-08 the property title was changed to Jeanette B. Tomson, et. al. The other owners were a number of relations of Tomson, including members of the Ablett family, and other relations Kathena I. Workman and Charles Treadwell. (Friel, 1910; Ventura County Official Records)

In 1910 W.A. Hobson encouraged the construction of causeways to promote vehicle travel along the Rincon between Ventura and Santa Barbara, a concept he had seen during a European trip. Until that time the journey was made long and difficult by the narrowness of the strip of land between the ocean and the hills or sea cliffs, which was occupied largely in places by the railroad, becoming impassable in high tides. Three causeways were constructed and completed in 1912. The causeways were repaired and replaced as needed through 1924, when they were replaced by a paved road protected by a seawall.

The improved road access between Ventura and Santa Barbara opened up the Rincon to motor tourism and the development of beachfront communities. Several appeared in the area during the 1920s and 1930s, catering mainly to the construction of casual weekend homes for county residents, often on land that could only be leased, not purchased. Among them, from south to north, were Solimar, Faria (at Pitas Point), Seacliff (also known as Mussell Rock or Mussel Shoals, at Punta Gorda), La Conchita del Mar, and Rincon Point. At least

three restaurants and other travel-related services were opened along this stretch of highway during this period.

It is unclear precisely when the name La Conchita del Mar emerged. Some accounts suggest that it began to be used by the Southern Pacific Railroad as early as 1887 to refer to a siding or spur line in the Mussel Shoals area on the recently-completed route between Ventura and Santa Barabara. Early maps, however, refer to this narrow shelf of land between the cliffs and the ocean as Punta, or Punta Gorda, and in other early accounts as Mussel Rock. The name Punta Gorda also appears as early as 1901 on a USGS topographic survey map, referring both to the geographical feature and the railroad siding. In railroad records the name was shortened to Punta. The Punta School was established in 1890, and for a time, functioned as an independent school district serving the widely-scattered settlers in the area. (Signor, 1994)

The La Conchita del Mar name appears for certain in 1923, with the opening of a speculative subdivision between Punta Gorda and Rincon Point developed by a group of Ventura investors. Two subdivisions with the name La Concita del Mar were created. The first was a row of lots between the highway and the surf line called La Conchita del Mar Subdivision No. 1. As was common practice during these years, this tract was never officially recorded. Consequently, it is difficult to be certain when it occurred, or who was behind it. However, it likely dates to 1923, and the work of the same group of investors who were responsible for the second, much larger tract called La Conchita del Mar Subdivision No. 2, recorded in 1924. This subdivision created 327 parcels, the majority of them a mere 2,400 square feet in area, between the highway and the bluffs. Additional parcels were created on the beach front with this map. (*Santa Paula Chronicle*, 10-26-1923)

It is often stated that the developer of La Conchita del Mar was William Ramelli of Ventura. While Ramelli may have been the most visible investor, he was more accurately only one of several partners in the subdivision, which also included Ventura residents Richard and Mary H. Langdon, Robert L. and Adeline Georgeson, Harry B. Waud, and Milton E. Ramelli (who also served as the property surveyor). Also mentioned as an owner of the subdivision in newspaper accounts is Homer J. Ridle. The sales manager was reported as Burt E. Cannon. William Ramelli and Waud, and perhaps some of the others, were also officers in the Ventura County Title Company, which appears to have been the conduit for the initial land purchase.

Sales were heavily promoted in the local press, particularly during the summer of 1924. Lots were advertised to sell for as little as \$200. Attractions included not just the beach, but a bathhouse and dancehall. As was the case with many of these seaside tracts, sales were not particularly brisk, and the number of homes constructed on the tiny parcels were few, especially on the lots north of the highway. The parcels located immediately along the beach remained the more attractive sites for vacation homes.

An added attraction of La Conchita del Mar advertised to buyers was the retention of the land's mineral rights. Oil and natural gas was extracted in nearby Summerland in Santa Barbara County briefly during the 1890s, and the Hobson brothers explored the potential for oil drilling in the Rincon district as early as 1895. Others followed during the mid-1920s, but the Rincon did not become a commercially viable area until the late 1920s. A significant feature of Rincon area oil development was the construction of the Seacliff Oil Pier Complex, historically known as the Ferguson and Needham Oil Piers. Construction began in 1929 off the beach southeast of La Conchita del Mar, and when completed in 1935, they extended more than 2,000 feet from the shoreline. The construction of the oil piers and nearby onshore pumping and storage facilities brought employment and new residents to the area, some of whom settled in La Conchita del Mar. Longterm residency in the area re-

mained problematical, however, due to the lack of a reliable domestic water supply. (San Buenaventura Research Associates, 1998)

A succession of highway improvements beginning in the late 1940s and culminating in the late 1960s with the upgrading Route 101 to a freeway led to the removal of all of the homes constructed along the beachfront at La Conchita del Mar, and others elsewhere along the Rincon. Some of the residences displaced by highway construction were relocated to other beachfront communities, including to La Conchita del Mar, which by this time was more commonly known simply as La Conchita. The completion of the Lake Casitas reservoir in 1958 finally addressed the domestic water supply issues along the Rincon, leading to an upswing in construction in La Conchita, and a growing number of year-round residents, a trend that accelerated into 1970s and 1980s, as beachfront living became generally more popular.

### 4. Potential Historic Resources

<u>Note</u>: The residence on this property had been largely demolished and was in the process of reconstruction at the time this report was prepared. Consequently the architectural description in this report is based upon the limited available preexisting photographic evidence of its appearance.

**6476 Ojai Avenue.** This single-story residence features a front-facing medium-pitched gable roof with open eaves supported by three knee-brackets. The entry door centered on the western street-facing elevation is flanked by a pair of single-light casement windows, possibly wood or vinyl-clad over wood. The contemporary entry door features a fanlight. The building is clad in medium wood lap siding. Windows along the side elevations appear to be wood multi-pane casements and wood sash. A low wood deck projects from the main elevation. [Photos 1-3]

Ventura County Assessors records estimate the date of construction for this building as 1953, but this date clearly reflects the year when the residence on the property was relocated to this site, not its original date of construction, which based on architectural evidence, is circa 1925. The original location of the building is unknown but it is likely to be one of the residences from the beachfront that were displaced by highway construction during this time period. Some local lore suggests that this building was the original Punta Gorda schoolhouse, but no evidence was found to support this claim. It is neither the period nor the style of the first building constructed for the school in 1890 nor of the second school constructed during the 1930s. (Ventura County Building Permits, Ventura County Assessor Building Record)

The property was subject to a series of transactions beginning in 1927 and the sequence leading up to it first being developed is complex. The table below details the chain of title for the property, from the current owners backwards.

Date	Grantor	Grantee	
11-3-12	Merz, Louis George	Wright, Matthew & Rebecca	
10-3-75	Cox, Carter M.	Merz, Louis & Nancy	
2-14-73	Morse, Berta	Cox, Carter M.	
5-22-63	Dienz, Robert C. & Norma	Morse, Berta (single woman) & Morse, May (widow)	
5-2-63	Bunce, Reginald & Elizabeth	Dienz, Robert C.	

### Historic Resources Report 6746 Ojai Avenue, La Conchita

Date	Grantor	Grantee
12-8-59	Goena, Louis L. & Mary Delores	Bunce, Reginald
3-13-59	Gardner, Grace Estella	Goena, Louis L.
6-2-58	Allen, Fred G. and Leila B.	Gardner, Grace
12-10-54	Hallenbeck, Albertina Perry	Allen, Fred G.
5-5-53	Carpenter, Francis J.	(sale contract assigned to Allen)
5-27-52	Hallenbeck, Albertina Perry	Ayala, Evie E. (sale contract assigned to Car- penter)
12-27-27	Langdon, et. al.	Hallenbeck, Albertina Perry
		Source: Ventura County Official Records

Albetina Perry Hallenbeck, purchased the parcel from the La Conchita del Mar partners in late 1927. Born in New York circa 1885, Hallenbeck worked as a librarian, and as a social worker in children's homes in New York, New Hampshire, North Carolina and Texas until the mid-1920s, when she was employed at the Ventura School for Girls. By 1931 she had returned to the Northeast, where it appears she remained for the rest of her life, leaving her La Conchita parcel vacant. In 1952 she contracted to sell the property to Evie E. Ayala, who the following year assigned the sale contact to Francis J. Carpenter without having taken title. Francis J. Carpenter was a carpenter and electrician living in Ventura during this time. He apparently relocated the residence to the property in 1953 and in 1954 assigned the sale contract to Fred G. and Leila B. Allen, completing a transaction from Hallenbeck to Allen. A number of short-term ownerships followed, few lasting more than a year or two, until the early 1960s when the property began to be held for longer terms.

### 5. Eligibility of Historic Resources

### National and California Registers: Significance, Eligibility and Integrity

This property does not appear to be closely associated with a significant historical event: it is only generally associated with the settlement of La Conchita during the 1950s, and is not known to have played any significant role in this event (NRHP Criterion A and CRHR Criterion 1). The property is not known to be associated with any notable residents of La Conchita (NRHP Criterion B and CRHR Criterion 2). The building is not a representative example of an architectural style, period, or type of construction. It is modest and somewhat altered example of the California Bungalow style constructed circa 1925 (NRHP Criterion C and CRHR Criterion 3). NRHP Criterion D and CRHR Criterion 4 pertain to archeological resources and consequently have not been evaluated in this report.

### Ventura County Landmark Eligibility

This property does not appear to exemplify or reflect special elements of the County's social, aesthetic, engineering, architectural or natural history (Criterion 1), or is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of history (Criterion 2). It does not appear to be significantly associated with the lives of persons important to Ventura County or its cities, California, or national history (Criterion 3); or to embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of a master or possesses high artistic values (Criterion 5). Criterion 4 pertains to archeological resources and consequently has not been evaluated in this report.

### Conclusion

The property evaluated in this report does not appear to be eligible for the NRHP, the CRHR or for Ventura County Landmark designation. Therefore, it should not be regarded as a historic resource for purposes of CEQA.

### 6. Selected Sources

Ball, K. Randall. *La Conchita, The Little Shell We Miss Along the Gold Coast*. Ventura County Magazine, July-Aug. 1985.

California Death Index.

Friel, L. (CE). Location Map of Right-of-Way for Proposed Toll Road from Ventura to Rincon by Rincon Toll Road Co. April 1910.

Gidney, et al. *History of Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo and Ventura Counties, California Volume II*. Lewis Publishing Company, 1917.

Hart, William. The Beach Colony Named Sun and Sea: A History of Solimar Beach. Private printing, 2005.

Johnson, Charles N. (ed.). *A Mountain Ranch*. Ventura County Museum of History & Art Quarterly. Volume 49, Nos. 1 & 2, Winter 2003-04 & Spring 2004.

Oxnard Daily Courier; 9-29-1923, 5-10-1924.

San Buenaventura Research Associates. *Historic Property Documentation, Ferguson-Needham (Mobil/Rincon) Oil Piers, Ventura County California*. Santa Paula: San Buenaventura Research Associates, March 1998.

Santa Paula Chronicle, 10-26-1923.

Signor, John R. Southern Pacific's Coast Line. Wilton CA: Signature Press, 1994.

Social Security Death Index.

Ventura County Assessors Records.

Ventura County directories, various years.

Ventura County Maps of Record.

Ventura County Official Records.

Unknown. *Our Neighborhood: La Conchita*. Typed manuscript dated 6-28-72. La Conchita file, Ventura County Museum.

US Census.

USGS 7.5' Quadrangle, Pitas Point, CA, 1952.

USGS 15' Quadrangle, Ventura CA, 1901.



Photo 1. 6746 Ojai Avenue, western and southern elevations. [date unknown]



Photo 2. 6746 Ojai Avenue, southern elevation. [date unknown]


Photo 3. 6746 Ojai Avenue, eastern elevation. [date unknown]