

[Blogs](#)

April 24, 2020

Intentional Misrepresentations Insufficient to Invalidate Coastal Development Permit Where They Did Not Affect the Coastal Commission's Decision

The court found that the Coastal Development Permit had been issued because it was



it was
en
tional or
coastal
ought to
that it had

On

appeal, plaintiffs relied on Section 13105(a) of the California Code of Regulations, which provides for revocation of a permit based on "[i]ntentional inclusion of inaccurate, erroneous or incomplete information in connection with [the] application, where the [C]ommission finds that accurate and complete information would have caused the [C]ommission to require additional or different conditions on a permit or deny an application." The appellate court concluded, based on the record, that although the CDP application had contained intentional

misrepresentations regarding approvals by other agencies, these had not been material to the Coastal Commission's decision. Thus, in accordance with section 13105(a), the permit was not revocable based on the intentional misrepresentations because the Coastal Commission would have reached the same decision and included the same conditions had accurate and complete information regarding the other state approvals been included in the application.