
Halted After County Discovers Missing Permits

Developer Obtains \$100 Permit Same Day County Stops Construction

By Linda Sutter October 16, 2026

CRESCENT CITY, CA (MPG) - An ambitious redevelopment project at the Crescent City Harbor District encountered an unexpected setback on Oct. 6 when Del Norte County officials halted construction at the Bayside laundromat and apartment facilities after discovering work had been undertaken without the necessary permits.

The enforcement action followed an inquiry by this reporter to Del Norte County Planning and Community Development Director Heidi Kunstal regarding construction activity taking place at the Harbor property.

Photographs documenting the construction were submitted to Kunstal, along with questions concerning whether the necessary building permits had been obtained. Kunstal responded that permits had not been issued and subsequently dispatched County inspectors to investigate.

On Oct. 6, County officials stopped the construction work. That same day, developer Daniel H. Dahan purchased a permit for \$100.

The incident raises questions about construction oversight, permitting compliance and the responsibilities of those undertaking redevelopment projects on property leased from a public agency.

Just three days after the construction shutdown, Dahan, managing director of Crescent City Beach Village, submitted a detailed Oct. 9 report to Harbor District Chairman Rick Shepherd and the Board of Harbor Commissioners outlining an extensive redevelopment program for the Bayside and Redwood RV parks.

The 19-page document describes plans to transform the existing properties into a professionally operated waterfront destination, complete with upgraded infrastructure, improved recreational facilities, modernized laundry operations, enhanced security, landscaping and additional revenue-producing businesses.

According to Dahan's report, operational control began in September, and considerable work has already been undertaken by coordinating contractors, purchasing equipment, planning improvements and communicating with regulatory agencies.

The report specifically identifies Del Norte County Planning, Building Inspection, Engineering, Environmental Health, and Code Enforcement among the departments involved in discussions concerning the proposed improvements.

Dahan explained that the purpose of these communications was to ensure that the development team understood the regulatory requirements before proceeding with substantial electrical, plumbing, grading and building improvements.

However, the Oct. 6 construction shutdown demonstrates that at least some work proceeded before the required permits had been obtained.

Among the improvements identified in Dahan's report are the rehabilitation of two Bayside apartments and modernization of the existing laundry facilities.

The report states that both apartments have already undergone substantial rehabilitation and improvement and that they are intended to support the property's management and operational needs.

The laundry modernization program includes commercial Speed Queen equipment and electronic payment technology designed to provide improved services for residents and visitors.

While these improvements may eventually benefit the Harbor District and its tenants, the discovery of unpermitted construction raises questions about when the work began, which activities required permits, and whether inspections were conducted before construction progressed.

The \$100 permit obtained on Oct. 6 also raises questions about its scope. It remains to be established whether the permit covers all the construction activities identified by County inspectors or whether additional permits, inspections or approvals will be necessary.

Harbormaster Michael Rademaker subsequently confirmed to this reporter that someone had complained about the construction activity.

The complaint originated from this reporter's inquiry to Kunstal concerning the absence of permits for work being performed at the Harbor property.

The issue is particularly noteworthy because the Harbor District is a public agency responsible for overseeing valuable waterfront property and ensuring that its leased facilities are maintained and Although redevelopment may be undertaken by private operators, the public has a legitimate interest in knowing whether improvements to publicly owned property are being completed with the necessary regulatory approvals.

Dahan's redevelopment report outlines numerous additional proposals, including a food court, improved recreational facilities, a possible dog park, public restrooms, upgraded electrical and sewer infrastructure, enhanced security systems and improvements intended to attract additional visitors to Crescent City.

The report also discusses opportunities to rehabilitate the existing Harbor car wash, develop partnerships with local businesses, and pursue grants for public amenities.

These projects could provide economic benefits to the Harbor District and surrounding businesses if successfully implemented.

However, the Oct. 6 enforcement action illustrates the importance of ensuring that regulatory compliance accompanies redevelopment efforts.

The County's intervention also raises a broader question: What procedures does the Harbor District have in place to monitor construction activity on its leased properties and verify that necessary permits have been obtained before work begins?

The Oct. 9 report emphasizes extensive coordination with regulatory agencies, yet it does not explain the circumstances surrounding the Oct. 6 construction shutdown.

Dahan could not be reached for comment regarding the permit issue or the County's enforcement action.

The Harbor District's redevelopment plans represent a potentially significant investment in the future of Crescent City's waterfront. Whether those plans succeed will depend not only on attracting visitors and developing new businesses, but also on proper planning, construction oversight, and compliance with applicable building requirements.

For now, one fact remains clear: Construction was stopped on Oct. 6, and a \$100 permit was purchased that same day. The remaining questions concern the extent of the unpermitted work, whether additional approvals are required, and when construction will be permitted to resume.