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## STAFF REPORT: REGULAR CALENDAR

APPLICATION NO.: 4-05-046
APPLICANT: Barry Kinyon
PROJECT LOCATION: 24700 block of West Saddle Peak Road (APN \#4453-025-028), Santa Monica Mountains (Los Angeles County)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Request for after-the-fact approval of Assessor's Parcel Number 4453-025-028, which was recognized by the County of Los Angeles in Certificate of Compliance \# CC-V-91-0582.

LOCAL APPROVALS RECEIVED: Certificate of Compliance \#CC-V-91-0582 recorded as document 91-2019625 on December 26, 1991.

SUBSTANTIVE FILE DOCUMENTS: Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning File No. V-1776; Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning File No. V-10322; "Geologic Data Sheet, Job \#00629C2.001" by Donald Kowalewsky, July 14, 2000.

## SUMMARY OF STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends APPROVAL of the proposed project with TWO (2) SPECIAL CONDITIONS regarding (1) cumulative impact mitigation and (2) condition compliance.

The applicant requests after-the-fact approval of Certificate of Compliance \# CC-V-91-0582 to legalize the subject lot. The subject lot was created by deed in 1970, in violation of the requirements of the Los Angeles County Subdivision Ordinance. In 1981, the creation of the subject parcel and two generations of parent parcels were determined to be violations by the County of Los Angeles. The County recorded a notice of violation on June 10, 1981 for the subdivision of the subject parcel and 24 other parcels in the immediate vicinity. Of these 24 parcels, 18 lots were created from the same parent parcel as the lot that is the subject of this CDP request. The Commission has previously approved permits for residential development on ten of the 18 other parcels that were part of the original 51.29-acre parent parcel. In addition, the subject parcel is not in common ownership with other contiguous parcels created from the parent parcel. No other development is proposed for the project site at this time.

The standard of review for the proposed permit application is the Chapter Three policies of the Coastal Act. As conditioned, the proposed project is consistent with all applicable Chapter Three policies of the Coastal Act.

## STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

## 1. Approval with Conditions

The staff recommends that the Commission adopt the following resolution:
MOTION: I move that the Commission approve Coastal Development Permit No. 4-05-046 pursuant to the staff recommendation.

## STAFF RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL:

Staff recommends a YES vote. Passage of this motion will result in approval of the permit as conditioned and adoption of the following resolution and findings. The motion passes only by affirmative vote of a majority of the Commissioners present.

## RESOLUTION TO APPROVE THE PERMIT:

The Commission hereby approves a coastal development permit for the proposed development and adopts the findings set forth below on grounds that the development as conditioned will be in conformity with the policies of Chapter 3 of the Coastal Act and will not prejudice the ability of the local government having jurisdiction over the area to prepare a Local Coastal Program conforming to the provisions of Chapter 3. Approval of the permit complies with the California Environmental Quality Act because either 1) feasible mitigation measures and/or alternatives have been incorporated to substantially lessen any significant adverse effects of the development on the environment, or 2) there are no further feasible mitigation measures or alternatives that would substantially lessen any significant adverse impacts of the development on the environment.

## II. Standard Conditions

1. Notice of Receipt and Acknowledgment. The permit is not valid and development shall not commence until a copy of the permit; signed by the permitee or authorized agent, acknowledging receipt of the permit and acceptance of the terms and conditions, is returned to the Commission office.
2. Expiration. If development has not commenced, the permit will expire two years from the date on which the Commission voted on the application. Development shall be pursued in a
diligent manner and completed in a reasonable period of time. Application for extension of the permit must be made prior to the expiration date.
3. Interpretation. Any questions of intent or interpretation of any condition will be resolved by the Executive Director or the Commission.
4. Assignment. The permit may be assigned to any qualified person, provided assignee files with the Commission an affidavit accepting all terms and conditions of the permit.
5. Terms and Conditions Run with the Land. These terms and conditions shall be perpetual, and it is the intention of the Commission and the permitee to bind all future owners and possessors of the subject property to the terms and conditions.

## III. Special Conditions

## 1. Cumulative Impact Mitigation

The applicant shall mitigate the cumulative impacts of the subject development with respect to build-out of the Santa Monica Mountains by ensuring that development rights for residential use have been extinguished on the equivalent of one (1) building site in the Santa Monica Mountains Coastal Zone through a Transfer of Development Credit (TDC) transaction.

Prior to the issuance of the Coastal Development Permit, the applicant shall complete the following steps to ensure that the development rights are extinguished on the lot(s) equivalent to one Transfer of Development Credit (TDC):

1) The applicant shall provide, for the review and approval of the Executive Director, evidence that the TDC lot(s) to be extinguished qualify with the criteria for TDC donor lots established in past Commission actions.
2) No development, as defined in Section 30106 of the Coastal Act, grazing, or agricultural activities shall occur on the TDC lot(s) except for:

Brush clearance required by Los Angeles County for permitted structures on adjacent parcels; planting of native vegetation and other restoration activities, if approved by the Commission in a coastal development permit; construction and maintenance of public hiking trails, if approved by the Commission in a coastal development permit; and existing easements for roads, trails, and utilities
3) The applicant shall execute and record a document in a form and content acceptable to the Executive Director, granting or irrevocably offering to dedicate, an open space easement over the TDC lot(s) to be restricted for TDC credit for the purpose of development right extinguishment. The recorded easement document shall include a formal legal description and graphic depiction, prepared by a licensed surveyor, of the entire parcel(s). The recorded document shall reflect that development in the parcel(s) is restricted as set forth in this permits condition. The grant of easement, or irrevocable offer to dedicate, shall be recorded free of prior liens and encumbrances which the Executive Director
determines may affect the interest being conveyed. Such grant of easement or offer to dedicate shall run with the land in favor of the People of the State of California, binding all successors and assigns, and any such offer to dedicate shall be irrevocable.
4) The applicant shall provide evidence, for the review and approval of the Executive Director, that the TDC lot(s) extinguished in Section 3 above have been combined with an adjacent lot(s) that is developed or developable and held in common ownership. The extinguished lot(s) shall be combined with the developed or developable lot(s) through a lot merger consistent with applicable local government lot merger ordinances. The combined lot shall be considered and treated as a single parcel of land for all purposes with respect to the lands included therein, including but not limited to sale, conveyance, taxation, or encumbrance.
5) The applicant shall submit, for the review and approval of the Executive Director, a title report for the combined lot created by merging the TDC lot(s) and the developed or developable lot(s) that demonstrates that the open space easement grant or offer to dedicate required in Section 3 above is on the title.

## 2. Condition Compliance

Within 180 days of Commission action on this coastal development permit application, or within such additional time as the Executive Director may grant for good cause, the applicant shall satisfy all requirements specified in the conditions hereto that the applicant is required to satisfy prior to issuance of this permit. Failure to comply with this requirement may result in the institution of enforcement action under the provisions of Chapter 9 of the Coastal Act.

Failure to comply with any requirement or condition of this permit, will result in a violation of the subject permit and the commencement of enforcement proceedings, including potential judicial action and administrative orders, as well as the recordation of a notice of violation in the chain of title for the property.

## IV. Findings and Declarations

The Commission hereby finds and declares:

## A. Project Description and Background

The applicant requests after-the-fact approval of Assessor's Parcel Number 4453-025-028, which was created pursuant to Certificate of Compliance \# CC-V-91-0582.

The project site is a vacant 2.84-acre parcel (Assessor's Parcel Number 4453-025-028) located on West Saddle Peak Road in the Santa Monica Mountains area (Exhiblts 1 and 2). The parcel descends steeply, at an average gradient of approximately 1.5:1 to 2:1, in a northwesterly direction from West Saddle Peak Road to a branch of Dark Creek, a United States Geological Survey designated blue-line stream. The site contains a rough graded dirt road that appears to have been constructed prior to the January 1, 1977 effectiveness date of
the Coastal Act. A drainage course crosses the northern portion of the property and descends to the blue line stream that parallels a portion of the northwestern property line (Exhibit 11).

Surrounding parcels are developed with custom single-family residences. Existing single-family homes neighbor the property to the southwest, southeast, east, and northeast. Due to surrounding residential development and brush clearance required for these residences, the portion of the property along West Saddle Peak Road has been cleared of vegetation. The remainder of the site contains chaparral vegetation interspersed with sandstone rock outcrops (Exhibit 11).

The applicant has submitted a conceptual plan for a proposed single family residence on the site (Exhibit 3). The plan includes an approximately 150 foot long driveway descending from West Saddle Peak Road within the alignment of the existing rough graded road, and a single family residence located on a relatively level area with average gradients of $10: 1$ to $2: 1$. The conceptual development area is located at least 100 feet from adjacent streams. The applicant has submitted a geologic site inspection report ("Geologic Data Sheet, Job \#00629C2.001" by Donald Kowalewsky, July 14, 2000) indicating that there are no geologic conditions that would preclude residential construction on the property. The applicant has submitted an estimate indicating that approximately $1,153 \mathrm{cu}$. yds. of grading would be necessary for construction of the development shown on the conceptual plan (Exhibit 4).

The subject 2.84-acre parcel was created by deed in 1970 (Exhibit 5). On April 21, 1971, a notice of violation (Violation File No. V-1776) was issued to the owners and the grantor of the deed indicating that the parcel was subdivided inconsistent with the Los Angeles County Subdivision Ordinance, which requires approval of a map or certificate of exception prior to dividing land (Exhibit 7). The violation was cleared on June 11, 1971, on the basis that the parcel was identical to a larger parcel that had been created by a deed recorded on September 20, 1967, two days prior to the effectiveness date of the County's subdivision ordinance. However, examination of the notes written by the analyst who reviewed the violation (Exhibit 7a), and comparison of the 1967 and 1970 deeds reveals that the western lot lines of the subject parcels differed significantly and that clearance of the violation was based on an incorrect assumption (Exhibits 5, 6, and 10).

On June 10, 1981, Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning issued a notice of intention to record a notice of violation of the Subdivision Map Act and/or the Los Angeles County Subdivision Ordinance (Violation File No. V-10322) to the owners of the subject parcel and 24 nearby parcels (Exhibit 8). The subject parcel was determined to be in violation on the basis that the legal parent parcel (the west half of the northeast quarter of the subject section) was illegally subdivided into eight parcels in a one year period from April 1963 to April 1964, and that subsequent owners had further subdivided the subject property to create the subject parcel and 18 other parcels (Exhibit 10). ${ }^{1}$ Thus the subject parcel (created by deed in 1970), and the larger parcel created by deed in 1967 and referred to in Violation File No. V-1776, were subdivisions of a parcel that had been illegally subdivided in 1963. The owners resolved their violation by obtaining a certificate of compliance (Certificate of Compliance \#CC-V-91-0582 recorded as document 91-2019625 on December 26, 1991). The County waived the standard conditions applied to certificates of compliance (Exhibit 9).

[^0]Although the lot was created by deed in 1970, prior to the effectiveness date of January 1, 1977 effectiveness date of the Coastal Act, because it was created in non-compliance with the requirements of the Subdivison Map Act and Los Angeles County Planning and Zoning Codes in place at the time, it was not recognized as a legal lot until the County issued the first Certificate of Compliance in 1991. The 1991 Certificate of Compliance that "legalized" this lot pursuant to the Subdivision Map Act is considered a form of land division and, therefore, requires a coastal development permit. However, the landowners at the time failed to secure a coastal development permit for the lot creation. The applicant is now requesting after-the-fact approval for the creation of the subject parcel through this coastal development permit, which is discussed in detail below (Section B. Cumulative Impacts).

## B. Cumulative Impacts

The Commission has consistently emphasized the need to address the cumulative impacts of new development in the Malibu/Santa Monica Mountains area. Section 30250(a) of the Coastal Act states:

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

Section 30105.5 of the Coastal Act defines the term "cumulatively" as it is used in Section 30250(a) to mean:

> IThe incremental effects of an individual profect shall be reviewed In connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.

The applicant is requesting after-the-fact approval of an unpermitted subdivision that created the subject 2.84 -acre parcel. The subject lot was created illegally by deed in 1970. The owners resolved their violation of the Subdivison Map Act and/or Los Angeles County Subdivision Ordinance by obtaining a certificate of compliance from the County of Los Angeles (Certificate of Compliance \#CC-V-91-0582 recorded as document 91-2019625 on December 26, 1991). The County waived the standard conditions applied to certificates of compliance (Exhibits 5 10).

Although the lot was created by deed in 1970, prior to the effectiveness date of January 1, 1977 effectiveness date of the Coastal Act, because it was created in non-compliance with the requirements of the Subdivison Map Act and Los Angeles County Planning and Zoning Codes, it was not recognized as a legal lot until the County issued the Certificate of Compliance in 1991. The 1991 Certificate of Compliance that "legalized" this lot pursuant to the Subdivision Map Act is considered a form of land division and, therefore, requires a coastal development permit. However, the owners of the subject parcel in 1991 failed to secure a coastal
development permit for the lot creation. The applicant (a subsequent owner) is now requesting after-the-fact approval for the creation of the subject parcel through this coastal development permit.

The Coastal Act includes land divisions in the definition of development. Section 30601 states that "development" includes:
"... subdivision pursuant to the Subdivision Map Act (commencing with Section 66410 of the Government Code), and any other division of land, including lot splits, except where the land division is brought about in connection with the purchase of such land by a public agency for public recreational use ..."

Because they constitute development, all land divisions must be authorized in a coastal development permit. (Section 30600). The Commission, through past permit actions, has considered "land division" to include: subdivisions (through parcel map, tract map, grant deed or any other method), lot line adjustments, redivisions, mergers and conditional certificates of compliance. The action of issuing the certificate of compliance (with conditions waived) grants government authorization for a parcel that was previously created illegally, through means that did not comply with the laws in effect at the time. This type of certificate, for the first time, authorizes the land division that created a new parcel. Therefore it constitutes development under the Coastal Act, and requires a coastal development permit.

The Commission typically reviews the creation of lots through a division of land in a comprehensive manner and not on a piecemeal basis. The Commission review typically entails an analysis of the individual and cumulative impacts of the subdivision on coastal resources. To accomplish this the Commission reviews the proposed lot sizes and lot configurations to ensure consistency with minimum lot size requirements of the LUP, surrounding lot sizes, and to ensure each lot can be developed consistent with Chapter Three Policies of the Coastal Act. To adequately analyze the environmental impacts of a subdivision and determine consistency with Chapter Three Policies of the Coastal Act the applicant is required to submit detailed grading plans, geology reports, percolation tests, biological studies, viewshed analysis and other studies that encompass the entire subdivision.

In this case, a comprehensive analysis of the land divisions, which created a total of nineteen separate parcels, is not possible because the lots have been sold to multiple owners and the Commission has permitted development on ten parcels that were created from the same illegally subdivided parent parcel as the subject lot, as detailed in Table 1 below. Therefore, the Commission review, in this case, is limited to the subject 2.84-acre parcel.

Table 1. Commission Approved Development on Parcels Created from the West Half of the Northeast Quarter of Section 21, Township 1 South, Range 17 West.

| Parcel No. | CDP No. | Approved Development |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4453-018-029 | $\begin{aligned} & 4-98-097-X \\ & 4-98-168-W \end{aligned}$ | SFR (exempt fire rebuild); Septic system (waiver) |
| 4453-018-052 | 7073 <br> Amend-80-7437 <br> 5-82-841-E <br> 5-87-1004 <br> 5-87-1004-A1 <br> 4-00-047 | SFR; <br> Amend to remove condition Extension <br> SFR <br> Amend to remove condition SFR |
| 4453-025-012 | 5-84-691 | SFR |
| 4453-025-013 | 77-1292 | SFR |
| 4453-025-017 | 2458 | SFR |
| 4453-025-019 | $\begin{aligned} & 2186 \\ & 77-512 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SFR } \\ & \text { SFR } \end{aligned}$ |
| 4453-025-027 | 79-5581 <br> Amend-80-7154 | SFR <br> Amend to reduce footprint |
| 4453-025-034 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A-81-7960 } \\ & 5-83-448-E \\ & 5-85-630 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Conversion of barn to SFR Extension Conversion of barn to SFR |
| $\begin{aligned} & 4453-025-035 \\ & 4453-025-036 \end{aligned}$ | 4-96-188-W | Lot line adjustment (waiver) |

The subject parcel and adjacent parcels that were subject to the underiying subdivision are in separate ownerships and the current landowners were not involved in the original subdivision of the original parent parcel. The Commission recently addressed this specific situation in the approval of the Malibu Local Coastal Program (LCP). Although the Malibu LCP is not the standard of review for development in Los Angels County, the LCP provides policy guidance regarding the certificate of compliance issue in this particular case. The Commission found in the approval of the Malibu LCP that:

A land division for which a certificate of compliance is requested may be approved where the land division complies with all requirements of Section 15.2 except the minimum parcel size, in two situations: 1) where the Coastal Commission previously approved a permit for development on one of the parcels created from the same parent parcel, those parcels do not have a common owner, and the owner requesting the certificate of compliance acquired the parcel prior to certification of the LCP in a good-falth, arm's length transaction and 2) where the parcel for which the certificate is requested Is not In common ownership with any other contiguous parcels created from the same parent parcel and the owner acqulred the parcel prior to certification of the LCP In a good-faith, arm's length transaction. (Sections 15.3 (C) and (D)). These provisions will prevent hardship to a subsequent purchaser, who was not the one who illegaily subdivided the property and did not know or have reason to know that the parcei was created without compliance with


#### Abstract

the Coastal Act, if applicable, or other state laws or local ordinances. For all certificates of compliance that require a coastal development permit, a transfer of development credit is required to mitigate the cumulative impacts on coastal resources from creating a new parcel.


In this case, the Commission has approved a permit for residential development on several of the parcels created from the same parent parcel, the applicant purchased the property in a good faith, arm's length transaction, and the subject parcel is not in current ownership with any other contiguous parcels created from the parent parcel. Therefore, the Commission finds that given the above set of facts in this particular case, approval of the certificate of compliance is appropriate. Given the facts of this particular case, denial of the coastal development permit would result in an unreasonable hardship to the applicant. However, the creation of an additional parcel in the Santa Monica Mountains will result in potential adverse cumulative impacts to coastal resources and therefore mitigation is required as discussed below.

The Commission has repeatedly emphasized the need to address the cumulative impacts of new development in the Malibu/Santa Monica Mountains area in past permit actions. The cumulative impact problem stems from the existence of thousands of undeveloped and poorly sited parcels in the mountains along with the potential for creating additional parcels and/or residential units through subdivisions and multi-unit projects. Because of the large number of existing undeveloped lots and potential future development, the demands on road capacity, services, recreational facilities, and beaches could be expected to grow tremendously. In addition, future build-out of many lots located in environmentally sensitive areas would create adverse cumulative impacts on coastal resources.

As a means of addressing the cumulative impact problem in past actions, the Commission has consistently required, as a special condition to development permits for land divisions and multiunit projects, participation in the Transfer Development Credit (TDC) program as mitigation, such as has been done in past actions including CDPs P-78-155 (Zal), P-78-158 (Eide), P-81182 (Malibu Deville), 5-83-43 (Heathercliff), 5-83-591 (Sunset-Regan), 5-85-748 (Ehrman \& Coombs), 4-98-281 (Cariker), 4-00-028 (Layman), 4-00-044 (Blank Par-E, LLC), and 4-01-046 ( PCH -Tyler Associates, Inc.). Additionally, the Commission has required the retirement of existing parcels as part of a TDC transaction in order to mitigate lot creation through the approval of certificates of compliance for illegally created parcels, including the following CDPs: 4-02-227 (Marks), 4-04-032 (Hannon), and 4-04-121 (Miran). The TDC program has resulted in the retirement from development of existing, poorly sited, and non-conforming parcels at the same time new parcels or units were created. The intent of the program is to insure that no net increase in residential units results from the approval of land divisions or multi-family projects while allowing development to proceed consistent with the requirements of $\S 30250(\mathrm{a})$. In summary, the Commission has found that the TDC program, or a similar technique to retire development rights on selected lots, remains a valid means of mitigating cumulative impacts. Without some means of mitigation, the Commission would have no alternative but to deny such projects, based on the provisions of $\S 30250(a)$ of the Coastal Act.

The applicant is requesting approval to legalize the 2.84 -acre subject parcel. Staff's review indicates that the incremental contribution to cumulative impacts would be the creation, in this case, of one additional lot. Impacts such as traffic, sewage disposal, recreational uses, visual scenic quality, and resource degradation are associated with the development of an additional parcel in this area. Therefore, the Commission finds it necessary to impose cumulative impact mitigation requirements as a condition of approval of this permit in order to insure that the cumulative impacts of the creation of an additional buildable lot is adequately mitigated.

Therefore, Special Condition One (1) requires the applicant to mitigate the cumulative impacts of the creation of the subject parcel, by ensuring that development rights for residential use have been extinguished on the equivalent of one building site in the Santa Monica Mountains through a TDC transaction. Special Condition No. 1 details the steps that must be taken to retire development rights through the recordation of deed restrictions and the merging of the retired lot with an adjacent developable lot. The Commission finds that, as conditioned, the proposed project is consistent with $\S 30250$ of the Coastal Act.

## C. Violations

As explained above, unpermitted development occurred on the subject parcel prior to submission of this permit application involving creation of the subject lot. The subject lot was created by deed in 1970, in violation of the requirements of the Los Angeles County Subdivision Ordinance. The applicant is now requesting after-the-fact approval to authorize the subject parcel as it was created pursuant to the 1991 Certificate of Compliance in order to address the unpermitted development.

In order to ensure that the matter of unpermitted development is resolved in a timely manner, Special Condition Two (2) requires the applicant satisfy all conditions of this permit that are prerequisite to the issuance of this permit within 180 days of commission action, or within such additional time as the Executive Director may grant for good cause.

Consideration of this application by the Commission has been based solely upon the Chapter 3 policies of the Coastal Act. Review of this permit does not constitute a waiver of any legal action with regard to the alleged violation nor does it constitute an admission as to the legality of any development undertaken on the subject site without a coastal permit.

## D. Local Coastal Program

Section 30604 of the Coastal Act states:
a) Prior to certification of the local coastal program, a coastal development permit shall be issued if the issuing agency, or the commission on appeal, finds that the proposed development is in conformity with the provisions of Chapter 3 (commencing with Section 30200) of this division and that the permitted development will not prejudice the ability of the local government to prepare a local program that is in conformity with the provisions of Chapter 3 (commencing with Section 30200).

Section 30604(a) of the Coastal Act provides that the Commission shall issue a Coastal Development Permit only if the project will not prejudice the ability of the local government having jurisdiction to prepare a Local Coastal Program, which conforms to Chapter 3 policies of the Coastal Act. The preceding sections provide findings that the proposed project will be in conformity with the provisions of Chapter 3 if certain conditions are incorporated into the projects and are accepted by the applicant. As conditioned, the proposed developments will not create adverse impacts and is found to be consistent with the applicable policies contained in Chapter 3. Therefore, the Commission finds that approval of the proposed developments, as conditioned, will not prejudice the County of Los Angeles' ability to prepare a Local Coastal

Program for this area which is also consistent with the policies of Chapter 3 of the Coastal Act, as required by Section 30604(a).

## E. California Environmental Quality Act

Section 13096(a) of the Commission's administrative regulations requires Commission approval of a Coastal Development Permit application to be supported by a finding showing the application, as conditioned by any conditions of approval, to be consistent with any applicable requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Section 21080.5(d)(2)(A) of CEQA prohibits a proposed development from being approved if there are feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen any significant adverse effect that the activity may have on the environment.

The Commission finds that the proposed projects, as conditioned, will not have significant adverse effects on the environment within the meaning of the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970. Therefore, the proposed project, as conditioned, has been adequately mitigated and is determined to be consistent with CEQA and the policies of the Coastal Act.
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## Preliminary Grading Volumes:

| Driveway | Cut: | 216 Cu. Yds. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Fill: | 108 Cu. Yds. |

Total Cut \& Fill:

Export:
$1.153 \mathrm{Cu} . \mathrm{Yds}$.

191 Cu . Yds.
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Malibu Fecrom Corp as Escrow Agent
THIS FORM FURNIsHED BY TITLE IMAURANEE AMD TRUST COMPANY
FOR A VALUABLE CONSIDERATION, receipt of which is hereby acknowledged,
hereby GRANT (S) to
ZENKAI OKAYAKA MND TATSUKO CKYAMA, husband and wife, KEISHC GKAYAMA AND LAUREN GCBYAYA, husband and WIfe, and KOSHO OKAYAMA, single man all
AS JOINT TENANTS.
the real property in the County of
unincorporated area
Los Angeles
State of California, described as:
per legal description more particularly described in Exhibit " $A$ " attached hereto and comprising of pages :
ZGMKAI OKAYAMA AND TATSUKO OKAYAMA: KEISHO OKAYAMA AND LANUREN OKAYAMA heraby accept the interest conveyed to them as joint tenants with KOSHO oKAYAMA by the foregoing deed.

$\qquad$

state of california $\}$ Ss.
COUNTY OF. Ios Angeles
On Cay pent $<3<970$ before me the under. signed, a Notary Public in and for said Sate, personally appeared Francta A. Benson. $\qquad$
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## DESCRIPTION

THE LAND REFERRED TO IN THIS REPORT IS SITUATED IN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES AND IS DESCRIBED AS FDLLOHS:

PARCEL $1:$
THAT PORTION OF THE WEST ONE-HALF OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER OF SECTION 21, TOUNSHIP I SOUTH, RANGE 17 WEST SAN BERNARDINO MERIDIAN IN THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA; ACCORDING TO THE OFFICIAL PLAT THEREOF DESCRIEED AS FOLLOWS:
beginning at the intersection of the hest line of said liest ONE-HALF WITH THE NORTHERLY LINE OF PIUMA ROAD 60 FEET HIDE AS CONVEYED TO SAID CDUNTY FER DEED RECORDED IN BOOK 3.1623 PAGE 339 OFFICIAL RECORDS OF SAID COUNTY; THENCE ALONG SAID HEST LINE, NORTH $2^{\circ} 44^{\prime} 04^{\prime \prime}$ INEST 400.00 FEET TO A POINT HEREAFTER REFERRED TO AS POINT "A"; THENCE CONTINUING NORTH $2^{\circ} 44^{\prime} 04^{\prime \prime}$ HEST 50.00 FEET; THENCE NORTH $37^{\circ} 09^{\prime}$ O7" EAST 853.10 FEET; THENCE NORTH $80^{\circ} 38^{\circ} 55^{\prime \prime}$ EAST 71. 84 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 220 51' 51" EAST 43.12 FEET; THENCE SOUTH 220 201 $28^{\circ}$ EAST 46.78 FEET; THENCE SOUTH $7^{\circ}$ 144' $09^{\prime \prime}$ EAST 255.81 FEEET: THENCE SOUTH $58^{\circ} 18^{\prime} 56^{\prime \prime}$ EAST 237.09 FEET TO A POINT IN A LINE DRAHN PARALLEL HITH THE EAST LINE OF SAID UEST ONE-HALF AND PASSING THROUGH A PUINT IN THE NORTH LINE OF SAID-SECTION 21, DISTANT HESTERLY THEREON 450 FEET FROM THE NORTHEAST CORNER DF SAID WEST ONE-HALF; THENCE SOUTH 10 $28^{\prime \prime}$ 26" TO THE SOUTH LINE DF THELAND DESCRIBED IN PARCEL I OF THAT CERTAIN DEED TO WILLIAM F. ARNOT AND WIFE RECORDED APRIL 26, 1963 AS INSTRUNENT NO. I 868 IN BOOK D 2006 PAGE 339 DE THE OFFICIAL RECORDS OF SAID CCUUITY: THENCE WESTERLY AND SOUTHWESTERLY ALONG SAID SOUTHERLY LINE THRDUGH ITS VARIOUS COURSES AND CURVES TO THE POINT DF. BEGINNING.

EXCEPT THEREFROM ANY PORTION LYING NORTHWESTERLY OF A LINE WHICH BEARS NORTH $53^{\circ} 44^{\prime} 36^{\prime \prime}$ EAST ANI WHICH PASSES. THROUGH SAID POINT "A".

ALSO EXCEPT THEREFROM THAT PORTION OF SAID LAND LYING UESTERLY OF THE FOLLOWIING DESCRIDEL LINE:
beginning at the interjecticn of the west line of said west half WITH THE NORTHERLY LINE DF PIUMA ROAD 160 FEET WIDE) AS CONVEYED TO SAID COUNTY PER DEED RECORDED IN BOOK 12623 PAE 5339 , OFFICIAL RECORDS OF SAID COUNTY; THENCE ALONG SAID WEST LINE, NORTH $2^{\circ} 4^{\prime} 104^{\prime \prime}$ WEST 400.00 FFET: THENCE NORTH $53^{\circ} 44^{\prime} 36^{\prime \prime}$ EAST 442.25 FEET TO THE TRUE PUINT OF BEGINNING; THENCE SOUTH $12^{\circ} 11152^{\prime \prime}$ EAST 150.74 FEET; THENCE SOUTH $14^{\circ} 20^{\circ} 14 " E A S T$ 243.27 FEET TO THE SOUTH LINE OF THE LAND DESCRIBED IN SAID

ORDER NO. 7022783
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DEED: RECORDED: IN BOOK D 2008 IPAGE 340, OFFICIAL RECORDS DF SAID CDUNTY:

ALSO EXCEPT AN UNDIVIDED ONE-EIGHTH OF ALL CIL; GAS, GEMS AND MINERALS UPON OR UNDER SAID LAND AS RESERVED BY EENJABIN F: FIELD IN THE DEED RECORDED ON FEBRUARY 16, 1944 IN BOOK 20649 PAGE 206, OFFICIAL RECORDS.

PARCEL 2 : $^{\circ}$
AN EASEMENT FOR INGRESS AND EGRESS AND UTILITY PURPOSES OVER A STRIP OF LAND, 30 FEET HIDE, IN THE UEST HALF OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER OF SECTION 2i, TONNSHIP 1 SOUTH, RANGE 27 UEST, SAN DERNARDINO HERIDIAN, IN THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, ACCDRIING TO THE OFFICIAL PLAT THEREOF, THE SOUTHERLY AND SOUTHEASTERLY BOUNDARY LINE OF SAID STRIP LEING THE CENTER LINE OF THAT 3OFOOT WIDE STRIP OF LAND DESCRIBED AS PARCEL A-IO7-E IN THE DECLARATION RECORIED ON SEPTEHEER 21, 2955 AS IHSTRUMENT NO. 3238 IN JOOK 49015 PAGE 195, OFFICIAL RECORDS OF SAID COUNTY AHD BEING BCUNDED northeasterly hy a lide that is described as follows:

BEGINNING AT A POINT IN THAT CERTAIN COURSE DESCRIBED AS SOUTH 320 $54^{\circ} 50^{\prime \prime}$ HEST 145.79 FEET IN SAID TRACT NO. A-107-E, SAID POINT BEING DISTANT ALONG SAIE-CERTAIN COURSE, NORTH 320 54' 50" EAST 100.54 FEET FROH THE SOUTHUESTERLY TERHINUS OF SAID CERTAIN COURSE: THEN: 5 AT RIGHT ANGLES FOORTH $57^{\circ}$ $05^{\prime}$ 10" HEST 30.00 FEET, AND IEING DOUNDED SOUTHHESTERLY DY A LINE DRAHN PERPENDICULAR TO THAT CERTAIN CENTER LINE COURSE, AT ITS NORTHEASTERLY TERIAINUS, DESCRIDED AS SOUTH $27^{\circ} 09^{\prime}$ 35" HEST 29.22 FEET, IN SAID TRACT NO. A-107-E.

PARCEL 3:
AN EASEMENT FOR INGRESS AND EGRESS AND PUBLIC UTILITY OVE, A STRIP OF LAND 60.00 FEET HIDE IN THE GEST HALF OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTERं OOF SECTION 21, TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH, RANGE 17 HEST, SAN BERNARDING MERIDIAN, IN THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES; STATE OF CALIFORNIA, ACCORDING TO THE DFFICIAL PLAT THEREDF, THE CENTER LINE OF SAID 60.00 FOOT WIDE STRIP BEING DESCR; 3ED AS FOLLOWS:

BEGINNING AT A POINT IH THE NORT:I LINE OF SECTICN 21 DISTANT SOUTH $88^{\circ} 38^{\prime} 55^{\prime \prime}$ WEST 450.00 FEET FROMI THE NORTHWESTERLY CORNER OF THE EAST ONE-HALF GF THE NORTHEAST ONE-QUARTER: THENCE PARALLEL HITH THE EAST LINE OF THE HEST HALF OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER OF SAID SECTION, SOUTH $10^{\circ} 24^{\circ} 09{ }^{\circ}$ EAST 522.15 FEET TO THE IEGINNING OF A TANGENT CURVE CONCAVE NORTHEASTERLY HAVING A RADTUS OF 70 FEET: THENCE SOUTHEASTERLY. ALONG SAID CURVE 8G. 74 FEET THROUGH A CENTFAL AIIGLE OF $71^{\circ}$ : THENCE TANGENT. SOUTH 720 241094 fAST. 68.99 FEET TO A TANGENT CURVE

ORDER HO. 7022783
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CONCAVE SOUTHHESTERLY HAVING A RADIUS OF 70 FEET; TIUENCE SOUTHERLY ALDNG SAID CURVE 89.19 FEET THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 730; THENCE TANGENT SOUTH OHEASTERLY, HAVING A FEET TO A TANGENT CURVE CONCAVE SOUTHEASTERLY ALONG SAID
RADIUS OF 70 FEET; THENCE S CENTRAL ANGLE OF $64^{\circ}$; THENCE CURVE 78.19 FEET THROUG 24.02 FEET TO THE EEGINNING OF A SOUTH $63^{\circ} 24^{\prime} 09^{\prime \prime}$ EAST SOUTHUESTERLY HAVING $\triangle$ RADIUS OF 70 TANGENT CURVE CONCAVE SOUTNG THE ARC DF SAID 70 FOOT CURVE FEET; THENCE SOUTHERLY CENTRAL AINGLE OF 76"; THENCE TANGENT 95.29 FEET THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGE TO THE CENTER LINE OF SOUTH $14^{\circ} 35^{\prime} 51$ " WEST 135.91 FEETE 30 FEET WIDE AS DESCRIBED IN SADDLE PEAK FIRE TRUCK TRAIL SARATION OF TAKING RECORDED TRACT NO. A-107-E DF THE DECLARATIENT NO. 3238 IN JOOK 490.5 GN SEPTEMSER 21, L955 AS INS OF SAI COUNTY.
PAGE 195; DFFICIAL RECORDS
THE SIDE LINES OF SAID 60 FOOT WIDE S.RIP OF BE PROLONGED OR. SHORTENED TO TER AND TO TERIIINATE SOUTHERLY NORTHERLY LIINE OF SAID SECT 30 FOOT HIDE STRIP OF LAND IESCRIBED IN SAID TRACT IN. A-IOT-E.

Eximit "A\%:


PARCLII 3
PARCEL $1:$
that portion dp. the hest dae-half of the northeast quarter of SECTION LI, TOWNSHIP $\sim$ SOUTH, RANGE 17 HEST. SAN JERNARJIINO MERIDIAN II THE COUNTY OF LOS-AHGELES. STATE OF CALIFORNIA ACCORDING TO THE OFFICIAL. PLAT THEREDF'DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:
beginning at the intersection of the hest dine def said hest onehaLF HITH THE NORTHERLY LINE OF PIUBA ROATE: 60 FEET HIDE AS CONYEYAED TO SAIL COUNTY PER DEED RECORDED IN JOOK 21623 PAGE 33.9 ; :OFFICIAL RECORDS OF SAID COUNTY Y THENCE ALONG SAIDTEEST LIME, FOURTH $2^{\circ} 44^{\circ} 04^{\circ}$ hest 400 -00 FEET TO A POINT HEREAFTER REFERRED TO. AS POINT "A"; THENCE CONTINUING NORTH $2^{\circ} 4^{\circ}$. $04^{\circ}$ HEST 50,00 FEET: THENCE HURT $37^{\circ}$ $090^{\circ}$ 07" EAST 853.20 FEET: THENCE NORTH BBe:3日' $55^{\circ}$ EAST 71.04 FEET;
 EAST 46.78 FEET: THENCE SOUTH $7^{\circ} 144^{\circ}$ OS" EAST 255.BL-FEETT: THENCE
 With the east line of said hest one-talf and passing through a point IN THE NORTH LINE OF SAID SECTION 21, DISTAMT MESTERLY THEREOH 450 FEET FROM THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF SAID HEST GNE-HALF G THENCE SOUTh, 10 $28^{\prime} 26^{\prime \prime}$ TO THE SOUTH LINE OF THE LAND DESCRIED IA PARCEL 1 OF THAT CERTAIN DEED TO WILLIAM F. ARAD AND WIFE, RECORDED CZ $6=63$ AS I:SSTKUMLIAT NO. $1866^{\circ}$ IN DORK D2006 PAGE 339 OF THE OFFICIAL RECORDS OF SAID COUNTY, thence westerly and southinesterly along said southerly line tirguch


EXCEPT THEREFROM ANY PORTIÖ́N Ty ING WORTHGESTERLY OF A LINE:HHICH DEARS : NORTH $53^{\circ} 44^{\circ} .36^{\prime \prime}$ EAST AND WHICH PASSES. THROUGH. SAID POINT "A". and also except therefroh any portion lying westerly of the follohing described lines.
 THENCE SOUTH $36^{\circ} 25^{\prime} 24^{\prime \prime}$ EAST 366:77 FEET T.O SAID SQUTH LINE UF SSAID dEED RECORDED IN BOOX D2006 PAGE 339, OFFICIAL RECGRYS





THE SIDE LINES OF SAID BA sOT HIDE STRIP OF LAND S HM, ${ }^{3}, 4$ be prolonged qr shartence vo terminate northerly in tiff:


PARCEL 2: AN EASEMENT: FOR IHGRESS AND EGRESS AND UTILITY PURPOSES DYER A STRIP. Of LAND, 30 FEET HIDE, IN THE NEST HALF: OF THE NDRTHEASY: QUARTER OF:SECIIDN 21, TOHNSHIP 1 SOUTH, RAGE 17 , WEST: SAM BERMARDIND MERIDIAN, IN THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, ACCORDING TO THE OFFICIAL PLAT OF -SAID LAND FILED IN. THE DISTRICT LAND OFFICE AUGUST 31. 1896; THE SOUTHERLY AND SOUTHEASTERLY BOUNOARY LIHE PF SAID STRIP BEING THE. CENTER LINE OF THAT 30 FOOT WIDE STRIP OF LAND DESCRIBED AS PARCEL A-107-E IN THE DECLARATION RECORDED. OM SEPTEMSER 21; 1955 MRS INSTRUMENT NO. 3238 IN BOOK . 49015 PAGE $195 ;$. OFFICIAL RECORDS OF SAID COUNTY AND BEING BOUNDED NORTHEASTERLY BY A LINE THAT IS DESCRIBED AS:FOLLOWS:
beginnthe at a point in that. Certain course described as SOUTH $32^{\circ} 54^{\circ} .50^{-1}$ HEST $145: 79$ FEET IN SAID TRACT NO. A-107-E. SAID POINT .BEING: DISTANT ALONG SAID CERTAIN COURSE, NORTh. $32^{\circ}$ 54․ 50円 EAST 100.14 FEST FROM THE SOUTHWESTERLY TERMINUS OF SAID CERTAIN COURSE; THENCE. AT RIGHT ANGLES NORTH $57{ }^{\circ}$ 05' $10^{\circ}$ NEST 30.00 FEET, AND BEING BOUNDED SUUTHWESTERLY - BY a LINE DRAMM PERPENDUCILAR TO THAT CERTAIN LINE CQURSE, AT ITS NORTHEASTERLY TERMINUS, DESCRIBED AS SOUTH $27^{\circ}$ 09! 35* MEST 29.22 FEETM:IN SAID'TRACT NO. A-10T-E;

Parcel: 3: - an easement for. INgress and egress and publpubeic UTILIJY DVER A STRIP OF LAND 60.00 FEET HIDE IN THE HEST HALF OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER OF SECTION 21. TONNSHIP 1 SOUTH. RANGE 17 WEST, SAN BERNARDINE MERIDIAN. IN THE CCUFTY OF LOS: ANGELES: STATE OF CALIFORNIA, ACCORDING TO THE OFFICIAL PLAT OF:SAIO LAND FILED. IN THE DISTRICT LAND OFFICE, AUGUST 31, 1896, THE CENTER LINE OF SAID 80:00 FFDOT MIDE STRIP BEING DESCRIBED: AS FOLLOWS:
SEGINHING AT A. POINT IN THE: NORTH LINE: OF SECTION 22 DISTANT SOUTH 88* 38': 55" NEST 450.00 FEET FROM THE NORTHUESTERLY CORMER DF THE EAST DNE-HALF OF THE, NORTH代AST ONE-QUARTER: THENCE PARALLEL :WITH THE EAST.LINE OF THE WEST HALF OF THE NORTHEAST QUARTER OF SAID SECTION. SOUTH $1024309{ }^{\circ}$ EAST: 522.15 FEET TO $G$ THE BEGINNING OF A TANGENT CURVE CONCAVE NORTHEASTERLY HAYING A RADIUS. OF 70 FEET .THENCE SOUTHEASTERLY ALDNG SAID CURYE 86. 74 FEET THROUGH A CENTRAL ANELE OF $711^{\circ}$ THENCE TANGENT SOUTH 72* $24^{\circ}{ }^{\circ}$ OM ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ EAST 68.99 FEET TO A TANGENT CURVE CONCAVE SOUTHWESTERLY, HAVING A RADIUS OF 70 FEET: .THENCE SOUTHERLY ALONG SAID CURYE 89-19 FEET THROUGH A CENTRAL":ANGLE OF $73^{\circ}$ i THENCE TANGENT SOUTH $0^{\circ} 35: ~ 51^{\prime \prime}$ HEST 29.12. FEET TO A TANGENT CURVE CONCAVE NDRTHEASTERLY HAVENG A RADIUS OF 70 :FEET; THENCE SOUTHEASTERLY ALONG SAID CURVE 78. 19 FEET THROUGH A.CENTPAL ANGLE: DF.,64?\% THENCE SOUTH

 THENCE SOUTHERLY' ALONG THE ARC OF' SAID 70 FOOT CURVE 95.29 FEET THRQUGH A CENTRAL, ANGLE OF 78\%; THENCE TANGENT SOUTH 140.35' 51" NEST 135.91 FEET TO THE CENTER, LINE OF SADDLE PEAK FIRE TRUCK TRAIL $30 \cdot$ FEET. HIDE AS DESCRIBED IN TRACT ND. A-IOT-E OF THE DECLARATION OF TAKING RECORDED ON SEPTEMBER 21, 1955 AS INSTRUMENT NO. 3238 IN BOOK 49015 PAGE 195. OFFICIAL RECORDS OF SAID COUNTY.

THE SIDE LINES OF SAID 60 FOOT WIDE STRIP OF LAND SHALL. BE PROLONGED OR SHORTENED TD TERHBHATE NORTHERLY IN THE NORTHERLY LINE OF SAID SECTION AND TO TERMINATE SOUTHERLY
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April 21, 1971

Mrs. Francis A. Besson
28353 Pacific Coast Highway
Malibu, California 90265
Dear Mrs. Besson:
SUEUECT: COMPLIANCE WITH THE COUNTY DIVISION OF IAND REGULAIIONS FIIE NO. V- 1776
Review of a deed recorded with the County Recorder on Aug. 18, 1970, Document No. 143 indicates that you were party to a recent division of property located in the vicinity of NE $\frac{1}{4}$, Zenkai Okayama et

In most cases the Los Angeles County Subdivision Ordinance requires a final map, parcel map, or certificate of exception be approved prior to dividing land. Since this office has no record of any type of map being approved, it is possible that a map should be filed before the new parcei can de recognized as a legal parcel by the County.
In certain cases (such as land contracts, escrow agreements, financiai commitmerts, or recorded deeds entered into or recorded prior to Septembe 22, 1967) sales recorded on or after September 22, 1967, will be recognieed as complying with the County Subdivision Ordinance. If this is the case, please provide us with copies of the documents so that we may reviev them.
Tour coperation in clarifying this matter will be greatily appreciated. $\bar{j}$ Lease direct your information and inquiries to Mrs. June Jackson of cur staff at 628-9211, Extension 63703.

Vemy truis yours,
THE REGIONAL FLANNING COMMISSION O.K. Christenson, Director of Planing

Frederick J. Barlow, Deputy Director
FJB: mm
(S-1)

EXHIBIT NO. 7
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Mr. Zenkai Okayama et al
211 West Jefferson Boulevard
Los Angeles, California 90007
Dear Mr. Okayama:
SUBJECT: COMPLIANCE WITH THE COUNTY DIVISION OF LAND REGULATIONS FILE NO. V- 1776

Review of a deed recorded with the County Recorder on August 18, 1970 Document No. 143 indicates that you were party to a recent division of property located in the vicinity of NE $\frac{1}{4}$ Sec. 21, TIS, Rl7W.

In most cases the Los Angeles County Subdivision Ordinance requires a final map, parcel map, or certificate of exception be approved prior to dividing land. Since this office has no record of any type of map being approved, it is possible that a map should be filed before the new parcel can be recognized as a legal parcel by the County.

In certain cases (such as land contracts, escrow agreements, financial commitments, or recorded deeds entered into or recorded prior to September 22, 1967) sales recorded on or after September 22, 1967 will be recognezed as complying with the County Subdivision Ordinance. If this is the case, please provide us with copies of the documents so that we may review them.

To eliminate the possibility of having the use of your property restricted since building permits may be withheld, please submit your information and inquiries to Mrs. June Jackson of our staff at the address above, or at 628-9211, Extension 63703, and refer to our File No.

Very truly yours,
THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
0. K. Christenson, Director of Planning


Frederick J. Barlow, Deputy Director
FJB:RF: eh
(Buyer-1)

```
1J.] Nest Jafferson slvd.
Log Anmelas, (iolifornia, Yowit
<uno 7. 1`7%
```

```
i`rs. June aqc;son
Co:גnty vf i.ts An!ra)e?
[.0 i!erio!ug] rlvaninerl:nm.iss:on
!us anmel#s, Cwlironnlu
Leer mrs. Jacitson:
```



fonward to you by yr fonv arvivo of tne injibu sierra



encrias in the nfitcipl rocoris:

mok $\quad$ Inse $\quad$ Instruigen:

| 557 | 2113 | 75k |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 'i. 5407 | 371 | 907 |
| [ 5407 | 237 | 761 |
| 1. 0.507 | 236 | 764 |
| aimintior ros Pbogen |  |  |
| B00: | ? $2 \cdot \underline{0}$ | lnatrumbnt |
| 1. 5577 | 239 | 7 me |
| $1-5 \cdot 7$ | ¢ | 357 |

if vol sinculi hamuire further intorm tion, dease contac:
tr. Devivn whose actres. jn:

```
#alibu ji`rio :`э@lty
```



```
                                    *sufbur, GalyJ゚ornl?
                                    ~mone: ii i-#O!j ralone: ji i-
ogncerajv yours.
```

Hhant


320 WEST TEMPLE STREET LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 00012

ARTHUR J. BaUm VCE-CMAIRMAM

Mas. 1.S. Baca

June 15, 2971
lirs. Prancis A. Desson
28353 Pacific Coast FiEhway
liclibu, California 90265
Dear lirs. Besson:

Subject: COMPLIANCE WITH THE COUNTY DIVISION OF LAND REGULATIONS. FILE NO. 1776
Document No.: 143
Buyer: Zenkai Okayana
In a letter dated April 21, 1971 we informed you of a possible violation of the Los Angeles County Subdivision Ordinance, Ordinance No. 4478.

Further investigation of maps submitted and subsequently approved, or further investigation of the recorded deeds and/or documents submitted indicates that no division of land violation exists.

Thank you for your cooperation in clarifying this matter.
Very truly yours,
THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
O.K. Christenson, Director of Planning

Frederick J. Barlow, Deputy Director
FJB:RF: $\mathrm{E}^{\text {h }}$

COUNTY OF OS ANGELES
THE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
1776 Minor Land Division Violation
File No. V- $\qquad$ Deed Recorded Aug. 18, 1970 Document No. 143
$\qquad$
HMM 138-H.085 $\triangle$ wis. 129-077 Zoning $A-1-1$
Deed signed Aug. 10, 1970 Zoning Violation Referral $\qquad$
Nature of violation Creation of two parcels (3.14士ac. and 2.84士 ar
vicinity: $N E / 4$ by sale of Tins, $R 17 \mathrm{~W}$.

Mrs. Francis A. Besson Buyer:
28353 Pacific Coast Hwy
Malibu, Calif. 90265

Phone $\qquad$ Phone
$\qquad$ et al.
III W. Jefferson Bled. Los Angeles, Calif. 90007 748-4911

Violation Letters Sent:
Seller 1: Clopacial, $14 \%$ Ln DA Referral:
Seller 2; Buyer 1:_ $5-26-2 \mathcal{L}$ Bldg. Permit Denial:
Others




Final Disposition
Era-: Cluarmace.letter
Cleared: Wii if 1971 Reason: $\qquad$ Truest deeds dated Sept. $20, \in 7$, as per Clearance Letter Sent (date) $\qquad$ By $\qquad$ Other Action $\qquad$ JJ:bc 3/71

TSSo 2 2 . $x$. Sept. $20,67=46.78 \mathrm{ft}$.
thitice south $7^{\circ} 14^{\prime} \circ 9^{\prime \prime} \in 182.40 \mathrm{ft}$ to a line vehicle bears N $53^{\circ} 44^{\prime} 36^{\prime \prime}$ east from true point of beginning, thence along last alescribed line, $553^{\circ} 44^{\prime} 36^{\prime \prime}$ west 786.56 ft , to the True print of beginning. paras $27=$ parcel 4- - an easement. 25 ft . Road

Sept. 20,67i:
Intersection of west lime of west $1 / 2 \mathrm{w}$. Northerly line of Puma Rd. 60 ft wide - along w line $N 2^{\circ} 44^{\prime} 04^{\prime \prime}$ W 400 ft . do true print beginnings H $2^{\circ} 44^{\prime} 04^{\prime}$ $w 50 \mathrm{ft} ; N .37^{\circ} 09^{\prime} 07^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{E} 853.10 \mathrm{ft}$; $H 88^{\circ} 38^{\prime} 55^{\prime \prime}$ E $71.84 \mathrm{ft} ; \mathrm{S} 11^{\circ} 51^{\prime} 51^{\prime \prime}$. E $43,12 \mathrm{ft}$. $\mathrm{j} 22^{\circ} 20^{\prime} 1 \mathrm{~s}^{\prime \prime}$ E $46.78 \mathrm{ft} . S 7^{\circ} 14^{\prime} 09^{\prime \prime} E 182.4 \mathrm{ft}$. To a like. lueconing $N 53^{\circ} 44^{\prime} 36^{\prime \prime} E$ frore thee point beyintacig
 To the point
Parcel 2- easement
parcel 3-Easenent
parcel 4- easement
T5507-(236-238) Doc .764- Troucis Besom to Cavalieri, Charles - Sept. 20, 67
Sauce as dee 143. parcel 1-Hen Except portion lying montuestely, of a line

Westerly line differs from 1970 deed (Deed 143)
bearing $53^{\circ} 44^{\prime} 36^{\prime} E$ paring throusle pint $A$ $\sum$ except portion lying westerly of ties. following dexilied lime : beginning_ point $A ; H 53^{\circ} 44^{\prime} 36^{\prime \prime}$ E 234,92 ft.; $S .36^{\circ} 15^{\prime} 24^{\prime \prime}$ E 366-72 ft. We said 5 lime of deed D2006 p. 333 . parcel 28
Thar Easmunuts
T5507-235-241 Doc. 765-Besook to Aral

 Fitersecton. W'/2 mith Picumen Ret, thence clomy wett live, H $2^{\circ} 44^{1004} 400 \mathrm{ft}$, N $53^{\circ} 44^{\prime \prime} 36^{\prime \prime}$ $2 \cong 4.92 \mathrm{ft} ; \mathrm{S} 36^{\circ} 15^{\prime} 24^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{E} 366.77 \mathrm{ft}$. To serecth bine of Raud Cioninteal in poricet 1- deced.
 t: léginmon - EvAenere $t_{\mathrm{J}}$
T5507-245 765. Anndt to Besson
$N 2^{\circ} 44^{\circ} 04^{\prime \prime} 400 \mathrm{ft} ; 1$ I $53^{\circ} 44.36$ E 234.92 ; $S 36^{\circ} 15^{\prime 2} 24^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{E} 366.77$ ft to socuth loud deocuitap meparcel 1....426.63. Then earenento

$$
T 5507-371 \quad 987 \text { Besson }
$$

Sept $20-67$



Toj Sierva Recelty
hackby


GOVERNMENT CODE: SECTION 66499.36

This NOTICE applies to the REAL PROPERTY within the unincorporated territory of the County of Los Angeles described as: PARCEI 1: The East Half of the Northwest Quarter of Sec. al TIS, RI7W, SBBM. (EXCEPT there from the Southwest Quarter of the Southeast Quarter of the Northwest Quarter of said Section al so EXCEPT there from that portion of said land lying Southerly of Piuma Road)

PARCEL II: The West Half of the Northeast Quarter of Sec. 2l, TIS, R17W Lying Northerly of Piuma Road \& Saddle Peak Rd. PARCEI III South 400 feet of the Southeast Quarter of Sec. 16 TIS, RI7W, Lying Westerly of Saddle Feak Road.

The OWNER(S) of RECORD are:
SEE ATTACHED HERETO

## DETERMINATION OF VIOLATION:

NOTICE is hereby filed that, based on the results of an official investigation, it has been determined that the above described property was divided into 30 or more parcels for purposes of sale of transfer without first filing a fina! map, in violation of the provisions of the Subdivision Map Act (Section 66410 et seq., Government Code, State of California and/or the Los Angeles County Subdivision Ordinance (Ordinance 4478). The above named Owneris) may present evidence why a NOTICE OF VIOLATION should not be recorded, to the Head, Subdivision Enforcement Section, Department of Regional Planning in Room 1381 of the Hall of Records, 320 West Temple Streat, Los Angeles, California 90012. If within 60 days of receipt of this NOTICE said owner(s) fail to inform this Agency of his (their) objections to recording the NOTICE OF VIOLATION, this Agency shall record said NOTICE OF VIOLATION. This NOTICE shall be deemed to be constructive notice of said VIOLATION to all Successors in Interest in such property. You may appear on August 31, 1.981 at 9:30 a.m. of by appointment on any working day within 60 days of receipt of this notice, to present evidence why a Notice of Violation should not be recorded. If you prefer relephoning, please contact a staff member at (213) 974-6483
This NOTICE does NOT affect any Certificate of Compliance previously issued.
DRP FILE:V 10322
ASSESSORS MAP: 4453:2, $18 \& 25$

DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING County of Lot Angeles, State of Celifornia Normen Murdoch, Pleming Director

## DEPARTMENT OF REGIONAL PLANNING



# NOTICE OF INTENTION TO RECORD A NOTICE OF VIOLATION <br> CONTINUATION 

The OWNER(S) of RECORD are

4453:2
(40) *MALIBU VISTA ENTERPRISES

4453:18
(29) BUNES, ROBERT M \& YOLANDA - RET
(48) WILSON, JAMES L - RET
(49) Valavicius, vytautas c
(50) CHITTENDEN, WILLIAM C \& JANE E
(52) BRESLIN, THOMAS L \& JOAN M
(54) FEIN, DOUGLAS P \& VICKIE Z CC 21619

4453:25
(Ol) MALIBU VISTA ENTERPRISES
(O2) MALIBU VISTA ENTERPRISES
(03) MALIBU VISTA ENTERPRISES
(O7) OLAN, BENNET
(12) VALAVICIUS, VYTAUTAS C
(13) STURMAN, EUGENE G
(15) CERNIK, ZDENEK \& GRACIELA
(17) MARELD, CIAES G \& DORIS F
(19) GIULIANO, CONCETTO R
(23) DEGIER, HUIBERTUS D \& WALTRAUD H
(26) STAFFORD, GEORGE C \& PEGGY C
(28) OKAYAMA, KOSHO ET AL
(33) DEAN, WILLIAM W - RET
(34) DEAN, WILLIAM W \& WILSON, SHARIE M
(35) GOSCHE, GEORGE K III \& MARGARET N
(36) GOSCHE, GEORGE $K$ \& MARGARET N
(38) ROSS, ROBERT L \& LORNA H
(39) FLETCHER, WILLIAM


# SUBDIVISION VIOLATION case na V-10322-B 

TATE 6-8-81

VIOLATION CASE V- $10322(B)$
FORMER CASE NO. V-1776\& 3340
ZONED DISTRICT MALIBU
ZONING
$A-1-1$
SECT O:

HMM 138 H_085 W'S_129-077
ASSESSOR MAP 4453:18.25
THOMLS GUIDE (pp) 108 (grad) C/ GE
INVESTIGATOR STEVE HOMO
SBEY
PLANTER
MYRON ELD


## SUEIEニ= FROPE:TY ! IESCミIPZION

Parcel 2: The West Half of the Northeast Quarter of Sec. 21, TI S, kl7W Lying Ny of Puma Road \& Saddle Peak Rd. Parcel 3: South 400 feet of the Southeast Quarter of Sec. 16, T1S, Rl7W, Lying Westerly of Saddle Peak Rd.
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VIOLATION CASE
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DESCRIPTION OF VIOLATION:
PHASE I.
Subdivider: Charles J. and Lillian P. Cavalieri, H/W, acquired title to the subject property per Grant Deeds No. 1069 Rec. 2-24-61 and No. 139 Rec. 4-18-63.

## PHASE II.

After the acquisition of the subject property, Said Subdividers divided the subject property creating 8 parcels in a one year period between April 18, 1963 and April 4, 1964, thus incurring a Major Violation.
PHASE III.
Subsequent owners, including Stephen J. and Audrey C. Vernon and Ernest Weissbeng further subdivided the subject property to create 19 par央els as included in the subject NOTICE.
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## CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

hequest for certificate of compliance
cc-v-91-0582
coord (and/ur vendee(s) pursuant to a contract of sole) in the following described
We the undersigned owner(s) of recoreritory of the County of Los Angeles, hereby REOUEST the County of Los Angeles to determine if said property descitited below complies with the provisions of the Subdivision Map Act (Sec. 66t10 et sea., Government Code, State of California) and the Los Angeles Codt. Title 21 (Subdivisions).


LEGAL DESCRIPTION (TYPED)

ORDER NO. 7022783
DESCRIPTION
The tand referred to in this report is situated fat the STATE OE CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OE LOS ANGELES AND IS DESCRIBED AS EOLLOWS:

PARCEL 1:
THAT PORTION OE' THE WEST ONE-HALE OE THE NORTHEAST QUARTER OE SECTION 21, TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH, RANGE 17 WEST SAN BERNARDINO MERIDIAN IN THE COUNTY OE LOS ANGELES, STATE OF CALIEORNIA, according to the official plat thereoe described as eoleows:
begining at the intersection oe the west line ot said west ONE-HALE WITH THE NORTHERLY LINE OE PIUMA ROAD 60 EEET WIDE AS CONVEYED TO SAID COUNTY PER DEED RECORDED IN BOOK 11623 PAGE 339 OEEICIAL RECORDS OF SAID COUNTY: THENCE ALONG SAID WEST LINE, NORTH $2^{\circ} 4^{\circ} 4^{\prime} 04^{\prime \prime}$ HEST 400.00 EEET TO A POINT herefter referred to as point "A": thence continuing north $2^{\circ} 4^{\circ} 04^{\prime \prime}$ WEST 50.00 EEET; THENCE NORTH $27^{\circ} 09^{\circ} 07^{\prime \prime}$ EASH 853.10 FEET; THENCE NORTH $88^{\circ} 38^{\circ} 55^{\prime \prime}$ EAST 71.84 EEET: THENCE SOUTH $11^{\circ} 51^{\prime} 51^{\prime \prime}$ EAST 43.12 EEET; THENCE SOUTH $22^{\circ} 20^{\circ}$ 18" EAST 46.78 EEET; THENCE SOUTH $7^{\circ}$ 14' O9" EAST 255.81 FEET: THENCE SOUTH S8. $18^{\circ}$ 56" EAST 237.09 EEET TO A POINT IN A LINE DRAWN PARALLEL WITH THE EAST LINE OE SAID WEST ONE-HALE AND PASSING THROUGH A POINT IN. THE NDRTH LINE OE SAID SECTION 21, OISTANT WESTERLY THEREON 450 EEET EROM THE NORTHEAST CORNER OE SAID WEST ONE-HALE; THENCE SOUTH $1^{\circ} 28^{\circ}$ 26" TO THE SOUTH LINE OF THE . $^{\circ}$ LAND DESCRIBED IN PARCEL 1 OF THAT CERTAIN DEED TO WICLIAM E: ARNOT AND WIEE RECORDED APRIL 26, 1963 AS INSTRUMENT NO. 1868 IN BOOK D 2006 PAGE 339 OE THE OFEICIAL RECORDS OF SAID COUNTY; THENCE WESTERLY AIID SOUTHWESTERLY ALONG SAID. SOUTHERLY LINE THROUGH ITS VARIOUS COURSES AND CURVES TO THE POINT OE BEGINEING.

EXHIBIT NO. 9
APPLICATION NO.
4-05-046
CC-V-91-0582

CC-91-05.82

XCETT THEREEROM ANY PORTION LYING NORTHWESTERLY OF A IIINE WHICH BEARS NORTH $53^{\circ} 44^{\prime} 36^{\prime \prime}$ EAST AND WHICH PASSES THROUGH SAID POINT "A".

ALSO EXCEPT THEREEROM THAT PORTION OE SAID LAND LYING WES:AERLY OE THE EOLLOWING DESCRIBED LINE:

BEGINNING AT THE INTERSECTION OE THE WEST LINE OE SAID WEST HALE WITH THE NORTHERLY LINE OF FIUMA ROAD $(60$ FEET WIDE $)$ AS CONVEYED TO SAID COUNTY PER DEED RECORDED IN BOOK 11623 EAGE 339. OFFICIAL RECONDS OF SAID COUNTY; THENCE ALONG SAID WEST LINE,
 EAST 442.25 EEET TO TKE TRUE POINT OE BEGINNING; THENCE SOUTH $12^{\circ} 11^{\prime \prime} 52^{\prime \prime}$ EAST 150.74 EEET; THENCE SOUTH $14^{\circ} 20^{\circ} 14^{\mu}$ EAST 243.27 E゙EETT TO THE SOUTH LINE OE THE LAND DESCRIBED IN SAID DEED RECORDED IN BOOK D 2008 PAGE 340, OEFICIAL RECORDS OF SAID COUNTY.

ALSO EXCEPT AN UNDIVIDED ONE-EIGHTH OF ALL OIL, GAS, GEMS AND MINERALS UPON OR UNDEK SAID LAND AS RESERVED BY BENJAMIN E. EIELD IN THE DEED RECORDED ON EEBRUARY 16, 1944 IN BOOK 20649 PAGE 206, OFEICIAL RECORDS.

## QARCEL 2:

AN EASEMENT EOR INGRESS AND EGRESS AND UTILITY PURPOSES OVER A STRIE OE LAND, 30 FEET WIDE, IN THE WEST HALE OE THE NORTHEAST QUARTER OF SECTION 21, TCNNSHIP 1 SOUTH, RANGE 17. WEST , SAN BERNARDINO MERIDIAN, IA THE COUNTY OE LOS ANGELES. STATE OF CALIEORNIA, ACCORDING TO THE OFEICIAL PLAT THEREOE, THE SOUTHERLY AND SOUTHEASTERLY BOUNDARY LINE OF SAID STRIP BEING THE CEATER LINE OE THAT 30 FOOT WIDE STRIP OF LAND DESCRIBRD-AS PARCEC A-107-E IN THE DECLARATION RECORDED ON SEPTEMBER 21, 1955 AS INSTRUMENT NO. 3238 IN BOOK 49015 PAGE 195, OFEICIAL RECORDS OE SAID COUNTY AND BEING BOUNDED NORTHEASTERLY BY A LINE THAT IS DESCRIBED AS EOCLONS:
gEGINNING AT A POINT IN THAT CERTAIN COURSE. DESCRIBED AS SOUTH $32^{\circ} 54^{\circ} 50^{\prime \prime}$ HEST 145.79 EEET IA SAID TRACT NO. A-107-E,GAID POINT BEING DISTANT ALONG SAID CERTAIN.COURSE, NORTH $32^{\circ} 54^{\circ} .50^{\circ}$ EAST 100.14 FEET EROM THE SOUTHWESTERLY TERMINUS OF SAID CERTAIN COURSE; THENCE AT RIGHT ANGLES NORTH $57^{\circ}$ $05^{\prime} 10^{\circ}$ WEST 30.00 FEET, AND BEING BOUNDED SOUTHWESTERLY BY A LINE DRANN PERPENDICULAR TO THAT CERTAIN CENTER LINE COURSE; AT IITS NORTHEASTERLY TERHINUS, DESCRIBED AS SOUTH 27* 09* 35" WEST 29.22 FEET, IN SAID TRACT NO. A-107-E.

PARCEC 3:
AN EASEMENT EOR INGRESS AND EGRESS AND PUBLIC UTILITY OVER A STRIP OF LAND 60.00 EEET HIDE IN THE WEST HALE OE THE NORTHEAST QUARTER OF SECTION 21, TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH, RANGE 17 WEST, SAN BERNARDINO MERIDIAN, IN THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, STATE OE CALIFORNIA, ACCORDING TO THE OFEICIAC PLAT THEREOE. THE CENTER LINE OE SAID 60.DO FOOT WIDE STRIP DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

- A.M.B. 4453-25-28
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CC-91-0582
CONTINUATION

BEGINUING AT A POINT IN THE NORTH LINE OE SECTION 21 DISTANT SOUTH $88^{\circ} 38^{\circ}$ 55" WEST 450.00 EEET FROM THE NORTHWESTERLY CORNER OF THE EAST ONE-HALE OE THE NORTHEAST ONE-QUARTER; THENCE PARALLEL WITH THE EAST LINE OE THE WEST HALE OE THE 52.15 NORTHEAST QUARTER OF SAI A TANGENT CURVE CONCAVE NORTHEASTERLY feET TO THEDIUS OF 70 EEET; THENCE SOUTHEASTEREY ALONG SAID CURVE 86.74 EEET THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF 710 : THENCE TANGENT SOUTH $72^{\circ}$. $24^{\prime}$ O $9^{\prime \prime}$ EAST 68.99 EEET TO A TANGENT CURVE CONCAVE SOUTHWESTERLY HAVING A RADIUS OF 70 FEET: THENCE SOUTHERLY ALONG SAID CURVE 89.19 EEET THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OF $73^{\circ}$; THENCE TANGENT SOUTH $0^{\circ} 35^{\circ}$ 51" WEST 29.17 ANGET TO A TANGENT CURVE CONCAVE NORTHEASTERLY, HAVING A RADIUS OF 70 EEET; THENCE SOUTHEASTERLY ALONG SAID CURVE 78.19 EEET THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGLE OE $64^{\circ}$; thence SOUTH 63' 24' 09" EAST 24.82 EEET TO THE BEGINNING OF $\boldsymbol{n}$ CANGENT CURVE CONCAVE SOUTHWESTERLY HAVING A RADIUS OE 70 EEET: THENCE SOUTHERLY ALONG THE ARC' OF SAID 70 FOOT CURVE 95.29 FEET THROUGH A CENTRAL ANGEE OE $78^{\circ}$; THENCE TANGENT 95.29 FEET THR $51^{\circ}$ WOUTH $14^{\circ} 35^{\prime}$ WEST 135.91 FEET TO THE CENTER LINE OF SOUTH $14^{\circ} 35^{\prime} 51^{\prime \prime}$ WEST TRSIC 30 EEET WIDE AS DESCRIBED IN TRACT NO. A-107-E OF THE DECLARATION OE TAKING RECORDED ON.SEPTEMBER 2L, 1955 AS INSTRUMENT NO. 3238 IN BOOK 49015 PAGE i95, OFEICIAE RECORDS OF SAID COUNTY.
THE SIDE LINES OE SAID 60 EOOT WIDE STRIP OF LANO SHALE GE PROLONGED OR SHORTENED TO TERMINATE NORTHERLY IN THE NORTHERLY LINE OE SAID SECTION. AND TO TERMINATE SOUTHERLY IN THE CENTER LINE OE SAID 30 EOOT WIDE STRIP OF LAND OESCRIBED IN SAID TRACT NO. A-107-E.
A.R.B. 4453-25-28
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Approximate parcel boundaries APN \# 4453-025-028


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ The June 10,1981 violation notice included additional parcels that had been illegally subdivided from a parcel adjacent to the subject parent parcel; it also excluded illegally created parcels that had previously obtained a Certificate of Compliance. Thus the number of parcels included in the notice of violation was 24, not 19.

