

## CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION

SOUTH COAST DISTRICT OFFICE  
301 E. OCEAN BLVD., SUITE 300  
LONG BEACH, CALIFORNIA 90802-4416  
PH (562) 590-5071 FAX (562) 590-5084  
[WWW.COASTAL.CA.GOV](http://WWW.COASTAL.CA.GOV)



# W12c

**5-21-0244 (Streams)**  
**October 13, 2021**

**CORRESPONDENCE**

**From:** [Lisa Farris](#)  
**To:** [Doyle\\_Jennifer@Coastal](mailto:Doyle_Jennifer@Coastal)  
**Subject:** FW: 7012 Vista Del Mar Lane (5-21-0244)  
**Date:** Friday, September 24, 2021 6:20:00 PM  
**Importance:** High

---

While we will prepare comments and notes for the commission hearing, there are important elements missing for public review and comment.

Below find the important PUBLIC notes and concerns, in order to be able to properly review:

We cannot read the measurements on most any of the plans, [herein](#), including setbacks based on a current survey and utility easements, the acaul (not approx. height of roof deck and chimneys : <https://documents.coastal.ca.gov/reports/2021/10/W12c/W12c-10-2021-exhibits.pdf>

Both the summary and document should clearly note the construction of 5,784 sq.ft., **on a 5,652 sq ft lot**, 3-story, **approx. 36'** high? The Coastal Commission approves on approximations? Any plans being approved should state factual and exact height that are being reviewed or in proper review for approval, including roof deck and chimneys. It does not address the areas of glass and windows which has been an ongoing concern and that which many adjacent neighbors had to adhere to and address with in relation to birds and wild life specifically from with Coastal Commission. This impending plan not address the retaining walls that have been clearly provided elevations plans (see below), which are higher than neighboring roof lines, as depicted in this elevation: **(note: the yellow line is the height of phone utility wires along the rear of the property)**.



**The public will need to have ALL of this information in advance of the hearing.**

a. [October 2021 Application No. 5-21-0244 \(Streams, Playa Del Rey\)](#)**Application No. 5-21-0244 (Streams, Playa Del Rey)** Application of Mark and Sheri Streams to demolish 1,987 sq.ft. single-family home and construct 5,784 sq.ft., 3-story, approx. 36' high, single-family home including 1,722 sq. ft. basement containing 3-car garage and storage, and roof deck with roof access structure at 7012 Vista Del Mar Lane, Playa Del Rey, Los Angeles County. (JD-LB) [Submit Comment](#)

Staff Report: <https://documents.coastal.ca.gov/reports/2021/10/W12c/W12c-10-2021-report.pdf>

Lisa Farris

---

**From:** Doyle, Jennifer@Coastal [mailto:jennifer.doyle@coastal.ca.gov]  
**Sent:** Friday, September 24, 2021 5:03 PM  
**To:** Lisa Farris

**Cc:** stewvox@hotmail.com; Halton Pardee + Partners <penny@haltonpardee.com> (penny@haltonpardee.com); 'bonnie@rockmillstone.com'; cigardenia; Bob & Lori Shelton  
**Subject:** 7012 Vista Del Mar Lane (5-21-0244)

Hello all,

The staff report for the project at 7012 Vista Del Mar Lane has been published on our website. You can find the agenda [here](#) and the staff report [here](#). On the agenda page, you will be able to submit a speaker request for your item at the hearing. The item number is W12c. Additionally, here is information regarding our [virtual hearing procedures](#). If you plan to submit items for an addendum or correspondence, please do so by the deadline of noon on Friday, October 8<sup>th</sup>.

Best regards,

**Jennifer Doyle | Coastal Program Analyst**

**CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION**

South Coast District Office  
301 E. Ocean Blvd, Suite 300  
Long Beach, CA 90802  
(562) 590-5071

Please note that public counter hours for all Commission offices are currently suspended indefinitely in light of the coronavirus. However, in order to provide the public with continuity of service while protecting both you and our employees, the Commission remains open for business, and you can contact staff by phone, email, and regular mail. Phone messages left in the Long Beach office will be returned sporadically. If your matter is urgent, please send an email. In addition, more information on the Commission's response to the COVID-19 virus can be found on our website at [www.coastal.ca.gov](http://www.coastal.ca.gov)

**From:** [SouthCoast@Coastal](mailto:SouthCoast@Coastal)  
**To:** [Doyle\\_Jennifer@Coastal](mailto:Doyle_Jennifer@Coastal)  
**Cc:** [Hammonds\\_Rebecca@Coastal](mailto:Hammonds_Rebecca@Coastal)  
**Subject:** FW: Public Comment on October 2021 Agenda Item Wednesday 12c - Application No. 5-21-0244 (Streams, Playa Del Rey)  
**Date:** Thursday, October 7, 2021 11:42:05 AM

---

**From:** Timothy Carrick [mailto:timcarrick@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 07, 2021 10:48 AM  
**To:** SouthCoast@Coastal  
**Subject:** Public Comment on October 2021 Agenda Item Wednesday 12c - Application No. 5-21-0244 (Streams, Playa Del Rey)

My name is Tim Carrick. I own west-facing ocean view property located at 7339 Trask Ave., Playa del Rey, California, and have an interest in the Streams project relating to how it impacts the neighborhood/community.

Two points are worth making from my perspective:

1. If the Commission keeps using new construction -- new construction the average size of which is constantly getting larger by this very process -- it permits an incremental change to the neighborhood. That does not appear to be a mandate of the governing statutes or good policy. In fact, the newest state laws suggest that smaller residential units are the future of California, in order to put more units in the same geographic space and not increase the need to expand infrastructure;

and

2. Specifically not taking a position on this project otherwise, I note that the design under current review generally complies with the City of Los Angeles City Council-passed motion to bring Playa del Rey (including this lot site) into the geographic regions covered by its BMO / BHO provisions, including a.) height restrictions, b.) view corridors created by roof plane inclinations of not more than 45 degrees from horizontal on buildings with side walls taller than 20 feet from their lowest elevation.

I hope that the Coastal Commission members use these points and incorporates them into their consideration, findings and conclusion.



Ginetta L. Giovinco

T 213.626.8484  
F 213.626.0078  
E [ggiovinco@rwglaw.com](mailto:ggiovinco@rwglaw.com)

350 South Grand Avenue  
37th Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90071  
[rwglaw.com](http://rwglaw.com)

**W12c**

October 8, 2021

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Mr. Steve Padilla, Chair  
and Honorable Commissioners  
California Coastal Commission  
455 Market Street, Suite 300  
San Francisco, CA 94105

Re: **CDP Application No. 5-21-0244 (Streams) – Request to Continue Hearing  
and Opposition to Project as Currently Designed**  
(7012 Vista del Mar, Playa del Rey; APN 4116-017-015)

Dear Chair Padilla and Honorable Commissioners:

This letter is submitted on behalf of Lisa Farris, an individual. Ms. Farris owns property located immediately upslope from the property that is located at 7012 Vista del Mar, in Playa del Rey (Los Angeles) (“Property”), which is before you for consideration of a coastal development permit (“CDP”) to allow the demolition of an existing single-family residence and construction of a new residence nearly triple in size and requiring substantial geotechnical work (“Project”).

We write to request that the Coastal Commission continue the current hearing on this matter and also, if necessary, to oppose the Project in its current form. As set forth more fully below, the Property was not properly posted as required, thereby creating a procedural defect that has deprived the public of adequate and required notice of this hearing. This alone warrants a continuance of the hearing. In addition, the Project as currently designed is inconsistent with multiple policies of the Coastal Act (Public Resources Code Section 30000, *et seq.*). The mass and scale of the Project, as currently designed, are not visually compatible with the character of surrounding area and are inconsistent with the City of Los Angeles’ (“City”) Baseline Mansionization Ordinance, thereby also prejudicing the ability of the City to prepare a Local Coastal Program (“LCP”) that is in conformity with the policies of the Coastal Act. Finally, the materials that the Applicant has presented to the Commission present a myopic view of the Project and omit critical information regarding the context of the Project in the neighborhood, both in terms of visual character and geotechnical work that would be required.

To be clear: Ms. Farris does not oppose the Applicant's right to redevelop the Property. But any redevelopment must remain compatible with the visual characteristics of the neighborhood and should protect the unique characteristics that make Playa del Rey the popular coastal area that it is. As a result, we request that the Commission continue this matter to allow not only for proper noticing but for Commission staff to consider additional information regarding the Project and to work with the Applicant regarding modifications of the Project's proposed mass and scale.

**I. The Applicant Failed to Comply with Mandatory Noticing Requirements**

Appendix D to the Coastal Commission's CDP Application Form unequivocally states as follows:

**Prior to or at the time the application is submitted for filing, the applicant or agent must post, at a conspicuous place as close as possible to the site of the proposed development and in a manner easily read by the public, notice that an application for the proposed development has been submitted to the Commission.** Such notice shall contain a general description of the nature of the proposed development. Use the NOTICE OF PENDING PERMIT form (last page) and print on yellow stock card. Fill in the application number on the Notice as soon as possible once staff communicates the application number to you. **The notice must remain posted until the application is acted on by the Commission.**

(Coastal Development Permit Application, Appendix D; underlining original, bold added.)

The Applicant failed to comply with this requirement. As shown in the attached photos that Ms. Farris took on October 6, September 24, and September 18, 2021 (see Attachment A), the required notice has not "remain[ed] posted until the application is acted on by the Commission." Instead, as is apparent from the empty wooden post shown in the photos, no notice was posted at all and certainly not continuously "until the application is acted on by the Commission." Ms. Farris is further prepared to testify that the required notice was not simply missing for one day but rather no notice was posted on the property for weeks.

Apparently recognizing this deficiency at the eleventh hour, on Tuesday, October 7, 2021, the Applicant belatedly posted the required notice on a new wooden post across the yard from the prior, barren one. This last-minute effort is insufficient. The purpose of the posting requirement is to ensure that the public, and particularly those in the affected neighborhood, are aware of a proposed project, can obtain information regarding it, and can participate in hearings on it. By failing to post notice on the property for weeks, and mere days before the Coastal Commission hearing, the Applicant has deprived the public of this opportunity.

We request that the Commission continue this matter to allow for the Property to be posted for a considerably longer time, to ensure that interested persons may learn about the Project and participate in these proceedings.

## **II. The Mass and Scale of the Project, as Proposed, Are Inconsistent with Coastal Act Policies**

The Project proposes to demolish an existing 1,987 square foot, 2-story, single-family residence and to replace it with a new 3-story, single-family residence that is 5,784 square feet. The proposed new house would be approximately 41.5 feet high with an elevator going up to a roof deck, would require cut and export of 1,500 cubic yards of fill, construction of new retaining walls, and significant excavation to support a 1,722 square foot basement containing a 3-car garage and storage, all on a modest 5,637 square foot lot. A project of this size conflicts with multiple Coastal Act policies.

### **A. The Project Conflicts with Section 30251 and Section 30253 of the Coastal Act**

Section 30251 of the Coastal Act provides, in relevant part:

“The scenic and visual qualities of coastal areas shall be considered and protected as a resource of public importance. Permitted development shall be sited and designed to protect views to and along the ocean and scenic coastal areas, to minimize alteration of natural land forms, to be visually compatible with the character of surrounding areas, and, where feasible, to restore and enhance visual quality in visually degraded areas.”

Similarly, Section 30253 states:

“New development shall do all of the following: ... (e): Where appropriate, protect special communities and neighborhoods that, because of their unique characteristics, are popular visitor destination points for recreational uses.”

Here, the visual character of the surrounding neighborhood on Vista del Mar Lane is a two-lane street that begins along the beach and rises to the top of a hill, providing viewing opportunities of the ocean and a broad swath of the beach below. Visitors often park along Vista del Mar to watch the sunset or to enjoy the close access to the beach.

The homes along the ocean side of this stretch of Vista del Mar, with limited exception at the bottom of the hill, are all single-story at street level. On the inland side of Vista del Mar Lane, where the Property is located, homes are largely one or two stories. The average size of a home in this general area is 3,363 square feet and the average floor area ratio (“FAR”) is 48%:

Address	Year Built	Home SqFt	Lot Sqft	FAR %
7360 Vista Del Mar	1941	3,121	9,595	33%
7352 Vista Del Mar	1960	4,621	6,529	71%
7344 Vista Del Mar	1941	3,220	7,132	45%
7334 Vista Del Mar	1974	5,831	6,150	95%
7328 Vista Del Mar	1952	2,048	5,968	34%
7324 Vista Del Mar	1925	2,602	9,005	29%
7314 Vista Del Mar	1953	2,090	9,237	23%
7310 Vista Del Mar	1959	2,832	6,179	46%
7306 Vista Del Mar	1997	10,887	6,819	160%
202 W Manchester Ave	1954	1,840	6,258	30%
201 W Manchester Ave	1990	6,312	9,297	68%
7046 Vista Del Mar	1963	3,005	6,633	45%
7040 Vista Del Mar	1974	2,438	7,310	33%
7034 Vista Del Mar	1968	3,356	7,519	45%
7030 Vista Del Mar	1925	2,015	7,385	27%
7026 Vista Del Mar	1940	4,360	13,503	32%
7016 Vista Del Mar	1927	2,752	5,685	48%
<b>7012 Vista Del Mar (current)</b>	<b>1958</b>	<b>1,987</b>	<b>5,651</b>	<b>35%</b>
7008 Vista Del Mar	1956	1,617	5,720	28%
7000 Vista Del Mar	1951	1,339	3,979	34%
6948 Vista Del Mar	1927	2,354	4,970	47%
<b>Average</b>		<b>3,633</b>		<b>48%</b>
<b>Proposed Project</b>		<b>5,734</b>		<b>103%</b>

The Project is in stark contrast to the average home in the neighborhood. (See Attachment B.)



The Commission has seen fit on other occasions to deny projects that do not comply with Sections 30251 and 30253 of the Coastal Act.

For example, in 5-05-414 (Shaw), the Commission denied an application to demolish a 1,400 square foot home in Venice and replace it with a new, 30-foot high, 3,900 square foot home. The Commission found the proposal to be incompatible with the character of the surrounding area and concluded that it would set a negative precedent for future development, relying upon Sections 30251 and 30253. As stated in a subsequent Commission staff report, “The Commission determined that the height (33 feet) and mass (3,900 sq. ft.) of the proposed three-level house does not conform with the character of the immediate neighborhood, as there is a significant contrast between the size of the proposed project and the existing homes in the area (the neighborhood is overwhelmingly single-story, with a few two-story homes).” (<https://documents.coastal.ca.gov/reports/2006/7/W17a-7-2006.pdf>)

Similarly, in 5-18-0393 (Kashani), Commission staff recommend that the Commission find a substantial issue with respect to a proposal to construct a 9,898 square foot home in Pacific Palisades that would have been more than twice the size of existing row structures in the area. As stated in the staff report (p. 16), “While this may be consistent with the City’s Zoning Code, it is not, in this case, consistent with the scenic and visual resource policies of the Coastal Act. Here, the increase to the allowable height and floor area are not consistent with that of existing development in the area because, as proposed by the applicant, the development would be distinctly larger and extend noticeably further down the slope than existing development in the area.” (<https://documents.coastal.ca.gov/reports/2018/10/W12c/W12c%20&%20W13a-10-2018-report.pdf>)

A nearly identical statement could be made with respect to the current Project. Its mass and scale are simply incompatible with the existing character of the area (see Attachment B) and, therefore, it is not consistent with the scenic and visual resource policies of the Coastal Act.

## **B. The Project Conflicts with Section 30250(a) of the Coastal Act**

Section 30250(a) of the Coastal Act provides, in relevant part, that “New residential ... development ... shall be located ... where it will not have significant adverse effects, either individually or cumulatively, on coastal resources.”

Here, the Project will have significant adverse effects and will set a precedent for the redevelopment of homes on Vista del Mar Lane specifically, and the nearby area more broadly, that is directly at odds with Coastal Act policies. Approval of the Project undoubtedly will create a ripple effect, with each property owner seeking not to have their home dwarfed by neighboring residences, leading to a string of large homes at odds with the topography and the

unique character of the area. Each homeowner will rely upon the Commission's precedent and will assert that they are entitled to make the same scale of modifications that the current Applicant is proposing and to receive the Commission's approval in response. While change is inevitable – and often desirable – it must be done in a manner that respects the topography and hews to the landforms rather than ignoring or altering them.

### **C. The Project Conflicts with Section 30604(a) of the Coastal Act**

As the Commission well knows, the City of Los Angeles does not have a certified LCP as required by Coastal Act section 30500(a) [(a) Each local government lying, in whole or in part, within the coastal zone shall prepare a local coastal program for that portion of the coastal zone within its jurisdiction"]. Yet, creation and certification of an LCP still must be a priority, and the Commission must not approve a CDP, such as the one requested here, that would "prejudice the ability of the local government to prepare a local coastal program that is in conformity with Chapter 3 [of the Coastal Act]." (Coastal Act § 30604(a).)

The Project is inconsistent with the City's Baseline Mansionization Ordinance ("BMO") which was adopted in 2008 and has been proposed to apply to the portion of the City located in the Coastal Zone. The BMO was adopted to address "teardown trends" in older neighborhoods in the City, where large, out of scale residences were replacing existing, single-family homes. To that end, the BMO established limits to ensure that new and enlarged homes remain closer to the character of existing development than prior regulations authorized. In 2020, Councilmember Mike Bonin introduced a motion to expand the BMO into the Coastal Zone. (See Attachment C.) As stated in the motion, "[e]xpanding the BMO into the Coastal Zone would bring those properties in line with the rest of the city and prevent[] mansionization in all single-family residential neighborhoods." While not yet adopted in final form, the clear thrust of the motion is to ensure that unique coastal neighborhoods like Playa del Rey, a beach community dating back to the 1920s, do not lose their character.

The proposed Project is far outside of what is permitted under Coastal Act policies and thus necessarily would prejudice the City's ability to prepare an LCP that is consistent with those policies.

### **III. The Commission Has Been Denied Critical Information Regarding the Project**

To make a full and fair decision, the Commission must have all relevant information available to it. This includes not just bare-bones schematics in a vacuum but renderings and plans that show the context of a project, and provide relevant details about how the project will be built. The Commission has been denied the opportunity to review and consider information relevant to both of these points with respect to this Project.

**A. The Applicant Has Failed to Provide Accurate Renderings in Context**

The single exhibit attached to the staff report that purports to show the Project in context (Exhibit 4) is incomplete and misleading. In looking at the visual, the Commission might assume that the Project will be nearly the same height, if not perhaps shorter, than all of the existing homes. The Commission also might conclude that the Project will occupy the same ratio with respect to its lot as do all of the other homes on the block. And, the Commission might believe that the residence would have the same set back approach from the street, with a yard that flows toward the front of the residence. None of these conclusions would be accurate. Instead, the Project would be substantially larger, taller, and more visually prominent than the houses immediately nearby, with a large elevator shaft extending up to a roof deck. This is exacerbated by the fact that the Property is located on a slope and, rather than conforming to the slope, the Applicant proposes to build multiple stories above it, which will present an even more stark contrast when viewed downslope.

Yet, none of this information has been presented to the Commission. The Commission does not have the benefit of any renderings showing how the house would appear from multiple angles. The Commission does not have any stringline views or analyses. The Commission does not even have a full-page color rendering of the proposed house, only the small, pasted visual that appears on a portion of the single page that is Exhibit 4. It is for precisely this reason why we request that the Commission continue this matter and request that Commission staff work with the Applicant to obtain additional visuals, renderings, and information.

**B. The Applicant Has Failed to Provide Sufficient Detail Regarding Construction Plans and Geotechnical Work**

The Project would require substantial geotechnical work, including for construction of the 1,722 square foot basement with a three-car garage and the retaining walls that plainly will be needed, and which will extend up all along the sides of the Property from front to back. Per the staff report, the Project would lead to the export of approximately 1,500 cubic yards of fill. Yet, no construction plan has been proposed or made available for public review. The staff report proposes a condition (Special Condition No. 2) that would require the Applicant to provide a Construction Staging Plan in the future. While some details understandably cannot be known at this time, it is impossible that one of the fundamental elements of the condition is not yet known – that is, “where construction equipment is proposed to be stored during construction in order to maintain slope stability, control erosion, and maintain public access along Vista Del Mar Lane.” (Special Condition No. 2.) This is critical information for both the Commission and nearby property owners. Absent a clear understanding of where equipment will be stored and how the Applicant will ensure slope stability – particularly as the rainy season looms – the Commission cannot conclude that the Project complies with Section 30253(a) of the Coastal Act, which

requires that new development shall “[m]inimize risks to life and property in areas of high geologic, flood, and fire hazard.

For this reason as well, we urge the Commission to pause this process and to request that Commission staff work with the Applicant to obtain more information regarding the geotechnical components of the Project, including plans to ensure slope stability during construction and additional information regarding the construction of retaining walls.

\* \* \*

In short, we wish to reiterate again that Ms. Farris does not oppose all new development or construction on the Property. Rather, we are simply asking the Commission to continue this matter at this time to ensure that the public has fair notice of the Project and to allow time for the Applicant to provide additional information as requested above.

Very truly yours,



Ginetta L. Giovinco

cc: Jack Ainsworth, Executive Director  
Steve Hudson, District Director  
Zach Rehm, District Supervisor  
Jennifer Doyle, Coastal Program Analyst  
Lisa Farris  
Stew Herrera  
Loretta Shelton  
Peter McDonald  
Jennifer Dakoske  
Teri Ende  
Wade Siegel  
Marilyn Hancock  
Penny Muck  
Jim Ouellet  
Heidi Ley

# EXHIBIT A

OCTOBER 6, 2021



ATTACHMENT A



OCTOBER 6, 2021



ATTACHMENT A

OCTOBER 6, 2021



ATTACHMENT A



SEPTEMBER 24, 2021



ATTACHMENT A

**SEPTEMBER 18, 2021**



**ATTACHMENT A**

# **EXHIBIT B**























# EXHIBIT C

## MOTION

## PLANNING & LAND USE MANAGEMENT

The City of Los Angeles passed the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance (BMO) in 2008 and a similar Baseline Hillside Ordinance (BHO) in 2011. The BMO and BHO sought to address neighborhood concerns like new building mass; the scale of driveways and garages; loss of natural light, air, and privacy; extensive hillside grading; and removal of street trees. These ordinances were a direct response to the "mansionization" and teardown trends in older neighborhoods throughout the City, with large, out-of-scale homes being constructed in many of the city's single-family residential neighborhoods.

In 2017, City Council further adopted revisions to the BMO and BHO to address loopholes that had allowed for larger developments to continue.

Although the City passed the BMO in 2008 and a similar Baseline Hillside Ordinance (BHO) in 2011, only the BHO applies within the Coastal Zone. Therefore, the Coastal Zone, which includes Pacific Palisades, Venice and Playa del Rey, and San Pedro, has gaps in coverage for protecting Coastal Zone properties located outside of designated Hillside Areas from out-of-scale development. As the Baseline Hillside Ordinance applies in the Coastal Zone, so should the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance. Expanding the BMO into the Coastal Zone would bring those properties in line with the rest of the city and preventing mansionization in all single-family residential neighborhoods.

I THEREFORE MOVE that the Department of City Planning, in consultation with City Attorney, the CLA, and CAO, report back with recommendations to create a new ordinance or amend the existing Baseline Mansionization Ordinance (BMO) to include the Coastal Zone areas not currently covered by the Baseline Hillside Ordinance within the City of Los Angeles under the same standards as the City's current BMO.

PRESENTED BY:



MIKE BONIN

*Councilmember, 11th District*

SECONDED BY:



ORIGINAL



JAN 28 2020

HOLLY L. WOLCOTT  
CITY CLERK

PETTY F. SANTOS  
EXECUTIVE OFFICER

City of Los Angeles  
CALIFORNIA



Eric Garcetti  
MAYOR

OFFICE OF THE  
CITY CLERK

Council and Public Services Division  
200 N. SPRING STREET, ROOM 395  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012  
GENERAL INFORMATION - (213) 978-1133  
FAX: (213) 978-1040

PATRICE Y. LATTIMORE  
DIVISION MANAGER

[CLERK.LACITY.ORG](http://CLERK.LACITY.ORG)

When making inquiries relative to  
this matter, please refer to the  
Council File No.: [10-1058-S4](#)

## OFFICIAL ACTION OF THE LOS ANGELES CITY COUNCIL

March 5, 2020

**Council File No.:** [10-1058-S4](#)

**Council Meeting Date:** March 03, 2020

**Agenda Item No.:** 10

**Agenda Description:** PLANNING AND LAND USE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE REPORT relative to amending the existing Baseline Mansionization Ordinance (BMO) to include the Coastal Zone areas not currently covered by the Baseline Hillside Ordinance within the City.

**Council Action:** PLANNING AND LAND USE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE REPORT - ADOPTED

<b>Council Vote:</b>	YES	BOB BLUMENFIELD
	YES	MIKE BONIN
	YES	JOE BUSCAINO
	ABSENT	GILBERT A. CEDILLO
	YES	MARQUEECE HARRIS-DAWSON
	ABSENT	JOSE HUIZAR
	YES	PAUL KORETZ
	ABSENT	PAUL KREKORIAN
	YES	JOHN LEE
	YES	NURY MARTINEZ
	YES	MITCH O'FARRELL
	YES	CURREN D. PRICE
	YES	MONICA RODRIGUEZ
	YES	DAVID RYU
	ABSENT	HERB WESSON

HOLLY L. WOLCOTT  
CITY CLERK

Adopted Report(s)

**Title**

Report from Planning and Land Use Management Committee

**Date**

02/18/2020