

CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION

SOUTH COAST DISTRICT OFFICE

301 E Ocean Blvd, Suite 300

Long Beach, CA 90802-4302

(562) 590-5071



F12

Deputy Director's Report for Los Angeles County

November 17, 2023

EXHIBITS

From: SouthCoast@Coastal
To: Amitay.Shahar@Coastal
Subject: FW: Say NO to any extension for LB pool
Date: Monday, October 2, 2023 12:02:07 PM

-----Original Message-----

From: Anne Proffit <anne.proffit@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, September 30, 2023 3:46 PM
To: SouthCoast@Coastal <SouthCoast@coastal.ca.gov>
Subject: Say NO to any extension for LB pool

Dear Decision Makers:

PLEASE stop this pool from happening. The city never should have torn down the old pool, one that was serviceable and could have used some maintenance. Unfortunately, maintenance is a dirty word in this city and I know this because I've lived here almost 50 years.

Building a pool that costs \$100 million or more, the city is depending on Tidelands Funds to complete (when oil, too, is a dirty word), on the sand, in a liquefaction zone with pending sea level rise... is stupid. The city is depending on holding an Olympic event at this pool, yet with their latest plans, they've eliminated the diving well and appropriate seating, eliminated the temporary pool in this proposal and are not considering the fact that those who are disabled, as well as disadvantaged adults and children, will never be able to use this pool in an equitable manner. If built at all, it should NEVER become part of this shoreline. Either let's construct a centralized pool or even smaller venues with pools throughout the city that everyone can use, not just the rich folks in 90803, where I lived for almost three decades.

If you go along with this baloney (my real term isn't suitable for public dissemination), then we'll all know you've caved to their stupidity and licentious behavior. PLEASE PLEASE PLEASE don't let this thing happen. If they build it, it'll be underwater shortly after the Olympics take place. We all know sea rise is happening and that climate change is more relevant than padding peoples' pockets with ill-gained funds. If you accept this, I'll know - and so will everyone else - that you caved to special interests and are getting yours.

JUST SAY NO.

Thanks -
Anne Proffit
140 Linden Avenue 661
Long Beach CA 90802

Exhibit 1
5-18-0788-E1
A-5-LOB-17-0032-E1
A-5-LOB-20-0007-E1

From: [SUSAN MILLER](#)
To: Huckelbridge.Kate@Coastal; Ziff.Dani@Coastal; Hudson.Steve@Coastal; Amitay.Shahar@Coastal
Subject: Re: City of Long Beach Pool extension request/I object and this should be denied
Date: Monday, October 2, 2023 2:10:22 PM
Attachments: [Granda launch kids water playground.png](#)
[Granada Launch kids water playground sand covered.png](#)
[Granada Launch sand covered kids playground.png](#)

Also, a spray garden does not work on the beach. Sand clogs the jets/water making the water element totally inoperable. See attached photos of the nonfunctioning children's water playground at the Granada Beach Launch/concession stand area due to sand intrusion. It is a total failure and waste of money because of the sand. I can't tell you how many children I have seen cry when they find out this water playground is completely unusable at Granada Launch/concession stand on the beach.

From: SUSAN MILLER <mpshogrl@msn.com>
Sent: Monday, October 2, 2023 1:44 PM
To: kate.huckelbridge@coastal.ca.gov <kate.huckelbridge@coastal.ca.gov>; dani.ziff@coastal.ca.gov <dani.ziff@coastal.ca.gov>; steve.hudson@coastal.ca.gov <steve.hudson@coastal.ca.gov>; shahar.amitay@coastal.ca.gov <shahar.amitay@coastal.ca.gov>
Subject: Fw: City of Long Beach Pool extension request/I object and this should be denied

Note: Sorry Kate, I misspelled your last name in my original correspondence and the email was kick backed to me.

From: SUSAN MILLER
Sent: Monday, October 2, 2023 1:22 PM
To: kate.hucklebridge@coastal.ca.gov <kate.hucklebridge@coastal.ca.gov>; dani.ziff@coastal.ca.gov <dani.ziff@coastal.ca.gov>; steve.hudson@coastal.ca.gov <steve.hudson@coastal.ca.gov>; shahar.amitay@coastal.ca.gov <shahar.amitay@coastal.ca.gov>
Subject: City of Long Beach Pool extension request/I object and this should be denied

Subject: NOTICE OF EXTENSION REQUEST FOR COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT Notice is hereby given that City of Long Beach has applied for a one-year extension of Coastal Development Permits Nos. 5-18-0788, A-5-LOB-17-0032, & A-5-LOB-20-0007 granted by the California Coastal Commission on February 11, 2021

To: Kate, Dani, Steve and Shahar,

The City of Long Beach has completely changed their design plans multiple times for the Belmont Pool. I have been actively involved with the Belmont Pool project since 2013 as Chuck Posner and Dani Ziff can attest. I have lived directly across the street on East Ocean Blvd. from the Belmont Olympic Pool for the past 30 years. The plans are not at all like the approved permit originally. This needs to be entirely reviewed as a brand-new project.

1. There is no need to remove the existing landscape. This reduced pool design should easily fit within the foundation perimeter size of the original Olympic pool building when the pool was demolished in 2013. This mature landscaping/park was part of original Olympic Plaza area and is utilized by the neighborhood. The park allowed the only outdoor avenue for the neighborhood to use during the pandemic as access to the beach was closed. The park landscape has mature trees which provide much needed shade for humans and wildlife, food for the wildlife, bare ground for water percolation from flooding during rains. More and more ground in the area has been concreted over thus decreasing porous ground to aid curbing the flooding problems/sea level rise. The landscaping provides a much-needed wind break/block for drifting sand from blowing into the neighborhood and covering East Ocean Blvd. with sand.
2. Absolutely NO need or reason to remove the street called East Olympic Plaza for the Pool. East Olympic Plaza NEEDS to remain open. It provides free parking space for beach/pool access as all the nearby beach parking lots charge for parking. It enables vehicle traffic movement for First Responders, keeps delivery and trash trucks from blocking traffic and parking on the now one lane East Ocean Blvd. when making deliveries to Chuck's coffee shop, ICONIX gym, Belmont Shore children's school and the Pool. First responders use East Olympic Plaza multiple times every day. This is an alternative route used often by First responders especially when the one lane East Ocean Blvd is blocked from traffic or special events. Daily, I see multiple First responders i.e. police, paramedics, fire trucks vehicles using East Olympic Plaza responding to calls at the temporary pool, the bike path, beach parking lot and attending to medical calls for "those without homes" that live on the beach, beach parking lot, beach sidewalk, the park and under and on Belmont Pier. The street provides the only free parking for beach access in the neighborhood. East Olympic Plaza is vital for the beach, neighborhood and traffic as an alternative to the Peninsula. The street and storm drainage on East Olympic Plaza are needed for flood diversion with the increased flooding issues in this neighborhood. East Olympic Plaza by far is the closest area for vehicles transporting/parking for the disabled/handicap that visit the pool. East Olympic Plaza is needed as a staging area for school buses dropping off/picking up for swim events at the Pool. I've lived here for 30 years; I know the problems and see it daily from my house.
3. I am not aware of any community outreach has been done/nor done satisfactorily as was a required of the City of Long Beach to do by the Coastal Commission. The underserved communities again are being unfairly ignored/disregarded. This project has been touted as a City-wide usage facility for all and it is not.
4. The high powered, highly illuminated 4 pole lights at the Belmont temporary pool have always exceeded the height restrictions for the area. The Belmont temporary Pool light pollution has negatively impacted the neighborhood, wildlife roosting areas and grunion spawning grounds on the beach. The oversized light poles were supposed to be removed. They have not been removed yet during these past 10 years. This facility was supposed to be temporary; I do not think ten years constitutes as being temporary. Any Pool permits must demand immediate removal of these illegal height light pole at the Belmont temporary pool and make sure any new light poles for any new Pool

design do not exceed the local height restrictions for this area.

5. It is still a Sea Level rise flood area on liquefaction ground that should not have anything built.

SAVE the Coast! Deny this and any extension request about a pool being built in this location.

Sincerely,
Susan Miller

From: anngadfly@aol.com
To: SouthCoast@Coastal; Huckelbridge_Kate@Coastal; Amitay_Shahar@Coastal; Hudson_Steve@Coastal
Subject: Re: Hearing Notice
Date: Monday, October 2, 2023 1:56:31 PM

I am responding to this notice of the City of Long Beach asking for an extension for the rebuilding of the Olympic Pool at 4000 Olympic Plaza, Long Beach 90803.

Director Hucklebridge, please deny the extension and urge the Commissioners to hold a public hearing.

In June, 2023, City Manager Tom Modica announced that the City was forced to scale back the \$100 million pool by at least \$50 million. Three new plans were offered at a public meeting, all of them different from the plan approved by council and CCC in 2021. None of them included an equity plan to serve disadvantaged youth.

If the pool plans are being changed, there should be no extension--the city must start over. Maybe this time they will use a more central, less costly location, which is not on sand or in a liquefaction zone.

Sincerely,
Ann Cantrell

From: [Rebecca Robles](#)
To: [anngadfly@aol.com](#)
Cc: [SouthCoast@Coastal](#); [Hucklebridge, Kate@Coastal](#); [Hudson, Steve@Coastal](#); [Amitay, Shahar@Coastal](#)
Subject: Re: Hearing Notice
Date: Monday, October 2, 2023 2:02:07 PM

Thank you,
Rebecca

On Mon, Oct 2, 2023 at 10:56 AM [anngadfly@aol.com](#) <[anngadfly@aol.com](#)> wrote:

I am responding to this notice of the City of Long Beach asking for an extension for the rebuilding of the Olympic Pool at [4000 Olympic Plaza, Long Beach 90803](#).

Director Hucklebridge, please deny the extension and urge the Commissioners to hold a public hearing.

In June, 2023, City Manager Tom Modica announced that the City was forced to scale back the \$100 million pool by at least \$50 million. Three new plans were offered at a public meeting, all of them different from the plan approved by council and CCC in 2021. None of them included an equity plan to serve disadvantaged youth.

If the pool plans are being changed, there should be no extension--the city must start over. Maybe this time they will use a more central, less costly location, which is not on sand or in a liquefaction zone.

Sincerely,
Ann Cantrell

From: corlisslee@aol.com
To: SouthCoast@Coastal; Hucklebridge_Kate@Coastal; Amitay_Shahar@Coastal; Hudson_Steve@Coastal
Cc: Ann_Gadfly
Subject: Re: Hearing Notice
Date: Monday, October 2, 2023 7:30:11 PM

Director Hucklebridge,
I validate the concerns noted below in Ann Cantrell's correspondence.

As I understand it, Coastal Commission staff did due diligence attempting to get the City of Long Beach to look at other location options for a community pool including the elephant lot by the LB Convention Center, which is centrally located and has the best access for all Long Beach citizens via public transportation.

The city of Long Beach is insisting on this Belmont Shore site that has numerous problems (sea level rise, parking impaction, in an earthquake zone with liquefaction, far from everywhere etc.) and is **in the least accessible location in the entire city for low income residents**. While the city has not filed a plan to accommodate the low income population, their last stated intent was to provide busing for students that are in park programs. That would only provide access to a miniscule part of the low income population and would not provide normal access to teenagers, young adults, families and parents that wish to accompany their children.

It is only the diving community that was included in the stakeholder meetings which wasn't fair but does provide visibility into what the City officials believe to be important with this pool. They are not looking for "equity." There are rumors that some members of the diving community are of the opinion that they would happily accept a pool in a different location to hurry the process.

The "temporary pool" that the city proposes making permanent, suffices to provide swimming to the Belmont Shore local community. They are covered - they don't need another pool.

We need the Coastal Commission to be the voice of reason. Please discourage the Long Beach city officials from pursuing this location on the beach by denying the application for an extension.

Corliss Lee
Eastside Voice
(714) 401 7063

On Monday, October 2, 2023 at 01:56:25 PM PDT, anngadfly@aol.com <anngadfly@aol.com> wrote:

I am responding to this notice of the City of Long Beach asking for an extension for the rebuilding of the Olympic Pool at 4000 Olympic Plaza, Long Beach 90803.

Director Hucklebridge, please deny the extension and urge the Commissioners to hold a public hearing.

In June, 2023, City Manager Tom Modica announced that the City was forced to scale back the \$100 million pool by at least \$50 million. Three new plans were offered at a public meeting, all of them different from the plan approved by council and CCC in 2021. None of them included an equity plan to serve disadvantaged youth.

If the pool plans are being changed, there should be no extension--the city must start over. Maybe this time they will use a more central, less costly location, which is not on sand or in a liquefaction zone.

Sincerely,
Ann Cantrell

From: Anne Proffit <anne.proffit@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, October 2, 2023 8:17 PM

To: Huckelbridge, Kate@Coastal <Kate.Huckelbridge@coastal.ca.gov>

Subject: Please say NO to LB pool extension

Ms Huckelbridge:

PLEASE stop this pool from happening. The city never should have torn down the old pool, one that was serviceable and could have used some maintenance. Unfortunately, maintenance is a dirty word in this city and I know this because I've lived here almost 50 years.

Building a pool that now costs \$50 million or more instead of the original \$100M+, the city is depending on Tidelands Funds to complete (when oil, too, is a dirty word), on the sand, in a liquefaction zone with pending sea level rise... is stupid.

The city is depending on holding an Olympic event at this pool, yet with their latest plans, they've eliminated the diving well and appropriate seating, eliminated the temporary pool in this proposal and are not considering the fact that those who are disabled, as well as disadvantaged adults and children residing in this city, will never be able to use this pool in an equitable manner.

If built at all, it should NEVER become part of this shoreline. Either let's construct a centralized pool or even smaller venues with pools throughout the city that everyone can use, not just the rich folks in 90803, where I lived for almost three decades.

I realize alternate solutions from the current site would not fall under your purvey, but this is just another dumb, "pet project" from special interests and not equitable at all.

If you go along with this baloney (my real term isn't suitable for public dissemination), then we'll all know you've caved to their stupidity and licentious behavior. PLEASE

PLEASE PLEASE don't let this thing happen. If they build it, it'll be underwater shortly after the Olympics take place. We all know sea rise is happening and that climate change is more relevant than padding peoples' pockets with ill-gained funds. If you accept this, I'll know - and so will everyone else - that you caved to special interests and are getting yours.

JUST SAY NO.

Thanks -
Anne Proffit
140 Linden Avenue 661
Long Beach CA 90802

From: Linda Scholl <lscholl2011@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, October 3, 2023 7:58 PM

To: Huckelbridge, Kate@Coastal <Kate.Huckelbridge@coastal.ca.gov>

Cc: Linda Scholl <lscholl2011@gmail.com>

Subject: Response: Opposed to City of Long Beach request for extension for the rebuilding of the Olympic Pool at 4000 Olympic Plaza, Long Beach 90803.

Dear Director Huckelbridge,

Please deny the extension request and urge the Commissioners to hold a public hearing for the proposed extension to the rebuilding of the Olympic Pool at 4000 Olympic Plaza, Long Beach, Ca 90803.

Reason: After the Coastal commission approval of the proposed Belmont Beach Aquatic Center, the City Manager Tom Modica announced that the City was forced to scale back the \$100 million pool project by at least \$50 million! *Three new plans* were offered at a public meeting, *all of them different from the plan approved by CCC in 2021*. Furthermore, the equity plan that was directed by the Coastal Commission to serve disadvantaged youth should be submitted as well; we have not seen that plan to date, have you?

If the pool plans are being changed, there should be no extension--the city must be required to start over.

Respectfully,
Dr. Linda Scholl
Long Beach, Ca

Public Comment on October 2023 Agenda Item Wednesday 10 - Deputy Director's Report // permit 5-21-0244 (APN:4116-017-015)

Carolina T <carol.wtristao@gmail.com>

Wed 10/4/2023 7:06 PM

To: Doyle, Jennifer@Coastal <jennifer.doyle@coastal.ca.gov>

Cc: SouthCoast@Coastal <SouthCoast@coastal.ca.gov>; Douglas Menezes <dougmeneses@gmail.com>

To Whom It May Concern,

We wish to formally express our objection to the applicant's request for an extension regarding permit 5-21-0244 (APN:4116-017-015). Furthermore, we respectfully request an extension of the time allotted for us to submit a more comprehensive opposition. Our request for an extension is rooted in the fact that the notice was not delivered in a manner that allowed us sufficient time to respond adequately.

To provide further context, the notice in question bears the date 9/19/23 and stipulated a 10-working-day period for interested parties to voice their objections. However, this very notice was not dispatched until ten days later, on 9/29/23, placing interested parties at a significant disadvantage. It was postmarked on Friday, 9/29/23, and reached us only on Monday, 10/2/23. Consequently, the delivery of the notice did not allow for a timely objection.

In summary, our objections to the applicant request for extension of his permit are as follows:

1. We firmly believe that granting this extension is unwarranted, especially considering the substantial community opposition when the initial permit application was made. It is our view that the applicant should be required to reapply for the permit since their previous one has expired and there has been substantial changes in the circumstances.
2. Crucially, a pertinent law was under review during the initial permit application process that, if in place, would have prohibited the approval of a construction of this magnitude. Subsequently, this law has been approved and is currently in the process of being incorporated by the City. Therefore, there has been an unquestionable change in circumstances that would affect this case directly.
3. The proposed development is incongruous with the character of the neighborhood, significantly exceeds the allowable construction size based on current regulations, laws, and other applicable criteria. Not only will it obstruct public views of the waterways and beaches, but it will also set a dangerous precedent for future construction.

We intend to provide a more substantive opposition once we have had adequate time to gather pertinent information and engage in discussions with the relevant representatives.

We kindly request confirmation of the receipt of this objection.

Sincerely,

Exhibit 2
5-21-0244-E1

Doug and Carolina Menezes

Objection to request for extension of permit 5-21-0244 (7012 Vista Del Mar Ln, Playa Del Rey)

Eileen Cahill <eileenmocahill@gmail.com>

Wed 10/4/2023 5:52 PM

To:ExecutiveStaff@Coastal <ExecutiveStaff@coastal.ca.gov>;SouthCoast@Coastal <SouthCoast@coastal.ca.gov>;Doyle, Jennifer@Coastal <jennifer.doyle@coastal.ca.gov>;Huckelbridge, Kate@Coastal <Kate.Huckelbridge@coastal.ca.gov>

Cc:Andrew Cahill <andrewrcahill@gmail.com>;Eileen Cahill <eileenmocahill@gmail.com>

To whom it may concern:

We are lodging a formal objection to applicant's request for an extension with respect to permit 5-21-0244. Further, we are requesting additional time to file a more substantial opposition because the notice was not served in a manner to permit adequate time to respond.

More specifically, the notice was dated 9/19/23 and stated that interested parties had 10 working days to oppose. However, this same notice was not mailed until ten days later, on 9/29/23, putting interested parties at a serious disadvantage. It was postmarked on Friday, 9/29/23, and we did not receive it until Monday 10/2/23. Accordingly, it was mailed in a fashion that did not permit objection.

In brief, our objections to the extension request are as follows:

1. We believe that there are changed circumstances affecting the proposed development's consistency with the Coastal Act.
2. The proposed development is out of character for the neighborhood, is grossly disproportionate to the lot size and allowable build under current regulations/laws/etc., and will obstruct public views of the waterways and beaches.

We will provide further more substantive opposition once we've had more time to gather information and confer with the appropriate representatives.

Please confirm receipt of this objection.

Best,

Eileen and Andrew Cahill

**FW: OBJECTION of CA COASTAL COMMISSION PERMIT EXTENSION (APN: 4116-017-015)
7012 Vista del Mar Ln, Playa del Rey, Los Angeles, (LA County)**

Hudson, Steve@Coastal <Steve.Hudson@coastal.ca.gov>

Tue 10/31/2023 4:07 PM

To: Stevens, Eric@Coastal <eric.stevens@coastal.ca.gov>

From: L Farris <lfarris@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, October 13, 2023 4:55 PM

To: Huckelbridge, Kate@Coastal <Kate.Huckelbridge@coastal.ca.gov>; Doyle, Jennifer@Coastal <jennifer.doyle@coastal.ca.gov>; Hudson, Steve@Coastal <Steve.Hudson@coastal.ca.gov>

Subject: OBJECTION of CA COASTAL COMMISSION PERMIT EXTENSION (APN: 4116-017-015) 7012 Vista del Mar Ln, Playa del Rey, Los Angeles, (LA County)

California Coastal Commission
South Coast District Office
301 E Ocean Blvd. Suite 300
Long Beach, CA 90802

Re: OBJECTION of CA COASTAL COMMISSION PERMIT EXTENSION (APN: 4116-017-015)

7012 Vista del Mar Ln, Playa del Rey, Los Angeles, (LA County)

Attn: Executive Director, Kate Huckelbridge, PhD & Jennifer Doyle

Dear Executive Director Huckle:

In 1977, the Legislature enacted the Coastal Act and required every coastal jurisdiction to prepare, submit, and implement a Local Coastal Program certified by the Coastal Commission. Today, 46 years later, nearly every coastal city and county has an LCP, but not the City of Los Angeles. I know we care about creating intelligent planning and protecting our limited California and Los Angeles coastline from over-development, and Baseline Hillside Ordinance.

On March 5, 2020, the City Council astutely approved a motion that you sponsored to include coastal communities in the City's existing Baseline Mansionization Ordinance (BMO), yet at the same time City planning had approved the development of a residence in historic Playa del Rey to replace an approximately 1900 sf home with an approximate 5,800 sf residence with an additional 1,722 basement, three stories, and an elevator, all carved into the hillside. As noted in the prior file, this structure would exceed 100% of the lot size, dwarfing adjacent homes on upper hillside (the east side) of Vista Del Mar (103%+ FAR), which is contrary to the misrepresentation by the Howard Robinson & Associates land use consultants and is not consistent with the properties on the east side of Vista Del Mar.

Please find the new and extending circumstances noted below, as we urge the coastal commission to review and schedule a hearing, as we object to any extension of the permit by the Coastal Commission.

**Exhibit 3
5-21-0244-E1**

Additionally, neighbors are requesting a meeting with the Streams, the owner /developer, since they, in fact, never met with Julie Ross and the Neighborhood Council's Planning and Land Use committee as

recommended by the City. I'm happy to share the note that addresses this from Ms. Ross after it was stated during the Coastal Review meeting that they had spoken with the NC-PLUC. The fact that it was misrepresented that there was any meeting Neighborhood Council Planning and Land Use Committee is another issue that came to life after the meeting. Then chair of the Playa del Rey/ Westchester NC PLUC committee, Julie Ross, was taken back by the misrepresentation and their dismissal to meet, as advised by the City.

It is important that the plans are reviewed for misrepresentation. As evident at the end of the last Coastal Meeting when those who filed an appeal and neighbors in Playa del Rey had only allocated 3-5 minutes to address the significant issues, only the perimeter retaining walls where the height of the rooftops exceed those of neighboring residences were addressed. This was just one example of the actual effect of misrepresented visual rendering (as evident in the photo below and must be reviewed prior to any extensions.

The utility wires are not shown in the development's visual representations as the roof line, rooftop deck, and elevator shaft is higher than adjacent utility lines where birds sit today, this includes ranging from green parrots to [endangered](#) Western snowy plover that makes the wires and trees along our coast their homes. Based on the Endangered & protected birds, per the U.S. Fish and Wildlife, particularly based on the height of the structure and rooftop decks. mechanical systems around rooftop decks, that tower above utility lines, which were not properly nor clearly marked nor shown in the plans. Per the **U.S. Fish & Wildlife**, along Coastal In Los Angeles, and specifically in the Playa del Rey area, including critical habitats for Western snowy plover (*Charadrius alexandrinus nivosus*), Coastal California Gnatcatcher (*Poliophtila californica*) plus nocturnal breeding birds primarily include owls, such as the Great Horned Owl. Again, in light of the fact that the City of LA has NO LCP at this time, we rely on the Coastal Commission to help protect coastal over-development.

We object to the permit extension for this project (**APN: 4116-017-015**) and the implications of this development based on new and additional information. If the Coastal Commission continues to support projects such as this it will jeopardize the intent of the Baseline Mansionization Ordinance (No. 180571), the baseline Hillside ordinance, and the LA City Council unanimous action to amend the existing ordinance to include coastal areas to be protected by the ordinance and making the BMO applicable in the coastal zone and will hinder the City's efforts to adopt an LCP.

We, as a community, are more responsible than this and we need to protect our coast from height-and-mass wars, with each property owner seeking to leapfrog over the next in size and scale of houses. It's important to note that we are not trying to prohibit the property owner from re-developing the site. We are simply asking that consideration be given to the mass and scale to ensure a project that better fits this community is adopted, particularly as it relates to the elevator shaft that exceeds the height of utilities lines, from the bluff below and that any place birds that reside in and around the bluffs are not protected. We appreciate your help in protecting the overbuilding of our coastal community.

The applicant's self-proclaimed "significant resources" have enabled them to pay for expensive development consultants that place many neighbors at a deficit in this instance. The plans that consultants presented to the Coastal Commission had severally skewed renderings that don't accurately display the project's height, mass, and scale in relation to existing homes along the full stretch of Vista del Mar Lane in Playa del Rey.

The applicant proposing to more than double the height of the house, excavate for a 1,722 square foot basement on a bluff, and place **42+ foot tall elevator shaft** to access to one of three rooftop decks

that will overlook all of the neighboring yards, and retaining walls in their own elevation that are the height of neighboring rooflines, also not to scale or City code. These pose new safety and fire concerns that some neighbors are requesting additional review since they were misrepresented in the application renderings and are indicative of the inconsistencies.



In 2022, the applicant knowingly had not posted a public notice for several weeks which should have mattered, as it is a Coastal Commission requirement, in order to comply with public notice and

comment that goes beyond neighbors who only reside 100 feet from the lot, was disregarded last time it was brought for review.

Finally, this development should be held to the same review and scrutiny as any other project in Playa del Rey no matter the consulting professionals hired or resources that the owner touts they have. We have had neighbors go through far more scrutiny over new windows than this development which will affect a range of wildlife from the more common green parrots to the endangered Western snowy plover, as well as neighbors with far less financial resources and influence. In fact, these same owners neglected to mention how they wanted to limit parking in the areas of their property on Vista del Mar which was placed in writing, as once again, they wish to use the Coastal Commission for their personal gain.

We implore that the Coastal Staff not extend this permit at this time and also meet with the Neighborhood Council Planning and Land Use Committee, as any other developer owner would need to do had they not circumvented them due to preferential treatment and false statements.

As we were not able to each speak during the hearing two years ago, we respectfully submit this objection to any extension of Coastal Development Permit: APN: 4116-017-015 located at 7012 Vista del Mar Ln, Playa del Rey, Los Angeles, (LA County), together as Playa del Rey Neighbors.

Regards,

Lisa Farris

Sent via mail & email: Kate.Huckelbridge@coastal.ca.gov, Jennifer.doyle@coastal.ca.gov, Steve.Hudson@coastal.ca.gov,

cc:

Stewart Herrera

Carolina Tristao Menezes

Barry Gribbon

Christina Chavez

Peter & Ann-sofi McDonald

Andrew Malekie

Jennifer Dakoske Koslu

Wade & Tessa Siegel

Tim Carrick

Mark Cully

Pamela Stacey

Teri & Duncan Ende

11/1/23, 1:13 PM

Mail - Stevens, Eric@Coastal - Outlook

Eric & Heidi Ley