

**Martha Alvarez, MMC**

---

**From:** dan@oconnorproperty.com  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 9, 2022 2:57 PM  
**To:** List - City Council  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Tonights meeting and RHNA Allocations

**EXTERNAL EMAIL:** Do not click links or open attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Council Members,

As a life long resident of the South Bay, and a professional real estate expert in the area. I strongly and truly encourage you to find an alternative to this required allocation and equally encourage you to find a way to regain control of our own local zoning laws, not be forced into rules brought down by the state like SB330 and SB9 and SB10. If we do not do something this place we love will be changed.

Please consider all options.

Dan O'Connor  
Pacifica Properties Group

(c) 310-261-7756 | Call or Text  
(w) [www.oconnorproperty.com](http://www.oconnorproperty.com)  
lic#01384632

"I have not verified any of the information contained in those documents that were prepared by other people"

## Martha Alvarez, MMC

---

**From:** Dunham Stewart <dunham.stewart@vistasir.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 9, 2022 4:45 PM  
**To:** List - City Council  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] MB Housing Element Update

**EXTERNAL EMAIL:** Do not click links or open attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear MB Council Members,

Thank you for considering alternatives to establishing high density overlays to meet RHNA allocations and methods of restoring local control. The character of our beach communities is at stake. I wanted to share some thoughts.

Driving through areas of Playa del Rey, Marina del Rey, Mar Vista, Palms and other areas of LA you consistently see large 4-6 story apartment buildings under construction. They are in stark contrast and tower over surrounding 1-3 story buildings/homes. The small beach cities in the South Bay don't have the infrastructure or land to come close to supporting similar density. It would be a disaster if buildings like this are allowed throughout the beach cities.

Development/redevelopment within the plan of the city in general is positive. New developments are helpful to the City's (and County's) revenue from increased property tax. However these developments should conform to existing city zoning codes allowed (in which density, use, height, setbacks are all incorporated). As a member of the real estate community for 23 years, the consistency in the application of local zoning code is a necessity that provides certainty to property owners (newer and longtime) as well as the developmental process. This certainty provides clarity (and security) on valuations which are essential to all property owners (at some point and time). Think not only sales, but passing property on to family, mortgaging a property and much more. Changes can have significant economic impacts to property owners (not just those immediately adjacent, but throughout the neighborhoods). These property rights that exist under the city's current zoning are absolutely essential and worthy of protection.

I strongly support the concept of local control over city zoning and planning. Perhaps you can use your influence and join together with leaders of Hermosa Beach (my hometown) and other cities to encourage the positive influence of local control. The current initiative, while pushing for the much needed local control, does have a negative slant on development in general.

It is not secret that a number of families have left our beach cities in recent years, mostly due to issues driven by the state. This type of "mandate" on our local cities will only encourage others. It is time to stand up for local control.

Your public service is appreciated. Please do what is best for your city and constituents. Thank you for your consideration.

Dunham Stewart

**Dunham Stewart, Realtor**  
CalDRE 01006738



310-200-5283 *cell* | 310-546-7611 x-330 *office*  
200 Pier Ave #305 | Hermosa Beach | CA 90254

[www.dunhamstewart.com](http://www.dunhamstewart.com)

## Martha Alvarez, MMC

---

**From:** Kris Terrill <kristerrill@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 9, 2022 12:57 PM  
**To:** List - City Council  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Density

**EXTERNAL EMAIL:** Do not click links or open attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Thank you for considering alternatives to establishing high density overlays to meet RHNA allocations and methods of restoring local control. The unique character of our beach city is at stake; part of the attraction of Manhattan Beach is its ability to showcase the beachfront. Development without regard to this unique characteristic must be avoided. I think the beachfront in South Redondo is a good example of an emphasis on density vs city aesthetic. Local planning boards should be allowed the freedom to develop creative approaches to increasing housing units without destroying a beautiful setting.

I'm not opposed to development in general, and realize that new developments are helpful and necessary to the City's revenue from increased property tax revenue, but firmly believe developments should conform to existing standards for allowed use, height, setbacks, etc. As a member of the real estate community, I've observed that consistency in the application of local zoning code provides certainty to the development process. It's a good thing and worthy of protection.

KRIS TERRILL  
REALTOR® | CalDRE#01243611

Strand Hill | Christie's International Real Estate  
D + 310.749.5158 | O + 310.545.4344  
[kristerrill@gmail.com](mailto:kristerrill@gmail.com) | [www.strandhill.com](http://www.strandhill.com)

I have not and will not verify or investigate the information supplied by third parties.

## Martha Alvarez, MMC

---

**From:** Rob Freedman <rob@domorealestate.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 9, 2022 11:52 AM  
**To:** List - City Council  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Density Overlay

**EXTERNAL EMAIL:** Do not click links or open attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Council,

Thanks for taking up the charge of pushing back on Sacramento's ill-conceived density overlays. As a local realtor and developer for more than three decades, I definitely support development as long as it is in keeping with a consistent fabric in a city. In an area like Manhattan Beach which is in constant transition seeking to meet the desires and needs of its residence, we all know how challenging this can be from a planning perspective. In gentrifying existing properties within the City, all of us in support of development want to make sure that the character of the City is not sacrificed, particularly without the residents of the City having a say over the matter through its council representatives.

The irony isn't lost on me that most local cities have worked to curtail increasing density as well "mansionization", within a general plan (required by Sacramento) that deals with zoning consistency in development standards. Now decades later, Sacramento is bringing a proverbial wrecking ball to the equation.

It's bad enough that the State wants to force unwanted density on its cities and the question is why? If the objective is to provide more housing, then by all means encourage development in areas of the that can support the environmental impact of development, can be properly planned to accommodate increased traffic, and be planned with an efficient and well thought out fabric that encourages a sense of community.

California has so much open land where new communities can be planned to accommodate the population in a much more affordable way than trying to accomplish it in cities which are already hampered with increased traffic, crowded schools and overtaxed systems.

This is where the push back should be. All cities should be pushed to think through ways to allow well thought out development that encourages its overall individual sense of community and this may very well allow for consistent development that allows for access by more people. It's simply that Sacramento needs to be smarter and more thoughtful about how they create more housing, rather than simply demanding it at the threat of taking over. Forcing this on cities like Manhattan Beach that are not equipped to handle it is reckless and unnecessary when there are reasonable alternatives available.

While it is incumbent on the state to help encourage more housing, it is NOT the responsibility of cities to be forced to do so in a state which has lots of space in which to expand.

California succeeds despite itself. Because there is not a reasonable amount of check and balance, Sacramento actually believes that it is doing good for the State and doesn't have to think clearly or efficiently. Imagine if we used the big brains that are available to actually handle issues in a way that worked in the long term.

The key is to push back based on the fact that other alternatives other than forcibly destroying the fabric of our cities are better alternatives.

## Martha Alvarez, MMC

---

**From:** Christa Lyons <christamlyons@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 9, 2022 6:54 AM  
**To:** List - City Council  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] High Density 2/9 Meeting

**EXTERNAL EMAIL:** Do not click links or open attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Council Members,

Thank you for considering alternatives to establishing high density overlays to meet RHNA allocations and methods of restoring local control. The character of our beach communities is at stake. I'm unavailable to attend tomorrow's meeting but wanted to share some thoughts.

Today I was viewing homes in the Mar Vista area for a client and was struck by the number of large 4-6 story apartment buildings under construction. Here's [a link](#) to photos of a few of these buildings. They stand out like sore thumbs and tower over surrounding 1-3 story buildings/homes. It would be a disaster if buildings like this are allowed throughout the beach cities.

I'm not opposed to development in general, and realize that new developments are helpful to the City's revenue from increased property tax revenue, but firmly believe developments should conform to existing standards for allowed use, height, setbacks, etc. As a member of the real estate community for 28 years, I've observed that consistency in the application of local zoning code provides certainty to the development process. It's a good thing and worthy of protection.

I support the concept of local control, but have not joined Bill Brand's cause due to its conflicting narrative which paints all developers as being evil. The [text of the initiative](#) itself is on target. Perhaps you can use your influence and join together with leaders of Hermosa Beach and other cities to encourage Brand to "rebrand" his message to focus on unifying issues that everyone can agree on like preserving community character and quality of life. Revising the narrative would lead to more broad based support from residents and the real estate community. I'm happy to assist as necessary.

Thank you for your consideration,

CHRISTA LYONS  
REALTOR® | CalDRE#01489213  
D + 310.722.7115  
<https://mattmorrisrealestategroup.com>

I have not and will not verify or investigate the information supplied by third parties.

## Martha Alvarez, MMC

---

**From:** Karynne Thim <kt@ktbeachproperties.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 8, 2022 6:52 PM  
**To:** List - City Council  
**Cc:** Carrie Tai, AICP  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Local Control / Community Character / Large Apartment Buildings Over Height

**EXTERNAL EMAIL:** Do not click links or open attachments unless you trust the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Council Members,

Thank you for considering alternatives to establishing high density overlays to meet RHNA allocations and methods of restoring local control. The character of our beach communities is at stake. I'm unavailable to attend tomorrow's meeting but wanted to share some thoughts.

Today I was viewing homes in the Mar Vista area for a client and was struck by the number of large 4-6 story apartment buildings under construction. Here's [a link](#) to photos of a few of these buildings. They stand out like sore thumbs and tower over surrounding 1-3 story buildings/homes. It would be a disaster if buildings like this are allowed throughout the beach cities.

I'm not opposed to development in general, and realize that new developments are helpful to the City's revenue from increased property tax revenue, but firmly believe developments should conform to existing standards for allowed use, height, setbacks, etc. As a member of the real estate community for 28 years, I've observed that consistency in the application of local zoning code provides certainty to the development process. It's a good thing and worthy of protection.

I support the concept of local control, but have not joined Bill Brand's cause due to its conflicting narrative which paints all developers as being evil. The [text of the initiative](#) itself is on target. Perhaps you can use your influence and join together with leaders of Hermosa Beach and other cities to encourage Brand to "rebrand" his message to focus on unifying issues that everyone can agree on like preserving community character and quality of life. Revising the narrative would lead to more broad based support from residents and the real estate community. I'm happy to assist as necessary.

Thank you for your consideration,

Karynne

--

## Martha Alvarez, MMC

---

**From:** coastaldefendermb@gmail.com  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 8, 2022 1:52 PM  
**To:** Hildy Stern; Joe Franklin; List - City Council; Richard Montgomery; Steve Napolitano; Suzanne Hadley  
**Cc:** Bruce Moe; Quinn Barrow; Paige Meyer; Liza Tamura; Martha Alvarez; Taly Mirzakhanian; Ted Faturros  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] RE: Downgrade Eat & Drink Encroachments to Category C  
**Attachments:** 220209-McP-CC-HEU.HIghrose.pdf

**CAUTION:** This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Please find attached my testimony for the HEU agenda item tomorrow night.

Take note that I request clarification whether the Highrose project at 401 Rosecrans Ave subject to CEQA in appeals to the planning commission and city council.

This information required for evaluating the options.

Don McPherson  
1014 1<sup>st</sup> St, Manhattan Beach CA 90266  
Cell 310 487 0383  
[coastaldefendermb@gmail.com](mailto:coastaldefendermb@gmail.com)

---

**From:** coastaldefendermb@gmail.com <coastaldefendermb@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, 4 February, 2022 16:17  
**To:** 'Hildy Stern' <hstern@citymb.info>; 'Joe Franklin' <jfranklin@citymb.info>; 'MB Council' <citycouncil@citymb.info>; 'Richard Montgomery' <rmontgomery@citymb.info>; 'Steve Napolitano' <snapolitano@citymb.info>; 'Suzanne Hadley' <shadley@citymb.info>  
**Cc:** 'Bruce Moe' <bmoe@citymb.info>; 'Quinn Barrow' <qbarrow@citymb.info>; 'Paige Meyer' <pmeyer@manhattanbeach.gov>; 'Liza Tamura' <LTamura@citymb.info>; 'Martha Alvarez' <malvarez@citymb.info>; 'Ted Faturros' <tfaturros@citymb.info>  
**Subject:** RE: Downgrade Eat & Drink Encroachments to Category C

Please find attached my written input for the public hearing tonight on the 6<sup>th</sup> Cycle Housing Element Update.

Don McPherson  
1014 1<sup>st</sup> St, Manhattan Beach CA 90266  
Cell 310 487 0383  
[coastaldefendermb@gmail.com](mailto:coastaldefendermb@gmail.com)

---

**From:** [coastaldefendermb@gmail.com](mailto:coastaldefendermb@gmail.com) <[coastaldefendermb@gmail.com](mailto:coastaldefendermb@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, 1 February, 2022 15:58  
**To:** 'Hildy Stern' <[hstern@citymb.info](mailto:hstern@citymb.info)>; 'Joe Franklin' <[jfranklin@citymb.info](mailto:jfranklin@citymb.info)>; 'MB Council' <[citycouncil@citymb.info](mailto:citycouncil@citymb.info)>; 'Richard Montgomery' <[rmontgomery@citymb.info](mailto:rmontgomery@citymb.info)>; 'Steve Napolitano' <[snapolitano@citymb.info](mailto:snapolitano@citymb.info)>; 'Suzanne Hadley' <[shadley@citymb.info](mailto:shadley@citymb.info)>  
**Cc:** 'Bruce Moe' <[bmoe@citymb.info](mailto:bmoe@citymb.info)>; 'Quinn Barrow' <[qbarrow@citymb.info](mailto:qbarrow@citymb.info)>; 'Paige Meyer' <[pmeyer@manhattanbeach.gov](mailto:pmeyer@manhattanbeach.gov)>; 'Liza Tamura' <[LTamura@citymb.info](mailto:LTamura@citymb.info)>; 'Martha Alvarez' <[malvarez@citymb.info](mailto:malvarez@citymb.info)>;



'Ted Faturos' <[tfaturos@citymb.info](mailto:tfaturos@citymb.info)>

**Subject:** Downgrade Eat & Drink Encroachments to Category C

Please find my testimony attached on Item #18 for tonight, DBA request for Category A eat and drink encroachments. The facts demand Category C.

Don McPherson

1014 1<sup>st</sup> St, Manhattan Beach CA 90266

Cell 310 487 0383

[dmcphersonla@gmail.com](mailto:dmcphersonla@gmail.com)

---

**From:** [coastaldefendermb@gmail.com](mailto:coastaldefendermb@gmail.com) <[coastaldefendermb@gmail.com](mailto:coastaldefendermb@gmail.com)>

**Sent:** Tuesday, 1 February, 2022 14:06

**To:** 'Hildy Stern' <[hstern@citymb.info](mailto:hstern@citymb.info)>; 'Joe Franklin' <[jfranklin@citymb.info](mailto:jfranklin@citymb.info)>; 'MB Council' <[citycouncil@citymb.info](mailto:citycouncil@citymb.info)>; 'Richard Montgomery' <[rmontgomery@citymb.info](mailto:rmontgomery@citymb.info)>; 'Steve Napolitano' <[snapolitano@citymb.info](mailto:snapolitano@citymb.info)>; 'Suzanne Hadley' <[shadley@citymb.info](mailto:shadley@citymb.info)>

**Cc:** 'Bruce Moe' <[bmoe@citymb.info](mailto:bmoe@citymb.info)>; 'Quinn Barrow' <[qbarrow@citymb.info](mailto:qbarrow@citymb.info)>; 'Paige Meyer' <[pmeyer@manhattanbeach.gov](mailto:pmeyer@manhattanbeach.gov)>; 'Liza Tamura' <[LTamura@citymb.info](mailto:LTamura@citymb.info)>; 'Martha Alvarez' <[malvarez@citymb.info](mailto:malvarez@citymb.info)>; 'Ted Faturos' <[tfaturos@citymb.info](mailto:tfaturos@citymb.info)>

**Subject:** RE: : Solution to HEU Affordable Housing

Please find attached my testimony for the Housing Element Upgrade item tonight.

Don McPherson

1014 1<sup>st</sup> St, Manhattan Beach CA 90266

Cell 310 487 0383 [coastaldefendermb@gmail.com](mailto:coastaldefendermb@gmail.com)

---

**From:** [coastaldefendermb@gmail.com](mailto:coastaldefendermb@gmail.com) <[coastaldefendermb@gmail.com](mailto:coastaldefendermb@gmail.com)>

**Sent:** Monday, 31 January, 2022 21:31

**To:** Hildy Stern <[hstern@citymb.info](mailto:hstern@citymb.info)>; Joe Franklin <[jfranklin@citymb.info](mailto:jfranklin@citymb.info)>; MB Council <[citycouncil@citymb.info](mailto:citycouncil@citymb.info)>; Richard Montgomery <[rmontgomery@citymb.info](mailto:rmontgomery@citymb.info)>; Steve Napolitano <[snapolitano@citymb.info](mailto:snapolitano@citymb.info)>; Suzanne Hadley <[shadley@citymb.info](mailto:shadley@citymb.info)>

**Cc:** Bruce Moe <[bmoe@citymb.info](mailto:bmoe@citymb.info)>; Quinn Barrow <[qbarrow@citymb.info](mailto:qbarrow@citymb.info)>; Paige Meyer <[pmeyer@manhattanbeach.gov](mailto:pmeyer@manhattanbeach.gov)>; Liza Tamura <[LTamura@citymb.info](mailto:LTamura@citymb.info)>; Martha Alvarez <[malvarez@citymb.info](mailto:malvarez@citymb.info)>; Ted Faturos <[tfaturos@citymb.info](mailto:tfaturos@citymb.info)>

**Subject:** : Solution to HEU Affordable Housing

1 February 2022

Hildy Stern, Mayor

City of Manhattan Beach

Via Email: [citycouncil@citymb.info](mailto:citycouncil@citymb.info)

Subject: Solution to HEU Affordable Housing

Mayor Stern and Councilmembers.

The attachment summarizes a solution for the city to provide the 407-unit shortfall in affordable housing by 2029, in compliance with both CEQA and the zoning code. No bonus-density waivers needed for this version of the Housing Element Update ["HEU"]

**HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE PROGRAM EIR VIOLATES CEQA CUMULATIVE IMPACTS ANALYSIS**

Don McPherson, representing Coastal Defender, 1014 1<sup>st</sup> St

Staff Report Note 2 states that the Housing Element Update, HEU, not related to the proposed Highrose project at 401 Rosecrans Avenue. That project will provide six affordable units, which will count for achieving the 774 units required by the state. As result, Highrose has a direct relationship with the HEU.

At the council meetings on February 1<sup>st</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup>, I raised the issue that the HEU program EIR fails to comply with the California Environmental Quality Act, CEQA. Specifically, the program EIR invalid because it does not include the required evaluation of cumulative impacts that will result from the eight-year Housing Element Update.

Those impacts include a population increase of roughly 50%, the resulting traffic and parking disasters, and a huge increase in city services, a cost paid by taxpayers, not the developers.

As the first project under the 6<sup>th</sup> update, to comply with CEQA, Highrose requires an EIR to analyze the cumulative impacts that will result from the HEU eight-year program.

In the *“Plans for Highrose El Porto Development”*, staff claims that in the ministerial deliberation, Highrose exempt from CEQA. If Highrose appealed to the planning commission and then to the city council, are those discretionary hearings subject to CEQA?

**Please answer that question.**

Starting with the Highrose project at Rosecrans and Highland, the city can purchase the property and lease it to developers for construction and operation of 100% affordable housing. That way, the public-housing operation remains in the private sector. The city, however, will have landlord authority to ensure compatibility with law, specifically, the General Plan, the Local Coastal Program and the General Plan. Same as they do for Metlox.

The city will have total control, rather than the developers, with their unending demands for financial incentives.

The city will need only five such 100% affordable projects to meet the 407-unit quota. In contrast, to provide that many units, the current HEU will require 68 projects the size and 50-foot height of Highrose, considering its meager six affordable units.

The costs easily managed. Based on a professional appraisal for a coastal property almost identical to Highrose, the city can finance the five acquisitions with a piddly increase in property taxes, amounting to \$376-\$522 per year per each taxpayer, for interest rates 4%-7%.

To ensure the purchases, the city could pay twice the appraised value, upon which the above property-tax increases based.

If an owner refuses to sell for twice the property value, the city can then exert its power of eminent domain to acquire the property at that price. That an incredible negotiating tool.

The attachment also establishes that the environmental impact report for the HEU blatantly violates CEQA. Consequently, the HEU invalid, as it stands. The solution outlined above eliminates the CEQA violations.

I request that the city council directs staff to pursue the above 100% affordability solution in the HEU. Otherwise, as is, it will start dead on arrival, as have all in California cities during past decades.

Thanks for considering this solution to the affordable housing enigma,

Don McPherson, President

Coastal Defender

1014 1<sup>st</sup> St, Manhattan Beach CA 90266

Cell: 310 487 0383

[coastaldefendermb@gmail.com](mailto:coastaldefendermb@gmail.com)

## Martha Alvarez, MMC

---

**From:** Jeff <drandell@verizon.net>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 7, 2022 7:49 PM  
**To:** List - City Council  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Housing density

**CAUTION:** This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

Dear MB City Council,

The ability of residents to implement and maintain appropriate zoning within their home towns is fundamentally important. I feel that we shouldn't let the fear of legal action prevent us from maintaining this autonomy, or discourage us from fighting back against the unreasonable state requirements.

We need to be realistic and understand that these state requirements will end up in court one way or the other, and Manhattan Beach and other cities will have a good case and a good chance of winning, or settling in a beneficial way. So I strongly suggest that Manhattan Beach take a strong stand against the state overreach.

Sincerely,

Jeff Drandell

## Martha Alvarez, MMC

---

**From:** PAULA PACKWOOD <ppss4@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 7, 2022 7:38 PM  
**To:** List - City Council  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Support for fire department

CAUTION: This Email is from an EXTERNAL source. Ensure you trust this sender before clicking on any links or attachments.

[https://urldefense.com/v3/\\_\\_https://www.manhattanbeachfirefighters.org/?fbclid=IwAR1dkMSnMjpd-DeG8i9xV\\_L7t8cxtH1VwPlw2IYa7By-qSThQG6tAKQgRuk\\_\\_!!AxJhxnnVZ8w!a\\_wz3FHMGNBeqc7wy6QI0ivLjpcj5NXczp0bQFyP1\\_G4vD4SULox4bdbhfscOA5vk5WuiS8KFoA\\$](https://urldefense.com/v3/__https://www.manhattanbeachfirefighters.org/?fbclid=IwAR1dkMSnMjpd-DeG8i9xV_L7t8cxtH1VwPlw2IYa7By-qSThQG6tAKQgRuk__!!AxJhxnnVZ8w!a_wz3FHMGNBeqc7wy6QI0ivLjpcj5NXczp0bQFyP1_G4vD4SULox4bdbhfscOA5vk5WuiS8KFoA$)

We have just received the attached correspondence from our Fire Department. If this is true, you are putting the city at potential risk from a public safety standpoint. If this is true you should all be ashamed of yourselves. I would like to know if this is true or not true. I would like to hear from each of you regarding this very important issue within our city. You should be supporting their ability to hire the leadership positions in the department and make sure the positions are funded appropriately to promote into these positions from within the department as compared to robbing Peter to pay Paul.

Thank you for your quick response on this very, very important community issue.

Steve Packwood

Sent from my iPhone