REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
SUMMARY OF PUBLIC HEARING PROCEEDINGS
SANTA MONICA MOUNTAINS LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM

The Regional Planning Commission (RPC) held a public hearing on October 25, 2006, which was continued to November 6, 2006 and January 24, 2007, to consider the Santa Monica Mountains Local Coastal Program (LCP). The RPC approved the LCP on March 7, 2007. The proposed LCP consists of the Coastal Zone Plan, a community standards district, and other implementing actions including a zoning consistency program, a lot merger ordinance, and changes to the County's Subdivision Ordinance (Title 21) and the Planning and Zoning Ordinance (Title 22). Located in the Third Supervisorial District, the Santa Monica Mountains Coastal Zone is the unincorporated area located west of the City of Los Angeles, east of Ventura County, and south of the coastal zone boundary, excluding the City of Malibu.

Notice of the public hearing was published in local newspapers (The Malibu Times, La Opiniòn, and The Daily News) and over 5,000 notices were sent to every property owner in the Coastal Zone, to owners of property in Los Angeles County within 500 feet of the Coastal Zone, as well as to those individuals and organizations on the Department's Santa Monica Mountains LCP courtesy mailing list. The draft LCP, staff report, and maps of the existing land use categories and zoning were available for review at the following locations:

- Department of Regional Planning, 320 West Temple Street, Room 1356, Los Angeles
- Department website, http://planning.co.la.ca.us/spSmmlcp.htm
- Agoura Hills Library, 29901 Ladyface Court, Agoura Hills
- Calabasas Library, 23975 Park Sorrento, Calabasas
- L.A. County One-Stop Center, 26600 Agoura Road, Calabasas
- Malibu Library, 23519 W. Civic Center Way, Malibu
- Palisades Branch Library, 861 Alma Real Drive, Pacific Palisades
- Westlake Village Library, 31220 Oak Crest Drive, Westlake Village
- Resource Conservation District, 122 N. Topanga Canyon Boulevard, Topanga

October 25, 2006
Staff presented the proposed LCP to the Commission for its review at a meeting held in Downtown Los Angeles. Approximately 20 people attended the hearing. The Commission held a brief discussion and then opened the public hearing. Six individuals testified at the hearing and expressed their opinions on several aspects of the LCP. The testimony is summarized below.

Testifiers in favor expressed their support for the LCP because it will enable the County to gain local control over land use and zoning matters in the Coastal Zone, and it establishes policies and standards to protect coastal resources. Speakers included representatives from the Department of Public Works, Las Virgenes Municipal Water District, Resource Conservation District of the Santa Monica Mountains, and the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy.

One testifier representing property owners in the area disagreed with the provisions for unmapped ESHA. Specifically, she argued that property owners should not be required to

reevaluate whether ESHA exists on their property and redesign their project after plans have been submitted. Another speaker indicated that Regional Planning staff should work with property owners individually to find a suitable location to build on their property.

The Commission continued the hearing to November 6, 2006, in the community, to offer individuals another opportunity to testify.

November 6, 2006
This hearing was held in the evening at Alice C. Stelle Middle School in Calabasas. Approximately 120 people attended the hearing. The Commission took testimony from 29 individuals. Those who testified in favor of the ordinance believed that the LCP would preserve environmentally sensitive habitat areas, scenic resources, recreational resources and areas, and other coastal resources. Speakers included representatives from the National Park Service, the California Department of Parks and Recreation, and local conservation and homeowner associations.

Some speakers opposing the LCP disagreed with the designation of Significant Ridgelines on their properties and the methodology used in determining whether a ridgeline is significant. A number of speakers indicated that arts and craft uses should be permitted in the R-C Zone in Old Topanga. Also, some wanted the LCP to allow for a full range of equestrian facilities, given the significance of horses in the history and cultural heritage of the Santa Monica Mountains. Other issues raised included applicability of the LCP, parks and recreational facilities, trails, mapping errors, property rights and values, and water quality.

The Commission then continued the hearing to allow for additional testimony and further discussion by the Commissioners. The Commission also directed staff to prepare: 1) responses to comments received between October 25 and November 16, 2006; and 2) changes to propose to the Commission at the continued hearing scheduled for January 24, 2007, in Downtown Los Angeles.

January 24, 2007
The Commission took testimony from 28 individuals. Approximately 60 people attended the hearing. Most who spoke in favor supported the tiered approached to ESHA as proposed by the LCP. Some supported policies and standards in the LCP that allows for equestrian uses throughout the Santa Monica Mountains.

A number of testifiers opposing the LCP said that there were flaws in the methodology used in the designation of significant ridgelines. Some indicated that the LCP “goes too far” by removing property rights and reducing property values.

The Commission closed the public hearing, discussed issues raised during testimony, and then directed staff to address six issues that they believed needed further evaluation. The six

issues were:

1. Whether definition of “person” should include those with a fractional share (as in a company)
2. Piuma area as a Significant Watershed
3. Hardening of streams
4. Clustering homes
5. Definition of “agriculture”
6. Off-road biking trails

The Commission directed staff to return with responses and any proposed changes to address the above issues.

March 7, 2007
The Commission heard comments from three individuals, reviewed staff’s responses and proposed changes, approved the proposed LCP on a vote of 5-0, and directed staff to transmit the LCP to the Board of Supervisors for their consideration.