Malibu City Council
Zoning Ordinance Revisions and Code Enforcement Subcommittee (ZORACES)
Special Meeting Agenda

Thursday, March 26, 2026

3:00 P.M.

City Hall – Multipurpose Room
23825 Stuart Ranch Road

Mayor Pro Tem Steve Uhring
Councilmember Marianne Riggins

Call to Order

Roll Call

Report on Posting of the Agenda – March 24, 2026

Approval of Agenda

Public Comment *This is the time for the public to comment on any items not appearing on this agenda. Each public speaker shall be allowed up to three (3) minutes for comments. The Subcommittee may not discuss or act on any matter not specifically identified on this agenda, pursuant to the Ralph M. Brown Act.*

Discussion Items

1. Presentations

None.

2. Old Business

None.

3. New Business

A. Approval of Minutes – October 12, 2022, and November 11, 2022

Recommended Action: Approve the minutes for the Zoning Ordinance Revisions and Code Enforcement Subcommittee (ZORACES) Special meeting of October 12, 2022, and November 11, 2022.

Staff Contact: Executive Assistant Gonzalez, 310-456-2489, ext. 336

B. Beachfront Definition for Residential Development Standards – Local Coastal Program Amendement No. Xx-xxx and Zoning Text Amendement No. xx-xxx

Recommended Action: Review the proposed definition of "beachfront" for inclusion in the Local Coastal Program (LCP) Local Implementation Plan (LIP) and Title 17 (Zoning) of the Malibu Municipal Code (MMC) and provide feedback for consideration by the Planning Commission.

Staff Contact: Community Development Director Bundy, 310-456-2489, ext. 229

Adjournment

I hereby certify under penalty of perjury, under the laws of the State of California, that the foregoing agenda was posted in accordance with the applicable legal requirements. Special meeting agendas may be amended up to 24 hours in advance of the meeting. Dated this 24th day of March 2026, at 9:30 a.m.

Alyssa Gonzalez

Alyssa Gonzalez, Executive Assistant

MINUTES
ZONING ORDINANCE REVISIONS AND CODE ENFORCEMENT
SUBCOMMITTEE (ZORACES)
SPECIAL MEETING
NOVEMBER 10, 2022
TELECONFERENCED – VARIOUS LOCATIONS
2:00 P.M.

CALL TO ORDER

Councilmember Uhring called the meeting to order at 2:05 p.m.

ROLL CALL

The following persons were recorded in attendance:

PRESENT: Councilmember Mikke Pierson and Councilmember Steve Uhring

ALSO PRESENT: City Manager Steve McClary; Interim City Attorney Trevor Rusin; Planning Director Richard Mollica; Contract Planner Joseph Smith; Media Technician Parker Davis; and Administrative Assistant Brittany Saleaumua

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MOTION Councilmember Uhring moved, and Councilmember Pierson seconded a motion to approve the agenda. The question was called, and the motion carried unanimously.

REPORT ON POSTING OF AGENDA

Administrative Assistant Saleaumua reported that the agenda for the meeting was properly posted on November 9, 2022.

ITEM 1 PRESENTATIONS

None.

ITEM 2 OLD BUSINESS

A. Zoning Text Amendment No. 21-005 amending Malibu Municipal Code Chapter 17.68 (Temporary Use Permits) – Third Meeting
Recommended Action: Provide further discussion on draft amendments to the temporary use permit (TUP) process, including proposed language for farmers market temporary use, and provide feedback for staff to use in finalizing an amendment.

Councilmember Pierson announced that this item was being re-heard due to a power outage that interrupted the previous meeting on October 12, 2022.

Contract Planner Smith presented the report. He explained today's presentation included a summary of key points from the previous discussions.

For the record, it is to be noted that Contract Planner Smith referred to a meeting of October 10, which actually was held on October 12, 2022.

Councilmember Pierson confirmed he and Councilmember Uhring agreed on some things and not on others after the October meeting discussion. He asked for clarification of what was needed to bring this item to the City Council.

Contract Planner Smith stated reduced noticing and Farmers Market were new issues in today's discussion.

Councilmember Uhring agreed with Councilmember Pierson that there was consensus on cultural events taking place in City parks. He stated their differences were primarily with the major TUP.

In response to Councilmember Uhring, Interim City Attorney Rusin stated he would examine whether preference or limitations favoring Malibu organizations could be included. In response to Interim City Attorney Rusin, Councilmember Uhring stated local organizations should be those run by the Malibu community. Councilmember Pierson stated that should be a decision for the City Council.

In response to Contract Planner Smith, Councilmember Uhring stated his only concern was that there were enough controls to prevent TUP events in neighborhoods where they did not belong.

Councilmember Pierson stated he agreed with a Major TUP for events over 1,000 people and significant impacts. He stated Major TUPs should go through the public review process by the Planning Commission.

In response to Councilmember Uhring, Councilmember Pierson stated serial events could fall under the Major TUP process due to greater potential of impact.

Councilmember Uhring agreed Major TUP would include such events as the Chili Cook-Off or Malibu Triathlon and would require Planning Commission review. He agreed serial events could be considered with Major TUP.

Contract Planner Smith stated Version 2 had language regarding serial events that would be brought forward.

In response to Councilmember Pierson, Interim City Attorney Rusin stated noticing requirements should apply to all TUP. Councilmember Pierson stated a Major TUP should require a minimum of 32 days noticing.

Planning Director Mollica stated 10- and 21-day notice was required for development.

Councilmember Pierson stated noticing was difficult for some art events.

Councilmember Uhring stated the purpose of a TUP was to protect neighborhoods from events held in areas not scheduled to be there or in venues not designed for those types of events. He stated he agreed with the 32-day noticing requirement.

Councilmember Pierson agreed with Councilmember Uhring that 32 days might be the right length of time, but he would want the Council to also consider 21 days. He stated 10 days was far too short.

Planning Director Mollica discussed potential language to modify the TUP specifically for farmers markets.

Contract Planner Smith discussed current issues being addressed for the Malibu Farmers Market. He stated it could not be permanently moved to Legacy Park without the park being rezoned. He stated the modification could be included in the TUP language reviewed by the Planning Commission while also being enacted by the City Council in an urgency ordinance.

Councilmember Uhring agreed with the farmers market modification. In response to Councilmember Uhring, Contract Planner Smith clarified the rezoning of Legacy Park was only if the farmers market moved permanently to the park.

Councilmember Pierson agreed with the farmers market modification. In response to Councilmember Pierson, Councilmember Uhring discussed the County and Santa Monica College (SMC) impacts on the farmers market. In response to Councilmember Pierson, Interim City Attorney Rusin stated the emergency ordinance could be presented to the City Council and would be effective immediately upon adoption.

City Manager McClary stated SMC stated it would impact the farmers market at least to the end of the year.

In response to Councilmember Pierson and Councilmember Uhring, Contract Planner Smith stated he could bring Version 2 with the additional comments agreed upon to the Council.

ITEM 3 NEW BUSINESS

A. Approval of Minutes – April 14, 2022
Staff recommendation: Approve the minutes for the Zoning Ordinance Revisions and Code Enforcement Subcommittee Special meeting of April 14, 2022.

MOTION Councilmember Uhring moved, and Councilmember Pierson seconded a motion to approve the minutes for the Zoning Ordinance Revisions and Code Enforcement Subcommittee Special meeting of April 14, 2022. The question was called, and the motion carried unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION At 3:09 p.m., Councilmember Pierson moved, and Councilmember Uhring seconded a motion to adjourn the meeting. The question was called, and the motion carried unanimously.

Approved and adopted by the Zoning Ordinance Revisions and Code Enforcement Subcommittee of the City of Malibu on _____.

_____
STEVE UHRING, Councilmember

ATTEST:

_____
Alyssa Gonzalez, Executive Assistant

MINUTES
ZONING ORDINANCE REVISIONS AND CODE ENFORCEMENT
SUBCOMMITTEE (ZORACES)
SPECIAL MEETING
OCTOBER 12, 2022
TELECONFERENCED – VARIOUS LOCATIONS
1:00 P.M.

CALL TO ORDER

Councilmember Pierson called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL

The following persons were recorded in attendance:

PRESENT: Councilmember Mikke Pierson and Councilmember Steve Uhring

ALSO PRESENT: City Manager Steve McClary; Planning Director Richard Mollica; Assistant Planning Director Adrian Fernandez; Senior Planner Jessica Thompson; Contract Planner Joseph Smith; Kristin Riesgo; Executive Assistant Mary Linden; and Administrative Assistant Rebecca Evans

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MOTION Councilmember Uhring moved, and Councilmember Pierson seconded a motion to approve the agenda. The question was called, and the motion carried unanimously.

REPORT ON POSTING OF AGENDA

Executive Assistant Linden reported that the agenda for the meeting was properly posted on October 7, 2022.

ITEM 1 PRESENTATIONS

None.

ITEM 2 OLD BUSINESS

A. Zoning Text Amendment No. 21-005 Amending Malibu Municipal Code Chapter 17.68 (Temporary Use Permits) (continued from April 14, 2022)
Staff recommendation: Discuss potential amendments to the temporary use permit (TUP) process, event criteria, and provide feedback for staff to incorporate into a draft ordinance amendment.

Contract Planner Smith provided a presentation with the report.

Scott Tallal ready from the Malibu Film Society (MFS) General Fund Grant application 2009 and 2010 MFS invited to partner with centrally located Malibu Jewish Center Synagogue (MJCS) as perfect venue for showing films under 501c3 charter of MJCS. He stated the former City Manager stated it fell under existing code. He stated they continued that until a complaint was filed.

E. Barry Haldeman, Board of Directors for 12 years, M Arts Commission and Chamber of Commerce Arts Council, stated Malibu needs MFS. 12 years with no interference from the City. He stated the City wants to work with MFS to continue as it had in the past with over 60 screenings per year. Only one other venue in Malibu meets requirements of distributors. When moved to Malibu Pacific Church, City required TUP with limit of 6 events per building per year. How can City deny MFS and church the right to assemble for these events. He suggested changing the ordinance to accommodate MFS.

Andy VomSteeg, representing the church, wants to open the church to the community. He expressed confusion that the church was industrial zoning and could not host the events. He stated they want to protect the neighborhood. He expressed support for providing opportunities to enjoy the arts.

Jo Drummond stated the TUP should not be able to be applied at place of worship. Churches should be able to host events for annual fee. TUP for artistic events should be allowed as a series and not charged per event. Hopes new City Council will bring back auditorium at City Hall.

Angel Burns, MFS Board member and media psychologist, stated MFS makes most influential movies and filmmakers in the world available to the community. She discussed social benefits. She stated fires and the pandemic disconnected the community. She stated frequency matters. She expressed support for MFS.

John Johannessen, VP of MFS, expressed support for MFS. He stated movies, documentaries, Q&A with actors, producers, writers who share their experiences. He stated MFS brought people together. He stated permit requirements did not fit what MFS does. He stated this needed to be fixed once and for all.

Julie Carmen requested everything necessary be done for MFS to hold events at the church. She discussed past events for Academy Award nominated films. She stated the church provided perfect facilities with ample parking. She stated she recommended the church to connect with MFS. She expressed support for modifying the TUP requirements.

Nancy Sanders discussed her experience with MFS. She agreed with previous speakers. She stated it was important for Malibu to support the film industry. She

suggested fixing the regulations to allow MFS to continue operating at the church. She stated asking residents to travel to see a movie was an unnecessary hardship.

Jane Albrecht stated she appreciated the MFS as a fulcrum of the community. She stated it should be easy to fix the problem since it worked for 12 years. She stated the TUP regulation required this only when the venue could not accommodate the event. She stated requiring the church to get a TUP that another venue would not require was discrimination. She expressed support for bringing MFS back to Malibu.

Marianne Riggins agreed with previous speakers in supporting the MFS. She stated it encourages the community to come together. She discussed the Christmas tree lot run by the MHS Boosters as a fundraiser. She stated the current TUP process inadvertently could raise that to a major TUP. She stated that should be cleaned up to not punish local schools. She stated it should be able to continue as it has for years.

John Mazza stated there were many factors to consider, including annual review, public review, and traffic. He stated changes must be limited to what can be reviewed rationally. He stated changing to a larger, easier to get permit, impacts on residents must be considered. He stated anyone could start a non-profit. He stated other facilities, including Pepperdine, were available. He suggested considering the entire community, not just MFS.

Ted Vaill stated he attended many MFS events at the MJCS. He stated MFS was needed. He stated the church regularly had large meetings with adequate parking. He requested the City be sympathetic to the needs of the community.

Debra Bianco was not available at the time of the hearing.

Councilmember Pierson closed public comment.

RECESS At 1:48 p.m., Councilmember Pierson recessed the meeting. The meeting reconvened at 1:50 p.m. with all Subcommittee members present.

Councilmember Pierson stated Version 2 looked more appropriate. He discussed smaller, cultural events at City parks. He stated the major TUP was worthwhile for larger events or a series with a bigger impact. He stated the regular TUP would still apply for events with not as many people or fewer impacts. He suggested three types of permits: A smaller event not requiring a TUP but requiring some sort of permit; medium events requiring a Regular TUP; and Major TUP events. He stated churches were places for the public to gather. He stated MFS should be allowed at those venues. He stated parking must be considered, even for other events or church

services. He stated movies and music were often part of church services. He stated any bonafide church with buildings built for congregating, such as MJCS and Pacific Church, should be allowed to hold events. He stated that was outside the scope of this TUP discussion. He stated there should be a path for a series TUP.

Councilmember Uhring stated his priority was the impact on the community when TUPs were issued. He stated that could not be left out. He agreed with Councilmember Pierson that small, cultural events with fewer than 100 people at a City park should not require a TUP.

In response to Councilmember Uhring, Contract Planner Smith explained how small events in public space would be exempt but may require clearance or approvals by the Fire Department or other agency. He stated other requirements, such as insurance or cleaning the site after the event, could be required and handled by the City. Planning Director Mollica stated permission for use of a City park was provided through the Community Services Department (CSD). He stated CSD ensured the park was maintained and conflicting events were not scheduled. In response to Councilmember Uhring, Planning Director Mollica confirmed CSD would issue the permit.

Councilmember Uhring asked how an event would be identified as a cultural event. Planning Director Mollica stated it would have to be a non-profit, 501(c)3 organization providing a public service. He stated it would have to be a passive event with limitations on amplified sound and the number of people in attendance. In response to Councilmember Uhring, Contract Planner Smith stated there would have to be a rational basis for requiring the organization to be a Malibu organization. He stated the appropriate language should be coordinated with the City Attorney.

In response to Councilmember Uhring, Planning Director Mollica confirmed Legacy Park could only host six events per year. In response to Councilmember Uhring, Contract Planner Smith stated deed restrictions on Legacy Park would still apply. Planning Director Mollica discussed the deed restrictions at Legacy Park.

In response to Councilmember Uhring, Councilmember Pierson expressed agreement with the small event description. In response to Planning Director Mollica, Councilmember Uhring and Councilmember Pierson agreed the small events should be limited to daylight hours. He stated those events would have very little impact on residents in the neighborhood. In response to Councilmember Pierson, Councilmember Uhring stated small event permits would not apply to commercially zoned settings.

Councilmember Uhring discussed the Trancas music event. He stated Cars and Coffee did not require a TUP but was approved by the Council as an item on the

Parks and Recreation Commission work plan. He suggested similar events at commercial properties be handled in a similar manner.

Interim City Attorney Rusin stated it must be an allowed use under City zoning and the location's conditional use permit (CUP). In response to Councilmember Uhring, Planning Director Mollica stated Trancas Market was in the process of amending its CUP to allow summer concerts.

Planning Director Mollica stated it must not violate any condition of the Planning Commission's approved CUP for that location. Councilmember Uhring stated the Planning Commission could amend the CUP, when necessary.

In response to Planning Director Mollica, Contract Planner Smith stated a section of existing code identified requirements for if a TUP was required to allow for indoor or outdoor entertainment events at a non-City, commercial location.

Councilmember Uhring stated most emails received incorrectly stated the City stopped MFS from showing movies in Malibu. He stated MFS did not have the permit to do so. In response to Councilmember Uhring, Planning Director Mollica confirmed MFS had never applied for a TUP. Councilmember Uhring discussed past fires that burned down Malibu Canyon in the area of the church. He discussed homes and the church burned in those fires. He stated traffic control was provided for the church's regular Sunday services due to traffic levels on Malibu Canyon Road. He expressed concern about 60 events per year at that location due to fire potential that could endanger residents. He stated the City Hall theater was a more appropriate venue. He stated MFS advised him that City Hall did not meet standards and conditions required by film distributors.

Councilmember Pierson asked how a TUP would work for MFS. Councilmember Uhring stated it was unknown since MFS never requested a TUP. Councilmember Uhring stated he did not support MFS showing 60 films in a fire zone. Councilmember Pierson stated the TUP could include requiring traffic control. He stated there were some problems at City Hall for showing films. Councilmember Uhring stated he wanted something in writing from the studios listing the conditions. He stated City Hall may fulfill those requirements with little or no modification. He requested a copy of the survey MFS conducted with residents near the church.

Contract Planner Smith stated this was why a Major TUP process was created. He stated fire season conditions could be part of the permit requirements, including a series permit. He stated the ability to scale up with the right protections was currently missing from the TUP process.

Councilmember Uhring stated he was not in favor of a Major TUP as defined. Councilmember Pierson disagreed.

Councilmember Uhring stated there was agreement on how to allow small group events to take place in public parks without a TUP and to provide a path for smaller events at commercial properties. He stated he would agree with looking into how the MFS could hold events at City Hall.

In response to Councilmember Pierson, Councilmember Uhring confirmed he did not support a Major TUP as presented. Councilmember Pierson stated he disagreed.

Interim City Attorney Rusin stated specifically discussing how to address MFS issues could be discussed to aid in forming a recommendation to the Council about the TUP process, but resolving those issues was not on this agenda and was not under the purview of the Subcommittee.

In response to Councilmember Pierson, Mr. Tallal discussed documentation he had about why his events at MJCS were cancelled based on information from the City. He discussed problems with meeting TUP requirements, including limitations on the number of shows and advance noticing. He stated a professional movie theater consultant advised that the City Hall theater had sightline problems. He stated it did not support installing surround sound. He discussed requirements for first run and pre-release films. He stated he monitored all public service messages during events. He discussed interrupting a movie on November 8, 2018 due to the Woolsey Fire. He stated the Malibu Knolls neighborhood residents were not concerned.

In response to Councilmember Uhring, Mr. Tallal stated he would provide a copy of the communication sent to residents in the church neighborhood. Councilmember Uhring suggested looking into modifications at City Hall. He discussed the Malibu Arts Task Force that examined all available locations in the City that met studio requirements.

Councilmember Pierson stated MJCS and Pacific Church should be allowable spaces for MFS. He stated he supported a Major TUP as described in Version 2. He expressed support for a serial TUP.

In response to Councilmember Uhring, Mr. Tallal stated Pepperdine was cost-prohibitive. He stated MJCS would be closed for renovations over the next two years. He discussed events other than movies offered by MFS. He stated Pacific Church was built in 1951 and was, therefore, grandfathered without a CUP prior to cityhood.

Councilmember Pierson acknowledged the frustration of Mr. Tallal and speakers supporting MFS. He suggested bringing it forward to the City Council for discussion.

At 2:52 p.m., City Manager McClary announced the City had received reports of a power outage in Point Dume that was preventing some residents from participating.

Councilmember Uhring questioned what was preventing the Farmers Market from moving in the parking spaces in front of Legacy Park. Planning Director Mollica stated Code required a farmers market to occur only on institutional property. He stated staff was looking at a potential amendment to that Code section or the possible use of an encroachment permit. He stated a street fair required the street to be shut down and traffic control provided.

Planning Director Mollica summarized that the Subcommittee was in agreement to support Version 2 except for the Major TUP. He stated staff had direction for events in public spaces without a TUP and to look into a mechanism for events in commercial areas to present to Council using Cars and Coffee as a model.

Contract Planner Smith stated the next report would include the City facility rental process and a definition of arts and cultural events.

ITEM 3 NEW BUSINESS

A. Approval of Minutes – April 14, 2022
Staff recommendation: Approve the minutes for the Zoning Ordinance Revisions and Code Enforcement Subcommittee Special meeting of April 14, 2022.

MOTION Councilmember Uhring moved, and Councilmember Pierson seconded a motion to approve the minutes for the Zoning Ordinance Revisions and Code Enforcement Subcommittee Special meeting of April 14, 2022. The question was called, and the motion carried unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION At 2:56 p.m., Councilmember Uhring moved, and Councilmember Pierson seconded a motion to adjourn the meeting. The question was called, and the motion carried unanimously.

Approved and adopted by the Zoning Ordinance Revisions and Code Enforcement Subcommittee of the City of Malibu on ____.

_____
STEVE UHRING, Councilmember

ATTEST:

_____
Alyssa Gonzalez, Executive Assistant

Zoning Ordinance Revisions
& Code Enforcement
Subcommittee Meeting
03-26-26

Item 3.B.

Zoning Ordinance Revisions and Code Enforcement Subcommittee Agenda Report

To: Councilmember Riggins and Mayor Pro Tem Uhring

Prepared by: Tyler Eaton, Assistant Community Development Director and Joseph Smith, AICP, Contract Planner

Approved by: Yolanda Bundy, MS, PE, CBO, CFCO, Community Development Director

Date prepared: March 20, 2026 **Meeting date:** March 26, 2026

Subject: Beachfront Definition for Residential Development Standards – Local Coastal Program Amendment No. xx-xxx and Zoning Text Amendment No. xx-xxx

---

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Review the proposed definition of "beachfront" for inclusion in the Local Coastal Program (LCP) Local Implementation Plan (LIP) and Title 17 (Zoning) of the Malibu Municipal Code (MMC) and provide feedback for consideration by the Planning Commission.

DISCUSSION: When applying development standards to projects requiring setbacks, height, impermeable coverage, two-thirds calculation, and Total Development Square Footage (TDSF), the LIP and MMC provide a different set of development standards for "beachfront" and "non-beachfront" projects. Beachfront development standards allow less setbacks and increased height than non-beachfront development standards. Additionally, beachfront development is not subject to the impermeable coverage, two-thirds calculation, and TDSF limitations that are otherwise applied to non-beachfront development.

Neither the LIP or MMC provide a definition of "beachfront" or "non-beachfront" and, while in most cases the distinction is obvious, there are nuances with the location of development and configuration of some ocean-fronting parcels in the City that have resulted in ambiguity for applicants, the City's reviewers, and decision-makers. In practice, the Planning Division and the California Coastal Commission through review

of Malibu projects, have historically qualified that beachfront development standards apply based on a parcel's orientation to the coast, the zoning designation, and the location of the structure; Geologic characteristics associated with the location of the primary use structure, such as the footprint of a residence as it is situated on the parcel is a defining factor, not just the location of the parcel. Establishing a definition of "beachfront" in the LIP and MMC would provide clarity to the public and City, improve consistency in project review, and reduce the need for case-by-base interpretations. It would also better position the City if challenges to a project's design standards were made by an applicant looking to maximize the extra code allowances of beachfront development that are intended to be for the typical constrained beachfront lot. Preparation of the beachfront definition was directed by the City Council on July 14, 2025.

Proposed Definition

The proposed definition would read:

> *BEACHFRONT: A parcel is considered beachfront when one of its parcel boundary lines is the Pacific Ocean or beach directly adjacent to the Pacific Ocean, the parcel does not have a zoning designation of Rural Residential,, and the site of proposed development is either directly on the beach or within a low-lying shoreline area contiguous with the beach and not separated from the beach by a coastal bluff, cliff, hill, or other elevated coastal landform. Parcels not meeting these criteria shall be considered non-beachfront. Beachfront development standards shall only apply to parcels meeting this definition where the primary use structure is located in one of these areas. An ancillary structure on the beach shall not constitute a parcel to be beachfront if the primary use structure is not located on the beach.*

The proposed definition would align LIP Section 2.1 (Definitions) and MMC Section 17.02.060 (Definitions) with the City's practices for qualifying when beachfront development standards apply. The structure of the proposed definition is characterized by the following three components:

1) Physical Relationship to the Pacific Ocean: A parcel must directly abut the ocean. This component is important to ensure beachfront development standards are applied to parcels adjacent to the coast and not parcels adjacent to other low-lying areas, such as lagoons or blue-line streams.

2) Consistency with the General Plan: A parcel must not be located within the General Plan, zoning code, or LCP land use designation of Rural Residential (RR) due to the lower-intensity development pattern envisioned for the RR residential land use and minimum lot size of one acre. This component is important because several parcels in the City are designated as RR and are oriented along the coast, as well as typically being larger in lot size. These lots are typically larger in size and have development that is separated from the

beach from elevated landforms covered in the paragraph below. Allowing the use of beachfront development standards for these large RR parcels along the coast could allow for the parcels to develop in a relatively dense pattern that would not be consistent with the rural ambiance envisioned by the General Plan for such areas.

3) Geologic Characteristics of a Beachfront Environment: The footprint of the primary use structure of a parcel must be reflective of geologic characteristics of a beachfront environment such as representing a low-lying coastal landform contiguous to the beach and not being separated from the beach by a coastal bluff, cliff, hill, or other prominent elevated coastal landform. This component is important because some parcels in the City are oriented along the coast and not within the RR land use designation, such as parcels in the Single Family Medium (SFM) land use designation; however, the location of proposed development for a primary use is separated from the beach by a coastal bluff, hill, or some other prominent coastal landform. Typically, parcels that include coastal bluffs or other prominent elevated coastal landforms are also larger in lot size than the parcels that are reflective of a beachfront environment. Allowing the use of beachfront development standards for parcels along the coast that are separated from the beach by a coastal bluff or some other prominent coastal landform would allow for development much larger than intended by the General Plan.

Some of the key supporting General Plan policies from the Land Use (LU) Element include the following:

1) LU Policy 1.1.1: The City shall protect the natural environment by regulating design and permitting only land uses compatible with the natural environment.
2) LU Policy 1.1.4: The City shall preserve the City's rural residential character.
3) LU Policy 1.1.5: The City shall require careful site planning which blends development with the natural topography.
4) LU Policy 2.3.2: The City shall discourage “mansionization” by establishing limits on height, bulk, and square footage for all new and remodel single-family residences.
5) LU Policy 2.4.1: The City shall preserve and protect vistas and large open areas that contribute to the rural feeling of the area.
6) LU Policy 6.1.1: The City shall use development standards and procedures that protect the property owners' reasonable use of their land consistent with the goals and policies of this General Plan.

Subcommittee Options

1. Recommend adoption of the proposed definition as drafted.
2. Recommend revisions to the definition language.
3. Request additional research before returning with a revised definition.
4. Recommend not to pursue the amendment.

Next Steps

Based on the input received by the Subcommittee, the Planning Division would develop a draft ordinance to be presented to the Planning Commission, for recommendation to the City Council. If adopted by the City Council, the amendment would be submitted to the California Coastal Commission for certification in the LCP.