

Communication from Public

Name: Kathrin Werner Miramar Homeowners Association
Date Submitted: 08/13/2026 01:27 AM
Council File No: 25-0600-S86
Comments for Public Posting: Re: Council File 25-0600-S86, Item 2, Council Agenda of August 14, 2026 Objection to Recommendation No. 2 as to four parcels on Paseo Miramar and Lucero Place Dear Council President Harris-Dawson and Members of the Council: The Miramar Homeowners Association, founded in 1947 and the oldest homeowners association in Pacific Palisades, submits this written comment for the administrative record and objects to Recommendation No. 2 of Item 2 as it applies to four parcels on our hillside. Please see attached PDF letter

MIRAMAR HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION

Pacific Palisades, California • Founded 1947

August 13, 2026

Honorable Members of the Los Angeles City Council
c/o Office of the City Clerk, Council and Public Services Division
200 North Spring Street, Room 395, Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: Council File 25-0600-S86, Item 2, Council Agenda of August 14, 2026

Objection to Recommendation No. 2 as to four parcels on Paseo Miramar and Lucero Place

Dear Council President Harris-Dawson and Members of the Council:

The Miramar Homeowners Association, founded in 1947 and the oldest homeowners association in Pacific Palisades, submits this written comment for the administrative record and objects to Recommendation No. 2 of Item 2 as it applies to four parcels on our hillside.

All eighteen parcels proposed for declaration as Surplus Land under Recommendation No. 2 are located in Pacific Palisades, 90272, as is one of the six parcels in Recommendation No. 1. The Community Impact Statement for this item reads "None submitted." No Palisades community organization was notified that the City proposed to begin disposing of its land holdings in this community, seven months after the fire that destroyed much of it.

The Association respectfully asks that the Council continue this item pending consultation with the affected communities, or in the alternative strike the following four parcels from Recommendation No. 2:

418 North Paseo Miramar, APN 4416-007-904

418 North Paseo Miramar, APN 4416-007-903

412 Paseo Miramar, APN 4416-007-905

500 North Lucero Place, APN 4416-007-902

1. This land is not developable, and the City's own records establish it.

Attachment B to the June 4, 2026 Municipal Facilities Committee report codes these four parcels "Developable, total of 2 residences." The stated basis for that determination is a 2026 appraisal. An appraisal is a valuation instrument. It cannot establish slope stability. The Department of General Services' own entry for 412 Paseo Miramar records the recommendation to review the site for a single-family home and notes that a "Geotech or other analysis may be required." No such analysis appears anywhere in the record.

An active landslide underlies these parcels. It is approximately 100 feet in depth and it continues to move. Geotechnical findings documenting it exist, are held by the Association, and are known to the City. The Association will provide them on request.

The City acquired these very parcels through inverse condemnation settlements arising from that movement. Attachment B states this on its face for each parcel, and the report confirms at page 4 that

most Council District 11 properties on this list "were acquired as a result of legal settlements due to land movement issues."

At its meeting of March 26, 2026, the Municipal Facilities Committee directed General Services to "separate properties on hillsides that are not considered buildable." General Services carried out that instruction for other parcels, which appear at the bottom of Attachment B identified as undevelopable. These four parcels were instead placed in Priority Band 1, at the top of the City's sale queue, among its most valuable properties. The City proposes to sell as buildable, and at premium value, land it purchased because it moves.

2. No written findings support this declaration.

The Surplus Land Act, as the Municipal Facilities Committee report itself states at page 5, requires that land "shall be declared either 'surplus land' or 'exempt surplus land,' as supported by written findings, before a local agency may take any action to dispose of it."

The report's Findings section provides a full statutory analysis for the six parcels in Recommendation No. 1, citing Government Code section 54221(f)(1)(B) and addressing each disqualifying characteristic. For the eighteen parcels in Recommendation No. 2 it provides a list of addresses and nothing further. The only stated basis for these four parcels appears in Attachment B: "This property was acquired through a settlement resulting from an inverse condemnation claim. Okay to declare Surplus." (Spelling as in the original.)

Recommendation No. 2 asks the Council to declare these parcels surplus "as supported by the Findings set forth in the June 4, 2026 MFC report." As to these parcels, no such findings exist.

3. The parcels are subject to an open space commitment the report does not disclose.

From 2016 the Association worked with the City, then represented by Councilmember Bonin, and with the Mountains Recreation and Conservation Authority to place open space easements over these same four assessor parcel numbers. On December 4, 2019, the MRCA Governing Board considered Agenda Item XI, a resolution authorizing acceptance of revocable open space easements from the City over all or parts of them. The MRCA staff report records that the City took ownership after a legal action regarding land slippage, that the Association had worked with the City since 2016 toward conservation or open space easements in favor of another public entity, and that the corresponding City motion was moving through the Council approval process.

The Association funded that work at substantial cost to its members. In the years following, the Association was advised that the matter remained pending and awaited a single remaining approval. At no point was the Association informed that the easement process had been abandoned, or that these parcels were instead under consideration for sale.

Neither the easements nor the MRCA appear anywhere in the 161-page Municipal Facilities Committee report, although General Services identifies MRCA and Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy interests in other parcels within the same attachment.

4. The parcels lie on a street that cannot evacuate the homes it already has.

Paseo Miramar is the sole ingress and egress for this hillside and dead-ends at the East Topanga Fire Road trailhead. Its only connector between the lower and upper street, Resolano Drive, is 15 to 20 feet

wide, remains officially temporary, is too narrow and too steep for reliable fire apparatus access, and is posted no-stopping along its entire length for that reason.

On January 7, 2025, roughly half the homes on this hill were lost. These are City-owned lots. Residents rebuilding existing homes have no alternative. The City is choosing to add new households to a street with an unresolved evacuation problem.

5. The Surplus Land Act provides a better outcome.

Government Code section 54222 requires that surplus land be offered first to public agencies and to park and open-space entities. General Services has already coded two of these four parcels "Surplus - Coastal - SMMC" in Attachment B. Conveyance to a conservation agency resolves the City's maintenance and liability exposure and completes what was begun in 2016.

Requests

- a. Continue Item 2 pending consultation with the affected communities, or in the alternative strike these four parcels from Recommendation No. 2.
- b. Direct General Services to obtain a current geotechnical assessment of these parcels before any declaration, and enter the Association's existing findings into the record.
- c. Direct that the Government Code section 54222 notices for these parcels issue to the Mountains Recreation and Conservation Authority, the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy, and the California Department of Parks and Recreation, with Council District 11 supporting conveyance to whichever entity responds.
- d. Report whether the MRCA open space easements were recorded, and if not, at what point the process stopped.

The Association requests that this correspondence be entered into the administrative record for this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathrin Werner

Co-Chair, Miramar Homeowners Association

cc: Councilwoman Traci Park, Council District 11

Arus Grigoryan, Office of Council District 11

Municipal Facilities Committee

Communication from Public

Name: Kathrin Werner

Date Submitted: 08/13/2026 01:28 AM

Council File No: 25-0600-S86

Comments for Public Posting: Re: Council File 25-0600-S86, Item 2, Council Agenda of August 14, 2026 Objection to Recommendation No. 2 as to four parcels on Paseo Miramar and Lucero Place Dear Council President Harris-Dawson and Members of the Council: The Miramar Homeowners Association, founded in 1947 and the oldest homeowners association in Pacific Palisades, submits this written comment for the administrative record and objects to Recommendation No. 2 of Item 2 as it applies to four parcels on our hillside. Please see attached letter

MIRAMAR HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION

Pacific Palisades, California • Founded 1947

August 13, 2026

Honorable Members of the Los Angeles City Council
c/o Office of the City Clerk, Council and Public Services Division
200 North Spring Street, Room 395, Los Angeles, CA 90012

Re: Council File 25-0600-S86, Item 2, Council Agenda of August 14, 2026

Objection to Recommendation No. 2 as to four parcels on Paseo Miramar and Lucero Place

Dear Council President Harris-Dawson and Members of the Council:

The Miramar Homeowners Association, founded in 1947 and the oldest homeowners association in Pacific Palisades, submits this written comment for the administrative record and objects to Recommendation No. 2 of Item 2 as it applies to four parcels on our hillside.

All eighteen parcels proposed for declaration as Surplus Land under Recommendation No. 2 are located in Pacific Palisades, 90272, as is one of the six parcels in Recommendation No. 1. The Community Impact Statement for this item reads "None submitted." No Palisades community organization was notified that the City proposed to begin disposing of its land holdings in this community, seven months after the fire that destroyed much of it.

The Association respectfully asks that the Council continue this item pending consultation with the affected communities, or in the alternative strike the following four parcels from Recommendation No. 2:

418 North Paseo Miramar, APN 4416-007-904

418 North Paseo Miramar, APN 4416-007-903

412 Paseo Miramar, APN 4416-007-905

500 North Lucero Place, APN 4416-007-902

1. This land is not developable, and the City's own records establish it.

Attachment B to the June 4, 2026 Municipal Facilities Committee report codes these four parcels "Developable, total of 2 residences." The stated basis for that determination is a 2026 appraisal. An appraisal is a valuation instrument. It cannot establish slope stability. The Department of General Services' own entry for 412 Paseo Miramar records the recommendation to review the site for a single-family home and notes that a "Geotech or other analysis may be required." No such analysis appears anywhere in the record.

An active landslide underlies these parcels. It is approximately 100 feet in depth and it continues to move. Geotechnical findings documenting it exist, are held by the Association, and are known to the City. The Association will provide them on request.

The City acquired these very parcels through inverse condemnation settlements arising from that movement. Attachment B states this on its face for each parcel, and the report confirms at page 4 that

most Council District 11 properties on this list "were acquired as a result of legal settlements due to land movement issues."

At its meeting of March 26, 2026, the Municipal Facilities Committee directed General Services to "separate properties on hillsides that are not considered buildable." General Services carried out that instruction for other parcels, which appear at the bottom of Attachment B identified as undevelopable. These four parcels were instead placed in Priority Band 1, at the top of the City's sale queue, among its most valuable properties. The City proposes to sell as buildable, and at premium value, land it purchased because it moves.

2. No written findings support this declaration.

The Surplus Land Act, as the Municipal Facilities Committee report itself states at page 5, requires that land "shall be declared either 'surplus land' or 'exempt surplus land,' as supported by written findings, before a local agency may take any action to dispose of it."

The report's Findings section provides a full statutory analysis for the six parcels in Recommendation No. 1, citing Government Code section 54221(f)(1)(B) and addressing each disqualifying characteristic. For the eighteen parcels in Recommendation No. 2 it provides a list of addresses and nothing further. The only stated basis for these four parcels appears in Attachment B: "This property was acquired through a settlement resulting from an inverse condemnation claim. Okay to declare Surplus." (Spelling as in the original.)

Recommendation No. 2 asks the Council to declare these parcels surplus "as supported by the Findings set forth in the June 4, 2026 MFC report." As to these parcels, no such findings exist.

3. The parcels are subject to an open space commitment the report does not disclose.

From 2016 the Association worked with the City, then represented by Councilmember Bonin, and with the Mountains Recreation and Conservation Authority to place open space easements over these same four assessor parcel numbers. On December 4, 2019, the MRCA Governing Board considered Agenda Item XI, a resolution authorizing acceptance of revocable open space easements from the City over all or parts of them. The MRCA staff report records that the City took ownership after a legal action regarding land slippage, that the Association had worked with the City since 2016 toward conservation or open space easements in favor of another public entity, and that the corresponding City motion was moving through the Council approval process.

The Association funded that work at substantial cost to its members. In the years following, the Association was advised that the matter remained pending and awaited a single remaining approval. At no point was the Association informed that the easement process had been abandoned, or that these parcels were instead under consideration for sale.

Neither the easements nor the MRCA appear anywhere in the 161-page Municipal Facilities Committee report, although General Services identifies MRCA and Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy interests in other parcels within the same attachment.

4. The parcels lie on a street that cannot evacuate the homes it already has.

Paseo Miramar is the sole ingress and egress for this hillside and dead-ends at the East Topanga Fire Road trailhead. Its only connector between the lower and upper street, Resolano Drive, is 15 to 20 feet

wide, remains officially temporary, is too narrow and too steep for reliable fire apparatus access, and is posted no-stopping along its entire length for that reason.

On January 7, 2025, roughly half the homes on this hill were lost. These are City-owned lots. Residents rebuilding existing homes have no alternative. The City is choosing to add new households to a street with an unresolved evacuation problem.

5. The Surplus Land Act provides a better outcome.

Government Code section 54222 requires that surplus land be offered first to public agencies and to park and open-space entities. General Services has already coded two of these four parcels "Surplus - Coastal - SMMC" in Attachment B. Conveyance to a conservation agency resolves the City's maintenance and liability exposure and completes what was begun in 2016.

Requests

- a. Continue Item 2 pending consultation with the affected communities, or in the alternative strike these four parcels from Recommendation No. 2.
- b. Direct General Services to obtain a current geotechnical assessment of these parcels before any declaration, and enter the Association's existing findings into the record.
- c. Direct that the Government Code section 54222 notices for these parcels issue to the Mountains Recreation and Conservation Authority, the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy, and the California Department of Parks and Recreation, with Council District 11 supporting conveyance to whichever entity responds.
- d. Report whether the MRCA open space easements were recorded, and if not, at what point the process stopped.

The Association requests that this correspondence be entered into the administrative record for this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathrin Werner

Co-Chair, Miramar Homeowners Association

cc: Councilwoman Traci Park, Council District 11

Arus Grigoryan, Office of Council District 11

Municipal Facilities Committee

Communication from Public

Name: Bart Young

Date Submitted: 08/13/2026 03:31 AM

Council File No: 25-0600-S86

Comments for Public Posting: I urge the City Council not to dispose of the 19 Pacific Palisades properties listed in Council File 25-0600-S86 until the City first determines whether some or all of them should be preserved as permanent public open space. This is not just a routine surplus property matter. In communities like Castellammare, these parcels can become targets for speculative luxury development on unstable hillside land with a long history of geologic problems. Our community has already lived through this. Nearly ten years ago, Greg Demos acquired City-owned surplus land in the middle of the Tramonto landslide area. Residents of Castellammare and CMHO then spent years fighting the proposed development of very large homes on dangerous terrain. We hired attorneys, retained experts, attended countless hearings, and devoted enormous time and money to protecting our neighborhood. In the end, the Mitigated Negative Declaration was overturned, and a more serious environmental review was required. That happened only because residents fought back for years. The city should learn from that experience. If these 19 Palisades parcels are declared surplus and moved into the disposal process, developers may purchase them on speculation, pursue entitlements for large ocean-view homes, and once again force neighbors and the City into years of conflict, hearings, CEQA challenges, appeals, delay, and litigation. This is the wrong path. Before selling any of this land, the City should ask a more important question: What could these properties become instead? Some of these parcels may be far better suited for passive public use than private development. They could become a network of small scenic parks, overlooks, and walking paths for residents and visitors to enjoy the coastline safely and permanently. Imagine: • small landscaped overlooks • native and drought-tolerant plantings • walking paths and resting areas • benches with ocean views • quiet open space that protects the hillside rather than overburdening it This idea is not unrealistic. The Palisades already has a model in George Wolfberg Park at Potrero Canyon, where difficult land became a treasured public asset. A similar vision could be explored here, especially in Castellammare and nearby hillside areas. There is also an opportunity to make these spaces meaningful to the community in another way. If the City preserved some of these parcels as parkland or overlooks, residents and families could

potentially help fund improvements or long-term care as gifts to the City. Benches, gardens, overlooks, or modest monuments could honor loved ones and recognize donors who want to leave behind something lasting for future generations. That would create beauty, memory, and public benefit — instead of more conflict over dangerous development. Rather than disposing of public land at cheap prices and watching it become the basis for speculative projects, Los Angeles should consider whether these parcels can become a lasting coastal legacy for everyone. Once public land is sold, getting it back may be impossible. But if preserved now, these properties could serve the City for generations. I respectfully ask the Council to hold or delay this item as it relates to the Pacific Palisades parcels, and direct the appropriate departments to study: 1. the landslide and geologic history of these properties; 2. their suitability or unsuitability for development; 3. their value as open space, trail connections, or scenic overlooks; and 4. whether a public-private or donor-supported model could help preserve them as community parkland. The city already learned a hard lesson at Tramonto. It should not create 19 more opportunities to repeat it. Please do not dispose of these Palisades properties until their potential as permanent public open space has been fully evaluated.