

# Case Details

[Print](#) [Close](#)

Case Number: 47206

Status: New

Tags:

Request Type: Comment

Customer: Heck, Dennis  
external customer

Location of Request:



Facility: N/A



██████████  
REDONDO BEACH CA  
██████████  
██████████

Preferred Contact Method: Email

Submitted By: Heck, Dennis  
customer

Primary Owner: ██████████

Submission Channel: Citizen portal

Topic: City Clerk>Other (City  
Clerk's Office)

Secondary Owner: ██████████

Date/Time Created: 10/01/2024  
14:08

Date/Time Closed:

## Custom Fields

\* internal custom field

## Original Request

I OPPOSE the Planning Commission's recommendation for a 0.5 FAR to general Public/Institutional (P/I) use. I do support the 1.25 FAR for all P/I use, which would ensure transparency, reasonableness and consistency for all public institutional uses. Any exceptions should be made public as to the (who & why) logic, or illogic of cherry picking an exception. And it is even more suspicious that another proposal as been submitted to further reduce the BCHD FAR from .75 to .5 FAR. This inconsistent proposal greatly affects BCHD and its ability to fund their programs and services for our communities. As Shakespeare so apply stated: "Something is rotten in the state of Denmark."

## Customer Communications \*

From	Text	Date
auto notification	Auto Case Notification Created TO: ██████████ Date: 10/01/2024 Subject: Your request (47206) has been received - City of Redondo Beach	10/01/2024 14:08

[Collapse](#)

Dear Dennis Heck,

Thank you for your letter received on 10/01/2024 concerning City Clerk>Other. It has been assigned ID# 47206. You will receive a response to your letter within ten business days. If you should have any further questions please feel free to contact us again and refer to the identification number above, and the link below. <https://clients.comcate.com/myfeedbackView.php?view=2173949&id=23>

Sincerely,

City of Redondo Beach  
<http://www.redondo.org>

\* Customer Communications are visible on the customer's case status page.

## Internal Activity

### Internal Notes

No records for internal activities found

### Tasks

Close task Due Subject Assigned By Assigned To Status

## Case Contacts

Role	Name	Email	Phone
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

## Attachments

No attachments found

## Activity History

Date	Event	Who	Description	Link
10/01/2024 14:08	Case Assignment Rule Used		Rule: City Clerk > Other	N/A

**From:** [Ann Wolfson](#)  
**To:** [CityClerk](#); [Scott Behrendt](#); [Todd Loewenstein](#); [Zein Obagi](#); [Paige Kaluderovic](#); [Nils Nehrenheim](#)  
**Subject:** Comment to L1 - I support 0.50 FAR for Public Land  
**Date:** Tuesday, October 1, 2024 3:01:56 PM

---

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

***CAUTION: Email is from an external source; Stop, Look, and Think before opening attachments or links.***

Dear City Council Members,

I support the Planning Commission's recommendation for 0.50 FAR for public institutional land. It took into consideration the most important aspect of the General Plan - to balance development and protection of public lands over the next 30 years. Can you imagine the misuse if all public land was at a 1.25 FAR? Please don't allow the rare public land to be misused for real estate development for private developers.

Thank you for your consideration,  
Ann Wolfson

**From:** [Support Far50](#)  
**To:** [CityClerk](#)  
**Subject:** I support for a 0.5 FAR to general Public/Institutional (P/I) use  
**Date:** Tuesday, October 1, 2024 9:35:51 PM

---

**CAUTION: Email is from an external source; Stop, Look, and Think before opening attachments or links.**

See below

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** Mark Razavi [REDACTED]  
**Date:** Tue, Oct 1, 2024 at 6:36 PM  
**Subject:** I support for a 0.5 FAR to general Public/Institutional (P/I) use  
**To:** <[YesToFAR50@gmail.com](mailto:YesToFAR50@gmail.com)>

I support the Planning Commission's recommendation for a 0.5 FAR to general Public/Institutional (P/I) use. I do not support an increase to 1.25 FAR for all P/I use, since it would "upzone" every P/I parcel and create the potential for reckless development that is not consistent with neighborhood character and would not protect property values. Thank you.

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [CityClerk](#); [Nils Nehrenheim](#); [Todd Loewenstein](#); [Paige Kaluderovic](#); [Zein Obagi](#); [Scott Behrendt](#); [Marc Wiener](#); [Sean Scully](#)  
**Cc:** [stopbchd@gmail.com](mailto:stopbchd@gmail.com); [James Light](#)  
**Subject:** L1 - Support the Planning Commission's Recommendation for 0.5 FAR for P/I land use  
**Date:** Tuesday, October 1, 2024 3:35:24 PM

---

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

**CAUTION: Email is from an external source; Stop, Look, and Think before opening attachments or links.**

Hello Everyone,

Please join the many residents in supporting the Planning Commission's recommendation for a 0.5 FAR for P/I land use to match the density of the surrounding light commercial and residential land uses. Their recommendation is well thought out and considers the residents of our beloved city.

An increase to a 1.25 FAR for all P/I land use, without regard for the surroundings, would be highly damaging to the character and quality of life in the city.

Additionally, we would greatly appreciate it if the Council would consider the PCH corridor in its entirety and develop a solid plan that is compatible with the surrounding area, keeping in mind how congested and narrow PCH already is.

We need more green spaces throughout the city.

Many thanks,

Marcie Guillermo  
Resident of Redondo Beach

**From:** [Lara Duke](#)  
**To:** [CityClerk](#); [Scott Behrendt](#); [Todd Loewenstein](#); [Zein Obagi](#); [Paige Kaluderovic](#); [Nils Nehrenheim](#)  
**Subject:** L1 Public Hearing  
**Date:** Tuesday, October 1, 2024 6:09:15 PM

---

***CAUTION: Email is from an external source; Stop, Look, and Think before opening attachments or links.***

The General Plan I know covers many things, and was inspired by the hard work of residents on the GPAC, who met for several years to hammer out this plan. I thank them and those on the Planning Commission for what has led us here today and I thank you on the Council for the work you're about to embark on this evening and in coming meetings.

A .5 FAR on public zoned land is more than reasonable. It's what the Planning Commission has recommended and I hope you will concur with them. They also felt that a 1.25 FAR should apply to emergency services like Fire and Police, the way it currently is for the Civic Center. But having seen what 1.25 looks like, thanks to Chair Hazeltine for asking the city staff to show what various FARs around town look like, even 1.25 allows for colossal structures. I challenge you to propose an even lower FAR for them. Just because it's fire and police doesn't mean a successful facility must bulk out every square inch of the property with structures. I know especially if their bond passes their dream may be to have a 4.0 FAR, but the reality is that these zones should be made to adhere to the specific purposes and standards of a public zone. They are: Maintain a high level of quality and character in the city's residential neighborhoods. Ensure the public buildings and uses are designed to be compatible with other buildings and uses on the site and with the neighborhood in which they are located.

Our own Planning Manager Sean Scully has commented on the built out and park poor nature of Redondo Beach. This is not a made up notion. We must try to preserve Redondo's land, especially the public zoned land. There are only 5 or 6 of these parcels in the entire city and they are special. We should even consider re-wilding efforts on some of these properties since they are so rare. Open space should not be treated as a bad term. It actually keeps us from going crazy. So, please consider implementing the .5 FAR on non-emergency service public zones, and perhaps a .75 for emergency services areas.

Sincerely,  
Lara Duke  
Redondo Beach

**From:** [Support Far50](#)  
**To:** [Nils Nehrenheim](#); [Todd Loewenstein](#); [CityClerk](#)  
**Subject:** PUBLIC COMMENT - SUPPORT 0.5FAR for P/I. OPPOSE 1.25FAR for all P/I.  
**Date:** Tuesday, October 1, 2024 3:35:12 PM

---

Some people who received this message don't often get email from yestofar50@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

**CAUTION: Email is from an external source; Stop, Look, and Think before opening attachments or links.**

PUBLIC COMMENT - SUPPORT 0.5FAR for P/I. OPPOSE 1.25FAR for all P/I.

See below for StopBCHD supporter comment.

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** Carl Paquette [REDACTED]  
**Date:** Tue, Oct 1, 2024 at 3:28 PM  
**Subject:** 0.5 FAR  
**To:** <[YesToFAR50@gmail.com](mailto:YesToFAR50@gmail.com)>

I support the Planning Commission's recommendation for a 0.5 FAR to general Public/Institutional (P/I) use. I do not support an increase to 1.25 FAR for all P/I use, since it would "upzone" every P/I parcel and create the potential for reckless development that is not consistent with neighborhood character and would not protect property values.

The BCHD "improvement" building does not take the welfare of the community into consideration. The traffic it will generate is not supported by Beryl which is already subject to backups during the morning and afternoon hours especially. It will also greatly increase the cut-through traffic on Redbeam, Towers and Flagler that our neighborhood already experiences.

Please maintain the 0.5 FAR and do everything to discourage this poorly planned expansion.

Respectively submitted,

Carl Paquette  
[REDACTED]  
Torrance 90503

**From:** [Support Far50](#)  
**To:** [Nils Nehrenheim](#); [Todd Loewenstein](#); [CityClerk](#)  
**Subject:** PUBLIC COMMENT - SUPPORT 0.5FAR for P/I. OPPOSE 1.25FAR for all P/I.  
**Date:** Tuesday, October 1, 2024 3:35:56 PM

---

Some people who received this message don't often get email from yestofar50@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

**CAUTION: Email is from an external source; Stop, Look, and Think before opening attachments or links.**

See below.

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** **Geoff Gilbert** [REDACTED]  
**Date:** Tue, Oct 1, 2024 at 2:39 PM  
**Subject:** Re: BCHD Comment: One Last Chance  
**To:** Stop BCHD <[stopbchd@gmail.com](mailto:stopbchd@gmail.com)>, [yestofar50@gmail.com](mailto:yestofar50@gmail.com) <[yestofar50@gmail.com](mailto:yestofar50@gmail.com)>

I support the Planning Commission's recommendation for a 0.5 FAR to general Public/Institutional (P/I) use. I do not support an increase to 1.25 FAR for all P/I use, since it would "upzone" every P/I parcel and create the potential for reckless development that is not consistent with neighborhood character and would not protect property values. Thank you.

--

StopBCHD.com ([StopBCHD@gmail.com](mailto:StopBCHD@gmail.com)) is a Neighborhood Quality-of-Life Community concerned about the quality-of-life, health, and economic damages that BCHDs 110-foot above the street, 800,000 sqft commercial development will inflict for the next 50-100 years. Our neighborhoods have been burdened since 1960 by the failed South Bay Hospital project and have not received the benefit of the voter-approved acute care public hospital since 1984. Yet we still suffer 100% of the damages and we will suffer 100% of the damages of BCHDs proposal.

**From:** [Support Far50](#)  
**To:** [Nils Nehrenheim](#); [Todd Loewenstein](#); [CityClerk](#)  
**Subject:** PUBLIC COMMENT - SUPPORT 0.5FAR for P/I. OPPOSE 1.25FAR for all P/I.  
**Date:** Tuesday, October 1, 2024 3:36:38 PM

---

Some people who received this message don't often get email from yestofar50@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

**CAUTION: Email is from an external source; Stop, Look, and Think before opening attachments or links.**

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** M. Nava [REDACTED]  
**Date:** Tue, Oct 1, 2024 at 11:00 AM  
**Subject:** Re: BCHD Comment: One Last Chance  
**To:** Stop BCHD <[stop.bchd@gmail.com](mailto:stop.bchd@gmail.com)>, [yestofar50@gmail.com](mailto:yestofar50@gmail.com) <[yestofar50@gmail.com](mailto:yestofar50@gmail.com)>

I support the Planning Commission's recommendation for a 0.5 FAR to general Public/Institutional (P/I) use. I do not support an increase to 1.25 FAR for all P/I use, since it would "upzone" every P/I parcel and create the potential for reckless development that is not consistent with neighborhood character and would not protect property values. Thank you.

Marcio

---

**From:** Stop BCHD <[stop.bchd@gmail.com](mailto:stop.bchd@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Monday, September 30, 2024 8:00 PM  
**To:** Stop BCHD <[stop.bchd@gmail.com](mailto:stop.bchd@gmail.com)>; [yestofar50@gmail.com](mailto:yestofar50@gmail.com) <[yestofar50@gmail.com](mailto:yestofar50@gmail.com)>  
**Subject:** BCHD Comment: One Last Chance

Hit Reply All to this email (or send an email to [YesToFAR50@gmail.com](mailto:YesToFAR50@gmail.com)) and we'll file the comment below on your behalf:

I support the Planning Commission's recommendation for a 0.5 FAR to general Public/Institutional (P/I) use. I do not support an increase to 1.25 FAR for all P/I use, since it would "upzone" every P/I parcel and create the potential for reckless development that is not consistent with neighborhood character and would not protect property values. Thank you.

--

StopBCHD.com ([StopBCHD@gmail.com](mailto:StopBCHD@gmail.com)) is a Neighborhood Quality-of-Life Community concerned about the quality-of-life, health, and economic damages that BCHDs 110-foot above the street, 800,000 sqft commercial development will inflict for the next 50-100 years. Our neighborhoods have been burdened since 1960 by the failed South Bay Hospital project and have not received the benefit of the voter-approved acute care public hospital since 1984. Yet we still suffer 100% of the damages and we will suffer 100% of the damages of

BCHDs proposal.

**From:** [Mark Nelson \(Home Gmail\)](#)  
**To:** [CityClerk](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment on the 10-1-24 Council Meeting  
**Date:** Wednesday, October 2, 2024 12:27:53 AM

---

***CAUTION: Email is from an external source; Stop, Look, and Think before opening attachments or links.***

Dency Nelson - Dency's comments were simply incorrect. Surrounding residents don't want BCHD proposed 110-foot above Beryl St, 800,000 sqft facility. Dency probably doesn't intend to cast misinformation, but his hearsay about what concerns residents have is simply gobbledygook.

Tom Bakaly - Started with an off color joke that bombed. Threatened to sue the City, yet again. Bakaly also spouted nonsense about fear and no project being proposed. BCHD is like a serial killer, it finds project proposals, kills them, and finds more. The current BCHD proposal on the table is 792,520 sqft, 83-feet above the BCHD mesa and 113-feet above Beryl street. BCHD cannot continue to propose enormous projects, file pre-CUP filings, and claim that the City doesn't know what the project is. BCHD has spent roughly \$1M on architects. Were they composing music? According to BCHD, they weren't proposing projects.

Vanessa Poster - BCHD has no proof that its program reduced childhood obesity as Poster claimed. In fact, the County stated that due to BCHDs failure to put a control group in place, no analysis of Livewell Kids is possible. Poster also defends that she's running unopposed - and apparently that's why BCHD spent \$400,000 on a November election? For three unopposed directors? Ugh.

**CAUTION: Email is from an external source. Stop, Look, and Think before opening attachments or links.**

BCHD's own audited financials show a declining asset balance. That's the definition of a structural deficit. Expenditures exceed revenues and require tapping the net position.

**Ending Net Position**

Net Investment in Capital Assets	24,157,514	23,675,147	22,754,628	22,572,806	21,873,088	21,620,650	22,183,078	23,560,593	25,790,291	27,548,720	30,214,396
Restricted	-	1,206,766	1,206,761	1,206,761	1,156,708	1,156,708	1,156,708	1,156,708	1,156,703	1,156,703	1,156,703
Unrestricted	39,828,027	36,587,345	36,510,867	36,943,947	37,258,663	36,595,718	37,970,631	36,183,501	31,033,044	28,434,703	24,439,860
	<b>63,985,541</b>	<b>61,469,258</b>	<b>60,472,256</b>	<b>60,723,514</b>	<b>60,288,459</b>	<b>59,373,076</b>	<b>61,310,417</b>	<b>60,900,802</b>	<b>57,980,938</b>	<b>57,140,126</b>	<b>55,810,959</b>

- 1) Beach Cities Health District implemented GASB Statement No. 75 requiring reporting the District's OPEB liability on the Financial Statement resulting in a retroactive restatement of Net Position
- 2) During the year ended June 30, 2019, the District corrected an error associated with the prior amortization of the Discount notes receivable discount.
- 3) Beach Cities Health District implemented GASB Statement No. 87 requiring reporting the District's Lease Receivable on the Financial Statements resulting in favorable net \$444,000 retroactive restatement of Net Position

**From:** [Mark Nelson \(Home Gmail\)](#)  
**To:** [CityClerk](#); [Communications](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment: BCHD  
**Date:** Wednesday, October 2, 2024 12:52:48 AM

---

**CAUTION: Email is from an external source; Stop, Look, and Think before opening attachments or links.**

From the ER

## Cold high ground

### Dear ER:

The burgeoning of Vanessa Poster’s “United Against Hate” signs is such a relief, in contrast to those yard signs supporting “Hate.” Oh wait. There are no “Hate” signs (“Sandbox,” ER September 26, 2024). Excuse my faux surprise, but the “United…” signs should come with their own Klieg lights and amplifiers to trumpet at all hours of the day and night the sign owner’s virtue. Poster inadvertently admits the irony of her blind spot: the signs have been posted in yards for nearly four years, but “hate” crimes and all those phobias continue to rise.

How is that possible? We have signs! We must need bigger signs? Maybe if the virtue signalers could tear themselves away from their latest vanity project/ad campaign and actually do the work — practice color blindness, getting kids off social media, foster resiliency, stop SEL, promote curriculum based learning, reduce psych therapies, read Abigail Shrier, stop confusing children with gender questions, and get rid of their ridiculous yard signs, hate might reduce. But, then folks like Vanessa Poster would have no drum to bang. There is a question from the Dowager character of “Downton Abbey” Maggie Smith, who just passed, I think is appropriate for Vanessa Poster and her cadres of feckless crusaders: “Do you need a coat? Because, it must be awfully chilly up there on that moral high ground?”

CWU

Manhattan Beach

**From:** [James Ecklund](#)  
**To:** [CityClerk](#); [Todd Loewenstein](#); [Zein Obagi](#); [Nils Nehrenheim](#); [Paige Kaluderovic](#); [Scott Behrendt](#)  
**Subject:** Subject: FAR  
**Date:** Tuesday, October 1, 2024 5:57:03 PM

---

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

***CAUTION: Email is from an external source; Stop, Look, and Think before opening attachments or links.***

---

Honorable Councilmembers,

I support the Planning Commission's recommendation for 0.5 FAR for P/I land use in order to match the density and character of surrounding light commercial and residential land uses.

I also support the 1.25 FAR for Public Safety (Fire and Police) land uses, as they directly service the areas where they are located and are mandatory services to Redondo Beach.

An increase to 1.25 FAR for all P/I land use would be highly damaging to the character and quality of life of the City & open a door for developers to exploit.

Please support the Planning Commission's recommendations for P/I (0.5) and Public Safety (1.25) FARs.

Thank you,

James Ecklund

**From:** [Stop BCHD](#)  
**To:** [CityClerk](#)  
**Subject:** SUPPORT 0.5 FAR for P/I Land Use (Oct 1, 2024 City Council Meeting)  
**Date:** Tuesday, October 1, 2024 4:24:31 PM

---

**CAUTION: Email is from an external source; Stop, Look, and Think before opening attachments or links.**

See comment below.

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** jonathan cole [REDACTED]  
**Date:** Tue, Oct 1, 2024 at 10:19 AM  
**Subject:** Fw: I SUPPORT 0.5 FAR for P/I Land Use (Oct 1, 2024 City Council Meeting)  
**To:** [cityclerk@redondo.org](mailto:cityclerk@redondo.org) <[cityclerk@redondo.org](mailto:cityclerk@redondo.org)>, Nils Nehrenheim <[nils.nehrenheim@redondo.org](mailto:nils.nehrenheim@redondo.org)>, [marc.wiener@redondo.org](mailto:marc.wiener@redondo.org) <[marc.wiener@redondo.org](mailto:marc.wiener@redondo.org)>, [paige.kaluderovic@redondo.org](mailto:paige.kaluderovic@redondo.org) <[paige.kaluderovic@redondo.org](mailto:paige.kaluderovic@redondo.org)>, Sean Scully <[sean.scully@redondo.org](mailto:sean.scully@redondo.org)>, [todd.loewenstein@redondo.org](mailto:todd.loewenstein@redondo.org) <[todd.loewenstein@redondo.org](mailto:todd.loewenstein@redondo.org)>, Zein Obagi <[zein.obagi@redondo.org](mailto:zein.obagi@redondo.org)>, [scott.behrendt@redondo.org](mailto:scott.behrendt@redondo.org) <[scott.behrendt@redondo.org](mailto:scott.behrendt@redondo.org)>, [stopbchd@gmail.com](mailto:stopbchd@gmail.com) <[stopbchd@gmail.com](mailto:stopbchd@gmail.com)>

I support the Planning Commission's recommendation for 0.5 FAR for P/I land use in order to match the density of surrounding light commercial and residential land uses. An increase to 1.25 FAR for all P/I land use would be highly damaging to the character and quality of life of the City.

To keep this easy, you can forward (with or without any personalization) THIS EMAIL to:

thank you

**From:** [Stop BCHD](#)  
**To:** [CityClerk](#)  
**Subject:** SUPPORT 0.5FAR, OPPOSE UPZONE OF P/I to 1.25FAR  
**Date:** Tuesday, October 1, 2024 6:08:51 PM

---

**CAUTION: Email is from an external source; Stop, Look, and Think before opening attachments or links.**

I support the Planning Commission's recommendation for a 0.5 FAR to general Public/Institutional (P/I) use. I do not support an increase to 1.25 FAR for all P/I use, since it would "upzone" every P/I parcel and create the potential for reckless development that is not consistent with neighborhood character and would not protect property values. Thank you.

sender below

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Date:** Tue, Oct 1, 2024 at 5:54 PM  
**Subject:** Re: BCHD Comment: One Last Chance  
**To:** Stop BCHD <[stop.bchd@gmail.com](mailto:stop.bchd@gmail.com)>, [yestofar50@gmail.com](mailto:yestofar50@gmail.com) <[yestofar50@gmail.com](mailto:yestofar50@gmail.com)>

On Monday, September 30, 2024 at 08:08:29 PM PDT, Stop BCHD <[stop.bchd@gmail.com](mailto:stop.bchd@gmail.com)> wrote:

Hit Reply All to this email (or send an email to [YesToFAR50@gmail.com](mailto:YesToFAR50@gmail.com)) and we'll file the comment below on your behalf:

I support the Planning Commission's recommendation for a 0.5 FAR to general Public/Institutional (P/I) use. I do not support an increase to 1.25 FAR for all P/I use, since it would "upzone" every P/I parcel and create the potential for reckless development that is not consistent with neighborhood character and would not protect property values. Thank you.

--

StopBCHD.com ([StopBCHD@gmail.com](mailto:StopBCHD@gmail.com)) is a Neighborhood Quality-of-Life Community concerned about the quality-of-life, health, and economic damages that BCHDs 110-foot above the street, 800,000 sqft commercial development will inflict for the next 50-100 years. Our neighborhoods have been burdened since 1960 by the failed South Bay Hospital project and have not received the benefit of the voter-approved acute care public hospital since 1984. Yet we still suffer 100% of the damages and we will suffer 100% of the damages of BCHDs proposal.

**From:** [Support Far50](#)  
**To:** [CityClerk](#)  
**Subject:** Support for Planning Commission's 0.5 FAR  
**Date:** Tuesday, October 1, 2024 9:36:54 PM

---

**CAUTION: Email is from an external source; Stop, Look, and Think before opening attachments or links.**

see below

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** Laura Zahn [REDACTED]  
**Date:** Tue, Oct 1, 2024 at 4:41 PM  
**Subject:** Support for Planning Commission's 0.5 FAR  
**To:** <[YesToFAR50@gmail.com](mailto:YesToFAR50@gmail.com)>

I support the Planning Commission's recommendation for a 0.5 FAR to General Public/Institutional (P/I) use. I do not support an increase to 1.25 FAR for all P/I use, since it would "upzone" every P/I parcel and create the potential for reckless development that is not consistent with the/a neighborhood character and would not protect property values.

Laura Zahn  
[REDACTED]  
Redondo Beach 90278  
Beneficiary of the Kay T Zahn Revocable Trust

Sent from my iPhone