

6th Cycle 2021-2029 Draft Housing Element – Public Comments and Responses
(Does not include comments/responses concerning associated environmental documents (ISND) or from/to State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD))

Date Comment Received	Commenter	Comment Summary	Draft Responses in progress and to be released prior to October 5, 2021 City Council Public Hearing
04.10.2021	Grace Peng, PhD, Resident	<p>Commented her concerns that HCD will reject the draft Housing Element and that the draft HE does not meet the requirements of Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) and produces disparate impacts. Offers alternatives.</p> <p>Comments and questions concerning why the City did not examine its past history. Notes that rules have changed since the fifth RHNA cycle and are publicly available.</p> <p>Notes multiple Federal, US Supreme Court, State, and Regional government sources of information related to provision of fair housing.</p> <p>Notes the importance of aerospace industry in North Redondo Beach and recommends not putting a housing overlay on the Industrial areas that support the aerospace industry.</p> <p>Comments that GPAC was guided by Environmental Justice. Notes data from CalEnviroScreen and cites that the proposed housing within an area bounded by Inglewood, Marine, Redondo Beach Ave, Manhattan Beach Ave and next to 405 freeway will be negatively impacted by pollution.</p> <p>Notes HCD would not support housing on the Northrop Grumman site and then assign the city a much higher housing target to reflect an expected low yield at this location.</p> <p>Claims that Redondo Beach still bears the marks of “20th century racist zoning and lending practices”. Cites a “mapping inequality” exhibit concerning lending practices and demographic data in support.</p>	<p>HCD’s September 2, 2021 letter has requested additional information concerning the North Tech District housing site and the contiguous small lot sites located along 190th and one small lot site on Pacific Coast Hwy. City staff continues to investigate these housing sites and has engaged property owners to confirm and, in some cases, reconfirm support for the identification of the subject properties as potential sites for future high density residential and/or mixed use. To date staff has confirmed significant interest from the property owner of the largest shopping center in the North Tech District for the future additional development of high density residential at this location. Additionally, none of the property owners of the small sites that city staff has been able to engage to date are opposed to the Residential Overlay designation on their properties. Staff is continuing to investigate these sites. Staff does not anticipate that HCD will not accept the proposed housing sites based upon the overwhelming interest by property owners for potential high density residential on the determined housing sites per the draft housing element.</p>

	<p>City should up zone all R1 zones to R2 or R3, and give incentives to combine lots for building even more densely.</p> <p>Cites a USC study that found in high rent areas a higher percentage of inclusionary (subsidized housing) can be supported.</p> <p>Notes that students living in the north tech area (Freeway) and transit center (South Galleria) housing sites will have to cross train tracks and at least one arterial roadway to get to elementary school. Claims this creates disparate pollution and traffic impacts on some residents. Comments on negative school impacts with plan.</p> <p>City should put housing above parking lot in Riviera Village and incentivize lot consolidation for mixed use in Riviera Village.</p> <p>Notes benefits of reducing segregation and includes a table with student economic and racial demographic information per school in Redondo Beach.</p> <p>Comments that AES power plant site should be developed with highest number of VLI/LI units in the City. Cites an environmental justice argument to support housing recommendation on AES site.</p> <p>Concludes with request that the City do better and more equitable zoning.</p> <p>Includes Appendixes with CalEnvironScreen data per City Census Tract, School Populations with Economic Data.</p>	<p>Any future redevelopment of high density residential within the North Tech District will be subject to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to address potential environmental impacts of a future project. Additionally, the current General Plan update will include an environmental justice analyses (as required by Senate Bill (SB) 1000) to address the potential for health effects in low-income communities and communities of color as they may apply. At the time of the future General Plan Amendment for the application of the Residential Overlay designation the environmental justice issues will be addressed and mitigation as required determined through the associated environmental analysis.</p> <p>No Northrop Grumman properties are included as future housing sites.</p> <p>The General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC), Planning Commission, and City Council conducted multiple public meetings over many months concerning housing sites at locations throughout the City. After carefully considering the public's input and the hundreds of comments/requests received, the City Council at their public meeting on June 15, 2021 approved the housing sites as identified within the draft housing element.</p>
--	--	---

04.12.2021	Therese Mufic Neustaedter	<p>Comments that Redondo Beach is “gaming” the Housing Element Update. Comments that RB downzoned southern part of town and added homes to northern end of town. Commenter questions putting housing overlays on northern industrial area next to freeway and between other busy roadways. Commenter attached letter with comments on Draft Housing Element from Grace Peng, PhD dated April 10, 2021.</p>	<p>The City’s existing residential density in the southern part of the City is the densest. Proposed “housing sites” for potential future high density residential were not necessarily based on existing density but rather on multiple State criteria and proximity to existing and future transit locations. It is noteworthy that even with the addition of the recommended housing sites in the northern area of the City, the city’s overall highest density remains within the southern area of the City.</p> <p>See responses above to commenter Grace Peng, PhD.</p>
05.11.2021	RUTAN & TUCKER, LLP, Attorneys representing fee owners of the 50-acre site on which AES operates	<p>Comments on Planning Commission’s vote, 5 to 2, in favor of mixed use allowing 30 dwelling units per acre for up to 50% of the Power Plant site. The property owner of the site agrees with Planning Commission’s recommendation.</p> <p>Comments on current status of the AES Power Plant permits to operate per the California State Water Resources Control Board.</p> <p>Comments on property owners plans for re-use of the Power Plant site.</p> <p>Notes that owner is wants to discuss with City Council the recommended re-use of the site for mixed use development of 30 DU/AC. Power plant site represents prototypical “underutilized” property that State Law has determined should be made available for future development.</p> <p>Comments that owner has developed a plan for closure and clearing of the site by 2027. Could have approximately half the site developed with residential by late 2025.</p>	<p>The General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC), Planning Commission, and City Council conducted multiple public meetings over many months concerning housing sites at locations throughout the City. After carefully considering the public’s input and the hundreds of comments/requests received, the City Council at their public meeting on June 15, 2021 approved the housing sites as identified within the draft housing element.</p> <p>The property owner of the largest shopping center in the North Tech District has expressed enthusiastic support for the allowance of high density residential on their property while maintaining their existing commercial center. Additionally, the property owner has recent experience with</p>

		<p>Comments that North Tech area site is less suitable for redevelopment and may not qualify due to the following: Proximity to freeway and adjacent industrial uses; Opposition by Northrup Grumman; eliminating commercial and industrial areas reducing local jobs and tax base; staggered leases which may make some areas unavailable; and elimination of last mile distribution of goods movement facilities.</p> <p>Comments that Power Plant site is superior location for large commercial or mixed-use campus that held remedy City jobs/housing imbalance. Owners contemplating:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 750 residential units • 300 key hotel • 750,000 sf of office (20% studio/production space) • 150,000 sf of retail, restaurant and event space 	<p>introducing high density residential within existing older shopping centers that retain existing commercial and are located in close proximity to freeways.</p> <p>Northrop Grumman has not expressed any opposition to the introduction of the proposed residential overlay on the North Tech District site.</p>
05.11.2021	RUTAN & TUCKER, LLP, Attorneys representing fee owners of 1021 N. Harbor	<p>Comments that this property, 1021 N. Harbor is a suitable housing site surrounded by other high density residential developed sites.</p> <p>Property owner requests that the City Council allow for residential uses at a density of no less than 30 DU/AC.</p>	<p>The General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC), Planning Commission, and City Council conducted multiple public meetings over many months concerning public housing sites at locations throughout the City. After carefully considering the public's input and the hundreds of comments/requests received, the City Council at their public meeting on June 15, 2021 approved the housing sites as identified within the draft housing element.</p>
05.20.2021	Anthony Dedousis, Director, Policy and Research, Abundant Housing LA (Letter submitted on	<p>Abundant Housing LA is a pro-housing, nonprofit advocacy organization. YIMBY Law's mission to make housing in CA more accessible and affordable through enforcement of state housing law.</p> <p>Cites major concerns about the City's willingness and ability to meet its state-mandate RHNA target of 2,490 homes by 2029. Claim that site inventory is inconsistent with HCD instructions and affirmatively further fair housing requirements under Assembly Bill 686.</p>	<p>HCD's September 2, 2021 letter has requested additional information concerning the North Tech District housing site and the contiguous small lot sites located along 190th and one small lot site on Pacific Coast Hwy. City staff continues to investigate these housing sites and has engaged property owners to confirm and, in some cases, reconfirm support for the identification of</p>

	<p>behalf of Abundant Housing LA and YIMBY Law)</p>	<p>City fails to identify enough sites where RHNA housing growth can be accommodated by 2029.</p> <p>City’s approach fails on three counts:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The City proposes new housing in locations where it is highly unlikely to be built. 2. The City does not encourage new housing in locations where it is likely to be built. Leave the City’s underutilized land as-is. 3. The City bans new mixed-use development in locations where it has successfully been built in recent years. <p>1. Unlikely that the City’s rezoning plan will encourage meaningful housing growth.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area bounded by Marine, Inglewood, Manhattan Beach, and Redondo Beach Boulevards – Not a credible site as Northrop Grumman is very unlikely to vacate Space Park over next 8 years. • Galleria District - Since the Galleria District developer is planning housing the remainder Galleria area should also be allowed to provide additional residential development. Instead City plans to allow additional residential development on surrounding properties, but those property owners have shown no interest in residential development. <p>City failed to provide convincing evidence that redevelopment of above sites is likely to happen.</p> <p>2. The City overlooks a large number of potential housing sites, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The AES site (51 Acres). New owner proposes office, hotel, and retail and no residential. If entire site is built at 55 units per acre nearly all of RB’s RHNA could be accommodated. • The former South Bay Medical Center (9.3 acres). Site should provide additional housing at 55 units per acre. • Beachside parking lots (24 acres). Should be developed with residential, similar to Marina Del Rey. • The Space Park and Aviation Park parking lots (62 acres). Northrop Grumman parking lots should be developed with residential. 	<p>the subject properties as potential sites for future high density residential and/or mixed use. To date staff has confirmed significant interest from the property owner of the largest shopping center in the North Tech District for the future additional development of high density residential at this location. Additionally, none of the property owners of the small sites that city staff has been able to engage to date are opposed to the Residential Overlay designation on their properties. Staff is continuing to investigate these sites. Staff does not anticipate that HCD will not accept the proposed housing sites based upon the overwhelming interest by property owners for potential high density residential on the determined housing sites per the draft housing element.</p> <p>As noted, none of the property owners of the proposed housing sites have expressed opposition to the potential future development of high density residential on their properties. Additionally, some of the subject property owners have experience with the “densification” of other properties they own/control that have existing commercial development.</p> <p>Mixed-use land designations are being maintained on properties with existing mixed-use developments as well as in</p>
--	---	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Riviera Village parking lots. Should be developed with 60 or 215 units. • The west side of the Redondo Beach Transit Center. Maximum legal density should be allowed on all parcels within a half-mile of station. <p>3. The City plans to reduce the amount of development in areas where housing “pencils out”. Claims the City violates “no net loss” requirements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The South Bay Galleria should allow for more residential. The City’s up zoning of surrounding parcels is not feasible as those landowners have shown no interest in building housing. • Pacific Coast Highway. The City has banned new mixed-use development along PCH and moving housing a mile to the north. • Artesia Boulevard. The City proposes to ban new apartment buildings along Artesia. To replace this capacity, City plans to redevelop two commercial plots along 190th, at Mary Anne and Meyer. <p>The City’s approach to updating the housing element does not affirmatively further fair housing and reverse existing patterns of residential segregation. The City must address the issue of residential segregation by accommodating the lower-income RHNA targets in a way that conforms with AFFH requirements.</p> <p>The City should commit to major constraint removal policies in order to encourage strong housing growth at all levels of income including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legalize apartments on all residentially zoned parcels including R-1. • Significantly up zone parcels near transit, job centers, schools, and parks. • Legalize by-right residential and mixed-use development on commercially zoned parcels. • Pre-approval of standard ADUs. • Introduce density bonus program near mass transit. • Establish small lot subdivision program similar to City of LA. • Establish a fast-ministerial review process to approve new multifamily buildings. • Citywide elimination of on-site minimum parking mandates. • More flexibility on height, floor-area ratio, and lot coverage. 	<p>locations in proximity to many of these developed sites.</p> <p>The General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC), Planning Commission, and City Council conducted multiple public meetings over many months concerning housing sites at locations throughout the City. After carefully considering the public’s input and the hundreds of comments/requests received, the City Council at their public meeting on June 15, 2021 approved the housing sites as identified within the draft housing element.</p> <p>The Housing Programs identified in the draft housing element specifically target the assessment and, if necessary, removal of governmental constraints concerning housing. Additionally, as proposed, the housing sites with the highest potential residential capacity are all within close proximity to existing and proposed transit centers. Recent changes in State housing laws, Senate Bill (SB) 9, allow for the subdivision of R-1/small lots.</p>
--	---	--

06.01.2021	Jon Wizard, Policy Director, Campaign for Fair Housing Elements, YIMBY Law	Requests that the City consider Redondo Beach resident and third-party commenter Dr. Grace Peng's comments. To date the majority of the City Council has been unresponsive to Dr. Peng's input this far. Cites Dr. Pang's letter dated	See responses above to commenter Grace Peng, PhD.
07.09.2021	Bill Maher, Realtor	The owners of the property located at 306-312 S. Catalina Avenue would like to have their property considered for multi-family or mixed-use development.	The General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC), Planning Commission, and City Council conducted multiple public meetings over many months concerning housing sites at locations throughout the City. After carefully considering the public's input and the hundreds of comments/requests received, the City Council at their public meeting on June 15, 2021 approved the housing sites as identified within the draft housing element.
07.09.2021	Bob Pinzler, Resident	Percentage share of Married with children in 2019 should be 23% not 29%.	The statistics as provided are consistent with most current credible data sets.
07.11.2021	Barbara Epstein, Resident	<p>Hopes planning process is protected from special commercial interests and "ill-conceived state government requirements".</p> <p>Most important thing in planning is "greening up" of Redondo.</p> <p>Claims past city governments have catered to special developer interests, resulting in inadequate yards/setbacks on residential lots and no space for beneficial trees and plants to capture carbon and water, beautify neighborhoods, provide oxygen, and cool the atmosphere.</p> <p>Require ample green space, parkland, and trees with every residential building permit.</p>	<p>The Draft Housing Element is required to comply with State housing laws. An ongoing review process is underway with the State's Department of Housing and Community Development to ensure the City's housing element is ultimately compliant with applicable State housing laws.</p> <p>The issue of "greening up" will be addressed as part of the ongoing updates to the City's Land Use and Open Space and Conservation, and Parks and Recreation Elements of the General Plan.</p>

		Supports a proposed development on Catalina Avenue between Diamond and Emerald Streets that preserves the café and adds a bakery. Notes that the development is also overcrowded. Suggests additional development standards including planting native plant species for this proposed development. Offered South Bay Parkland Conservancy as a resource.	The General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC), Planning Commission, and City Council conducted multiple public meetings over many months concerning housing sites at locations throughout the City. After carefully considering the public's input and the hundreds of comments/requests received, the City Council at their public meeting on June 15, 2021 approved the housing sites as identified within the draft housing element.
07.26.2021	Nancy Skiba, Resident	"Affordable housing for 90277 and 90278 should be equally planned."	The General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC), Planning Commission, and City Council conducted multiple public meetings over many months concerning housing sites at locations throughout the City. After carefully considering the public's input and the hundreds of comments/requests received, the City Council at their public meeting on June 15, 2021 approved the housing sites as identified within the draft housing element.
08.06.2021	Mark Nelson	Commented on the City's associated environmental document for the HE update.	The City formally responded to these comments on the associated environmental document and they were included in the final environmental document.
08.23.2021	Laura Emdee, Resident (Council Person)	"If the Housing Element has been sent to HCD, what are the purpose of the comments? Where will they go and to what purpose?"	In HCD's continued discussions with City as well as in their correspondence dated September 2, 2021, HCD has emphasized Government Code Section 65583, which requires local governments to make a diligent effort to achieve public participation from all economic segments of the community in the development of the City's

			<p>housing element. Specifically, HCD commented... “The City must proactively make future revisions available to the public, including any commenters, prior to submitting any revisions to HCD and diligently consider and address comments, including revising the document where appropriate. HCD’s future review will consider the extent to which the revised element demonstrates that the City solicited, considered, and addressed public comments in the element.”</p> <p>All comments should be addressed to the City for further consideration as the City continues to confirm the housing element complies with State laws as they pertain to this matter.</p>
08.24.2021	Natalie Bennion, Resident	<p>“North Redondo Beach is already doing it’s share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50-acre power plant site.”</p>	<p>The General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC), Planning Commission, and City Council conducted multiple public meetings over many months concerning housing sites at locations throughout the City. After carefully considering the public’s input and the hundreds of comments/requests received, the City Council at their public meeting on June 15, 2021 approved the housing sites as identified within the draft housing element.</p>
08.25.2021	Leonid Pustilnikov, Property Owner	<p>Claims the City of Redondo Beach has spent the last generation fighting development. Cites the Legado Project development review process in support of claim.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Originally planned for 180 units, was approved for 115 units. • Still awaiting permits more than a decade later. 	<p>Permits have been issued for the Legado Project.</p> <p>Concerning the comments regarding the probability of residential development</p>

	<p>Notes surprise that Redondo completed 40% (559 of 1,397) of its required 5th Cycle.</p> <p>In order to meet 6th Cycle goal commenter recommends the City be proactive and update its zoning throughout the City. Notes that City’s proposed solution puts 49% of housing at the city’s edge. Claims all housing overlay sites are adjacent to other, less affluent jurisdictions. Claims probability of any units in the proposed housing overlay areas is “extremely low” and cites the following claims in support of assertion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • North Tech site. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A business in Redondo Beach since 1985 has no intentions of relocating or shutting down. ○ A grocery anchored shopping center with 100% occupancy (17 tenants) has no plans of selling or repositioning the property. ○ A national plumbing fixture showroom located at site for years. ○ Any residential development would pose a serious adverse health impacts on its residents. • South Transit Center site. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Property recently purchased in 2019 and as currently planned does not include housing. • South Bay Galleria site. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Sought entitlements for 650 units and was approved for on 300 units. ○ Claims that due to “covid pandemic” significant changes to the project are likely and will take years to resolve. <p>Claims Redondo Beach is not “serious about housing” as evidenced by residential overlays instead of rezoning sites exclusively for residential. Cites the reason for residential overlays is to avoid “vocal protest” from property owners.</p> <p>Comments that currently proposed housing sites create the illusion of housing and ignores changes to most of the city. More suitable solutions in and around affluent parts of the city were not considered.</p>	<p>potential of the recommended housing sites, during the 6th cycle, the following is provided:</p> <p>North Tech site – The property owner of the largest shopping center in the North Tech District has expressed enthusiastic support for the allowance of high density residential on their property while maintaining their existing commercial center. Additionally, the property owner has recent experience with introducing high density residential within existing older shopping centers that retain existing commercial and are located in close proximity to freeways.</p> <p>South Transit Center site – City staff continues to investigate this site and has engaged the property owner(s) to confirm and, in this case, reconfirm support for the identification of the subject property as potential sites for future high density residential and/or mixed use. Staff does not anticipate that HCD will not accept the proposed housing site at the South Transit Center as they did not request additional information regarding this property. Finally concerning this site, during the many GPAC meetings specific interest from representatives of this site requested that the GPAC recommend this site for high density residential, citing the site’s close proximity to the City’s Transit Center under</p>
--	--	--

		<p>Cited appropriate alternative locations for exclusively residential or mixed-use development that are adjacent to parks, bike paths, beaches and harbors and developments ranging from 17.5 to 120 units per acre but not considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1-acre site at 1021 N. Harbor. • 50-acre power plant at 1100 N. Harbor. <p>Notes Planning Commission’s recommendation for 50% of power plant site be zoned at 30 dwelling units per acre. Notes City Council chose other areas for housing and ignored power plant site that commenter claims are not suitable sites that will never be developed.</p> <p>Notes as the property owner of 1021 N. Harbor and 1100 N. Harbor that he has studies and reports confirming housing could be built on the site within the 6th cycle, is eager to build housing, and is currently cleaning and remediating 1100 N. Harbor in anticipation of its closure on or before December 31, 2023. Claims that the City deemed 1021 and 1100 N. Harbor unsuitable because “the city knew it would mean real housing units”.</p> <p>Strongly urges HCD to reject the housing element as drafted. Requests that the city obtain commitments from property owners of the designated housing sites demonstrating their commitment, support, and willingness to pursue residential development. Comments that city should be fairer to its electorate and spread development throughout the city and that housing is better suited nearer to parks and space rather than freeways and industrial centers.</p>	<p>construction and the future planned Metro station.</p> <p>To date staff has confirmed interest from many of the property owners of the recommended housing sites for the application of a high-density Residential Overlay designation on their properties. Additionally, none of the property owners of the sites that city staff has been able to engage to date are opposed to the Residential Overlay designation on their properties.</p> <p>Staff does not anticipate that HCD will not accept any of the proposed housing sites.</p> <p>The General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC), Planning Commission, and City Council conducted multiple public meetings over many months concerning housing sites at locations throughout the City, including the 50-acre Power Plant site. After carefully considering the public’s input and the hundreds of comments/requests received, the City Council at their public meeting on June 15, 2021 approved the housing sites as identified within the draft housing element.</p>
08.26.2021	Melissa K. Dagodag, Attorney representing a North Redondo	<p>Comments that best place to build high density housing is on the 50-acre Power Plant site. Don’t put housing on sites that are bad for community when there are large parcels next to beach, bike path, parks.</p>	<p>The General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC), Planning Commission, and City Council conducted multiple public meetings over many months concerning housing sites at locations throughout the City, including the 50-acre Power Plant site. After carefully</p>

	Beach resident (Golden Hills neighborhood)		considering the public's input and the hundreds of comments/requests received, the City Council at their public meeting on June 15, 2021 approved the housing sites as identified within the draft housing element.
08.30.2021	CalTrans	Commented on the City's associated environmental document for the HE update.	The City formally responded to these comments on the associated environmental document and they were included in the final environmental document.
08.31.2021	Sheila Lamb, resident (GPAC Member)	<p>General: Requests that new additions to housing element be identified.</p> <p>Comments on the following Sections requesting clarifications, some additional information, edits in language, and challenging various conclusions and claims that the cited information is incorrect within the document:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 2.2.1 Introduction (Page 1). • Section 2.2.1C Public Participation (Page 2). • Section 2.2.2D Homeless Resources (Page 22). • Section 2.2.2E Table H22 Single family attached units (Page 24). • Section 2.2.3A Constraints on Housing Production-Government Constraints (Page 34). • Section 2.2.3A4 Tables H35-36 Provision for a Variety of Housing Types (Pages 41-42). • Section 2.2.3A4 Provision for a Variety of Housing Types-Zoning and Land Use (Pages 46-47). • Section 2.2.3A4 Provision for a Variety of Housing Types-Senior Housing (Page 48). • Section 2.2.3A4 Provision for a Variety of Housing Types-Emergency Shelters, Transitional Housing, Supportive Housing, SRO's (Page 48). • Section 2.2.3B5 Liquefaction (Page 61). • Section 2.2.3B Flooding (Page 61-64). • Fig. H2/H3 Sites Inventory (Pages 75-76). • Appendix C Public Participation (Page C-1). • Add Appendix-List of legislation mentioned in the text. • Add Appendix-List of zoning amendments in the text. 	At their meeting on September 16, 2021, the City's Planning Commission carefully considered these comments, in addition to many other comments, and determined that some should be addressed as revisions/edits to the proposed draft housing element. For example, figures (bar charts) were added to the draft housing element which illustrate the City's unique housing mix, with more percentage of residential land area designated as multi-family zoning rather than single-family zoning, in comparison to surrounding jurisdictions and the SCAG region overall.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add Additional Numbers-More easily search the document. 	
09.02.2021	Brian Clark, Resident (Golden Hills neighborhood)	<p>Raised four (4) main concerns with the Housing Element:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Housing Element does not mention the GLBTQIA+ community and requests that the document identify and count this community and include specialized support resources that other segments of the population have been given. 2. Commenter does not support the placement of the majority of housing in North Redondo and most specifically the housing adjacent to the 405 freeway (North Tech District). Cites health and well-being concerns for persons having to live next to the 405 freeway. 3. Commenter concerned with over-densifying the Northern-most corner of the City, citing that it will be too impactful a change in one area. Prefers that development be more evenly spread throughout the City on smaller parcels. Comments on inequity of plan to locate high density in one area and leave other others unchanged. 4. Commented that during the City Council debates concerning the land plan some viewpoints were overlooked, consensus was not gained, and minority voices were disregarded. 	<p>The City continues to review the comment concerning the GLBTQIA+ community and whether additional considerations are necessary to include in the draft housing element.</p> <p>Any future redevelopment of high density residential within the North Tech District will be subject to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to address potential environmental impacts of a future project. Additionally, the current General Plan update will include an environmental justice analyses (as required by Senate Bill (SB) 1000) to address the potential for health effects in low-income communities and communities of color as they may apply. At the time of the future General Plan Amendment for the application of the Residential Overlay designation, the environmental justice issues will be addressed and mitigation as required to be determined through the associated environmental analysis will be applied.</p> <p>The City’s existing residential density in the southern part of the City is the densest. Proposed “housing sites” for potential future high density residential were not necessarily based on existing density but rather on multiple State criteria and proximity to existing and future transit locations. It is noteworthy that even with</p>

			<p>the addition of the recommended housing sites in the northern area of the City, the city's overall highest residential density remains within the southern area of the City.</p> <p>The General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC), Planning Commission, and City Council conducted multiple public meetings over many months concerning housing sites at locations throughout the City. After carefully considering the public's input and the hundreds of comments/requests received, the City Council at their public meeting on June 15, 2021 approved the housing sites as identified within the draft housing element.</p>
09.02.2021	Dan Elder, Resident	<p>Commented that the overwhelming feedback from residents and the Planning Commission was ignored by City Council in identifying the Residential Overlays for the required RHNA housing locations. Cites that nearly every RHNA housing sites are in North Redondo Beach which will place a significant burden on infrastructure. Supports a more balanced approach for locating housing as identified by residents at multiple meetings.</p>	<p>The General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC), Planning Commission, and City Council conducted multiple public meetings over many months concerning housing sites at locations throughout the City. After carefully considering the public's input and the hundreds of comments/requests received, the City Council at their public meeting on June 15, 2021 approved the housing sites as identified within the draft housing element.</p>
09.02.2021	Barbara Epstein, Resident	<p>Commenter supports the preservation and creation of as much open space and parkland as possible in the City. Cites too much density existing in support of this comment. Comments desire to increase tree canopy for healthier air quality, carbon capture, shade, habitat and beauty in every neighborhood.</p>	<p>The issue of "open space and parkland" will be addressed as part of the ongoing updates to the City's Land Use and Open Space and Conservation, and Parks and Recreation Elements of the General Plan.</p>
09.02.2021	Gregory McGinity,	<p>Strongly urges the City Council and Planning Commission to reject the 2021-2029 Housing Element. Cites severe lack of water. City should implement</p>	<p>The actual changes in land use designations to accommodate the recommended housing</p>

	Resident	<p>system similar to City of Cambria, which does not allow additional housing without additional water. Recommends “growth management” ordinance.</p> <p>Commenter does not believe the City has enough water to accommodate the City’s housing needs through 2040. Comments that water rationing now is necessary.</p> <p>Commenter cites NASA and IPCC concerning impacts of climate change in the future and its furtherance of water shortage for City.</p> <p>Comments on uncertainty of future supplies from State Water Project and the Colorado River Aqueduct which supply nearly 50% of water purveyors sources.</p> <p>Commenter further specified water resource details concerning State Water Project and Colorado River water supplies and cites the crises facing both of these sources.</p> <p>Provides additional comments and sources concerning climate change, Sierra Nevada snowpack issues, and other water resources shortages, and concludes that because of all data the commenter cites, it seems unlikely that current and certainly future water needs can be met, and therefor the City should reject the plan.</p>	<p>sites will be executed with the update to the City’s Land Use Element of the General Plan. At that time a comprehensive environmental analysis compliant with CEQA will be conducted. The environmental impact report will include an assessment of water resources and impacts of climate change and mitigation as necessary will be identified.</p>
09.03.2021	Chris Ahearn, Resident - Homeowner	<p>Comments that it is very difficult to see the maps of the draft plan. City emailed copies but the quality was similarly poor. Because of the poor-quality plan commenter does not feel he has enough information to comment. Document does not specifically answer how this plan will affect current homeowners and it should.</p>	<p>The commenter is invited to visit City Hall to meet and confer in person. Plans can be enlarged and provided as necessary.</p>
09.03.2021	Peter Aziz, Resident	<p>Comments that the housing needs to be equally distributed throughout all of Redondo Beach, not just one or two of the densest districts. Comments that public input was ignored. Disagrees with location of housing near the freeway, citing poor air quality and poor quality of life.</p>	<p>The City’s existing residential density in the southern part of the City is the densest. Proposed “housing sites” for potential future high density residential were not necessarily based on existing density but rather on multiple State criteria and</p>

		<p>Included multiple links to articles concerning poor air quality and negative health affects for residents of housing near freeways.</p> <p>Requests that the housing near the freeway be removed from the plan and distributed equally throughout the City.</p>	<p>proximity to existing and future transit locations. It is noteworthy that even with the addition of the recommended housing sites in the northern area of the City, the city's overall highest residential density remains within the southern area of the City.</p> <p>Any future redevelopment of high density residential within the North Tech District will be subject to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to address potential environmental impacts of a future project. Additionally, the current General Plan update will include an environmental justice analyses (as required by Senate Bill (SB) 1000) to address the potential for health effects in low-income communities and communities of color as they may apply. At the time of the future General Plan Amendment for the application of the Residential Overlay designation the environmental justice issues will be addressed and mitigation as required determined through the associated environmental analysis will be applied.</p> <p>The General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC), Planning Commission, and City Council conducted multiple public meetings over many months concerning housing sites at locations throughout the City. After carefully considering the public's input and the hundreds of comments/requests received, the City Council at their public</p>
--	--	--	---

			meeting on June 15, 2021 approved the housing sites as identified within the draft housing element.
09.03.2021	Alisa Beeli, Resident	<p>Strongly urges the City to reject the Housing Element plan and cites the following in support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nearly 94% of required units in the North/90278 zip code • Places nearly all new zones (residential high density overlays) on edges of City • All overlay zones are adjacent to less affluent areas of the City • North Tech district property owner have no plans to relocate existing commercial tenants and its location adjacent to 405 Freeway is a serious health risk • Alternative options for housing were not considered, 1021 and 1100 North Harbor Drive, and should be as they are next to parks, bike paths, the beach and Planning Commission recommended the 1100 North Harbor Drive location. • Based on only developing 40% of 5th Cycle RHNA housing, developing 2,490 is unlikely without updating zoning throughout the City. <p>Placing majority of new housing in North Redondo/90278 near freeways and industrial areas is not realistic or equitable. Cites concerns with traffic and overcrowding of schools in North Redondo.</p> <p>Concerned that hundreds of public comments were ignored and housing should be better distributed throughout the entire City.</p>	<p>The City's existing residential density in the southern part of the City is the densest. Proposed "housing sites" for potential future high density residential were not necessarily based on existing density but rather on multiple State criteria and proximity to existing and future transit locations. It is noteworthy that even with the addition of the recommended housing sites in the northern area of the City, the city's overall highest residential density remains within the southern area of the City.</p> <p>North Tech site – The property owner of the largest shopping center in the North Tech District has expressed enthusiastic support for the allowance of high density residential on their property while maintaining their existing commercial center. Additionally, the property owner has recent experience with introducing high density residential within existing older shopping centers that retain existing commercial and are located in close proximity to freeways.</p> <p>Any future redevelopment of high density residential within the any of the proposed housing sites will be subject to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to address potential environmental impacts of</p>

			<p>a future project. Additionally, the current General Plan update will include an environmental justice analyses (as required by Senate Bill (SB) 1000) to address the potential for health effects in low-income communities and communities of color as they may apply. At the time of the future General Plan Amendment for the application of the Residential Overlay designation, the environmental justice issues will be addressed and mitigation as required to be determined through the associated environmental analysis will be applied.</p> <p>The General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC), Planning Commission, and City Council conducted multiple public meetings over many months concerning housing sites at locations throughout the City, including 1021 and 1100 North Harbor Drive sites. After carefully considering the public's input and the hundreds of comments/requests received, the City Council at their public meeting on June 15, 2021 approved the housing sites as identified within the draft housing element.</p>
09.03.2021	Mariam P. Butler, Resident	Requests that housing/low income housing be evenly distributed throughout the City to minimize impacts to one district. D4 is already very dense and cannot accept the majority of housing. Impacts on schools and resources need to be considered.	The City's existing residential density in the southern part of the City is the densest. Proposed "housing sites" for potential future high density residential were not necessarily based on existing density but rather on multiple State criteria and proximity to existing and future transit locations. It is noteworthy that even with

			<p>the addition of the recommended housing sites in the northern area of the City, the city's overall highest residential density remains within the southern area of the City.</p> <p>The General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC), Planning Commission, and City Council conducted multiple public meetings over many months concerning housing sites at locations throughout the City. After carefully considering the public's input and the hundreds of comments/requests received, the City Council at their public meeting on June 15, 2021 approved the housing sites as identified within the draft housing element.</p> <p>Any future redevelopment of high density residential within the any of the proposed housing sites will be subject to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to address potential environmental impacts of a future project. Additionally, the current General Plan update will include an environmental justice analyses (as required by Senate Bill (SB) 1000) to address the potential for health effects in low-income communities and communities of color as they may apply. At the time of the future General Plan Amendment for the application of the Residential Overlay designation, the environmental justice issues will be addressed and mitigation as required to be</p>
--	--	--	--

			determined through the associated environmental analysis will be applied.
09.03.2021	Tieira	<p>Comments that the City must build more affordable housing in all Redondo Beach neighborhoods. All deserve safe, clean and affordable housing. Comments on Segregation and negative impacts on lower-income and black populations.</p> <p>Comments that not providing affordable housing has negative impacts. Notes that LA County residents have been requesting more affordable housing for 10 years.</p> <p>Comments that poverty is a failed policy and that we must build more housing in all communities in Redondo Beach, especially in single family zones.</p>	<p>The City is currently investigating the development of an “inclusionary housing” ordinance that could serve to further the City’s intentions to build more affordable housing throughout the City at locations in addition to the recommended housing sites in the draft housing element. The City’s development of an “inclusionary housing” ordinance is outlined in Program 3 of the draft housing element.</p> <p>Additionally, the current General Plan update will include an environmental justice analyses (as required by Senate Bill (SB) 1000) to address the potential for health effects in low-income communities and communities of color as they may apply. At the time of the future General Plan Amendment for the application of the Residential Overlay designation, the environmental justice issues will be addressed and mitigation as required to be determined through the associated environmental analysis will be applied.</p> <p>Recent changes in State housing laws, Senate Bill (SB) 9, allow for the subdivision of R-1/small lots.</p>
09.03.2021	Marianne Teola, Resident	Comments on the thoroughness and significant research went into the document. Expressed disappointment with short notice for providing comments, received email day before comments due. Suggests that a summary of the main points of the Housing Element be attached to the	Due to the length of time that it took the State (HCD) and the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAGs) (and its member jurisdictions including the City of

		<p>element. Asks the question, how will the City be impacted by the recommendations in the element?</p> <p>Comments on the difference between a single-family residence in District 1 vs. District 3. Questions the allowance of “third floors” in single family residences. Requests that a zoom meeting with the average citizen be scheduled to discuss the plan. Asks questions about the Beach Cities Health District.</p>	<p>Redondo Beach) to complete the 6th Cycle Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) process, inclusive of the appeal process, coupled with the State’s 60 day review period and deadline for adoption of the City’s housing element, October 15, 2021, the schedule for engaging the public was severely compressed. The City plans to continue the public engagement process through and beyond the adoption process to ensure compliance with State law on this matter.</p> <p>The “Administrative Reports” for both the September 16, 2021 Planning Commission public hearing as well as the City Council’s October 5, 2021 public hearing includes comprehensive summaries of the housing element and are linked to the City’s PLANredondo webpage.</p> <p>The City’s public hearings are accessible to all interested parties and opportunities for questions and comments were afforded to the public during said meetings. Additional future meetings on the housing element will be advertised and open to the public.</p> <p>Any concerns with zoning development standards, “third floors” can be addressed to the City’s GPAC as they continue to review the update to the City’s General Plan Land Use Element. Information of past and</p>
--	--	---	---

			upcoming meetings of the GPAC are on the City's PLANredondo webpage.
09.13.2021	Mark Nelson, Resident – BCHD Volunteer	Comments on "Planning Commission Resolution No. 2021-**-PCR-**" citing an inaccuracy regarding outreach. Provides additional comments on the BCHD entity, their proposed project and their project review process to date.	<p>The General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC), Planning Commission, and City Council conducted multiple public meetings over many months concerning housing sites at locations throughout the City. After carefully considering the public's input and the hundreds of comments/requests received, the City Council at their public meeting on June 15, 2021 approved the housing sites as identified within the draft housing element.</p> <p>The Beach City's Health District (BCHD's) planned project will require entitlements to be issued by the City prior to its development at which time additional analysis and reviews will be conducted by the City including taking public testimony/input/questions.</p>
09.13.2021	Mike Martin	Comments on the Land Use Category Descriptions for Public/Institutional (PI), Public/Utility (U), and Parks and Open Space (OS) descriptions.	Any concerns with Land Use Category Descriptions and standards concerning Public/Institutional (PI), Public/Utility (U), and Parks and Open Space (OS) descriptions, can be addressed to the City's GPAC as they continue to review the update to the City's General Plan Land Use Element and Parks, Recreation, Open Space and Conservation Elements. Information of past and upcoming meetings of the GPAC are on the City's PLANredondo webpage.
09.14.2021	Our Future LA,	Commenter provides multiple statistics concerning Black and Latino housing issues and attributes the effects to "decades of racist policies" that still	The City's Affirmative Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) appendix of the City's draft

<p>Steering Committee Members</p>	<p>remain. Cites restrictive covenants, exclusionary zoning, redlining, the California Constitution’s Article 34 and local “crime-free housing” policies as contributing towards racial divisions.</p> <p>Commenter presents disproportionate statistics concerning COVID and cites overcrowding in Black and Latino neighborhoods as reasons for higher infection/death rates.</p> <p>Commenter cites that LA County ranks last in the US in terms of housing affordability, overcrowding, and homelessness. States that lower-income Black, Latino and AAPI families are being pushed out of their homes/communities at alarming rate.</p> <p>Cites that LA County is only expected to build 7% of required housing by 2030 and shortfall will impact Black and Latino families disproportionately.</p> <p>Commenter notes making every neighborhood resource-rich will create better housing future. Housing Element must consider intersection between housing, public health, and environmental justice. Cites a number of statistics concerning low-income people of color bearing brunt of negative impacts of poor air and soil qualities.</p> <p>Commenter doesn’t believe the draft housing element provides equity and affordability and wishes to meet to discuss the following:</p> <p><u>Protections</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expand just-cause eviction protections. • Implement local RSO or strengthen/reduce the annual allowable rent increases. • Codify tenant’s right to council for evictions. • Strengthen tenant education programs. • Create tenant anti-harassment ordinance. <p><u>Preservation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prioritize rezoning in high-resource neighborhoods which are transit- and job-rich, including single-family zones. 	<p>housing element includes the following components pursuant to Assembly Bill (AB) 686:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summary of fair housing issues and assessment of the City’s fair housing enforcement and outreach capacity; • Analysis of segregation patterns and disparities in access to opportunities; • Assessment of contributing factors; and • Identification of fair housing goals and actions. <p>As confirmed in the AFFH appendix, all of the City’s neighborhoods are determined to be “high resource areas” which supports the good health of future neighborhood populations as affordability and integration is realized as a result of the implementation of the City’s housing element with the recommended land uses and housing programs.</p> <p>City staff and the City’s housing consultant plan to initiate meeting(s) to confirm with the Our Future LA Steering Committee Members (commenter).</p> <p><u>Protections:</u> The City of Redondo Beach contracts with the Housing Rights Center (HRC) for fair housing services. The Housing Rights Center investigates and resolves discrimination complaints, conduct discrimination auditing and testing, and education and outreach, including the</p>
-----------------------------------	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exclude parcels containing RSO housing units in site inventory. • No net loss provisions should apply to site inventory parcels and include rezoning program with monitoring/implementation. • Institute local program and funding sources for preservation of existing affordable housing. <p><u>Prioritization of affordable housing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include inclusionary zoning to locally fund/incentivize affordable housing. • Prioritize creation of affordable housing on public land. • Streamline affordable housing production. • Include programs for 100% affordable housing zoning overlays and apply to high-opportunity and R1 areas. <p><u>Site Capacity Assessment</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report the realistic capacity vs. estimated realistic capacity for both vacant and nonvacant sites. • Commenter estimates draft housing element will fall short of RHNA by 2,575 units of realistic capacity. • Report proportion of sites from previous housing element’s inventory that were developed during the previous planning period and utilize HCD recommended methodologies/data sources/factors for realistic development capacity. • Survey owners of nonvacant housing sites to determine likelihood of being discontinued during the planning period. • A buffer of 15-30% capacity should be included in sites inventory. • Provide quantitative estimate of in-pipeline projects likely to be completed based on historical data and adjust accordingly. • Commit to mid-cycle review. <p><u>Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase the concentration of lower-income households in areas where concentrations are low. • Reduce the concentration of lower-income households in areas with significant exposure to noise/pollution. • Ensure community-serving investment in historically disinvested areas to gain affordable housing/stop displacement, while prioritizing 	<p>dissemination of fair housing information such as written material, workshops, and seminars.</p> <p>They also provide landlord/tenant counseling, which is another fair housing service that involves informing landlords and tenants of their rights and responsibilities under fair housing law and other consumer protection regulations, as well as mediating disputes between tenants and landlords. Additional measures per the commenter are under further consideration by the City.</p> <p><u>Preservation:</u> The City has instituted all suggested measures of preservation with the exception of the development of a local program and funding sources for preservation of existing affordable housing. The City is further considering adding this measure to the existing “program” to address this matter.</p> <p>The City has incorporated some of the commenters suggested measures regarding Prioritization, Site Capacity Assessment, and Affirmative Furthering Fair Housing, and intends to further consider additional noted measures in future meeting(s) with this organization. Concerning “<u>Prioritization</u>” the City is currently investigating the development of a Citywide inclusionary housing ordinance. Concerning “<u>Site Capacity Assessment</u>” the City is conducting</p>
--	--	--

		<p>environmental justice, community health, and strengthen equitable community leadership in planning.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analyze local patterns in socioeconomic/racial segregation and integration. Prioritize high-opportunity census tracts and well-resourced areas when selecting sites for lower-income housing. Identify funding sources/public resources/density bonus programs to maximize likelihood of below market rate units are built. Solicit public feedback/commentary on housing element reflecting City's socioeconomic makeup. Utilize HCD recommended safe harbor methodology for forecasting future ADU development. Provide mid-cycle adjustments in inventory sites/ADU development is less than projected. Mid-cycle adjustments should automatically implement by-right density bonus large enough to make up for ADU shortfall. Use city-specific data (instead of regional) for assessing projected affordability of ADUs. 	<p>surveys with the property owners of the recommended housing sites. Concerning "<u>Affirmative Furthering Fair Housing</u>" since all of the City's neighborhoods are qualified as "high resource", all future affordable housing will benefit within Redondo Beach.</p>
09.15.2021	Abundant Housing LA/YIMBY Law	<p>Commenter supports more housing at all levels of affordability and reforms to land use and zoning to improve affordability, access to jobs/transit, environmental sustainability, and racial/economic equity.</p> <p>Commenter cites and summarizes their earlier letter dated May 20, 2021. Noted inconsistencies of draft housing element with state housing element law and AFFH, and HCD's instructions for housing element design and implementation. Also referenced their October 2020 communication sharing their "best practices" for housing element updates.</p> <p>Commenter cites HCD's September 2, 2021 letter identifying, "revisions will be necessary to comply with State Housing Element Law".</p> <p>Commenter provides a summary table that includes deficiencies, HCD's comments from their September 2, 2021 letter, Abundant Housing LA (AHLA)/YIMBY Law comments, and AHLA/YIMBY Law policy</p>	<p>The City also supports more housing at all levels of affordability as described and programed in the draft housing element.</p> <p>HCD's September 2, 2021 letter has requested additional information concerning the North Tech District housing site and the contiguous small lot sites located along 190th and one small lot site on Pacific Coast Hwy. City staff continues to investigate these housing sites and has engaged property owners to confirm and, in some cases, reconfirm support for the identification of the subject properties as potential sites for future high density residential and/or mixed use. To date staff has confirmed significant interest from the property owner of the</p>

		<p>recommendations. The following is a summary list of AHLA/YIMBY’s policy recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rezone parcels located near transit, job centers, schools, and parks to expand housing supply in high- and highest-resource areas, including R1 parcels. • Reduce concentration of lower-income households in neighborhoods with high concentrations of low/moderate income households or with high pollution. • Identify new funding sources/public resources for production/preservations of affordable housing including real estate transfer tax, congestion pricing, local density bonus, and abatement of polluting infrastructure. • Exempt parcels containing affordable housing to prevent displacement of vulnerable households. • Annually monitor “no net loss” and include rezoning implementation program. • Include offering publicly-owned land at no cost to nonprofit affordable housing developers as a state density bonus law concession. • Create 100% affordable housing zoning overlay for high-opportunity neighborhoods including R-1. • Provide quantitative estimate of site’s realistic capacity. Commenter references “Survey Method” or “Historical Redevelopment Rate Method”. • Report sites developed during prior planning period. • Share interest letters with planned development descriptions from owners of site inventory parcels. • If City lacks enough suitable sites to achieve RHNA, don’t add more theoretical units to existing sites, rezone additional parcels. • Commit to mid-cycle review to verify assumptions and adjust if necessary. • Provide quantitative estimate of “in-pipeline projects” and adjust if necessary. • Create local density bonus program that also applies to low-density parcels. 	<p>largest shopping center in the North Tech District for the future additional development of high density residential at this location. Additionally, none of the property owners of the small sites that city staff has been able to engage to date are opposed to the Residential Overlay designation on their properties. Staff is continuing to investigate these sites. Staff does not anticipate that HCD will not accept the proposed housing sites based upon the overwhelming interest by property owners for potential high density residential on the determined housing sites per the draft housing element.</p> <p>The City has incorporated or plans to incorporate some of the many policy recommendations cited by the commenter including: The sharing of interest letters for future development from owners of housing sites; Updating the existing Residential Design Guidelines with objective design standards to further “expand and speed up the ministerial review process” (Program 14); Amendments to the City’s zoning ordinance consistent with State housing laws that serve to reduce/mitigate potential governmental constraints to housing production and affordability (Program 13); and The development of ADU guidelines that will be included within the City’s updated Residential Design Guidelines (Program 12).</p>
--	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pre-approve standard ADU's, small-scale multifamily and small lot subdivision housing plans. • Expand and speed up ministerial review process. • Eliminate on-site parking requirements. • Reduce restrictions on development standards. • Reduce fees on multi-family residential development. • Survey/poll online and hardcopy formats in top languages spoken in community regarding preferences/priorities for zoning and residential development. 	<p>The following is a list of additionally proposed "programs" within the draft housing element that address and are consistent with the intentions of many of the policy recommendations from the commenter:</p> <p>Program 1: Mobility Access/Emergency Repair Program; Program 2: Preservation of Affordable Housing; Program 3: Inclusionary Housing; Program 4: Housing Choice Voucher (Section 8) Program; Program 5: Response to Homelessness; Program 6: Affordable Housing Development; Program 7: Green Task Force; Program 8: Residential Sites Inventory and Monitoring of No Net Loss; Program 9: By-Right Approval for Projects with 20 Percent Affordable Units; Program 10: Replacement Housing; and Program 11: Small Lot Development/Lot Consolidation.</p>
09.15.2021	Wally Marks, Property owner: 2810-2860 Artesia Boulevard	<p>Commenter supports the Housing Element document identifying ways in which the housing needs of existing and future populations can be met and its focus on improving affordable housing, finding more affordable housing and removing constraints.</p> <p>Comments on need for updating zoning and adopting an inclusionary housing ordinance.</p>	<p>As noted by the commenter, the City's draft housing element promotes and furthers the identification of ways in which the housing needs of existing and future populations can be met and focuses on improving affordable housing, finding more affordable housing, and removing constraints.</p>

		<p>Comments on restrictions from past and current being prohibitive of housing development and recommends incentive based policies to create opportunities for more affordable units throughout Redondo Beach.</p> <p>Comments on future opportunities for creative policies ensuring new housing of all types for all income levels and the benefit economically and otherwise to the community.</p>	<p>The City is currently investigating the development of an “inclusionary housing” ordinance that could serve to further the City’s intentions to build more affordable housing throughout the City at locations in addition to the recommended housing sites in the draft housing element. The City’s development of an “inclusionary housing” ordinance is outlined in Program 3 of the draft housing element.</p> <p>Included within the many “programs” contained in the draft housing element are initiatives to directly address past and current regulations that may serve as a constraint on housing while also including creative elements that promote more housing opportunities for all income levels throughout the City.</p>
09.16.2021	Alisa Beeli, Resident	<p>Commenter expresses concerns with the City’s 6th Cycle Housing Element and urges Planning Commission to reject it. Notes that the Housing Element places nearly all of the required units in 90278, which she states is unfair. Recommends it is better (more equitable) to distribute the units through the entire City</p> <p>Commenters concerns:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Plan places nearly all new units on edges of City, which are highly trafficked and border Lawndale and Torrance, which have their housing requirements. 2. All the overlay zones are adjacent to less affluent areas of the City and all in North Redondo. Plan does not provide increased housing in more affluent, beach-adjacent communities in South Redondo. Cites that State law prohibits the concentration of low-income housing in one location. Questions how Housing Element can be considered in current state. 	<p>Proposed “housing sites” for potential future high density residential were not necessarily based on existing traffic patterns but rather on multiple State criteria and proximity to existing and future transit locations. It is noteworthy that the City’s existing and planned/proposed Metro stations are in close proximity to the proposed high-density housing sites as opposed to areas in South Redondo that are much further from existing and proposed regional transportation rail stations. Housing sites are located in multiple locations which is consistent with State law.</p>

		<p>3. North Tech is estimated to accommodate 28%of the required units. Questions whether the current property owners plan to relocate? Questions health impacts from freeway for residential at this site. Also claims it is a 45-minute commute to high school.</p> <p>4. City Council ignored the Planning Commission’s recommendation for 50% of power plant site to be zoned at 30 units per acre and hundreds of public emails and statements asking to consider sites within 90277.</p> <p>5. Redondo Beach completed 40% of its 5th Cycle RHNA. Commenter doesn’t think the City will meet its requirement for 2,490 units as currently planned.</p> <p>Asks the City to work toward a more equitable distribution of the housing units throughout the entire City.</p>	<p>North Tech site – The property owner of the largest shopping center in the North Tech District has expressed enthusiastic support for the allowance of high density residential on their property while maintaining their existing commercial center. Additionally, the property owner has recent experience with introducing high density residential within existing older shopping centers that retain existing commercial and are located in close proximity to freeways.</p> <p>Any future redevelopment of high density residential within the any of the proposed housing sites will be subject to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to address potential environmental impacts of a future project. Additionally, the current General Plan update will include an environmental justice analyses (as required by Senate Bill (SB) 1000) to address the potential for health effects in low-income communities and communities of color as they may apply. At the time of the future General Plan Amendment for the application of the Residential Overlay designation, the environmental justice issues will be addressed and mitigation as required to be determined through the associated environmental analysis will be applied.</p> <p>The General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC), Planning Commission, and City</p>
--	--	---	--

			<p>Council conducted multiple public meetings over many months concerning housing sites at locations throughout the City, including the power plant site. After carefully considering the public’s input and the hundreds of comments/requests received, the City Council at their public meeting on June 15, 2021 approved the housing sites as identified within the draft housing element.</p> <p>The City is not required to build the housing but rather to ensure there is capacity with the correct high-density residential zoning to accommodate the required housing at the required income levels.</p>
09.17.2021	Mary Schurr, Resident	<p>Commenter expresses that the best place for high density housing is the 50-acre Power Plant site. Cites that 500 persons expressed this sentiment as part of the City’s Social Pin Point land use plan survey.</p> <p>Supports the development of housing at 1021 and 1100 N. Harbor Drive and cites the property owners’ letter. Also cites the Planning Commission’s recommendation for housing at the 50-acre site.</p> <p>Cites percentage of housing developed during 5th Cycle as 40%. Doesn’t believe the City will meet 6th Cycle requirement for 2,490 units.</p> <p>Cites City’s solution is to place housing on fringes of City. All housing sites are adjacent to other “less affluent jurisdictions”.</p> <p>Cites list of reasons why many of the identified housing sites are not likely to be developed: <u>North Tech Site</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing development not likely to shut down/relocate. 	<p>The General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC), Planning Commission, and City Council conducted multiple public meetings over many months concerning housing sites at locations throughout the City, including 1021 and 1100 North Harbor Drive sites. After carefully considering the public’s input and the hundreds of comments/requests received, the City Council at their public meeting on June 15, 2021 approved the housing sites as identified within the draft housing element.</p> <p>The City’s existing residential density in the southern part of the City is the densest. Proposed “housing sites” for potential future high density residential were not necessarily based on existing density but rather on multiple State criteria and</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If any residential is developed they will have a 45-minute commute to Redondo Union High School. • Would not be near any amenities. <p><u>South Transit Site</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cites property owner is working on a project that does not include residential. <p><u>South Bay Galleria</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should have more residential. There is an EIR for 650 units. <p>Cites that City is losing its small-town charm. Development is out of control. Parking in the streets is severely impacting neighborhoods. Increased traffic on Artesia Blvd is not safe. North Redondo is overdeveloped now. Does not support more housing in North Redondo.</p> <p>Don't allow zoning on unlikely properties while ignoring large parcels next to the beach/bike paths/parks.</p>	<p>proximity to existing and future transit locations. It is noteworthy that even with the addition of the recommended housing sites in the northern area of the City, the city's overall highest residential density remains within the southern area of the City.</p> <p>North Tech site – The property owner of the largest shopping center in the North Tech District has expressed enthusiastic support for the allowance of high density residential on their property while maintaining their existing commercial center. Additionally, the property owner has recent experience with introducing high density residential within existing older shopping centers that retain existing commercial and are located in close proximity to freeways.</p> <p>South Transit Center site – City staff continues to investigate this site and has engaged the property owner(s) to confirm and, in this case, reconfirm support for the identification of the subject property as potential sites for future high density residential and/or mixed use. Staff does not anticipate that HCD will not accept the proposed housing site at the South Transit Center as they did not request additional information regarding this property. Finally concerning this site, during the many GPAC meetings specific interest from representatives of this site requested that the GPAC recommend this site for high</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>density residential, citing the sites close proximity to the City’s Transit Center under construction and the future planned Metro station.</p> <p>To date staff has confirmed interest from many of the property owners of the recommended housing sites for the application of a high-density Residential Overlay designation on their properties. Additionally, none of the property owners of the sites that city staff has been able to engage to date are opposed to the Residential Overlay designation on their properties.</p> <p>Staff does not anticipate that HCD will not accept any of the proposed housing sites.</p>
09.22.2021	Robert Doran, Director of Development & Construction, Redondo Beach Plaza (North Tech District – Housing Site)	<p>Commenter (property owner of Redondo Beach Plaza-North Tech District Site) supports the identification of the Redondo Beach Plaza as a “housing site”. See email comment below.</p> <p>“ROIC would welcome the opportunity to introduce High Density Residential to our Redondo Beach Plaza. I have attached some examples of other properties we own where we have recently completed or are in the process of entitling/permitting densification efforts which includes residential components.”</p>	<p>North Tech site – The property owner of the largest shopping center in the North Tech District has expressed enthusiastic support for the allowance of high density residential on their property while maintaining their existing commercial center. Additionally, the property owner has recent experience with introducing high density residential within existing older shopping centers that retain existing commercial and are located in close proximity to freeways.</p>
10.04.2021	James Light, Resident (GPAC Member – Comments	<p>Commenter raised concerns with the adequacy of the environmental documents in support of the Housing Element. Commenter claims that the negative declaration relies on two (2) flawed/inaccurate conclusions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the Housing Element is only a policy document and therefore does not require CEQA analysis. 	<p>The 2021-2029 Housing Element provides a framework for the City to identify opportunities to increase the housing stock within the City to accommodate the City’s RHNA allocation. The document identifies</p>

<p>on the proposed Housing Element CEQA document – The Initial Study/ Negative Declaration was available for public review for 30 days beginning August 5, 2021 and ending September 3, 2021)</p>	<p>2. That the Housing Element does not create changes that impact certain analysis elements and that any analyses would be accomplished in conjunction with each future specific project.</p> <p>States that even policy documents are subject to CEQA.</p> <p>Commenter supports deferring the analysis to the EIR to conducted for the General Plan update. Requests that the ISND be modified to remove “flawed/inaccurate” conclusions that policy documents are not subject to CEQA analysis.</p> <p>States that the ISND intends to defer CEQA analysis to individual projects to avoid analysis of land use changes made by the City. Commenter states concerns that City is avoiding a required CEQA analysis of impacts and will use same argument concerning the upcoming CEQA analysis for the General Plan changes. States land use changes are a discretionary act by the City that can drive environmental impacts. Deferring to specific future projects would avoid the foreseeable cumulative impacts of all proposed zoning land use changes. CEQA intends that the public understand potential impacts of changes when proposed by the City. The IS/ND should be revised wherever this inaccurate conclusion is used.</p> <p>City Council should reject the IS/ND document as written and rewritten to reflect the housing element recommended zoning/land use changes will be analyzed as part of the PlanRedondo General Plan update process.</p> <p>Commenter appended his comments above with an example of case law, “City of Redlands v. County of San Bernardino (2002) 96 Cal.App.4th 398, at p. 409” which held that CEQA applies to revisions or amendments to an agency’s general plan...</p> <p>Stated that the negative declaration is wrong. The City cannot waive off CEQA analysis by stating the document is just a “policy document” or by deferring</p>	<p>strategies and programs to conserve and improve existing affordable housing; provide adequate housing sites; assist in the development of affordable housing; remove governmental and other constraints to housing development; and promote equal housing opportunities in a strategic manner. The City clearly agrees that CEQA analysis is necessary for the Housing Element and therefore, prepared the Negative Declaration. As such, the Housing Element is a policy document, and did require a CEQA analysis which was done.</p> <p>As indicated in the Negative Declaration, the land use designations and zoning amendments necessary to fully implement the Housing Element are not being considered at this time and will be considered and evaluated as part of the PLANRedondo process. The EIR that will be prepared for PLANRedondo will evaluate the potential environmental impacts that could occur from full buildout of the Plan. The City is not deferring the analysis but will consider all the necessary General Plan and Zoning amendments associated with the Preferred Land Use Plan that was approved by Council in May 2021. The amendments necessary to fully implement the Housing Element are a subset of the amendments that will be considered as part of PLANRedondo. The timing for the adoption of the Housing Element, which was separated from the</p>	
---	---	--	--

		to a future specific project. The negative declaration should be rejected and the CEQA analysis rolled in with the PlanRedondo General Plan Amendment.	PLANRedondo, is to meet the October 15 deadline that is imposed by the State. The Housing Element stipulates that the City must complete the land use and zoning amendments by November 2023, either as part of or regardless of the adoption of PLANRedondo to ensure consistency between the 2021 Housing Element and the General Plan at that time.
10.04.2021	Warren Chun, Resident	21-year resident. Requests the Mayor and City Council consider a balanced approach in the placement of affordable housing locations between South Redondo and North Redondo.	The General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC), Planning Commission, and City Council conducted multiple public meetings over many months concerning housing sites at locations throughout the City. After carefully considering the public's input and the hundreds of comments/requests received, the City Council at their public meeting on June 15, 2021 approved the housing sites as identified within the draft housing element.
10.04.2021	Guernsey, Resident	30+ year resident. Redondo Beach is one city. Commenter states that it makes sense to add new homeless units near El Nido neighborhood but next ones, if any, should go in South Redondo. Also fine with new 30+ new units near edge of commenter's "R1" neighborhood and with Friendship Foundation planned next to Franklin Park. Commenter objects to "unfair amount of new housing to go into "North Redondo". Requests City do what's right overall for "our ONE city".	The General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC), Planning Commission, and City Council conducted multiple public meetings over many months concerning housing sites at locations throughout the City. After carefully considering the public's input and the hundreds of comments/requests received, the City Council at their public meeting on June 15, 2021 approved the housing sites as identified within the draft housing element.

<p>10.05.2021</p>	<p>Grace Peng, PhD, Resident</p>	<p>Commenter frustrated with City's 6th Cycle 2021-2029 Draft Housing Element. States it does not meet City's needs nor meet intent of Federal law for Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH).</p> <p>Housing Element should consider Jobs-Housing fit to not increase traffic.</p> <p>Comments on North Redondo being a tech center generating large numbers of jobs and attracting two-tech worker families that value short commutes to work and school, and coastal South Redondo being a beach community attracting tourists, retirees, and singles and inland South Redondo attracting families. South Redondo is a generator of low-income jobs. Comments that City needs to add housing in proximity of the service's essential workers.</p> <p>Comments on eldercare workforce issues.</p> <p>States that the current HE puts almost all the low-income housing at the extreme Northeast corner of the City. States the City will be providing homes for low-income workers of other Cities not Redondo Beach.</p> <p>Comments that North Redondo parents are frustrated by over-crowded schools. States there is less school crowding in South Redondo and more family homes should be built there.</p> <p>Comments that the draft element puts all the very low-income housing in the most polluted area of the City. Cites distances, noise, air pollution will stress children on way to school. Not AFFH.</p> <p>States that HE would put all low-income children in Adams MS which has twice as many as Parras MS. States that the additional low-income students into existing schools with higher proportions of low-income students is not compliant with AFFH.</p> <p>States most segregated schools are in South Redondo and are the least crowded requiring those schools to attract students outside their area, which</p>	<p>Regarding the commenter's concerns with Redondo Beach's Jobs-Housing ratio the following is presented.</p> <p>In support of the City's ongoing General Plan Update the City commissioned a comprehensive and robust "Demographic and Economic Trends Analysis". Included within this analysis was detailed data concerning the City's employment and labor trends. The analysis highlighted the comparison of resident employment and available jobs in Redondo Beach and quantified the mismatch between residents' professions and the opportunity to find employment within that profession within the City. The most significant commuter flow data documented that over 92.5% of the employed residents of the City of Redondo Beach commuted to their jobs which were outside the City. The total outflow of Redondo Beach workers is 30,527 (source US Census LEHD, 2014; BAE, 2017). Redondo Beach also imports much of its retail and service sectors workforce from other jurisdictions; however, that number is significantly less than the net outflow of the Redondo Beach residents commuting for work. The following are the key data points from the City's recent economic analysis.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The most significant commuter flow data documented that over 92% of the employed residents of the City of
-------------------	--	---	--

	<p>generates traffic. States one third of morning traffic is school drop-off. New housing in South Redondo would reduce this. Presents table with current RBUSD student demographics in support of above assertions.</p> <p>Asserts justice and the law requires that we balance the benefits and burdens of new residents to improve the lives of our new residents. States that research/evidence shows that children who attend racially and economically integrated schools have the best outcomes.</p> <p>To address cited concerns, commenter recommends spreading new housing throughout the city.</p> <p>Asks why fees for new single-family homes are lower than fees for multifamily homes. States that is backwards.</p> <p>Commenter recommends removing current residential height restrictions to increase housing capacity. States advances in elevator technologies to make higher buildings more feasible and attractive for medically-fragile residents.</p> <p>Notes additional advances in building technologies and recommends the City allow recycling of multi-family as well as SFHs throughout the City and build mid-rise of up to 11 stories.</p> <p>Recommends amending parking regulations and base on unit size/type and generally reduce required parking to reduce housing costs.</p> <p>Commenter submitted additional analysis of the 2020 Census Data compared to 2010 Census Data using an interactive map program. Reports that data infers coastal South Redondo is losing both homes and people, particularly in the harbor area. Recommends gaining people in the Riviera Village or adding people without adding homes near Beach Cities Health District. Presents table with Census Tract population/homes data for 2010 and 2020.</p>	<p>Redondo Beach commuted to their jobs which were outside the City.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is an existing demand for approximately 400,000 square feet of professional office space in Redondo Beach. <p>According to the most recent SCAG Regional Transportation Plan (2016), Redondo Beach had a Jobs-to-Household Ratio of 0.83 in 2012. This indicates that there were only approximately 0.83 citywide jobs per Redondo Beach household, one of the lowest ratios in the South Bay.</p> <p>Additionally, with recommended housing site locations for low-income housing adjacent to the Galleria, along 190th Street, and along South/Central Pacific Coast Hwy, there are ample options for in-proximity housing for the City's service related workforce in South Redondo. Even the low-income housing recommended at the North Tech location is within a large shopping center (that per the property owner would be retained) and in close proximity to another large shopping center within ½ a mile distance and less than 2 miles from the Aviation/Artesia commercial corridor and less than 6 miles from the furthest South Redondo service jobs. It's important to note that most trips for the service workforce take place outside AM and PM peak travel</p>
--	--	---

		<p>States that RHNA requires City to provide 8% more homes in 8 years. Claims City has only provided 15 in last 10 years. Recent development trends won't meet needs of our children or RHNA. Claims we are adding people mainly because adult children are living with their parents for lack of affordable alternatives.</p> <p>States that entire region is experiencing the same housing affordability issues as Redondo Beach. Long commutes which generates horrible traffic and parking problems while at the same time essential workers can't find a place to live in the communities they serve.</p> <p>Recommends:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building workforce housing at all income levels in the neighborhoods where the jobs are located. • Build safe and supportive cycling infrastructure so that people can commute safely by bike even after dark. • Work with Metro and local transit agencies to provide more frequent buses. • Build transit-oriented housing near the train stations and high frequency bus corridors. 	<p>times making additional potential local traffic impacts minimal.</p> <p>After carefully reviewing the commenter's data regarding balanced school integration there is nearly an identical average % of low-income elementary student ratios between the elementary schools in North Redondo, 14.2%, and South Redondo, 13.3%, which over time will create more balance than the current discrepancy between Adams MS and Parras MS. Additionally, all of the recommended housing sites locations are in close proximity to numerous Elementary Schools and over half of the recommended sites are near both Junior High Schools and Redondo Union High School.</p> <p>Regarding the commenter's concerns with the location of the recommended housing site in proximity to the freeway and the stress of potential air and noise pollution on children the following is presented.</p> <p>Any future redevelopment of high density residential within any of the proposed housing sites will be subject to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to address potential environmental impacts of a future project. Additionally, the current General Plan update will include an environmental justice analyses (as required by Senate Bill (SB) 1000) to address the</p>
--	--	---	--

			<p>potential for health effects in low-income communities and communities of color as they may apply. At the time of the future General Plan Amendment for the application of the Residential Overlay designations, the environmental justice issues will be addressed and mitigation as required to be determined through the associated environmental analysis will be applied.</p> <p>Regarding costs associated with single family developments versus multi-family developments, the City, as are all public agencies, bound by State law to only charge fees pursuant to the time and costs associated with the review of the development project. There must be a rational nexus for any fees charged by the City and single-family developments are less complicated and as a result typically require much less time and are therefore assessed less fees to process. The City cannot manipulate fees to incentivize one development type over another.</p> <p>Regarding the commenter's recommendations for relaxing residential development standards, including building height, stories, and parking requirements the following is presented/recommended.</p> <p>As the City continues to review and update its General Plan Land Use Element future opportunities exist to engage the process for</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>the introduction of revising existing land use policies and ultimately zoning ordinance residential development standards including height, stories, and parking. The City's General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC) will conduct five (5) more PLANRedondo meetings, of which three (3) will be focused on land use element policies. The commenter is encouraged to participate in these futures publicly noticed meetings and request consideration of her recommendations. The noted GPAC meetings are planned for Spring 2022.</p> <p>The commenter's summary recommendations concerning workforce housing for all income levels and all neighborhoods, safe and supporting cycling infrastructure, coordinating with Metro and local transit agencies to increase frequency of buses, and development of transit oriented development are in some cases already reflected within the 6th Cycle 2021-2029 Housing Element, for example, the two largest housing sites for lower income housing are sited in proximity to an existing and proposed Metro rail stations. Also the City's accessory dwelling unit ordinance and plan to implement an inclusionary housing ordinance will serve to provide affordable housing in neighborhoods throughout the City and furthering balancing locations for future affordable housing and locating it near job centers for all types of workers.</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>Concerning cycling infrastructure and Metro and transit agency coordination, although the City is not currently updating its Circulation Element it is anticipated that an update to this General Plan element will be initiated during this Housing Cycle and the commenter is again encouraged to work with the GPAC to introduce policies that could be placed in the Land Use element to ensure these topics are clarified and pursued further when the City updates its Circulation Element.</p>
--	--	--	--

<p>Via HCD: 12.14.21 Grace Peng emails to HCD: September 3, 2021 and December 13, 2021</p>	<p>Grace Peng, PhD, Resident</p>	<p>09.03.21 Grace Peng Email to HCD (forwarded to City on 12.14.21): Notes she is Redondo Beach Housing Element “watchdog”. Inquired with HCD about one site she believed was “unrealistic for Lower Income housing.” Asked questions of HCD including if HCD had written the City a letter yet and which sites HCD disallowed and which sites are still under review?</p> <p>Claims the draft 2021 RB HE “wholly inadequate and in violation of AFFH.” Claims that having all the City’s Very Low-Income housing “relegated” to one site next to the freeway, is a clear violation.</p> <p>She claims that she demonstrated through her “GIS 5 class capstone” that the City’s draft housing element is bad in terms of meeting the basic needs of people who live in RB.</p> <p>Children and people should not be placed right next to the freeway, especially on the of the busiest freeways in the US with over 250,000 vehicles every day.</p> <p>Claims City is treating low income people like toxic waste.</p> <p>The 2021 RB draft HE puts nearly all of the lower income children in Adams Middle School, which already enrolls over twice as many poor children as Parras Middle School.</p> <p>The only High School in the City’s district is in South RB and the bus system serving it is inadequate. School district has outsourced their school bus service to Beach Cities Transit, which has a very small fleet of 32-40 seat buses. The buses are to small and fill up when they are 3 miles from school. This is disparate impact on families that do not have cars.</p> <p>The draft RB HE removes 1000 sites that were available in 2014 HE.</p> <p>Claims that City won’t let BCHD build 600 units of senior apartments at 11 acre closed hospital.</p>	<p>Concerning the commenters questions to HCD about housing sites, the City is in receipt of two (2) letters from HCD. The most recent HCD letter, dated January 5, 2022, had the following comments/requests for information on three (3) of the City’s proposed housing sites:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. North Tech Site: Suitability of Nonvacant Sites. HCD cited Government Code section 65583.2, subdivision (g)(2) concerning existing uses and their presumption to impede additional residential development. <p>The revised HE now includes more details concerning the planned future development regulations which would not require the discontinuance of the existing uses but rather would allow the existing uses to continue and the parking areas to be developed with residentially separately. Additionally, for this site the area was reduced to only the portion of the site that received strong interest and experience in the planned envisioned future residential development at this location/site.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. One South PCH Site and the 190th Street Sites: Small Sites. (South PCH and 190th Street Sites less than 0.5 acres). HCD listed sites in these areas that were less than 0.50 acres and requested additional information concerning the viability of these “small sites”.
--	----------------------------------	---	---

	<p>Claims the owner of the soon-to-close AES power plan wants to build housing and the city won't let him.</p> <p>12.13.21 Grace Peng Email to HCD and State DOJ (forwarded to City on 12.14.21): "Implores" State HCD and DOJ not to accept the RB housing element. Claims that the City's HE only allows new homes along dangerous, noisy, and polluted arterial roads, and removed mixed use in the "whiter and more affluent" coastal areas and changed zoning adjacent to the 405 freeway to put all low-income housing there.</p> <p>Claims that Mayor Bill Brand and 3/5 majority City Council have approved policies to obstruct housing production, including passing an inclusionary zoning ordinance that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Exempts Single-Family Homes from paying any in-lieu fees 2. Charges in-lieu fees by the square foot, as required, but the per square foot fees rises with the number of units. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. A 4,500 sf SFH replacing a smaller home pays nothing, a duplex totaling the same 4,500 sf pays \$8,100, and nine 500 sf apartments (4,500 sf) will be charged \$64,800. 3. IZ units are subject to the same (already high) parking requirements as market rate, despite evidence that lower income residents own fewer cars. <p>Cites a number of additional concerns with a future proposed Inclusionary Housing Ordinance. Claims that the City raised its Quimby Fee to \$35,000 for each additional unit of housing with Inclusionary Housing still subject to the current Quimby Fee of \$25,000 per unit.</p> <p>Notes that the Mayor took issue with Planning Commissioners that accepted plans for 300 apartments at the South Bay Galleria Mall. Claims that the City Council only approved 150 units at the South Bay Galleria Mall.</p>	<p>The City has engaged property owners of the sites noted by HCD and has confirmed strong interest from most of the identified "small sites" to sell or consolidate with adjacent properties and pursue future residential development. Additionally, those sites that have not shown interest were not included in the housing calculation forecast/capacity for these areas. The revised HE was updated to reflect this information.</p> <p>3. North Kingsdale Sites: HCD noted an internal inconsistency in HE. The HE identified that this site would accommodate both moderate-income housing <u>and</u> lower-income housing. Additional meetings with the property owner confirmed that this site is planned to accommodate 15% lower-income housing. The revised HE reconciles this noted inconsistency.</p> <p>The commenters claim that the HE is "wholly inadequate and in violation of AFFH." because it places all the City's affordable house in one location has been addressed in the revised HE. In response, the North Tech Site that the commenter referenced has been significantly revised downward in terms of its area and number of potential very low/low income units that it could accommodate. Additionally, the revised HE has identified numerous additional sites throughout the City to accommodate the lost housing capacity</p>
--	--	--

		<p>Commenter takes issue with City's analysis and discussion of possible updates to Redondo Beach's housing and land use regulations to address/mitigate potential impacts from Senate Bill 9 (SB9).</p> <p>Claims Redondo Beach has contempt for state and federal housing laws. States that "zoning is supposed to protect residents from harm." Claims Redondo Beach bans additional homes in the healthiest areas while forcing future residents to live in the most polluted and dangerous areas next to freeways and 40 mph truck routes.</p> <p>States, "Please, please, take zoning decisions away from Redondo Beach officials. They cannot be trusted to act in the public interest."</p>	<p>resulting from the reduced number of housing units at the North Tech Site.</p> <p>In careful review of the commenters various claims with respect to school district data, the following response/analysis is provided:</p> <p>Concerning middle school student population data, it is factual that Adams MS has a higher % of low-income students than that of Parras MS, however only by a factor of 1.5x not the "2x to 3x" that the commenter claims. In addition to the low-income student populations it is also important to evaluate the land areas and overall student populations of the impacted school facilities to ensure additional capacity exists. The consideration of overall real school capacity is not necessarily a direct AFFH consideration but nevertheless an important consideration that the City investigated as part of its housing sites analysis. In consideration of a school area factor Parras MS is significantly more constrained in area, 10 acres vs. the Adams school complex which sits on a 24-acre site (shared with Washington Elementary and the RBUSD) which has considerably more area in the event additional school classroom facilities are warranted. Concerning total student populations, Parras MS's (1,257 students) existing overall student population is 15% larger than Adams MS (1,066 students). When</p>
--	--	---	--

			<p>considering these overarching issues Adams MS has additional area and overall potential capacity to accommodate future student populations compared with Parras MS. Looking now more closely at the “low-income” student populations in the City/School District we can also see that it is much more balanced across the City than the commenter represents. If we review the elementary school data, the percentage of low-income students is nearly identical between elementary schools south of 190th Street (13%) and north of 190th Street (14%). This demonstrates the general equity of the Redondo Beach low income student population moving forward during this planning period. As the elementary school population advances through grade levels, the % of low-income student population becomes more equally distributed throughout the City. As the student population moves from MS to HS the low-income population is then more weighted towards schools south of 190th street. With a comprehensive analysis of the school district data and in consideration of all the school age populations and their locations it is clearly demonstrated that the City’s low-income student population is equally distributed throughout the City and not in violation of AFFH requirements with respect to low-income student populations.</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>Concerning the commenters claims that the City won't let BCHD build 600 units of senior apartments at 11 acre closed hospital, the following is provided in response.</p> <p>This is not factual on two (2) counts. First, BCHD is not proposing the build 600 units of senior apartments. The preferred project approved by BCHD, but not yet submitted to the City of Redondo Beach for its review, is for an assisted living facility for less than 300 Seniors. These units do not qualify as residential units as they are not independent living quarters with kitchens. Second, the BCHD project has not yet been submitted to the City of Redondo Beach for review and processing. The proposed use is a conditionally permitted use and the until the project is thoroughly reviewed the City has no official position concerning this project and will work with BCHD on the future project. It is premature to claim the City will not permit a future BCHD assisted living facility.</p> <p>Concerning the commenters claims that the City won't allow housing on the AES the following response is provided.</p> <p>The AES site is not currently zoned for residential development. The AES site is currently an operating power plant and cannot be relied upon as a housing site in the 6th Cycle Housing Element due to the</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>continuing mandated extension of the use of the power plant due to climate change and inadequate power supply in California, as stated by the California Independent System Operator in recent hearings before the California State Water Resources Control Board. This will be exacerbated as the Diablo Canyon Nuclear Plant is removed from service. See pages 5 and 6 of the City's revised HE for a detailed history of the AES site and the many initiatives over the years that have attempted and failed to include housing at this location.</p> <p>Concerning the commenters claims that the City only allows homes along dangerous, noisy, and polluted arterial roads, and removed mixed use in the "whiter and more affluent" coastal areas and changed zoning adjacent to the 405 freeway to put all low-income housing there the following response is provided.</p> <p>The majority of the proposed housing sites are in fact along the City's commercial and mixed-use zoning corridors as these locations have the larger parcels to accommodate future high-density housing development and the roadways with capacity for accommodating future anticipated trips as well as transit stops/facilities to provide additional transit options. Additionally, some additional sites added in the revised HE (South PCH) have</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>increased the allowable density from 35 DU/AC to 55 DU/AC. Additionally, the North Tech Site (referred to by the commenter as the site “adjacent to the 405 freeway) only accounts for 4.9% of the City’s affordable housing unit capacity.</p> <p>Regarding the commenters claims that the City Council has approved policies to obstruct housing production, including passing an inclusionary zoning ordinance the following is provided.</p> <p>The City has not yet adopted an inclusionary housing ordinance and its particular component requirements have not yet been determined. The City is considering an inclusionary housing ordinance to promote affordable housing in neighborhoods throughout the City not to obstruct the future development of housing.</p> <p>Regarding the commenters claims that the City raised its Quimby Fee to \$35,000 for each additional unit of housing. This is not factual and is incorrect. The City has not raised its Quimby Fee to \$35,000.</p> <p>Regarding the commenters claims that the City Council only approved 150 units at the South Bay Galleria Mall. This is not factual and is incorrect. The City approved 300 residential apartment units with 20% affordable to low-income or 10% to very</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>low-income. Additionally, up to 5% of the housing is to be offered first to teachers and air force personnel with minimum deposits and other relaxed lease terms.</p> <p>Concerning the commenters remarks on Senate Bill 9 (SB9). The City is complying with the State law as written.</p> <p>Concerning the commenters claims that Redondo Beach bans additional homes in the healthiest areas while forcing future residents to live in the most polluted and dangerous areas next to freeways and 40 mph truck routes the following response is provided.</p> <p>The City's HE proposes housing throughout the City and in all its neighborhoods. "Residential Recycling", "Housing on Church Properties", and "Mixed Use" are located throughout the City and account for approximately half of the City's remaining RHNA. Additionally, less than 5% of the City's affordable housing is located at the North Tech Site (adjacent to the 405 Freeway). It is correct that many of the remaining sites for affordable housing are located in commercial districts however it is important to note that these proposed locations are near the City's transit center and a planned Green Line station.</p>
--	--	--	--

<p>Via HCD email on 01.21.22 Grace Peng email to HCD on 01.21.22</p>	<p>Grace Peng, PhD, Resident</p>	<p>Alerting HCD to “all the ways that Redondo Beach is trying to stifle housing production while telling your office (HCD) otherwise.”</p> <p>Claims that the City Council, at their meeting on 01.13.22, voted to resubmit the previously rejected HE “with more narrative” but without adding and sites.</p> <p>Claims the City is violating AFFH because all the major sites are north of 190th and zoned for Adams Middle School, which already has 3x the low-income students as Parras MS and for Washington and Lincoln Elementary with Washington having the highest % of low-income student population. States that AFFH requires that low-income students be placed throughout the city, and in higher numbers near schools that currently have fewer low-income students.</p> <p>Commenter provided a table with Redondo Beach School District student population information in support of her claims.</p> <p>Notes her personal experiences as a mom/school volunteer at Madison ES and Adams MS with “Title I” student populations and recommends these students be spread throughout the school district.</p> <p>Cites that Council Member Zein Obagi Jr says that it is right to put housing on the periphery of the city because it will result in the lowest “traffic congestion in the interior of the city”. Commenter claims that Council Member Obagi argues that “VMT in the interior of the city is all that matters” and that new residents at the periphery won’t have any business in the city.</p> <p>Commenter notes that “Traffic flows both ways.” Cites that a spatial mismatch between jobs and housing, and between where children live and existing schools generates traffic. Cites that 30% of morning and afternoon traffic is due to student dropoff/pickup. Putting new housing walking distance to elementary schools reduces traffic/VMT.</p>	<p>Concerning the commenters claims that the City Council, at their meeting on 01.13.22, voted to resubmit the previously rejected HE “with more narrative” but without adding any sites the following is provided.</p> <p>This is not factual and is incorrect. The City Council directed staff and the consultant to reduce the capacity of the North Tech site and investigate additional sites near the Galleria, the City’s Transit Center, and future location of Metro’s planned Green Line Station, as well as other locations throughout the City. As evidenced in the revised HE, additional sites throughout the City have been identified.</p> <p>Concerning the commenters claims that the City is “violating AFFH” because of the impacts on schools as it relates to “low-income students”, a careful review of the commenters school district data was conducted and the following response is presented.</p> <p>Concerning middle school student population data, it is factual that Adams MS has a higher % of low-income students than that of Parras MS, however only by a factor of 1.5x not the “2x to 3x” that the commenter claims. In addition to the low-income student populations it is also important to evaluate the land areas and overall student populations of the impacted</p>
--	----------------------------------	--	---

	<p>Claims that CM Zein Obagi Jr said there will never be low income housing by the beach. Commenter opposes this claimed statement. Notes that there is subsidized housing right next to the beach adjacent to Veterans Park and it can be built there again.</p> <p>Claims that the City is a “significant job center”, “the coast is a state park and a regional tourist destination.” Claims that Redondo Beach is “built on the backs of an army of low-income workers coming in to cook, clean and take care of our children and elderly.”</p> <p>States that “Provisioning housing for our workers would reduce traffic, not generate it. Conveniently putting low-income housing near low-income jobs would also put low-income students in the schools with the lowest current enrollment, spreading the benefits and burdens of a diverse student populace more evenly.”</p> <p>Cites that South Redondo Beach borders the 7th largest job center in LA County, Torrance-Carson. North Redondo Beach borders the 3rd largest. Cites that South Redondo Beach is home to physicians who work at the 3 hospitals in Torrance-Harbor City. Wants south Redondo Beach to also be home to nurses, technicians, assistants, janitors. Desires street engineering to provide safe micro-mobility making hundreds of thousands of jobs accessible without a car in a 5-mile radius. Cites the City’s adoption of the South Bay Bicycle Master Plan in 2011 and claims that the City has only built a small portion of it. Claims that if completed, there would be safe connections across the City’s busy arterial roads, and VMT could be drastically lowered.</p> <p>Claims South Redondo Beach is not a “transit desert”. Notes the various bus lines that run every 30-60 minutes. Cites the various transportation providers and routes that connect South Redondo Beach with Downtown LA, claiming it is faster than driving and parking. Notes that North Redondo Beach is served by a frequent Beach Cities Transit line that connects neighborhoods to the green line light rail station at the northeast corner of the City. Not having</p>	<p>school facilities to ensure additional capacity exists. The consideration of overall real school capacity is not necessarily a direct AFFH consideration but nevertheless an important consideration that the City investigated as part of its housing sites analysis. In consideration of a school area factor Parras MS is significantly more constrained in area, 10 acres vs. the Adams school complex which sits on a 24-acre site (shared with Washington Elementary and the RBUSD) which has considerably more area in the event additional school classroom facilities are warranted. Concerning total student populations, Parras MS’s (1,257 students) existing overall student population is 15% larger than Adams MS (1,066 students). When considering these overarching issues Adams MS has additional area and overall potential capacity to accommodate future student populations compared with Parras MS. Looking now more closely at the “low-income” student populations in the City/School District we can also see that it is much more balanced across the City than the commenter represents. If we review the elementary school data, the percentage of low-income students is nearly identical between elementary schools south of 190th Street (13%) and north of 190th Street (14%). This demonstrates the general equity of the Redondo Beach low income student population moving forward during this</p>
--	---	--

		<p>high-frequency lines on Hawthorne, Crenshaw, or on I-110 is a policy choice that should change.</p> <p>Claims that City is trying to suppress housing by making it infeasible with stricter standards as part of the City's update to their residential design guidelines. Claims the City is attempting to lower its allowable building envelopes. Claims mezzanines could accommodate ADU's and that the City may not allow for them with the update to the City's residential design guidelines. Commenter also noted discussions concerning basements and that the City should permit them to accommodate future ADU's.</p> <p>Claims that the City is trying to limit allowable building envelopes to reduce the potential for ADU's while the City is telling HCD that ADU production will increase in the future.</p> <p>Claims and requests the following: "Redondo Beach leadership has no plan to meet our obligation to the region to build our fair share of housing. In fact, by adopting inclusionary zoning, doubling Quimby fees, and ratcheting down building volumes they are using the entire playbook of housing suppression techniques. Please do not certify the City of Redondo Beach's Housing Element."</p>	<p>planning period. As the elementary school population advances through grade levels, the % of low-income student population becomes more equally distributed throughout the City. As the student population moves from MS to HS the low-income population is then more weighted towards schools south of 190th street. With a comprehensive analysis of the school district data and in consideration of all the school age populations and their locations it is clearly demonstrated that the City's low-income student population is equally distributed throughout the City and not in violation of AFFH requirements with respect to low-income student populations.</p> <p>Concerning the commenter's claims that Council Member Obagi argues that "VMT in the interior of the city is all that matters" and that new residents at the periphery won't have any business in the city it is important to note that Council Member Obagi (4th District) accepted the majority of the affordable housing sites in his district. He did note that the City's transit center and future Green Line station in proximity was the predominant reason for his support of housing in his district which supports and is consistent with transit-oriented land use principles.</p> <p>Concerning the commenters claims that CM Zein Obagi Jr said there will never be low</p>
--	--	---	---

			<p>income housing by the beach, the following is presented.</p> <p>CM Obagi supports the sites inventory proposed within the revised HE. Additionally, CM Obagi has gone on record in support of a future inclusionary housing ordinance which will include future projects containing affordable units throughout the City, including “by the beach”.</p> <p>Regarding the commenters claims that the City is a “significant job center”, “the coast is a state park and a regional tourist destination.” and Redondo Beach is “built on the backs of an army of low-income workers coming in to cook, clean and take care of our children and elderly.” the following is provided.</p> <p>The reference to “significant job center” is not factual when compared with the City’s existing resident population. As part of the City’s ongoing General Plan Update, a city-wide market/economic study was conducted and confirmed that 93% of the City’s resident working population commutes outside of the City for work. The City’s beaches and harbor (coast) are not a State Park. It is factual that the City’s beaches and pier/waterfront support a tourist industry and in support of housing workers in this industry the City’s existing and most dense residential areas are in proximity to these</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>areas which provide the City's largest existing supply of high-density housing and housing types. Additionally, as planned in the revised HE, approximated 30% of the City's proposed "affordable housing sites" are within approximately 2 miles of the beaches and waterfront an along transit corridors with easy access to these locations.</p> <p>Regarding the commenters statement, "Provisioning housing for our workers would reduce traffic, not generate it. Conveniently putting low-income housing near low-income jobs would also put low-income students in the schools with the lowest current enrollment, spreading the benefits and burdens of a diverse student populace more evenly." the following is provided.</p> <p>The City concurs with the commenters opinion on providing housing for workers in in proximity to low-income jobs. As such the revised HE has the majority of affordable housing sites in proximity to the City's largest retail center, the Galleria, and 30% of affordable housing sites within approximately 2 miles of our beaches and waterfront, another large service commercial center within the City. As noted previously the affordable housing sites within approximately 2 miles of the beaches/pier/waterfront are along well served commercial/transit corridors.</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>Concerning the commenters remarks regarding the City's low-income student population, see the City's prior comprehensive remarks/analysis of the City's low-income student population and the confirmation that in consideration of the City's entire low-income student population (K-12) more low-income students are at schools south of 190th street.</p> <p>Concerning the commenters remarks regarding proximity to job centers outside the city, the 3 hospitals in Torrance-Harbor City, a desire for technicians and service workers that support the noted job centers and hospitals to live in South Redondo, and safe micro-mobility and the South Bay Master Bicycle Plan the following is provided.</p> <p>The City shares the commenters concerns and desires with respect to all these elements of a balanced and comprehensive approach to jobs/housing balance and mobility. With the majority of housing sites identified in the revised HE located in proximity to the City's transit center and future Green Line Station the principles of Transit Oriented Development served as an important factor to integrate transit and housing. Additionally, the City is making the further implementation of the South Bay Master Bicycle Plan a priority in the next budget cycle. Again, the City shares the</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>commenters desires on these matters and has demonstrated this in the revised HE and as part of upcoming City priorities.</p> <p>Concerning the commenters remarks on transit service in South Redondo the City agrees. All of the proposed South Redondo housing sites in the revised HE are along the city's commercial corridors and arterials in with the most frequent transit services.</p> <p>Regarding the commenter's remarks concerning the City's ongoing work upon its Residential Design Guidelines, the following is provided.</p> <p>In response to recent changes in State law the City is updating its Residential Design Guidelines in large part to streamline the future development of housing throughout the City. As required by State law, the current "subjective and quasi discretionary" residential design guidelines are being amended to "objective standards". This will significantly reduce the time to process future residential projects by removing the subjective nature of the process. This update coupled with the many elements of Program 13 within the revised HE will serve to support the timely development of housing moving forward.</p> <p>Concerning the commenters remarks regarding ADU's. The following is presented.</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>The City has recently updated it's ADU ordinance and it is fully compliant with State Law. Any future residential standards resulting from the City's ongoing update to its Residential Design Guidelines or to future residential zoning standards could not limit the development of ADU's as long as the future proposed ADU complies with applicable City/State ADU regulations. To be clear in the event a proposed ADU complies with the City/State ADU regulations and conflicts with a Residential Design Guideline/Standard and or zoning development standard the City/State ADU regulation takes precedence and is allowable.</p> <p>Concerning the commenters closing remarks... "Redondo Beach leadership has no plan to meet our obligation to the region to build our fair share of housing. In fact, by adopting inclusionary zoning, doubling Quimby fees, and ratcheting down building volumes they are using the entire playbook of housing suppression techniques. Please do not certify the City of Redondo Beach's Housing Element.", the City disagrees. The City's revised HE and plans for an inclusionary housing ordinance demonstrate the City's commitment to housing development in the future. This is consistent with Redondo Beach's historical support of housing as demonstrated comprehensively</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>in the "Executive Summary" of the revised HE. The City has no plans to double it's Quimby fees or to ratchet down building volumes (although clearly defining objective residential development standards is ongoing in an effort to streamline future housing development).</p>
--	--	--	---

<p>Via HCD email on 02.02.22; Leo Pustilnikov email to HCD on 02.01.22</p>	<p>Leo Pustilnikov, Property Owner</p>	<p>Relays to HCD, via email on 02.01.22, City Council discussions concerning housing sites on retail parking lots (e.g. Living Spaces and Vons). Claims that the retail tenants have a “tenant control area” restricting any such development in their parking lots. Attached an “example” of a “zone of control” document he claims is for the “Vons” (North Tech) housing site that requires any development of the parking lot without “Vons” approval.</p> <p>Claims that the 1100 N. Harbor (AES power plant) property can be developed within the 6th cycle. Notes he has a study from EFI and AECOM demonstrating housing can be developed within the 6th cycle.</p> <p>Notes another site at 1021 N. Harbor (1 acre in size) is surrounded by housing developed at 70-120 dwelling units per acre and requires no clean up and the city is not considering it because the commenter owns it.</p> <p>Claims that the City wants a 25-acre park on the AES site but doesn’t want to pay for it.</p>	<p>Concerning the commenters remarks regarding “tenant control areas” the City is having ongoing discussions with property owners and tenants at housing sites that include potential parking lot development. At this time feedback concerning parking has maintained that as long as the number of existing available parking spaces is retained for the existing commercial tenants, all parties contacted remain supportive of these housing site locations and the envisioned high-density residential concepts. As evidenced by the property owner of the North Tech site specifically, similar concepts to what is proposed in Redondo Beach is demonstrated in their correspondence to the City dated September 22, 2021.</p> <p>Concerning the commenters claim that the “1100 N. Harbor (AES power plant) property can be developed within the 6th cycle” and his claim that the that the City wants a 25-acre park on the AES site but doesn’t want to pay for it, the City refers the commenter to the “Executive Summary” of the revised HE and specifically, pages 4, 5, and 6, and the letter dated February 10, 2022, signed by California State Assemblymember Al Muratsuchi (66th District) and California State Senator Ben Allen (26th District). The “Executive Summary” in the revised</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>HE contains significant details chronicling the history and current standing of the AES power plant inclusive of the multiple city-wide public votes that have included residential development options all of which have failed. Additionally, the City along with the assistance of Los Angeles County, the California Natural Resources Agency, the State Coastal Conservancy, the Wildlife Conservation Board, surrounding communities, and the offices of State Assemblymember Al Muratsuchi and State Senator Ben Allen, continue to work for the restoration of the wetlands at the site and the creation of a regional park and open space amenity for the public.</p> <p>Concerning the commenters reference to 1021 N. Harbor, the City has considered the site and at this time has determined the site as infeasible. The building on the subject property has been identified as a historic structure as it originally served as a pumping station in support of the power plant at 1100 N. Harbor Drive. The existing structure exhibits potential significant historic architectural value.</p>
--	--	--	---

<p>Via HCD email on 02.07.22 Roger Light email to HCD on 02.04.22</p>	<p>Roger Light, Resident</p>	<p>Commenter sent letter to HCD via email. Email message requests that HCD consider his letter when they deliberate on housing at the AES power plant as it may not be a feasible site and would not assist the unhoused.</p> <p>Commenter cites that a “minority of RB council persons” is proposing rezoning for high density housing at the AES power plant site.</p> <p>Notes he is a longtime resident of RB that has been “fighting” for years to decommission the AES power plant. Also notes that he and “many others” have fought “equally hard” to ensure the area is restored as a wetland and thoughtfully managed. Claims that South Redondo Beach is one of the most densely populated areas of this region and the AES site is zoned for recreational purposes and parkland. Claims the proposal for high density housing at this site by a small group of residents is in reaction to having some housing sites identified in their portion of the city.</p> <p>Claims a majority of residents have spoken loudly in four separate elections and “most do not want to have high density housing on the retiring AES power plant site,...”. Claims this is the desire of a “wealthy developer”.</p> <p>Claims that Redondo Beach has a long history of “over-development” resulting in the “unfortunately well-earned nickname, “Condo Redondo””.</p> <p>Claims there is a “movement” to use the issue of homelessness and statewide mandates on housing density to “push for having over 1000 units” built on the AES site.</p> <p>Commenter notes that he is a North Redondo District 5 resident but is not a NIMBY. Notes that he could say (but doesn’t) “Go overbuild some more in South Redondo”. Notes traffic congestion and overcrowded schools and lack of parkland in South Redondo. Claims that those pushing for zone change of AES site are from North Redondo and are “working to exploit division in our community”.</p>	<p>The commenters primary focus concerns the potential for the AES power plant site to serve as a housing site in the HE. The commenter makes numerous claims and assertions concerning the testimony from members of the public that support identifying the AES power plant site as a housing site in the HE. The commenter cites results from multiple past city-wide public votes documenting prior attempts to develop the AES site that have failed. Additionally, the commenter claims that the AES site is inappropriate for new housing because it is not consistent with State requirements that new developments be close to mass transit and freeway access. The commenter also asserts that the AES site has a wetland that it is mandated by the Coastal Commission to be restored and that the AES site will require significant remediation. The commenter notes he supports a fair distribution throughout the city of increased density housing, including areas in district 5. Claims that with existing higher density in South Redondo it is fair to locate additional new housing in North Redondo.</p> <p>In response to the commenter’s remarks concerning the AES site and other general remarks the City provides the following response.</p>
---	------------------------------	---	---

		<p>Claims that the voters of Redondo Beach, “even when outspent”, do not support zoning for residential at the AES site. Notes that some mixed use including recreational, parkland, office, and some “modest residential” as part of a planned redevelopment of the waterfront is one thing to consider, but “cramming the majority of required high density housing in the AES site is unconscionable.” Claims that any units in that area will not be affordable.</p> <p>Claims that the AES site is inappropriate for new housing because it is not consistent with State requirements that new developments be close to mass transit and freeway access. Notes that the AES site is not close to a freeway or the Green Line (transit) stop.</p> <p>Claims that the AES site is wetlands with portions of it mandated by the California Coastal Commission to be restored as wetlands. Commenter also claims the site is contaminated and will require “a tremendous amount of remediation” to make the site safe for housing. Claims “It is unreasonable to even propose that the site could provide affordable housing this cycle.”</p> <p>Commenter strongly urges HCD not to consider the AES site for housing.</p>	<p>The revised HE is generally consistent with the commenters disposition concerning the AES site as well as the commenters remarks concerning the City’s proposed distribution of housing sites throughout the City. However, the City would like to refer the commenter to the revised HE and specifically the information concerning the AES power plant site within the “Executive Summary” pages 4, 5, and 6 to better understand the complete and factual record concerning this site. Additionally, the City refers the commenter to the letter dated February 10, 2022, signed by California State Assemblymember Al Muratsuchi (66th District) and California State Senator Ben Allen (26th District) for facts surrounding the history and efforts to restore the wetland and develop a future park on the AES power plant site.</p>
--	--	--	--

<p>Via HCD email on 02.07.22 Dawn Esser email to HCD on 02.06.22</p>	<p>Dawn Esser, Resident</p>	<p>Commenter is 33-year resident of Redondo Beach and 12-year resident activist. Claims that the majority of Redondo Beach residents are against residential development on the AES power plant site. Claims that the two council members and the developer pushing for the residential development are doing so against the wishes of residents and the financial benefit of the City due to the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Majority of residents recently voted down residential development on the site when Measure B (included 650 residential units) was defeated. Commenter claims to have spoken to thousands of residents and knows first hand their opposition to residential development at this location due to traffic, over-crowding of schools, and negative financial impacts to the City. Claims that residents do not want Redondo Beach to turn into Santa Monica. 2. Residents signing petitions against SB9. Claims SB9 law is for developers and not for affordable housing as it does not include an affordable housing requirement. Claims residents do not want “condo boxes” put up next to them. Upset with no parking requirement, over-crowding of schools, traffic, and a negative quality of life that goes with over-development. Claims SB9 is irresponsible. 3. Claims that Redondo has emphasized residential development for 40+ years to the financial detriment of the City. Commenter was on the City’s Budget and Finance Committee for 3 years and the City’s finances. Claims City is in “desperate need of higher revenues”. Cites that over 85% of residents travel out of the City for work, creating traffic grid lock on the majority of streets, like PCH by the AES site. Claims that AES site is the only available property where major commercial development can occur. Claims AES site is “perfect site for a “Google” type campus. Claims the City needs businesses to supply jobs, employ more residents, and balance traffic patterns. Claims residential development costs the City financially, because most of the property taxes to the County and the State and increase costs to the City for residential services (schools, fire, police, trash, sewer, community services). 	<p>The commenters primary focus concerns the potential for the AES power plant site to serve as a housing site in the HE. The commenter opposes residential development on the AES power plant site. The commenter makes claims and assertions concerning two (2) council members that have gone on record in support of the designation of the AES power plant property as a housing site and the current owner of the AES power plant site. Additionally, the commenter notes their opposition to SB9 and the City’s history towards residential development in general. The commenter supports the development of a technology campus and a park (cites results of prior citywide public votes in support of a park at this location) at the AES power plant site.</p> <p>In response to the commenter’s remarks concerning the AES site the City provides the following response.</p> <p>The revised HE does not identify the AES power plant property as a housing site in the revised HE. For additional details and historical perspectives concerning the AES site and the City’s disposition towards residential development in general the City would like to refer the commenter to the revised HE and specifically the information concerning the AES power plant site within the “Executive Summary” pages 4, 5, and 6 as well as the remainder of the “Executive</p>
--	-----------------------------	---	--

		<p>4. Claims residents want a significant park on the AES site and have voted for it many times. The site is zoned for a park. Claims the City has received millions in funds from the County to restore wetlands and support a park.</p> <p>Commenter request that HCD look at all the “issues” when reviewing the future housing plans for Redondo.</p>	<p>Summary” to better understand the complete and factual record concerning this site and residential development in general in the City of Redondo Beach. Additionally, the City refers the commenter to the letter dated February 10, 2022, signed by California State Assemblymember Al Muratsuchi (66th District) and California State Senator Ben Allen (26th District) for facts surrounding the history and efforts to restore the wetland and develop a future park on the AES power plant site.</p> <p>In response to the commenter’s remarks concerning SB9 the City notes that its current zoning ordinance complies with this recently enacted State law.</p>
--	--	---	---

<p>Via HCD email on 02.08.22 Dr. Zaremski email to HCD on 02.08.22</p>	<p>Lori Zaremski, Ph. D., Resident</p>	<p>Commenter strongly disapproves “of the attempt by a small group of misguided Redondo Beach residents to re-zone the AES power plant site in order to allow a huge over development of this precious area which will someday include open space parkland”. Cites that the AES site is currently zoned for recreation and minimal development.</p> <p>Claims that “Mixed use options including recreational facilities, parkland, office building and some modest residential development as part of a planned redevelopment of the Waterfront is what Redondo voters approved in four previous elections.”</p> <p>Claims the AES site is not appropriate for large residential development. Claims it contains “ancient wetlands” and has been contaminated and is not safe for large scale high density residential development. Claims South Redondo already has traffic congestion, overcrowded schools, and lacks parkland.</p> <p>Claims that AES site would not meet State requirements to be close to easy access mass transit and freeway access. AES site is not close to freeway and is over 5 miles from the closest Green Line transit stop.</p> <p>Claims South Redondo Beach is one of the most densely populated areas of this region. Claims proponents of housing at the AES site is a reaction to some in north Redondo Beach not wanting housing in their area.</p> <p>Commenter requests that HCD “look deeply at this matter and scrutinize the misguided attempts by a minority of the community that disregards the best interests of the south bay Los Angeles residents.”</p>	<p>The commenters primary focus concerns the potential for the AES power plant site to serve as a housing site in the HE. The commenter opposes residential development on the AES power plant site. The commenter makes numerous claims and assertions concerning the testimony from members of the public that support identifying the AES power plant site as a housing site in the HE. The commenter cites results from multiple past city-wide public votes documenting prior attempts to develop the AES site that have failed. Additionally, the commenter claims that the AES site is inappropriate for new housing because it is not consistent with State requirements that new developments be close to mass transit and freeway access. The commenter also asserts that the AES site has a wetland and that the site is contaminated and that the AES site will require significant remediation.</p> <p>In response to the commenter’s remarks concerning the AES site the City provides the following response.</p> <p>The revised HE does not identify the AES power plant property as a housing site in the revised HE. For additional details and historical perspectives concerning the AES site and the City’s disposition towards residential development in general the City would like to refer the commenter to the</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>revised HE and specifically the information concerning the AES power plant site within the “Executive Summary” pages 4, 5, and 6 as well as the remainder of the “Executive Summary” to better understand the complete and factual record concerning this site and residential development in general in the City of Redondo Beach. Additionally, the City refers the commenter to the letter dated February 10, 2022, signed by California State Assemblymember Al Muratsuchi (66th District) and California State Senator Ben Allen (26th District) for facts surrounding the history and efforts to restore the wetland and develop a future park on the AES power plant site.</p> <p>Regarding the commenter’s remarks concerning South Redondo Beach being one of the most densely populated areas of this region, the City has noted that density within South Redondo and portions of North Redondo have similarly high residential densities.</p>
--	--	--	--

<p>Via HCD email on 02.10.22 Lezlie Campeggi email to HCD on 02.08.22</p>	<p>Lezlie Campeggi, Resident</p>	<p>Commenter identifies as a long-time resident of Redondo Beach concerned with housing element requirements. Commenter inquired with HCD asking how much weight was given to public comments submitted and voiced on the City's October 5, 2021 adopted HE? Commenter claims that it is largely people that disagree that speak up and those that agree remain quiet and provide less comment. Commenter makes several points in support of their contention that it is typically those that disagree make statements vs. those that agree which make much fewer statements.</p> <p>Commenter goes on to note the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Voters in Redondo Beach have 5 TIMES rejected the 50-acre power plant site being re-zoned from open space to housing and development. 2. The power plant site does NOT fit the HCD criteria for new affordable housing to be located in close proximity to metro, public transportation hubs. 3. The City of Redondo Beach comprises 5 districts, 3 of which are known as North Redondo Beach. There is MORE LAND MASS available in the 3 NORTH Redondo districts than in the 2 southern districts. 4. South Redondo Beach has abundance of multi-story, multi-unit housing; far greater and within a smaller footprint than exists in North Redondo Beach. 5. The 50-acre power plant site is NOT DELIVERABLE as a contender for this RHNA cycle. 6. Ms. Peng's statement in a prior email to you that the City won't let the Beach Cities Health District (BCHD) build 600 units of senior apartments on their 11-acre site in District 3, is also false. 7. Correspondence you received from Leonid Pustilnikov, one of the power plant property owners, is self-serving. For him to suggest the City is not conducting itself lawfully regarding his property is 100% false. Mr. Pustilnikov knowingly purchased a 50-acre property zoned for open space, with a conditional use permit to operate a power plant. 	<p>The commenters primary focus concerns the potential for the AES power plant site to serve as a housing site in the HE. The commenter opposes residential development on the AES power plant site. The commenter makes numerous claims and assertions concerning past votes on the AES power plant site, the inability of the AES site to meet multiple State requirements for housing, and other commenters claims including that of the current property owner.</p> <p>In response to the commenter's remarks concerning the AES site the City provides the following response.</p> <p>The revised HE does not identify the AES power plant property as a housing site in the revised HE. For additional details and historical perspectives concerning the AES site and the City's disposition towards residential development in general the City would like to refer the commenter to the revised HE and specifically the information concerning the AES power plant site within the "Executive Summary" pages 4, 5, and 6 as well as the remainder of the "Executive Summary" to better understand the complete and factual record concerning this site and residential development in general in the City of Redondo Beach. Additionally, the City refers the commenter to the letter dated February 10, 2022, signed by</p>
---	----------------------------------	--	---

	<p>The commenter claims that South Redondo has experienced “far more housing development density in a smaller land area than the northern part of the City.” Commenter expresses their position that “It’s time for the Northern part of the City to receive its “fair and equitable share” of new housing distribution to satisfy the RHNA allocations for this cycle.”</p> <p>Commenter relays their personal history of residency in Redondo Beach and their reason for residing in the various districts throughout the City.</p> <p>Commenter requests that HCD, “consider the source” of the comments they receive. Claims the majority of commenters to date on the City’s HE were NIMBYs.</p> <p>Commenter requests that HCD adopt the City’s revised HE and notes that the revised HE “has been carefully evaluated, reviewed to comply with your questions and clarifications, and voted on by our City Council whose majority is RESIDENT centric, aligned with what our citizens want while best matching the HCD requirements.</p> <p>The commenter notes that the Mayor, Council and City Staff have worked very hard to comply with the requirements to revise a Plan that can be certified.</p> <p>Commenter notes in closing that the City of Redondo Beach “is one of the most densely-populated cities on the entire west coast of California, with approximately 12,000 residents per square mile. Yet our RHNA requirement for this cycle is much higher than other cities on a percentage basis, and whose density is far less.”</p>	<p>California State Assemblymember Al Muratsuchi (66th District) and California State Senator Ben Allen (26th District) for facts surrounding the history and efforts to restore the wetland and develop a future park on the AES power plant site.</p> <p>Concerning the commenters remarks on density and other general comments related to the process of the City’s development of the HE, the City refers the commenter to the records of the many public hearings by the Mayor and City Council where the topic of density and all matters related to the State’s criteria for Housing Elements was analyzed and presented in detail.</p>
--	--	---

<p>Letter to HCD from Assemblymember Al Muratsuchi and State Senator Ben Allen dated 02.10.22</p>	<p>Assemblymember Al Muratsuchi (66th District) and State Senator Ben Allen (26th District)</p>	<p>The commenters, State Assemblymember Al Muratsuchi (66th District) and State Senator Ben Allen (26th District) recite their efforts in assisting the City of Redondo Beach and the County of Los Angeles for “several years” to restore the wetland at that site (AES Power Plan Site) and create a regional park and open space amenity for the public. The commenters additionally note that “these efforts are ongoing with the assistance of the California Natural Resources Agency, State Coastal Conservancy, Wildlife Conservation Board, and surrounding communities.”</p> <p>The commenters additionally cite the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Along with the efforts regarding wetland restoration and open space creation the site has garnered a number of supportive public votes over the past 20 years for open space. <p>The commenters cite their concerns with some individuals advocating for a zoning change to allow for residential development on the site. Additionally, the commenters note their concern that a blanket zoning change along the lines that some have advocated without the utmost care to ensure wetlands preservation “would be inconsistent with the community’s long-standing vision for the site and its environmental needs.”</p> <p>The commenters state that they would like to work with you (Robin Huntley, HCD) to ensure that (a rezoning to residential) does not happen.</p> <p>The commenters close their communication with HCD as follows: “Thank you for taking our concerns regarding this area of the coast under consideration. We are most hopeful that the City’s vision of wetland restoration and park space at the site will finally come to fruition. The community has waited long enough.”</p>	<p>The City’s shares the concerns raised by the commenters and the revised HE is consistent with the commenters request regarding the future use of the AES power plan site.</p>
---	---	---	--