AGENDA – PUBLIC MEETING
GENERAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE
CITY OF REDONDO BEACH
THURSDAY JULY 27, 2017 – 7:00 P.M.
Redondo Beach Public Library
Second Floor Meeting Room
303 N. Pacific Coast Highway
Redondo Beach, CA 90277

I. AGENDA

*Items for presentation, discussion or action.*

1. Call Meeting to Order – WELCOME-OPENING REMARKS
2. Roll Call
3. Consent Calendar
   b. Approval of Minutes for the General Plan Advisory Committee Regular Meeting of June 08, 2017.
4. Overview of Topics to be Covered at Future Meetings
5. Review of Homework Assignment from Meeting 2 (Photographs of Likes/Dislikes)
7. Brief Presentation and Group Exercise: General Plan Vision 2040
8. Next Steps
   a. Homework

II. PUBLIC COMMENT

*This section is intended to provide members of the public with the opportunity to comment on any subject. This section is limited to 30 minutes. Each speaker will be afforded three minutes to address the Committee. Each speaker will be permitted to speak only once. Written requests, if any, will be considered first under this section.*

III. ADJOURNMENT

The next meeting of the General Plan Advisory Committee will be a Regular Meeting that is planned to be held at 7:00 p.m. on Thursday, August 31, 2017 in the Redondo Beach Public Library, Second Floor Meeting Room, 303 N. Pacific Coast Highway Redondo Beach, CA 90277. All Regular Meetings, Workshops and any Special Meetings of the GPAC will be noticed as required by law and may be at an alternative location.

Any writings or documents provided to the General Plan Advisory Committee regarding any item on this agenda shall be submitted to staff for review and distribution to the GPAC as appropriate. Said writings or documents will be retained as required by public records retention laws.

It is the intention of the City of Redondo Beach to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) in all respects. If, as an attendee or a participant at this meeting you will need special assistance beyond what is normally provided, the City will attempt to accommodate you in every reasonable manner. Please contact the City Clerk's Office at (310) 318-0656 at least forty-eight (48) hours prior to the meeting to inform us of your particular needs and to determine if accommodation is feasible. Please advise us at that time if you will need accommodations to attend or participate in meetings on a regular basis.

An agenda packet is available 24 hours at www.redondo.org under the Planning Division and during City Hall hours, agenda items are also available for review in the Planning Division.
RULES PERTAINING TO ALL PUBLIC TESTIMONY  
(Section 6.1, Article 6, Rules of Conduct)

1. No person shall address the General Plan Advisory Committee without first securing the permission of the Chairperson; provided, however, that permission shall not be refused except for a good cause.

2. After a motion is passed or an item closed, no person shall address the GPAC on the matter without first securing permission of the Chairperson.

3. Each person addressing the GPAC shall step up to the lectern and clearly state his/her name and city for the record, the subject he/she wishes to discuss, and proceed with his/her remarks.

4. Unless otherwise designated, remarks shall be limited to three (3) minutes on any one agenda item. The time may be extended for a speaker(s) by the majority vote of the GPAC.

5. In situations where an unusual number of people wish to speak on an item, the Chairperson may reasonably limit the aggregate time of hearing or discussion, and/or time for each individual speaker, and/or the number of speakers. Such time limits shall allow for full discussion of the item by interested parties or their representative(s). Groups are encouraged to designate a spokesperson who may be granted additional time to speak.

6. No person shall speak twice on the same agenda item unless permission is granted by a majority of the GPAC.

7. Speakers are encouraged to present new evidence and points of view not previously considered, and avoid repetition of statements made by previous speakers.

8. All remarks shall be addressed to the GPAC as a whole and not to any member thereof. No questions shall be directed to a member of the GPAC or the City staff or Consultant except through, and with the permission of, the Chairperson.

9. Speakers shall confine their remarks to those which are relevant to the subject matter. Attacks against the character or motives of any person shall be out of order. The Chairperson, subject to appeal to the GPAC, shall be the judge of relevancy and whether character or motives are being impugned.

10. The public participation portion of the agenda shall be reserved for the public to address the GPAC regarding problems, questions, or complaints within the jurisdiction of the GPAC.

11. Any person making personal, impertinent, or slanderous remarks, or who shall become boisterous while addressing the GPAC, shall be forthwith barred from future audience before the GPAC, unless permission to continue be granted by the Chairperson.

12. The Chairperson, or majority of the members present, may at any time request that a police officer be present to enforce order and decorum. The Chairperson or such majority may request that the police officer eject from the place of meeting or place under arrest, any person who violates the order and decorum of the meeting.

13. In the event that any meeting is willfully interrupted so as to render the orderly conduct of such meeting unfeasible and order cannot be restored by the removal of individuals willfully interrupting the meeting, the GPAC may order the meeting room cleared and continue its session in accordance with the provisions of Government Code subsection 54957.9 and any amendments.
July 24, 2017

STATE OF CALIFORNIA )
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES ) ss
CITY OF REDONDO BEACH )

AFFIDAVIT OF POSTING

Pursuant to the requirements of Government Code Section 54955, agendas for a Regular Meeting of the General Plan Advisory Committee must be posted at least seventy-two (72) hours in advance and in a location that is freely accessible to members of the public. As Planning Analyst for the City of Redondo Beach, I declare, under penalty of perjury, that in compliance with the requirements of Government Code Section 54955, I caused to have posted on Monday, July 24, 2017, the agenda for the July 27, 2017 Regular Meeting of the City of Redondo Beach General Plan Advisory Committee in the following locations:

City Hall, Door "A", 415 Diamond Street, Redondo Beach
City Clerk's Counter, Door "C", 415 Diamond Street, Redondo Beach

Lina Portolese
Planning Analyst
OPENING SESSION
A Regular Meeting of the Redondo Beach General Plan Advisory Committee was called to order by Acting Chair Sanchez at 7:06 p.m. in the Redondo Beach Public Library Second Floor Meeting Room, 303 N. Pacific Coast Highway, Redondo Beach, California.

ROLL CALL
Members Present: Chrzan, Eller, Funabashi, Glad, Hannon, Hashmi, Kartounian, Lamb, Light, Ludwig, McKenzie, Moses, Pinzler, Sanchez, Solomon, Stodder, Szymanski, Turner
Members Absent: Biro, Burke, Carey, Nafissi, Royds, Shaer, Voisey, Waller, Williams
Officials Present: Aaron Jones, Community Development Director
Sean Scully, Planning Manager
Lina Portolese, Planning Analyst
Diane Cleary, Recording Secretary
Consultants Present: Woodie Tescher, PlaceWorks
Wendee Nowak, PlaceWorks
Suzanne Schwab, PlaceWorks
Josh Rohmer, BAE
Aaron Baker, BAE

CONSENT CALENDAR
a. APPROVAL OF AFFIDAVIT OF POSTING for the General Plan Advisory Committee Regular Meeting of June 8, 2017.

Motion by Member Eller, seconded by Member Light, to approve the Consent Calendar as presented. Motion carried, with Member Hannon abstaining.

SELECTION OF VICE-CHAIR
Member Eller nominated Member Glad.
Member Lamb nominated Member Light.
Member Szmanski nominated Member Sanchez.
It was noted that Chair Biro recommended Member Sanchez.
By majority, Member Sanchez was selected as Vice-Chair.

REVIEW OF HOMEWORK ASSIGNMENT (PHOTOGRAPHS OF LIKES/DISLIKES)
Wendee Nowak, PlaceWorks, presented a brief recap of Homework #1 as follows:
- Received 180 photos and comments
- 17 members responded
- Most comments made along corridors or adjacent to amenities
- Submissions generally fit into 8 broad categories
  - Open space/recreation (49)
  - Likes
• Parks in otherwise builtout areas
• Beach and ocean views (a place by the sea)
• King Harbor
• Farmers markets
• Full size parks, parkettes, playgrounds, Wilderness Park, Dog Park, multi-purpose trails

  ▪ Dislikes
  • Underutilized spaces
  • Limited park hours
  • Using parkland as a parking lot
  • Park safety and maintenance

  o Community character (42)
    ▪ Likes
    • Historical buildings
    • Wyland’s mural
    • Riviera Village “quaint, small town atmosphere”

    ▪ Dislikes
    • Powerlines and telephone poles
    • Corridor appearances (not enough green)
    • Poor building design and architecture
    • Views and appearance of AES plant

  o Commercial/retail/office (30)
    ▪ Likes
    • Riviera Village and Shade Hotel
    • Outdoor dining
    • Northrop Grumman

    ▪ Dislikes
    • No supermarkets in North Redondo
    • Vacancy of south Bay Galleria
    • No more big box (time is over)
    • Grandfathered bars and thrift stores on Artesia Blvd.
    • Appearance of storefronts, strip malls, empty retail buildings

  o Transportation/traffic/accessibility (26)
    ▪ Likes
    • Metro Station
    • Walkable safe neighborhoods
    • Auto/ped/bike friendly streets and pathways

    ▪ Dislikes
    • Green Line station ends
    • PCH, high volumes and fast-moving traffic (dangerous for peds and bikes)
    • Traffic gridlock and overflowing turn lanes
    • Lack of sidewalks in various locations

DEVELOPMENT HISTORY IN REDONDO BEACH
Community Development Director Aaron Jones discussed the following:

• Development History
  o Population growth each decade since 1980
  o Population 1940-2016
  o Population Percent Change per decade
  o Population and housing
    o Residential growth estimates from 2009
- Annual increase four-tenths of one percent (120 units per year; 840 units total)
- Actual change 13 units/year (91 units total)
- Increase at annual rate of four-tenths of one percent (approximately 120 units per year, 2880 units total)

- Residential 2040
  - 3,681 net new housing units, and
  - 8,334 potential resident population increase
  - Adopted General Plan
    - Anticipated 18% housing unit gain 1991-2010
    - Predicted 0.9% gain per year
    - Projected numbers not realized until 2025

- 2016 Community Growth Summary
  - New units (121 total)
  - Demolished units (102 total)

- Actual commercial industrial growth

- Commercial/industrial/institutional growth estimate
  - 1.4 Million net new square feet
    - 1 Million sf commercial/industrial development outside Harbor/Pier area
    - 400,000 sf within Harbor/Pier area

- Historical zoning & development
  - Height reductions

- Existing GP Framework
  - General Plan Framework
  - General Plan Update 2017-2040

- Conclusions
  - Community growth rates well under General Plan projections
  - City mature with limited and historically reduced growth rates
  - Infrastructure exists, but requires improvement as necessary to support new development
  - Sustainable growth (infill and recycling) can be accommodated with adequate community investment and improvement

- What about Traffic?
  - How has traffic changed in the last 20 years?
    - PCH/Palos Verdes Blvd. – ADT
    - PCH/Torrance Blvd. – ADT
    - PCH/Aviation Blvd – ADT
    - PCH/Manhattan Beach Blvd – ADT
    - PCH/Rosecrans – ADT
  - Comparative & Cumulative Impacts

**REVIEW OF GENERAL PLAN MARKET STUDY (PRESENTATION BY BAE)**

Josh Rohmer, BAE, discussed the following:

- Market Analysis:
  - Purpose of market analysis
  - Provides basis for understanding Redondo Beach’s demographic past and present
  - Examines residential, office, and retail demand through 2040
  - These help to:
    - Establish existing baseline conditions
    - Identify emerging trends
    - Help guide land use decisions

- Beach Cities benchmark geography
• Demographic overview
  o Demographic trends: household type
  o Demographic trends: household size
  o Demographic trends: Age distribution 2010-2017
  o Household income 2017
  o Educational attainment 2017

• Employment and jobs
  o Employed residents by occupation, 2015
  o Jobs in Redondo Beach – top industries and growth by sector
    ▪ Sector growth: Redondo Beach vs LA County
  o Jobs outflow by sector, 2014
  o Commuting analysis
  o Location of jobs – where residents work

• Real Estate Trends
  o Residential
  o Affordability
    ▪ Single family sales 2016
    ▪ Condominium sales 2016
  o Office
  o Retail

• Demand Projections
  o What should we anticipate?
  o Comparative vacancy rates
  o Population and Housing
  o Population + Household Growth Projections
  o Employment Growth Projections
  o New demand – residential
  o New demand – Total through 2040

OVERVIEW: ISSUES TO ADDRESS IN THE LAND USE, OPEN SPACE, RECREATION AND CONSERVATION ELEMENTS

Woodie Tescher, PlaceWorks, spoke on General Plan Considerations:
• GP considerations
  o Little or no vacant lands available to accommodate new development and parks
  o Changing economic conditions and marketplaces offer opportunity for re-use of some properties – Galleria
  o Extension of Metro Green Line offers opportunity to creat a new “place” and development adjacent to its stations
  o Need for additional housing
  o Significant opportunity to attract office development
  o Build upon the “Silicon Beach” creative industries
  o Obstacles for viable corridor development
  o Appropriate locations and intensities for mixed-use development
  o Lack of neighborhood-serving commercial uses and services in many areas
  o North Redondo lack of open spaces and amenities

• Other Land Use Considerations
  o South Bay Metro Light Rail Extension Transit Corridor Project

Community Services Director John La Rock discussed the following:
• Open Space & Recreation Considerations
• Countrywide Parks Inventory
• LA Co Park Needs Assessment
• Countywide Parks Inventory
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Member Glad expressed concern with more traffic shifting into the neighborhoods creating gridlocking.

Member Hannon suggested submitting pictures from other locations.

Member Pinzler noted bars and thrift stores on Artesia Boulevard are not grandfathered which is a term of art.

Member Chrzan stated she could include both a green and red dot on pictures she took, which may not be captured in the pictures submitted.

Member Hannon referred to the old General Plan and questioned if the end result of feedback was implemented.

Member Pinzler pointed out that underlying zoning can be changed but it doesn’t change the items that are on it until the property changes hands, because they are grandfathered.

In response to Member Eller, Community Development Director Jones explained that North Redondo had dirt streets until the late 60’s/early 70’s, and R2 and R3 are in place due to funding needed for lighting, landscaping, paving, etc.

In response to Member Pinzler, Community Development Director Jones explained there are anomalies regarding growth, and they need to be justified. He also said it’s better to estimate high.

In response to Member Glad, Community Development Director Jones stated 120 units per year will be used going forward which may never have to be built, but it’s important there is enough to accommodate from the standpoint of infrastructure, traffic management, etc.

Member Lamb suggested the 120 units could be a limiting number, noting all impacts and density numbers need to be included as well when addressing growth.

Woodie Tescher, PlaceWorks, stated these are just starting benchmarks, and the next exercise will be to look at the map, capacity and impacts.

In response to Member Light, Community Development Director Jones explained that multiunit properties are coming down and fewer units are going up, and new zoning is more restrictive than what was in place.

Member Pinzler suggested including a source when presenting numbers along with a benchmark.

In response to Member Solomon, Community Development Director Jones noted there is a new household formation and housing availability.

In response to Member Stodder, Mr. Rohmer stated that Beach Cities is similar and LA County is very different.

Member Pinzler suggested having a chart on longevity.
Member Stodder noted slow growth because people are staying in the City.

In response to Member Lamb, Mr. Rohmer stated it is difficult to capture exactly who has moved in and who has moved out of the City.

Community Development Director Jones stated ten year of residents is included in the census data.

In response to Member Pinzler, Mr. Rohmer stated they use census data and third-party contractors, California Department of Finance, etc.

In response to Member Ludwig, Mr. Rohmer said people could have aged up into another age group, with fewer younger people aging into the group.

Member Ludwig pointed out Hermosa Beach has higher housing costs and one of the largest populations of very wealthy young people between 25 and 45.

Member Hannon suggested capturing self-employed as part of the employment and jobs.

In response to Member Pinzler, Community Development Director Jones stated the City has a home occupation business license database.

In response to Member Solomon, Mr. Rohmer stated shared office employment could be something to consider.

In response to Member Light, Mr. Rohmer stated the real estate data is from Costar.

In response to Member Pinzler, Mr. Rohmer stated the timeline on the data is constantly turned and updated.

Member Chrzan asked the percentage of condos and single family homes owned by Redondo residents versus rented. Mr. Rohmer stated this is available in the census data.

Member Solomon noted the rental rate is just over 51%. Community Development Director Jones stated this number has been this way for years and hasn’t changed much.

Member Pinzler asked if the per square foot rate is lower because what exists is substandard.

In response to Member Lamb, Mr. Rohmer stated the SCAG projections are based on RHNA and are partially based on the current City zoning.

In response to Member Lamb, Community Development Director Jones stated the RHNA won’t be reassigned until 2021 which is a capacity number.

Vice-Chair Sanchez believed that Redondo Beach has a higher demand for RHNA than some of the surrounding cities.

Community Development Director Jones explained that the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) is a number imposed by the Regional Planning Agency.

In response to Members Light and Lamb, Mr. Rohmer stated this document tonight doesn’t make recommendations and the Housing Element isn’t being updated here.

Member Chrzan pointed out the vacancy rate will go up if properties were improved for office demand.
Member Light believed the retail number isn’t correct.

Member Pinzler stated the world has changed dramatically and questioned having a projection through 2040 being a straight line.

In response to Vice Chair Sanchez, Mr. Rohmer stated the projections are based on current snapshot conditions and not on a straight line.

Member Eller noted by 2050, 50% of cars will be automatic and not owned, and there will be a virtual office environment.

Mr. Tescher stated that retail is constantly changing and brick and mortar is going away, and the nature of occupants have evolved over time.

Member Solomon noted age in population and office space which is very impactful.

Member Pinzler questioned if there was a station at the Del Amo Mall, would we need to rethink the Galleria location as opposed to trying to just fit those two links together.

Member Light stated mixed-use is not just vertical, and also park space is going down.

NEXT STEPS

a. OVERVIEW OF TOPICS TO BE COVERED AT NEXT MEETING
b. HOMEWORK

Ms. Nowak reviewed the next meeting topics.

Member Moses suggested tailoring projections and working with realistic numbers.

Community Development Director Jones stated recommendations need to be passed on to what the community can absorb and to deal with agencies as needed.

Ms. Nowak suggested having a topic on the RHNA numbers and expectations.

Mr. Tescher stated land use planning is driven by the numbers, and suggested having discussions on what should be replaced, how much does it mean, and accommodate it from other standpoints.

Ms. Nowak stated a discussion could also take place on office opportunities.

Member Pinzler spoke on RHNA and stated because of primary SCAG requirements, they are seeking highest density which may not be compatible.

Mr. Tescher supported having good solid planning.

In response to Member Eller, Ms. Nowak suggested sending questions to staff which can be sent over to PlaceWorks.

Community Development Director Jones stated that staff has set up a specific email for the Committee for questions.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Holly Osborne, North Redondo Beach, expressed concern with developers merging two lots, and supported not allowing developers to account acreage into their allowable density.
Sandy Wilson-White, South Redondo, expressed concern with planned development pushed by the State of California to get funding which has to do with United Nations Agenda 2030, redistribution of wealth, taking away private property rights, along with other issues of concern.

Paul Semas, North Redondo Beach, planner City of El Segundo, thanked staff and the consulting team, encouraged local council of governments regarding planning and smart growth, small neighborhood centers, reduced traffic, appropriately locating uses, and stated the market on Artesia closed due to competition and not enough people in the area. He also expressed concern with density, traffic impacts, and suggested looking at local solutions.

Wayne Craig, District 1, stated accurate data is important and should be referenced. He also pointed out that the power plant will be active only a few more years and parkland could be considered. He also said Costar is updated daily and is very accurate.

ADJOURNMENT: 9:28 P.M.
Motion by Member Eller, seconded by Member Glad, to adjourn the meeting at 9:28 p.m. to a Regular Meeting to be held on July 27, 2017 in the Redondo Beach Public Library, Second Floor Meeting Room, 303 N. Pacific Coast Highway, Redondo Beach, CA 90277. Motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

_________________________________
Aaron Jones
Community Development Director
ADDITIONAL HOMEWORK SUBMITTALS

GPAC Homework #1
What do you like and dislike about Redondo Beach?

- Like
- Dislike
- Parks and Open Space
- Utility and Open Space
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Comment Number</th>
<th>Do you Like or Dislike this?</th>
<th>Please tell us what you like or dislike about this place.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outside Inspiration</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>Like</td>
<td>It is a miniature town used to teach children pedestrian and bicycle safety techniques.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Character</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>Like</td>
<td>Love the view and current access to the view of the ocean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Inspiration</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>Like</td>
<td>Its one of the many peaceful streets in Culver City with many wonderful round-about, the locals seem to customize each one of them for their neighborhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Character</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>Dislike</td>
<td>All you see is power lines &amp; plant, concrete and ugly rust stained retaining walls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation/ Traffic Accessibility</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>Like</td>
<td>Bike paths throughout the city are great ... however it would be nice to connect these properly between north and south, to the beach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial/Retial/Office</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>Like</td>
<td>Nicely landscaped medians, trees ... sense of parks and very welcoming to RB. On the downside, not enough of a draw to get people walking around to help businesses thrive within the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial/Retial/Office</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>Dislike</td>
<td>An inconsistent drive through PCH has mixed residential and businesses, however many businesses are closed and can’t find tenants due to restrictive parking. I always ask the question of what zoning should be along PCH. It’s mixed today, however maybe residential would be better and push businesses to a more thriving centralized areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>Like</td>
<td>Great sense of welcoming by the King Harbor sign. Other entry points in Redondo have older, tiny signs. This would be great to see at Artesia/Inglewood, welcoming people to the Artesia Village” (obviously not its name. ... but something like that)”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial/Retial/Office</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>Dislike</td>
<td>Inefficient use of prime commercial area. While this is private land, it would be great to encourage this to be a much more efficiently designed and utilized Campus” area to attract other companies. Wasted surface level parking consumes high value land that could be used to attract new residents and businesses. NOTE: In order to have a high tech campus we need to find affordable housing. These types of workers typically look for apartment/townhouse rental type of living.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space/Recreation</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>Like</td>
<td>LOVE! We live in an area that has parks, but they are underutilized and should be focused around appropriate activities. This playground at Anderson Park is amazing. We should focus on a big park in the north and south that get primary attention (i.e., Anderson &amp; Alta Vista). Smaller parks are great but we also have this giant underutilized park” that spans our ocean front. The beach! ”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Character</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>Dislike</td>
<td>Civic Center is dated. If we want a city that is progressive and ready for the modern society, then we need to start at City Hall. Not only would it look great along PCH, but it would make an impact on the people that work in and visit it. Today it is a flashback to the 60’s. In addition to the City Hall buildings, we need to have proper Fire and Police stations to support our first responders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Character</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>Dislike</td>
<td>Wasted land between North and South Redondo that could be zoned for the future with parks and possibly a central fire and/or police station. With the future of the power lines looming and based on the plant, better uses for this land should be considered to connect the north and south with parks and biking paths. Necessary lines could be buried and a central first responder center could reduce response times for emergencies. Likewise, land could be utilized and shared with businesses and supporting residences to keep people closer to work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>