I. AGENDA

*Items for presentation, discussion or action.*

1. Call Meeting to Order – Welcome and opening remarks

2. Roll Call

3. Salute to the Flag

4. Consent Calendar
   a. Approval of the Affidavit of Posting for the General Plan Advisory Committee Regular Meeting of August 31, 2017.
   b. Approval of the following Minutes:
      (i) General Plan Advisory Committee Regular Meeting of June 8, 2017
      (ii) General Plan Advisory Committee Regular Meeting of July 27, 2017

5. Group Discussion: Draft Redondo Beach General Plan Vision 2017
   a. Identify refinements
   b. Motion to forward to City Council for review and action

6. Framework for the Development of an Updated Land Use Plan
   a. Confirm opportunities to consider and challenges to address
   b. Presentation of Case Studies
   c. Confirm Areas of Enhancement or Change (from prior meeting)
   d. Small Group Exercise: Envisioning a Plan for the Future

7. Next Steps

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 to be held at 7:00 p.m. on Thursday, October 26, 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, question, 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.
August 25, 2017

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
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 Friday, August 25, 2017, the agenda for the August 31, 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

[Signature]

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
Wendy 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 Szymanski 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

  ○ 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

  ○ 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

  ○ 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
  ○ Population growth each decade since 1980
  ○ Population 1940-2016
  ○ Population Percent Change per decade
  ○ Population and housing
    ○ 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 create 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
• Amenity quantities & Conditions
• Redondo Beach Park Metrics
• Countywide Needs Assessment
• Administration & Next Steps

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. She also noted the RHNA numbers are higher for Redondo Beach than the surrounding communities.

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 44. She objected to the statement that housing costs is driving 25 to 44 year olds out of Redondo Beach.

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**
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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
OPENING SESSION
A Regular Meeting of the Redondo Beach General Plan Advisory Committee was called to order by Chair Biro at 7:00 p.m. in the Redondo Beach Public Library Second Floor Meeting Room, 303 N. Pacific Coast Highway, Redondo Beach, California.

ROLL CALL
Members Absent: Burke, Eller, Royds, Sanchez, Shaer, Stodder, Szymanski, Waller, Williams
Officials Present: Aaron Jones, Community Development Director
John La Rock, Community Services Director
Antonio Gardea, Senior Planner
Sean Scully, Planning Manager
Stacey Kinsella, Associate Planner
Lina Portolese, Planning Analyst
Diane Cleary, Recording Secretary
Consultants Present: Woodie Tescher, PlaceWorks
Wendy Nowak, PlaceWorks
Halley Grundy, PaceWorks

CONSENT CALENDAR
b. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR THE GENERAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE REGULAR MEETING: June 8, 2017.

Member Lamb referred to the minutes, page 5, 7th paragraph from the bottom, and requested that the word “inadequate” replace “limiting.” She also stated that the RHNA numbers being higher in Redondo Beach than the surrounding communities should be noted in the minutes.

Member Pinzler suggested that the recording be the official verbatim record, not the minutes.

Member Ludwig requested that the discussion regarding losing the 25- to 44-year olds due to not having enough affordable housing be included in the minutes, noting she objected to this comment and pointed out that there are many 25- to 44-year olds in both Hermosa Beach and Manhattan Beach.

Community Development Director Aaron Jones stated that summary meeting minutes are the official record of the proceedings and reviewed and approved by the body, and noted that verbatim transcripts are not prepared. However, there are recordings of meetings available for a period of time available to the public.

Member Light suggested having email input with any changes.

Mr. Tescher pointed out there will be small group interactions going forward that will not be recorded.
Item b. was pulled for further changes to be brought back at the next meeting.

Motion by Member Lamb, seconded by Member Light, to approve Item a. of the Consent Calendar. Motion carried unanimously.

ORDER OF AGENDA
Motion by Member Solomon, seconded by Member Hannon, to consider Public Comment next on the Agenda. Motion carried, with Members Pinzler and Moses voting no.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Michael O’Connell spoke on the following:

- Suggested having metrics to measure progress and achieve the target
- Look to see if the policies and procedures put into the plans are effective
- Questioned money still needed for lighting and paving – what is the metrics on zoning, ordinance, zoning map, etc.
- Issues with how broadly the statistics are being used. Losing visibility of some of the key differentiators such as median sales prices for condos at $810K which is true in the table but by size is $1,000,030 apiece. Prices for new condos going forward will be $1,000,030, not $810K
- Statistics need to be taken into account – the age and size of the house or condo – household size of 2.3 does take this into account either
- 2016-2040 projection of the population growth at around 5500 with a number of household growth at 3600, only averages out to 1.5 people per unit
- Not a wash on population
- Undercutting/understating population growth
- Parking 1.7 cars per household which is broad across all categories of houses – should check on a non-street sweeping day – walk the streets and see how many cars are parked

Ursula Lazo, Asset Manager Selective Real Estate Investment, spoke on the following:

- Represent ownership 1207-1209 Aviation Blvd. Redondo Beach
- Property unique being partly in Hermosa Beach and Redondo Beach
- Has been identified by both municipalities as a gateway corridor on location
- Asked that both cities and Planning Commissioners work together for mutual and consistent zoning standards as well as future development plans
- Inconsistencies and discrepancies between zoning, noting that Hermosa Beach property is zoned C3, and Redondo Beach is C2
- Different story requirements and restrictions in height and future development type of planning
- Suggested looking in a broader nature for future development plans regarding this property

Sandy Willson-White, South Redondo, objected to consultants coming to cities and getting a high price for business that they do in the City. She supported the housing proposed at the Galleria going down to 300 units, but expressed concern with people not having ownership, government intrusion and Section 8 housing. She also supported keeping good quality of life in the City.

Harry Johnson requested that the Chairman have a Pledge of Allegiance.

Led by Mayor Brand, the Members, staff and audience rose to Salute the Flag.

Mayor Brand stated it is important to keep a good record of the meeting minutes and that they be accurate. He said land use is also very important, and noted concerns include overdevelopment, traffic and parking. He said the crisis in Redondo Beach is traffic, the state is not sending requirements for meeting school size classes, waits at lights, etc. and the state supporting more housing. He supported the Committee address this based on impacts to the City, not just
perceiving housing shortage or affordability crisis. He noted there are less than 3 acres per 1,000 residents in the City and the state is determining this is critically underserved. He also said that USC for Sustainable Studies ranked Redondo Beach, Manhattan Beach and Hermosa Beach in with South LA and East LA as the most park poor communities in the entire region. He suggested that School Board Member Mike Christianson and the Superintendent speak at a future GPAC meeting regarding ratio to students, housing units, etc., and pointed out that Redondo Beach has an incredible mix of housing. He also pointed out Members will be dropped after missing three meetings.

Tracey Hopkins spoke on the SCAG numbers and stated a judge determined that the SCAG housing numbers are considered as “fatally flawed” and should be disregarded. She said they were disregarded in Hollywood and Hermosa Beach and other cities. She stated this was a Hollywood court case when they were doing their plan, and suggested visiting the website Democrats Against UN Agenda 21.com which will provide an alternate look at what is being shared by the consultants. She also asked if the book “Growing Smart Legislative Guidebook a Management of Change Model Statutes” is being utilized in the planning process.

Jane Abrams, District 1, stated in 2015/16, she started attending Planning and City Council meetings when District 1 was threatened by Legado and Sea Breeze projects. She noted vacancy rates in the City and asked if commercial vacancy rates are being tracked. She stated she is Interested in land use and zoning, and hoped the Committee will work towards improving and scaling back mixed use.

Rebecca James, District 2, noted a unique opportunity in the City due to the AES site being for sale and the waterfront influx and to take advantage of this opportunity to make a grand scale park and open space project. She said the parcel is approximately 50 acres along with additional parking up the hill privately owned but there would be a decommissioning of the transmission lines on the corridor on 190th that would be anchored with Dominguez Park. She asked that the Committee consider this amazing chance to have the City be known for something really stellar and a grand vision for a park.

Jeff Abrams, District 1, stated the GPAC has a chance to redo the General Plan which will last for some time, and to correct all errors in the past. He addressed density, noting the zoning laws allow for excess density in all building. He suggested concentrating on how to get density per acre more realistic. He said Avenue G has no parking, and stated the traffic has been getting worse and worse with developers cramming more units into an acre, and opposed mixed use being 35 units per acre.

Barbara Epstein supported open space and parkland, and expressed concern with the consultants giving information about commercial and real estate development and lack of park discussion. She suggested preservation, public amenities and discussions on quality of life rather than commercial and development focus on future plans.

Wayne Craig, District 1, stated he spoke to the Hermosa Beach Mayor regarding potential traffic impacts from the proposed CenterCal development who did not support it and noted he never received a call back when reaching out to the Redondo Beach Mayor and Council. He said the GPAC now has the ability to do something that will not only impact Redondo Beach but the entire region for the next 50 to 100 years. He also said there are other options and supported taking input with the other surrounding cities, and noted support for a park regarding the corridor up the hill.

Bedros Enfiedjian, District 1, introduced himself as a resident, stated he was available for any advice or input and supported the GPAC.
A resident from District 5 stated he did not see AES turned into a park and believed there should be a better use. He said he would like to see land for water storage and believed parking in North Redondo is terrible. He also opposed increasing driveway space when buying old homes which decreases parking.

Motion by Member Moses, seconded by Member Funabashi, to close the Public Comments. Motion carried unanimously.

OVERVIEW OF TOPICS TO BE COVERED AT FUTURE MEETINGS

Wendy Nowak, PlaceWorks, discussed the following:
- A preview of future meeting topics (meetings 3 through 11)
- Priorities of Tonight’s Meeting
  - Identify areas of preservation and potential change in the City
  - Identify values and ideals to incorporate into draft Vision Statement

Woodie Tescher, PlaceWorks, discussed the following:
- Understanding the City
  - Planning Considerations
    - Foundation: Existing land use and urban form analysis
    - Foundation to inform identification of areas of preservation and future change
    - Layering of several factors
  - Street Pattern
    - Predominantly block/grid patterns with long corridors
    - Exceptions
  - Building Footprints
    - Distinctive patterns based upon types of development
  - Typologies
  - Lot Depths
  - Districts
  - Adjacent Land Use
  - Setting the Foundation
  - Current GP approach to land use

REVIEW OF HOMEWORK ASSIGNMENT FROM MEETING 2 (PHOTOGRAPHS OF LIKES/DISLIKES)

Ms. Nowak discussed the following:
- Homework – Likes & Dislikes Survey
  - Received 192 photos and comments
  - 18 members responded
  - Most comments made along corridors or adjacent to amenities
  - Submissions generally fit into 8 broad categories:
    - Open Space/Recreation (49)
    - Community Character (42)
    - Commercial/Retail/Office (30)
    - Transportation/Traffic/Accessibility (26)
    - Residential (10)
    - Community services (9)
    - Parking (6)
    - Signage (5)
  - Open Space & Recreation likes/dislikes
- Community Character likes/dislikes
- Commercial/Retail/Office likes/dislikes
- Transportation/Traffic/Accessibility likes/dislikes

**SMALL GROUP EXERCISE: AREAS OF PRESERVATION AND OPPORTUNITY AREAS FOR POTENTIAL CHANGE**

Mr. Tescher reviewed the following to be considered from the small group exercise:
- Establishing Change Criteria
- Areas of Preservation & Potential Change
- Map it: Small Group Exercise
- Ground Rules for Group Discussion
- Group Presentations

**BRIEF PRESENTATION AND GROUP EXERCISE: GENERAL PLAN VISION 2040**

**GROUP PRESENTATIONS**

Group 1: Member Glad presented the following discussed:
- Preserve every park and green space
- Enhance Wilderness Park
- Enhance Dominguez Park with more accessible use for different demographics
- Preserve historic buildings
- City identify and designate additional areas that is historic and preserve character
- Preserve Riviera Village, The Esplanade
- Opposed dense housing, high rises and what can be done to change it
- Lower density housing throughout the City
- Power lines, sub stations, AES changes
- Power poles in terms of residential – not seeing a lot of green
- Waterfront and pier – change waterfront area versus Seaside Lagoon – maintain as recreation space and enhance to be more usable and accessible/functional
- Corridors need to be used - vacancies on Artesia, 190th and down PCH – vacant strip malls
- The Galleria
- Some enhancement at the Beach Cities Health District – supported its character having everything together

Group 2: Sheila Lamb presented the following discussed:
- Themes – connectivity through bike lanes, walking opportunities, from south to north to the very tip of the north
- Commercial industrial at Northrop Grumman which may have a possibility for change and enhanced.
- District 5 – potential for enhancement along with change – changing zoning from R3 to R2 and bring down density
- Enhance with more parks and increase parkland for the community
- Artesia corridor – enhance the area which is in progress.
- Golden Triangle – preserve and area on top enhance as a park
- Ripley – part of connectivity and preserve and enhance with traffic circles and traffic calming
- Moving south – preserve area down to south
- Enhance Hollywood Riviera, preserve area on the front
- Waterfront and AES will change but did not make an attempt to define this anymore
- Dominguez Park centrally located – opportunity to have the area be a linkage between North and South through a community center for all residents
Member Moses noted potential to put police and fire stations at Dominguez Park, change power lines to public, recreation and open space, knowing there will be power lines over it, and the possibility of changes on AES was not limited.

Group 3: Chair Biro presented the following discussed:
- Save R1
- Save properties under Mill’s Act
- Greenline extension should go to the Galleria Mall onto Del Amo – connectivity
- Key item corridors – Artesia Blvd., Torrance Blvd., and PCH
- Opportunity at Northrop Grumman for residential, park uses, etc.
- Connectivity – Galleria, Artesia, harbor, hotels, The Village
- Golden Hills – more sidewalks
- AES - Mixed Use – park, hotel, institutional use, different opportunities

Group 4: Member Hashmi presented the following discussed:
- Preserve and enhance the Performing Arts Center being more of a revenue generator
- Anderson Park – preserve all parks
- Enhance the Artesia corridor
- Preserve metro station as a link to increase mobility
- Enhance and change the Galleria
- Preserve parkland, historical homes on Broadway, parkettes
- PCH enhancement, Pacific Center enhance as a space for community meeting spaces as well as police and fire
- Preserve King Harbor sign
- Preserve and enhancement Riviera Village with walkability, bikability and access
- Preserve The Esplanade and view corridor
- Walkways, greenbelts or bike paths through residential areas
- Areas of interest include The Pier, Seaside Lagoon, having spaces for public art, community meeting spaces, preserving and enhancing view corridors down 190th

GENERAL PLAN VISION 2040

Ms. Nowak discussed the following:
- What is a Vision Statement?
  - Articulation of the core values and desires of the community as they relate to the General Plan
  - Guides and informs the development of more specific policies later in the planning process
  - An image of the future we wish to create
  - Succinct description of community values
- Characteristics of a GP Vision
  - Future-oriented
  - Idealistic
  - Appropriate
  - Inspirational
  - Purposeful
  - Ambitious
- Strategic Plan vs. General Plan Vision
- Forming the Vision
- What Does It Address?
- What is the Vision?
- Documenting the Vision
- Vision 2040: Next Steps
GROUP EXERCISE
- Post-it note exercise
- Using words to express attributes of the future community
- Paired with land use mapping exercise
- Will be used to draft a Vision Statement for GPA to review before next meeting

REDONDO BEACH GP VISION 2040
- What should the City of Redondo Beach look like in 2040?

CRAFTING GP VISION 2040
- Use post its to identify words, phrases or ides to respond to the following:
  - What does Redondo Beach value?
  - What will Redondo Beach look like in 20 years?
  - What makes Redondo Beach unique?
  - If the City could change one thing to make Redondo Beach a better place to live, what change would that be?
- Review ideas posted in response to each question with the group

Ms. Nowak discussed the following:
- Identified themes
- Take post-its and grouping exercise back to office and coordinate with themes
- Craft vision statement with Committee for review

NEXT MEETING
- Mr. Tescher discussed the following:
  - Committee Look at beginnings of vision statement between now and next meeting
  - Next exercise
    - Judgement calls and recommendations
    - Will provide visual imagery
    - Case studies

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS
In response to Member Eller, Ms. Nowak explained that Council has the ability to revise or change any of the recommendations from the GPAC who are the ultimate decision makers.

Mr. Tescher stated GPAC recommendations go to the Planning Commission which only has the authority to make a recommendation to the City Council. He said in the final action, the City Council would have to make findings of the Environmental Impact Report as well.

In response to Member Eller, Mr. Tescher suggested input can be provided by marking up the map and bringing it to the next meeting.

Member Lamb suggested distinguishing between institutional and park on the map.

Member Glad also agreed that institutional and park should be separate on the map and to use separate colors.

Member Pinzler stated technology needs to be included in the discussions, noting changes between now and 2040 in mobility, structure of business and use of technology.
In response to Member Hanson, Mr. Tescher stated as details get further into the policies, there will be other high level topics to address. He said tonight, the Committee will break down into small groups and to get general direction first with all considerations and then focus on the implementation of plan map and policy.

Member Glad pointed out that discussions at the last meeting included traffic shifting into the neighborhoods and turning them into cut through traffic, and hoped to see this addressed through the process.

Ms. Nowak stated the focus of the two elements being updated will be land use and open space, and traffic calming and traffic impacts to neighborhoods will be considered.

Chair Biro noted other cities having issues with apps and Ubers using certain streets rather than taking main roads. Ms. Nowak stated this can be reviewed.

Member Hannon believed the City itself could weigh in on ways to make recommendations to avoid certain streets.

Member Ludwig stated it is important to make sure each district is represented in each discussion group.

Member Solomon pointed out that there will be some areas that will not change such as Northrop-Grumman not becoming 500 units of housing.

**ADJOURNMENT: 9:44 P.M.**
Motion by Member Glad, seconded by Member Voisey, to adjourn the meeting at 9:44 p.m. to a Regular Meeting to be held on August 31, 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
Public written comment received for GPAC4 August 31, 2017
I have 2 concerns which I would like considered regarding the current revision to the General Plan. I was on the GPAC nearly 30 years ago, and one of these concerns stems from back then.

The first concern is regarding the lack of parking in commercial zones. It seems that whenever a new development meets “code required parking”, it is given the green light (for adequate parking). Often as tenants in a new development change, so do the parking needs, and often residential neighborhoods become impacted with cars visiting this commercial development. Then the residents are forced to ask for and pay for a “parking permit district” so that they can park at their homes. I would like to propose that we require new commercial establishments have more parking than the Code requires.

I am particular concerned with new commercial uses at the AES site. Not having adequate parking will greatly impact the adjacent residential neighborhoods. Especially in this area, we should require perhaps an extra 25-50% more parking. In addition, it should be mandated that this parking can only be used for customers of the particular commercial use and must be provided free of charge, and that the commercial use must self-police, or face very stiff consequences from the city. Lastly, employees must be required to park at the commercial site and parking for the employees must be free of charge.

Without these rules, employees will be informally told to park in the adjacent residential neighborhoods, so that paying customers can use the spaces and/or paid parking can be made available for beach and/or commercial visitors.

My next concern has to do with the re-building of legally built non-conforming residential structures, if a fire, etc. destroys over 50% of the building. During our discussions nearly 30 years ago, there was a faction that felt that if a home was destroyed by, let’s say, 60%, then the entire structure would need to be replaced. If this subject is to be currently visited by your committee, please let me know, so that I can pass on some history on this subject and let you know why, back then, we decided to allow legally non-conforming residential structures to be rebuilt if needed.

Very truly yours,

Bill Lippert