Minutes
Regular Meeting
General Plan Advisory Committee
June 8, 2017

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 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 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
  o 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/Airport 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.

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, one of which had an existing development with an immutable footprint, and supported not allowing developers to account the acreage of the immutable footprint 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