1. 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 in the Redondo Beach Public Library Second Floor Meeting Room, 303 N. Pacific Coast Highway, Redondo Beach, California.

2. ROLL CALL
Members Present: Biro, Eller, Funabashi, Gaddis, Glad, Hashmi, Kartounian, Kilroy, Lamb, Light, Ludwig, McKenzie, Moses, Nafissi, Vice-Chair Sanchez, Simpson, Solomon, Stodder, Szymanski, Turner, Voisey, Waller
Members Absent: Burke, Chrzan, Hannon, Pinzler, Shaer
Officials Present: Aaron Jones, Community Development Director
John La Rock, Community Services Director
Ted Semaan, Public Works Director
Antonio Gardea, Senior Planner
Sean Scully, Planning Manager
Stacey Kinsella, Associate Planner
Diane Cleary, Recording Secretary

Consultants Present: Woodie Tescher, PlaceWorks
Wendy Nowak, PlaceWorks
Suzanne Schwab, PlaceWorks

3. SALUTE TO THE FLAG
At the request of Chair Biro, Member Solomon led those assembled in a Salute to the Flag.

4. CONSENT CALENDAR
   a. APPROVAL OF AFFIDAVIT OF POSTING for the General Plan Advisory Committee
      Regular Meeting of September 28, 2017.
   b. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR THE GENERAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The Committee voted unanimously to approve the Consent Calendar as presented.

5. FRAMEWORK FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF AN UPDATED LAND USE PLAN
   a. Confirm opportunities to consider and challenges to address
   b. Confirm areas of enhancement or change (from prior meeting)

Wendy Nowak of PlaceWorks gave a report and discussed the following:
• Draft General Plan Vision 2040
• Planning Considerations:
• Population
  o Based on preliminary City, SCAG and Census projections:
    * 2016 Estimate
      • 69,494 Persons
      • 30,677 Housing Units
    * 2040 projection (assuming current trends continue):
- +/- 6,338 Persons
- +/- 2,798 Housing Units

- **Housing Considerations**
  - Statewide Housing Demands
  - Recent State Legislation

- **The Future of Retail**
  - E-commerce is taking shoppers out of stores; we are shopping more and more online
  - Stores are closing, and there is a surplus of retail buildings across the county
  - It is estimated that 10% of retail locations nationwide are at risk of closure
  - Amazon grew nearly ten times faster than other retailers
  - Reuse of properties developed with retail
  - Stores are looking to new, experience-oriented store models, and shopping destinations
  - Retail development will likely occupy less land than it did a decade ago

- **Office**
  - Silicon Beach
  - There is room for growth, knowledge occupations (on the rise)

- **New Demand Projections**
  - Total demand through 2040: Residential Units 3,973; Office (sf) 466,715; Retail (sf) 326,967

- **Focused Commercial Capacity Analysis**

- **Corridor considerations**
  - Lot Depths: PCH
  - Lot Depths: Artesia

- **Trip Generation Comparison Typical Block (4 acres)**
  - Commercial higher than residential

- **Considerations**
  - Little or no vacant lands available to accommodate new development and parks
  - Changing economic conditions and marketplaces offer opportunity for re-use of some properties
  - Extension of Metro Green Line offers opportunity to create a new "place" and development adjacent to its stations
  - Need for additional housing
  - Significant opportunity to attract office development
  - Build upon the "Silicon Beach" creative industries
    - Less demand for retail uses
    - Opportunity for specialty and lifestyle retail

**c. Land use considerations and presentations of case studies**

Mr. Tescher spoke on the following Case Studies:
- **Corridor redevelopment** (Examples: Pasadena, Santa Monica, Ventura, La Habra)
- **Corridor Redevelopment Santa Monica**
- **Corridor Redevelopment – Mixed-Use – The Lofts/Encinitas**
- **Commercial Redevelopment – Uptown District/San Diego/Hillcrest**
- **Redevelopment of a Regional Mall – The Crossings & San Antonio Center**
- **Redevelopment of a Regional Mall – The Crossings/Mountain View**
- **Redevelopment of a Regional Mall – San Antonio Center/Mountain View**
- **Blended Density Neighborhood Concept**
- **Blended Density Neighborhood King City, CA**
- **Blended Density Neighborhood – Blackbirds/Echo Park/Los Angeles**
- **Blended Density Neighborhood – San Diego/Bankers’ Hill**
- **Transit-Oriented Development Santa Monica**
Member Ludwig stated the City is not a place for first-time homebuyers and believed it would be less likely 20 years from now. She suggested/questioned creating low income housing so first time homebuyers can buy in a beach community.

Member Lamb questioned how much of the vision needs to be aligned with what residents see as a reality and expressed concern with not having enough time for discussion on this topic. Ms. Nowak stated they are trying to be efficient with time but respectful of input, and the public will be given opportunity to comment on the vision statement. She said all comments and feedback will go to Council to refine further. She also said the process is starting with a vision statement with the ability to go back making adjustments. The Vision statement is flexible, incorporating as much balance as possible, but the final decision is Council.

Member Lamb supported being flexible moving forward.

Member Gaddis pointed out that all three versions of the vision statement say the “City provides housing” and suggested a better way of wording would be the “City enjoys housing.”

Chair Biro suggested that a few members speak at a City Council meeting with recommendations.

Member Stodder questioned putting this before the Council at the beginning of the process as opposed to the end of the process. Ms. Novak stated it is important to know the Council’s direction before moving forward.

Member Light suggested the vision should be submitted to Council first and then obtain guidance.

Community Development Director Jones agreed and said it is important to inform Council what the Committee is doing, receive guidance and make sure the Committee is heading in the right direction.

Member Ludwig believed that it was determined months ago that affordable housing was not an inclusion as part of the vision statement, and questioned coming up with recommended fixes. Ms. Novak noted there is a housing crisis in the City, and said it is important the City provide housing opportunities for anyone to live in the City.

Member Solomon pointed out that a first-time home buyer doesn’t necessarily mean low income, and supported having a vision statement with as broad and idealistic terminology that encompasses everything.

Member Ludwig believed that a vision statement should be more general and less specific.

Woodie Tescher of PlaceWorks explained that affordable could be all income levels and pointed out that it’s the law California provide affordable housing.

Member Volsey suggested that a draft of the vision come back to the Committee, put a sticker on any disagreements, and then forward to the City Council.

In response to Member Glad and Member Lamb, Ms. Novak stated that corridors are different and allow an opportunity to do different things.

In response to Member Glad regarding outdated strip malls, Mr. Tescher stated there is a lot of existing inventory that is outdated relative to current retail. Ms. Novak noted new creative types of office.
Member Light stated the aerospace industry is reaching out to Silicon Beach for new capabilities, noted there are people who live here that would love to open office space but there is not critical mass, and noted there are just chunks of creative office space which aren’t supported, and yet El Segundo and Manhattan Beach are blowing out this type of market. He also pointed out a high turnover of the commercial on the bottom.

Mr. Tescher explained the numbers and how trips are generated.

Member Light stated it is important to note that there are different types of trips, noting over 90% of people working will commute out of the City, and the C1 and C2 depends on if they are regional or local serving. He said local serving trips will be made anyway and regional will draw in more trips. He also said every new house generates new trips out of the City.

Mr. Tescher explained that the numbers are based on in and out trips, and the number of trips entering and leaving are based upon home to work in the a.m. and p.m. He also said through traffic also includes other trips coming through the City.

Member Gaddis asked if the retail clustering assumes a certain pedestrian friendliness. Mr. Tescher said there will be pedestrian friendly retail uses in the areas where retail is supported.

Member Lamb asked if there are other slide/examples that do not include mixed use. Mr. Tescher stated 100% residential or retail is allowed as well as a MU building.

Member Lamb asked about available greenspaces. Mr. Tescher stated these will be marked this evening.

Member Light pointed out there are grandfathered uses in the R3 zone especially in South Redondo where not much can be done with them. He also pointed out commercial corridors at 2000 Artesia Blvd. and 1800 PCH are underperforming with high turnover, which is vertical mixed use. He also said the transit oriented development process will not even start until 2028 which may be designated high density forever for transit oriented development that may never show up.

Member Solomon asked if subcategories are being considered such as big box retail from 500 to 2500 square feet or office spaces at Class A which are not in Redondo. He also said co-sharing spaces are typically more Class A.

Member Lamb stated the Artesia corridor is evolving on its own without a developer coming in and asked what is being done to liven the corridor which can be done in other corridors. She suggested engaging the people and creatively enliven the corridors. Mr. Tescher stated a corridor like Artesia would not be a single developer and a series of decisions will be made along with a series of property owners doing their own thing consistent with the City rules.

d. Small Group Exercise: Envisioning A Plan for the Future
   i. Artesia and Aviation Corridors

The Committee broke down into groups at 8:25 p.m.

Artesia Boulevard

Member Glad spoke for their table with the following recommendations:
- Section of the Artesia Corridor near the Galleria - redesignate as mixed-use all the way up to the park for the bike path
- From the bike path to Blossom – designate as C4
• Portion between Blossom and Aviation - remain as the current designation as a mixed use – how to attract a better mixed use of that area

Member Funabashi spoke for their table with the following recommendations:
• Existing zoning – distinguish between the multi-use and commercial use
• Parking issues – policy where each individual project should have its own adequate parking
• How the added parking on the greenbelt will factor in
• MU 3 – concerned about height
• From the library west to Aviation Way remain the same
• Going east – C4 where the grocery store is located
• From the greenbelt east to Inglewood – MU2
• Galleria back to C4 from the railroad tracks east

Chair Biro spoke for their table with the following recommendations:
• Artesia Blvd. – Looking at three parking structures/ lots along the Artesia corridor around the power lines, Slauson and Blossom
• Enhanced mixing throughout the Artesia corridor – parking spots get lost – enhance landscaping
• Enhancement of the Edison easement to be active park
• Focus on business along Artesia mostly around Ruxton and Felton and adjacent to SCE
• Going north - industrial park adjacent to Northrop-Grumman - have some R2 and some MU
• Commercial

Member Solomon spoke for their table with the following recommendations:
• East end from SCE R of W up to Inglewood – office low rise – service people who come in through the area, easy freeway access, service the residential, activate the Galleria site during the day for people remaining here at offices during the day
• Blossom to Phelan underperforming - create more parking or other accessibility within this corridor – may serve to better activate the current corridor or improve it – create more parking opportunities from office space, and opportunities on the western portion from Blossom to activate the area during the day, and in the evening activate the space from residential serving activities or uses currently in the corridor or be replaced in the corridor
• From Blossom west leave as residential use but make a little bit more of a mixed use in the area

Member Glad referred to the green space on Artesia Blvd. near Mira Costa counted as open space/park space and noted it is actually fenced off and not used, and questioned leaving it more like Park 1 rather than Park 4.

Mr. Tescher stated overlay of green open space ideas will be reviewed.

**Aviation Boulevard**

Chair Biro spoke for their table with the following recommendations:
• Continue theme of Artesia Blvd. to have streetscape improvement along the entire corridor along with needed parking
• Corner of Artesia and Aviation – parkette to enhance the location
• Bike accessibility

Member ____________ spoke for their table with the following recommendations:
• Leave as is
• Big Lots area – can’t change
• Possibly have 1-2 story housing – leave the rest as is
Member Glad spoke for their table with the following recommendations:
- Starting at Aviation and Artesia intersection – designated commercial creative industry business space – entire section at gas station all the way up to Big Lots creative business space
- To Ormond – designate as Commercial 1
- From Ormond all the way down to the remaining of corridor on east side of street – designate as office low commercial – west side of street MU2
- Enhance streetscaping

Member Moses spoke for their table with the following recommendations:
- Artesia and Aviation – creative industry business office space – served well by the major thoroughfares – keeping traffic out of the neighborhoods
- Gateway of Green 6 – gateway designation – tie in with designation
- Rest of corridor down to PCH – leave alone – changes may create some organic improvement
- Bars do build neighborhoods

Group Discussion Questions:
- Do the existing General Plan land use designations represent your ideas about the future of the opportunity areas?
- Using the Land Use Typology Menu, is there another typology that would be more appropriate?
- Recognizing that there is insufficient demand to support full retail development of the commercial corridors, what alternative uses should be located in these areas?
- Should housing be accommodated, in what locations should it be located and what densities permitted?

6. CONFIRM REDONDO BEACH GENERAL PLAN VISION 2040
   a. Forward to City Council for review and action

After discussion, the Committee recommended the following language for the Vision Statement:

Redondo Beach offers the excitement and opportunity of a large city combined with the charm, beauty and attitude of a small town. We are a seaside city with an active and casual beach culture and a high quality of life. Our beaches, waterfront and harbor, aerospace industry and regional mall serve to frame our neighborhoods with award winning schools. Redondo Beach is safe, family-friendly and a highly desirable place to live. Our residents and businesses have strong community ties and are invested in the future of our City. Our city and public safety services serve our community as if it were a small town—providing neighborhood service rooted in earlier traditions. Sustainability is important as the community changes and evolves we want to adapt in an environmentally, economically, and fiscally responsible way. Our City has a variety of housing that appeals to the life styles and affordability needs of all our residents. We are an active, health-oriented community that enjoys outdoor living. Our substantial parks and open space amenities and programs are vital components of our community. Business and technology are important in Redondo Beach. We embrace creativity, innovation, and technological advances to attract businesses that are on the cutting edge of their industries. We have reimagined and revitalized our corridors, the waterfront, our regional mall, and all commercial and industrial sectors to create more quality jobs and unique destinations for residents, employers, and visitors, while protecting our neighborhoods and preserving our public space. We continue to support new modes of transportation—reducing our reliance on personal automobiles. Our location along the Green Line connects our residents to regional employment centers and cultural destinations throughout the region. Our City leaders foster meaningful civic engagement to ensure their decisions related to the future of our community are informed, transparent and reflective of our citizens’ views.
7. NEXT STEPS

It was determined that the Committee will participate in the same exercise for Torrance Boulevard on October 26, 2017.

8. PUBLIC COMMENT

Henry Johnson reviewed his handout and opposed SB1069 regarding secondary dwelling units on residential lots.

Holly Osborne spoke on parking on Artesia and opposed metered parking structures and supported preserving current street parking. She also opposed building too much on Artesia that will require a metered structure.

Paul Samaras spoke on the following:
- Supported stronger transportation language in the vision statement (second sentence in second paragraph) and to rephrase to “all aspects are assets”
- Supported leadership language
- Stated a variety of housing addresses various needs is a good way to compromise
- Stated there is a need for housing
- Encouraged thinking about people who live here, age here, stay close, and to think about younger people not leaving Redondo
- Noted there is an oversupply of retail which is another reason retail is falling and suggested reducing retail zoning and uses and concentrate at key locations
- Supported accessible residential neighborhoods
- Suggested opportunities at Artesia and Aviation facing residential neighborhoods and obtain depth when possible.

Gary Mlynek believed that the slide show tonight conflicts with the Mayor’s agenda of slow growth/no growth. He also said home prices build a wall, and noted a conflict of interest.

Tracy spoke on the following:
- General Plan having basic characteristics of the other cities
- Stack and pack housing and development
- Central planning – getting people out of their cars and lower vehicle miles traveled
- Increase regionalism and impacts to having fewer single family homes
- SCAG numbers have been determined to be fatally flawed, and Hollywood and Hermosa Beach are not using SCAG numbers for housing
- Sustainability being an attack on capitalism, and coming up with a new economy, and not having free market elements, new technologies and invasion of privacy
- She questioned if the original planning document was used and questioned disenfranchising public input and participation by not allowing public comments at the beginning of the meeting

Paul Moses spoke on SB1069 which is the additional dwelling unit mandate for the state. He said this serves the community very well, allowing affordable housing to family members which were originally called granny flats. He said the units have to honor all codes and setbacks, creating opportunities to stay in the neighborhood such as for parents or children. He supported implementing SB1069 to its fullest in Redondo Beach.

9. ADJOURNMENT: 10:04 P.M.
The Committee voted unanimously to adjourn the meeting at 10:04 p.m. to a Regular Meeting to be held on October 26, 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