AGENDA – PUBLIC MEETING
GENERAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE
CITY OF REDONDO BEACH
THURSDAY NOVEMBER 30, 2017 – 6:30 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. Salute to Flag
4. Consent Calendar
   a. Approval of the Affidavit of Posting for the General Plan Advisory Committee
      Regular Meeting of November 30, 2017
   b. Approval of Minutes for the General Plan Advisory Committee Regular Meeting of
      October 26, 2017
5. Project Status and Scope Updates
6. Legislative Updates: Housing
7. Framework for the Development of an Updated Land Use Plan
   a. Small Group Exercise: Envisioning A Plan for the Future (continuation of discussion
      from previous meeting of remaining areas)
8. 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 an Adjourned Special Meeting that is planned to be held at 6:30 p.m. on Thursday, December 21, 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.
November 21, 2017

STATE OF CALIFORNIA  )  ss
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 Tuesday, November 21, 2017, the agenda for the November 30, 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
1. OPENING SESSION
A Regular Meeting of the Redondo Beach General Plan Advisory Committee was called to order by Chair Biro at 7:04 p.m. in the Redondo Beach Public Library Second Floor Meeting Room, 303 N. Pacific Coast Highway, Redondo Beach, California.

2. ROLL CALL
Members Present: Chair Biro, Members Burke, Chrzan, Eller, Funabashi, Gaddis, Glad, Hannon, Hashmi, Light, Ludwig, Nafissi, Pinzler, Sanchez, Simpson, Solomon, Szymanski, Turner, Voisey, Waller, Moses (arrived 7:10 p.m.), Stodder (arrived 7:12 p.m.)

Members Absent: Burke, Kartounian, Kilroy, Lamb, McKenzie, Shaer

Officials Present: Aaron Jones, Community Development Director
John La Rock, Community Services Director
Ted Semaan, Public Works Director
Sean Scully, Planning Manager
Antonio Gardea, Senior Planner
Marianne Gastelum, Assistant Planner
Lina Portolese, Planning Analyst (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 Light 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 October 26, 2017.

Motion by Member Eller, seconded by Member Sanchez, to approve the Consent Calendar. Motion carried unanimously, with Members Pinzler, Hannon, and Chrzan abstaining.

5. FRAMEWORK FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF AN UPDATED LAND USE PLAN
Chair Biro began the item by asking for a motion to Receive and File written comments for the exercise from Member Lamb who could not be in attendance. It was moved and seconded to receive and file the written comments from Member Lamb. Motion carried unanimously.

Woodie Tescher, PlaceWorks, introduced the item and stated this will be a continuation of the exercise from the previous month to identify areas of change and enhancement. The previous exercise covered Artesia and Aviation Boulevards. This meeting will cover additional corridors on the map. The group ideas from these exercises will be compiled and reported back to GPAC at future meetings on composite maps, at which point the GPAC will begin discussing land use options and recommendations.
In response to Member Pinzler regarding timing, Wendy Nowak, PlaceWorks, stated it will take some time to compile all the ideas and anticipated the information will be presented at the January 2018 meeting.

Ms. Nowak stated this exercise will go through the remaining areas.

In response to Member Light, Community Development Director Jones stated that input for the Galleria area can be given by looking at the entire area as a district, rather than just the Galleria site on its own, which has a pending proposal for development currently.

Ms. Nowak reviewed the process for the exercise, which involves breaking up into the same small groups from the last meeting.

**Torrance Boulevard**

Mr. Tescher introduced the first subarea for the exercise, Torrance Boulevard Corridor.

- Reviewed the current General Plan designations
- Land uses comprised predominately of offices and automotive with some restaurant
- Western half higher density development
- Eastern half lower density development
- Can be a possible gateway to the City

Small group exercise for Torrance Boulevard commenced at 7:20 p.m.

**RECONVENE - 7:40 P.M.**

**Group 1:**

Member Stodder spoke on behalf of Group 1.

- Extend corridor all the way down to the Pier, natural flow, connect with existing bike path
- Split into an upper and lower corridor; upper corridor to the east being more commercial and office with some parkettes, parking structure in the middle of the corridor to serve all the uses, pedestrian flow down to the Pier
- Member Light stated the western portion would be pedestrian oriented commercial uses down to the Pier

**Group 2:**

Member Moses spoke on behalf of Group 2.

- Low rise office on the south side to encourage the continuation of medical office uses, similar to a medical center like Lomita Boulevard it Torrance, provides opportunities for jobs
- At PCH and west towards the Pier, pedestrian oriented commercial uses with streetscape enhancements
- A gateway at the easterly end as an entry point to the City
**Group 3:**

Member Solomon spoke on behalf of Group 3.

- Pedestrian friendly gateway at the western edge from PCH to the Pier with multi-tenant commercial to serve visitors and local residents that can walk there
- Retail has seemed to struggle heading east, therefore low rise office uses to the east
- Office uses to have on-site parking, preserve street parking and possibly create a parking lot at the very eastern portion so that visitors can walk down from there

**Group 4:**

Member Waller spoke on behalf of Group 4.

- Easternmost edge should have a gateway
- Neighborhood commercial or pedestrian oriented commercial at the eastern half
- No more than 2 stories on the eastern half (east of Irena Ave); no more than 3 stories on the western half (west of Irena Ave)
- Increase pedestrian oriented uses as you move more west
- The draw for the office and restaurant uses will be from people living in the adjacent neighborhoods who will walk
- Maintain the residential zoning that exists on the west side of PCH

This concluded Torrance Boulevard exercise.

**190th Street**

Mr. Tescher introduced the next subarea for the exercise, 190th Street Corridor.

- Comprised of different land uses including light industrial, offices, commercial, and residential
- Should industrial uses remain as land uses and possibly become industrial/office uses
- R-3 density residential zoning, most parcels are shallow therefore projects would not be of a large scale
- Commercial uses at the intersections
- Local serving uses rather than destination uses
- Could these corridor also serve as a gateway

Small group exercise for 190th Street commenced at 7:50 p.m.

**RECONVENE - 8:05 P.M.**

**Group 2:**

- West end of the corridor office uses
- Parkette where current strip mall is
- Creative office spaces where current industrial sites are
- Make the corridor more walkable and accessible by bike
- Residential uses to the west of Inglewood Avenue
Group 4:
- Enhance the area currently zoned for Mobile Home Park, make it a pedestrian friendly access area if feasible
- Maintain some of the light industrial uses, add creative office space
- Maintain multi-family residential to the east

Group 3:
- Improve the mobile home park area
- The industrial uses are successful and should remain

Group 1:
- Whole area should be high tech offices, beginning at the eastern end
- Middle can be commercial uses to serve the adjacent residential area
- Expand the existing parkette
- Create a tech campus
- Bike path through Lillienthal park

Mr. Tescher stated that a strategy would need to be determined for the displacement of any residents of the mobile home park, if that is a direction the GPAC wishes to take. Additionally, the loss of units would need to be replaced in another area.

This concluded the 190th Street exercise.

Pacific Coast Highway

Mr. Tescher introduced the next subarea for the exercise, Pacific Coast Highway.

- This corridor is comprised of a mix of uses including automotive, strip commercial with parking lots in front, multi-tenant commercial centers, and mid-block residential
- The residential portion is high-density multi-family residential
- Several mixed-use designated areas, which allows for all commercial development or ground-floor commercial with residential component above on lots of a minimum size; mixed-use does not permit residential-only development
- Southern end near the Avenues designated as pedestrian-oriented commercial

Community Development Director Jones stated that the current pedestrian-oriented commercial development standards prohibit office uses on the ground floor. The intent was to have continuous commercial store fronts, but that has not always been successful. The GPAC may want to consider if this standard should be changed to allow office uses in a certain percentage of ground floor space.

In response to Member Pinzler, Community Development Director Jones stated that the pedestrian-oriented designation does require pedestrian friendly features such as sidewalk storefronts with parking lots to the rear or subterranean.

In response to Chair Biro, Mr. Tescher stated that although Caltrans does need to be consulted along PCH for expanded streetscapes, it does not preclude the City from adopting its development standards.

Small group exercise for Pacific Coast Highway commenced at 8:28 p.m.
RECONVENE - 8:55 P.M.

Group 4:
Member Solomon spoke for Group 4

- Western side of PCH:
  - Enhance the walkability around the area of Torrance Boulevard and few blocks south, pedestrian-oriented commercial
  - In order to slow down PCH a bit, create parking islands inset off of PCH, and visitors can walk to the various businesses
  - Pedestrian-friendly retail south of Knob Hill, serving the adjacent neighborhoods

- Eastern side of PCH:
  - Current development is in good shape, continue to enhance pedestrian access
  - Residential uses are good, can be served by new commercial uses on the western side of the street

Group 3:
Member Waller spoke for Group 3

- Zone the current police annex as Civic Center
- Carnelian to Garnet St. – Pedestrian-oriented Commercial; it could also serve visitors to the Civic Center, they can walk to commercial uses
- PCH & Torrance Blvd – Current Mixed-Use designation is ok, 3 story height limit
- PCH from Torrance Blvd to Knob Hill – Mixed-Use
- PCH from Knob Hill to Riviera Village – Pedestrian- Oriented Commercial
- Enhanced streetscapes along the entire corridor

Group 1:
Member Stodder spoke for Group 1

- Enhanced streetscapes with greenery to attract pedestrians
- Parking should be available to allow visitors to drive to the area but then walk to the different businesses without having to park on the street
- Low-density residential on the northern end up to Torrance Blvd; these residents could utilize the businesses to the south
- Corner of PCH & Torrance Blvd – Mixed-Use residential and commercial
- Pedestrian-oriented commercial to the south

Group 2:
Member Naffisi spoke for Group 2

- Parking areas towards the south end
- Low-rise office buildings at PCH & Pearl St.
- Seasons Senior Living and St. James Church are good existing uses

This concluded the Pacific Coast Highway exercise.

At the suggestion of Member Light, it was agreed by all GPAC members that the remaining exercises would be continued to the November meeting.

Chair Biro suggested moving the GPAC meeting start time up to 6:30 p.m.
Moved and seconded to change the start time of future GPAC meetings to 6:30 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.

Chair Biro commenced the public comment portion of the meeting.

II. PUBLIC COMMENT

Holly Osbourne, resident, spoke to the moratorium on mixed-use development. She stated the Legado project was just approved by City Council for 115 units but she questioned why the original project included the land area of the hotel towards the allowable building size for 146 units, and 180 units with a density bonus, since the hotel is not being demolished. She asked the GPAC to direct staff not to include land area that has an existing structure that will remain towards the calculation for total buildable area.

Henry Johnson, public attendee, distributed a handout summarizing 14 new affordable housing laws in California. He stated some of the laws allow developers to bypass the normal review process, bypass environmental analysis, and bypass public hearing process. The laws streamline approvals for apartment housing developments. He stated that apartment houses could be built even in single-family neighborhoods, or mixed-use properties, or major streets with public transit without providing parking.

Paul Samaras, resident, pointed out opportunities along 190th Street for pedestrian oriented development, and street enhancements for walkability. He commented on connecting the adjacent residential neighborhoods to the street.

Chair Biro asked that staff provide the GPAC with a legislative update on the new state laws which impact housing.

Member Pinzler stated the laws are very complicated and cannot only look at highlights.

Mr. Tescher stated that there has been at least 15 housing bills signed recently into law. Materials will be brought to GPAC at future meetings, citing accurate sources.

It was the consensus of the members to have the December meeting on December 21, 2017 given the City Holiday Closure the last week of that month.

III. ADJOURNMENT: 9:25 P.M.

Moved and seconded to adjourn the meeting at 9:25 p.m. to a Regular Meeting to be held on November 30, 2017 at 6:30 p.m. 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
## Legislation addresses: STREAMLINING HOUSING DEVELOPMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is affected?</th>
<th>Senate/Assembly Bill Number and Name</th>
<th>Source and Additional Links</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Intent:</strong> Streamline approval process of affordable housing projects that meet very specific requirements in urban areas</td>
<td>CalCOG <a href="https://www.calcog.org/index.php?src=directory&amp;view=legislation&amp;srctype=detail&amp;back=legislation&amp;refno=84">https://www.calcog.org/index.php?src=directory&amp;view=legislation&amp;srctype=detail&amp;back=legislation&amp;refno=84</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In eligible jurisdictions&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;, where RHNA housing targets have not been met for each income category for each reporting period&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt; or when the Annual Report has not been filed for a two-year period, a developer may choose to submit a multifamily affordable housing project under SB-35. If the project meets all the requirements, the project is only subject to ministerial review and not subject to conditional permits (which does not require CEQA), and it may use reduced parking requirements. The maximum density permitted in an area designated for multifamily housing shall be that stipulated by the General Plan and not the zoning ordinance if it is less. No parking standards may be imposed if the project is located within one-half mile of public transit, within an architecturally or historically significant district, in an area where on-street parking permits are required but not offered to the occupants of the development, and/or within one block of a car share vehicle. No more than one parking space per unit may be required for all other projects. Project requirements are extensive and specific. To qualify, the project must: include two or more units, be located in an urban area on a site zoned and planned for residential development, be consistent with “objective” standards&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt; of the General Plan and Zoning Code (affordable housing projects are only required to comply with the General Plan density standards (not zoning density requirements)), include either 10 or 50 percent affordable units (based on the jurisdiction’s fulfillment of RHNA requirements), be on a property that has not been occupied by residential tenants within the last 10 years, and the project cannot be located in a number of high-risk areas, including: the coastal zone, prime agricultural land, wetlands, fire hazard areas, former mobile home parks, floodplains, fault zones, and other specified areas. In addition to above requirements, projects may only be subdivided under very specific conditions, and all projects over 10 units must be prevailing wage, while larger projects (150 units or more) must provide skilled and trained labor (this typically means union labor).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Note:</strong> Opt-in program for developers&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>CA Legislative Information <a href="https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180SB35">https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180SB35</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<sup>1</sup> The State Department of Housing and Community Development will designate eligible jurisdictions shortly after January 1, 2018.

<sup>2</sup> Reports are required to be submitted annually.

<sup>3</sup> The term “objective” standards excludes such criteria as “community character” and “viewsheild protection” unless explicitly codified by a zoning overlay, specific plan, ordinance, or other regulatory document.

<sup>4</sup> Opt-in program for developers means that developers have a choice of participating or not, while jurisdictions do not have a choice.
## 2017 California Housing Legislation Summary

* DENOTES KEY LEGISLATION

**Updated 11/21/2017**

### Legislation addresses: STREAMLINING HOUSING DEVELOPMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is affected?</th>
<th>Senate/Assembly Bill Number and Name</th>
<th>Source and Additional Links</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intent: Promote the creation of housing on infill sites around public transportation by incentivizing local governments to complete upfront zoning and environmental review and rewarding them when they permit housing</td>
<td>CalCOG <a href="https://www.calcog.org/index.php?src=directory&amp;view=legislation&amp;srctype=detail&amp;back=legislation&amp;refno=78">https://www.calcog.org/index.php?src=directory&amp;view=legislation&amp;srctype=detail&amp;back=legislation&amp;refno=78</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allows a city or county to create a “Housing Sustainability District” (District), by completing upfront zoning and environmental review. A District must be located near public transit, have access to infrastructure, the zoning must allow higher densities in addition to requiring a minimum amount of affordable housing, and the jurisdiction must complete an EIR. Once established, housing sites within the district are only subject to ministerial approval (which does not require CEQA).</td>
<td>CA Legislative Information <a href="https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180AB73">https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180AB73</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To encourage jurisdictions to create Housing Sustainability Districts, two incentive payments will be offered. First, local governments will receive a payment from HCD upon preliminary approval of the District and issuance of the EIR. Second, jurisdictions will receive an additional payment from HCD when the first housing units within the District are permitted and the jurisdiction receives a certificate of compliance from HCD. Development projects must use prevailing wage and include a minimum amount of affordable housing.</td>
<td>Note: Opt-in program for jurisdictions and developers⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intent: Spur housing construction by creating zones where projects that meet requirements are not subject to environmental review and are approved or rejected within 90 days of submittal</td>
<td>CA Legislative Information <a href="https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180SB540">https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180SB540</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Permits a jurisdiction to establish a Workforce Housing Opportunity Zone (WHOZ) by preparing an environmental impact report (EIR) to identify and mitigate impacts from establishing a WHOZ and adopting a specific plan. For the next five years, absent unforeseen environmental conditions, a locality may not deny a development that meets the mitigation requirements under this bill, and is located within the WHOZ. In effect, this bill eliminates project-specific environmental review, which could allow for housing developments within the WHOZ to proceed in an expedited manner.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To fund development of the Specific Plan and EIR, jurisdictions may apply for a grant or no-interest loan from HCD. After the WHOZ is formed, the jurisdiction may impose a specific plan fee on all persons seeking government approvals within the zone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At least 50 percent of total housing units within the WHOZ must be affordable to persons or families, at or below moderate income, with at least 10 percent of total units affordable for lower income households. Development projects must use prevailing wage.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Note: Opt-in program for jurisdictions⁶</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

¹ Opt-in program for jurisdictions and developers means that jurisdictions have a choice to create Housing Sustainability Districts or not, while developers have a choice to develop within a Housing Sustainability District or not.

² Opt-in program for jurisdictions means that jurisdictions have choice to create Workforce Housing Opportunity Zones or not.
**2017 California Housing Legislation Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislation addresses: ACCOUNTABILITY AND ENFORCEMENT</th>
<th>What is affected?</th>
<th>Senate/Assembly Bill Number and Name</th>
<th>Source and Additional Links</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Amends Housing Accountability Act                     | AB 678 (Bocanegra)/SB 167 (Skinner) Housing Accountability Act* | Intent: Strengthen the Housing Accountability Act  
Strengthens the Housing Accountability Act by increasing the documentation necessary and the standard of proof required (from “substantial evidence” to “preponderance of evidence”) for a local agency to legally defend its denial of low and moderate-income housing development projects, and requires courts to impose a fine of $10,000 or more per unit on local agencies that fail to legally defend their rejection of an affordable housing development project, among other changes. In general, must demonstrate that the project would adversely impact the “public health and safety.” | HCD  
CA Legislative Information  
https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180SB167 |
| Amends Housing Accountability Act                     | AB 1515 (Daly) Housing | Intent: Establishes a “reasonable person” standard for the Housing Accountability Act (HAA) to provide the courts with clear standards for interpreting the HAA in favor of building housing.  
States that a housing development conforms with local land use requirements if there is substantial evidence that would allow a reasonable person to reach that conclusion. | HCD  
CA Legislative Information  
https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180AB1515 |

---

7 Under the previous Housing Accountability Act (HAA), the jurisdiction was required to provide “substantial evidence” to support its findings. Under new law, a jurisdiction is required to provide a “preponderance of evidence.” These legal terms represent the burden of evidence that a jurisdiction is required to provide and defend a decision. Requiring substantial evidence generally means that the jurisdiction must supply such relevant evidence as a reasonable mind might accept as adequate to support a conclusion. A preponderance of the evidence means that the jurisdiction must supply such relevant evidence that as a whole shows that the existence of the fact to be proven is more likely than not. As such, requiring a preponderance of evidence means that the jurisdiction has a heavier burden than it did previously. This change makes it more difficult for jurisdictions to support findings that would prevent construction or reduce density of an affordable housing development, and it gives more weight to evidence contrary to the jurisdiction’s evidence.
## Legislation addresses: ACCOUNTABILITY AND ENFORCEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is affected?</th>
<th>Senate/Assembly Bill Number and Name</th>
<th>Source and Additional Links</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|                    | Requires HCD to review a jurisdiction’s action (or failure to act) at any time (instead of every eight years) to determine if the action (or failure to act) in question is consistent with jurisdiction’s Housing Element, its inventory of sites suitable to accommodate RHNA, and its program to rezone land to meet RHNA requirements. If HCD finds that a jurisdiction’s action (or failure to act) does not comply with the jurisdiction’s Housing Element, HCD can effectively declare that the jurisdiction’s Housing Element is non-compliant. Having a non-compliant Housing Element limits a jurisdiction’s access to state funding, and the jurisdiction is more vulnerable to lawsuits from developers and advocates who have the right to sue jurisdictions if their Housing Element is not compliant with state law. Furthermore, if HCD finds that a jurisdiction’s action (or failure to act) is contrary to the jurisdiction’s Housing Element or in violation of other housing laws, including: The Housing Accountability Act (including AB 678/SB167), No-net-loss-in zoning density law (including SB 166), Density Bonus Law, or GOV section 65008 prohibiting discrimination against affordable housing, the HCD must notify the jurisdiction of its findings. If the jurisdiction fails to correct the violation within 30 days (or less), the HCD may choose to report a violation to the office of the Attorney General (AG) to enforce state housing law.

### Notes:


8 The Housing Accountability Act (HAA) was passed into law in 1982 with the intent of making it harder for a jurisdiction to deny or reduce the density of a housing development project. It was amended in the 2017 Legislative Housing Package. The 2017 changes affect the development of market rate housing by limiting a jurisdiction’s ability to deny or reduce the density of any project that complies with “objective” general plan, zoning, and subdivision requirements (see footnote no. 3 for more info on “objective” standards), unless the jurisdiction can define a specific adverse impact to public health and safety that cannot be mitigated. The 2017 changes to the HAA affect the development of affordable housing by requiring everything necessary for market-rate housing as well as additional findings to deny an affordable housing development or reduce the density of an affordable housing project. See California Legislative Information website for details: [https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180AB72](https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180AB72)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislation addresses: ACCOUNTABILITY AND ENFORCEMENT</th>
<th>Source and Additional Links</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amends Housing Element Law</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 1397 (Low) Inventory of land for residential development*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Intention: Require more careful analysis of sites used to meet housing needs</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When a jurisdiction’s Housing Element is updated, AB 1397 requires the jurisdiction to consider additional requirements when zoning to accommodate their share of regional housing needs. Sites identified in the inventory should have a realistic and demonstrated potential for development during the eight-year planning period. To establish the realistic and demonstrated potential for development, among other requirements, jurisdictions must analyze sites for access to water, sewer and dry utilities, sites must not be too small or too large, strong justification must be provided when non-vacant sites are listed, and vacant sites that were included and not developed in the last two Housing Elements, or non-vacant sites that were included and not developed in the last Housing Element can only be included again if each site meets all of the new criteria and is included in the Housing Element’s program to rezone sites, which requires the jurisdiction to rezone identified sites within three years of the beginning of the Housing Element cycle. Sites that are included in the rezoning program must allow residential use by right for housing developments with at least 20% affordable units.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA Legislative Information <a href="https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180AB1397">https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180AB1397</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amends Housing Element Law</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 166 (Skinner) No Net Loss*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Intention: Require a local government to accommodate its remaining unmet housing need at all times throughout the Housing Element planning period</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amends the existing No Net Loss Zoning Law to ensure that when sites identified for housing in a jurisdiction’s Housing Element develop with fewer units than were anticipated or at a higher income level or with no housing at all, the jurisdiction continues to maintain an ongoing supply of sites identified by the Housing Element adequate to meet the unmet need for housing for all income levels. Should the remaining sites be inadequate, the City shall identify additional adequate and available sites, which can be documented in the Annual Report in lieu of an amendment of the Housing Element.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA Legislative Information <a href="https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180SB166">https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180SB166</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amends Housing Element Law</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB 879 (Grayson) and Related Reporting Bills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Intention: Require local governments to include additional data in annual Housing Element reports to better understand the root causes of the housing crisis</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes various updates to Housing Element and annual report requirements, which must now provide data on local implementation including: the number of project applications received, disapproved, and approved each year, information about processing times, a listing of sites rezoned to accommodate the jurisdiction’s share of RHNA needs for each income level that could not be accommodated on the sites identified in the Housing Element’s inventory, and a list of sites that were required to be rezoned under the No Net Loss Zoning law. The bill also requires HCD to deliver a report to the Legislature on how local fees impact the cost of housing development, and charter cities would no longer be exempt from housing reporting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA Legislative Information <a href="https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180AB879">https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180AB879</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

20 I.e., results in “not net loss,” which may be achieved when the jurisdiction has approved more units on a site not shown in the inventory or has other units at that income category, or another site is “identified and made available.”
## 2017 California Housing Legislation Summary

* DENOTES KEY LEGISLATION

### Legislation addresses: CREATING AND PRESERVING AFFORDABLE HOUSING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is affected?</th>
<th>Senate/Assembly Bill Number and Name</th>
<th>Source and Additional Links</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enacts Building Homes and Jobs Act</strong></td>
<td><strong>SB 2 (Atkins) Building Jobs and Homes Act</strong>&lt;br&gt;&lt;em&gt;Intent: Establish a permanent funding source that will increase California’s supply of affordable homes, create jobs, and spur economic growth without incurring additional debt&lt;/em&gt;&lt;br&gt;Imposes a $75 recording fee for real estate documents (excluding sales) for the purposes of funding affordable housing. Provides that first-year proceeds will be split evenly between local planning grants and HCD’s programs that address homelessness. Thereafter, 70 percent of the proceeds will be allocated to local governments in either an over-the-counter or competitive process. Fifteen percent will be allocated to HCD, ten percent to assist the development of farmworker housing and five percent to administer a program to incentivize the permitting of affordable housing. Fifteen percent will be allocated to CalHFA to assist mixed-income multifamily developments.</td>
<td><strong>HCD</strong>&lt;br&gt;<a href="http://www.hcd.ca.gov/policy-research/docs/15-bill-matrix-with-links.pdf">http://www.hcd.ca.gov/policy-research/docs/15-bill-matrix-with-links.pdf</a>&lt;br&gt;<strong>CA Legislative Information</strong>&lt;br&gt;<a href="https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180SB2">https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180SB2</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enacts Veterans and Affordable Housing Bond Act of 2018</strong></td>
<td><strong>SB 3 (Beall) Veterans and Affordable Housing Bond Act</strong>&lt;br&gt;&lt;em&gt;Intent: Provide new funding for several existing affordable housing programs&lt;/em&gt;&lt;br&gt;Places a $4 billion general obligation bond on the November 2018 general election ballot. Allocates $3 billion in bond proceeds among programs that assist affordable multifamily developments, housing for farmworkers, transit-oriented development, infrastructure for infill development, and homeownership. Also funds matching grants for Local Housing Trust Funds and homeownership programs. Provides $1 billion in bond proceeds to CalVet for home and farm purchase assistance for veterans.</td>
<td><strong>HCD</strong>&lt;br&gt;<a href="http://www.hcd.ca.gov/policy-research/docs/15-bill-matrix-with-links.pdf">http://www.hcd.ca.gov/policy-research/docs/15-bill-matrix-with-links.pdf</a>&lt;br&gt;<strong>CA Legislative Information</strong>&lt;br&gt;<a href="https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180SB3">https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180SB3</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amends State Housing Law</strong></td>
<td><strong>AB 352 (Santiago) Efficiency Units</strong>&lt;br&gt;&lt;em&gt;Intent: Allow micro apartments in targeted areas&lt;/em&gt;&lt;br&gt;Prohibits a jurisdiction that allows efficiency units from limiting the number of efficiency units that can be built in certain locations near public transit or university campuses, as specified.</td>
<td><strong>CalCOG</strong>&lt;br&gt;<a href="https://www.calcog.org/index.php?src=directory&amp;view=legislation&amp;srctype=detail&amp;back=legislation&amp;refno=116">https://www.calcog.org/index.php?src=directory&amp;view=legislation&amp;srctype=detail&amp;back=legislation&amp;refno=116</a>&lt;br&gt;<strong>CA Legislative Information</strong>&lt;br&gt;<a href="https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180AB352">https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180AB352</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use: Accessory Dwelling Units</strong></td>
<td><strong>AB 494 / SB 229 Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs)</strong>&lt;br&gt;&lt;em&gt;Intent: Clarify the intent of ADU law&lt;/em&gt;&lt;br&gt;Exterior ADUs: Jurisdictions may designate where exterior ADUs are permitted, and have the authority to authorize them anywhere existing or proposed single family homes are permitted. Interior ADUs: Jurisdictions must allow interior ADUs in any district where single family homes are permitted. Parking requirements are limited to 1 space per unit or bedroom (whichever is less). Jurisdictions cannot restrict tandem parking or parking in setbacks. The bills also limit the ability to charge for new utility connections for ADUs.</td>
<td><strong>CA Legislative Information</strong>&lt;br&gt;<a href="https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180AB494">https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180AB494</a>&lt;br&gt;<a href="https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180SB229">https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180SB229</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Legislation addresses: CREATING AND PRESERVING AFFORDABLE HOUSING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is affected</th>
<th>Senate/Assembly Bill Number and Name</th>
<th>Source and Additional Links</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use:</strong> Zoning Regulations</td>
<td><strong>AB 1505 (Bloom) Zoning Regulations</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Intent:</strong> Allow inclusionary housing ordinance to include both rental and for-sale housing, and ensure that new inclusionary housing ordinances will be economically viable&lt;br&gt;Affirms the right of a jurisdiction to establish an inclusionary housing ordinance that covers rental housing as well as for-sale units. The inclusionary housing ordinance can require that new housing (rental or for-sale) includes a certain amount of low-income housing on-site or via an alternative means of compliance (such as building off-site housing or paying an in-lieu fee).&lt;br&gt;If a new ordinance requires 15% or more of new housing development to be affordable, the jurisdiction will be required to conduct an economic feasibility study that demonstrates that the policies will not limit new market rate development.</td>
<td>HCD <a href="http://www.hcd.ca.gov/policy-research/docs/15-bill-matrix-with-links.pdf">http://www.hcd.ca.gov/policy-research/docs/15-bill-matrix-with-links.pdf</a>&lt;br&gt;CalCOG <a href="https://www.calcog.org/index.php?src=directory&amp;view=legislation&amp;srctype=detail&amp;back=legislation&amp;refno=263">https://www.calcog.org/index.php?src=directory&amp;view=legislation&amp;srctype=detail&amp;back=legislation&amp;refno=263</a>&lt;br&gt;CA Legislative Information <a href="https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180AB1505">https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180AB1505</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amends Preservation Noticing Law</strong></td>
<td><strong>AB 1521 (Bloom) Assisted Housing Developments</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Intent:</strong> Preserve the existing stock of affordable rental homes&lt;br&gt;Requires owners of rental housing with expiring federal and/or state subsidies and/or affordability protections to accept any market-rate purchase offer from a qualified preservation entity that intends to maintain the property’s affordability restrictions. The bill also requires the Department of Housing and Community Development to monitor compliance with the law and allows affected tenants and local governments the right to enforce the law.</td>
<td>HCD <a href="http://www.hcd.ca.gov/policy-research/docs/15-bill-matrix-with-links.pdf">http://www.hcd.ca.gov/policy-research/docs/15-bill-matrix-with-links.pdf</a>&lt;br&gt;CA Legislative Information <a href="https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180AB1521">https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180AB1521</a>&lt;br&gt;NPH [Nonprofit Housing Association of Northern California] <a href="http://nonprofithousing.org/wp-content/uploads/AB-1521-Fact-Sheet-3.1.17.pdf">http://nonprofithousing.org/wp-content/uploads/AB-1521-Fact-Sheet-3.1.17.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amends Farmworker Housing and Office of Migrant Services Programs</strong></td>
<td><strong>AB 571 (E. Garcia) Low-Income Housing Credits for Farmworkers</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Intent:</strong> Improve the efficacy and flexibility of using state low income housing tax credits for developers of farmworker housing&lt;br&gt;Makes modifications to the state’s farmworker housing tax credit to increase use. Authorizes HCD to advance funds to operators of migrant housing centers at the beginning of each season to allow them to get up-and-running. Extends the period that migrant housing centers may be occupied up to 275 days.</td>
<td>HCD <a href="http://www.hcd.ca.gov/policy-research/docs/15-bill-matrix-with-links.pdf">http://www.hcd.ca.gov/policy-research/docs/15-bill-matrix-with-links.pdf</a>&lt;br&gt;CA Legislative Information <a href="https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180AB571">https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180AB571</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expands AB 2 (Alejo) Community Revitalization Authority [Chapter 319, Statutes of 2015]</strong></td>
<td><strong>AB 1598 (Mullin) Affordable Housing Authorities</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Intent:</strong> Create a tool for localities to capture the growth in tax increment produced by new commercial development and invest those revenues in the production of homes affordable to the local workforce&lt;br&gt;Allows a jurisdiction to create an Affordable Housing Authority (Authority) to fund affordable housing and affordable workforce housing, similar to a Community Revitalization and Investment Authority (CRIA). The Authority can capture property tax increment, or revenues from local sales and use tax or transactions and use tax. Upon formation, the Authority must adopt an affordable housing investment plan.</td>
<td>CA Legislative Information <a href="https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180AB1598">https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180AB1598</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# 2017 California Housing Legislation Summary

* DENOTES KEY LEGISLATION

## PENDING LEGISLATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is affected?</th>
<th>Senate/Assembly Bill Number and Name</th>
<th>Source and Additional Links</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amends Housing Element Law</td>
<td><strong>AB 1350 (Friedman) Regional Housing Need, Non-Compliant Cities and Counties, Penalties</strong>&lt;br&gt;PENDING&lt;br&gt;&lt;i&gt;Intent: Enforce fair share housing production&lt;/i&gt;&lt;br&gt;Requires a non-compliant jurisdiction, who has not met at least 1/3 of its share of the regional housing need for low-and-very-low-income housing, to pay a penalty to HCD. The funds generated would be used to fund grants for affordable housing projects in compliant jurisdictions (with priority given to those that neighbor non-compliant jurisdictions).</td>
<td><strong>CalCOG</strong>&lt;br&gt;<a href="https://www.calcog.org/index.php?src=directory&amp;view=legislation&amp;srctype=detail&amp;back=legislation&amp;refno=238">https://www.calcog.org/index.php?src=directory&amp;view=legislation&amp;srctype=detail&amp;back=legislation&amp;refno=238</a>&lt;br&gt;<strong>CA Legislative Information</strong>&lt;br&gt;<a href="https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180AB1350">https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=201720180AB1350</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recap of Land Use Changes for Corridors C (Torrance Blvd), D (PCH), and G (190th) by Group

**C - Torrance Boulevard**

**Group 1**

- **Highway-Oriented Commercial**
- **Pedestrian-Oriented Commercial Districts**
- **Enhanced Streetscape & Urban Parklet**
- **Community/Neighborhood Park, Active Recreation**
- **Creative Industry/Business**
- **Mixed-Use Vertical 1**
- **Parking**

- Increase connectivity
  - For bikes
  - For Pedestrians
  - Linkages to the pier
- Parking at Irena and Torrance (at middle of corridor) - transition residential parcels to parking
- Opportunity for a gateway at the City boundary
- Enhanced Streetscape and Opportunities for Urban Parklets along Torrance, especially west of PCH
- Mixed-Use opportunity at intersection with PCH - no residential and limit to two stories
- Community/Neighborhood Park and Active Recreation west of PCH
- C-2 east of PCH, keep medical buildings
- Transition to Ped-Oriented Commercial C-4 closer to PCH and down to the water
- Creative commercial mid-corridor
- Maintain residential designations
Torrance Boulevard

Group 2

- Entry/Gateway opportunity at City boundary and intersection of PCH and Torrance
  - City entrance to the East
  - Pier identification to the West
- C-8 Office low- as medical office- east of PCH near City of Torrance
  - Low scale medical office/ general office (on South Side of Torrance)
  - South side of street office, Med office north side of the street (similar to med offices near Costco in Torrance)
  - Keep existing medical offices
  - Encourage more dense medical office
- C-4 Ped- Oriented Office closest to PCH
- Leave Residential west of PCH as is but add streetscape enhancements
  - Enhancements should go all the way to Broadway
• Entry or gateway improvements at the boundary with Torrance, something more than the median sign
• Do not add residential east of PCH
• Existing private parking is OK
• Add more street-adjacent parking
• Walkable to residents (even now) keep residential R-3
• West of PCH keep residential land use, typology 3 would be appropriate
  o Residential here is declining and some non-conforming but could be replaced by newer residential development
• East of PCH either Neighborhood Commercial or Pedestrian-Oriented Commercial Districts would be OK, Creative Office Space may be OK too but no office towers
  o Height of buildings should consider topography and scale of the surrounding neighborhood
• East of PCH add more office
  o Add medical offices (retail has struggled)
  o Activate space and serve existing residential by providing jobs in low-rise office buildings
  o Add office-multi-tenant commercial on South side
Torrance Boulevard

Group 4

- Add parking
- More pedestrian-oriented feel to support medical/offices
- Low office buildings 2 stories max east of Irena, 3 stories max west of Irena
  - Encourage more local business
- East towards Prospect (to Juanita)
  - Multi-Tenant Commercial
- West of PCH maintain residential
- West of PCH streetscape enhancements
- Enhance eastern gateway (existing 4’ tall monument is covered by bushes)

Notes needing clarification:

1. Notes says: “West of prospect Rest./ offices”...Is that restaurant and office uses?
D PCH

Group 1

- Knob Hill to Torrance – R3 (low density housing) that feeds neighborhood commercial on Torrance and some corner commercial
- Mixed-use vertical 2 at the intersection of PCH and Torrance (office & commercial only, no residential, limit to 2 floors?)
- Add parking structures south Torrance to better support retail development
  - Parking structure should have ground floor uses (i.e. Starbucks)
- Streetscape Enhancements- Design theme for the area: Green up!
  - Develop light standards and street furniture specific to the area
  - Each corridor should have a theme
- Provide adequate setbacks in the South
- North towards Civic Center: low density R3 housing

Notes needing clarification:
1. R3- is that existing R3 or the Residential 3 typology from the menu?
2. Is the note to limit development to two floors or is it residential on the 2nd floor and commercial on the first floor? (Wendy’s notes indicate no residential)
3. Is that each corridor in the City or each segment of the PCH corridor?
Group 2

- Keep in mind PCH is a highway
- General Theme: Largely maintain existing zoning/land use designations
  - Strongly encourage the development of office low near Torrance Boulevard on west side of the street
  - Keep pedestrian oriented commercial where it is at along the corridor
- Add left turn signal near Civic Center
- Keep senior uses
- South between Avenue C and Avenue F relax parking restrictions
  - Reduce parking requirements
  - Add interspersed surface parking lots
- Note dangerous corner at PCH & Diamond
- Opportunity to move the fire station
- Auto-body: One lot, low rise office?
- North areas: remain as-is

Notes needing clarification:
1. What what are the conditions? Did the group have ideas for improving them?
2. Where should the fire station move to?
3. Is the Auto-body Shop an opportunity site?
Recap of Land Use Changes for Corridors C (Torrance Blvd), D (PCH), and G (190th) by Group

**D**

**PCH**

**Group 3**

- Pedestrian-Oriented Commercial adjacent to the Civic Center and High School
- Opportunity to move the Civic Center and Police Station to the west side of PCH adjacent to the High School
- Mixed-use vertical 1 (up to 3 stories) on West side of street at intersection with Torrance Blvd, one block north to Garnet and south almost to Knob Hill
  - Maintain historic block at corner of PCH and Garnet
- Pedestrian-Oriented Commercial at intersection with Knob Hill south to Avenue G, leading all the way to Riviera Village area
- Maintain senior uses, but if churches go away allow for commercial
- Streetscape enhancements along the entire stretch of PCH - improve walkability
  - How do we incorporate bikes?
GPAC Meeting #6
Recap of Land Use Changes for Corridors C (Torrance Blvd), D (PCH), and G (190th) by Group

D

PCH

Group 4

- Parking is needed to get people out of their cars and walking
- South of Knob Hill:
  - Add parking islands
  - Knob Hill to Kensington: Add retail and restaurant; enhance the area is underutilized
  - Keep residential on East side of street
- Enhanced streetscape to provide a more friendly commercial environment
- Pedestrian-Oriented Commercial at PCH and Torrance Blvd and also keep the designation south to Avenue G
- Overall enhance the PCH area
- Commercial should support the adjacent neighborhoods

Notes needing clarification:
What about the area north of Torrance? Should the other uses remain? (Residential between Vincent and Garnet? Mixed-Use between Garnet and Torrance?)
190th Street

Group 1

- Create a “Tech Corridor”
- Add creative commercial/ industrial
- Relate uses to Greenline extension
- Connect bike path to transit center north near Galleria
- Mid-block mixed-use, but no residential, limit to one story
- Expand existing park
- Extend corridor back to Armour lane
- Connect the neighborhoods to the corridor
- Small businesses need to have a larger draw

***Areas on the map that are hatched should stay as is
190th Street

Group 2

- Allow Multi-Family Low on either side of Inglewood Ave, creating a link to the neighborhoods behind the corridor (including Schooners and low-rise shopping mall)
- Consider increasing housing here
- Creative industry/office space to the west where existing mobile home and industrial uses are - incentivize for owners to revitalize or change uses to replace industrial
- Put a parkette in place of the strip mall
- Make more walkable on north side of 190th at intersection with Anza

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3</th>
<th>Creative Industry/Business and/or Adaptive Industrial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Urban Parklet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Multi-Family Low (2 Stories)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
190th Street

Group 3

- Consider adjacent uses in Torrance
- Existing industrial uses have lots of truck deliveries - but are small business owners who live in the City - want to preserve these uses and local businesses
- Can a park be added somewhere here?
- Enhance the mobile home park, add pedestrian paths and overall beautification
- Keep the existing land use designations
- Clean up the industrial areas to make them better neighbor with surrounding residential

Encourage enhancement of the mobile home park
Urban Parklet or other park opportunity
190th Street

Group 4

- Create parkette
- Industrial is doing well, leave as is or add creative office space
- Enhance mobile home park, add a walkable area to connect to existing neighborhoods
- Add alley access along 190th
- Keep R-3 residential 1 and 2 story multifamily, townhomes, and duplexes to buffer neighborhoods
- Transition to corridor commercial
- Opportunity for revenue producing area (like Manhattan Beach)

Clarification Note: Where should the transition to corridor commercial begin and end?