I. OPEN THE MEETING

1. Calling Meeting to Order
A Special Meeting of the Redondo Beach General Plan Advisory Committee was called to order by Chair Biro at 9:15 a.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: Chair Biro, Members Bajaj, Chrzan, Eiler, Funabashi, Gaddis, Hannon, Hashmi, Kilroy, Lamb, Light, Ludwig, McKenzie, Nafissi, Pinzler, Samaras, Sanchez, Simpson, Solomon, Turner, and Waller

Members Absent: Glad, Kartounian, Moses, Stodder, Szymanski, and Voisey

Officials Present: Aaron Jones, Community Development Director
Sean Scully, Planning Manager
Stacey Kinsella, Associate 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 Lamb led those assembled in a salute to the flag.

II. APPROVAL OF THE ORDER OF AGENDA
It was moved and seconded to approve the order of the agenda as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

III. CONSENT CALENDAR
4. Approval of the Affidavit of Posting for the General Plan Advisory Committee Special Meeting of March 31, 2018.

5. Approval of Minutes for the General Plan Advisory Committee Regular Meeting of February 22, 2018.

Member Lamb requested that her statement be amended to reflect that the guidelines presented reflect a planning perspective not the community perspective.

Moved and seconded to approve the Consent Calendar, with the amendment to the Minutes of February 22, 2018 as requested by Member Lamb. Motion carried, with Member Pinzler voting no.

IV. PUBLIC COMMENT – 1ST SESSION
Chair Biro invited members of the public to provide comment. There were none at this point.
V. ITEMS FOR PRESENTATION, DISCUSSION OR ACTION

6. Announcements and Updates

Chair Biro thanked everyone for coming on a Saturday and addressed the members regarding concerns expressed by some with the process. Chair Biro stated that moving forward any concerns or questions should be directed to him, and he will coordinate with the Vice-Chair and staff.

Chair Biro stressed the public outreach component and stated that each GPAC member is responsible for being an ambassador of the process to the community.

Chair Biro stated meetings work more efficiently when the activities are done in small groups, so that will be the preferred format moving forward.

Discussion ensued among the members regarding the process of placing items on the agenda.

It was the consensus of the group to add an item to the agenda for “Referrals to Staff.”

Member Solomon expressed concern with the process being staff driven rather member driven.

Member Light recalls voting for a Saturday meeting that would have been GPAC members only without staff or consultant, and which did not necessarily replace the regular meeting for the month. He expressed frustration with the format of this meeting not being what the members voted for and that the process continues to be staff driven.

Chair Biro reaffirmed that members can bring concerns directly to him and he will be involved in the agenda preparation.

Member Pinzler expressed concern that the Guiding Principles were not discussed in the initial meetings that staff and consultant are leading the entire process and felt the purpose of this meeting should have been to discuss how the members want to move the process forward.

Chair Biro stated the Guiding Principles can remain in the abstract and will evolve and be shaped as the process moves forward.

Member Gaddis stated that without a set of clear principles there is no criteria to measure a land use decision.

Member Samaras commented that not all members will agree on all principles or they might mean different things to different members, so everyone must remain open minded and flexible.

Wendy Nowak, PlaceWorks, provided a brief update on outreach. PlanRedondo signs were displayed at the St. Patrick’s Day Run. The e-blast subscription is up to 368 subscribers.

7. Review, Draft, and Confirm General Plan Update Guiding Principles

i. Small Group Exercise to Review and Draft

Ms. Nowak reviewed the structure of the exercise and reviewed the over-arching principles. Some members commented that “Land Use” is not a principal, but there was agreement to still discuss the topic. Small group exercise commenced at 9:55 a.m.
ii. Large Group Discussion to Confirm - RECONVENE 11:30 a.m.

**Public Parks and Open Space**
Member Pinzler presented.

**Principle:**
"Preserve and expand public open space for active and passive recreation throughout the City."

- Goal of 5 acres/1,000 residents;
- Define parkland/open space more strictly to prevent sidewalks, parking lots, setbacks being counted as open space;
- Improve access to open space where feasible.

**Land Use**
Member Sanchez presented.

Land Use planning is the implementation of the community values. Broken down to three main ideas:
- Housing
- Transportation
- Sub-communities

**Principle:**
"Use Land Use Planning to invigorate Redondo Beach by preserving single-family residential neighborhoods while promoting new and sustainable concentrated housing near transit nodes, embracing transportation innovations and nurturing corridors where residents want to work and play."

Discussion ensued among the members regarding the statement. Discussion included comments that "Land Use" may not be an actual principal.

**Economic Prosperity**
Member McKenzie presented.

**Principle:**
"The economic engine of the City of Redondo Beach shall encourage Redondo Beach as a place to live, a place to work, place to play, and a place to shop in order to attain the highest amount of services."

Member McKenzie clarified that the word "services" refers to City services such as Police, Fire, and Public Works for residents. The intent is economic prosperity which will bring revenue to enhance the lives of residents, reinvest funds back into the community. Ensures that the City has enough funding to provide a high level of service to the residents.

Discussion ensued among the members regarding the statement.

Consensus among the members to replace "highest amount of services" with "highest attainable level of services."

**Principle:**
“The economic engine of the City of Redondo Beach shall encourage Redondo Beach as a place to live, a place to work, place to play, and a place to shop in order to attain the highest attainable level of services."

Community Character
Members Funabashi and Bajaj presented.

Principle:
"Redondo Beach seeks to achieve our vision by making decisions that prioritize quality of life when taking actions that help us to:

- Preserve beach town character
  - Vibrant, energetic
  - Open and welcoming
  - Healthy and active living
  - Laid- back
  - Diverse
  - Value heritage, history, and preservation
  - Promote community comradery

- Maintain environmental consciousness
  - Appreciation for the natural beauty which is afforded to us here

- Promote safety and security

- Support family-friendly, multi-generational connectedness

- Sustain quality education system

Discussion ensued among the members regarding the statement.

Consensus among the members to add a statement regarding the enhancement of "green space."

Livability and Sustainability
Member Simpson presented.

Four main categories emerged from the ideas.

- Traffic and Transit
  - Reduce traffic volume and congestion
  - Safe and efficient public transportation
  - Prevent cut-through traffic to promote safe neighborhood streets

- Environment
  - Improve environmental quality and ecological sustainability by implementing best existing practices
  - Fiscal responsibility
  - Implement land use policies that apply sound fiscal practices

- Schools
  - Prioritize educational opportunities for all ages

Discussion ensued among the members regarding the statement.
Discussion took place regarding the terms "reduce traffic," "manage traffic," "improve traffic," "level of service," "congestion."

Consensus among the group to amend this phrase as the process goes on.

**Health and Vitality**
Member Samaras presented the ideas:

- Promote a good work/life balance; and
- Active lifestyle for all age groups

Achieve these goals by:
- Walkable and bikeable interconnected neighborhoods
- Walking trails and sports facilities
- Public/private partnerships to provide these facilities and amenities
- Self-sufficient neighborhoods with neighborhood centers that promote walking and biking with some commercial within the residential neighborhoods
- Neighborhood center is defined as the center where the local residents’ daily needs for shopping, services, recreation, and jobs can be met

This concluded the Guiding Principles exercise.

Member Pinzler suggested forming a subcommittee to write and edit the Guiding Principles document and adding the subcommittee formation to the next agenda.

Member Ludwig suggested having PlaceWorks write to document for the entire group to review, as PlaceWorks is objective.

Member Pinzler commented that GPAC will have more ownership of the document if it is prepared by its members.

Member Samaras stated confidence that consultant and staff and draft the document for GPAC to review.

Chair Biro stated that the consultant will prepare the draft and GPAC review of the document will be placed on the next agenda, along with discussion to form a subcommittee, if needed.

Member Light expressed concern with the previous ineffectiveness of the consultant preparing this document.

Ms. Nowak reviewed suggestions that were written during the exercise that did not fit into a topic area including:

- Address the homeless issue

Member Funabashi stated the issue can be place under several principles including Community Character, Health and Livability, or Economic Prosperity.

Chair Biro stated the term “homeless” should also be defined.

Woodie Tescher, PlaceWorks, stated that housing for homeless is typically addressed in the Housing Element.

Aaron Jones, Community Development Director, stated that cities are required to have provisions for accommodations for homeless by having certain zones identified as allowing transitional
housing, emergency shelters, and single-room occupancies. Cities must zone, but whether or not the facilities are actually built is a separate issue.

In response to Member Pinzler, Mr. Jones stated that the land use component to the homeless issue would be developing a policy to provide for facilities for the homeless.

It was the consensus of the group to decide at a later time the principle which homelessness will fall under.

- Improve public engagement with social media and online means

After discussion among the members, it was the consensus to include it as part of Community Character.

8. Review and Confirm Land Use Options Identified for Areas of Land Use Change

Large group discussion began on selecting three options for each sub-area covered in previous group exercises to present to the public at the future community meetings, highlighting the GPAC preferred option.

The members selected options for the following sub-areas:
- Artesia Boulevard
- Aviation Boulevard
- 190th Street

Artesia Boulevard
Mr. Tescher described the existing conditions and outlined the following options identified through the previous group exercises:

- **Option 1**: Mixed-Use (with residential) at each end, commercial through the middle
- **Option 2**: Neighborhood commercial to the west, then office only to the east
- **Option 3**: Commercial Retail/Office throughout, with possible limitation on amount of office

Group discussion included the following comments:

Member Gaddis – Term “Mixed-Use” needs to be defined, whether it includes commercial and residential or mix of commercial uses such as retail and office.

Member Chrzan – Asked what the term is for neighborhood commercial on the bottom and office on top. Mr. Tescher responded that it can also be called mixed-use or mixed-use flexible, but the GPAC can define its own term.

Member Light – The commercial component of the current Mixed-Use zoning does not work; 2001 Artesia project is difficult to tell what tenants are in the commercial spaces; 1800 S. PCH has only one successful restaurant, other spaces have been high vacancy, high turnover; vertical mixed-use creates low quality commercial tenants and high turnover.

Member Gaddis – The term mixed-use should stand for only one thing; asked to clarify what is the category for restaurant and retail on the bottom with offices above.

In response, Mr. Tescher stated GPAC can create the categories. He stated that typically in most communities mixed-use refers to a mix of both housing and retail.
Member Gaddis – Suggested keeping mixed-use to mean housing and retail and create a new term for the retail/office mix. Mr. Tescher suggested calling it Retail/Office.

Chair Biro – The developer of the 1 South Mixed-Use Project at PCH and Prospect has invited GPAC members to tour the development and discuss the method utilized to ensure vitality of the commercial spaces within that project.

Member Simpson – 2001 Artesia Boulevard has had a successful travel agency with 10 employees operate in the commercial space; although other two tenant spaces have had turn over, the project should not be categorized as a failure.

Member Eller – New Coffee Bean and Tea Leaf has been very successful, however Option 2 would make it non-conforming, with only offices allowed in that area; strongly against Option 2; ideal option would be retail and office down the entire corridor.

Mr. Tescher stated the properties along Artesia are shallow in depth, which creates a challenge for incorporating multi-story parking structures.

Member Eller – The Artesia working group recommends designated parking areas.

Member Solomon – Concurred with Member Eller regarding creating cut-outs for parking; how do options fit in with Guiding Principles discussed earlier.

Member Pinzler – Should speak with people of the failing businesses to understand what went wrong; an office corridor may help bring more activity to the retail businesses than housing would; parking is an important element and must be addressed

Member Light – Horizontal mixed-use should be an option with mix of retail and office on same level, would not create a non-conforming use issue; critiqued the parking lot that will be developed at the right of way which will only serve the immediate adjacent businesses, with use of City funds that were designated for open-space.

Mr. Tescher stated the GPAC will also be working on an Artesia Area plan later in the process.

In response to Member Chrzan, Mr. Tescher stated that approximately 160 to 180 feet of lot depth is needed for a multi-story parking structure, which encroach halfway to lots in the rear.

Member Simpson – Is on a task force currently working with the City Manager on the Artesia corridor; parking issues came up at last meeting; discussed possible cooperative parking agreements for shared parking behind the buildings; group did not take an official position but seemed to favor mixed-use at both ends; keen interest on what come from the GPAC process.

In response to Member Light, Mr. Tescher clarified that the parking for 2001 Artesia has access from an alleyway off of Green Lane.

Mr. Tescher summarized the 3 options again to take a vote.

Member Pinzler – Majority of the north side is developed as one-story, the intent is to enable two-story.

Members clarified the current zoning does allow two-story.

After the large group discussion, the following vote was taken:
Option 1: 3 votes in favor
Option 2: 0 votes in favor
Option 3: 16 votes in favor

Option 3 was selected as the GPAC recommended option.

Mr. Tescher asked the group whether they would like to garner public opinion on the other two options at the community meetings.

Member Simpson – favored getting input on the other options; term mixed-use must be clarified when going to the public; concern that if mixed-use zoning is removed, the existing mixed-use project becomes non-conforming.

Member Pinzler – does not support presenting all nuances of options to the public, too complicated; the GPAC role is to decide on the options and present its plan as a whole.

Member Lamb – when GPAC goes out to the community, it needs to be clear whether asking for input or presenting what GPAC believes is the best option; public would not want to be asked for their opinion and have the opinion ignored.

Member Sanchez – people will offer their opinion regardless.

Ms. Nowak suggested a format to the community meetings of first discussing community challenges and then presenting the GPAC ideas to address these challenges, and then asking for input as to whether GPAC is heading in the right direction.

In response to a Member Light, Ms. Nowak clarified that the reasoning behind GPAC’s ideas can definitely be provided.

Member Eller – present it as GPAC’s vision and ask for input

Member Gaddis – suggested having a team of members work on a draft message to accompany the options.

Mr. Tescher stated the message will be worked on as a group when coordinating the workshops.

Member Samaras – keep in mind that the additional commercial density will bring extra traffic, so consider concentrating to commercial density.

Mr. Tescher reminded the group of the limited demand for retail type commercial, the group should consider what other types of uses can the retail square footages be exchanged for.

Member Pinzler – important to involve the public now in order to avoid anything that they may see as egregious, or that the Planning Commission or City Council will not support.

Member Simpson – clarified that the Artesia group is working on revitalizing the corridor, not on land use.

Member Gaddis – zone in order to encourage tech offices to come in that can provide local jobs; the commercial below would serve the employees in the offices.

Member Simpson – after discussion, it’s clear Option 3 is the best agreed upon.
Mr. Tescher mentioned the idea of the commercial not only serving the offices, but also the surrounding neighborhoods, being walkable, identify neighborhood serving centers, concentrate retail.

Member Solomon - group is using its best judgement, need feedback from the public, with multiple choices there will be feedback on each choice; must make it user-friendly

In response to Member Lamb, Mr. Tescher stated GPAC will help decide on the workshop format will be facilitators of discussion.

In response to Member Chrzan, Mr. Tescher stated that the City cannot designate a property for public purpose if the property is not currently owned by the City.

**Aviation Boulevard**
Mr. Tescher described the existing conditions and outlined the following options identified through the previous group exercises:

**Option 1:** Commercial-flex (office or retail) on east side, with portion closest to Artesia for office only; Vertical Mixed-Use for the west side

**Option 2:** Office use along the entire corridor, retail only adjacent to Artesia

Group discussion included the following comments:

Ms. Nowak pointed out to keep in mind that by rezoning the entire corridor commercial, it would make the existing multi-family residential buildings non-conforming.

Discussion among members regarding the area adjacent to Artesia Blvd. and retaining Commercial on east side and Residential on west side.

Member Pinzler - Aviation and Artesia have existing services and the goal should to bring traffic to those services besides just from the residential and can be achieved by having an office overlay over those services.

Member Funabashi - Does eliminating any possibility of residential on Artesia and Aviation corridors affect the Housing Element.

Mr. Tescher commented that the group should think about housing as the process evolves and where and how can new housing be placed in the City.

Member Lamb - City is in a new RHNA cycle which may result in a lower housing requirement number.

Consensus of the group on Option 2 with the amendment to retain Residential zone on the west side of Aviation at Artesia.

**190th Street**
Mr. Tescher described the existing conditions and outlined the following options identified through the previous group exercises:

**Option 1:** Maintain existing land use designations and refine.
**Option 2**: Industrial incubator at the mobile home park and adjacent properties to the east and west; commercial moving east and incorporating properties back to Armour Lane to acquire additional lot depth to physically accommodate commercial uses.

Member Hashmi – the intent of this option was to also incorporate neighborhood services such as coffee shops.

Member Gaddis – the properties on Armour are single-family homes and questioned if this means they would be rezoned.

Mr. Tescher confirmed it would rezone the single family homes on Armour along with the Mobile Home Park.

Member Gaddis – expressed concern with this rezone gaining any support and displacing of the residents.

Member Chrzan – clarified that the idea for industrial incubator was to bring in small software and technological companies and an opportunity to reduce traffic with the office uses.

Member Eller – expressed concern that the existing home owners will be upset and not support the change; there should be a middle ground between removing the homes and improving the properties on 190th.

Member Gaddis – asked what the problem with the current zoning is.

Member Chrzan – no problem with the current zoning, intent was to encourage high tech offices.

Member Hashmi – thinking of the future and what future jobs will look like and create a corridor that will attract those types of jobs, seems like the ideal place in the City to locate.

Member Samaras – suggested increasing the density in the adjacent residential zone in order to have no net loss in housing.

Member Pinzler – recalls that prior discussion about industrializing an area focused on relationship to the Greenline extension; assuming properties on Artesia and Aviation will become more office focused taking away housing in this area may go against the concept of trying to keep people in Redondo and not commuting; this area might be more ideal to remain for residential; industrializing this area does not make sense in the context of the Artesia and Aviation discussions; each individual area is part of the entire system and needs to be analyzed within the context of all the areas.

Member Samaras – concern with the walk-ability and bike-ability of the area.

Member Eller – suggested a hybrid, leave residential from Inglewood to the east, high-tech to the west.

Member Bajaj – such a major change will spark resistance from the community and discredit the entire GPAC.

Mr. Tescher clarified that industrial incubator locations were also identified in the Industrial area in North Redondo, and an area adjacent to the Galleria.

Member Simpson – confirmed Mr. Tescher’s statement on the selection of the other incubator locations.
Member Lamb – familiar with homeowners on that street and they see themselves as part of a bigger neighborhood; the neighborhood will rally against the plan if they feel threatened; should honor current residents and honor the R-1 zone; should be able to still improve the area with office space and neighborhood serving commercial, and improve access for that neighborhood to the commercial.

Member Pinzler – existing developments are 1-story commercial; could be helpful to enable building 2nd-story office; leave the residential and leave the existing zoning at the corner of 190th and Inglewood.

Member Simpson – asked if the current zoning allows for 2-story development.

Mr. Jones confirmed the current zoning allows for 2-story development. The constraint is lot size and depth that make it difficult to incorporate the required parking to build 2-stories.

Chair Biro mentioned that previous comments criticized the way this corridor was planned and that there could be real opportunity here with a little bit of planning.

Mr. Light asked for clarification as to whether the area on the map zoned R-3 is currently developed to the R-3 standards. Mr. Jones stated certain lots have been, other lots have older developments of single-family homes or apartment buildings.

Member Eller – suggested that possibly this area be put to a vote by the public.

Mr. Tescher included a third option:

Option 3: Ask the public for their preference between Options 1 and 2.

The following vote was taken:

Option 1: 2 votes in favor
Option 2: 6 votes in favor
Option 3: 8 votes in favor

This conclude the exercise. PCH and Galleria areas will be discussed at the next meeting.

9. Topics for April Meeting/Next Steps

i. Draft Outreach Plan

Chair Biro expressed interest in forming an Outreach Subcommittee. He stated every member is an ambassador for the process, but can be constrained by individual schedules. He stated certain members could attend Councilmember monthly meetings on a regular basis to give a brief presentation and update.

Member Lamb suggested taking surveys to the district meetings for residents to fill out.

Ms. Nowak stated PlaceWorks staff is compiling an outreach packet for members to take to meetings, community events, local community group meetings.

Member Lamb stated the more GPAC goes out into the community the better the outcome. A video or other tools would be helpful to present to various groups.
Member Pinzler suggested having GPAC information be included with City mailers such as dog licenses and business licenses; utilize every communication opportunity possible.

Mr. Jones stated updates are being send through the E-blast, articles in the City newsletter which goes out to 20,000 people, GPAC cards are being placed at all City facility public counters and handed out at meetings and events, and other avenues are always helpful also.

Chair Biro stated the Mayor mentions the GPAC process at each City Council meeting and mentioned it at the State of the City. GPAC members that are on other Commissions mention it at those meetings. He spoke of GPAC at his local neighborhood watch meetings.

Member Chrzan stated the public must get involved before the process gets too far along. She expressed disappointment that outreach hasn’t been done sooner. Groups she is part of have not heard of GPAC. She also stated a more creative venue could have been found for this Saturday meeting and there may have been more public attendance.

Chair Biro commended all the members for being civic-minded and their efforts and stated that sometimes there are meetings where no one from the public attends.

Member Pinzler stated the public responds when they have something to respond to. He stated this meeting was productive in order to have something to speak about for the public to respond rather than generalities of how they feel. This is the right time to go out to the public.

Member Chrzan stated that the public might respond negatively to GPAC meeting for a year before involving them.

Chair Biro stated moving forward over the next several months the focus will be on getting the community involved.

Member Lamb commented that data should be collected to see which type of outreach is working and what is a reasonable goal for number of people that feedback is received from, and which outreach method is most effective.

Chair Biro commented that voter turn-out is most likely the best indicator.

Mr. Tescher commented that a General Plan is so high level that many people do not feel the need to be involved even though it is the most important document, the message does not come across to most people until there is a specific project which affects them. The dilemma is selling the importance of being involved in the General Plan process. His experience with Pasadena had the highest turnout and was still only 5%.

Ms. Nowak suggested that each member reach out to at least 10 people they know.

Member Pinzler stated bias should not be present when speaking on the GPAC. Present everything as coming from the group and on the process, but not individual feelings.

Member Ludwig stressed the need for talking points.

Ms. Nowak stated they are drafting talking points and communication plan.

Chair Biro asked the members to email him their ideas of various community and neighborhood groups for outreach, which he will forward to PlaceWorks.

Chair Biro stated next meeting will have an item for the Writing and Editing Working Group.
ii. Parks and Open Space

No discussion.

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT – 2nd SESSION

Holly Osborne, resident District 5, expressed concern with the discussion on re-zoning the residential properties behind 190th Street to commercial which would lower the owners’ property value. She also expressed concern with re-zoning the former grocery store property on Artesia Blvd and a mixed-use project is constructed and the neighborhood loses a grocery store. Additionally, she asked the members to keep in mind that if businesses along Artesia are allowed to expand their size but if they do not add parking it will create a big problem, and parking should continue to be free. She cannot picture Artesia being any denser.

VII. ADJOURNMENT: 2:55 P.M.

Chair Biro asked for a vote if the meeting had been productive. Unanimous vote of “yes.”

Moved and seconded to adjourn the meeting at 2:55 p.m. to a Regular Meeting to be held on Thursday April 26, 2018 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.

Aaron Jones
Community Development Director