AGENDA – REGULAR MEETING  
GENERAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
CITY OF REDONDO BEACH  
THURSDAY MAY 31, 2018 – 6:30 P.M.  
Redondo Beach Public Library - Second Floor Meeting Room  
303 N. Pacific Coast Highway  
Redondo Beach, CA 90277

I. OPEN THE MEETING  
1. Call Meeting to Order – WELCOME-OPENING REMARKS  
2. Roll Call  
3. Salute to Flag

II. APPROVAL OF THE ORDER OF AGENDA

III. CONSENT CALENDAR  
4. Approval of the Affidavit of Posting for the General Plan Advisory Committee Regular Meeting of May 31, 2018  
5. Approval of Minutes for the General Plan Advisory Committee Regular Meeting of April 26, 2018

IV. PUBLIC COMMENT – 1st SESSION  
This section is intended to provide members of the public with the opportunity to comment on any subject. This section is limited to 15 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.

V. ITEMS FOR PRESENTATION, DISCUSSION OR ACTION  
6. Announcements and Updates  
7. Large Group Discussion: Review and Confirm Land Use Options Identified for Areas of Land Use Change  
   a. Galleria and Other Citywide Areas as suggested by GPAC  
8. Presentation: Open Space and Recreation  
9. Small Group Activity: Open Space and Recreation  
10. Large Group Discussion: Review of General Plan Update Guiding Principles  
11. Outreach Ambassadors Reminder/Overview and Next Steps  
12. Overview of Future Topics for June Meeting/Next Steps

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT – 2nd SESSION  
This section is intended to provide members of the public with the opportunity to comment on any subject. This section is limited to 15 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.

VII. GPAC MEMBERS REFERRALS TO STAFF

VIII. ADJOURNMENT
The next meeting of the General Plan Advisory Committee will be a Regular Meeting that is planned to be held at 6:30 p.m. on Thursday, June 28, 2018 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.
May 24, 2018

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
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 Thursday, May 24, 2018, the agenda for the May 31, 2018 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

Lina Portolese
Planning Analyst
I. OPENING SESSION

1. CALL MEETING TO ORDER
A Regular Meeting of the Redondo Beach General Plan Advisory Committee was called to order by Chair Biro at 6:38 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: Members Bajaj, Chrzan, Eller, Funabashi, Gaddis, Hannon, Kartounian (arrived at 6:47 p.m.), Kilroy, Lamb, Ludwig, Moses, Nafissi, Samaras, Sanchez, Simpson, Solomon, Voisey, Waller, Chair Biro
Members Absent: Glad, Hashmi, Light, McKenzie, Pinzler, Stodder, Szymanski, Turner

Officials Present: Aaron Jones, Community Development Director
John La Rock, Community Services Director
Antonio Gardea, Senior Planner
Sean Scully, Planning Manager
Stacey Kinsella, Associate Planner
Diane Cleary, Recording Secretary

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

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

II. APPROVAL OF THE ORDER OF AGENDA
The Committee voted unanimously to approve the Order of Agenda as presented.

III. CONSENT CALENDAR

4. APPROVAL OF AFFIDAVIT OF POSTING for the General Plan Advisory Committee Regular Meeting of April 26, 2018

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR THE GENERAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE SPECIAL MEETING: March 31, 2018.

Member Lamb stated the discussion was not included regarding land use not being a principal on Page 3 after “Public Parks and Open Space” and before “Economic Prosperity.” She also referred to the “Community Character” section on Page 4 and requested adding the entire five categories that the group identified to include preserve beach town character, maintain environmental consciousness, promote safety and security, support family friendly multi-generational connectedness and sustain quality of education.
Holly Osborne referred to “Public Comment” on page 13, next to the last sentence, and corrected it to state “parking should continue to be free.”

Motion by Member Eller, seconded by Member Hannon, to approve the Consent Calendar with amended changes to the minutes. Motion carried unanimously.

IV. PUBLIC COMMENT – 1ST SESSION
Holly Osborne questioned Option 3 under Artesia Boulevard and requested a picture of it.

Motion by Commissioner Eller, seconded by Commissioner Hannon, that Option 3 entity map be provided to the group along with a very specific discussion of mixed-use. Motion carried unanimously.

V. ITEMS FOR PRESENTATION, DISCUSSION OR ACTION

6. Announcements and Updates
Wendy Nowak of PlaceWorks gave a report and discussed the following:
- General outline of topics to cover
- Remaining areas for land use options
- Next meeting in May – confirmation of all pieces and survey
- Parks on next schedule
- Confirm land use options, get to a community workshop with feedback from the community on land use ideas
- More detail related to Aviation and Artesia corridor
- Working with traffic regarding the parking study
- Second workshop for Artesia corridor
- October timeline for land use plans
- Land Plan – take to community, then to Planning Commissioner Council
- Feedback on open policies and plan

In response to Member Lamb, Ms. Nowak stated there are no other speakers scheduled going forward other than their group.

Member Moses asked if the community suggestions are added as amendments or changes. Ms. Nowak stated the GPAC recommendation is presented to the community, Planning Commission and City Council where changes and recommendations can be made.

Member Chrzan referred to the objectives for the main meeting and believed the map description is needed quickly to allow the GPAC to take action at the May meeting, and requested information on letting the community know about the workshop.

7. Large Group Discussion

a. Review of General Plan Update Guiding Principles
Confirm Guiding Principles
Chair Biro stated a draft of the Guiding Principles has been provided and distributed with the help of staff and PlaceWorks. He also said Member Lamb provided a comprehensive re-write as well and requested comments from the Members on both versions. He stated there is not enough work to have an edit subcommittee at this point but can be considered if the current procedure doesn’t work.
The following changes were recommended to the Draft City of Redondo Beach Guiding Principles under “To enhance our “Community Character and Livability,” Redondo Beach seeks to preserve our Beach Town Character that…”:

- First paragraph: Replace “implement” with “realize”
- Third bullet point to state: “Promotes Community Camaraderie, engagement, inclusiveness, and transparency”
- Sixth bullet point discussion:
  - Have an efficient complete transportation system or network with reduced traffic volume and congestion, multimodal transportation such as alternatives to the car
  - Seeking safe efficient multilevel transportation with reduction of traffic volume by cars
  - Manage traffic volume and congestion and seek safe and efficient multimodal transportation
  - Period after the word “congestion.”
  - Not include “reduce.”
  - The goal is to have traffic more efficient than it is today.
  - Congestion is not just cars but includes other factors. There is a goal of reducing congestion.
  - Safe and efficient multimodal transportation network.
  - Improve movement from one place to another.
  - Improve a safe and efficient multimodal transportation network.
  - Improve traffic transportation system to have safe and efficient multimodal transportation that reduce time in traffic and provide alternatives to the car.
  - Distance and time, public safety, pedestrian safety, biking safety, parking all need to be considered.
  - Member Lamb believed that the principle itself is too broad, and community character is one issue, and congestion management reducing automobile traffic, volume and congestion is a state guide/goal. She believed this should be included to be in alignment with the state. She also said in the South Bay, traffic volume will not be reduced by riding a bicycle.
  - Member Waller suggested “improve traffic and reduce congestion.”
  - Reducing levels of congestion by improving a safe and efficient multimodal transportation network.
  - Member Chrzan suggested “promote development and zoning changes that reduce traffic congestion, and improve pedestrian biking and public transit infrastructure”.
  - Member Samaras suggested “have a complete or efficient transportation system with reduced congestion and alternatives to the car.”
  - Ms. Nowak suggested “improving the way people are getting around in the community through various transportation options”
  - Reduce transportation congestion
  - Improve mobility

Mr. Tescher explained that the policies in the plan are a roadmap on how to reduce congestion. He suggested looking at this as very high level and thinking of the “how to” and to define where you want to go. He said the principle should be a statement, and the principles should be defining the end result and not necessarily the mode of getting there.

Member Lamb questioned what is being measured and the congestion or the number of multimodal products being used. She said there may be other metrics to choose that will reduce traffic congestion.

Member Hannon suggested including safety.

Mr. Tescher suggested as a start tonight, getting the big ideas out and what to achieve without the precise wording and going through the policy, coming back with the principle and wordsmithing.
Member Eller expressed concern with becoming a dysfunctional group and rejecting the leadership of the Chair, the group being dominated by a few members, and not having a consensus. He believed that the draft is well-stated as to what was crafted and stated last time, and is a composite statement.

Chair Biro suggested the members write their edits and email comments directly to him by May 11, 2018.

Member Kilroy expressed concern with a Brown Act violation.

Commissioner Nafissi suggested sending all comments to staff first who can then forward them over to the Chair.

Community Development Director Jones pointed out many of the goals are already in the General Plan regarding transportation and circulation goals. He said staff will send a link to all members of the City’s Circulation Element of the General Plan.

Member Bajaj suggested there should be five subcategories as to what was proposed at the last Saturday meeting and to elect a subcommittee of four or five members. Chair Biro stated a unanimous vote would need to take place to agree.

In response to Member Gaddis regarding the Guiding Principles, Ms. Nowak stated there is first the vision about where you want to go, and then specifics can take place.

Member Moses opposed a subcommittee going beyond the Committee’s research and just collecting data, and supported the Committee working through the item together.

Commissioner Nafissi believed the Committee needs to come to an internal process on how to make decisions. She said the Committee has to work through the work together and to make decisions in a cohesive manner. She said it would help to know the decision-making process and to know the Committee’s concerns are validated, and expressed concern with being shut out of the process.

Chair Biro stated he will have a metric of what he receives, and requested comments and guidance on what is material.

Member Gaddis believed that there are many points that the group can agree on and suggested they be identified and eliminated as part of the items to send to the Chair.

Ms. Nowak suggested the members could indicate the items they agree on, and note the ones that are of issue.

Community Development Director Jones stated staff will send out an email to those who are absent tonight regarding the discussion, along with examples of the format that works best regarding the Guiding Principles goals.

8. Large Group Discussion: Review and Confirm Land Use Options Identified for Areas of Land Use Change

a. PCH, Galleria, Other Citywide Areas

Mr. Tescher gave a report and discussed the following:

- Land Use Options Overview
- Combined Types of Uses
Pacific Coast Highway (North) – Current General Plan

Suzanne Schwab, PlaceWorks, gave a report and reviewed discussions.

- Pacific Coast Highway (North) – Option 1: Refine current GP and expand corridor
  - Commercial Flex
  - Incubator industrial
  - No industrial
  - No residential

Member Lamb suggested office and increasing the opportunity walking to retail places. Member Waller agreed.

In response to Member Moses regarding Incubator industrial, Mr. Tescher stated this would be a small industrial building for small spaces. Member Moses stated it is important to be more specific, removing the industrial designation. He also supported no mass producing or repetitive manufacturing in the area and to get rid of Option A.

Ms. Schwab noted adaptive industrial as incubator industrial.

Member Chrzan supported having Option 1A or to use a different term.

Member Solomon believed an incidental use would be okay, but no industrial in the neighborhood.

Member Gaddis agreed with removing the industrial component which is noisy, dusty, and stated materials are being trucked into the facility.

Mr. Tescher summarized that office would be okay, but industrial would be very limited and to be non-impactive with no noise, air quality impacts, and only day time operation.

Member Voisey supported low emission, and addressing transportation and noise impacts.

Mr. Tescher noted beach front location compatible uses.

Member Funabashi supported keeping the area commercial flex and an individual tenant could get a conditional use permit if needed, and to get rid of “industrial.”

- Pacific Coast Highway (Central) – Current General Plan
  - Option 1 – Refine Current GP
  - Option 2 – Reduce Housing Density
  - Option 3 – Create a PCH Mixed-Use District

Member Moses supported the third option and asked if there is a percentage of what a maximum of any designation could be. Mr. Tescher reviewed and stated some basic standards would need to be developed, and believed that the shallowness of the parcels and number of areas will limit what can be developed on this site.

In response to Member Moses, Mr. Tescher stated there could be a way to incentivize consolidation of lots.

Member Waller stated the intersection such as PCH/Torrance are the gateway to the pier, and supported mixed-use for this area, not residential.

Member Eller noted a very nice mixed-use unit at Aviation near Manhattan Beach Boulevard.
Member Kilroy gave a history on the Pearl Plaza Project which complied but was denied and he said he is not in favor of mixed use in this area along PCH.

Member Voisey also pointed out that PCH is narrow going through the area, and the street cannot support mixed use right there, with no in and out of the alley, and parking being an issue.

Member Kilroy pointed out that the Pearl Plaza project had a deceleration lane and parking.

Member Simpson believed that housing would not be supported and suggested refining the plan slightly.

Member Solomon supported thinking more holistic and believed stating no housing on PCH is a bold statement.

Member Ludwig questioned having sufficient corridor transportation and parking in the future, and she leaned towards no residential only if there is not sufficient parking and egress/ingress.

Member Moses stated everyone will not agree, and stated housing will have to be allowed, noting the units will have to be made up somewhere.

Member Chrzan suggested having a description and images.

Member Funabashi noted the south end of PCH on the Torrance side is all multiunit residential and the north side has a new development going in currently. He suggested making this a residential or mixed-use zone and make the north end towards Torrance non-residential.

Mr. Tescher took the following poll:
- Restricting any future housing development between Diamond and Avenue G on PCH — 12 yes. Allowing some additional capacity — 6 yes
- Option 1 — higher density — 11 yes
- Option 2 — reduced density designated for residential — 5 yes
- Option 3 — changing the area to mixed use commercial flex allow residential — 8 yes
- Option 4 — strips of residential — 8 yes

Options 1,3 and 4 will be taken to the public.

- **Pacific Coast Highway (South)**
  - Option 1 — reduce density and maintain existing uses
  - Option 2 — Plug ‘n play
  - Option 3 — create a south PCH mixed-use district

Member Waller noted the offices, restaurants and retail along Catalina have been successful and suggested Option 3 extending what is working in the village out a little bit more along PCH.

Member Lamb supported the use of office which would allow residents to have the opportunity to work in the area. Member Waller also said there is a demand for office.

Member Gaddis believed the office vacancy is very low and a goal is to work at more walkable professional jobs.

Mr. Tescher stated the Galleria District will be discussed at the next meeting and asked the Committee regarding any other areas to discuss, including areas that are currently designated for higher density residential but not fully developed for those capacities.
Member Samaras suggested discussing transportation options.

Chair Biro stated another incentive is renting out accessory dwelling units to meet a housing need in R1.

Mr. Tescher noted diversity of wages and an employer looking for housing for what those employees could afford.

Mr. Tescher took the following poll:
Option 1 – reduce density and maintain existing uses – no
Option 2 – Plug ‘n play – no
Option 3 – create a south PCH mixed-use district – 12 yes

9. Community Outreach
   a. Next Steps – Tool Kits
   b. Discussion of Possible Outreach Subcommittee

Ms. Nowak gave a report and discussed the following:
- Outreach Toolkit
- Outreach toolkit contents
- Process to arrive at a Land Use Plan
- List of Community Organizations
- Upcoming Outreach

Chair Biro stated the goal is to obtain a contact person and email address and obtain a database with a list and contact person. He also suggested an update every month regarding who has reached out to people.

Member Nafissi suggested a draft email and a living document to share among the members, sharing updates, and to keep track and the communication open.

In response to Member Simpson, Ms. Nowak stated members could be assigned certain organizations.

Member Hannon suggested adding a column as to who was contacted.

Member Chrzan suggested having common language before the next meeting.

Chair Biro stated the goal is to supplement the list with a contact person, email address and the number of those who have been contacted. He also suggested a possible volunteer as to who will reach out and which ones are left open to be assigned to a volunteer.

A master list of community organizations was provided to the members for their assignment.

It was determined that no outreach subcommittee is necessary.

10. Topics for May Meeting/Next Steps
    a. Recap Land Use Focus Area Options
    b. Parks and Open Space
Ms. Nowak reviewed the schedule for the next meeting to include finishing up the Galleria and other areas, parks and Guiding Principles.

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT – 2nd SESSION
Holly Osborne suggested the area outside of the diagram be colored which would help make it easier to understand, and requested that the building on Avenue G at 52 units/acre be included.

Tom Bauer stated that zoning defines the value of the land, and the key to rezoning is to motivate change in the City. He said he supports Option 3 which allows for flexibility and motivates him, and said it is important to know what the current lots and rezoning are worth, and to consider a rebuilt clause.

Jo Hrzina, 2503 190th, reviewed her neighborhood which is single family, and supported preserving single family neighborhoods, not having a high tech corridor in her neighborhood, and to look at zoning.

Gary Mlynek, District 5, questioned how to reduce automotive traffic and congestion and suggested removing that section out of the Guiding Principles. He also said reducing lanes creates more congestion because cars are taking longer to get home. He also stated no complete streets, no road diets.

Nathan Thompson, North Redondo, stated his office is on PCH and noted the technology center on Catalina is almost bankrupt with not many using it. He suggested when looking at corridors and districts, to look at the demand.

Mr. Mlynek asked if residential on top of commercial would be considered housing and if so, pointed out that the resident would not have to drive to work when working in the same building below.

VII. GPAC MEMBERS REFERRALS TO STAFF
Member Nafissi requested binders and the emailing list at the next meeting.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT: 9:44 P.M.
Motion by Member Eller, seconded by Member Moses, to adjourn the meeting at 9:44 p.m. to a Regular Meeting to be held at 6:30 p.m. on Thursday, May 31, 2018 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
A portion of our next GPAC meeting will focus on Parks, Recreation, and Open Space. Please bring 5 pictures of examples of parks or open spaces areas that you like (a printed photo is preferred we will be posting them on the walls). Be prepared to discuss the features in each photo that you would like to see here in the City. We encourage you to expand your search beyond Redondo Beach. The following categories are provided for your consideration, but you are not limited to these. You may have or find examples of other spaces or opportunities for active and passive recreational use or ideas for plazas, greenways, or paseo enhancements.

1. General Park
2. Playground
3. Beach
4. Public Art
5. Trails
6. Vista/Viewpoints
7. Sports Fields
8. Preserved/Conserved Open Space
City Funds for Park Land Development and Improvement

Quimby Fee:

The Quimby Fee was adopted by ordinance in 2004, along with a resolution setting a Quimby Fee cap. The Fee cap was established in order to set a developer exaction lower than a fee based solely on land valuation, which would create a prohibitive fee structure. New housing developments of less than 50 units in the City pay the Quimby fee (or provide a combination of land dedication and fee) at the capped amount. Developments of more than 50 units can provide a land dedication in lieu of the Quimby Fee, or potentially a combination thereof, all subject to City approval. The funds are intended to be allocated to projects within an area projected to be impacted by the development. The current fee cap is $25,000 per unit, adopted by the City Council in 2017. Quimby Fees are dedicated to the Subdivision Park Trust Fund.

Parks and Recreation Facilities Fund:

This fund was created in July, 1972, and assesses a one-time $400 per unit tax on residential units built within the City. It applies to any single-family dwelling and each unit of any apartment, condominium, duplex, or multiple dwelling structure designed as a separate habitation for one or more persons, motel unit, or trailer park space. Housing for seniors, the disabled, and housing constructed in the Harbor area are exempted.

Open Space Acquisition Fund:

Created in 2016, the fund is intended to accrue, through discretionary Council appropriations over time, for the purpose of land acquisition in the City. The land purchased would be used for parks and open space public uses.
Future Recreation and Park Needs (2004-2014)

The following is a discussion of future recreation and park needs and priorities based on analysis of the following information:

- Inventory of existing parkland, recreation facilities, and recreation programs
- Public parkland acreage per population ratios
- Public Input Program
- Distribution of existing public parkland and recreation facilities
- Current and projected population, age composition, and growth trends

General themes derived from analyzing this information are presented below.

General Themes:

1. There is a deficit of parks and recreational facilities in the City.
   Additional parks and recreation facilities are needed to adequately serve the current and future populations of Redondo Beach. The City is approaching build-out, and there are few available vacant parcels remaining to develop new parkland or recreational facilities. It will be necessary to supplement the existing inventory with other types of recreational resources.

2. Ongoing park and facility maintenance/rehabilitation will play a crucial role in a city with limited opportunities to develop new parkland.
   Improving the quality and preserving the existing inventory of recreation resources will contribute to the level of service and quality of the leisure experience available to residents. The condition and types of park facilities should be evaluated periodically. Facilities should be rehabilitated and modified as demographics change.

3. The City should continue to capitalize on its prime coastal location to the maximum extent possible.
   There are opportunities west of Pacific Coast Highway, particularly in the marina and at the beach, to create a vibrant leisure experience for residents and visitors. Creating an enhanced waterfront with trail connections to neighboring coastal cities could heighten the appeal of one of the City’s top attractions—the beach area.

4. It is essential for the City to identify and pursue alternative revenue sources for future capital improvement projects.
   Residential development fees will not be available to fund most park and recreation projects after build-out. The City will need creative and effective financing mechanisms.

A list of the community’s recreation-related needs is presented in Exhibit 5. Each need has been rated as high, moderate, or low priority as follows:
Priority Rating 1 (high):
- Participants in the Public Input Program frequently rated the need as a high priority.
- Addressing the need will help the City achieve the recommended standard of three acres of parkland for every 1,000 residents.
- Addressing the need will maintain or improve the quality of the recreation experience for a large number of residents in the City.
- Addressing the need will result in the development of a desirable recreational resource that is currently lacking in the City.
- This need is related to a State or federal mandate (i.e., the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990).

Priority Rating 2 (moderate):
- Participants in the Public Input Program identified the need, but did not rate it as a high priority.
- Addressing the need will potentially enhance recreational opportunities and quality of life for Redondo Beach residents.

Priority Rating 3 (low):
- Participants in the Public Input Program rated need as a low priority.
- Addressing the need will eventually improve the quality of the parks and recreation system in the City.
### Current General Plan 2004-2014 Update on Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARKLAND/RECREATION AREAS</th>
<th>ISSUE</th>
<th>NEED</th>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADA Compliance</td>
<td>• Upgrade parks and recreation facilities per ADA standards</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson Park Improvements</td>
<td>• Construct a multi-purpose community center to replace the Annex building, Scott Houses, and Modular building</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Enlarge restrooms and remodel kitchen at the Senior Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aviation Park Improvements</td>
<td>• Complete Phase II of the Aviation Park/Redondo Beach Performing Arts Center project</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop the vacant lot adjacent to the Gymnasium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increase public use of Gymnasium and coordinate an “Open Gym” period</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reevaluate the agreement between Northrop Grumman Corporation and the City in relation to the use of the Gymnasium by Northrop employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach Bluffs/Blue Butterfly Habitat Restoration</td>
<td>• Revegetate the bluffs with native plants</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Install decorative fencing at the top and bottom of the bluffs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Install educational signage along the bluffs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Path Connection from The Strand</td>
<td>• Provide a bike path connection from The Strand in Hermosa Beach to the Municipal Pier in Redondo Beach</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Align the bike path adjacent to the California Coastal Trail or along the marina to provide a view of the water, contingent upon development of the area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Coastal Trail Connection</td>
<td>• Develop the California Coastal Trail through Redondo Beach</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Connect the Trail from Mole D to the Pier Plaza International Boardwalk area by a pedestrian bridge across Basin 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Continue the widening of the pedestrian path through the south end of the City</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide a minimum 12-foot-wide paved public pedestrian path along the water’s edge in the harbor area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coliseum Park</td>
<td>• Provide signage to identify public access</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evaluate potential active uses for the park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominguez Park Improvements</td>
<td>• Evaluate construction of a shade structure with benches in the dog park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Relocate Parks Yard and/or Police Department pistol range and replace with recreation-related uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Repair and properly maintain historic homes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esplanade Beautification</td>
<td>• Develop plan to enhance the Esplanade by widening sidewalks, maximizing parking spaces, improving pedestrian amenities and bike path, restoring the bluffs, adding trails and viewing platforms, and improving coastal access</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenbelt Park Connection</td>
<td>• Extend Greenbelt Park from Hermosa Beach into the City, contingent upon funding/development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation, Replacement, and Maintenance</td>
<td>• Replace outdated &amp; dilapidated facilities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Maintain high maintenance service levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 2017 ADA study completed for all park facilities
- Kitchen & restrooms partially updated. Community Center unfunded.
- RBPAC completed. Vacant lot undeveloped. Gymnasium rented consistently. NGC license for fitness center.
- County property – program of Sea Lab.
- Completed HB-RB bike path connection.
- Future bike path improvements pending.
- Dog Park improvements funded as future CIP.
- Morrell and Queen Anne Houses in good condition.
- Esplanade project complete. Keep the Esplanade Beautiful community group.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUE</th>
<th>NEED</th>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moonstone Park/Mole B Improvements</td>
<td>Develop strategy to increase/enhance boating facilities</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Create storage facilities for boating uses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improve the park with enhanced landscaping, public parking, and additional recreation amenities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improve wayfinding to Mole B with more apparent access from the Marina Way harbor entrance by installing appropriate signage and landscaping leading to the park’s location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work with the lessee to have existing entry gate at Marina Way and North Harbor Drive removed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Pier</td>
<td>Install educational exhibits along the Pier</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Parkland Acquisition</td>
<td>Explore vacuum/unmet/unused sites and public/county-parcels buildings throughout the City for potential locations to acquire and develop new parkland and/or recreation facilities</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Determine whether or not to develop a “Heart” park (in former Heart of the City project area)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkette Improvements</td>
<td>Complete parkette renovations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Furniture</td>
<td>Install new and maintain/upgrade existing park furniture at all parks and recreation areas</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>Evaluate the parking supply and demand at Perry Park, Veterans Park, Aviation Park</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mitigate parking conflicts at parks and recreation areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive Open Space &amp; Gathering Areas</td>
<td>Increase quantity of passive open space, plazas, promenades, and gathering areas in public spaces throughout the City</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perry Allison Playfield Improvements</td>
<td>Evaluate redesign of the field into a park or new recreation facility</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety</td>
<td>Improve enforcement of graffiti ordinance</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transit</td>
<td>Encourage citizen use of City-sponsored transportation (i.e., WAVE, Dial-a-Ride), ride sharing, and the public transit system to local recreation facilities to alleviate parking and traffic congestion</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restroom Facilities</td>
<td>Upgrade restrooms to comply with ADA standards</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern California Edison Company Rights-of-Way</td>
<td>Evaluate multiple uses of compatible recreational activities in public utility easements such as bikeways, athletic fields, community gardens, walking trails, landscaping, and passive and/or active recreation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanniago Lagoon Improvements</td>
<td>Improve wayfinding and entrance to park</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluate expanding hours of operation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improve quality of concession facility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Install secure and permanent storage areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluate additional off-season events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluate expansion of facility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage Space</td>
<td>Create permanent storage space at recreation areas/facilities for use by clubs and organizations</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans Park Improvements</td>
<td>Restore and revitalize the historic Ainsworth Court stairway</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Historical features installed at Reznick leasehold.

Open Space Acquisition Fund established.

Parkette improvements included in CIP.

Benches, trash receptacles, picnic tables replaced as needed/donated.

Parking at Perry remains a challenge.

Under development.

City graffiti hotline.


N. Bike Path, Artesia parcel improvements, PCH/Catalina triangle improvements.

Study in association with SCE proposed for FY 18-19 Budget.

Meistrell public art, gates and building renovations.

Hours of operation determined by NPDES permit and available PT staff.

Off-season events increasing.

Would be a project in partnership with the County.
## Current General Plan 2004-2014 Update on Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUE</th>
<th>NEED</th>
<th>PRIORITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Newsletter/Website            | • Improve on-line access  
                                 | • Evaluate on-line facility reservations/applications  
                                 | • Notify all residents of on-line class registration  
                                 | • Distribute surveys/evaluations to students in the RBUSD  
                                 | for input regarding recreation program needs, interests, and participation in this age group, if funding is available  
                                 | • Effectively advertise program offerings to maximize community participation | 1        |
| Parent & Child Development Classes | • Expand the number of parenting and child development classes | 2        |
| Path of History               | • Integrate recreational learning opportunities with historically significant sites throughout the City  
                                 | • Complete the “Path of History” project | 1        |
| Special Events                | • Continue providing public recreational activities and special events such as the summer concert series and outdoor movies  
                                 | • Expand the type and frequency of special events to facilitate more youth involvement  
                                 | • Adapt and plan public spaces to serve special events and community activities | 1        |

- Newsletter online publication.
- Seeds of Joy, Pre-K and Tiny Tots available.
- Ongoing pending funds.
MEASURE A: IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINE

SPRING 2017
- Initial Outreach.

Data and calculations for new tax.

FALL 2017
- Ongoing outreach regarding draft framework and guidelines.

WINTER 2018
- First revenue from Measure A is received.

SPRING 2018
- Testing of online application, payment, and communications system.

- Bond approval of framework and guidelines.

SUMMER 2018
- First funds available - study area allocations and M&S.

WINTER 2019
- Competitive Grant first request for proposals.

- Formation of Steering Committee.

- Draft framework and guidelines for allocation process and competitive grants.

- Ongoing outreach regarding draft framework and guidelines.

- Formation of Oversight Committee.

- Framework and guidelines finalized.

- Draft recommendations for financing and forwarding allocations.

Contact: Jane I. Beesley | OSDInfo@parks.lacounty.gov | 213.738.2981 | Website: RPOSD.LAcounty.gov
MEASURE A: SAFE, CLEAN NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS AND BEACHES MEASURE OF 2016

**PURPOSE** - Provides dedicated, local funding for parks, recreation, beaches, open space, trails, cultural facilities, and related projects throughout Los Angeles County.

**SUPPORT** - Approved by 75% of voters in November 2016.

**REVENUE** - Financed by an annual parcel tax of 1.5 cents per square foot of development. Estimated annual revenue is $94 million.

**TIMING** - The first Measure A tax will be placed on property tax bills in Fall 2017. Initial funding is anticipated to be available in July 2018.

**EXPENDITURE PLAN:**

- **35% CATEGORY 1**
  - Community Based Park Investment Program: Formula-based allocations of funds for grants to each study area.

- **13% CATEGORY 2**
  - Safe Parks, Healthy Communities, Urban Greening Program: Formula-based allocations of funds for grants to high and very high need study areas.

- **13% CATEGORY 3**
  - Protecting Open Space, Beaches, Watersheds Program: Grants, to be awarded through a competitive process.

- **13% CATEGORY 4**
  - Regional Recreational Facilities, Trail and Accessibility Program: Grants, to be awarded through a competitive process.

- **13% CATEGORY 4**
  - Youth and Veterans Job Training & Placement Opportunities Program: Grants, to be awarded through a competitive process.

- **3.8% CATEGORY 5**
  - Maintenance and Servicing: Formula-based allocate for M&S of grant-funded projects.

- **15% MAINTENANCE & SERVICING**
  - Program Innovation and Oversight: Needs Assessment updates, innovative technologies, and operations of RPOSD.

Contact: Jane I. Beesley | OSDInfo@parks.lacounty.gov | 213.738.2981 | Website: RPOSD.LAcounty.gov
City Funds for Park Land Development and Improvement

Quimby Fee:

The Quimby Fee was adopted by ordinance in 2004, along with a resolution setting a Quimby Fee cap. The Fee cap was established in order to set a developer exaction lower than a fee based solely on land valuation, which would create a prohibitive fee structure. New housing developments of less than 50 units in the City pay the Quimby fee (or provide a combination of land dedication and fee) at the capped amount. Developments of more than 50 units can provide a land dedication in lieu of the Quimby Fee, or potentially a combination thereof, all subject to City approval. The funds are intended to be allocated to projects within an area projected to be impacted by the development. The current fee cap is $25,000 per unit, adopted by the City Council in 2017. Quimby Fees are dedicated to the Subdivision Park Trust Fund.

Parks and Recreation Facilities Fund:

This fund was created in July, 1972, and assesses a one-time $400 per unit tax on residential units built within the City. It applies to any single-family dwelling and each unit of any apartment, condominium, duplex, or multiple dwelling structure designed as a separate habitation for one or more persons, motel unit, or trailer park space. Housing for seniors, the disabled, and housing constructed in the Harbor area are exempted.

Open Space Acquisition Fund:

Created in 2016, the fund is intended to accrue, through discretionary Council appropriations over time, for the purpose of land acquisition in the City. The land purchased would be used for parks and open space public uses.