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 June 28, 2018
   5. Approval of Minutes for the General Plan Advisory Committee Regular Meetings of April 26, 2018 and May 31, 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. Presentation and Large Group Discussion: Parks and Open Space
      a. Summary: Parks Survey Results - GPAC Parks Priorities
      b. Existing Parks and Open Space Definitions: Overview and comment
   8. Large Group Discussion: Citywide Land Use: Review of remaining areas outside of Focus Areas (if questions outstanding)
   9. Outreach Ambassadors Reminder/Update of Groups Reached
   10. Overview of Future Topics for July 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, July 26, 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.
June 21, 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, June 21, 2018, the agenda for the June 28, 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

[Signature]
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
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 the consensus that land use is not 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 for Artesia Boulevard and requested a color rendering of it for clarification.

Wendy Nowak of PlaceWorks clarified that Option 3 was not in the original presentation and was developed during the group discussion and therefore there was not a prepared map for it.

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

V. ITEMS FOR PRESENTATION, DISCUSSION OR ACTION

6. Announcements and Updates

Wendy Nowak of PlaceWorks provided the following overview of upcoming steps:
- 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
- Review more detail related to Aviation and Artesia corridor and create area plan, looking at more detail at things like parking, landscape improvements, façade improvements, mix of uses, functionality of the corridor, working with traffic regarding the parking study, BAE will do a market study
- Second public workshop for Artesia corridor
- October timeline for land use plans
- Land Plan – take to community, then to Planning Commission and City Council
- Feedback on policies and plan

In response to Member Lamb, Ms. Nowak stated there are no other speakers scheduled.

Member Moses asked if the community suggestions are added as amendments or changes. Ms. Nowak stated the GPAC recommendations are presented to Planning Commission and City Council along with the community comments on those recommendations. The Planning Commission and City Council will determine if changes are to be made to the GPAC recommendations based on the community feedback.

Member Samaras thanked Ms. Nowak for providing the overview.

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 the plan to inform the community about any workshops.

7. Large Group Discussion
a. Review of General Plan Update Guiding Principles

Confirm Guiding Principles
Chair Biro stated he prepared a draft of the Guiding Principles based on the feedback that was collected by staff and PlaceWorks and provided to him. He also said Member Lamb provided a comprehensive re-write as well and requested comments from the Members on both versions.

In response to a question from a member regarding establishing an editing subcommittee versus having the Chair create the draft document, Chair Biro stated that regardless of how the draft was prepared the outcome would still be the same in terms of having to bring the draft back to the entire GPAC for input, therefore the Chair created the draft rather than a subcommittee to streamline the process.

Discussion continued among some of the members regarding the validity of having only the Chair prepare the draft and that the entire committee should have voted on that process.

In response to Member Lamb, Chair Biro confirmed that input will be taken tonight but the document will still remain in draft form.

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:
  o Have an efficient complete transportation system or network with reduced traffic volume and congestion, multimodal transportation such as alternatives to the car
  o Seeking safe efficient multilevel transportation with reduction of traffic volume by cars
  o Manage traffic volume and congestion and seek safe and efficient multimodal transportation
  o Period after the word “congestion.”
  o Not include “reduce.”
  o The goal is to have traffic more efficient than it is today.
  o Congestion is not just cars but includes other factors. There is a goal of reducing congestion.
  o Safe and efficient multimodal transportation network.
  o Improve movement from one place to another.
  o Improve a safe and efficient multimodal transportation network.
  o Improve traffic transportation system to have safe and efficient multimodal transportation that reduce time in traffic and provide alternatives to the car.
  o Distance and time, public safety, pedestrian safety, biking safety, parking all need to be considered.
  o 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.
  o Member Waller suggested “improve traffic and reduce congestion.”
  o Reducing levels of congestion by improving a safe and efficient multimodal transportation network.
  o Member Chrzan suggested “promote development and zoning changes that reduce traffic congestion, and improve pedestrian biking and public transit infrastructure”.
  o 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

In response to Member Gaddis, 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. The metrics will be contained in the goals and policies of the plan.

Discussion continued among the group regarding the concepts of and differences between principles, goals, methods, and policies.

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. The precise wording and the policies can come later.

Member Lamb suggested narrowing down to a specific number of big ideas.

Member Eller expressed concern with becoming a dysfunctional group and rejecting the leadership of the consultants and the Chair, the group being dominated by a few members, and not having a consensus. He believes that the draft is well-stated as to what was crafted and stated last time, and is a composite statement and that the role of leadership should be to consolidate all the ideas.

Chair Biro suggested the members provide 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.

Chair Biro described his process of compiling the comments.

Community Development Director Jones pointed out many of the goals are already in 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 confirmed that the principles guide the land use decisions, but that the principles are general statements, not specific.

Member Moses strongly opposes a subcommittee going beyond the Committee’s research and supported the Committee working through the item together. He stated concern with having a
small group interpreting the input of the entire group, which would go against the purpose of having the GPAC.

Member Nafassi agreed with Member Moses believed the entire Committee needs to come to an internal process on how to make decisions, and that having a subcommittee has the potential of shutting a lot of input out. She said the Committee has to work together and make decisions in a cohesive manner and come to a consensus. She said it would help to know the decision-making process of the Chair as he evaluates all the input so that the group feels their concerns are validated and so that no one feels shut out of the process.

Chair Biro stated he will have a metric of how to review what he receives, and will group similar comments and topics together. He requested that members provide guidance in their comments in addition to edits.

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, resident, suggested the area outside of the diagram be a color other than black which would help make it easier to understand, and requested that the area on Avenue G at 52 units/acre be included, because the area is very over developed and dense.

Tom Bauer, property owner on PCH, stated that zoning defines the value of the land, and the key to rezoning is to motivate change in the City. He asked GPAC members to keep in mind that any properties that are developed as residential will stay residential even if re-zoned to office because residential is worth more, and therefore it is not in fact facilitating change and makes properties non-conforming and harder to secure insurance or financing. Up-zoning properties will be what motivates owners to seek new development. 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 rebuild clause.

Jo Hrzina, 2503 190th, reviewed her neighborhood which is single family, and supported preserving single family neighborhoods, and does not support having a high tech corridor adjacent to that area.

Gary Mlynek, District 5, questioned how to reduce automobile traffic and congestion without forcing people to not use their cars. He 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, and creating more CO2. He also stated no complete streets, no road diets.

Nathan Thompson, North Redondo, stated he works in an incubator office in Santa Monica and that he had an office PCH. He noted the technology center building on Catalina and stated not many people are renting offices there. He suggested when looking at corridors and districts, to look at the demand.

Mr. Mlynek asked to add a comment. He pointed out the discussion of no housing on PCH, and asked if someone want to live on top of a commercial building if that is 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 email language 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
Minutes
GPAC Meeting of May 31, 2018
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 6:35 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: Members Bajaj, Chrzan (arrived at 7:43 p.m.), Eller, Gaddis, Glad, Hannon, Lamb, Light (arrived at 6:48), McKenzie, Nafissi (arrived at 6:50 p.m.), Pinzler, Samaras, Sanchez, Simpson, Solomon, Stodder, Szymanski, Turner, Voisey (arrived at 6:41 p.m.), Waller (arrived at 6:47 p.m.), Chair Biro

Members Absent: Members Funabashi, Hashmi, Kartounian, Kilroy, Ludwig, Moses

Officials Present: Aaron Jones, Community Development Director
John La Rock, Community Services Director
Antonio Gardea, Senior Planner
Sean Scully, Planning Manager
Marianne Gastelum, Assistant Planner
Lina Portolese, Planning Analyst
Diane Cleary, Recording Secretary

Consultants Present: Wendy Nowak, PlaceWorks
Suzanne Schwab, PlaceWorks

3. SALUTE TO THE FLAG
Chair Biro 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 May 31, 2018

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR THE GENERAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE SPECIAL MEETING: April 26, 2018.

Member Szymanski referred to Item 5 and noted his absence was excused. Community Development Director Jones stated excused absences will be approved after Council action.

Member Solomon referred to Item 5 and requested that the dialogue with the Chairman regarding the process of the Guiding Principles and open meeting laws be included in the minutes.
In response to Member Lamb regarding the procedure for approving minutes with missing statements, Community Development Director Jones advised that the Committee could make a motion to have the minutes amended and brought back for reconsideration at the next meeting.

Motion by Member Pinzler, and seconded, to withdraw the minutes. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion by Member Eller, seconded by Member Solomon, to approve the Affidavit of Posting. Motion carried unanimously.

IV. PUBLIC COMMENT – 1ST SESSION
Tom Bauer, resident and investment property owner, expressed concern with higher density in commercial and some residential on the Galleria site and supported keeping density at a cap. He also said flexibility in zoning can allow for changes to happen without a density increase and he encouraged creativity in zoning along with flexibility. He also expressed concern with nonconforming properties and zoning should incorporate a legal clause otherwise it makes it difficult for property owners to get financing and the properties sit stagnate.

Rebecca James, District 2, expressed concern with what City staff considers a park, and calling the sections adjacent to the sidewalk for the Galleria Project a linear park or linear greenspace. She asked members to look at the public comments for the Galleria Project.

V. ITEMS FOR PRESENTATION, DISCUSSION OR ACTION

6. Announcements and Updates
Wendy Nowak reviewed the announcements and updates to include:
- Land Use Options (Galleria District and Citywide), Parks and Open Space (May)
- Guiding Principles (June)
- Definitions for Land Use Designations (June)
- Continuation of Parks, Recreation and Open Space (if Needed) (June)
- Initiate discussions about Artesia-Aviation Corridor Area Plan (June)
- Update of the Local Hazard Mitigation plan is occurring

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

Wendy Nowak spoke on the following:
- Land Use Options Overview
- The Galleria property has a pending project, GPAC will not discuss this property
- Combined Types of Uses
- Galleria District – Current General Plan
- Designated as regional commercial – commercial, office, residential
- Mix of uses to the west of the Galleria
- Commercial along Artesia
- Easement
- Kingsdale
- Two industrial designations southwest corner
- Option 1 – Refine current GP - no commercial frontage along Artesia
- Option 2 – Integrate High Density Residential
  - Increase residential density to Multi-Family High
  - Create a transit-oriented district near the future Green Line station
  - The easement is an open space opportunity
• Option 3 – Create a Mixed-Use Galleria District
  o Create a mixed-use district specific to the Galleria area with maximum flexibility

Member Light asked why the Galleria property is excluded from discussion and expressed concern with not discussing all areas. Community Development Director Jones explained that the Galleria portion of the CR zone has an approved entitlement application which is currently under appeal. This is consistent with the group not discussing the Waterfront area which also has an approved entitlement under appeal. He suggested it is not advisable to plan out a site that has a current project under consideration. He stated staff will check with the City Attorney’s Office regarding any discussions on a site under consideration.

Member Nafissi also agreed it was City Council’s intent to have GPAC look at the City as a whole and to not handpick certain areas to exclude, noting this is a long-term commitment and vision and all areas should be included. Community Development Director Jones agreed and pointed out that this would also include the AES site as well which is currently under discussions.

Member Pinzler pointed out that two different plans may need to be created when taking into consideration that the Metro may end up running down the center of Hawthorne Blvd. with no stop at the Galleria, and then there is a misplaced Transit Center. This may also be a rational for not having residential on the Galleria site.

Member Eller thought the stop was going to be at the Galleria.

Member Pinzler stated that Alternative 4 does not stop at the Galleria.

In response to Member Simpson, Planning Manager Scully stated the exact schedule and status for the Metro itself is unknown at this time.

Community Development Director Jones stated it will be some time before it is known which alternative will be selected regarding the Metro.

Member Gaddis suggested considering the Galleria site as part of the discussion which can always be taken out at the direction of the City Attorney.

Chair Biro believed for the purpose of the meeting, “macro” zoning items can be discussed without getting into details of the Galleria Project application itself.

Community Development Director Jones pointed out the Galleria project has filed a vesting tract map which will carry entitlements from the date of application and locks in the development standards and policies at the time the map was filed. He said creating new policies and standards afterwards wouldn’t be applicable to the project.

Member Gaddis asked if this wouldn’t also apply to any developments that already exist on properties, that the developments are grandfathered in. Mr. Jones replied that properties discussed previously do not have a current application in process with a pending development, and a measure of caution is necessary in changing zoning standards when there is a vesting map in place.

Member Pinzler stated the retail business is changing and questioned what would happen if the Galleria becomes the unsuccessful, and suggested thinking beyond what exists.

Ms. Nowak pointed out that GPAC will have to determine a General Plan designation on the Galleria area, and suggested that was is known about the potential development be incorporated into the vision. She noted that changing the rules that the current application is being considered under would make it difficult.
Community Development Director Jones suggested having an office employment center if retail didn’t work.

Member Light stated that the law says that the Planning Commission and City have to judge the project by what is in place at the time of their vesting and gives them vested rights, however doesn’t prevent the City from changing zoning for the future.

Community Development Director Jones agreed and believed the best approach is to receive direction from the City Attorney.

Member Solomon questioned that there is a violation by just discussing the project, noting there are other vested rights as they exist currently in the City and those properties have been discussed.

Ms. Nowak suggested beginning the discussion and see where it leads. If the group feels they are getting too far into the details for the Galleria site, they can decide to stop.

The group began its discussion of the land use options.

**Option 1** – Ms. Nowak stated Option 1 is refinement of the current General Plan designations, leaving commercial and industrial areas the same, but changing the density of the residential area from single-family to low-density multi-family. This plan has no commercial frontage on Artesia.

**Option 2** – Integrating high-density multi-family residential, with industrial incubator space to create jobs to the south.

**Option 3** – The whole area be a Mixed-use district, to be able to vary uses to respond to market needs and master plan each project that comes in, allows for flexibility, not specifying exactly where the land uses need to go.

Member Gaddis questioned using the term “mixed-use” and felt that the group was trying to move away from that term since it isn’t clear what it can mean.

Ms. Nowak clarified that “mixed-use” incorporates residential, commercial, and office. The term “commercial-flex” means retail and office. She stated the group could even adopt a term called “Mixed-Use Galleria” which could incorporate industrial.

Member Gaddis asked which option offers offices with commercial ground floor that serves the offices.

Ms. Nowak stated that option didn’t seem to have been in the previous feedback from the exercises, but suggested adding a fourth option.

Member Gaddis supported commercial-flex through the entire area and bringing jobs into the City to reduce traffic of people leaving the city for work, no residential.

Some members stated they felt traffic wouldn’t necessarily be helped, most people will still have to commute for work.

Member Pinzler pointed out that things have evolved since the group started making the maps, and the group should not be limited to only the options identified previously.
In response to Member Pinzler, Ms. Nowak stated the group is not limited and a fourth option can be added. She suggested assuming the metro is where it is currently located, get that recommendation and what to take out to the group and to then consider changes.

Member Lamb pointed out that this is a large piece of property that could help with changing the ratio of jobs/housing balance, population shift, reducing congestion and improving the climate.

Member Sanchez stated he is still commuting through, his job would not relocate to Redondo Beach, and suggested looking at the numbers regarding who would be looking at this from his perspective.

In response to Member Eller, Ms. Nowak stated the vision is for the next 20 years.

Member Glad expressed concern with piecemealing property and zoning it without looking at the larger impact. She said there are state mandates to provide housing. She also pointed out without housing at the Galleria project, density will be increased somewhere else in the City, creating more problems. She did not support removing all of the housing options from this area, and expressed concern with having spot homes and small commercial lots that really serve no purpose for commercial/industrial. She also said greenspace is proposed along Kingsdale Avenue which defeats the purpose if it is parked in the middle of a commercial zone.

Member Voisey suggested each option could state the location of Metro.

Member Bajaj suggested a Metro stop would be a great location at this area for a self-contained community.

Member Gaddis pointed out that Redondo Beach is already 11,000 residents per square mile, much denser than other areas of LA County, and if this continues, the City will be the densest in LA County, and questioned if this is the goal.

Member Light stated RHNA has not been a fair process, noting Redondo Beach has gotten an unfair share, and should not go by the current RHNA as the allocation process. He also said per Caltrans studies of mass transit in Los Angeles, transit oriented development has not increased trips, but job centers that are accessible to mass transit and where there is low income housing where people can’t afford cars do increase trips. He also pointed out that the area is already impacted from a traffic perspective.

Chair Biro pointed out that retail is changing and the same metrics should be used for the way people work which has changed dramatically. He said there is now a need to have after hour support as well, and not a work center that vacates out and is empty at night. He pointed out that Downtown LA now has residential at night.

Member Light noted an imbalance of jobs to the workforce, and putting in more residential just exacerbates the problem. He said people are leaving the City to work creating more traffic and less revenue to the City. He supported putting in business centers, and creating more housing here makes no sense. He also said residential would have to be affordable, but if Metro doesn’t happen at the Galleria area, there would be no need to put in residential.

Member Simpson stated there needs to be more affordable housing opportunities and believed both Option 1 and 2 address this. He said the project underway already has apartments going into it and it made sense to have some form of additional housing. He also suggested both Option 1 and 2 kept an industrial job creating area as well.

Member Voisey spoke on city densities and stated Redondo Beach is well down on the list.
Member Solomon clarified according to census data, Redondo Beach is 4500% of the average city in California, being one of ten densest cities in California population per square mile. He said it is important to consider what is trying to be accomplished regarding residential, i.e., adding it to meet the RHNA numbers, creating more affordable, or for people to work and live here. He spoke on Downtown with many new units and the vacancy rate being three times the average of the community around them and yet the cost of housing has not been mitigated. He also pointed out affordable in our area is a family income of $113K a year and the median is $103K, with the median income being affordable housing in Redondo Beach. He said if the goal is to create more people working and living in the area, it is important to focus on the office component, and if the goal is to create affordable units, then clarification is needed as to what would need to be accomplished.

Member Stodder suggested looking at other areas of the City for housing as well, such as the area by the Green Line station, looking at a more citywide perspective. He also said there is a movement taking place with more creative office space and coworking space, allowing people to get out of their cars and creating community around work.

Member Lamb suggested option 4 could be office creative space, minimal to no residential, as an option for the community.

Ms. Nowak suggested jobs that would support residential, with opportunity to balance out, and have flexibility.

Chair Biro suggested Option 4 has no residential, and Option 4A has residential with a cap to be determined.

Member Pinzler questioned the meaning of MU flex in terms of building and density.

Ms. Nowak pointed out that the mix of uses is the same on Artesia but the scale is different.

Member Pinzler stated it is important to know what the structure would be in order to make a decision.

Community Development Jones suggested looking at the current definition which is part of the park discussion coming up, regarding open space. He said open space currently is 10% with incentives up to 20% which is already defined in the code.

In response to Member Pinzler regarding building heights, Community Development Jones stated there are two height standards in the CR zone, one for additions to existing buildings at 100 Feet, noting Northrop is allowed 110 feet.

Member Pinzler pointed out that this is one of those few spots for some leverage to make a change, especially on the south end, such as the area near the Green Line.

Community Development Jones reviewed what is there now and said the amenities are there, and it is important to look at the future.

Member Eller stated Option 2 is to give an incentive to improve the residential component.

Member Glad stated there are very few places in the city where industrial is allowed and more and more are going elsewhere, to include small business owners that live in the City, forcing a situation where they have to leave the City. She also said there are a lot of industrial automotive businesses in the couple of areas where they are allowed.
Member Light supported having a special designation, incentivize the industrial business owner, and creative office space and light industrial in the south end which would be perfect and should be expanded.

Community Development Jones pointed out there is storage behind Ralphs.

Member Glad did not support high density high rises.

Member Light said the Galleria can be higher and to keep the south end lower which blends in with the other areas.

Member Samaras suggested higher heights if there were more open space.

Chair Biro supported height along with providing public open space.

Ms. Nowak summarized the following options:
1. Keep industrial, lower density multifamily, regional commercial.
2. Get to higher density residential, difference is south, removing some of the industrial use.

Member Chrzan asked about healthcare/medical.

First Vote:
- GP as is. 0.
- Option 1 – multifamily, keep industrial, allows for MU and residential south of easement. 2.
- Option 2 – higher density, residential and some industrial. 5.
- Option 3 – MU, anything goes, includes residential. 4.
- Option 4 – everything but residential. 7.

Chair Biro suggested consolidating Options 3 and 2.

Member Eller supported Option 2, noting the northwest corner needs to be upgraded.

Member Pinzler suggested mixing the top half of Option 2 with the bottom half of Option 4.

Member Glad questioned leaving the upper left corner residential or convert it to something else.

Member Szymanski suggested agreeing on only two options and then have another session.

Member McKenzie also suggested having just two simple options to present to the public to avoid confusion. Chair Biro agreed.

Second Vote:
- Option A. Everything but residential. 6
- Option B. Hybrid. Top 2 (residential) and bottom 4 (no residential on bottom). Commercial flex stays, keep regional commercial, MU allow residential, multifamily high housing. 10.

These two options will go to the public.

In response to Member Lamb regarding having a rebuild clause, Community Development Director Jones stated there are two types of nonconforming, one is a building that doesn’t conform, and zoning or General Plan designation that doesn’t conform with the current use of the property, and noted it takes many years to achieve everything to conformity.
Motion by Member Glad, seconded by Member Gaddis, to continue the large group discussion to the next meeting for the Citywide Areas, and to move to the open space discussion next. Motion carried unanimously.

8. Presentation: Open Space and Recreation

Community Services Director John La Rock gave a report and discussed the following:
- Strategic Plan Goals for Open Space
- How parks are funded
- Blue zones
- Amenities and facilities that meet the needs of the public
- Park Amenity Needs vs Need for new/Acreage
- Balance the needs of general public recreation vs. organized athletics, i.e., Little Leagues, AYSO, etc.
- Definition of Open Space (parkettes, ROW, etc.)
- WiFi
- Parking/RV parking spaces
- Solar
- Craftsperson demonstrations
- QR reader educational opportunities
- Countywide Parks Inventory
- LA Co Park needs Assessment
- Redondo Beach Park Metrics
- Origin and Intent of Quimby Act
- Build Out of the City Before & After Quimby
- Various Types of Open Space

In response to Member Light regarding the total Quimby Fees that have been generated, Community Services Director La Rock John stated there will be a BRR presented on June 5 to the City Council regarding Quimby Fees.

In response to Member Light regarding acquiring parks with Quimby Fees, Community Development Director Jones stated a portion of the Quimby funding was used towards the gateway park on the cycle path along with transportation funds.

In response to Member Eller, Community Services Director La Rock stated the greenbelt or beaches are not included, only the pier, harbor and park spaces.

In response to Member Solomon regarding an opportunity to state Quimby Fees can be used citywide, Community Development Director Jones stated Quimby Fees are to be used in areas considered of benefit to the development to include large areas of the City.

In response to Member Szymanski, Community Services Director La Rock stated the hard deck would be considered open space, not the water.

In response to Member Chrzan, Community Services Director La Rock stated the pier would be considered open space, not necessarily the sidewalks, but he did not know how this is determined.

In response to Member Waller, Community Services Director La Rock stated the public spaces of the pier are considered open space.

Ms. Nowak stated beaches are included in the calculation of open space but not for funding.
Member Chrzan questioned including the pier which is city-owned commercial district and not a park. Ms. Nowak explained the sidewalks and access to the coastal areas are very important and an amenity which wouldn’t be anywhere else. Community Development Director Jones noted the space serving public recreation function space that can’t be developed is the area being counted such as a plaza.

Planning Manager Scully spoke on the following:
• Current Open Space Requirements
  o Public access to open space for development projects
    ▪ Private open space in all residential zones
    ▪ Useable public open space
    ▪ The use of covenants and easements
• 3 vs. 5 acres per 1,000 scale in Redondo Beach
• Neighboring City goals

In response to Member Chrzan, Community Development Director Jones stated this does not include parking lots or landscaping within parking lots.

In response to Member Light, Ms. Nowak stated this will just be an overview for the Committee and exercise tonight to eventually go out to the public.

Member Light stated the abuse of the public open space in the Galleria and harbor should be addressed by the public, noting landscaping next to a building that never could be used, 10% is very low and not accurate, and every walkway in the Galleria is called open space.

Ms. Nowak suggested revisiting this section of the Zoning Code, noting other cities can’t use more than 10%.

9. Small Group Activity: Open Space and Recreation

The Committee broke into small groups.

Ms. Nowak reviewed the small group survey presented to the Committee.

Group 1:
Member Hashmi presented the following items that were discussed:
• Pocket parks underutilized – look for opportunities to expand the existing ones
• Potential pocket parks adjacent to commercial uses used by both residents and workers
• Schools work with the City to make their facilities available regularly (joint use facility)
• Favorite Parks: Anderson Park and South Park in Hermosa Beach

Group 3:
Member Lamb presented the following items that were discussed:
• District 4
• More parks
• Increased accessibility to existing parks
• Revitalize spaces already in existence such as the sump
• Add amenities such as flash pads and other amenities in south park
• High quality programing for youth
• Multigenerational opportunities within the park for all ages
• Basketball attendance opportunities which are on the low end

Member Glad pointed out that South Park has playground equipment for young children and older children, green open space surrounded by a cement path for activities, community garden, and a
variety of uses. She also suggested skateparks being opened up to cater to scooters and roller skates.

Other items discussed in Group 3:
- Wilson Park in Torrance
- Skate park for all ages
- Teen center at Perry not programed
- Exercise opportunities
- Favorite parks: Anderson and Wilderness

Member Stodder presented the following items that were discussed:
- Favorite parks: Wilderness Park and South Park
- Park on the waterfront and creating more interactivity
- Programming for children such as skateparks and accommodating other kinds of sports
- Incorporate natural setting unique wild conservation elements
- Green belt to include exercise stations along Herondo
- Create a place for larger gatherings and events
- Integrate more art sculptures, etc.

Member Solomon presented the following items that were discussed:
- Alta Vista Park, Wilderness Park discussed
- Czuleger Park blue water views
- AES site – restoring some of the natural features such as the salt lake, incorporate trails, green belt, amphitheater and gathering place
- Improve what have and maintain
- Address small areas such as between Juanita and Pearl
- Medians, City-owned vacant lots – repurpose into small parkettes
- Baseline of what will define as a park
- Repurpose obsolete buildings, areas around corridors, old maintenance yards, vacant lots/buildings
- Examples from around the world and US
- Cafes and pushcarts
- All ages and appetites
- Ball fields and waterways
- Rotary park with natural space and incorporate developed spaces
- Incorporate natural landscape with trails and other useful features
- Connected trails, natural open space
- Paris – parks, walking through the parks, fountain in center, interconnective way of getting through the city

10. Large Group Discussion: Review of General Plan Update Guiding Principles

Ms. Nowak gave an overview of the process
- Comments received from 12 members
- Names redacted and give to chair
- Chair reviewed for common themes and ideas
- Folded comments into revised draft
- Group will take revised draft and review for discussion at next meeting
- PC and CC will receive draft generally agreed to by GPAC and with a list of outstanding comments
- Degrees of Consensus
- Guiding Principles – DRAFT
- Outreach next steps
• Outreach toolkit
• Process to arrive at a Land Use Plan

Chair Biro reviewed his process:
• Received 12 comments and went through revisions
• 10 stayed within the three major categories
• Suggested at next meeting how comments are coming back if fall within the five and six levels, voting and scoring
• Ms. Nowak suggested getting closure at the next meeting

Member Lamb questioned if the group can accept the three broad categories and if it would be helpful to start at that level.

Chair Biro clarified he only received comments from 12 members and only 2 wanted to have the five broad categories.

Member Solomon stated he did not provide comments because he felt the process was unacceptable.

11. Outreach Ambassadors Reminder/Overview and Next Steps

Ms. Nowak suggested that reach out be discussed, who is getting contacted, and consistency of reaching out. She also requested the members drop off their surveys and photos.

Chair Biro suggested keeping a current list on the outreach and who has been contacted.

12. Overview of Future Topics for June Meeting/Next Steps

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT – 2nd SESSION

Jo Razena supported the two options that were discussed to go out to the public; stated some of the parks are very underutilized such as the Fulton Play Field which has no lights, and Franklin Park which only has two picnic benches, the Dog Park has no shade and very little seating space. She also asked how the pocket parks are watered, supported rooftop cinemas for adults, a blow up screen for families, and bocce for seniors.

VII. GPAC MEMBERS REFERRALS TO STAFF

Chair Biro stated he will not be at the next meeting on June 28.

Member Lamb discussed health and disability, stated the Beach Cities Health District supports the beach cities to become more livable, Hermosa Beach has integrated the health concepts into their general plan and helped their residents in that process, and to look at some of the tradeoffs needed to help balance economics, etc. She said Tom Bakaly, CEO of Beach Cities Health District and former City Manager of Hermosa Beach, was involved in the development of Hermosa Beach’s most recent General Plan which could be a great resource to the Committee moving forward. She suggested he attend a GPAC meeting, sharing insights and helping the Committee engage the community along with tradeoffs. She also said current work by the Beach Cities Health District is directly related to improving the building environment to support help. She asked if the group would be interested in having him come to speak to them about his process, integrate health goals into the GP and give ideas about engaging with the community, so all are invested in having the GP plan.
Community Development Director Jones suggested a short presentation by Mr. Bakaly could be presented to the Committee.

Member McKenzie supported a presentation by Mr. Bakaly regarding options for the youth and how it would apply to moving forward with building a better Redondo.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT: 9:45 P.M.
Motion by Member Eller, seconded by Member Waller, to adjourn the meeting at 9:45 p.m. to a Regular Meeting 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. Motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

_________________________________
Aaron Jones
Community Development Director