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 stagnant.

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
  o Increase residential density to Multi-Family High
  o Create a transit-oriented district near the future Green Line station
  o 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 carries 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.
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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
- Crafts-person 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
  - 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
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• 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,

[Signature]

Aaron Jones
Community Development Director