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 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.” She asked for clarification of Option 3 for Artesia Boulevard.

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 map prepared for it yet.

Motion by Commissioner Eller, seconded by Commissioner Hannon, that Option 3 map be provided to the group along with a very specific description of the term “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 for Option 3 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 work from the Saturday meeting and 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 to complete a final draft of the principles.

Member Solomon questioned why the Chair created the draft rather than a subcommittee of several members, and whether that was a unilateral decision. In response, 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, and this was the Chair’s decision.

Member Solomon stated that he recalled voting to have an editing committee and continued to raise concern with the Chair solely drafting the document, and that it was an arbitrary decision by the Chair not voted on by the members.

Chair Biro stated an editing subcommittee was not formed at the last meeting, and expressed concern with further delays, and stated this method streamlined the process.

Member Solomon stated the choice of method should have been made by the entire group. He asked if the group completes the exercise this evening and still requests that the subcommittee be formed, would that be an option. Chair Biro answered yes.

Member Solomon thanked Chair Biro for his effort but that GPAC is a committee of 27 people that should all have a say in decisions.

Member Solomon questioned the leeway and extent of authority the Chair has and whether the resolution establishing the committee granted this authority.

Chair Biro stated that if there is consensus that this process did not work, a subcommittee can still be formed.

In response to Member Chrzan, Chair Biro clarified that the draft he prepared was the version distributed with the agenda. The one handed out at this meeting as a blue folder item was the draft Member Lamb prepared.

Member Lamb asked for clarification that once the discussion concludes if a vote will be taken and consensus is still not reached can a vote be taken to form a subcommittee. Chair Biro confirmed that can be the process. He referred to the agenda wording stating “Review” of the Guiding Principles, not “confirming,” and that with the input taken tonight 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:
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o Have an efficient complete transportation system or network with reduced traffic volume and congestion, and multimodal transportation that includes 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 Do 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 A safe and efficient multimodal transportation network.
  
o Improve traffic transportation system to have safe and efficient multimodal transportation that reduces time in traffic and provides 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."
  
o Ms. Nowak suggested "improving the way people are getting around in the community through various transportation options"
  
o Reduce transportation congestion
  
o 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, 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 Hannon expressed concern with becoming a dysfunctional group and rejecting the leadership of the consultants and the Chair with the group being dominated by a few individuals, and not having a consensus. He believes that the draft is well-stated as to what was crafted and stated last time, it's fine as 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 Solomon expressed concern with a Brown Act violation if Chair Biro is receiving communication from all the members.

Member Moses stated it could constitute a private meeting and is a violation.

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

Member Moses questioned the effectiveness of the process and stated members may still feel their input was not reflected.

Chair Biro described his process of compiling the comments and incorporating them into a concise document.

Member Ludwig questioned why there were only 3 categories when she recalls there being 5 originally. Chair Biro confirmed he consolidated some of the categories.

Community Development Director Jones pointed out many of the goals are already in the City's Circulation Element of the General Plan.

Chair Biro asked that comments and edits be emailed to City staff by May 11th.

Member Bajaj suggested there should be five subcategories as was proposed at the Saturday meeting and to elect a writing subcommittee of four or five members with final say for the document. Chair Biro stated a unanimous vote would need to take place to agree that a subcommittee would have final authority, and that there are 9 members absent tonight.

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 forming a subcommittee with full authority over the principles 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 and believed the entire Committee needs to come to an agreement on 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.

Member Solomon asked that City Staff send an email to the members not in attendance tonight to notify them of this process.

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.

Chair Biro stated since there is some opposition to forming a subcommittee, the current process will continue as discussed but if it appears to be becoming ineffective or burdensome the group will select another process.

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 of 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.
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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 in a 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 the 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 including residential.

Member Eller noted a very nice mixed-use 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 else in the City.

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 Blvd 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)**
  o Option 1 – reduce density and maintain existing uses
  o Option 2 – Plug 'n play
  o 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 gain 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 overdeveloped 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 Hrznata, 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 Mlynk, 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, Redondo Beach resident, 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. Mlynak asked to add a comment. He pointed out the discussion of no housing on PCH, and asked if someone wanted 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