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 September 27, 2018
   5. Approval of Minutes for the General Plan Advisory Committee Regular Meetings of June 28, 2018 and July 26, 2018

IV. PUBLIC COMMENT – 1st SESSION

   This section is intended to provide members of the public with the opportunity to comment on any subject. This section is limited to 15 minutes. Each speaker will be afforded three minutes to address the Committee. Each speaker will be permitted to speak only once. Written requests, if any, will be considered first under this section.

V. ITEMS FOR PRESENTATION, DISCUSSION OR ACTION
   6. Beach Cities Health District CEO Tom Bakaly, “Blue Zones”
   7. Announcements and Updates
      a. GPAC Ambassador Outreach Updates: Member Feedback, Upcoming Events
      b. General Outreach Updates: Facebook Ads, E-Mail Subscribers, Parks and LHMP Survey, City 2018 Fall Newsletter
   8. Large Group Discussion: Overview of Draft Land Use Designations
      a. Small Group Breakout Discussions of Land Use Categories
   9. Project Progress/Next Steps: Tentative Schedule and Meeting Topics, Community Meeting

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, October 25, 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](http://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.
AFFIDAVIT OF POSTING
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Draft Minutes

June 28, 2018 GPAC Meeting
I. OPENING SESSION

1. CALL MEETING TO ORDER
A Regular Meeting of the Redondo Beach General Plan Advisory Committee was called to order by Vice-Chair Sanchez at 6:42 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 (arrived 6:52pm), Eller, Funabashi, Gaddis, Glad, Hannon, Kilroy, Lamb, Light, Ludwig, McKenzie, Nafissi, Pinzler, Simpson, Szymanski, Turner (arrived 6:46 pm), Voisey, Waller, Vice-Chair Sanchez

Members Absent: Members Hashmi, Kartounian, Moses, Samaras, Solomon, Stodder, Chair Biro

Officials Present: Sean Scully, Planning Manager  
John LaRock, Community Services Director  
Antonio Gardea, Senior Plannerr  
Marianne Gastelum, Assistant Planner  
Lina Portolese, Planning Analyst  
Diane Cleary, Recording Secretary

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

3. SALUTE TO THE FLAG
At the request of Vice-Chair Sanchez, Member Gaddis led those assembled in a Salute to the Flag.

II. APPROVAL OF THE ORDER OF AGENDA
Motion by Member Kilroy, seconded by Member Glad, to approve the Order of Agenda as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

III. CONSENT CALENDAR

4. APPROVAL OF 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 SPECIAL MEETING: April 26, 2018 and May 31, 2018.

Member Lamb referred to the April 26, 2018 minutes and noted that comments by Member Solomon regarding potential Brown Act violations are missing.

Sean Scully, Planning Manager, stated the minutes should be pulled from the agenda also given the fact that Member Solomon is not present at this meeting to comment.
Motion by Member Waller, seconded by Member Eller, to approve the Affidavit of Posting for the General Plan Advisory Committee Regular Meeting of June 28, 2018 and the May 31, 2018 minutes. The April 26, 2018 minutes were pulled for further revisions and will be brought back for approval at the next meeting. Motion carried unanimously.

IV. PUBLIC COMMENT – 1ST SESSION

Vice-Chair Sanchez asked for any written requests to address the GPAC. There being none, he asked any members from the audience wishing to speak to come up.

Mayor Bill Brand spoke on SB28 which would double the RHNA numbers in Redondo Beach from 1,400 to 2,800. In comparison, Hermosa Beach will only increase to 4. He said letters have been written in opposition and said there will not be any increase in RHNA numbers due to SB828 and will introduce a new methodology in RHNA allocation and commented that it is a very complex process.

Mayor Brand also stated Prop 68 passed June 5 which includes a clause allocating about $40M to repurpose former fossil fuel power plants due to retire by 2020 which includes AES. The City will work to secure funding from the allocation to utilize for the AES property for park development. He said Redondo Beach is park poor and critically underserved, supports and appreciates the GPAC work, and redoing the whole General Plan.

Member Pinzler noted until Legislature adjourns, there is a process called “gut and amend” regarding a bill, noting at any point the bill could change.

In response to Member Glad regarding challenging the RHNA numbers in the City, Mayor Brand stated he has met several times with California State Senator Scott Wiener and has told him the Redondo Beach numbers are unfair, and a bill is being crafted to bring a whole new methodology to the RHNA process. He also said that RHNA allocation is a state-wide issue and transparency of the process is very important.

Woodie Tescher of PlaceWorks stated he has also spoken with State Senator Wiener and that the intent is to create a consistent methodology regarding RHNA, data-driven so that like places will receive like numbers.

Amy Josefek, Hollywood Riviera, noted bad decisions made recently regarding projects such as the Prospect Avenue condos, Legado Mixed-Use, and the Legado hotel. She said these projects sparked the need for GPAC, which was formed to update the General Plan, and noted she opposed the proposed density and height of the Legado mixed use residential project plus a fifth floor pool and spa area at the hotel which will impact neighbors and services. She also pointed out that lowering the RHNA numbers isn’t enough while approving buildings that are large and tall. She supported having a beach community and to do the right thing for the community. She encouraged GPAC to take advantage of this opportunity they’ve been handed and do what’s right for the community.

In response to Vice-Chair Sanchez regarding the GPAC not necessarily being formed due to Legado, Planning Manager Scully explained it was the direction of City Council to update the Land Use Element, open space and parks, and safety elements.

Resident by the name of Kim requested consideration for parking around the high school and changing street sweeping times. She stated that the high school only has 175 parking spaces for students and parking issues will increase over time. She supported having the parking lot by the auditorium, changing street sweeping along Vincent and Diamond, noting there is no parking along the school from PCH to Prospect.
Marie Francenusbaum, South Redondo, stated that along beaches there are two water cycles, water that evaporates from the ocean and creates clouds and water that evaporates from vegetation that creates a local water cycle. She suggested that having more trees by the beach and the coast would create a better local water cycle. Trees not only help for aesthetic and shade, but also help the local environment.

Vice-Chair Sanchez asked if there was anyone else that would like to address the GPAC. There being none, the 1st Public Comment Session was closed.

V. ITEMS FOR PRESENTATION, DISCUSSION OR ACTION

6. Announcements and Updates

Wendy Nowak, PlaceWorks, discussed the following:
- Topics for remaining GPAC Meetings
  - June – Parks and Open Space, public survey for Parks and Open Space, information will be forwarded to Parks and Recreation Commission, remaining Land Use Plan discussion for all non-focus areas
  - July – Land Use definitions and designations, Guiding Principles
  - August – break, no meeting
- Community Workshop #1 – Vision, Guiding Principles, input on GPAC Land Use ideas, Preliminary Parks Survey
  - September – Review community input on Land Use concepts; make determinations about what land uses to include in proposed plan

In response to Member Pinzler voicing concern regarding the possibility of not finalizing Guiding Principles in July in time for a Community Workshop in early fall, Ms. Nowak stated the approach to the Guiding Principles would include confirming the items that there is consensus on, and that further discussion would be on only the items members have issue with. The principles will remain in draft form and be presented to Planning Commission and City Council showing both the areas of consensus and disagreement for finalization.

In response to Member Pinzler regarding having an agenda outline structure for the community workshop, Ms. Nowak and Planning Manager Scully stated it will come back at the July meeting along with definitions for land uses.

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

Community Services Director John LaRock reviewed the parks survey results:
- Q1a – What are your priorities for the City’s existing parks inventory
- Q1b – If selected “Playground equipment,” prioritize/rank 1-4
- Q1c – If selected “Designated sports fields/courts,” prioritize/rank 1-6
- Q1d – If checked “Specialty recreation amenities,” select all that interest you
- Q1e – If checked “Event Locations,” select all that interest you
- Q2 – What additional spaces could be activated for public parks and recreation activity?
- Q3 – What should the City of Redondo Beach prioritize for implementation to make our parks and recreational areas ready for 2040?
- Q4 – What steps can be taken to improve public safety in the parks?
- Q5 – Where should the City focus efforts in the near term to create additional green/open space/gathering spaces in the City?
- GPAC Parks Survey Feedback
- RB Park Acre Need
- RB Distance to Parks
- RB Population Density
- Redondo Beach Park Needs
- Types of Parkland identified in the current General Plan
- Open Spaces typically provided by Private Development

Member Glad suggested having a skate park accessible to younger kids and girls such as allowing scooters and skates. Community Services Director LaRock noted a concept art presentation on a skate park to include various features for different age groups, considering something other than just skateboards.

In response to Member Pinzler regarding the stability of Dominguez Park, Community Services Director LaRock stated the geotechnical examination for which the City Council has approved the funding will address how physically sound it is and the stability.

In response to Member Chrzan regarding if the skate park idea at Dominguez Park is abandoned, Community Services Director LaRock referred to the section of the park as blank pallet and community input would be sought as to what other amenity should go there.

Member Lamb suggested putting together an overall Redondo Park and Rec future plan moving forward that the residents could look at. Community Services Director LaRock stated a new type of list will be created for the Parks Element which will show short and long-term priorities based on the GPAC’s feedback and will be visible to the community to view and comment. Member Lamb suggested a graphic form as well that would be helpful for residents to visually see map-wise where potential new amenities will be placed.

In response to Member Pinzler regarding the gas, water, and oil lines in the area going up the Edison Right of Way and continuing to Dominguez Park, Community Services Director LaRock confirmed the gas lines do divert off, but he was unsure about the oil lines.

In response to Member Waller regarding, Community Services Director LaRock stated there are oil lines in the Artesia Right-of-Way, noting there are no dig zones on the parameters which have to be avoided, but this will be explored as needed.

Member Glad suggested meandering paths such as at the Natural History Museum, Irvine, etc., which are great for walking with edible gardens. Community Services Director LaRock stated the GPAC can consider any idea and ultimately it would the City Council to decide on the implementation and funding.

In response to Member Pinzler, Ms. Nowak referred to the Artesia/Aviation Specific Area Plan and said parking strategies and complementing the work already done for the facade improvements will be looked at, shared parking, access to the adjacent neighborhoods, but will not define zoning.
Community Services Director LaRock continued his parks survey presentation with the following topics:

- Create new band shell / amphitheater
- Allowing BBQs (currently not allowed)
- Experiential trails and pathways, connectivity
- Allowing dogs in the parks
- More trees
- Gardening and farming for the community
- Public safety / park marshals, cameras, lighting

In response to Member McKenzie regarding complaints about lighting in the parks, Community Services Director LaRock stated there are complaints that take place from some of the residents adjacent to parks, and stated tree trimming affects the impact of lighting as well. He also stated a long range plan is to convert all lighting to focused LED.

Member Eller pointed out that universities have call buttons in the parking lots and suggested they could be installed in parks. Community Services Director LaRock suggested it would have to be coordinated with the Police Department because of the potential for abuse.

Community Services Director LaRock reviewed the LA County Park Needs Assessment maps for Redondo Beach.

Member Lamb asked how north Redondo and south Redondo are measured in terms of park needs. Community Services Director LaRock pointed out the county survey only looked at the city as a whole, they do not breakdown between north and south Redondo.

Member Gaddis stated standard metrics would include how many residents are within a quarter mile. Community Services Director LaRock stated it is about saturation as much as possible across the neighborhoods.

Member Eller stated the DWP has a 100,000 volt line that runs down Ventura Blvd. all underground, so that it is possible to underground utilities. Community Services Director LaRock stated the City Council with the budget approved funding for a method of service study by Edison regarding both removing and undergrounding the high tension wires on the right-of-way that could even go as far as Dominguez Park. He also said blight has to be fought at every level with all utilities including cell phone towers.

Ms. Nowak stated there is more detail from the LA County Park Needs Assessment for the City. Community Services Director LaRock stated the entire county survey is a public document and available online. He encouraged members to research Measure A.

Member Pinzler stated the map shows areas within ½ mile of park and believed it should be ¼ mile. Community Services Director LaRock stated the map was created by LA County. Ms. Nowak stated the ¼ mile map can be part of the General Plan.

Planning Manager Scully clarified that the distance in proximity of a park from residents depends on the size of the park and amenities. Parkettes can be closer, but larger
community parks with more amenities will have a farther range of the residents it can serve.

Member Pinzler asked why requirements for a child to be able to walk to a park be different for a large park versus a small park. Planning Manager Scully stated small parks can be easily located in neighborhoods versus a large park with a lot of amenities. Logistically it would not be feasible to have a large park within every ¼ mile.

Mr. Tescher stated there are various classifications of parks and stated neighborhood parks are intended to serve an immediate neighborhood, versus large community parks. He gave the example of Griffith Park as a regional park, and one of those would not be located every ¼ or ½ mile.

Member Pinzler asked about Redondo Beach being a park poor city and the distance issue as a decider regarding where to place parks. Community Services Director LaRock stated the map and survey would show where parks should go and the Committee could give staff direction if they are to be broken down further.

Community Services Director LaRock reviewed other amenities listed such as community centers, meeting rooms, bike lanes and trails.

Member Glad expressed concern with bike lanes on streets being included in the parks and open space total. Community Services Director LaRock stated that it would be for GPAC to decide if bike lanes should count or not.

Planning Manager Scully stated the current park acreage is 2.2 acres per 1,000 residents and that the Committee expressed interest in going to 5 acres per 1,000 residents. He stated that per the Quimby act, the new General Plan cannot make the jump to 5 acres/1,000 residents without the City first meeting its current General Plan goal of 3 acres/1,000 residents. He suggested that a little broader definition of open space might help the City meet its current 3 acres/1,000 residents goal in order to allow for a new goal of 5 acres/1,000 residents.

Mr. Tescher clarified that the 3 acres per 1,000 resident is the current amount of the Quimby fee that City can assess for parks. The City can increase the goal to 5 acres / 1,000 residents, but the Quimby fee the City collects could not be increased until the previous goal is met.

In response to Member Gaddis, Mr. Tescher said the figure 5 can still be used but the City can only get up to 3 in Quimby fees.

Member Glad asked if including bike lanes would increase the open space amount to a point that would prevent the City from obtaining future funding to help with parks.

Community Services Director LaRock stated in his opinion bikeways are more part of the transit system than the open space system, but that it was an option he wanted to simply present to GPAC because bikeways are also used for recreation.

Member Hannon explained that Class I bike lanes are not on the road, Class II includes stripes on the road, and Class III are just markings.

Member Chrzan commented on meandering trails counting towards open space. Community Services Director LaRock stated that if the trails go through parks, the entire park space is counted.
In response to Member Eller regarding the bike path in North Redondo, Community Services Director LaRock stated it is currently activated and used by the City but not counted towards open space because the entire greenbelt is privately owned by SCE.

Ms. Nowak as for clarification from the group if trails that of decomposed granite and landscape can be included in the open space definition but not the traditional Class 1 striped bike lane.

Member Szymanski asked about the eventual cost of maintaining the open space to a certain standard and money having to be set aside to maintain it. Community Services Director LaRock stated the GPAC can set the goals for parks and open space, but that the implementation would be decided on by the City Council on a case by case basis, and they would consider the cost impact.

In response to Ms. Nowak’s question, Member Light stated he disagreed with considering a bike path in the street that is used more for transit to be open space. BMX tracks and bike trails may be different, but a bike path in the street should not be considered open space.

Ms. Nowak reviewed park calculations and requirements and said the spaces for plazas, squares, etc., on private property are not counted when calculating the park acreage. She stated that private development projects will have requirements to provide public usable open space as part of the project on private property, but that open space is not included in calculations for public park space. It is a method for communities to get more open space feel rather than wall-to-wall buildings, but the open areas are not counted towards park space.

Member Lamb how to make a distinction in the document between these two open spaces and a definition for development open space different from a definition for City park open space. Ms. Nowak explained that there can be two definitions for private open space dedicated to public use and City parks, but that the standards for private development open space would be detailed in the zoning ordinance, not the General Plan.

Mr. Tescher gave an example of a project in Santa Monica which was allowed an additional story in exchange for creating more green space in addition to what would have already been required as part of the project and the additional green space has to be publicly accessible. However, this green space was not counted towards the parkland acreage for the City. The concept still helps with the “greening” of the community, although it does not add to the overall park acreage are recreation area.

Member Pinzler stated the community benefit in Santa Monica was done as a climate issue and not a public open space issue. He believed the issue is what is publicly owned land, and the City is responsible to create open space on its own land. Any green area the City asks for from a private development is not part of the City’s goal towards parks.

Mr. Tescher stated it is actually a law that the open space plan map has to be in public ownership. Ms. Nowak stated the City can still encourage private developers to provide open space since Redondo Beach is built out and the areas the City can actually acquire for new public parkland are limited. She said private projects provide opportunities to get additional spaces where possible.

Member Light disagreed with the definitions of public open space in a big development, and the setback around the perimeter of the property should not be counted towards
that. He stated having a setback as a buffer between a sidewalk and building has no usable value to the public and should not be counted towards the open space requirement such as at the CenterCal Project and Galleria Project.

Ms. Nowak stated the definitions of private development open space are part of the zoning ordinance, not the General Plan.

Member Light stated that goals and policies can be stated in the General Plan so that open space can be truly usable and of high quality.

Member Waller suggested in the interest of time concentrating only on publicly owned park space and not get involved in the private development issues tonight.

In response to Member Light regarding when the discussion on private open space should take place, Planning Manager Scully clarified that private open space is part of the Land Use Element, and what is being discussed tonight is the Parks and Recreation Element. There can be a reference in the Parks and Recreation Element that private open space is addressed in the Land Use Element. Policies can be incorporated into the Land Use Element that will guide towards future development standards that will better define and increase the private development open space. This can take place during GPAC’s Land Use Policy development.

Member Chrzan suggested having usable public open space as a topic.

Ms. Nowak clarified that the “goal” in the General Plan would be to expand opportunities for open space, find the public spaces and then look for other spaces, and the “how” becomes the zoning, and details of what gets counted will be discussed with and decided on by the Planning Commission and City Council.

Member Nafissi pointed out that the AES plant is 50 acres of privately owned land, and noted controversial issues when discussing land uses but it needs to be discussed in an open conversation.

Member Pinzler asked if the discussion is about City owned or publicly owned as park land. Ms. Nowak stated that the current Parks and Recreation Element does include the beach as public open space. The elements for Hermosa Beach and Manhattan Beach include the beach in their calculations as well. She also said the beach is not city-owned and is a county beach.

Planning Manager Scully stated the pier is included, but the harbor is not.

Planning Manager Scully stated the beach is included when calculating 2.24 acres per 1,000 residents.

Member Lamb asked at what point the members would give input on the issue of private development open space and changing the definitions. Mr. Tescher stated the Committee will give input during the Land Use Element policy discussion. Mr. Tescher clarified that the GPAC will characterize private open space, but will not define the specifics.

Member Light expressed concern with counting parking lots towards open space acreage such as at Aviation Park, and stated there are communities that have a definition to limit only 10% of park to parking lot. He also stated there is 17 acres counted under the right-of-way which Edison owns, not publicly owned.
Community Services Director LaRock stated that the City has an internal policy to use parking lots for programs whenever possible, like the food truck events, bicycle lessons, and movie nights. Staff recognizes that parking lots are in some cases the dominant square footage of a park area, and therefore try to activate them for other uses.

In response to Member Gaddis, Community Services Director LaRock stated the triangle at the Riviera Village is a parking lot, not a park.

Ms. Nowak stated that options are being presented with the fact that Redondo Beach is built out and trying to offer other opportunities the create places for people to gather and create character for the community.

Planning Manager Scully stated issues include trying to balance the issue of increasing parks per 1,000 from 3 to 5, grants and other funding mechanisms predicated on the need of the community, and what we define and include.

Community Services Director LaRock highlighted the Class 1 bike path as a recreational feature of the City but not as park space in his opinion.

In response to Member Gaddis, Planning Manager Scully explained the formula for the Quimby fee is the fair market value for the acreage that has to be generated as a factor of how many units are developed residentially. As the acreage increases requirement the fee a developer would pay increases.

Ms. Nowak stated once 3 is achieved, more acreage can be asked for, which is a higher fee.

Member Gaddis stated it appears that the legislation may be written to charge more in park poor places than park rich places.

Planning Manager Scully explained the Quimby Fee in a scenario. At 3 acres per 1,000 residents, a 3 acre park would be required if a development came in with 1,000 residents. At 5 acres per 1,000, the same development would be required to fund a 5 acre park, which is a higher cost. The same development can generate more park space.

Ms. Nowak clarified that the City must demonstrate it has met the 3 before it can increase the goal to 5.

In response to Commissioner Glad regarding the amount of existing park space and if it limits opportunities for grant funding for new park space, Community Services Director LaRock explained that the two most important parts of any park funding grant are partnerships to execute a project and the specifics of the serving group that the project delivers to, demonstrating the specific needs for that project. The highest weighted aspects are the purpose of the project and who it’s partnered with. He also said Measure A has three different categories of competitive grants which have very specific with criteria.

Member Hannon asked about El Dorado Park in Long Beach and the bike route. Community Services Director LaRock assumed the bike route is part of the park and does have connectivity to the aqueduct bike path and there may be some boundary issues. He also said a lot of those bike paths have bad conflicts with vehicular roads.
Member Light believed that a Class I bike path going through a park can be called a park, or also a bike path through a greenbelt, but an area set aside for bikes along a street like on Harbor Drive should not be classified parkland. He stated residents would not be supportive saying an area that used to be road is now park.

Member Chrzan expressed concern with losing the amenity of natural areas and trails in a park.

Member Pinzler asked if open space versus parkland would be define separately.

Mr. Tescher noted a privately owned golf course could be classified as open space but not necessarily parkland, discerning what is public and not. It could be classified as commercial recreational space, not parkland.

Member Pinzler commented that open space and parkland should be defined. Mr. Tescher concurred that there should be specific definition for each.

Member Pinzler stated there are buildings on Aviation which could be part of parks but not open space, and said it is important to define open space.

Other members concurred that there needs to be a clear definition of open space.

Ms. Nowak pointed out that some open spaces can have buildings for recreational benefit such as a community center, but also making sure the intent is captured that not all open space or green space will have buildings.

This concluded the Parks and Open Space Discussion.

8. Large Group Discussion: Citywide Land Use: Review of remaining areas outside of Focus Areas (if questions outstanding)

Ms. Nowak asked for input from the members on any remaining areas or topics not covered in the previous discussions of Land Use and the corridors.

Member Light stated the following:
- Historic preservation – including individual structures and/or neighborhoods
- Horizontal mixed use within neighborhoods / blended densities
- Inclusionary housing
- Homogenous multifamily areas (Member Glad asked about the possibility of reducing density in some areas if density in other areas is increased, liked around the Galleria)
- Harbor waterfront area including the AES site (Planning Manager Scully commented that input from City Council may be needed as to whether this area can be discussed)
- Current Mixed-Use (MU) zoning

Member Ludwig expressed concern with the major alley between Catalina and Esplanade. Ms. Nowak stated the land use as an alley will not change.

Member Chrzan stated sections of Catalina should be discussed.

Member Eller asked about general parking and residential parking. Ms. Nowak stated parking is not a land use designation.
Member Szymanski asked about the residential building, Marina Cove apartments, and designating it as something else. Ms. Nowak stated it is in a harbor leasehold, City-owned, an existing building, but the General Plan designation is Coastal Commercial. The designation is already different than what is built there and the current residential use is nonconforming.

Ms. Nowak reminded the members that an area cannot be designated as park or open space unless the City as first acquired the land.

Member Eller asked about influencing Edison on the use of its right-of-way. Ms. Nowak replied that suggestions can be provided, but the land use designation cannot change. Community Services Director LaRock stated that any use of the Edison right-of-way is subject to a lease agreement and requirements set by Edison, which can change over time.

Member Chrzan asked about the School District adding any new schools, and their future plans. Ms. Nowak stated they keep in contact with the School District, and Planning Manager Scully stated the School District has actually sold surplus properties in recent years.

Member Waller explained that the School District has not actually sold any properties but have long-term leases for a number of properties being used as private schools, senior housing, properties being developed, and assisted living. He said the population studies done are seeing a peak in the next few years and dropping off back to levels in the past. He said people are moving to the area due to the school popularity, whereas some surrounding communities' enrollments have declined, and also said the studies are only accurate for three years.

Member Lamb believed that the AES site should be treated as the Galleria site, going forward without getting into too much detail. She felt the group was successful discussing the Galleria area. She said the Galleria is equal to AES in terms of their development process, as well as the waterfront, treating the whole City equally.

Ms. Nowak agreed the group was able to reach consensus on high-level concepts for the Galleria area.

Planning Manager Scully supported going back to City Council for policy direction.

In response to Member Chrzan, Planning Manager Scully stated the Committee was formed to discuss all of the City except for the waterfront, AES and Galleria.

Member Pinzler stated there are areas in New York which have apartments with only one-third occupied more than two months out of the year. He asked if this is starting to take place here, where people may have only a summer home or such. Ms. Nowak stated the original analysis of demand did not show that, but they could take a look again to see if this is a trend.

Mr. Tescher noted it’s a good question and stated that situation may be occurring along the coast in Malibu.

Mr. Tescher began the discussion on Blended Density. He reviewed the existing land use map, noted the places that are not yet built to the highest potential density. He stated that a blended density area could have a mix of housing units of varying heights and types, rather than the entire area being developed to the 100% maximum potential. He asked the members to see if this is a concept that resonates with them.
Member Light stated that part of the issue is housing types, but also there are several mom and pop businesses and small coffee shops that serve local communities that went out of business because of re-zoning, forcing them out with the homogenous zoning. He noted that blended density should not just be different densities of housing, but also allow for local serving neighborhood businesses.

Mr. Tescher stated there are options of how to implement blended densities and said it is important to know if this should be applied to all areas designated in the plan as multifamily or only specific subareas.

Member Funabashi stated picking individual parcels or doing spot zoning cannot take place.

Mr. Tescher reviewed options to include:

- Down-zoning the area from existing densities
- Establish a percentage or numerical development cap of new units within the area
- Leave densities as-is

Member Light stated homogenous zoning is a practice of the past is failing, which is why mixed density and mixes of uses are being advocated within a neighborhood. He also stated that making neighborhood businesses non-conforming uses is detrimental to them.

Member Ludwig left the meeting at 8:57 p.m.

Mr. Tescher suggested they could put together descriptions about the options before the next meeting.

Member Pinzler asked about legal ramifications regarding a change like this. Mr. Tescher stated the City has the right to down-zone but noted legislation last November that states no net loss, if an area loses capacity for housing it must be made up somewhere else in the City.

In response to Member Gaddis, Mr. Tescher stated it’s the reduction to potential capacity to sites designated for housing in the Housing Element.

Planning Manager Scully stated there are some areas in the R2 neighborhoods that have now been included in the Housing Element sites inventory list for meeting housing per RHNA, and stated if some are lost, it has to be gained somewhere else.

Member Pinzler stated that the plan will have to go to a vote and the public will need to be educated and understand how the GPAC came to their decisions. Mr. Tescher stated any zone change up or down will requires a good understanding by the public.

Member Eller asked how the new granny legislation affect the RHNA numbers (ie ADUs). Mr. Tescher stated this legislation is for single family zones so multifamily will not have real applicability.

Member Eller asked when downzoning and if one of the homes is two-on-a-lot and was destroyed, that they couldn’t be rebuilt. Mr. Tescher stated this is something to have in the zoning ordinance to allow rebuild, noting there could be financial consequences for property owners and their mortgages.
9. Outreach Ambassadors Reminder/Update of Groups Reached

- Feedback
  - Please send Lina the groups you have had contact with and any summary information of your outreach efforts
- Upcoming Community-wide Parks Survey
- Up to 100 Facebook followers and 401 (up to 19 people) email subscribes
- The following feedback was presented:
  - Member Eller – PowerPoint presentation to NRBBA and shared options. Galleria area, Artesia corridor, showed maps, available to everyone
  - Member Simpson – good PowerPoint presentation relevant to the entire City
  - Member Nafissi – creating documents – need streamline method – marketing
  - Member Hannon – send out another Excel spreadsheet to update.
  - Member Pinzler supported NRBBA – actual residents of RB. Need to get the area around it. – Wendy – three total community wide meetings and will move around the City. Meeting four – culmination of meetings –
  - Member Lamb – supported the PowerPoint – effective marketing tool.
  - Member Waller – take the PowerPoint and enhance it to cover everything.
  - Ms. Nowak – put survey out to everyone.
  - Member Lamb – checking when someone logs in – put “survey” in question field as a search feature.

10. Overview of Future Topics for July Meeting/Next Steps

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT – 2nd SESSION
Holly Osborne supported preserving R1 blocks and properties that haven’t been developed yet in North Redondo, supported having a cap, supported a neighborhood having its own design standards, and expressed concern with the current Housing Element identifying every R2 zoned lot that had only one house to build up the RHNA number. She believed it’s artificial to preserve the high RHNA number, and down-zoning somewhere and up-zoning somewhere else.

Jo Hrzina, District 3, expressed concern with no clear plan on outreach, and stated most people are unaware of the General Plan and of what is going on.

VII. GPAC MEMBERS REFERRALS TO STAFF
Member Nafissi asked for a report from staff of the next event staff plans to be at for outreach. She also requested at every meeting that staff provide opportunities for the Committee outside of their networks to help with promotion. Planning Manager Scully confirmed the members will be provided with the list of upcoming City events.

Member Lamb asked about the status of Mr. Bakaly coming to a meeting. Planning Manager Scully stated staff is in contact with Beach Cities Health District regarding scheduling him for a future meeting.

Member Light suggested going back to City Council on the waterfront areas.

Member Waller stated he has reached out to everyone on Facebook that lives in the South Bay that he knows, and suggested allocating funds to have a targeted Facebook ad which would reach many people.
VIII. ADJOURNMENT: 9:25 P.M.

There being no further business, motion by Member Light, seconded by Member Glad, to adjourn the meeting at 9:25 p.m. to a Regular Meeting 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. Motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

_________________________________
Aaron Jones
Community Development Director
Draft Minutes

July 26, 2018 GPAC Meeting
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 6:30 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 Eller, Funabashi, Gaddis, Glad, Hannon, Lamb, Light, Ludwig, McKenzie, Moses, Nafissi, Pinzler, Samaras, Simpson, Solomon, Stodder, Szymanski, Turner, Voisey, Waller, Chair Biro

Members Absent: Members Bajaj (excused), Chrzan (excused), Hashmi, Kartounian, Kilroy, Sanchez (excused)

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

Consultants Present: Woodie Tescher, PlaceWorks
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
Member Pinzler stated an attachment to the agendas did not include the Guiding Principles. Chair Biro stated they were distributed on May 17 and have not changed since then.

Member Pinzler stated material to be discussed should be included in the packet, whether or not it has been distributed previously.

Member Light asked about receiving a copy of comments received. Chair Biro stated all 12 comments were distributed with the May packet.

Member Glad stated the comments are online as well.

Community Development Director Jones stated typically items distributed are not redistributed and said copies can be provided tonight if needed.

Member Solomon pointed out that the agenda is for the general public to be noticed on items discussed.
Community Development Director Jones stated all of the materials are available to the general public.

In response to Member Nafissi, Chair Biro stated everybody receives all documents by email every month and there are hard copies provided tonight at the last meeting.

Member Nafissi recommended items being discussed should be included in the packet.

Member Glad suggested just referencing the meeting to avoid printing out more hard copies.

Member Lamb expressed concern with the implication of having no discussion, and stated it was noted that the Committee would be able to look at all submissions and to look at the Guiding Principles in total. Chair Biro stated all documents are available tonight for discussion.

Member Solomon supported proper notification for the public for transparency for something that is going to be addressed on the agenda at a meeting. He also said it is not incumbent on the public to have to go back three or four months to determine if something had been printed previously to be discussed at this meeting.

Ms. Wendy Nowak of PlaceWorks noted a preference to make sure that everything is referenced on the agenda and if it’s been there before, to add it again, creating a whole package, being all in one spot.

Member Light referred to the May meeting and stated he only sees the pictures on the board, not the comments and expressed concern having to hunt it down, especially for the public.

Motion by Member Glad, seconded by Member Moses, to approve the Order of Agenda as presented. Motion carried, with Member Solomon voting no.

III. CONSENT CALENDAR

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

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

Motion by Member Glad, seconded by Member Moses, to approve the Affidavit of Posting for the General Plan Advisory Committee Regular Meeting of July 26, 2018 and the April 26, 2018 minutes. Motion carried, with Member Solomon voting no.

IV. PUBLIC COMMENT – 1ST SESSION

Holly Osborne noted the RHNA numbers are being renegotiated per Planning Manager Scully and asked that these numbers be provided. She also discussed the following:

- The total RHNA capability which has been published as 2200.
- 2013 – City Council zoned MU for the Galleria and put in the number 1,000+ units.
- Only had to show the RHNA allocations could be met provided by the state.
- The Council zoned this huge number to protect the R1 neighborhoods so that the state could not force upzoning to meet RHNA.
- The 1,000 was a guarantee to be able to handle whatever SCAG allowed.
- Senator Wiener trying to get people to actually build to that RHNA number.
• Recent change to the law – if don’t build to a certain capability in one area, have to add somewhere else.
• Putting a cap on one neighborhood would make a bubble somewhere else, especially in an R1 neighborhood.

Motion by Member Glad, seconded by Member Nafissi, to extend Ms. Osborne’s time. Motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Osborne asked if there is a possibility that the state will reset the City’s RHNA capability number, and supported taking every advantage possible.

Amy Josefek expressed concern with the City Council not extending the mixed use moratorium, and also expressed concern with the 1970 high rise apartments, blocking views, and overly dense projects such as One South and Legado. She requested minimizing the future harm that will be done to this unique community and come up with a plan to end the mixed use zoning laws.

Laura Duke suggested a moratorium for projects on property zoned PCF until the GPAC work has been completed such as at Prospect and Diamond. She reviewed the benefits and uses to be compatible and accessible to the entire community. She believed the Beach Cities proposal should be on a RH3 zone and PCF as the zoning intended. She said the City Hall and library are on a PCF zone and intended for use for the entire community. She said the Beach Cities Health District plan does not fit with the public aspect with the zoning.

V. ITEMS FOR PRESENTATION, DISCUSSION OR ACTION

6. Announcements and Updates
   
a. Blue Zone Speaker Update

Ms. Nowak gave a report and stated her staff is working on getting a speaker at the September meeting.

In response to Member Nafissi, Ms. Nowak stated a Blue Zone speaker was a request of the GPAC.

b. Parks Survey

Ms. Nowak gave an update on the park survey, requested outreach, and stated Member Solomon reached out to the Beach Reporter. She also said the last day to comment is August 31, and provided maps showing a circumference of quarter mile of walking. She said the three maps include one showing the parks with public facilities, and one shows the areas map with the current General Plan land uses.

Member Pinzler asked about a circle around the Wylie Sump which is not a park. Community Services Director La Rock stated it is green space, not a park.

Ms. Nowak stated this is a first round of maps which can be refined further. She noted the City has some green spaces that are not official parks.

Member Pinzler asked if this is a park survey or green space survey.
Ms. Nowak stated the maps are not going out to the public and the survey was modified to be an online version. She said the maps are a work in progress to use at a future meeting.

Member Gaddis asked who prepared the maps and what else have they been used for as well. Ms. Nowak stated the maps were prepared by staff and they haven't been used for anything at this point.

Member Gaddis asked if there is a designation on a strip of land. Community Services Director La Rock stated that parks are named by City Council through action, usually as a resolution.

In response to Member Lamb, Ms. Nowak stated all emails will go to Lina Portolese, Planning Analyst.

c. Local Hazard Mitigation Plan Survey

Ms. Nowak gave a report and stated this is a parallel process going on with the General Plan, and the City is in the process. She said their team members are working on preparing a vulnerability assessment for the Hazard Mitigation Plan. These will be used as the technical foundation for the safety element goals and policies.

d. August Break
  * Upcoming topics: Land Use Map
  * Open House tentative mid-Sept (aiming to complete before next GPAC meetings but may be shortly thereafter).

Member Stodder asked about a schedule of these milestones. Ms. Nowak stated they can supply the GPAC an e-blast of anticipated next steps.

Ms. Nowak stated at the next meeting, the Committee will see how definitions start applying to the map and parks mapping at the next meeting on September 27, 2018.

e. GPAC Ambassador Outreach Update.

Ms. Nowak gave an overview and stated there are approximately 100 groups to reach and just above about 28%. She said Member Funabashi reached out to the yacht clubs, Member Turner reached out to her groups, Member Moses met with Friends of Redondo Beach Arts, Member Kilroy spoke with AYSO Region 17, Member Lamb has been posting on NextDoor and Rescue Our Waterfront and has spoken with South Bay Parkland, and Member Voisey has spoken to Redondo Sunset and found opportunities to advertise an article in their fall newsletter. She also stated the Sea Lab has been informed, and noted the Redondo Harbor Boardwalk and Market Place is no longer an active group. She further requested updates from the members.

Member Moses suggested having a large map of the City showing all the streets.

Community Development Director Jones suggested having the maps available when meeting with a group and suggested contacting Planning Analyst Lina Portolese.

In response to Chair Biro, Ms. Nowak stated her staff has copies of the ambassador packets available.

Ms. Nowak stated her staff will do some updating over the next couple of weeks to make sure the Committee has the most recent copy.
Chair Biro suggested obtaining approximately ten maps for the Committee.

In response to Member Moses, Ms. Nowak stated that every member is signed up to reach out to someone, and there is an Excel handout showing the assignments of who has been reached to date.

Member Nafissi stated the people she reached out to are not included on the sheet. Ms. Nowak stated the sheet will be updated to include these.

Member Waller asked where to obtain the PowerPoint presentations. Ms. Nowak stated there will be standard slides, and slides on all options for discussion slides, and will be used as a basis for the land use survey that goes out when doing the open house, which should be available by early next week. She also suggested the members notify staff when meeting with a group.

Member Lamb stated a survey works well and is an effective way to get feedback from the community. She asked who is collecting the numbers and are they available in terms of surveys. Ms. Nowak stated it is still too fresh but will report back on it.

Member Moses stated the survey is a great tool and realizes every IP of the device taking the survey. He asked where these IP’s come from. Ms. Nowak stated she didn’t believe this would be known but sometimes personal information can be obtained.

Ms. Suzanne Schwab of PlaceWorks stated personal information was requested but it is not required.

Member Moses stated he would like to see how much response is outside of Redondo.

Member Nafissi believed the Committee is posting with a lot of groups and sharing with a lot of other groups.

Member Moses stated there is a site where any type of photo can be uploaded.

Ms. Nowak pointed out that social media policies have to be followed, and staff is looking into Facebook ads but clearance has to be obtained from the proper channels first.

Motion by Member Samaras, seconded by Member Glad, to receive and file all blue folder items. Motion carried unanimously.

7. Large Group Discussion: General Plan Update Guiding Principles

RECESS: 7:18 P.M.

Motion by Member Solomon, seconded by Member Samaras, to recess at 7:18 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.

RECONVENE: 7:23 P.M.

Chair Biro asked when the May 17 Guiding Principles were circulated and posted on the website along with the 12 comments. Planning Analyst Portolese stated this was discussed in the May minutes.

Member Elder stated the draft Guiding Principles document is a good document as presented and represents the group quite well.
Member Pinzler stated this document is proof that more words do not necessarily increase clarity or communication, questioned defining balance in the third bullet point, and stated the document doesn’t take the Committee anywhere.

Member Pinzler stated the following five questions should be answered regarding the Guiding Principles:

- By 2045, do we want Redondo Beach to have increased, decreased or maintain its housing density.
- Do we want Redondo Beach to have increased, decreased, or maintain its amount of active use parkland.
- How do we want Redondo Beach to have increased, decreased or maintain various percentages of housing, commercial (office and retail), and active use parkland as a proportion of the neighborhoods within our City.
- Do we want Redondo Beach to have implemented programs which increase, decrease or maintain its level of automobile traffic.
- Do we want Redondo Beach to have increased, decreased or maintain its environmental quality.

Member McKenzie stated no one wants increased traffic but not everyone is addressing the fact that there are certain things that can’t be controlled. She said change comes with living in California and being realistic is important.

Member Pinzler stated items the Commission can address are dealing with housing density, parkland, and commercial.

Ms. Nowak stated the Guiding Principles are seeking a balance and objectives, and when the Committee starts getting into the policies, items that can be addressed would be density location and management and dealing with corridors. She also said when the Committee starts to get into discussions of land use designations, some of the things being asked tonight will start to get more articulated in the details.

Member Lamb suggested it would be helpful to bring back the data gathered at the Saturday meeting regarding the preliminary Guiding Principles with five categories, and to see the results during that time, and then move forward from there.

Chair Biro stated if there are no edits on the draft principles, then it will be circulated back out, but no progress will be made. He said consensus is needed and suggested the Committee take a vote to move forward with what we have.

Member Nafissi noted concerns with some of the wording and believed it is hard to hold the City accountable to any of the wording. She supported making concrete statements and suggested having a subgroup to work on the document. Chair Biro stated this was explored last time and it was decided not to have a subgroup.

Member Solomon noted the issue of process which is some of the frustration. He stated there was a lot of consensus at the Saturday meeting which was very productive, and the Committee came up with five charts. He said since then, there was a subcommittee created for all information and comments, and people now feel frustrated where they feel they aren’t being heard and this has been changed significantly from what the group decided. He also believed that consensus may not be achieved due to the process by which this is being produced.

Member Stodder stated the comments tonight are different from what is in the document.
Member Waller agreed with the five Principles which turned into three which are not that different, and believed the submission from Member Lamb is closest to what we have now.

Member Gaddis did not agree with “reduces automobile traffic volume and congestion by seeking safe efficient multimodal transportation that provides alternatives to the car,” and stated this was not what they voted on. Member Voisey stated they voted as a larger group.

Member Light supported maintaining the current density as much as possible, and to reduce traffic, and stated he also has further edits.

Member Lamb supported having five categories, not three. Chair Biro stated the Committee agreed in May to go from five to three categories, which is in the May minutes.

Member Elder expressed concern with wasting City resources, the group not being a workable group and not getting into a consensus. He did not support starting over again and wasting $100K.

Chair Biro suggested taking this further tonight and wrapping it up with some minor edits, making the language so it’s sufficient.

Member Szymanski noted a lot of disagreement and suggested having a topic area and value statements, and another set of statements. He suggested being guided towards an overall structure in order to compartmentalize the value statements, coming up with things that can be objectively measured. He also did not agree with throwing away all the work the Committee has done so far. He suggested reconstituting the document, come up with topic areas, and come up with the value statements.

In response to Member Moses, Member Szymanski believed that the topics being discussed are commonly agreed to as to what should be Guiding Principles for the General Plan.

Member Moses also stated he could not support starting over.

Motion by Member Elder, seconded by Member Glad, to accept amendments to the Guiding Principles document.

Amended Motion by Member Gaddis, seconded by Member Solomon, to allow for further changes and edits.

Member Solomon supported the second motion, noting he has further edits.

Substitute Motion by Member Simpson, seconded by Member Glad, to allow 20 minutes for edits and revisions, put the document to a vote. Motion carried.

Member Moses referred to the fourth bullet point in the first section and suggested moving “transparent” up to the top statement to state, “The City of Redondo Beach shall……community’s character, ‘transparency’, health, vitality and economic prosperity, when making decisions and taking actions.” He also referred to the second bullet point in the second section and suggested changing “a place to play and shop for residents and visitors alike” to “a place for recreation and commerce.”

Member Light referred to the next to last bullet point in section one and suggested separating multimodal transportation because there other methods for reducing traffic.
congestion. He suggested making multimodal transportation a separate bullet point. Members of the committee agreed.

Member Light also suggested removing “when feasible” from the next to last bullet in section three. Members of the committee agreed.

Member Light referred to the last bullet point in section three and stated he did not believe the members had been briefed on Living Streets. He stated it should be stricken until the members understand what it is.

In response to Member Light, Community Development Director Jones stated City Council adopted the Living Streets policy document. He stated the concept of Living Streets is to accommodate all modes and types of transportation and mobility. It also includes environmental sustainability. Staff will provide the Living Streets document to the members.

Member Glad stated this document has been reported in the local paper, addressed at City Council.

Member Light stated that if the intent of Living Streets is to make streets more bikeable or walkable, that concept is covered under the “multimodal” transportation bullet point.

After further discussion, there was consensus among the members to remove the Living Streets bullet point, and discuss adding it back after the policy has been reviewed by the members.

Member Solomon referred to the last bullet point in section one and suggested it state the “highest level of quality education system” to have it be more aspirational.

Member Solomon also referred to the second bullet point under section three and suggested changing the term “park” to “parkland.”

There was consensus among the group to support the changes suggested by Members Light and Solomon.

Member Pinzler referred to section two and questioned the use of the term “Economic Engine” and suggested the words “encourages” and “encouraging” in sections 2 and 3 should be replaced by firmer terms, such as “creating” and “providing.”

Member Simpson referred to the second bullet point of the last section and suggested it read, “Maintenance and expansion of parkland, trails, and sports facilities” in order to work better with the term “providing.”

Motion by Member Gaddis, and seconded, to approve the draft Guiding Principles with edits as amended. Motion carried, with Member Pinzler voting no.

8. Large Group Discussion: Overview of Draft Land Use Designations

Blended Density: Overview
- Current GP and Zoning Ordinance designates many areas for multi-family housing (up to 28 du/ac)
- Some have been developed to their maximum densities, others have not, leading to a “checkerboard” pattern of single family, duplex and apartment uses.
- Current regulations allow parcels with existing development at lesser densities to be redeveloped
Blended Density: considerations
- Spot zoning
- Inequity

Blended Density Memo: Options
- Option 1: Downzoning
- Option 2: Development Caps – Cumulative
- Option 3: Development Caps – Density-based
- Option 4: Transfer of Development Rights (TDR)

Other considerations: Development & Performance Standards
  - Additional standards could be developed to achieve a higher level of design or architectural performance

Current Designations
- Land Use Designations
- Land Use Definitions
- Residential: Single-Family
- Residential: Multi-Family
- Commercial
- Mixed-Use
- Industrial
- Public, Institutional, & Open Space
- Neighborhood Retail

Member Solomon referred to TDR and asked if the transfers are only within the geographic area or in the entire General Plan. Community Development Director Jones explained it can be very limited or very broad, and is a way to capture open space and also limit development.

In response to Member Glad, Ms. Nowak stated the inequity issue is about fairness and is not illegal.

In response to Member Gaddis regarding freezing density to what is already built on every lot, Ms. Nowak stated this would be a development cap, Option 2.

In response to Member Gaddis regarding downzoning and spot zoning, Ms. Nowak explained it would be a case by case basis, noting there are certain areas already built up and wouldn’t change.

Member Lamb referred to Option 2 development caps and asked if it’s done by specific areas. Ms. Nowak said yes, identifying each area. Member Lamb asked how this is operationalized. Ms. Nowak stated this would be a general approach but it is zoning, with everything being implemented through zoning.

Member Lamb asked if Option 2 would be, as an example, District 5 with the mix already good and not wanting anymore teardowns from single family to R3, and capping it. Ms. Nowak stated this could be done by downzoning or doing the cap.

Member Light believed RHNA can be achieved and stated euclidean zoning is a thing of the past and should be fixed.

Ms. Nowak stated zoning goes 0 to 28 for the General Plan and there is a little blended density already.

Member Light did not believe downzoning is the answer, creating impacts, believed that Option 2 would be the best choice, allowing to pick areas and lock in the density to avoid
making it all R-3 and does not rule out people making modifications to their houses and having difficulty getting mortgages. He also believed Option 3 is too complex for a built-out city, and Option 4 would be hard to administer. He suggested doing both Option 2 and development and performance standards due to maximization of size. He also suggested addressing neighborhood retail and service which should have parking, not driving that much traffic. Ms. Nowak stated there would be a limited space, and the retail eases up the parking requirements. Member Light stated there is a difference between on site parking not being required and being prohibited. Ms. Nowak stated the intent was to help encourage.

Member Moses supported Option 4 which is flexible and the easiest one to get into the community and promotes mixed densities.

In response to Member Moses, Community Development Director Jones stated residential design guidelines have been adopted. He also referred to four base zoning which is a hybrid, only addressing the look of the property, not the use of the property.

Member Samaras supported density where it is appropriate, downzoning portions of neighborhoods down to R1, and increase zoning closer to retail, parks, and schools. He said a single family residence zoned R3 today would still have rights of 2 or more units on their lot, sell them to somebody in a commercial zone, modifying Option 4, preserving the single family neighborhood core, and spreading the density where it makes more sense.

Member Moses expressed concern with devaluing people’s properties.

Member Pinzler stated the intention seems to be to maintain density and asked if this is a Guiding Principle. Ms. Nowak stated it is difficult to put this into a Guiding Principle because there may be cases where it makes sense to do a mixed-use, maintaining it lower somewhere else.

In response to Member Moses, Ms. Nowak stated for the Housing Element, no net loss of the units is required.

Member Pinzler stated if zoning takes place differently, the population will not grow. Ms. Nowak noted there are trade-off’s such as everyone commuting, or the City providing housing so people can live and work here, and special policies may not be globally everywhere.

Ms. Nowak reviewed the Land Use Designations and stated homework for the next meeting will be to read the definitions and stated the Committee will eventually start looking at the map.

Member Moses asked about the most successful density change. Ms. Nowak stated it depends on the community, what you want to preserve, and the areas.

In response to Member Gaddis, Ms. Nowak stated the current description is the current definition and if there are differences in what is proposed, and it can be redefined in a particular way. She reviewed examples.

In response to Member Gaddis about the map exercise being done first, stated every definition of mixed use has residential, and asked if there would be an opportunity to look at mixed use that are 35 units. Ms. Nowak gave an overview on the mixed use and stated there is actually a reduction in density on the mixed-use area which includes only two spots, with the mixed use being reduced down to 30 overall and the Galleria was left at 35.
In response to Member Lamb, Ms. Nowak noted description of options and reviewed changes that have taken place.

9. Outreach Update: Generic GP PowerPoint Show, Upcoming Events, Online Parks Survey, Update on Facebook Ads

- Outreach Toolkits
  - PowerPoint Roadshow (will be ready by end of the week)
  - Parks and open space survey
  - Local Hazard Mitigation Plan Survey (forthcoming)
  - 117 Facebook followers/140 Facebook Friends and 425 email subscribers
  - Need updates on groups members have met with
  - Thanks for helping to spread the word
  - What additional documents, maps or other tools would be helpful?

Member Light stated the results of the survey are useful and noted positive feedback.

Member Lamb suggested having a link to the survey on the City Website.

In response to Member Pinzler, Ms. Nowak stated the message should be kept consistent and should not be editable.

Member Hannon noted that Living Streets is a significant document and should be made available to the public and posted on the website.

- Upcoming Events
  - Pier Summer Concerts
  - Coastal Clean Up Day
  - LA Kings 5K Run/Walk
  - Rods, Rides and Relics
  - GPAC members station a booth
  - National Night Out August 7

Member Glad stated there is a car show at Ruby’s every Friday at 5 p.m.

10. Overview of Future Topics for September Meeting/Next Steps

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT – 2nd SESSION

Doug Boswell, District 3, stated density is the root problem and deteriorating quality of life, creating traffic problems, overcrowding schools, impacting medical facilities, and water impacts. He stated a Guiding Principle should address reducing density, and building 2 or 3 units on a R2 should be prohibited. He said a developer can still make a huge profit on a single family home. He questioned still having R3, and supported looking for ways to reduce density and stopping the population increase.

Motion by Member Glad, seconded by Chair Biro, to extend Mr. Boswell’s time. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Boswell supported a better consensus, and being more productive at the GPAC meetings. He also supported making Redondo Beach a place where we want to live, and to focus on developing a professional office space environment such as along Artesia to allow people to work here.
Holly Osborne asked for clarification on the map on the wall, showing the existing land uses as built currently. She commented on the properties currently built as single-family and stated those should be preserved.

There being no further public comment, Chair Biro closed the Public Comment session.

VII. GPAC MEMBERS REFERRALS TO STAFF

In response to Chair Biro, Community Development Director Jones stated copies of the Living Streets Policy will be provided to the Committee members.

Member Pinzler noted disagreements at the meetings at which Living Streets were discussed and suggested including write ups and responses that took place at those meetings.

Community Development Director Jones stated the Living Streets meetings were led by Beach Cities Health District and therefore the City staff may not have those meeting materials.

Member Solomon motioned to close the public comment session.

Member Solomon stated he had missed the last meeting and asked for clarification as to whether the other areas of concern or change in the City were discussed. Ms. Nowak stated those areas were completed at the last meeting. Member Solomon referred to the public comment and the mention of the Beach Cities Health District property and stated he did not recall discussing it. Ms. Nowak confirmed that area was not discussed. Member Solomon suggested having a discussion about the area around the Beach Cities Health District and impacts to the neighborhood, especially with the project that is proposed to take place in the future.

Community Development Director Jones suggested Tom Bakaly of Beach Cities Health District could provide an overview of the proposed project along with the Blue Zones presentation.

In response to a question regarding the ability to discuss the waterfront area, Community Development Director Jones stated that although the City withdrew the waterfront project application to the Coastal Commission, there is still active litigation of the project and cautioned any discussion. The discussion would most likely have to encompass the waterfront area, pier, AES site, and power corridor to cohesively plan the entire area, and therefore it would require direction and policy decision from the City Council as an area plan or master plan and authorize additional meetings.

In response to Chair Biro, the majority of the Committee agreed to that they would be willing to have additional meetings.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT: 9:31 P.M.

Motion by Member Hannon, seconded by Member McKenzie, to adjourn the meeting at 9:31 p.m. to a Regular Meeting to be held at 6:30 p.m. on Thursday, September 27, 2018 in the Redondo Beach Public Library, Second Floor Meeting Room, 303 N. Pacific Coast Highway, Redondo Beach, CA 90277. Motion carried unanimously.

______________________________
Aaron Jones, Community Development Director
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Visit the Farmers Market by the Sea
Open every Thursday
8:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m.
Located at George Freeth Way,
just west of Veterans Park

City officials
Mayor                        Bill Brand
District 1                    Nils Nehrenheim
District 2                    Todd Loewenstein
District 3                    Christian Horn
District 4                    John F. Gran
District 5                    Laura Emdee
City Attorney                Mike Webb
City Clerk                   Eleanor Manzano
City Treasurer               Steve Diels
City Manager                 Joe Hoefgen

City offices are open alternate Fridays from 7:30 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. During the fall and early winter months, the City will be OPEN on the following Fridays:
- Sept 7
- Sept 21
- Oct 5
- Oct 19
- Nov 2
- Nov 16
- Nov 30
- Dec 14
The City of Redondo Beach is currently preparing their Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (LHMP), a five-year strategy to reduce the threat of natural and human-caused disasters in our community. An LHMP will enable Redondo Beach to plan for future emergencies caused by flooding, earthquakes, coastal hazards, extreme weather, or other natural hazards.

An LHMP outlines proactive steps a city can take to better prepare for and respond to disasters. The goal is to make recovery from these events easier and as a result, reduce costly impacts. By taking steps to reduce property damage, injury, and loss of life, mitigation could save an average of four dollars for every dollar invested in hazard mitigation activities.

What is in our LHMP?
The City of Redondo Beach LHMP includes four main sections:

- **A hazard profile** that describes the natural hazards that pose a risk to our community, past disaster events, and the potential for those events to occur in the future.
- **A threat assessment**, which describes how our community is vulnerable to different hazards. It will identify sensitive sites, such as emergency facilities, public buildings, and utility lines that are located in hazardous areas and discuss the social vulnerability of community members, particularly disadvantaged persons.
- **A hazard mitigation strategy**, which will lay out potential mitigation actions that Redondo Beach can undertake to address natural hazard conditions.
- **A maintenance section**, which helps ensure the LHMP is kept up-to-date, making it easier to proactively protect residents and businesses and keep the City eligible to receive additional funding.

When will it be released?
Release of the public review draft of the Redondo Beach LHMP will occur in late 2018/early 2019. After members of the public provide comments and feedback, the project team will revise the Plan, and send it to the California Office of Emergency Services (Cal OES) and the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) for review and approval. Once approved by these agencies, the Redondo Beach City Council will adopt the final LHMP, which should occur in 2019.

How can I stay involved?
It is vital to us that our LHMP reflects the opinions, concerns, and goals of our community members, which is why we want your input. The project team will hold public meetings to share information about our LHMP and obtain community feedback. Keep an eye out for updates about future meetings at: [www.redondo.org/PlanRedondo](http://www.redondo.org/PlanRedondo)

Take our survey!
An online survey has been posted for all community members. Your participation in the survey will help us better understand the issues important to you, how prepared we are as a community now, and what actions we should take to be better prepared in the future. The survey should only take five to ten minutes of your time, and all responses are completely anonymous.

You can access the survey at: [www.surveymonkey.com/r/RedondoLHMPsurvey](http://www.surveymonkey.com/r/RedondoLHMPsurvey)

The deadline to submit a response is 5:30 PM on October 1st, 2018.

Parks & Open Space Preliminary Survey Results

Thank you to all who have participated in our recent Parks & Open Space Survey! Your opinions about future parks planning including types of activities desired, age groups to plan for and types of amenities to enhance your experience at Redondo’s parks will be compiled and presented to our General Plan Advisory Committee at an upcoming meeting this fall to inform the update of the Conservation, Recreation and Parks, and Open Space Element of the City’s General Plan.

Here’s what we have heard from you so far...

- **Add more general open park space** (open grass/turf areas) and specialty recreation amenities (skatepark, swimming pool, etc.) to existing parks and recreation areas.

- **Consider new trails/paseos** and improvements to existing sidewalk and bicycle facilities to encourage physical activity throughout the City.

- **Implement solar technology** (panels, paint, lights, etc.) and community gardens/farming programs to prepare our parks for the future.

To date, 651 responses have been received and 94.5% of respondents either live or live and work in Redondo Beach. Visit [www.redondo.org/planredondo](http://www.redondo.org/planredondo) in late September to view final survey results!
Help Keep Our Marine Life Safe

THE PROBLEM

Plastics are one of the most common pollutants found in ocean waters worldwide. It’s in our cars and our carpets, we wrap it around the food we eat, and it can be found in many other products we consume. Plastics are impacting our environment in ways that most of us aren’t aware of. Plastics biodegrade exceptionally slowly, breaking into tiny fragments in a centuries-long process and can ultimately entangle and slowly harm millions of birds and sea creatures. Once in the ocean, the plastic can easily be mistaken for natural food resulting in wildlife ingesting toxicants that cause harmful damage. If not properly disposed of, plastics can reach our ocean by traveling in the storm drain system or transported by wind.

THE SOLUTION

There are many ways to help alleviate the problem of plastic accumulation in the world’s oceans. By properly disposing of plastic waste in the trash we can help keep them out of our oceans. In addition, by considering the use of “single use” products and alternative material such as paper, glass, or aluminum (such as water bottles and bags), we can help protect our marine life. Using a reusable alternative such as a stainless steel water bottle is a good choice.

Finally, if you see plastic items, and any other litter on the ground, be a good community member and pick it up and place it in a trash can to help protect our environment.

For more information on solid waste and recycling, please visit https://www.redondo.org/dept/public_works/recycling/default.asp

Youth Services

Beach Cities Health District (BCHD) partners with the Hermosa, Manhattan and Redondo Beach school districts to deliver more than 15 programs annually that measurably improve the health and well-being of Beach Cities students. These programs increase physical activity, improve nutrition, reduce substance use and encourage social-emotional wellness in our schools.

PHYSICAL ACTIVITY

- 8-Minute Morning Exercises
- Classroom Activity Breaks
- Walking School Bus
- Walking Wednesdays

SUBSTANCE USE PREVENTION

- Families Connected Speaker Series
- Families Connected Parent Chat
- Families Connected Parent Advisory Group
- Project Alert

SOCIAL-EMOTIONAL LEARNING

- MindUP
- Purpose Series
- Second Step
- Student Mental Health Task Force
- Youth Advisory Council

NUTRITION

- LiveWell Kids Nutrition and Garden
- LiveWell Tots
- School Gardens
- School Wellness Councils

“Schools should play a prominent role in preventing obesity in students. Physical fitness and a healthy diet, like learning, should be part of a student’s knowledge base, which can lead to building healthy life-long habits. When we partnered with BCHD back in 2006 and instituted their LiveWell Kids program, we all had lofty goals. Staff, parents, kids, the board of education as well as BCHD have all contributed to a program that continues to exceed those goals.

- Dr. Steven Keller, RBUSD Superintendent”
Here at Beach Cities Health District (BCHD), facts and data drive our decision-making process. We use measurement and outcomes to gauge the success of our programs and services. As such, we are proud to report that childhood obesity (K-5th grades) in Redondo Beach – part of Los Angeles County where 22.4 percent of students are obese – currently registers at a lean 6.4 percent, an astounding 68 percent decline since data collection began in 2007.

So how did this dramatic turnaround occur? Our LiveWell Kids program, a physical activity and nutrition curriculum, debuted in the Redondo Beach Unified School District during the 2005-'06 school year – a time when one out of every five students in Redondo Beach was obese. Since then, LiveWell Kids has emphasized nutrition and physical education for students, and the results are眼-opening. Los Angeles, statewide and national obesity levels are three times higher than Redondo Beach.

By bringing comprehensive health programming into schools – ranging from "the walking school bus," to gardens at each of the eight Redondo Beach elementary schools – physical fitness and proper diets have become a regular facet of a Redondo Beach student's curriculum. Eight minutes of daily morning exercises and salad bars during school lunch are now commonplace. Better yet, nutrition lessons are delivered to classrooms by 400 trained parent-volunteers, who promote food literacy, mindfulness practices and garden education.

Research and clinical practice show that health habits are developed very early in life, and once well established, are difficult to change. We also know that obese children have up to a 60 percent chance of becoming obese adults and are more likely to suffer from chronic health conditions later in life.

Enabling healthy behaviors and lifestyles at an early age is the sweet-spot for LiveWell Kids. Through innovative partnerships and supportive volunteers, our programs are setting Redondo Beach students up for a lifetime of healthy habits.

---

**Student Mental Health & Well-Being**

According to the California Healthy Kids Survey, Beach Cities teens report higher than average rates of drug and alcohol use, bullying and missing school due to feelings like stress or anxiety. In response, we are partnering with the school districts, South Bay Families Connected, parents, local leaders and organizations to lead a community-wide effort to proactively address these issues and to help our kids be healthy, happy and thrive – in school and life. This collaborative, community-driven approach to solving complex social problems is known as the "collective impact model," and it requires the five elements illustrated below to succeed.

---

**Obesity Plunges in Redondo Beach**

Obesity Plunges in Redondo Beach

Childhood Obesity: How Redondo Beach Compares

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>National (2-19 yrs old)</th>
<th>LA County (10-15 yrs old)</th>
<th>RBUSD</th>
<th>California (10-17 yrs old)</th>
<th>DROP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By focusing comprehensive health programming into schools – ranging from "the walking school bus," to gardens at each of the eight Redondo Beach elementary schools – physical fitness and proper diets have become a regular facet of a Redondo Beach student's curriculum. Eight minutes of daily morning exercises and salad bars during school lunch are now commonplace. Better yet, nutrition lessons are delivered to classrooms by 400 trained parent-volunteers, who promote food literacy, mindfulness practices and garden education.

Research and clinical practice show that health habits are developed very early in life, and once well established, are difficult to change. We also know that obese children have up to a 60 percent chance of becoming obese adults and are more likely to suffer from chronic health conditions later in life.

Enabling healthy behaviors and lifestyles at an early age is the sweet-spot for LiveWell Kids. Through innovative partnerships and supportive volunteers, our programs are setting Redondo Beach students up for a lifetime of healthy habits.
Blue Zones Project

In 2010, we launched the nationally acclaimed Blue Zones Project® in the Beach Cities to help measurably improve the health and well-being of our community. Our goal was, and still is, to make the healthy choice the easy choice in our community through impactful environmental changes modeled after the five areas of the world where people measurably longer, healthier lives—known as the “Blue Zones.”

After eight years spent weaving health into the fabric of public policy, creating more livable streets, optimizing hundreds of restaurants for nutrition, growing community connectedness and supporting healthy school environments, the Gallup-Sharecare Well-Being Index (WBI) shows Blue Zones Project is spurring real, measurable change in the physical health of Beach Cities residents. Stress, however, remains a concern and will be a key area of focus for us moving forward.

Amid a Tumultuous Year for National Well-Being, the Beach Cities Shine Bright

In March, the 2017 Gallup-Sharecare Well-Being Index (WBI) was released. The nationwide poll of adults, which annually analyzes social, purpose, financial, community and physical health and welfare, carried some gloomy news for most of the U.S. That same WBI, though, reported that well-being in the Beach Cities was faring exceptionally well.

Across the U.S., compared to previous yearly WBI data, 21 states were experiencing a decline in well-being, zero states had improved, and stress and worry reached the highest national levels since 2009. Conversely, in 17 measurable WBI metrics, Hermosa, Manhattan and Redondo Beach outsized all of California and practically all of the country “by a meaningfully large amount,” according to Dan Witter, research director of the Well-Being Index for Gallup.

The WBI classifies the Beach Cities as part of the LA Metro region due to population. However, if the Beach Cities were measured as a standalone metro area, it would rank third nationally.

This is no anomaly. For more than 20 years, we’ve been helping our residents focus on prevention, not sickness, by offering more than 40 community-focused health and wellness programs that extend from promoting physical activity to providing health services for children, adults and seniors. A specific example is our Blue Zones Project, which, since 2010, has helped residents, schools, city government, restaurants and businesses learn and integrate health into their everyday lives. This concerted effort to blend nutrition, mental health and physical exercise, stress management and education helped Beach Cities become the first California community—and the largest in the U.S.—to earn Blue Zones Community certification.

The WBI, which equates elevated well-being statistics with “a life well-lived—all the things that are important to each of us, what we think about and how we experience our lives”—began measuring the Beach Cities in 2010. The also happens to coincide with a time when many of our community leaders began actively making long-term commitments to wellness. As the most recent WBI findings reveal, our healthy partnership with the community, which centers on making the healthy choice the easy choice where we live, work and play, is helping residents achieve a life-well lived.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Designation Name</th>
<th>Current Density/Intensity</th>
<th>Current Description</th>
<th>Proposed Designation Name</th>
<th>Proposed Density/Intensity Range</th>
<th>Proposed Description</th>
<th>Implementing Zone</th>
<th>Notes/ Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>Up to and including 8.8 du/ac</td>
<td>Single-family residential uses</td>
<td>Single Family Residential - Low (R-1)</td>
<td>Up to and including 8.8 du/ac</td>
<td>Provides for complete neighborhoods composed primarily of single-family detached residential units with complementary neighborhood-serving uses such as corner commercial and appropriately scaled public open space, community serving facilities, and institutional uses. Density range is up to and including 8.8 dwelling units per acre. This designation also allows for accessory dwelling units.</td>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>Current density ranges already allow for &quot;blended&quot; density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-2</td>
<td>Up to and including 14.6 du/ac</td>
<td>Single-family residential uses, duplexes, townhomes, condominiums, apartments</td>
<td>Single Family Residential - Medium (R-2)</td>
<td>Up to and including 14.6 du/ac</td>
<td>Provides for complete neighborhoods that contain a diversity of housing types and complementary neighborhood-serving uses such as corner commercial and appropriately scaled public open space, community serving facilities, and institutional uses. Single-family attached and detached units and multi-family units such as duplexes, triplexes, townhomes, stacked flats, courtyard homes, and patio homes are appropriate in this designation. Density range is up to and including 14.6 dwelling units per acre.</td>
<td>R-2</td>
<td>Current density ranges already allow for &quot;blended&quot; density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-1-A</td>
<td>Up to and including 17.5 du/ac</td>
<td>Single-family residential uses</td>
<td>Small Lot Residential (R-1-A)</td>
<td>Up to and including 17.5 du/ac</td>
<td>Provides for small lot single-family detached residential units, including accessory dwelling units, with a density range up to and including 17.5 dwelling units per acre.</td>
<td>R-1A</td>
<td>Current density ranges already allow for &quot;blended&quot; density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-3</td>
<td>Up to and including 17.5 du/ac</td>
<td>Single-family residential uses, duplexes, townhomes, condominiums, apartments</td>
<td>Multi-Family Residential - Low (R-3)</td>
<td>Up to and including 17.5 du/ac</td>
<td>Provides for complete neighborhoods that contain a diversity of housing types and complementary neighborhood-serving uses such as corner commercial and appropriately scaled public open space, community serving facilities, and institutional uses. Single-family attached and detached units and multi-family units such as duplexes, triplexes, townhomes, stacked flats, courtyard homes, and patio homes. Density range is up to and including 17.5 dwelling units per acre.</td>
<td>R-3, R-3A</td>
<td>Current density ranges already allow for &quot;blended&quot; density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMD</td>
<td>Up to and including 23.3 du/ac</td>
<td>Single-family residential uses, duplexes, townhomes, condominiums, apartments</td>
<td>Multi-Family Residential - Medium (RM)</td>
<td>Up to and including 23.3 du/ac</td>
<td>Provides for complete neighborhoods that contain a diversity of housing types and complementary neighborhood-serving uses such as corner commercial and appropriately scaled public open space, community serving facilities, and institutional uses. Single-family attached and detached units and multi-family units such as duplexes, triplexes, townhomes, stacked flats, courtyard homes, and patio homes. Density range is up to and including 23.3 dwelling units per acre.</td>
<td>RM, RM-1</td>
<td>Current density ranges already allow for &quot;blended&quot; density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RH</td>
<td>Up to and including 28.0 du/ac</td>
<td>Single-family residential uses, duplexes, townhomes, condominiums, apartments</td>
<td>Multi-Family Residential - High (RH)</td>
<td>Up to and including 28.0 du/ac</td>
<td>Provides for complete neighborhoods that contain a diversity of housing types and complementary neighborhood-serving uses such as corner commercial and appropriately scaled public open space, community serving facilities, and institutional uses. Single-family attached and detached units and multi-family units such as duplexes, triplexes, townhomes, stacked flats, courtyard homes, and patio homes. Density range is up to and including 28.0 dwelling units per acre.</td>
<td>RH-1, RH-2, RH-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Designation Name</td>
<td>Current Density/Intensity</td>
<td>Current Description</td>
<td>Proposed Designation Name</td>
<td>Proposed Density/Intensity Range</td>
<td>Proposed Description</td>
<td>Implementing Zone</td>
<td>Notes/Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMMERCIAL CURRENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-1</td>
<td>FAR 0.35</td>
<td>Retail commercial, eating and drinking establishments, household goods, food sales, drugstores, building materials and supplies, professional offices, personal services, cultural facilities, and similar uses</td>
<td>Commercial Flex Corridor (CFC)</td>
<td>FAR 0.35 - 0.50</td>
<td>Provides for commercial districts with uses that complement adjacent residential neighborhoods. Allowed uses include retail, restaurants, personal services, office and similar uses. The intent of this designation is to provide goods and services that meet the needs of residents and businesses. Buildings in the CFC districts should front the street with rear, alley loaded parking where feasible. Where CFC designations contain existing residential uses, they shall be allowed to remain and shall be considered conforming; however, no new residential units are permitted. FAR 0.35 - 0.50.</td>
<td>C-1, C-2, C-3A, C-3B, C-2-PD, C-3-PD(Riv), C-4-PD(Riv)</td>
<td>Could this be combined with the other commercial flex categories?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-2</td>
<td>FAR 0.50</td>
<td>Same uses as C-1 and movie theaters, and overnight accommodations; except Riviera Village where no &quot;footprint&quot; exceeding 30,000 sq. ft. is permitted for a single use for food sales, retail goods, or other large volume use</td>
<td>Multi-Tenant Commercial (MTC)</td>
<td>FAR 0.50 - 1.00</td>
<td>Provides for commercial districts with a broad range of retail and service uses. This designation accommodates uses that typically generate heavy traffic such as multi-tenant shopping centers with grocery stores, restaurants, specialty shops, dry cleaners and other personal services. Buildings in multi-tenant commercial districts should be clustered. FAR 0.50 - 1.00.</td>
<td>C-3, C-3A, C-3B, C-4-PD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-3</td>
<td>FAR 0.70</td>
<td>Same uses as C-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-4</td>
<td>FAR 1.00</td>
<td>Same uses as C-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. FAR 0.70</td>
<td></td>
<td>a. Retail commercial, personal and business services, professional offices, household supply and furnishings, eating and drinking establishments, drug stores, entertainment, automobile related sales, car wash, and similar uses</td>
<td>Commercial Flex - Retail Primary (CFR)</td>
<td>FAR 0.70 - 1.00</td>
<td>Provides for commercial-oriented districts with uses that are predominantly comprised of commercial, retail and personal service uses. Office uses and hotels are permitted, but the overall character of all properties in this designation is intended to prioritize the operation of commercial uses. Developments may be configured with ground floor commercial with office or hotel on upper floors (horizontal). Where CFR designations contain existing residential uses, they shall be allowed to remain and shall be considered conforming; however, no new residential units are permitted. FAR 0.70 - 1.00.</td>
<td>C-4, C-4A, C-4B, C-4-PD</td>
<td>Any reason to keep the FAR up to 1.5?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. FAR 0.70</td>
<td></td>
<td>b. Automobile and marine related repair (west side of Catalina Avenue)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. FAR 1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>c. Light industrial and wholesale uses (west side of Catalina Avenue)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. FAR 1.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>d. Storage and self-storage (west side of Catalina Avenue)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>e. Boat and recreational vehicle outdoor storage (west side of Catalina Avenue)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. FAR 0.70</td>
<td></td>
<td>a. Retail commercial, personal and business services, professional offices, household supply and furnishings, eating and drinking establishments, drug stores, entertainment, automobile related sales, car wash, and similar uses</td>
<td>Commercial Flex - Office Primary (CFO)</td>
<td>FAR 0.70 - 1.00</td>
<td>Provides for commercial-oriented districts that are predominantly comprised of office, research and development, incubator space, creative or technology based businesses (what about hotels?) but that also allow for retail and service uses as secondary to the office uses. Where CFO designations contain existing residential uses, they shall be allowed to remain and shall be considered conforming; however, no new residential units are permitted. FAR 0.70 - 1.00.</td>
<td>C-4, C-4A, C-4B, C-4-PD</td>
<td>Any reason to keep the FAR up to 1.5?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. FAR 0.70</td>
<td></td>
<td>b. Automobile and marine related repair (west side of Catalina Avenue)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. FAR 1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>c. Light industrial and wholesale uses (west side of Catalina Avenue)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. FAR 1.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>d. Storage and self-storage (west side of Catalina Avenue)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>e. Boat and recreational vehicle outdoor storage (west side of Catalina Avenue)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coastal- and recreation-oriented commercial retail and service uses</td>
<td>Coastal Commercial (CC)</td>
<td>Per Redondo Beach Pier Master Plan and Local Coastal Program (LCP)</td>
<td>Provides for coastal and recreation-oriented commercial retail and service uses.</td>
<td>C-5A, CC-1, CC-2, CC-3, CC-4, CC-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Office (O)</td>
<td>FAR 0.70 - 1.00</td>
<td>Provides for a variety of office uses, including legal services, insurance services, real estate, and medical or dental offices, research, incubator, and bio medical, and other support services. FAR 0.70 to 1.00.</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Redondo Beach General Plan Update - DRAFT Land Use Definitions - July 19, 2018

## Mixed-Use Current

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation Name</th>
<th>Current FAR</th>
<th>Current Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>1.00 - 1.50</td>
<td>Provides an integrated mix of both community and regional serving commercial retail, service, office, entertainment, hotel and residential uses in close proximity to transit stations. Mixed-use transit center development should be of high quality and designed to be pedestrian-oriented and integrated with existing surrounding uses. Configurations include ground floor commercial with medium to high density residential units on upper floors or stand alone commercial and residential development. FAR 1.00 - 1.50 and density up to and including 35 dwelling units per acre.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mixed-Use Proposed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation Name</th>
<th>Proposed FAR</th>
<th>Proposed Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>1.00 - 1.50</td>
<td>Provides an integrated mix of both community and regional serving commercial retail, service, office, entertainment, hotel and residential uses in close proximity to transit stations. Mixed-use transit center development should be of high quality and designed to be pedestrian-oriented and integrated with existing surrounding uses. Configurations include ground floor commercial with medium to high density residential units on upper floors or stand alone commercial and residential development. FAR 1.00 - 1.50 and density up to and including 35 dwelling units per acre.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Industrial Current

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation Name</th>
<th>Current FAR</th>
<th>Current Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-1</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>Light industrial, research and development, “office park” facilities, manufacture of spacecraft and associated aerospace systems, supporting commercial uses (e.g., restaurants, banks, copiers, and similar uses), educational and governmental facilities and day care centers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-2</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Same uses as I-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-3</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>Same uses as I-1, and building material sales, furniture stores, vehicles sales and services, maintenance and repair services, restaurants, banks, photocopies, and similar uses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Indusrial Proposed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation Name</th>
<th>Proposed FAR</th>
<th>Proposed Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Industrial (IS)</td>
<td>0.70 - 1.00</td>
<td>Provides for light industrial and light manufacturing for industries such as aerospace, creative art, technology and software development, and bio medical. Other complementary uses include research and development, technology based businesses, office park, warehousing, wholesale, vehicle sales and services, maintenance and repair services, auxiliary educational and governmental facilities, and supporting commercial uses. FAR 0.70 - 1.00.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Public / Institutional / Open Space Current

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation Name</th>
<th>FAR</th>
<th>Current Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Governmental administrative and capital facilities, parks, schools, libraries, hospitals and associated medical offices, public cultural facilities, public open space, utility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Public / Institutional / Open Space Proposed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation Name</th>
<th>Proposed FAR</th>
<th>Proposed Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public/Institutional (PI)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Provides for governmental administrative and capital facilities, schools, libraries, hospitals and associated medical offices, public cultural facilities, and other public uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/Utility (PU)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Provides for utility uses including easements with public access for recreation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Notes / Questions

- CR
- MU-1
- MU-2
- MU-3
- Do we need to address increased density for affordable units?
- I-1, I-1A, I-1B, I-2, I-2A, IC, 1
- I, I-1A, I-1B, I-2, I-2A, IC, 1
- P-CTV, P-RVP, P-GP, P-ROW, P-CFT, P-SF, P-RVPR(RM)
- Having an FAR would be helpful for buildout
- TBD
- Do we need to address nursery or similar uses to cover the AES lines that run up hereons?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Designation Name</th>
<th>Current Density/Intensity</th>
<th>Current Description</th>
<th>Proposed Designation Name</th>
<th>Proposed Density/Intensity Range</th>
<th>Proposed Description</th>
<th>Implementing Zone</th>
<th>Notes/ Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Open Space (OS)</td>
<td>FAR 0.05</td>
<td>Provides for public open space, passive uses, sports fields, active recreation uses, and coastal related recreational activities as well as accompanying public facilities such as restrooms, picnic pavilions, and lifeguard towers. FAR 0.05</td>
<td>P-ROW, P-PRO</td>
<td>Could break Beach into its own category like Hermosa Beach? - helps to clarify open space that meets Quimby vs. what may be counted for a grant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>