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 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 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
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 SB28 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 statewide 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 Franceniusbaum, 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 be 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 ¼ mile of park and believed it should be ½ mile. Community Services Director LaRock stated the map was created by LA County. Ms. Nowak stated the ¾ 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 Chran 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 that 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,

[Signature]

Aaron Jones
Community Development Director