Minutes
Regular Meeting
General Plan Advisory Committee
July 26, 2018

I. OPENING SESSION

1. CALL MEETING TO ORDER
A Regular Meeting of the Redondo Beach General Plan Advisory Committee was called to order by Chair Biro at 6:30 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 subgroup 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 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
  o PowerPoint Roadshow (will be ready by end of the week)
  o Parks and open space survey
  o Local Hazard Mitigation Plan Survey (forthcoming)
  o 117 Facebook followers/140 Facebook Friends and 425 email subscribers
  o Need updates on groups members have met with
  o Thanks for helping to spread the word
  o 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 Hanlon noted that Living Streets is a significant document and should be made available to the public and posted on the website.

- Upcoming Events
  o Pier Summer Concerts
  o Coastal Clean Up Day
  o LA Kings 5K Run/Walk
  o Rods, Rides and Relics
  o GPAC members station a booth
  o 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.

[Signature]
Aaron Jones, Community Development Director