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 Redondo Beach Public Library Second Floor Meeting Room, 303 N. Pacific Coast Highway, Redondo Beach, California.

2. ROLL CALL
Members Present: Members Bajaj, Chrzan, Eller, Funabashi, Gaddis, Glad, Hashmi (arrived at 6:40 p.m.), Hannon, Kilroy, Lamb, Light (arrived at 6:55 p.m.), Ludwig, McKenzie, Moses (left at 8:47 p.m.), Nafissi, Pinzler, Samaras, Sanchez (arrived at 7:17 p.m.), Simpson, Solomon (left at 9:00 p.m.), Stodder, Szymanski, Voisey, Waller, Chair Biro

Members Absent: Kartounian, Turner

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
Diane Cleary, Recording Secretary

Consultants Present: Wendy Nowak, PlaceWorks
Suzanne Schwab, PlaceWorks

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

II. APPROVAL OF THE ORDER OF AGENDA
It was the consensus of the Committee to approve the Order of Agenda as presented.

III. CONSENT CALENDAR

4. APPROVAL OF AFFIDAVIT OF POSTING for the General Plan Advisory Committee Regular Meeting of October 25, 2018

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR THE GENERAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE SPECIAL MEETING: September 27, 2018.

Motion by Member Kilroy, seconded by Member Glad, to approve Items 4 and 5. Motion carried unanimously.

IV. PUBLIC COMMENT – 1ST SESSION
Lara Duke spoke on accessory dwelling units, the Palos Verdes area and standing up to the state’s mandates, expressed concern with building accessory dwelling units on top of garages, and having more than one dwelling unit per lot. She also expressed concern with the state bills which could ruin the vibe and character of the neighborhoods.
In response to Member Pinzler, Community Development Director Jones stated bringing back details on what authority charter cities have versus what other general law cities don’t have is a broad topic and huge project. He suggested a report back on charter law city exemptions from general zoning requirements.

Motion by Member Pinzler, seconded by Chair Biro, that a report be brought back on charter law city exemptions from general zoning requirements and what it would mean to the City. Motion carried unanimously.

V. ITEMS FOR PRESENTATION, DISCUSSION OR ACTION

6. Announcements and Updates
   a. GPAC Ambassador Outreach Updates: Member Feedback, Upcoming Events
   b. General Outreach Updates: Email Subscribers, LHMP Survey (Extended to October 31, 2018)
   c. First Community Meeting Outreach (Saturday November 17, 2018): Press Releases (Daily Breeze, Easy Reader, Beach Reporter), Cable Crawl, Electronic Newsletter (November), E-Blasts, Social Media (FB), Street Banner, Web Page, Flyers

Ms. Nowak gave a brief update on outreach events coming up as follows:
   • 10/31 – Pumpkins in the Park
   • 11/2 – Flu Vaccine at Aviation Park Gym
   • 11/17 – General Plan Update Community Meeting
   • 11/29 – Riviera Village Holiday Stroll
   • 12/8 – 7th Annual Holiday Concert & Santa on the Pier
   • Every Sunday – Riviera Village Farmers Market
   • Every Thursday – Veterans Park Farmers Market

Member Waller stated he briefed both the Redondo Chamber Local Actions Committee and the Riviera Village Business Improvement District and suggested the businesses in the Riviera Village would benefit from information put in all their windows.

Member Voisey believed the numbers are very low as far as reaching out to the number of people.

Ms. Nowak stated that numbers vary depending on the survey, and pointed out that there are still about 80 community members on the list to reach out to for feedback.

Member Waller stated the Chamber group had lots of questions on the process and procedures, as opposed to the BID.

Member Lamb noted general questions at the Council meeting to include the GPAC status and what it does. She encouraged people to come to the meetings, and believed that people are waiting to have their say.

Member Solomon stated the main topic at the Council meeting seemed to be housing density.

Member Voisey stated the electronic signs over the next couple of months will be gone. He noted a low period in January and suggested getting some space for outreach.
Member Bajaj asked for a pdf copy for the Committee, stated he lives on a street that is heavily traveled and said he would be happy to put a lawn sign on his property.

Member Lamb noted no banners are on Artesia or Aviation. Member Funabashi stated there is a large banner on Inglewood Avenue just south of Artesia.

Ms. Nowak stated they will keep watching and monitoring and let the Committee know how the survey is going for the Land Use.

Chair Biro stated it would be helpful to have a list printed out of groups within the City for the community meeting as a cross reference.

7. Large Group Discussion: Overview of Draft Land Use Designations (Continued for Mixed Use)

Ms. Nowak gave an overview of Draft Land Use Designations (continued for Mixed Use) and spoke on:
- Commercial flex retail and commercial flex office definition (mixing retail and office)
- Mixed Use Transit Center – replace the CR designation
- Areas where mixed use (residential and commercial) currently exit (built) and recently approved mixed use projects
- Areas designated mixed use in the current General Plan
- Redevelopment of a regional mall The Crossings and San Antonio Center
- Redevelopment of a regional mall The Crossings/Mountain View
- San Antonio Center/Mountain View
- Runway Mall/Playa Vista/Los Angeles
- Uptown District/San Diego/Hillcrest
- Corridor Redevelopment – Mixed Use The Lofts/Encinitas
- Mixed-Use (Corridor, Small-scale), Boulder, CO
- Floor Area Ratio (defined)
- Mixed-Use
- Additional Opportunities to address mixed use

COMMERCIAL

In response to Member Light, Ms. Nowak stated the new mixed used definition for CR isn’t on the map yet.

In response to Member Solomon, Ms. Nowak stated open spaces and vertical setbacks wouldn’t be incorporated into these designations, since these would be part of the zoning.

In response to Member Lamb, Ms. Nowak stated the task is to look at the definition which is the CR definition, and suggestions could be provided regarding the FAR and density ranges. She also said this would be the time to look at a range question to change.

Member Pinzler believed historical data is being used to create the definition, and asked what indication that 35 units an acre is correct. Ms. Nowak stated the types of projects in review are consistent with these.

In response to Member Pinzler regarding 35 to 30, Community Development Director Jones stated that 30 is a default density under state housing law and units at or above 30 units per acre immediately quality for the low and very low income RHNA requirements.
In response to Member Chrzan, Ms. Nowak stated that residential is density and FARs are the other which are .7 to 1.0.

Member Gaddis stated this is the opportunity to bring down the 35 to 30, even in this definition.

Community Development Director Jones stated it has been recommended throughout the City to bring the density down to 30.

Member Light pointed out that projects that have already gone through this designation are underperforming commercially. Community Development Director Jones stated this will be addressed with zoning but for the General Zone, less than 35 can be recommended for this zone.

Member Light questioned why residential density can be specified but the mix can’t be touched.

Ms. Nowak explained the types of uses are defined in the definition.

Member Light stated there is not the performance at mixed use density mix that shows the commercial is viable, noting a net loss to the City with more traffic, school impacts, safety impacts and road maintenance. Ms. Nowak stated it’s a balance regarding residential and commercial to keep the uses thriving.

Member Light pointed out the City already has a higher density, noting the 100 units at 1800 PCH didn’t provide enough business for the businesses below them.

Community Development Director Jones suggested defining the allowable uses and percentages in the specific zones to put into place, and stated there will be a mix with a zoning requirement.

Member Light suggesting putting commercial or office on the second floor. Community Development Director Jones stated this will be addressed when looking at the study for the Artesia corridor and other mixed uses.

Member Moses questioned how reducing the residential helps the commercial.

Member Light stated residential always sells out but it doesn’t produce the revenue. He said El Segundo makes three times the revenue per resident and the density is the opposite. He noted failing businesses and failing corridors in Redondo Beach.

Member Ludwig stated The Village wants the residential. Ms. Nowak pointed out that people can stay there all weekend with all services available.

Ms. Nowak said there are other reasons commercial can fail such as location, design, etc.

Member Simpson pointed out that 2001 Artesia has been successful.

Ms. Nowak stated the types of uses that should be allowed are being looked at and not the exact placement.

Member Light suggested proposing a mix of uses that is good for the city and developer.

RECESS – 7:20 p.m.

The Committee recessed and broke into groups.

RECONVENE – 7:52 p.m.
Member Kilroy presented the following items discussed in their group:
- Having both dwelling units at 30 – selling point for the General Plan moving forward
- Why is there a FAR minimum
- 1.5 maximum okay – policies and detail different in the TOD compared to other mixed uses
  – keep as two separate line items

Ms. Nowak explained a minimum FAR is needed to allow for some sort of consolidated development on a site. Community Development Director Jones also stated the minimum FAR is the commercial requirement to have at least .3 FAR commercial, the maximum amount of commercial is .7 and anything beyond has to be residential up to 1.5.

In response to Member Waller, Community Development Director Jones stated that residential does count toward FAR.

In response to Member Kilroy, Community Development Director Jones stated the maximum commercial is .7 which is a zoning provision.

Member Szymanski presented the following items discussed in their group:
- Agreed with the 30 unit limit
- Reducing FAR to 0 but would be a parking lot in a transient area
- Maximum at 1.5 allowing for a little bit more of air space in a commercial area; Increase the max to 2, commercial area anyway, why not get full benefit of it in terms of revenue
- Add public and cultural pursuits for this designation

Member Waller presented the following items discussed in their group:
- Questioned the higher dwelling unit level at the Galleria area making sense, particularly related to affordable housing
- Support for higher dwelling units because they would be affordable
- Removing words “medium to high density” – no definition for this
- 30 being the right number

Community Development Director Jones stated the existing General Plan has areas identified as inclusionary affordable housing areas which were built. He suggested building in a mandatory provision for affordable housing.

Ms. Nowak also clarified that 35 to the acre helps so that it doesn’t go to other areas of the City.

In response to Member Simpson, Ms. Nowak stated if a developer applies for a density bonus, the number could be higher.

Community Development Director Jones stated there is a sliding scale for affordable housing under the state density bonus law, from 10% to 35%.

Member Lamb asked if stipulated in this designation that it can be exclusive to affordable. Community Development Director Jones stated the most ever mandated has been Santa Monica at 30% or 40% of new housing. He stated a minimum of 10% at Ruxton has been required and suggested that the Committee could recommend that affordable housing be required, noting it is already required in the Coastal Zone and at targeted revitalization sites.

Chair Biro noted there are things the City has to have in place in order to manage the affordable housing. Community Development Director Jones stated the City already has a Housing Manager, Housing Authority, and various housing programs. He also said the affordable units can be either for sale or for rent but are restricted in terms of affordability of a buyer or renter taking on the unit.
Member Solomon presented the following items discussed in their group:
- Supported maximum 30 units/acre
- Include cultural facilities

Member Kilroy questioned having a limit of .7 for office space and commercial. Community Development Director Jones explained that commercial is a heavy traffic generator, but suggested getting rid of the .7 commercial cap.

It was the consensus of the Committee by motion to remove the .7 commercial cap.

Community Development Director Jones clarified a minimum of .3 commercial and max 1.5.

In response to Member Moses regarding affecting the RHNA number, Community Development Director Jones stated it is still zoned for residential.

Community Development Director Jones suggested requiring affordable housing consistent with state density bonus law.

Ms. Nowak suggested not doing percentages.

Community Development Director Jones stated usually levels higher than 10% are subsidized by housing authorities and agencies. He suggested adding 10% to all projects for affordable housing units or as described by state density bonus law.

In response to Member Kilroy regarding affecting property tax revenue to the City, Community Development Director Jones stated the properties would be assessed at a lower value for affordable housing.

Member Kilroy pointed out that two incomes could get to the $103K medium income in LA County.

Member Chrzan suggested higher FAR numbers near transit for office space.

Member Pinzler expressed concern with an empty property if the Galleria fails in the future and what would be done with it.

Ms. Nowak stated sites are always evolving and it is unknown what will happen but it's important to be responsive if something is changing.

Community Development Director Jones suggest posing the question would taller office buildings be acceptable. He said the current General Plan allows up to 100 feet of building height on the CR zone, and the zoning allows up to 60 feet with additions to go higher. He said 60 to 100 feet height is already in place but not the FAR.

In response to Chair Biro, Community Development Director Jones stated Northrop-Grumman is 110 feet in height and has screening on top with a vertical height to setback from Manhattan Beach Boulevard. He also said that taller buildings and more public open space are very related.

It was the consensus of the Committee to recommend:
- 30 units/acre
- Minimum 10% affordable housing units
- .7 commercial cap
• Remove the “high and medium density” language
• Bring back language for the FAR

MIXED-USE

Ms. Nowak gave a presentation on mixed-use:
• Areas along corridor
• Details that go into the zoning - fit into a broader range of a definition
• Integrating a mix of commercial, service, office
• Different type of pedestrian oriented environment
• Take out “medium and high density” language
• Add cultural and parks and open space
• Required affordable
• Maximum 1.5

Member Solomon pointed out that commercial uses are butted up against residential and suggested considering lowering the FAR or limiting some of the commercial uses. He noted also conflicts up and down Artesia and PCH, and also the potential intensity of the commercial uses butting up against the residential areas by taking the top off.

Member Glad stated that commercial/office generates more traffic, and expressed concern with driving property back to the middle of the City.

Member Solomon asked if taking the top off of the FAR ratio for the second category of mixed use at .7 or allowing up to 1.5 is being considered.

Member Lamb suggested being more fully defined when moving forward in zoning.

Community Development Director Jones stated reductions have already been done in MU zones, including reducing the height from 45 feet to 38 feet height. He also said the fear of 4 and 5 stories should go away at 1.5 which will only provide 3 stories.

Member Light stated the 2001 Artesia zoning is out of character and stated at 1800 PCH there is a wall and people can’t get through to the rest of the community. He supported the mixed use at 223-225 Avenue I which is dominated with commercial in the front and housing in the back is not seen which doesn’t dominate the rest of the neighborhood.

Member Light believed that residential and commercial should flip-flop. Community Development Director Jones stated a provision was changed to allow up to 50% of the frontage to be office as well.

In response to Member Kilroy, Community Development Director Jones stated because of senior housing, affordable housing and density bonus, the height limit had an exemption or bonus placed on it for Montecito.

Member Kilroy referred to Pearl Plaza and asked if 100% commercial/retail with no residential would be appropriate for the site. Community Development Director Jones stated the project went from 45 down to 38 and received a mayoral veto because it was two units more dense than the density of the surrounding block.

Member Light also referred to Pearl Plaza and noted opposition due to blocking the view and the density not being compatible with the neighborhood, using an old noncompliant building for the neighborhood character. He said it was .7 for commercial and .3 for residential at the time.
Community Development Director Jones stated the question is reducing the FAR from 1.5 to 1.0 and require a minimum commercial component of .5 to .7. Member Kilroy expressed concern with mandating underground parking by going that high, making things unbuildable.

Member Kilroy suggested dropping down to 1.0 and .5 on both.

Member Solomon pointed out that there is no net loss of parking in the Coastal Zone.

Community Development Director Jones suggested getting the opinion of the group and reporting back on exact numbers. He said by going 1.0, half the project would be commercial use and half residential at 50/50.

In response to Member Solomon, Community Development Director Jones stated the height has been reduced to 38 from 45 and density bonus could be requested such as a story at about 10 feet if a developer came in with affordable housing.

Community Development Director Jones pointed out that small lots are not eligible for mixed use development as written now and 15,000 square feet minimum is required.

Motion by Member Eller, seconded by Member Gaddis, to approve half for commercial use and half for residential at 50/50. Motion carried unanimously.

Public, Institutional, Utility, and Parks and Open Space

Ms. Nowak gave a report on Public, Institutional and Open Space, and explained ancillary parks.

Member Light stated ancillary should be a usable and functional use for the City in the parks and recreation element. He opposed counting open space in parks and recreation calculations, noting the parking lot at the PAC is currently counted as parkland.

Ms. Nowak stated the mapping will be reviewed, noting there could be a blue public facilities designation and a playground park carved out of it and still count. She also stated blue on a map could include a school and playground and a standalone park.

Community Development Director Jones stated parks were added to the power plant designation and now the allowable uses are park or power plant.

Member Light also pointed out that the triangle parking lot with small green spaces is defined as a park.

In response to Member Light, Ms. Nowak stated parks could be added to public utility.

In response to Member Lamb, Community Development Director Jones stated beach is counted as part of the parkland.

In response to Member Chrzan, Community Development Director Jones stated community facilities are allowed in parks.

8. Project Progress/Next Steps: Community Meeting, Saturday November 17, 2018, 10 AM – 1 PM (Perry Park Teen Center)

Next Steps:
- Press releases to all three papers
- Facebook posts
• Advertised on cable channel
• City newsletter
• Overview of a General Plan
• Land Use Map
• Focus areas
• Survey
• Feedback from community on alternatives
• Next steps
• Role of GPAC
• Setting up stations
• Opportunity for presentation, public comment, stations around the room, take survey
  at community meeting, sign up for E-mail blasts
• Presentation and public question opportunity
• Help get the word out
• Globally discuss items
• Name tags for GPAC members

Community Development Director Jones stated there may be a Brown Act question and tonight's
meeting may have to be adjourned to the November 17th meeting.

Member Nafissi recommended having some guidance questions/topics for the members.

Ms. Nowak explained the process of the meeting which will be made flexible.

Member Kilroy noted issues with parking at Perry Park.

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT – 2nd SESSION
Irena Shelby stated she lives in a mixed uses zone on S. PCH, and expressed concern with the
development on the corner of PCH and Palos Verdes Drive and density. She supported reducing
dwelling units from 35 to 30, noting less people and cars, and suggested consideration the issue
of the FAR which applies to both commercial and residential together. She also expressed
concern with bulk and massing and retaining the huge size.

VII. GPAC MEMBERS REFERRALS TO STAFF
Member Light announced this Saturday from 10 to 4 p.m., a section of the Wilderness Park will
be cleaned out and replaced with native plants.

Member Waller request a map showing transit lines and stops.

Member Pinzler requested a map of the ridership.

Member Lamb requested a pedestrian map or plan for the City.

In response to Member Lamb, Ms. Nowak gave an update on the decision tool and the healthy
General Plan document. Chair Biro suggested sending this out as a link to the group overall as
reading information.

Community Development Director Jones announced that he is retiring on December 28, 2018.
VIII. ADJOURNMENT: 9:24 P.M.
Motion by Member Kilroy, seconded by Member Glad, to adjourn the meeting at 9:24 p.m. to a Regular Meeting to be held at 6:30 p.m. on Thursday, January 31, 2018, in the Redondo Beach Public Library, Second Floor Meeting Room, 303 N. Pacific Coast Highway, Redondo Beach, CA 90277. Motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

Aaron Jones
Community Development Director