Agenda

- Opening Remarks
  - Call to Order
  - Roll Call
  - Salute to Flag
- Approval of the Order of Agenda & Consent Calendar
- Public Comment (Session 1)
- Announcements & Updates (Staff and Consultant team)
  - Update: Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) Ordinance
  - Staff Update – Artesia Corridor Parklettes / Streetlets

continued next slide
Agenda (cont’d)

• Small and Large Group Discussion
  • Overview of Survey Results
  • Discussion of Draft Land Use Designations for Focus Areas
    – Small Group Discussion
    – Large Group Report Out

• Next Steps
• Public Comment (Session 2)
• GPAC Referrals to Staff
• Adjournment

Public Comment
Session 1
Announcements and Updates

- Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) Ordinance Adopted by City Council
  - Second reading

- Internal staff discussions about Open Space opportunities along Artesia Boulevard

Lilenthal Park – Existing Street to Open Space Conversion Example

Parklette/Streetlet Study Area

- Idea originated from public comment via “on-line survey”
- Initially considered only those “T” intersections with Artesia Blvd:
  - Aviation Way: Conflict with adjacent commercial driveways (future location of Chick-fil-a)
  - Flagler Lane: Topography (too steep)
  - Slauson Lane: Conflict with adjacent commercial driveways (rear parking lot behind Dollar Tree)
  - Vail Avenue: Existing Bus Route (Beach Cities Transit)
Parklette/Streetlet Study Area

Before

After

Parklette/Streetlet Study Area

Before

After
Staff Met to Further Investigate:
- Community Development Director, Brandy Forbes
- Community Services Director, John LaRock
- Public Works Director, Ted Semaan
- City Engineer, Andrew Winje
- Traffic Engineer, Gene Kim
- Senior Management Analyst, WED, Elizabeth Hause
- Planning Manager, Sean Scully

Focus Areas:
- Reviewed all intersections along Artesia Blvd between Aviation and SCE ROW

Factors:
- Circulation/Access Conflicts with adjacent commercial uses
- Controlled intersection
- Bus Routes
- Adjacent uses:
  - Mix of office, small scale service, restaurants, higher density residential in proximity
  - Create “synergy” of uses in proximity, nodes of “Walkability”…

Parklette/Streetlet Study Area

Parklette/Streetlet Study Area – Green Lane

- Community Services Department-Police Substation; North Library
- Across street from Senior MU Development (Montecito), other higher density residential
- Proximity to small office, restaurants, services
Parklette/Streetlet Study Area – Mackay Lane

• Adjacent strip commercial centers with mix of uses including numerous small restaurants;
• Higher residential density nearby on Mathews
• Proximity to small scale office-services
• Across from larger lot for sale

GPAC Considerations & Next Steps

GPAC Considerations
• Consider as policy within Land Use and Parks Elements
• Artesia Area Plan
  • Policy and Implementation Measure
• Land Use
  • Walkability nodes
  • Synergy with adjacent convenience restaurants, office, higher density residential
• Additional Discussion (Staff)
  • Consider removal of median to create bike lane
    • Scooters require dedicated bike lane
  • Consider removal of median to create wider sidewalks
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>GPAC 18: Review of feedback/input on land use options from Community Survey, refine Land Use definitions (if needed), initiate revisions to Land Use Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer/Fall 2019</td>
<td>Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (LHMP) 30-day Public Review; Public Safety Commission Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GPAC 19: Review outstanding Land Use questions, definitions and map; Artesia/Aviation Corridor Meeting #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GPAC 20: Review of Land Use Map - final refinements prior to public review/comment, Planning Commission, and City Council consideration (July)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Meeting 2: Artesia Aviation Corridor Area Plan Presentation and Proposed Land Use Plan Community Workshop (GPAC recommendations, staff recommendations, and public comments will be forwarded to PC/CC)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tentative Schedule (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 2019</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning Commission/City Council:</td>
<td>Review Draft Land Use Map approve for study in environmental documents (initiate technical studies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIR Scoping Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park &amp; Recreation Commission Meeting – City Staff to facilitate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPAC 21: General Plan Goals &amp; Policies – Parks, Recreation, and Open Space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPAC 22: General Plan Goals &amp; Policies – Land Use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPAC 23: General Plan Goals &amp; Policies – Any carry over items</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 2020/Winter 2021</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Meeting 3:</td>
<td>Presentation of Land Plan, Updated Element Goals &amp; Policies, and EIR (Open House)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Commission and City Council: Adoption Hearings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citywide Vote and Coastal Commission Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Large and Small Group Discussion:
Focused Opportunity Areas

Survey Stats

531 Total Responses

Relationship to City
- 94% live in Redondo Beach
  (18% of 94% also work in Redondo Beach)
- 2% work in Redondo Beach
- 4% do not live or work in Redondo Beach

Zip Code
- 56% North Redondo (90278)
- 37% South Redondo (90277)
- 7% Other zip code or no answer

Age

- Under 18: 1 ppl (<1%)
- 18-24: 6 ppl (1%)
- 25-34: 48 ppl (9%)
- 35-44: 90 ppl (17%)
- 45-54: 121 ppl (23%)
- 55-64: 135 ppl (26%)
- 65+: 122 ppl (23%)
Purpose of the Meeting

• Review options for each area and survey responses
• Resolve or provide direction regarding outstanding questions or other considerations needing clarification by staff or the consultant team
• Provide direction to staff and consultant team regarding land uses to be applied
• Next meeting: Return to GPAC with draft land use designations and map for review and confirmation
• Will also address any concerns or potential issues that could arise by existing legislation or pending legislation that could impact land use direction GPAC provides tonight

Process to Review Each Area

Presentation:
• Overview of Area and Findings to Large Group

Breakout:
• Small Group discussions to discuss and resolve outstanding questions

Report back:
• Return to Large Group to discuss and provide direction to staff

In the essence of time and for meeting efficiency:
If a clear preference for an alternative was selected by the public in the survey and the group is in general agreement of how to move forward on an area, the GPAC can forgo the Small Group discussion and provide direction to Staff and the Consultant Team in the Large Group setting
General Comments

• General concerns about traffic, mixed use
• Compatibility and health concerns about placing residential uses near high-traffic routes such as PCH, Industrial Area, Galleria (was not mentioned on Artesia, Aviation, or Torrance)

Artesia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GP currently allows:</th>
<th>Option A: mixed-use at the gateways</th>
<th>Option B: commercial and office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small scale retail commercial (retail, restaurants, etc.) with office. The mixed-use designation from Aviation to Blossom allows for residential on the 2nd floor with commercial on the ground floor.</td>
<td>Maintains the mixed-use designation (residential and commercial) on the west side of the corridor and also applies it to the parcels east of the SCE easement. The center of the corridor would continue to allow for small scale pedestrian commercial.</td>
<td>Creates a flexible, commercial oriented district that allows for retail, service, and office uses. Prioritizes office near the Galleria and retail closer to Aviation Boulevard.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Artesia Boulevard- Results

Artesia Boulevard

Option A total: 46.5%
Option B total: 36.5%

Artesia Option A: Mixed Use at Gateways

COMMERCIAL - NEIGHBORHOOD-SERVING
(public and institutional, no residential)

MIXED-USE
(combination of residential, commercial and office uses - including retail, hotel and medical)

INSTITUTIONAL/CIVIC
(School, library, government, etc.)

PUBLIC OR INSTITUTIONAL

FOCUS AREA BOUNDARY

CITY LIMITS
Artesia Option B: Commercial & Office

General Considerations:
Highlights of Comments Received

- Improve mix of stores, facades, landscaping and traffic
- Make the corridor pedestrian-friendly (create a pedestrian/urban design overlay)
- Add parks / open space
- Add a bike route
- Need a parking lot
- Branding: Rename? Redondo Beach Boulevard
- Require improvements to be energy neutral (photovoltaic panels, etc.)
Highlights GPAC’s Previous Discussion of Artesia Blvd.

- Corridor should have a pedestrian focus (along corridor and linkages to adjacent neighborhoods)
- Prefer for corridor to evolve organically over time; incremental changes over the medium term (allow time for revitalized Galleria to affect the corridor)
- Residential densities for mixed use areas are generally ok (don’t need to change now)
- Some interest in allowing for minor intensification or change of development standards and regulations:
  - Would consider increasing FAR for non-residential uses to 0.60 FAR (currently 0.50 FAR) to help encourage new commercial uses
  - Revised parking standards/reductions (spaces required, shared & off-site opportunities, etc.)
- Open to City further exploring:
  - Implementation of alternative modes of transportation (scooters, dedicated bike lanes, etc.)
  - Opportunities to generate new open spaces and plazas (temporary or permanent street vacations, parkettes/streetlets, etc.)
  - Continue business improvement program for façade improvements and encourage the formation of a Business Improvement District (BID)

Small Group Discussion Questions

1. Confirm Artesia Boulevard should have pedestrian focus

2. Should the corridor allow limited residential uses? If so, where (gateways or entire corridor)? Allow for second-story residential in the center of the corridor? Where residential is allowed, Mixed Use Designation will be applied or
   Should corridor be a mix of commercial and office? If commercial is primary use, Commercial Flex designation will be applied (but office/hotel is allowed)

3. Confirm increase in FAR to 0.60 is acceptable in this area for non-residential uses
Large Group Discussion

Aviation Boulevard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GP currently allows:</th>
<th>Option A: commercial/office/mixed-use</th>
<th>Option B: commercial/office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For uses that create a low-rise commercial “village” Intended to keep existing multi-family residential and local-serving highway-oriented commercial uses.</td>
<td>Changes some commercial to strictly office and other areas to a flexible combined office and commercial use type.</td>
<td>Commercial uses become the focus with predominantly office along the majority of the corridor. Current residential uses would remain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed-use allows for integrated commercial and residential use on the west side.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Aviation Boulevard - Results

Aviation Boulevard

- Option A total: 45.7%
- Option B total: 27.6%

Aviation Option A: Commercial/Office/Mixed-Use
Aviation Option B: Commercial & Office

If Option A:
- Preserve commercial at southeast corner of Aviation & Artesia (not office only)
- Consider making both sides of the street mixed use

If Option B:
- Allow other commercial uses (like retail) in office designation

Other considerations from previous GPAC meeting:
- Lot depth could be problematic for mixed use development (based on results of Artesia Blvd. analysis (where it was tough to accommodate mixed use with 150 ft depth)
- Properties in focus area that are generally large enough to accommodate mixed use are parcels a handful of parcels on the west side of Aviation and the large parcel at the northeast corner of Aviation and Artesia (existing commercial center)
Small Group Discussion Questions

1. Confirm: Maintain low rise character and auto-oriented focus (but create pedestrian connections to residential adjacent to the corridors)?

2. Confirm Option A (add mixed use on west side of street) is starting point

3. Office only at northeast corner of Aviation and Artesia Blvd. (per Option A – most selected in survey)? Or allow for more flexibility to respond to changing market conditions over time, by applying: Commercial Flex (Office Primary) or Commercial Flex (Commercial Primary)?

4. Based on Artesia analysis, with lot depths being so narrow on the mid section of Aviation (west side of Aviation) should mixed use still be applied?
Torrance Boulevard

GP currently allows:
- Vertical mixed use allowed (residential over commercial).
- Commercial such as restaurants, drugstores, offices, retail, personal services, etc.
- One single family residential parcel fronts Torrance Blvd.

Option A: Transition Retail to Office
- More intense retail uses near PCH that transition to offices toward the middle of the corridor.
- Provides a cluster of office only uses, intended to provide a concentration of jobs.

Option B: Office with Supporting Retail (co-mingling)
- Allows for a mix of low scale office and retail uses.
- Supports and connects surrounding neighborhoods.
- Difference from A: office and retail is co-mingled throughout corridor.

Torrance Boulevard - Results

Option A total: 15.4%
Option B total: 56.9%
Torrance Option B: Office with Supporting Retail

Torrance Option A: Transition Retail to Office
Additional Considerations: Highlight of Comments

General:

- Approximately a third of the 35 open ended responses expressed a desire for residential use in this corridor (either stand alone multi-family or as a part of mixed use)
- Comments to improve pedestrian/bike access (add bike lanes) and improve transit service (add transit stop)
- One respondent thought offices should not be prioritized here because of the poor cell service, and retail/mixed use should be designated instead. If new jobs are desired here, the General Plan should also address the need for the appropriate infrastructure to make the corridor attractive for new businesses (fiber optics, etc.)

Small Group Discussion Questions

1. Confirm Option B uses should be applied (Commercial Flex – Office Primary); retains single family residential use fronting Torrance.
2. Confirm keep SFR designation on south side(to keep use conforming)?
Pacific Coast Highway- North Corridor

GP currently allows:
- Allows for commercial such as retail, restaurants, grocery and drug stores, offices, services, etc.
- Industrial uses allow for research and development, office parks, and supporting commercial uses.
- Public/Civic use allows for governmental uses such as City Hall and the Library (Existing).

Option A: Refine Current General Plan
- Maintain the east-side as low scale commercial.
- The west-side to maintain commercial but prioritize retail or multi-tenant commercial.
- Remove the industrial land and replace it with commercial/office use.
- Current low density, multi-family properties remain and the appropriate multi-family low density designation would be applied.
- Civic institutional uses maintained.

PCH North Corridor- Results

- Option A total: 67.8%
- Option A total: 65.1%
- Option A, with a few changes: 4.7%
- None of these options: 3.9%
- Something completely different: 1.7%

Option A total: 67.8%
PCH North Corridor Option A: Refine Current GP

Additional Considerations: Highlight of Comments

**General:**

- Received a few comments suggesting to add multi-family residential or mixed use (including residential), but comments did not reflect majority
- Encourage more pedestrian-oriented uses and green spaces / park land (area is too auto-centric)
Small Group Discussion Questions

1. Confirm Option A approach. Should it be designated Commercial Flex – Retail or Commercial Flex - Office on the west side of PCH?

2. Confirm commercial on east side PCH should be Commercial Flex Corridor (re-named Neighborhood Commercial)?

3. Confirm that Residential uses will remain Multi-Family Residential Low Density (formerly R-3).

Pacific Coast Highway- Central

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GP currently allows:</th>
<th>Option A: Refine Current General Plan</th>
<th>Option B: Create Commercial Corridor</th>
<th>Option C: Create Mixed-Use Corridor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current plan allows for a variety of uses. i.e. High density residential, commercial, and mixed use. Transitioning to community/highway commercial with medium density multi-family housing. Areas of public institutional use (Redondo Beach Unified High school, Assisted Living Project)</td>
<td>Refine the plan by maintain majority of the uses with the exception of mixed-use. Garnet to Pearl would change from mixed use to combination of commercial and office. Pedestrian oriented commercial hub at the intersection of Torrance and PCH.</td>
<td>Change all mixed-use and residential designations to a community/highway oriented commercial use. Uses include retail, restaurants, grocery and drug stores, offices, movie theaters, etc. Portion from Knob Hill to Avenue G would have no change.</td>
<td>Create a mixed use corridor from Vincent Street to Knob Hill allowing residential and commercial uses to be located side by side. All other areas of the corridor would have no change.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PCH Central - Results

Note: If combine Current GP with Option A and Option A with a few changes, total is 39.4% - very close to totals for Option C

PCH Central Option A: Refine Current GP
PCH Central Option C: Create a Mixed-Use Corridor

PCH Central Option B: Create Commercial Corridor
Additional Considerations: Highlight of Comments

**If commercial only option:**
- Concern that commercial vacancy is due to too much commercial, so converting some of the existing commercial area to residential (with mixed use or residential designations) would reduce the amount of commercial and help reduce vacancy.

**General:**
- Lot depths here are generally deep enough to accommodate mixed-use parcels
- Improve pedestrian and bike safety
- Preserve beach town character (Limit building heights)

Small Group Discussion Questions

1. Which option, Option A (Refine current GP) or Option C (Mixed Use) is most appropriate for the corridor?

2. If Option A selected, should Commercial Flex –Retail or Commercial Flex – Office be applied near Torrance?

3. Confirm everything south of Knob Hill should be Commercial Flex Corridor (renamed Neighborhood Commercial)?
Pacific Coast Highway- South

**GP currently allows:**
Current plan allows for community and highway-oriented commercial uses south of Avenue G as PCH approaches Riviera Village.

From Palos Verde Boulevard south to the City border the designation is mixed-use (ground floor retail / residential above) with adjacent medium density multifamily residential one street behind.

**Option A: commercial/mixed-use/residential**
Create a live-work environment by extending the existing mixed-use corridor to encompass the area between Elena Avenue and the City border.

The mix of residential and commercial could be applied horizontally or vertically.

The adjacent medium density residential would remain to provide a transition from the mixed-use corridor to the single family residential to the North.

The commercial uses near Riviera Village would remain.

---

PCH South Results

**Pacific Coast Highway - South Corridor**

- Keep current general plan with no changes: 25.8%
- Option A: Extend the Mixed-Use Corridor: 51.8%
- Option A, with a few changes: 4.0%
- None of these options: 11.0%
- Something completely different: 2.0%

**Option A total: 55.8%**
PCH South– Option A:
Commercial/Mixed-Use/Residential

Additional Considerations:
Highlight of Comments

General:

- Improve pedestrian and bike access / safety
- A couple of respondents thought high density housing should not be allowed because there is limited public transit service in this area
- Some concerns about commercial viability in existing and future mixed use projects based on perceived vacancy and turnover in the existing mixed use development
Small Group Discussion Questions

1. Confirm extension of mixed use northwest of Palos Verdes Blvd. and that remainder stays the same (with new land use designation names).

Industrial District

**Current General Plan**

- GP currently allows:
  - Allows for two areas of commercial at varying intensities.
  - Majority is designated light industrial.
  - A utility easement runs through the area, currently nurseries and parking lots are located within the easement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option A: Refine Current General Plan</th>
<th>Option B: Create a Transit Oriented District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Majority of uses maintained with minor refinements.</td>
<td>Transit oriented district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage tech and campus development to attract/maintain jobs.</td>
<td>Integrates jobs, housing, and retail by retaining the commercial areas and designating portions of the industrial areas for high density housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean up for zoning consistency to designate more appropriate multi-tenant commercial use.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transit oriented district.
Industrial District- Results

Option A total: 38.7%  
Option B total: 43.4%

Industrial Option A: Refine Current GP

COMMERCIAL - COMMUNITY-SERVING (including larger-scale retail and hotel with either a pedestrian or auto focus, no residential)
TECH / BUSINESS CAMPUS WITH HEAVY INDUSTRIAL
UTILITY EASEMENT / OPEN SPACE
FOCUS AREA BOUNDARY
CITY LIMITS
EXISTING METRO STATION
Industrial Option B: Transit Oriented District (with Res)

Industrial District - Aerial
Additional Considerations: Highlight of Comments

If residential is introduced:
• Possibly consider affordable housing options

General
• Consider changing residential-only designation to mixed-use to ensure retail and other services are available within walking distance of new high-density housing
• Compatibility concerns about noise/air quality/nuisance impact of heavy industrial uses on existing housing (south of Manhattan Beach Blvd)

Small Group Discussion Questions

1. Should this area:
   • Focus on jobs (Option A – General Industrial and Commercial Flex - Retail)
   • Allow for integration of new residential uses because of proximity to the Metro (Option B – TOD), or
   • Apply a hybrid (not one of two current options) by designating (non-commercial) areas as General Industrial with a TOD overlay that could allow for some residential over time if appropriate?
Galleria District

GP currently allows:
- Commercial allows a mix of commercial uses.
- Residential is permitted on the second floor and higher in CR.
- Light industrial is permitted, and large scale retail.
- SoCal Edison easements run through this district. The area also abuts a Metro easement.

Option A: everything but Residential
- Commercial-Regional areas continue to allow for commercial uses (retail, restaurants, entertainment, etc.)
- Light industrial uses continue to allow light industrial (research and development, office park, manufacturing to support commercial uses, educational and governmental facilities)
- Including the sale of large retail items.

Option B: Hybrid
- Mixed-use would allow residential integrated with commercial uses.
- A combination of commercial, office, and industrial uses would be allowed south of SCE easement.
- Area would create a job center and allow for a variety of uses near the Metro stop.

Galleria District - Results

- Option A total: 29.4%
- Option B total: 60.7%

Current General Plan

[Map of Galleria District showing current general plan and options A and B]
Galleria Option B: Mixed Use & Comm/Office/Industrial

Galleria Option A: Everything but Residential
Additional Considerations: Highlight of Comments

If mixed use:
- Create a destination (like The Americana or The Grove)
- Site design considerations:
  - Put housing on west side (near Metro / away from Hawthorne)
  - Provide green space
  - Pedestrian-oriented
- Some concerns about revenue implications of less commercial

General:
- Metro should be central to any new development
- New housing should be near Metro
- New housing should be away from Hawthorne (noise / air quality)
- Provide safe pedestrian and bike connections between adjacent neighborhoods and Metro
- Add transit links between Metro and rest of Redondo Beach
- Add Park and ride at Metro
Small Group Discussion Questions

1. Confirm: Should the area north of the utility easement (Galleria) be designated as a mixed use district (Mixed Use – Transit Center)? Should the FAR be increased to allow for taller buildings for office or other uses? (carry over question to revisit that was not resolved from prior meeting when GPAC reviewed definitions)

2. Should the area south of the utility easement become tech corridor area that allows for commercial/office/industrial mix (that wasn’t pursued on 190th)? Possibly create a new designation of “Industrial Flex” since none of the definitions for Industrial or Commercial quite fit the intent of the area as envisioned by the community?

Kingsdale Neighborhood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GP currently allows:</th>
<th>Option A: Residential Only</th>
<th>Option B: Higher Density Housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allows single-family residential.</td>
<td>Increase density allowed for majority of the area to low density multi-family neighborhood.</td>
<td>Increase density allowed for the majority of the area to a high density multi-family neighborhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial from neighborhood serving to greater intensity permitted.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Community serving commercial uses allowed, buffering and transitioning traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are also abuts Metro easement, which is being considered as possible Green Line extension.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current General Plan
Kingsdale Neighborhood - Results

Galleria District

- Keep current general plan with no changes: 6.5%
- Option A - Everything but residential: 28.6%
- Option A, with a few changes: 0.8%
- Option B - Hybrid: 54.6%
- Option B, with a few changes: 6.1%
- None of these options: 2.7%
- Something completely different: 0.8%

Option A total: 29.4%
Option B total: 60.7%

Kingsdale Option B: Multi-family High Density

- RES. - MULTI-FAMILY HIGH DENSITY
- COMMERCIAL - COMMUNITY-SERVING
- Including larger scale retail and hotel with either a pedestrian or auto focus, no residential

SEE GALLERIA AREA OPTIONS

FOCUS AREA BOUNDARY

CITY LIMITS

POTENTIAL METRO STATION
(Final location to be determined)
Kingsdale Option A: Residential Multi-Family (Low Density)

Additional Considerations: Highlight of Comments

**General**

- Keep commercial along Artesia
- Improve road, pedestrian and bike safety
- Include affordable housing
Small Group Discussion Questions

1. Confirm area should be higher density residential and that uses in the area should support a transit-oriented development (TOD) approach

Public Comment
Session 2
Next Steps

Process to Arrive at a Land Use Plan

Guiding Principles & Focus Areas
  - Community Workshop #1
    - Vision
    - Guiding Principles
    - Focus Area Options
      - Survey
    - Parks and Recreation
  - GPAC Survey
  - #1 Vision
  - #2 Parks

Evaluation & Analysis of Focus Area Options
  - GPAC Survey
  - #3 Land Use Alternatives

Develop Citywide Land Use Map
  - GPAC Survey
  - #4 Feedback on Proposed Land Use Plan

Selection of Land Use Plan to Evaluate in EIR
  - Planning Commission Study Sessions
  - City Council
  - Summarize Input/Feedback from Public to present to PC/CC
  - GPAC Survey
  - Survey #4 Feedback on Proposed Land Use Plan
  - Parks and Recreation
  - Artesia and Aviation Corridors
Next Meeting

May 30, 2019
6:30 P.M.
Redondo Beach Public Library
Second Floor Meeting Room
303 N. Pacific Coast Highway
Redondo Beach, CA 90277

Please visit the project website: www.redondo.org/PLANredondo