AGENDA – REGULAR MEETING
GENERAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE
CITY OF REDONDO BEACH
THURSDAY MAY 30, 2019 – 6:30 P.M.
Redondo Beach Public Library - Second Floor Meeting Room
303 N. Pacific Coast Highway
Redondo Beach, CA 90277

I. OPEN THE MEETING
   1. Call Meeting to Order – WELCOME-OPENING REMARKS
   2. Roll Call
   3. Salute to Flag

II. APPROVAL OF THE ORDER OF AGENDA

III. CONSENT CALENDAR
   4. Approval of the Affidavit of Posting for the General Plan Advisory Committee Regular Meeting of May 30, 2019
   5. Approval of Minutes for the General Plan Advisory Committee Regular Meetings of April 25, 2019

IV. PUBLIC COMMENT – 1st SESSION
   This section is intended to provide members of the public with the opportunity to comment on any subject. This section is limited to 15 minutes. Each speaker will be afforded three minutes to address the Committee. Each speaker will be permitted to speak only once. Written requests, if any, will be considered first under this section.

V. ITEMS FOR PRESENTATION, DISCUSSION OR ACTION
   6. Announcements and Updates
      a. General Updates
   7. Review of Updated Land Use Definitions (with revisions from prior GPAC Meeting)
   8. Small and Large Group Discussion for Remaining Focus Areas (continuation of Pacific Coast Highway Central, Pacific Coast Highway South, Industrial North and Galleria and Kingsdale Neighborhood)
      a. Overview of Survey Results and Discussion of Draft Land Use Designations for Focus Areas (small group exercise with report out to the group)
   9. Review of General Plan Land Use “Translation” Map (Draft Land Use Map showing new Designations and Preliminary Mapping of Selected Uses for Focus Areas covered in previous meetings)
   10. Next Steps: Tentative Schedule and Topics for Remaining Meetings

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT – 2ND SESSION
   This section is intended to provide members of the public with the opportunity to comment on any subject. This section is limited to 15 minutes. Each speaker will be afforded three minutes to address the Committee. Each speaker will be permitted to speak only once. Written requests, if any, will be considered first under this section.

VII. GPAC MEMBERS REFERRALS TO STAFF

VIII. ADJOURNMENT
The next meeting of the General Plan Advisory Committee is tentatively scheduled for **June 27, 2019 in the Redondo Beach Public Library, Second Floor Meeting Room, 303 N. Pacific Coast Highway Redondo Beach, CA 90277.** All Regular Meetings, Workshops and any Special Meetings of the GPAC will be noticed as required by law and may be at an alternative location.

Any writings or documents provided to the General Plan Advisory Committee regarding any item on this agenda shall be submitted to staff for review and distribution to the GPAC as appropriate. Said writings or documents will be retained as required by public records retention laws.

It is the intention of the City of Redondo Beach to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) in all respects. If, as an attendee or a participant at this meeting you will need special assistance beyond what is normally provided, the City will attempt to accommodate you in every reasonable manner. Please contact the City Clerk's Office at (310) 318-0656 at least forty-eight (48) hours prior to the meeting to inform us of your particular needs and to determine if accommodation is feasible. Please advise us at that time if you will need accommodations to attend or participate in meetings on a regular basis.

An agenda packet is available 24 hours at [www.redondo.org](http://www.redondo.org) under the Planning Division and during City Hall hours, agenda items are also available for review in the Planning Division.

**RULES PERTAINING TO ALL PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

(Section 6.1, Article 6, Rules of Conduct)

1. **No person shall address the General Plan Advisory Committee without first securing the permission of the Chairperson; provided, however, that permission shall not be refused except for a good cause.**

2. **After a motion is passed or an item closed, no person shall address the GPAC on the matter without first securing permission of the Chairperson.**

3. **Each person addressing the GPAC shall step up to the lectern and clearly state his/her name and city for the record, the subject he/she wishes to discuss, and proceed with his/her remarks.**

4. **Unless otherwise designated, remarks shall be limited to three (3) minutes on any one agenda item. The time may be extended for a speaker(s) by the majority vote of the GPAC.**

5. **In situations where an unusual number of people wish to speak on an item, the Chairperson may reasonably limit the aggregate time of hearing or discussion, and/or time for each individual speaker, and/or the number of speakers. Such time limits shall allow for full discussion of the item by interested parties or their representative(s). Groups are encouraged to designate a spokesperson who may be granted additional time to speak.**

6. **No person shall speak twice on the same agenda item unless permission is granted by a majority of the GPAC.**

7. **Speakers are encouraged to present new evidence and points of view not previously considered, and avoid repetition of statements made by previous speakers.**

8. **All remarks shall be addressed to the GPAC as a whole and not to any member thereof. No questions shall be directed to a member of the GPAC or the City staff or Consultant except through, and with the permission of, the Chairperson.**

9. **Speakers shall confine their remarks to those which are relevant to the subject matter. Attacks against the character or motives of any person shall be out of order. The Chairperson, subject to appeal to the GPAC, shall be the judge of relevancy and whether character or motives are being impugned.**
10. The public participation portion of the agenda shall be reserved for the public to address the GPAC regarding problems, question, or complaints within the jurisdiction of the GPAC.

11. Any person making personal, impertinent, or slanderous remarks, or who shall become boisterous while addressing the GPAC, shall be forthwith barred from future audience before the GPAC, unless permission to continue be granted by the Chairperson.

12. The Chairperson, or majority of the members present, may at any time request that a police officer be present to enforce order and decorum. The Chairperson or such majority may request that the police officer eject from the place of meeting or place under arrest, any person who violates the order and decorum of the meeting.

13. In the event that any meeting is willfully interrupted so as to render the orderly conduct of such meeting unfeasible and order cannot be restored by the removal of individuals willfully interrupting the meeting, the GPAC may order the meeting room cleared and continue its session in accordance with the provisions of Government Code subsection 54957.9 and any amendments.
STATE OF CALIFORNIA )
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES )  SS
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AFFIDAVIT OF POSTING

In compliance with the Brown Act, the following materials have been posted at the locations indicated below.

Legislative Body General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC)
Posting Type Regular Meeting Agenda
Posting Locations 415 Diamond Street, Redondo Beach, CA 90277
✓ City Clerk’s Counter, Door “1”
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Meeting Date & Time Thursday May 30, 2019  6:30 p.m.

As Planning Analyst of the City of Redondo Beach, I declare, under penalty of perjury, the document noted above was posted at the date displayed below.

Lina Portolese, Planning Analyst

Date: May 23, 2019
OPENING SESSION

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.

ROLL CALL
Members Present: Chrzan, Eller, Funabashi, Gaddis (arrived 6:39 pm), Glad, Hannon, Hashmi, Kilroy, Lamb (arrived 6:37 pm), Light, Ludwig, McKenzie, Moses (arrived 6:40 pm), Nafissi, Samaras (arrived 6:35 pm), Simpson, Solomon, Stoddet, Szymanski, Waller (arrived 7:00 pm), Chair Biro

Members Absent: Bajaj, Kartounian, Pinzler, Sanchez, Turner, Voisey

Officials Present: Brandy Forbes, Community Development Director
Sean Scully, Planning Manager
Lina Portolese, Planning Analyst
Camy Byrd, Recording Secretary

Consultants Present: Wendy Nowak, PlaceWorks

SALUTE TO THE FLAG
Member Solomon led those assembled in a Salute to the Flag.

APPROVAL OF ORDER OF AGENDA

CONSENT CALENDAR

4. APPROVAL OF AFFIDAVIT OF POSTING for the General Plan Advisory Committee Regular Meeting of April 25, 2019.

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR THE GENERAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE REGULAR MEETING for March 7, 2019.

Motion made by Member Eller, seconded by Member Szmanski to approve the Consent Calendar as presented.

PUBLIC COMMENT – 1ST SESSION

Holly Osborne, resident, noted that the District 5 option received the most votes, however, when the item was discussed, the consensus was that the area should not be industrial. She also noted that she didn’t think the metro-based housing should be there and she thought it was removed, but it was put back in and it got the most votes. She said the problem is things are left in and voted on by people who are not informed.

Wayne Craig, District 1, spoke about issues going on within GPAC Commission members and what happens when their final decision is so biased that when it comes to vote by the people, it doesn’t pass. He mentioned Senate Bill SB 550 could pass the legislature which could allow the State to override the local zoning, and allow high density buildings to be built ¼ mile from the
transportation corridor. The structures would impact all of PCH, from El Segundo to Torrance, and can be 45’ tall, with the potential to be 70’ tall if it is low income housing. They may have little to no parking, some only requiring 25 parking spaces per building. He asked them to think of the citizens of Redondo Beach rather than the developers.

Jim Rosenberger, Hermosa Beach resident, said the Land Rover space at 190th and PCH has been empty for a long time and affects Hermosa Beach and Redondo Beach. He suggested low income or senior housing for the spot and working with the City of Hermosa Beach.

ITEMS FOR PRESENTATION, DISCUSSION, OR ACTION

6. Announcements and Updates
   a. General Updates
      i. Update: Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) Ordinance

Community Development Director Forbes stated that the Accessory Dwelling Unit Ordinance was adopted at the last City Council meeting, and will become effective May 16, 2019. Anybody who is in the pipeline needs to be vested under the state regulations and the applicant would need to have their building permit by May 15th, so they need to be well into their process. Regulations that the City has adopted makes more clarifications about minimum lot size and restrictions so there is not the ability to build above the garages.

   ii. Staff Update – Artesia Corridor Parklettes/Streetlets

Planning Manager Scully said staff met with several department heads regarding the feasibility of parklettes/streetlets. He said they initially looked at the streets that T’d into Artesia Boulevard, but none of the intersections worked due to access to the adjacent commercial businesses. The improvements would be minimal, essentially barricading it off with planters or bollards and painting it, creating an active open public space. They looked at every Artesia Boulevard intersection, from Aviation to the SCE right-of-way. The two locations that were most viable were 1) the west end of the south leg of Green Lane and 2) McKay Lane.

In response to Member Lamb regarding the process, Planning Manager Scully said staff would take general concepts to City Council to see if there is support. If they agree to fund it, it would be a separate project.

Ms. Nowak said the GPAC members and staff seemed excited about this option, so they met to discuss it. The two locations look the best at the moment.

Member Samaras commended staff for being creative and finding places to put in parklettes. If these cater to residents, then another spot would be the first parallel street off Artesia.

Member Eller asked if the location of Madison Elementary which is in a high traffic area, one block north would be an issue. Planning Manager Scully said it could be an issue, the bigger circulation patterns would be examined.

In response to Member Lamb regarding the GPAC participating in the implementation process, Ms. Nowak said that would be part of the general plan, so they will have goals, policies, and a separate document that is called implementation action items. That will show how they plan to implement goals, short term/long term and then City Council will review them.

Member Glad said she is interested in open space, especially in North Redondo where the lots are smaller and people don’t have space, but she would not take her kids to a parklette like that. She said it is like a band-aid, not solving the problem and not providing the kind of experience
most families are looking for when they are looking for green space for their kids to play. It seems like a half-hearted effort to find some green space because there aren’t a lot of other options that are being seriously considered.

Community Development Director Forbes said this would not replace the open space goals. This is additional, to provide some outdoor space, trying to keep the connectivity, walkability and flow in the community. It would be under the Artesia/Aviation plan, rather than the open space plan.

Ms. Nowak said tonight’s goal is to interpret and understand if the results that came out show how land uses should be applied and how to refine them. The intent of the next meeting will be to come back with the translation map, which is the updated land use map, with the new definitions and feedback received for the corridors. There will be two more meetings talking about and getting consensus on the land use map, which will then go to the Planning Commission and City Council. The remainder of the meetings are related to the goals and policies, where she will work with staff to draft up a review for each of the goals and elements.

In response to Member Lamb regarding financial feasibility, Ms. Nowak said they would do a fiscal analysis once they get direction from City Council. If it is not financially feasible, they would share it with City Council, along with suggestions for revisions.

Member Gaddis asked if the land use decisions that are being recommended can be measured against the guided principles that were set aside.

Ms. Nowak suggested going through the different options, seeing where everyone is on them, and if they meet the guided principles. She said they are aware of the new legislation that is coming out.

They received 531 responses from the survey, the majority living in North Redondo Beach with a pretty balanced age.

In response to Member Eller, Ms. Nowak said she could look at the population split of North and South Redondo.

7. Small and Large Group Discussion: Overview of Survey Results and Discussion of Draft Land Use Designations for Focus Areas (small group exercise with report out to the group)

Overall on the survey, people had concerns about traffic, where mixed use would go, few comments about compatibility with putting housing along corridors due to noise. Each area will include specific concerns that people wrote in.

ARTEZIA BOULEVARD

The general plan currently allows small scale commercial on the majority of the corridor, mixed use on the west end.

- Option A - mixed use at the gateways, with office and retail in the middle.
- Option B - commercial and office corridor. The responses showed the majority was for the mixed use at the gateway.

The feedback from the public was similar to what the Committee spoke about - approved mix of stores, appearance of the corridor, landscaping, fixing traffic flows, more pedestrian friendly, added opportunity for parks and open space, bike route, parking lot, rebranded Redondo Beach Boulevard, requiring sustainability improvements.
In response to Member Szymanski regarding the facades, Ms. Nowak said they wouldn’t get into the specifics of what the facades look like. The City cannot create a business improvement district, but they can encourage the businesses to do that. The pedestrian focus would be on the corridor, the corridor would evolve organically over time. There wasn’t a need for a lot of change to development standards or intensity to incentivize new development with the exception of allowing for an increase in FAR for retail and office type uses and turnover of those uses. The other discussion was the possibility of reducing parking standards in this area. What options could be considered for parking, for example, off-site parking or Uber, that would get people to walk, bike.

- Should Artesia should have a pedestrian focus?
- Should the corridor allow mixed use in the entire corridor to be able to respond to changing market conditions and create viable walking space throughout?
- Would it be ground floor retail or some sort of restaurant with residential above. This was not one of the two options that the community had voted on, it evolved into this version.
- If residential is allowed, where would it be?
- Should the corridor be mixed use and office. If the commercial option is selected, by what name and definition? Commercial flex retail instead of commercial flex office would allow for primary use rather than office.
- Confirm the discussion with increasing the FAR to help incentivize restaurants and retail uses to redevelop there.
- Two options to choose from for land use – 1. mixed use on entire thing. 2. mixed use, commercial something, mixed use. The new name for ‘commercial’ is commercial flex, so it would need to be either commercial flex retail or commercial flex office.

Member McKenzie asked why it needs to be defined if they want it to develop organically and not limit it.

Ms. Nowak said it would then be mixed use which would mean any use, residential or commercial. If they say the middle can only be commercial, restaurant or retail, then it has to be commercial flex office or retail.

Member Light said this denies the whole fiscal reality of mixed use, commercial, mixed use. 1600-1800 PCH is one of the biggest spaces that has been empty for over a year, their historical occupancy rate is under 75% and anyone who is there under performs, but their residential sells out right away. With State Bill 550 turning any land that isn't already zoned residential, it is basically saying it doesn't matter what it is zoned for, it will be for housing. The City will lose control.

Ms. Nowak said everyone did not like the words ‘mixed use’. The Committee has a lot of areas where they want to allow the flexibility of office or retail. She clarified when residential is allowed and when it is not, the only time it would considered ‘mixed use’ is if it is residential and something.

Member Samaras made the following comments:
- Make sure residents will have easy access to the commercial area
- Suggested keeping it to gateways rather than the entire corridor
- Regarding the FAR increase, it makes sense for non-residential uses
- Most residents bring up traffic – it is the responsibility of the Committee and staff to demonstrate alternative transportation solutions, otherwise it will be hard to convince people that it is a good idea.

Member Simpson clarified that two defined options were presented to the public. One is mixed use at each end, and the other is no mixed use except in one small area where it currently exists and all the rest would be commercial.
Ms. Nowak replied that a third option developed because of the BAE economic analysis where she asked if they want to limit the options long term, and not allow residential in the middle of the barbell. If so, there would only be two uses rather than three to choose from.

Member Simpson asked for further clarification as to how answering those questions goes to one or the other.

Ms. Nowak said if they picked mixed use, residential is allowed in the corridor, it would be Option A; mixed use all the way through would be another interpretation of Option A.

Member Solomon said if the general idea is to make it a pedestrian focused boulevard, how is that created? Is it created through traffic litigation procedures, for example, road diets to get people to slow down, pull over and park? Is it done by adding mixed use commercial flex, or retail and residential? If the main idea is a pedestrian focused area, who will stop and slow down, and what is the best way of creating it? Which of these options create that environment.

Community Development Director Forbes addressed the traffic concerns and the pedestrian friendly concept. She said there have been conversations with Public Works regarding adjusting the streets with the current widths, making it more pedestrian friendly, and parklettes/streetlets. That can be another initiative that comes as a recommendation for the City to pursue different policies to make this a more pedestrian friendly neighborhood area. Regarding the uses, the options that came forward were based on what could be done to make this a more active corridor.

Member Kilroy said if he could wave a magic wand on Artesia Boulevard, it would be office space on the second floor, retail on the ground floor, eliminating any residential. He said they talked about horizontal mixed use which it already is. Adding mixed residential will skew the development. Residential will be the financial driver. He doesn’t think anything should be more than two stories and is against residential. There is a 45’ height limit. He thinks a walkable, pedestrian boulevard with office space and retail can be achieved. He suggests designating the whole thing as it is, letting the marketplace decide whether it is office or retail.

Ms. Nowak said when they were going through some areas to capture the Committee’s feedback, they had said to call it commercial flex. It says office primary in some cases and retail primary in others.

Member Gaddis said if anyone has any doubt whether there is enough residential density in that neighborhood, drive down Mathews Avenue from Aviation Boulevard to Inglewood Avenue, to see how much residential there is. Montecito has turned Mathews into a dark canyon, because they get no sun back there. Artesia Blvd should not be turned into that.

Member Simpson made note that the option most favored on the survey is once again the option that is getting the most push back from those affected, similar to the 190th Street option.

Member Eller noted that the GPAC narrowed it down to two options, and adding a third now would set the process back. GPAC should vote on only the two options.

Member Lamb asked if the commercial and office combination precludes neighborhood commercial.

Member Glad said in the office versus retail, if the market dictates how the spaces are used, it would be more productive. Given the high traffic volume on here, and trying to make this a pedestrian friendly corridor, should the possibility of hotel stay in, or should it be taken out?

Member Light said if the trip generation for hotels is looked at, it is less than for restaurants. He said traffic is already bad and hotels bring in City revenue. He thinks it should be left to the market.
Member Glad said voters were pretty clear they want to make this pedestrian friendly, want neighborhood survey. They want things that serve that need, not sure about hotels versus restaurants and commercial.

Ms. Nowak said if it is neighborhood surveying, does that mean only local? A hotel could be there and be pedestrian friendly. Ideally it is market driven, focusing on connectivity, locals want to come so they walk there — so don’t want to be specific about what comes in now, that is what the zoning would do. If the hotel came in, for some reason it was being permitted, that would be the time to say this isn’t fitting in the community.

Member Samaras agreed with taking the hotel out. He stated once it’s before the Planning Commission, it’s too late, your hands are tied if the zoning allows it. All that can be done is to place conditions on the development.

Community Development Director Forbes said it is important to be concerned about that, but the point is that it is pedestrian friendly. That is where it is suggesting the design guideline, and then with those in place there will be something that is requiring that pedestrian connectivity.

Member Funabashi noted that Artesia Boulevard is zoned for mixed use and asked if the one mixed use that includes residential on Artesia, are factored into the housing numbers? Would those potential units be lost? If we rezone it, it eliminates the residential.

Ms. Nowak confirmed it would factor into net loss for housing capacity.

Member Funabashi asked if that changes, does that mean that number would have to be found somewhere else?

Ms. Nowak said there are not a lot of areas in the city that allow creativity, the focus areas are right here.

In response to Member Gaddis, staff stated that only parcels at the western end of Artesia are currently zoned mixed-use.

In response to Member Chrzan, Ms. Nowak said she envisions each one will restructure the land use element of the general plan, and there will be a description of the ‘personality type’ of each corridor and the intent of what each corridor should be. Everything will be nuanced to what is preferred in that area, and they are taking notes on what the committee wants.

In response to Member Gaddis regarding the commercial designation on Artesia Boulevard, Ms. Nowak said it does allow for retail or office.

Member Gaddis clarified that it is zoned mixed use, which is essentially Option B. Planning Manager Scully said that is correct.

Member Gaddis asked if one of the choices is to leave the zoning alone.

Ms. Nowak said yes, they could leave the general plan alone. The current general plan is mixed use, commercial, more of the neighborhood commercial.

Member Ludwig stated that the zoning should remain flexible to accommodate market demand over the next 20 years.
Ms. Nowak took a vote:
Option A – mixed use on both ends - 3
Option B - commercial and office, getting rid of existing mixed use – 16

Member Simpson said he thinks general consideration highlights should be reflective going forward.

Ms. Nowak said they are not saying commercial flex or office, just saying it is commercial flex.

Ms. Nowak asked if everyone agrees with prioritizing neighborhood serving uses to describe the area. It wouldn't change in the land use definition, but when describing the area it will be included.

Member Glad explained that when things go to the Planning Commission, if they meet the requirements, there is not a lot the Commission can do except approve it, even if they have concerns or issues about it.

Ms. Nowak said because the mixed use has been taken off, another spot would have to be found for those units. The mixed use allows for housing, so the housing element looks at the ability to accommodate the housing, not constructing it.

In response to Member Kilroy asking if the ADU counts towards RHNA, Planning Manager Scully said it does.

Member Szymanski said it shows maximum of .5.

**AVIATION BOULEVARD**

Ms. Nowak said this is a low-rise commercial village. This corridor is narrower than Artesia Boulevard, making it a little more challenging. The current general plan has multi-family residential in this area. Artesia Boulevard is slated to be pedestrian friendly, while this is slated to be more auto/highway oriented. Everything is still walkable but not to the same degree as on Artesia.

Option A was allowing some changes from commercial to straightforward office. This was the new definition where office only would be allowed which is very limiting and may be tough based on changing market conditions.

Member Simpson added also based on what is there now which is a fairly successful retail shopping center.

Ms. Nowak said the other thing that it allows on Option A is a mixed use on half of the corridor. Option B allows for just commercial and office, like on the last one for Artesia. The results of this one was to allow for some mixed use on the west side of the street and leaving residential the way it is. The second option that was not as popular was to make the whole corridor office.

Some of the feedback from the survey was if Option A is selected, instead of doing office in the top corner, preserve the commercial so it isn't office only. Some people said why not make both sides of the street mixed use. If Option B was selected, it is the same thing. Everybody was saying don't just put office, try to mix it up a bit to allow flexibility for the market.

Based upon conversations and measuring the lot depths, they noticed the lots on this side are 85' feet, which is pretty shallow. Though one of the options was mixed use down the whole corridor, it might not pencil here. For some of these properties, it might not make sense to put in mixed use.
Member Eller said both options look bad and proposed voting to have one of the options be leave it as is.

Ms. Nowak said the option to keep it as is, on the survey was 21%; Option A is commercial office and mixed use. Option A was the one that won, however, if the section that is taken out is too shallow for the mixed use, Option A would be to leave the corridor alone, and do some mixed use in some of the areas that would allow for that.

Member Funabashi said in theory, you would get housing numbers that will never get built.

Member Glad said speaking as someone who lives in that general neighborhood and deals with the density in there, she thinks adding a residential component in there and increasing that density is not a good idea. The neighborhood has been excited about some of the turnover in the commercial businesses that are really focused on the needs of the residents in that area – a new coffee shop, new restaurant, the things that they are walking to from that neighborhood, doing exactly what they want people to do. Changing it to office only is contrary to what the people want. The commercial center on the corner is constantly busy with a gas station, community serving drug stores, and dry cleaners. She wants an option to keep it as is.

Member Moses said there are three brand new office buildings, one less than a year old, and they are all empty.

Member Glad said they are medical type office buildings, which all had major facelifts and they are all sitting there empty.

Ms. Nowak noted that on the options it was leaving this side alone, as the commercial and office, focusing on what happens on the other corners.

Member Lamb lives in the area and agrees that it is in transition and that is going to work in favor of the residents.

Ms. Nowak took a vote:
Leave it alone – 18
Option A – Member Nafissi

Chair Biro said it is pretty powerful to see such a strong vote to leave it as is. He thinks it should include reasons why they want to leave it as is. For example, it is an odd mix, however, that is what is preferred.

Member Glad said if you look at the comments for people who voted for Option A, it was Option A, but essentially leave it as is.

Member Glad said the lots in that area are a lot of tall and skinnys, where there are no yards or green space. She is in favor of encouraging parklettes and trying to have some sort of open space to increase pedestrian friendly areas. There are major traffic issues and cut through traffic – pedestrian friendly would be the best.

**TORRANCE BOULEVARD**

Ms. Nowak said the general plan allows for some vertical mixed use that matches the other uses. It was a mix of two different types of commercial. One parcel they talked about keeping single family residential would be non-conforming. If there is residential in certain properties, it could be conforming. Option A was more intense resale near PCH and providing a cluster of office only. Comingling was where everyone was going.
Thirty-five open ended responses were received. One-third said some residential should go in this corridor. Comments included making it more pedestrian friendly and walkable, and transit service. One thing that was mentioned because it is a business district, is that it’s a dead zone for cell service.

Option B was commercial flex office primary. Or are we saying just keep commercial flex. If the definition says it can remain conforming, should the whole corridor remain commercial flex. There are two ways it can be conforming – the land use would be residential which is what it is, or it can be the same as the rest of the corridor, and if there is existing residential there already, it is considered conforming.

Multiple people responded for the latter.

Ms. Nowak noted Option B was chosen.

Planning Manager Scully said that is a little vacant City owned lot. A PF can be done, it is residentially zoned.

Member Light said it not residential, it’s C-2, there is an illegal shed back there.

Member Szymanski said it is called a residential lot, there are three homes there.

Planning Manager Scully noted that it should be changed to a Public Facility Designation.

Ms. Nowak took a vote:
Unanimous - 19/19

Chair Biro asked when the balance will take place for units that are lost for the unit reduction, how it will be tallied, and what the process will be to reincorporate that in.

Ms. Nowak said they will bring the map to the next meeting, going through all the numbers, indicating the reduced units and accessory dwelling locations.

Chair Biro asked if it will be based on each one that is final selected, or a blanket through the City based on ADU’s now counting additional units or being counted in as part of this effort.

Ms. Nowak said it would be both. They will go through all the corridors, add up and tally where all the changes are, then they will see how the numbers changed citywide.

**PCH NORTH**

Ms. Nowak said there is currently a mix of commercial restaurants and retail. The refined current general plan which everyone picked would be commercial and office, cleaning the area up. It would be better to be permitted use in a commercial office, rather than making it commercial and having to go back and rezone it.

Member Gaddis said there was a dirt lot that tried to sneak through zoning as a hotel, across the street from the powerplant. There are pressurized gas pipes underneath the right-of-way where the power lines are, and it can’t be dug into. The dirt lot would be good for a multi-story parking garage if a park is in the area. He suggested being careful rezoning that.

Ms. Nowak clarified the point in carving out the dirt lot is to keep it industrial.

Member Gaddis said that would allow the ability to rezone it later to what is going to serve all these purposes in the community.
Ms. Nowak said the question becomes are the commercial and office buildings moved to the other side of the street. Originally the intent was about connectivity to the neighborhood, but maybe the neighborhood connectivity is not as critical for this corridor. With the exception of the multi-family that would stay, the suggestion is that these pieces that were originally identified as neighborhood serving commercial, could be the commercial/office combo.

Member Gaddis said what is likely to happen with the right-of-way under the powerlines, is SCE will lease the land cheap to the City so essentially it will be park.

Ms. Nowak said typically parks are allowed in industrial, if it is an opportunity for a parking structure to get more people in one spot to have access to these amenities, then it should be left available.

Member Kilroy said something should be done with the dirt lot, even if it is zoned as a public park - not doing anything with it creates its own problems down the road.

Member Gaddis asked if there is some way to do it so nothing commercial would be developed for now.

Ms. Nowak said instead of doing it in land use designation, mark it as a priority or an area to explore in the open space element.

Community Development Director Forbes said she thinks it is appropriate to look at the open space component of it making that recommendation. She is concerned with overlay, or a recommendation of this is industrial, allowing parks.

Ms. Nowak said they want to allow for flexibility, but from a land use perspective, parks are hard.

Member Solomon said the AES site is 50+ acres and when it gets developed it is going to be a substantial park, and it will need public parking. He suggests leaving it flexible to be open space plan.

Member Chrzan said they don’t want it to be a hotel, but want the flexibility to have a decent plan, because it is very much an entrance to Redondo Beach.

Ms. Nowak said industrial does not allow for hotels.

Community Development Director Forbes said industrial zoning for this location allows parks, but not parking garages. There could be a recommendation to amend the industrial but zoning to allow parking garages.

Member Light agreed with the last part, leaving the city property. If doing an overlay, it should be a mini storage.

Ms. Nowak said they want to expand the focus area, this would be that commercial flex area.

Member Light asked if mini storage is allowed in commercial flex.

Ms. Nowak said maybe the whole thing should be industrial, the overlay is not being done now. It would be industrial allowing for parks, but not a parking structure. They will come back with different ways to address it.

Member Lamb said comprehensive language would be included regarding what is expected or want they want to see.
Ms. Nowak said this could be one of the changes in the corridor. If one parcel is being taken, it is the same thing as when the residential one was cleaned up through the whole corridor.

Member Moses said he doesn’t see any incentive for the current tenant to change anything he is doing. The idea of rezoning the city is to incentivize change.

Ms. Nowak wanted to vote on leaving it alone with the same land use designation, commercial flex, institutional, with direction saying that parking should be prioritized in the industrial area to help create connectivity and provide services to the other amenities coming in later.

Ms. Nowak took a vote:
Vote - 18-1

Member Chrzan said she doesn’t think the purple one should be picked on.

Ms. Nowak said the conversation about the industrial was no hotel, leaving it and adding the parking. They are coming back with options for this other area.

Member Chrzan said she agrees with what was voted on east of Catalina.

Ms. Nowak said the vote is 17-2.

**PCH CENTRAL**

Ms. Nowak said the general plan currently allows for high density residential, mixed use, commercial, commercial flex. Option C was the one most people chose, mixed use corridor. Other options were to have commercial use corridor or keep current general plan and refine it. She noted that if the general plan is kept with no changes and combined with refining the general plan a little, it would be at 39.4%. The two to talk about is leaving it as is, or refining it with mixed use.

Option A was some refinement - institutional uses, some multi-family residential, commercial office combination in the middle, a mix of multi-family and neighborhood serving commercial.

The commercial flex corridor, the C1 and C2 was the neighborhood corridor definition. It should be renamed as neighborhood commercial instead of commercial flex corridor. Heading south it is smaller scale retail type offices that are neighborhood oriented.

Option C allowed residential all the way down, looking at the neighborhood serving commercial on the south side. This helps because there can be horizontal or vertical mixed use with multi-family in there and that can be added.

Member Light said although that is what the survey says, when they tried to put mixed use in that area, the neighborhood was very opposed to it. It is already bad because there are so many driveways entering onto PCH and it slows down traffic. It will also ruin views. This is already a commercially challenged corridor, and commercial under residential just doesn't work in Redondo Beach.

Ms. Nowak said the concern there is a lot of commercial and too much vacancy. She suggested integrating residential would reduce some of the commercial vacancy. Lot depths are deeper, so mixed use could be accommodated. Additional feedback was to improve pedestrian and bike safety and trying to preserve the beach town character.

Member Szymanski asked if anybody drives through that area and feels like they are in a beach town.
Member Gaddis said the east side of PCH has ocean views and they don’t want 45’ buildings blocking the beach views.

Member Solomon noted that the area on PCH and Torrance Blvd is very congested. The setbacks for commercial pieces, short term pockets going north/south create bad choke points. He asked if there is anything going on with the property owners to open that up.

Planning Manager Scully said there are acquisitions and street designs for right turn pockets going north and south.

Member Solomon clarified they might have deceleration lanes and other feeder pockets that are created in and around that area with deep lots for consideration.

Member Kilroy said that the deceleration lane at the CVS property was acquired 15 years ago and a bill remains for that lane. A large part of it has to do with Caltrans.

Member Lamb said people like the low density, low height, funkiness in Redondo Beach and it is a cultural quality that people look forward to.

Member Light said there is some affordable housing that looks like little bungalows, and a little area that looks like a beach town. The owner wanted to come in and bulldoze it all, put in commercial on the first floor and two stories of residential. The whole community came out on both sides of the street and it got vetoed.

In response to Ms. Nowak regarding land use, Member Light said it preserves residential that was there, and added commercial flex in the middle.

Ms. Nowak said it is like Option A, refined a bit.

Member Light said don’t get rid of those units, the community likes those.

Community Development Director Forbes said the FAR difference between neighborhood commercial and commercial office flex is 1 vs .5.

Ms. Nowak said scale wise it is probably more neighborhood commercial size. Lots are a little deeper, as they get narrower there is a smaller FAR.

Member Nafissi cautioned the group to be wary of the survey results, and the decisions that they are making. The community was asked what they want, then recommending something different. She said at the end of this process, when it is submitted to vote and it gets voted down, nobody in the room should be shocked that it is voted down. She reminded them to think about what they are doing and to review the survey results, looking at what the community is doing. The last vote was completely against the community.

Ms. Nowak said it is a good point, and tough challenge. The GPAC is to interpret the community and it has to go to a vote.

Member Eller said the question is if these changes are made and there are 60% who didn’t vote for Option C, how is their advocacy captured.

Ms. Nowak said they could pass along comments explaining the GPAC was going back and forth and their thoughts and explanations forwarded along to City Council to decide.
Member Light asked if the committee’s explanations and recommendations could be included when it goes out to the community for vote.

Ms. Nowak said it is the group's job to interpret, discuss the information, debate and decide what is the most appropriate.

Community Development Director Forbes said they have information that the public might not have been aware of when they were voting on the survey.

Member Simpson said they are making the recommendation for the Planning Commission who may change it substantially and then it will go to City Council. Before it goes to the voting public, it may be changed substantially, and he thinks their job throughout the process is to explain their actions and convince people to vote for it.

Member Eller said based on the discussion, he switched his vote. When he responded to the survey, he had different answers and this dialogue has helped. Everyone voted for mixed use because everything goes, and everyone votes for it because they don't really understand what goes along with it.

Member Szymanski agreed with Member Eller and said it came up in the discussion how it might be undesirable to do mixed use with residential on top, and he thinks that is a general theme that could be played back. With the stuff going on with State right now, the City may find itself in that situation anyways, so why exacerbate it now.

Member Moses said he voted for mixed use because it represents change, but looking at the remodeled Smart n Final, and the empty car lot, and the mismatch that's down there, it's not working. Refining it now would not fix or incentivize anything.

Member Samaras said perhaps PCH had something down the middle leaving it commercial flex in the middle, partly supporting mixed use is also a solution.

Member Moses said lots don't allow for that parking, existing businesses can't change what they do because they don't have any parking.

Member Solomon said it’s not that they can't change, but that the property owners aren't incentivized. He doesn't want to create a situation where they are imagining that zoning it this different way will incentivize beyond where they are now. He thinks if they tweak it, they can still have that demand and allow flexibility there.

Member Moses said he doesn't see enough of an incentive here and sees this as an opportunity to change what it is.

Member Lamb said the assumption here is that changing the zoning is going to somehow magically up the desirability of the area. She said maybe there are some other elements at play in that corridor that don't have to do with zoning and doesn't think it is the best option for change in the area.

Member Simpson noted Option A would be a pretty viable option, some areas zoned multi-family residential, horizontal mixed use.

Ms. Nowak said that would allow more flexibility on all parts - Option A with change to neighborhood commercial.

Per Member Moses’ request to see changing to neighborhood commercial, Ms. Nowak took a vote:
Vote – 17/1 with Chair Biro abstaining.

Member Glad said the residents don't want the zoning to be changing in a way that allows 4-5 story buildings. She said she cannot vote.

Ms. Nowak said they generally like to keep heights out of the general plan because that's for zoning. Heights in mixed use go up to four stories, 45’. Maximum height for multi-family is two stories, 30’.

Ms. Nowack took a vote:
Option A with two stories, or 30’: Vote - 13
Option C – mixed use, 45’: Vote – 2
Abstained: 4

Member Kilroy said he wants an option for mixed use, although he is not sure he would want Option C with 30’ mixed use - one residential unit above the retail or commercial. He is in favor of single story residential for many different reasons. While he doesn’t support that throughout PCH, or anywhere, it is a good option to have.

Chair Biro suggested modifying Option C with a height limit of 30’ and seeing what the vote looks like.

Ms. Nowak said Option D, which is Option C allowing for vertical and horizontal mixed use with height maximum of 30’. Vote – 10.

Option A – with neighborhood commercial change at top: Vote - 8
Option C – 45’: Vote – 0
Option D – mixed use, height maximum of 30’: Vote - 11

Member Light said the beachiest parts of PCH that exist today will be ruined and people in districts 1 and 2 are going to be mad.

Ms. Nowak said that is why it will go to the Planning Commission and City Council for them to debate.

Member Chrzan said she wants to preserve the single family and cottages, which doesn't sound like it is in any of the options.

Chair Biro said the rest of the land use will be continued to the next meeting.

8. Next Steps: Tentative Schedule and Topics for Remaining Meetings

PUBLIC COMMENT – 2ND SECTION

Holly Osborne said at the last meeting she asked for bar graphs to be done by zip codes, 90277 & 90278. They broke it down overall, but didn't include the individual options. The people in the north might have made dumb votes for options in the south and vice versa. She wonders if there is a correlation in what was picked tonight, what people in the correct zip code would have voted for. If it is, then there is a lot stronger defense of what was voted for.

Planning Manager Scully explained that each question on the survey is not broken down by zip code.

Ms. Osborne said if commercial property is changed to mixed use, the value will be jacked up, someone will buy it and put residential on it because that’s where they make the money. She is
against zoning from commercial to mixed use because it would kill the small stores they are trying to preserve.

Wayne Craig, District 1, said the Committee almost voted for what SB 50 is going to cause - 45’ high. He said although it was lowered, people are going to freak about this. He wants to start out right. If it goes to the Planning Commission, they would tweak it more and then it would go to City Council and get worse on top of that. He believes it is a bad idea and it isn’t going to fly. He said the City doesn’t want mixed use, it is not going to go through, and it will back fire.

Matthew Henley, District 3, lives on Standard Avenue said where options A and B were not fantastic, he feels something else should have been considered. The businesses on Artesia and Aviation don’t draw him out of the house, so he feels it wasn’t well utilized. Regarding the discussion at the last meeting regarding parklettes, or closing off streets to have common space for people, greatly impacts how the neighborhood feels or how many people come out. A parking garage to alleviate parking on some areas helps the neighborhood feel rather than zoning. This whole vision is 20-30 years, not now. Reconsider the longer vision.

Member Glad said the comments coming from the residents are density concerns, traffic, and green space. She said the committee is thinking about commercial, forgetting about making the neighborhoods walkable and livable, and changing it into what the residents want to live in. She said when they are looking at zoning mixed use, commercial, they are missing that picture.

Member Light commented that some Committee members are being bombarded with CA public records requests that are onerous asking for any emails related to certain individuals, from the time they joined this committee. It has been two years now, about stuff that has nothing to do with this committee. He wants everyone to be aware there is a certain element of the public trying to shut down the ones who are on the “slow growth” side by bombarding them with requests, just more intimidation from the other side. He also noted that they are not written by a community member.

Member Nafissi suggesting speaking to Mike Webb before sharing any public records.

Member Light said Mike Webb said to give them all, but two years of emails is a lot. He wants to make people aware that there are certain pressures underside. What is really onerous is when city officials have this, they have the city email, this is his personal email.

**GPAC MEMBERS REFERRAL TO STAFF**

Member Nafissi requested staff share the future options on social media and capture any options underneath and bring them in to share with the committee. She would like the items they will vote on to be on social media to receive more input that can be taken into consideration. Sharing the information on Facebook is one opportunity to get more feedback.

Ms. Nowak clarified that social media will be giving people a heads-up on what will be discussed at the meeting, not asking people to re-vote.

Member Light said he would like the option that was just voted on to show which properties that now have residential zoning that didn’t out of the current zoning so they would know what SB50 would apply to, that it currently does not. Secondly, he would like to see the analysis of what density bonus if they put in affordable housing, because if they do he thinks that will bump it back up to 45’.

In response to Member Light regarding the density threshold, Community Development Director Forbes said with the density bonus it isn’t just the additional units, they can get certain concessions, and that includes height.
Member Chrzan said based on the changes that were made, the close vote and the information that was asked for, she feels like that should be talked about more at the next meeting.

Chair Biro said they will have the ability to have another conversation about it again, don't have to rush it. He said they could stay until 10:30 p.m., but they didn't agree to that today. He said they will reconvene on May 30.

Ms. Nowak said the team will regroup and target May 30, however, if there is extra research, they may need a little more time. She asked if they would be open to scheduling a later date.

Chair Biro said most people plan for the last Thursday of every month and maybe that is why some didn’t make it to the last meeting. He suggested finishing the items from this meeting on May 30 and continue the concerns to a later date.

Community Director Forbes said she doesn’t have the budget to add another GPAC meeting. She went back to the second contract and there are a limited number of meetings. She would rather get to those and accomplish the Artesia/Aviation area and be as productive as possible because a lot of prep goes into the meetings.

Member Lamb suggested considering a Saturday meeting so there is an appropriate amount of time to make the decisions.

Chair Biro asked if Ms. Nowak needs June 30.

Ms. Nowak said she needs to reassess. She said there is a lot on their plates for three weeks from now. If they can’t get to it by May 30, it would be pushed to June 30.

In response to Chair Biro, Ms. Nowak said she will let staff know in two weeks if the meeting date needs to be changed.

**VIII. ADJOURNMENT – 9:39 p.m.**

Motion by Member Solomon, seconded by Member Chrzan, to adjourn the meeting at 9:39 p.m. to a Regular Meeting to be held at 6:30 p.m. on Thursday, May 30, 2019, in the Redondo Beach Public Library, Second Floor Meeting Room, 303 N. Pacific Coast Highway, Redondo Beach, CA 90277. Motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

_________________________________
Brandy Forbes
Community Development Director