ARTESIA BOULEVARD

Voting Results: Option A – 3; Option B – 16

- GPAC selected Option B for Artesia Boulevard, which allows for commercial and office uses throughout the corridor (no mixed use; however existing mixed use may remain and will not be considered non-conforming).

- The GPAC preferred to allow for the area to evolve organically over time versus creating significant changes to (or increases in) the area’s development capacity to prompt change. The group heard feedback from the economic feasibility consultant and property/business owners along Artesia Blvd. that a slight increase in FAR (from 0.50 FAR to 0.60 FAR, for example) would provide the added development capacity needed to incentivize property owners to reinvest and redevelop existing commercial uses that have reached the end of their useful lifespan.

- The group was generally opposed to increasing building heights above three stories to accommodate new residential uses, and expressed concern regarding the effect the additional stories would have on the adjacent residential uses and also expressed concern that the scale of taller buildings would alter the aesthetic character of the existing neighborhood.

- In addition, a development feasibility study was conducted for the Artesia Aviation Area Plan that concluded the shallow lot depths and high land values along Artesia Blvd. significantly limited near term redevelopment of the corridor unless the development standards allowed for additional height (e.g. 4 stories). The study determined that residential and mixed-use development with three stories or fewer was generally not financially feasible in the near term.

- In their discussions related to housing and why that was not selected for the corridor, GPAC also expressed concerns about the impacts existing and future housing legislation could have on the allowable heights in the area (density bonus laws, potential impacts of SB 50) and determined that the focus of the corridor should be primarily restaurant and office focused with some general retail and service commercial, catering to the adjacent neighborhoods and creating connectivity to the adjacent residential uses.

- The group provided additional policy and/or implementation measures focused on:
  - A pedestrian-focused/priority environment
  - Investigating a bike lane and possibly scooter access along Artesia
  - Enhancing physical connections to the adjacent community and adjacent residential neighborhoods
  - Alternative streetscape and street section design options
  - Exploring opportunities to create temporary or permanent gathering spaces along the corridor (streetlet/parklet in a portion of select street rights-of-way that run perpendicular to Artesia Blvd.). Spaces could be tried out temporarily and permanently installed if they are actively used by the community and funding could be secured to install and maintain.
AVIATION BOULEVARD

Vote: Keep current GP – 18; Option A – 1; Option B – 0

- GPAC preferred to keep the current General Plan Land Uses with the existing mix of commercial (includes office) and multifamily uses shown in the corridor.

- GPAC observed that in recent years this focus area is organically evolving in an appropriate manner. Preserving the current uses and intensities would maintain that momentum.

- After some deliberation, GPAC’s recommendation for land uses in the focus area was different from the response in the community survey for the following reasons:
  - The GPAC agreed with many survey comments noting that designating office-only uses (as shown in Option A) did not allow for the flexibility of properties to respond to changing market conditions and was too restrictive.
  - The feasibility study conducted for the Artesia Aviation Area Plan (completed after the survey closed) concluded that the corridor’s narrow lot depths made it financially infeasible to build mixed-use projects along the Artesia corridor, without increasing building height. Since the majority of the lots along Aviation Blvd. are even shallower than those on Artesia Blvd., mixed use and residential development along this corridor seemed unlikely. As a result, GPAC determined that the most appropriate uses for the area would be a mix of commercial, retail, and office as the market determined.

- The GPAC also provided direction to include additional policy and/or implementation measures focused on:
  - Enhancing physical connections to the adjacent community/neighborhoods (more walkable)
  - Provide some pedestrian improvements, although not at the same level of enhancement as envisioned for Artesia Blvd. (2nd tier improvements).
GPAC Proposed Land Use Options

Summary of land use discussion for each Focus Area at the April 25, 2019 GPAC Meeting

TORRANCE BOULEVARD

Vote: Option A – 0; Option B – 19

- The GPAC agreed with the results of the public survey to allow a mix of office and commercial uses throughout the corridor (no mixed-use allowing residential uses would be permitted) to be consistent with the character of nearby neighborhoods and to focus the mix of office and commercial uses to those that cater toward adjacent residents.

- There are properties with existing homes along the corridor in areas that will have a commercial flex land use designation, they will, however, be allowed to remain and be considered conforming. No new residential uses would be permitted.

- The commercial uses that will be applied to the corridor will be a combination of Commercial Flex (1.0 FAR) and Neighborhood Commercial (0.50 FAR) to be consistent with the existing General Plan designations.

PCH NORTH

Vote: Option A – 0; Option A with modifications – 17; None of these options – 2

- The GPAC recommended allowing a mix of office and commercial on both sides of PCH. This would protect existing businesses and provide flexibility to respond to changing market conditions. It was envisioned that the west side of PCH in this area would allow for more intense office and commercial uses (1.0 FAR) because of lot size, and the east side of the street would accommodate new retail and office uses at a smaller scale (0.50 FAR) because of parcel size.

- There was much discussion regarding connectivity to the future design of the AES site. The focus of the discussion related to the vacant lot west of the existing post office because it is ideally situated to support the future redevelopment of the AES site, much of which is anticipated to be converted to park space. This lot could provide parking, additional park land, or other complementary programming, and it could serve as a connection between the Focus Area, the AES site, and ultimately the Harbor / waterfront.

  The GPAC expressed a desire to retain the industrial use on this property and emphasized the importance of providing policy direction in the General Plan to allow for stand alone parking structures in Industrial areas to maintain this opportunity moving forward.

- The GPAC also provided direction to include additional policy and/or implementation measures focused on:
  - Enhancing physical connections to the envisioned park and recreational spaces with bike and pedestrian pathways.
GPAC Proposed Land Use Options

*Summary of land use discussion for each Focus Area at the April 25, 2019 GPAC Meeting*

**PCH CENTRAL**

Vote: Option A – 8; Option B – 0; Option C – 0; Option D – 11 (new option generated by GPAC)

- Option D is the same as Option C with a 30’ height limit in mixed-use areas.

GPAC had a considerable amount of discussion regarding the most appropriate mix of uses for this section of the PCH Corridor.

- The GPAC’s discussion primarily focused on building height/community character and the application of mixed use.

- Questions the GPAC debated during the meeting related to land use also included:
  - Does no change mean we think the corridor is great as-is?
  - Would a land use change improve the corridor?
  - What else could improve the corridor (are there other strategies beside land use changes)?

- **Building Height / Community Character.**
  - In general, the group felt that this is not the location for increased building heights.
  - Maintain the low-height “eclectic” development along PCH, particularly the cottage-style beach bungalow homes as these buildings embody the beach town culture in the City.

- **Mixed-Use**
  - The current General Plan allows for a mix of high-density multi-family residential, commercial and mixed use (allows for housing).
  - The option that received the largest percentage of votes from the public (41.2%) was the mixed-use option (Option C), which allowed for mixed use on both sides of PCH in the northern portion of the corridor and transitioned to neighborhood commercial approximately halfway down PCH as it continues south.
    - It should be noted that the survey participants located in the same zip code of the Central PCH corridor were generally split in their voting for the three options. The uptick in interest for Option C was primarily generated by votes from outside of the area, with a significant number of votes coming from North Redondo participants.
  - Several of the GPAC members expressed a preference for the mixed-use option (Option C) to reflect the public survey results (prior to learning about the breakout of votes) and the flexibility a mixed-use designation would allow to respond to changing market demands, but they were concerned about the tall building heights this mixed-use option may allow, so a fourth option (option D) that mirrored option C, but imposed a height limit of 30’ on mixed-use projects was proposed.
  - The GPAC voted in favor of Option D but expressed concerns about how SB 50 and density bonuses would potentially affect the GPAC’s intent behind the designations. For example, if density bonuses were requested by an applicant under a mixed-use
project, it is possible that the heights could be increased above 30 feet (which may not be acceptable to the community)

- The State Legislature has suspended SB 50 until 2020. In its current form and given the current transit options available in the City, no corridors in Redondo Beach are applicable to SB 50 provisions. If SB 50 was amended to include corridors in Redondo Beach, its provisions would apply to all residentially zoned properties within ¼ mile of qualifying bus stops or ½ mile of rail stations.

- To inform the discussion at the May 30th meeting the GPAC requested the following items from staff:
  - Identify which properties would allow residential under Option C or Option D that did not previously allow residential uses (this request was primarily concerned with the affect of SB 50 on these properties)
  - Clarify what building heights would density bonuses allow if Option D were selected

- The GPAC also provided preliminary direction to include additional policy and/or implementation measures focused on:
  - Road improvements at the PCH/Torrance intersection are needed: consider deceleration lane (already dedicated by CVS developer) and better coordination with Caltrans