I. OPENING SESSION

1. CALL MEETING TO ORDER
A Regular Meeting of the Redondo Beach General Plan Advisory Committee was called to order by Chair Biro at 6:30 p.m. in the Redondo Beach Public Library Second Floor Meeting Room, 303 N. Pacific Coast Highway, Redondo Beach, California.

2. ROLL CALL
Members Present: Members Bajaj, Chrzan, Eiller, Funabashi, Gaddis, Glad, Hannon, Lamb, Light, Ludwig, McKenzie, Moses, Nafissi, Samaras, Sanchez, Simpson, Stoddor, Szymanski, Turner, Voisey, Waller, Chair Biro

Members Absent: Hashmi, Kartounian, Kilroy, Pinzler, Solomon

Officials Present: Brandy Forbes, Community Development Director
John La Rock, Community Services Director
Sean Scully, Planning Manager
Marianne Gastelum, Assistant Planner
Lina Portolese, Planning Analyst
Camy Byrd, Recording Secretary

Consultants Present: Wendy Nowak, PlaceWorks
Sherry Okun-Rudnak, BAE Urban Economics
Michael Kennedy, Fehr & Peers Transportation Consultants

3. SALUTE TO THE FLAG
Vice-Chair Sanchez led those assembled in a Salute to the Flag.

II. APPROVAL OF ORDER OF AGENDA

III. CONSENT CALENDAR

4. APPROVAL OF AFFIDAVIT OF POSTING for the General Plan Advisory Committee Regular Meeting of March 7, 2019.

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR THE GENERAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE REGULAR MEETING for October 25, 2018.

Motion by Member Light, seconded by Member Glad to approve the Consent Calendar as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

Chair Biro recommended suspending the Public Comment time limit of 15 minutes due to the number of speakers in attendance.

IV. PUBLIC COMMENT – 1ST SESSION

Wayne Craig, District 1, voiced disagreement with the claim that Member Nafissi supported the Tech Corridor Option B for 190th Street and discussed concerns regarding certain GPAC
members’ use of social media platforms for what he views as improper characterizations of Rescue Our Waterfront members.

Mr. Craig asked that the committee receive and file copies of online comments. Motion by Member Gaddis, seconded by Member Nafissi, to receive and file. Motion carried, with Members Moses and Eller abstaining.

Holly Osborne, District 5, expressed concern with replacing office space with housing in the industrial district, when there are so few industrial spaces. She also noted that there will be no Metro stations in Lawndale, which reduces the need for housing there. She voiced concern with Option B for the Industrial District receiving the most votes in the survey.

Ms. Osborne asked that the committee receive and file an excerpt from a SBCOG publication noting there will be no Metro station in Lawndale. Moved and seconded to receive and file. Motion carried unanimously.

V. ITEMS FOR PRESENTATION, DISCUSSION, OR ACTION

6. 190th Street Land Use Plan Options – Consideration by GPAC for Removal of “Option B: Create a Tech Corridor” from further consideration.

   a. Receive and File Letter Signed by Residents and Some Elected Officials Requesting GPAC Remove from Further Consideration “Option B: Create a Tech Corridor” from the 190th Street Corridor Land Use Plan Options.

Councilmember Christian Horvath, District 3, said a letter was sent to the GPAC, signed by four of his colleagues, requesting the Committee consider the removal of Option B for 190th Street. Residents will provide personal details and he is present to support them.

Councilmember Nils Nehrenheim, District 1, stated his previous desire as a resident for a GPAC to be created to remove certain types of zoning from his district and represent the people. He expressed concern with bad zoning and an ineffective process. He stated his disappointment that this process being politicized. He reviewed his involvement with the GPAC members form his district. He stated he did not sign the letter that was submitted as he felt it was used for electioneering against a GPAC member that was running for office. He stated he supports the content of the letter, but not the methods used.

Larry Nelson, 15-year Armour Lane resident, stated he likes the idea of Option B to bring more jobs and taxes which would help the City, however he disagrees with rezoning on Armour Lane which would remove the residential neighborhood. He stated there are more ideal areas to locate a tech corridor such as 182nd and Kingsdale. He suggested partnering with Northrop to co-develop a campus that would attract young engineers with its proximity to the restaurants and entertainment at the Galleria and Artesia Blvd. He stated he was the resident that contacted the Councilmember for the district when he became aware of Option B. He asked the GPAC members to consider the removal of Option B, which would relieve a lot of pressure on families in the city.

Brian Croft, Armour Lane resident, stated he and his wife bought their home in 2016 and began a home renovation earlier this year. He expressed concern with Option B lowering the values of the residential properties. Should Option B pass they would not be able to carry the home loan and would be forced to sell. Residents did not buy their homes to live next to tech offices or to be forced to sell to a developer. He asked that the committee remove Option B.

Darryl Wiggum, Armour Lane resident, said their home has been in their family and they have put a lot of time and effort into cleaning up and making it part of the community. If Option B passes they would not be able to expand on their house because there would be restrictions. He stated
they enjoy their neighborhood, especially during holidays. He asked the committee to remove Option B.

Joy Rizina, 190th Street resident, stated they have lived in their home in the middle of 190th Street for over 20 years. She feels it is an established neighborhood and not the place for a high-tech corridor and Option B should be taken off the GPAC agenda. She also commented that this option has been on the GPAC calendar for one year, discussed at the February 2018 meeting and was never put forth as a concept by Rescue Our Waterfront nor did Member Nafissi develop this concept. She expressed disappointment with the issue coming out as an election message when the option was out in the public for a year. She stated she is against Option B and asked the committee to remove it.

Mark Stanley, Armour Lane resident since 1971, described his history with the property and improvements they have made and the importance of maintaining the residential neighborhood. He asked the committee to remove Option B.

Megan Dixon, Armour Lane resident, said they are not just neighbors on this street, they celebrate holidays together. She asked that they not move forward with the proposal.

Jen Rodriguez, 17-year Armour Lane resident, said Armour Lane is a community, where they have BBQ’s, block parties, movie nights on garage doors, and a bike race on 4th of July. She asked if changing this residential community is true of their general vision of 2040?

Serafina Perry, 14-years old, Armour Lane resident, said it is a community, family, a place she can call home, her sense of family. She said she was adopted and planned to live there when she got older, but the land use option would take away her life, her community and every opportunity she ever got.

Ted Jimenez, 190th Street resident, said he does not see the value of a tech corridor on that corner and said it would be better if they did this at another location.

Diane McAurthur, 38-year Pruitt Drive resident, said traffic in her neighborhood off Inglewood and 190th is already a problem and believes completing this type of plan would intensify traffic and put their children at risk.

John Fiedler, 52-year Armour Lane resident, said if the Committee thinks it is a good idea to take people’s homes, let it be their homes instead.

Moved and seconded to receive and file the three letters. Motion carried unanimously.

Chair Biro closed the public participation.

Member Sanchez clarified that GPAC is not creating policies only making recommendations which Planning Commission and City Council will ultimately decide on. There may be bold ideas, but no malice behind them and the changes will be a decades long process.

Member Light said he was a proponent of this, not to take people’s homes away but to do what is right for the City, which is a longer corridor. Business areas put them along arterial roots, however, after feedback at the last council meeting and this testimony, he does not support rezoning residential to something nonconforming.

Member Voisey asked the residents to come back and offer more input. He is in favor of removing Option B.
Member Gaddis stated he is an active member of Rescue Our Waterfront and noted that the GPAC minutes reflect that he was opposed to Option B when discussed. He also stated that the Option B is not consistent with the Guiding Principles and preservation of single-family neighborhoods should be top priority and should be stated explicitly in the Guiding Principles.

Member Nafissi expressed appreciation to the residents for coming to the meeting and expressing their concerns. She said it is hard to get the public engaged on land use. She referred them to the link on the City website for GPAC updates and agendas.

Member Glad, District 4, agreed that there are better areas to do this near Kingsdale or Northrop Grumman. It is important to have industrial and commercial zones, but taking people’s homes is not the solution. She said the residents’ voices matter and make a huge difference and appreciated that the residents came out. She encouraged residents to also provide input on all other areas in addition to their immediate neighborhoods.

Member Ludwig stated that residents should trust the GPAC process and come voice concerns at the meetings rather than involve City Councilmembers first.

Member Light thanked the residents for coming out and speaking. He stated that although he was previously in favor of Option B, he has been swayed by the testimonies.

Motion by Member Light, seconded by Member Eller to withdraw 190th Street Option B Tech Corridor.

Member Samaras reminded the group how difficult it was to come up with a plan for 190th Street, and the consensus was to put the options out to get input and believes the process worked.

In reply to Member Samaras regarding replacements options, Chair Biro said at this point the option is just being removed.

Member Samaras encouraged residents to also voice what they would like to see in addition to what they oppose.

Chair Biro identified Members Bajaj, Chrzan and Stodder, as the District 3 GPAC members and said they would like to hear what the residents want before it goes to the Planning Commission.

Member Bajaj introduced himself as one of the District 3 members and gave some background on how Option B came about.

Member Chrzan introduced herself as another District 3 member. She stated the 190th Street corridor was one of the areas where the group had the most varied ideas. She is in favor of removing Option B but would like to have a future discussion on an additional option.

Member Stodder introduced himself as a member from District 3. He stated that most GPAC meetings up to this point had seen limited participation and he was glad to see so many people come out tonight. He encouraged residents to participate and stated the GPAC is trying to create the best future for the City and they need resident input. He also stressed the importance of focusing on the economic future of the City, therefore the idea of tech corridors is valid and would like to hear ideas of where best to locate them.

Member Szymanski appreciated the thoughtfulness behind all the input.

Member McKenzie was glad to see young children in attendance and involved because the planning of the future of the City will be for them.
Member Stodder commended how the discussion took place with respect and believes it should be a model moving forward on how committee members and residents interact.

Member Lamb hopes that the residents now understand that not just one person is responsible for the decisions that were made related to this area and encouraged the positive discussion and input.

Member Simpson stated that the survey sent out by the City is how residents became aware of the option. The survey went out City-wide, and Option B received the most support City-wide, and it shows how complex the process is and the danger of over-reliance on surveys.

Chair Biro stated that simply looking at the raw data without the direct community input it would seem that Option B would work.

Member Glad noted that there were 500 responses to a citywide survey of 65,000. She encouraged GPAC members to do outreach and also encouraged the residents to do outreach and get their neighbors engaged.

Chair Biro called for a vote on the motion to remove Option B. Motion carried unanimously.

7. Introductions: Speed Dating – Meet the Community Development Director & GPAC Members

Chair Biro suggested skipping the speed dating.

8. Announcements and Updates
   a. General Updates - Community Meeting November 17th, Land Use Alternatives Survey, Staff Updates.

Wendy Nowak suggested moving announcements and updates to the end.

9. Presentations
   a. Artesia Blvd. Conceptual Block Alternatives
   b. Development Feasibility/Pro Forma – Artesia Blvd.
   c. Artesia-Aviation Area Plan Parking Study – Existing Conditions
   d. Artesia and Aviation Revitalization Committee Report – John Simpson
   e. Land Use Alternative Survey Findings – Aviation Blvd. and Artesia Blvd.

Ms. Nowak presented the following on the Artesia and Aviation Corridors:

- Largest percent is service
- Some mixed-use areas with retail under, residential above
- Some industrial
- Challenges Facing Corridors
  - Poor connectivity with adjacent residential, which is a priority
  - "Dead zones" – unwalkable areas, non-complimentary uses, no activity
  - Lack of comfort, convenience and security for pedestrians
  - Disorganized land use patterns
  - Ownership (multiple)
  - Lot depths & configurations
- Corridor Evaluation
  - Redevelopment potential of the corridor
  - Vacancies & Tenure
  - Role of the corridor in the community – pedestrian friendly
  - Relevance and use by residents – services and activities neighbors want
  - Lifestyle demographics
  - Placemaking opportunities – who is coming and who would be using it

- Prototype Purpose
  - Prototype block size: 130 ft. x 600 ft.
  - Used to evaluate tradeoffs of design, function, mix of uses, parking and financial feasibility

Some options considered:
- Existing - traditional one-story retail, surface parking lots, on street parking.
- Residential:
  - 2 & 3-story residential, garages, on street parking
  - 5-plex - more units in same amount of space with alley parking. Considering walkability and street frontage, parking is big constraint
  - 2-story office with surface parking - on street parking - walkable corridor
  - Mixed-use - retail on ground floor, residential above
  - Commercial flex – ground floor commercial, top floor offices, corner retail
  - Retail/Office - first story retail, second story office, restaurant on corner

9b. Development Feasibility/Pro Forma – Artesia Blvd
Presented by Sherry Okun-Rudnak from BAE Urban Economics

Ms. Rudnak reviewed the economic analysis report for Artesia Boulevard.

In response to a question regarding the absence of underground parking structures, Ms. Rudnak replied that they cost a lot of money.

In response to a question regarding the Galleria renovation and office space, Ms. Rudnak said market analysis looks at development projections and residual demand for retail space. They included a range of projections for how much retail can be absorbed in the city, accounting for minimum and maximum potential development at the Galleria. There was high office demand for the market study. Planned and proposed development was taken into account.

Ms. Rudnak explained that when doing a general plan update, they do a market analysis on different uses that will have demand over time and make space for them. Doing an EIR on this, saves developers time, which saves money.

The purpose of financial feasibility analysis is to understand whether new development desired by local community residents can occur under market conditions, which helps inform any potential zoning changes.

A project is feasible when the value of the completed project is worth more than the cost to develop it. The analysis identifies the residual land value, the value of the project after construction costs, financing costs, and developer profit. Based on comparable sales, the value of the land under the Artesia corridor is approximately $6.9 million per acre.

The two-story townhome had 24 units, residual land value of approximately $1.8 million per acre which is not feasible in current conditions. The three-story concept had 45 units, a lot closer to penciling, the retail and residential was close to penciling, the commercial flex was not very close.
In response to Member Light regarding the increased value of residential zoning, Ms. Rudnak said they used the median home prices for comparable units and included 15% premium for new construction. The $1.8 million is what a developer would be willing to pay, based on the unit prices, plus the 15% premium. With today’s land value, a land owner would want $7 million per acre.

Member Light said residential would cause the value to go up and with the state bills going through, there is no limit to what could be put there because it is a transit rich corridor.

Ms. Rudnak explained that in the last 9 months construction costs have skyrocketed while rents are going up slower. Things that would have penciled a year ago, are not penciling now. What will it take to transition things in the corridor, and if residential does a much better job, is it worth finding a place for residential as catalysts bring more people.

Member Glad noted that none of these are particularly feasible including retail/office which is currently in existence. While residential has the greatest value, how are the residents being served by taking away the businesses that are supporting the communities and putting in residential?

Ms. Rudnak agreed and said Ms. Nowak had addressed those three things – physical sustainability, economical sustainability and environmental sustainability.

Possible reasons the Artesia Corridor has not gone through a revitalization:

- High underlying land value ($6.9 million per acre) Developers could not get rent to support.
- Low vacancy rate (3.8%)
- Lack of recent development
- Lower rate per sq/ft than other areas of the City

Ms. Rudnak suggested finding the catalytic development and incentivizing that development, through a subsidy, land breakdown if it is publicly owned, improving walkability, making it more desirable. The other thing is proof of concept – once the first building on Artesia is able to get the higher rate to support redevelopment, it will continue.

In response to Member Light regarding medical facilities and the Whole Foods parking lot that utilize underground parking, Ms. Rudnak said she has not seen two-story buildings built in California for a long time due to high fees and construction costs.

Member Light pointed out that the warehouse district in El Segundo went from a run-down area to a desirable area.

Member Glad stated that she is troubled that it shows that the Quimby fee was raised last year from $7,500 to $25,000 as one of the things that could be considered changing, because of how much emphasis was put on parks. The residents would be really upset to think it could be changed.

Member Szymanski said those additional fees are valued and it is not something the group would support in terms of incentives.

Member Simpson noted what might work is the more organic perspective of development. The City Council recently encouraged land owners and business owners to start a BID, which would bring them together to create a concept for the streets. Organic development could look holistically at the area.
Ms. Nowak said one alternative is residential in the entryways and nothing in the middle, maybe some value to having flexibility in the corridor, for walkability, maybe have residential on the second story or in the middle.

Member Moses said it sounds like even the marginal options for zoning for an economic downturn is the only way these are going to work - maybe zone for that and wait for the economy to go down. Shoot low, not over-intensify things.

Member Gaddis suggested looking at downtown Culver City, which used existing buildings and put in parking garages to support surrounding businesses and office space.

9d. Artesia and Aviation Revitalization Committee Report – John Simpson

Member Simpson reported on the following:

- Comprised of 10 Redondo Beach residents, property and business owners
- Began meeting in February 2018, conducted a total of 7 meetings
- Continue to support the NRBBA through fee waivers for corridor events
- Continue the Storefront Improvement Program
- Consider new Special Events along the corridor (i.e., Santa Run in 2019)
- Consider installation of decorative lighting - tree lighting, sidewalk-illuminating
- Form a BID and possible formation of a Main Street Program
- Consider installation of electric charging stations and rideshare locations
- Though the General Plan update consider updating zoning to permit for additional housing, office uses; modify requirements to promote dining establishments and associated parking
- Explore ways to provide shared parking for evening businesses – create a “park and walk” program
- Capitalize on the SCE greenbelt and create a multimodal corridor
- Prospect of changing the name of Artesia Boulevard to Redondo Beach Boulevard – the committee did not reach consensus

Wally Marks, owner of 2810, 2860 Artesia Blvd., for 65 years, emphasized encouraging residents to walk, or bike and avoid getting in their cars. He also suggested adding housing units and creating jobs locally.

In response to Member Bajaj regarding the economic feasibility analysis, Mr. Marks said higher density would be required to see change. Housing gets more rent than office.

In response to Member Lamb regarding incentives, Planning Manager Scully said the City does not currently offer incentives.

Member Samaras suggested improving existing conditions, organic development, helping existing businesses, an uptick on FAR, reducing parking, encouraging restaurants to allow outdoor dining without the parking requirement.

Community Development Director Forbes said recommendations could be made to encourage a BID. The City cannot enforce it, but recommendations can be made on areas that would incentivize, and include things like the FAR, possible parking adjustments, possible flexibility in the outdoor dining.

Member Glad stated that the Galleria revitalization will increase the value of the rents and the current tenants aren’t going to be able to pay the increased rent value. New tenants will come only if something is done to store frontages and the space.
9c. Artesia-Aviation Area Plan Parking Study – Existing Conditions

Michael Kennedy, Fehr & Peers presented on the following:

- Conducted parking space (supply) and vehicle count (demand) for all on- and off-street spaces within the area plan.
- Counts taken mid-day on Thursday and Saturday in December 2018 (peak parking demand period for retail)
- Off-Street Parking Occupancy – 51% Thursday, 47% Saturday
- On-Street Parking Occupancy – 55% Thursday, 69% Saturday

A shared parking model was developed which will be used to determine estimates for demand when contemplating land use changes.

Restaurants are attractive and seem to perform better than retail in terms of business, but they generate the need for more parking. Constraining the parking supply is a policy choice.

In response to Member McKenzie regarding bike lanes, Mr. Kennedy said they are fairly new, so there isn’t much research that shows a change in travel behavior and parking demands. It is something to consider in the general plan.

Mr. Kennedy said they use the term ‘park once’, parking the car quickly then walking, bike sharing, etc.

In response to Member Samaras, Mr. Kennedy said different parking strategies will be identified in the next phase.

In response to Member Szymanski regarding two streets immediately north and south of Artesia, Mr. Kennedy said their focus was evaluating how the commercial developments along the corridor are generating parking demand.

Ms. Nowak noted that a recommendation was made in the survey for a parklet, or streetlet. They can be created on a trial basis and if it works well, then funded for permanent implementation.

Member Lamb commented that the speed on Artesia is an issue for both residents and businesses. She said there was a time that Grant Avenue was four lanes and it took traffic from Artesia. She asked if there is a potential for that again.

Planning Manager Scully said there are consequences when addressing traffic calming approaches, due to people rerouting and getting around them. The City Traffic Engineer and Public Safety Commission considers traffic calming frequently.

Member Samaras believes parklettes and streetlets are a great idea, and suggested testing it to see how the community reacts.

Member Bajaj said community partnerships are heavily dependent upon when considered parklettes. It would be beneficial to partner with NRBBA.

Member Hannon said duplicating what Long Beach did with bike lanes would be a significant improvement for businesses on Artesia.
Ms. Nowak explained that in the 2nd Street area of Belmont Shore, they painted one lane green as a bike lane, and had one lane for automobiles. They did a lot of testing, and got push back, but it works now and according to numbers it is safer.

8. Announcements and Updates
   a. General Updates – Community Meeting November 17th, Land Use Alternatives Survey, Staff Updates.
   e. Land Use Alternative Survey Findings – Aviation Blvd and Artesia Blvd

Ms. Nowak reported the following:

- 60 community members in attendance at the meeting
- The Land Use Alternative Survey was kicked-off. People filled them out at the meeting – 531 responses.
- Continual increase of Facebook subscribers (+/- 15 month)

Community Development Director Forbes noted that SB 50 is one of the pieces of legislation that Member Light mentioned. There are at least six different bills that are housing related, a lot of it is usurping the local control - the City is pushing back as a municipality. The Mayor and City Council are aware of those initiatives.

Community Development Director Forbes reported on the ADU (Accessory Dwelling Units) Ordinance – City Council approved at first reading February 19, 2019. Ordinance is in line with State regulations, also have what controls are allowed. She will circulate those documents; SB50 that was sent to housing subcommittee and ADU ordinance.

Ms. Nowak said they will review the administrative draft on the Local Hazard Mitigation Plan, which will be presented to the Safety Commission and used as the basis for the safety element. It will then be forwarded to the Office of Emergency Services, then taken to City Council for review and adoption.

Community Development Director Forbes said the conversation regarding Artesia and Aviation can be continued, as well as the LHM plan, at the next meeting on April 25, 2019. The summer meeting will focus on land use option feedback, community survey, land use definitions, and review land use map.

VI. PUBLIC COMMENT – 2ND SECTION

Wally Marks, Artesia Blvd commercial property owner, supports the mixed-use transit center that was covered during the October meeting. He believes it is a great area to be developed.

Tom Bauer, resident, was really impressed with the meeting and the ability of the members to look at what pencils and what incentivizes developers and investors. He encouraged being flexible in the zoning that allows for market forces to work, and noted that the economy is going to change, and technology is going to change.

Larry Nelson recommended looking at how autonomous vehicles and car sharing services are going to change the requirements of parking.
Matthew Hensmen, District 3, is interested in the zoning and noted that it is important to the City. The purpose is long term vision but also not to assume that no one will shop retail and that no one will drive. He thinks a parking structure is a good idea on Artesia Blvd.

VII. GPAC MEMBERS REFERRAL TO STAFF

VIII. ADJOURNMENT – 9:44 p.m.

Motion by Member Gaddis, seconded by Member McKenzie, to adjourn the meeting at 9:44 p.m. to a Regular Meeting to be held at 6:30 p.m. on Thursday, April 25, 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,

[Signature]

Brandy Forbes
Community Development Director