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: Bajaj, Chrzan, Eller, Funabashi, Gaddis, Glad, Hannon, Kilroy, Lamb, Light, Ludwig, Moses, Nafissi, Pinzler, Samaras, Sanchez, Simpson, Solomon, Stodder, Szymanski, Turner, Waller, Voisey, Chair Biro

Members Absent: Kartounian, McKenzie

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

Consultants Present: Wendy Nowak, PlaceWorks

SALUTE TO THE FLAG
Chair Biro led those assembled in a Salute to the Flag.

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

CONSENT CALENDAR


5. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR THE GENERAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE REGULAR MEETING** for April 25, 2019.

Member Simpson noted that on the first page of the minutes it should be SB 50 rather than SB 550. Because it is an important item, he wants to clarify that it should be SB 50.

Chair Biro noted that there was a letter regarding changes to the minutes. These items need to be discussed in a public forum.

Member Gaddis said at the April meeting there was a lot of discussion about the vote regarding approving mixed use along PCH with a height limit of 30'; there was a subsequent conversation at the end of the meeting where Staff acknowledged that there is nothing that GPAC can do to prevent an affordability bonus that would push the heights up to 45'. By approving mixed-use on the PCH corridor, the City is exposing itself to 45' heights. He stated the discussion was not reflected in the draft minutes for approval on tonight's agenda.

Planning Manager Scully said Staff will listen to the tape and add more to the discussion.
Member Lamb noted that Member Chrzan had initiated a second vote, and specifically asked to revisit the issue at the next meeting and it is not reflected in the minutes. Planning Manager Scully clarified that part will be added to the minutes.

Motion by Chair Biro, seconded by Member to hold off on the approval of the minutes.

In response to Member Moses regarding Holly Osborne’s letter, Chair Biro explained they will have her clarify during the Public Comment session. They will include public comment to amend those comments, a motion to not approve the minutes, and make an amendment based on the feedback that has been received and public testimony amending public comments of the meeting.

Moved and seconded to approve the Affidavit of Posting. Motion carried unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMENT – 1ST SESSION

Wayne Craig, District 1, said the community is not particularly happy about the PCH Central location - the 30 foot restriction just means that it can’t be 45 feet and he thinks they will receive a lot of pushback on it. Also, the bills that are in Sacramento could undermine what they are talking about here.

Leslie Campeggi, District 2, would like the recommendation to keep the zoning on PCH Central as is. She also noted the bills will likely increase density.

Will Scholtz, resident of PCH South, would like to see a restriction of 30 foot height, he is a fan of mixed use, however, a 45 foot height is a concern.

Randy Kimose, resident of Elvira, said someone bought a lot near him and while speaking to the residents the owner indicated that he would like to build higher. Mr. Kimose asked the Committee to consider long-term residents having to live with a 40-45 foot high wall, 5 feet from their backyard.

Matthew Hinsley, District 3, noted that mixed use along several blocks on PCH would be okay, but not for seven or eight blocks. Regarding the east corner of Aviation and Artesia, he said there is a park and a 55+ community behind the commercial buildings. He thinks it would be nice to connect the park with the community to draw people out.

Valerie Fernandez, is most affected by the industrial corridor and is greatly affected by 2-on-a-lots in North Redondo. There are 11 on her street. She is asking that Option B be struck because there will no longer be a metro station on the corner of Inglewood Avenue and Manhattan Beach Boulevard.

Moved and seconded to extend the Public Comment session. Motion carried unanimously.

Amy Josefik, 15-year resident read a letter regarding the high rise buildings on the Esplanade, fighting against the plans proposed by Legado for the Bristol Farms site that were too tall for the parcel, and concerns with SB 50.

Holly Osborne, resident noted that District 5, Option B received the most votes, however, when the item was discussed, the consensus was that the area should remain industrial. Option B rezones a lot to non-industrial. She also noted that she didn’t think the Metro based housing should be there because Metro is no longer providing a stop at Manhattan Beach Boulevard. She thought that Option B was removed but it was put back in and got the most votes. She said the problem is things are left in and voted on by “people who are not informed.” That’s the way she wants the minutes. In the blue folder items, there were some eloquent letters about North
Redondo. Some people aren't here and some are, but none want Option B and all that extra housing. Please remove Option B, no more housing at that corner.

Sean Killackey said he is opposition of the 45 foot building heights.

Motion by Member Pinzler, seconded by Member Glad to receive and file the blue folder item. Motion carried unanimously.

ITEMS FOR PRESENTATION, DISCUSSION, OR ACTION

6. Announcements and Updates
   a. General Updates

Planning Manager Scully reported they issued a certificate of occupancy for a 52-unit development on PCH and Prospect. Kensington moving close to their opening in July, of a 132-bed assisted living development. Legado is very nearly through the plan check process. The RHNA-SCAG work is ongoing, regular meetings are held monthly for updates. The City has submitted additional documentation to SCAG in an effort to bring realistic numbers to the City in the upcoming issuance with the RHNA at the end of the year.

Outreach update - the email subscriptions and blasts continue to grow.

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

The update will be covered and the remaining areas will be covered. For the next meeting they will take feedback, the translation map, taking revised definitions and directions from prior meeting for new land use map; it is an interim working draft.

They will take the information for the remaining areas, fold it in put together a build out summary and present that at the next meeting. That map and those numbers will go to Planning Commission and City Council to get their blessing so they can start the technical studies for the environmental analysis.

The community will have multiple opportunities to weigh in on the plan even after it goes to the next decision makers.

They are working on an outline and drafting the Artesia Boulevard/Aviation corridor, ACAP area plan.
The Committee will give direction and okay on the land plan and then they will go out into the community for their feedback, then to the Planning Commission and City Council for their feedback.

In response to Member Lamb regarding the ability to give feedback on the format of the plan, Planning Manager Scully said they are months away from putting together a format.

Ms. Nowak said the difference between that General Plan is with that General Plan, all of the elements were pulled together, this is not a comprehensive General Plan update.

Member Lamb wanted to reiterate that the document reflects community input and heretofore, the documents have been geared towards professionals, developers, and contractors. Irregardless of whether it's a comprehensive plan, it needs to reflect the business community's document.

Member Solomon asked if there has been any interface between what the goals and policies being developed here will interface with the strategic plan, how it will affect the strategic plan. When these documents go to the public, a simplified vocabulary should be included, showing what the terms and phrasing mean.

Ms. Nowak said they will put definitions in there. Regarding the strategic plan, because the General Plan is such a big investment, they encourage the community tie it with the strategic plan. They had a conversation with the City Manager and he is interested in making sure they tie together.

Planning Manager Scully said when they are building the basic drafts of the policies, they will be looking closely at the strategic plan.

Ms. Nowak said a lot of the action items that come out of the General Plan will end up being priorities on the strategic plan.

Member Pinzier said the documents need to be a much more open statement to the public than they are used to. Having it stay "inside" is not going to help. He suggested a sub-committee to be part of the crafting process.

Ms. Nowak agreed that it needs to usable, approachable, understandable so people feel it is a transparent process that they can participate in.

Chair Biro clarified that at the 23rd meeting, they will do an exercise on goals and policies but won't see a draft document and comments on the last session. Ms. Nowak said they still need to cover Parks and Rec, land use and noise and safety. They are focusing on parks and open space. They hadn't talked about how it all comes together.

Member Glad said they are not looking holistically at how it impacts the city and depending on what those traffic impacts are, they want to know what the final results would be. She is concerned that the overall picture will be something none of them will want.

Ms. Nowak said they will see the overall land use plan at the next meeting.

Chair Biro said there has to be some satisfaction with the work they have done.

Planning Manager Scully said they will see a nearly final document – the map, the story, and the concepts that they came up with that are feeding the determinations on the focus areas. It will be a narrative that goes with the goals and policies, which will cover the city with the different land use categories.
Member Simpson asked if there will be a document that the group will sign off on before it goes to the Planning Commission. Ms. Nowak said she needs to discuss that with staff. With the 23 meetings, one will be on Parks and Rec and one on land use. Ideally, they should have that. She made a commitment to figure out how to have one voice going to the Planning Commission and City Council.

She said the current meeting would be group discussions on some of the areas that haven’t been addressed and then Central PCH.

Ms. Nowak said there are three remaining areas – North Redondo Industrial, South PCH, Galleria and a revisit of Central PCH.

Chair Biro said they could go straight to Central PCH and go backwards.

**CENTRAL PCH**

Ms. Nowak said there were 531 respondents to the survey; 94% lived in Redondo, 18% also lived and worked in Redondo. Some people were outside of Redondo. 56% were from North Redondo, 40% from South Redondo.

Ms. Nowak said per a request at the last meeting, they included a document in the packet, showing for each option, what the votes are for North and South Redondo.

Ms. Nowak defined Central PCH as Diamond Street to Avenue G – including Knob Hill, Sapphire and Torrance Boulevard.

Ms. Nowak said the General Plan allows for high density residential, mixed-use, and predominately commercial going south down PCH.

The first option is to refine the current General Plan - maintaining the majority of existing uses but changing from Garnet to Pearl from mixed use to commercial and office.

In response to Member Glad, Planning Manager Scully said residential is limited to 2-story, 30 feet; commercial mixed-use is 3-story, 38 feet, to 45 feet. Regular commercial is 2-story, 30 feet.

In response to Member Glad, Planning Manager Scully said someone could exceed mixed-use 30 foot height limit with density bonus if they were including affordable housing.

In response to Member Eiler, Planning Manager Scully explained that there is a percentage sliding scale based on the targeted affordable – very, very low has a less percentage number, for moderate, a higher percentage of the units have to be moderate level.

In response to Ms. Nowak, Planning Manager Scully confirmed if they got a density bonus they would be able to go up to 45 feet.

Ms. Nowak continued with options:

Option A - changing mixed-use to commercial flex. When neighborhood commercial is used it’s a different FAR -.5; commercial flex is 1. Pedestrian oriented commercial hub at the intersection of Torrance Boulevard and PCH.

Option B – commercial flex transitioning to neighborhood commercial at Knob Hill.

Option C – allowing mixed-use from Vincent to Knob Hill ("mixed-use" is residential and either commercial or office and "commercial flex" is office and commercial).
Planning Manager Scully confirmed the height limit is 38 feet, and with Planning Commission design review approval, up to 45 feet.

Ms. Nowak explained that’s what was put out to the public, but the Committee was talking about it and entertaining that, but didn’t like the height part.

Ms. Nowak went through the results – keep General Plan with no changes; Option A – The General Plan with a few little tweaks; the mixed-use got the most votes, but looking at South Redondo, all of the different options are relatively equal, what put it over was North Redondo that thought mixed-use might be appropriate there.

Ms. Nowak said the area where it will change from straight commercial to mixed-use runs between Pearl Avenue and Knob Hill – including The Ramada, Walgreens, The Moonlight Hotel. It went from straight commercial to adding residential.

Member Chrzan commented that during a breakout months ago, there was commentary that some of the high-density residential are churches and if they change from churches they didn’t want residential.

Member Light noted that if they keep the current zoning they are not preserving the bungalows, because there are areas zoned high-density and areas zoned mixed-use. The Pearl Plaza project converting the bungalows into mixed-use development, which raised a lot of ire. Leaving it as is isn’t preserving those options. Cities are adopting ordinances that prevent them from limiting current low-income housing.

Member Gaddis clarified if there were a shift to Option B which creates a commercial corridor, on places that are residential with churches on them, churches won’t go away, they just can’t be turned into mixed-use, or high-density residential and if places are zoned commercial, as in Option B, it won’t make them go away, but it would prevent someone from putting high-density residential on top of current low-density structures, that they can do now.

Member Glad said while she understands preserving some of the bungalows, maintaining a little individual bungalow surrounded by commercial buildings, looking at it holistically, it doesn’t make a lot of sense. Someone wanting to buy, wouldn’t want to back out onto PCH.

Member Lamb said looking at what the residents are saying, it has a character and charm, barring those individual units, their task is to look at options that are going to preserve the character. As a central part of PCH, it is important as a reflection of Redondo Beach – the character, the small beach town, the family centered. People are saying they don’t want canyons there.

Member Pinzler said it is already non-conforming, all they are doing is changing what non-conforming is. He asked what the value of keeping a little section would be.

Member Solomon said it is non-conforming because the growth and changes of the city. He agrees with preserving the beach town character, but along that stretch, it has already changed. Adding more high-density housing will not help traffic, or the holistic approach that they are going towards.

In response to Member Solomon regarding commercial flex, 30 feet, Planning Manager Scully said if there is a particular design element, the Planning Commission has the authority to raise the height to create the enhancement they are trying to make.

Member Samaras said they could adopt design guidelines, that reflect beach character, and when developments are being reviewed along this corridor, those things could be kept in mind. Historic preservation helps accomplish what they are trying to accomplish. They can change zoning and
make it mixed-use or commercial, but make it easy for bungalows to convert to those uses. They can suggest that the City adopt guidelines, or put in a preservation district, that incorporates incentives.

Member Voisey said people are looking to transfer the value of what they have. Bungalows are awesome, but the Committee can't preserve that. They have to be fair to the people who own the properties, and how it can be re-zoned.

Member Moses said PCH is one of the worst stretches of Redondo, it is a hodgepodge and it doesn't work. Businesses can't do anything because of the parking restrictions. It doesn't work the way it is. He said he doesn't know if commercial flex preserves the character of the city better than mixed use. It's just falling apart businesses and old houses.

Planning Manager Scully said the choices are mixed-use with the height limit, the conversion to commercial, and the preservation of those existing bungalows. He said Member Samaras brought up good points, tools they could use to follow up to relax standards. For example, with a conversion of commercial office from a bungalow, the parking standard could be diminished to allow conversion to help preserve some character-building elements to the corridor.

Member Chrzan said regarding the variation of height of buildings of one-story homes and bungalows, if it's rezoned to allow those, but everything could go to 30 feet, eventually the whole strip will be 30 feet and it would feel like a canyon.

In response to Member Lamb regarding the viability of commercial office space for the area, Planning Manager Scully said the economic feasibility study said it does indicate that there is demand for office in the City.

Ms. Nowak said they have not done a development feasibility study for the corridor, so all they can do is say is that an acceptable use.

Planning Manager Scully said one of the reasons the group came up with the commercial flex was let the market decide.

Member Light said there is non-conforming bungalows on the current zoning. Pearl Plaza is zoned mixed-use and commercial on the first floor and mixed-use is non-conforming. Option A keeps that non-conforming because it keeps the mixed-use where it is today.

Member Gaddis said Option B allows height control, but is flexible so it allows the market to decide the uses of the land, and doesn't bulldoze the bungalows already there. If somebody wants to turn a residential bungalow into commercial use, the City incentivizes them to keep the character by relaxing other things, but they can have the new use.

Chair Biro noted that from a unit count standpoint, supposed to have a zero loss.

Member Samaras mentioned a way to compromise and combine Options B and C to limit the mixed-use to some specific areas and make the rest commercial. The major intersections might be better for mixed-use and the rest go to commercial flex.

Ms. Nowak took a vote:
Option A – 9
Option B – 13
Option D – Mixed-use 30 feet – 1

Ms. Nowak said Options A and B go; they got rid of Options C and D.
Member Solomon wants to memorialize Member Samaras’ idea and Planning Manager Scully’s amplification of it.

Planning Manager Scully noted that there is a consensus on the incentives for preserving the beach cottage character, expanding the residential design guidelines element for Options A or B.

Ms. Nowak said they would include a summary saying the group also discussed the importance of the need for design guidelines, reducing and making sure there is not a canyon effect, etc.

There was a consensus.

Ms. Nowak asked for a vote of bringing two forward versus one to Planning Commission and City Council:

Vote – 19/majority

PCH SOUTH

The General Plan currently allows for community and highway oriented commercial south of Avenue G, as PCH approaches Riviera Village. From Palos Verdes Boulevard to the border, it is existing mixed-use, ground floor office with residential above and medium-density, multi-family residential.

Ms. Nowak went through the options, showing existing commercial, multi-family, mixed-use and one area that was changed.

Member Kilroy said he has the same issue with mixed-use as everywhere else. Nothing can be done with what is already there. He thinks the designation should be changed – keep it mixed-use, but lower the height limit to 30 feet.

Member Gaddis confirmed that the proposal is converting what is currently commercial to adding residential to commercial.

Member Lamb clarifying that they are voting on current configuration for Option A. Mixed-use would add more residential with a history of ambiguous results for mixed-use.

Planning Manager Scully confirmed that the mixed-use, land use definition the group came up with lowers the density to 30 dwelling units per acre. That’s the lowest density it could be and qualify for categorizing that location as a potentially affordable housing site.

Member Kilroy said this has to be voted on and passed by the people. They didn’t like the mixed-use that’s there now. He doesn’t see the gain versus the risk. He also noted that 1,000 units were added south of Torrance Boulevard. There is a potential for a lot of ADU’s. The risk of causing so much negativity with whatever the gain of going mixed-use is not worth the risk.

Vote:
Keep it the same – majority
Not in favor - 4
INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT

Ms. Nowak went through survey results for Options A, B, and C

Ms. Nowak said Option B started to look at the idea of creating mixed-use because it is an area that is adjacent to a Metro station, a potential opportunity for people to live near the station and have jobs nearby.

Ms. Nowak mentioned a third option if there was an interest in preserving the jobs, but down the road if a big employer comes in and they want to have housing and it's next to the station, to allow for that in strategic cases, is to do the whole area as industrial and put a TOD overlay.

Ms. Nowak also noted the market study shows a huge demand for jobs.

Member Eller said there is a tech campus currently, which would be turning into residential. Northrop has facilities in there that would be non-conforming. He is not in favor of this.

Member Solomon supports keeping the job center rather than increasing the intensity of what is there with residential.

Member Glad said a lot of the discussion has been how can jobs be directed into the City? There is plenty of housing and density. What needs to happen is to reduce the number of people that are getting in their cars and leaving the city. She suggested creating a tech area, that attracts high tech industries. If residential is an option, it will take away from the campus feel and reduce the number of employers that would come.

Member Kilroy said there have already been significant changes in the use of industrial area. He suggested the Galleria would be a more appropriate area for residential. This area should stay with Option A.

Member Voisey disagreed and said the overlay is interesting. He said residential is an important concept.

Member Light would like to consider an overlay of workforce housing in conjunction with the job center.

Member Pinzler said his experience with overlays is that people ten years down the road people look back and wonder what they were thinking. It could be designed as workforce housing, but if they leave the job, they can't be thrown out. It will essentially be a residential zone, which is Option B. If it's overlay, it would have to be written really well; the ability to limit that is nearly impossible.

Chair Biro said it's a tech district, and the overlay is the ¼ mile that it is, it would be Redondo's destination. It would be no residential, just small commercial office buildings, can convert the warehouses to flex office space, a job center with an image that can be branded as a destination.

Vote:
Option A - North Redondo tech district/campus – 18
Option C – Workforce housing overlay – 4

Option A - North Redondo – 24%
Option B – North Redondo – 26%

Ms. Nowak said adding keep it the same with no changes and refine the General Plan, is the majority.
GALLERIA DISTRICT:

Current General Plan allows regional commercial which allows for residential, essentially mixed-use, with light industrial and commercial along Artesia.

Option A – Everything the same, took out residential

Option B – Created Galleria areas as mixed-use, true residential, commercial, hotel; new designation with tech type, with office, industrial, retail, hotel, no residential.

Results were for Option B – the difference is adding residential and mixed-use on top and industrial/tech underneath.

Member Glad said Option A was already zoned to allow mixed-use, commercial, residential, retail. If it is changed now, it buys a lawsuit.

Member Pinzler suggested limiting the residential to only what exists.

Planning Manager Scully said putting a limit on the number of units is not consistent with state law.

Ms. Nowak asked if it would be possible to designate 60% commercial, or non-residential, and 40% residential so it's not capping the residential.

Member Glad said if it's designated as solely mixed-use, residential would not be allowed.

Planning Manager Scully confirmed that a certain percentage of the FAR is limited to residential.

Ms. Nowak said the only place the City could accommodate affordable housing is in the mixed-use areas.

In response to Member Simpson regarding an approved project going in with affordable housing, Planning Manager Scully said that project doesn't cover the required allocation.

Planning Manager Scully said once the designations are completed, it will be vetted with the housing consultant and see where the available housing sites are. The housing element will be updated starting the end of 2019 and it is uncertain as to where the RHNA numbers are going to fall.

Planning Manager Scully confirmed that ADU's are considered affordable and will be utilized, however, the credit will not be given everywhere to have those be affordable. They have to demonstrate affordability with the ADU's. A survey is being done to see how much they are being rented for, for family members, trying to get as many qualifications as possible. It is based on how many have been developed in the past. A trend will be developed and take a portion of those RHNA based on survey numbers for rents that qualify and try to qualify as many ADU's to satisfy the RHNA.

Planning Manager Scully said when the annual housing progress report was submitted to the State, it was reported that every ADU was affordable. They recently asked for justification, so the survey was sent out.

Member Pinzler noted that the concern is that it might be all residential.

Ms. Nowak reviewed the Kingsdale area options. Residential – single family medium density. The results from the survey was Option B, which was the higher density housing.
Vote for Kingsdale:
Keep General Plan as is - 5
Option A - 14 DU's per acre, residential for the entire thing, no commercial - 0
Option B - Add 28 to the acre - 16

Back to Galleria District
Option A - Keeps industrial uses, retail, restaurants, entertainment, no residential.
Option B - Keeps it the same, allows for mixed-use with regional serving uses.
Option C - Same as Option B, carving out approved Galleria acreage project, that allowed for
residential with remaining area commercial office, industrial.

Survey results – most everybody voted for Option B

Vote:
Option A - 0
Option B - 4
Option C - 17

PUBLIC COMMENT – 2ND SESSION

Matthew Hinsley, District 3, noted that he works outside of Redondo Beach, but not everyone who
commutes dislikes it. His comment on PCH Central is he would think people would want housing
near the high school; Northern Industrial area, he thinks that would be a good place for housing
and the addition of the tech park. Regarding the Galleria, he thinks it’s a good idea to limit it to
the housing that’s already there. In addition, he’s worried that if all the housing keeps getting taken
away, it won’t be a positive for the housing plan. Lastly, where they chose to put high-density
housing, on Inglewood and Artesia, it’s already dense, with a lot of lights.

Lisa Garth, District 3, noted that the group has already voted on the neighborhood impact, without
allowing them to speak.

Chair Biro explained that it is not a public hearing, it is a selected group that was tasked by the
Mayor and City Council to provide this. There is 15 minutes at the beginning and the end of
the meetings to take public comments, but it is not an open discussion.

Ms. Garth said from a holistic standpoint, she does not see how people from the south are getting
to the freeways. The traffic in her area, near 182nd Street and Inglewood Avenue is being affected
by whatever is happening down there. She noted that there is only one lane going each way on
182nd Street and there are a lot accidents. She said the existing General Plan allows a lot of
housing already and it will impact traffic and safety. These things are affecting the quality of life.
She said when the school quality goes down, it makes the property taxes go down and it affects
the city financially. When considering re-zoning, she would like traffic and traffic patterns
considered.

Jacklyn Mullen said she represents the renter community. She takes the Metro to downtown one
day a week and noted that it is a great place to have a metro station. She said it might not be the
best place to live and noted that there will be a lot of COPD cases in that area. She said the
Galleria and Kingsdale area are the best places for people to live. She thinks if they allow flexibility,
they would get more interesting development.

Doug Boswell said that any additional residential area in South Redondo will affect North
Redondo. He does not want any more residential in South Redondo. Regarding the Industrial
area, he thinks the westside of the industrial area would be the best place for high-density
residential. He noted the parking lots are wasted space. If they put the parking underground with
high-rise, high-density residential on Aviation and Marine, Marine will get them to the Metro station and the freeway. The idea of the east side of the Industrial area being repurposed as a tech campus great. He isn’t sure about the overlay. He suggested the Kingsdale area remaining single-family residence. He said adding residential in the far northeast corner, near the major transportation hubs and freeways, would impact the City far less than south, central, or the Galleria. If a big tech company wants to move in, there are homes in that area. He said they need to stop building residential south of the industrial area.

Lastly, he said if the Greenline is not rerouted down Hawthorne, all the traffic coming up Inglewood Avenue now, and the potential doubling coming along, when they get to 405 freeway, the train will come every 10 minutes and it will back up the streets. He said the residential needs to be north of where the tracks cross Inglewood Avenue.

Member Kilroy said every model he’s seen shows the Greenline going above Inglewood Avenue, and coming down 159th Street. It is not supposed to go on the ground across Inglewood Avenue or Manhattan Beach Boulevard.

GPAC MEMBERS REFERRAL TO STAFF

In response to Member Pinzler regarding having a written document from the Committee at the close of the meetings, Chair Biro said they will get feedback at the next meeting on how they will close it out, and if it requires a review or editing subcommittee, they can make that decision. He also wants to see a document at the end. He said the group should not be disbanded until they know what will be sent to the Planning Commission.

Ms. Nowak said they will take a break in June and come back in July with a draft.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT – 10:10 p.m.

Motion to adjourn by Chair Biro, seconded by Member Gaddis, at 10:10 p.m. to a Regular Meeting to be held at 6:30 p.m. on Thursday, July 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,

Brandy Forbes
Community Development Director