AGENDA – REGULAR MEETING
GENERAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE
CITY OF REDONDO BEACH
WEDNESDAY DECEMBER 11, 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 December 11, 2019
5. Approval of Minutes for the General Plan Advisory Committee Regular Meeting of September 26, 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. Presentation: Draft Open Space and Conservation Element
8. Legislative and Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) Update
9. 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 will be scheduled for Spring, 2020 (date and time to be determined) 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 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.
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”
✓ City Hall Bulletin Board, Door “4”
**Meeting Date & Time** | Wednesday December 11, 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: December 5, 2019*
OPENING SESSION

CALL 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 90277.

ROLL CALL

Members Present: Bajaj, Chrzan, Funabashi, Gaddis, Hannon, Kilroy, Lamb, Ludwig, McKenzie, Moses, Pinzler, Samaras, Sanchez, Simpson, Solomon, Stodder, Szymanski, Turner, Waller, Voisey, and Chair Biro

Members Absent: Eller, Glad, Kartounian, Light, and Nafissi.

Officials Present: Brandy Forbes, Community Development Director (arrived 7:03 p.m.)
Sean Scully, Planning Manager
Marianne Gastelum, Assistant Planner
Lina Portolese, Planning Analyst
Maria Shafer, Recording Secretary

Consultants Present: Wendy Nowak, Placeworks
Halley Grundy, Placeworks
Michael Kennedy, Fehr & Peers

SALUTE TO FLAG

Chair Biro led the assembly in the Salute to the Flag.

APPROVAL OF THE ORDER OF AGENDA

CONSENT CALENDAR

4. **APPROVAL OF THE AFFIDAVIT OF POSTING** for the General Plan Advisory Committee Regular Meeting of September 26, 2019

5. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** for the General Plan Advisory Committee Regular Meeting of April 25, 2019

6. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** for the General Plan Advisory Committee Regular Meeting of May 30, 2019

Member Sanchez indicated he will abstain from the minutes of the April 25, 2019 meeting as he was unavailable to attend.

Member Gaddis presented corrections to the meeting minutes of April 25, 2019.
Motion by Member Solomon, seconded by Member Moses, to approve the Consent Calendar, as corrected. Motion carried unanimously, with Member Sanchez abstaining from the minutes of April 25, 2019.

PUBLIC COMMENT – 1st SESSION

Tom Bauer, resident, thanked the GPAC for its work; referenced the PCH Central corridor, noting the public had voted for Option C; expressed disappointment the GPAC recommended downsizing the area; noted State bills are pushing increased residency in the area and asked the GPAC to reconsider its decision as it eliminates any type of grant funding.

Tom Dempsey referenced previous district meeting discussions regarding a possible parking lot near Perry Park on the Southern California Edison parkway and asked about the status of the project.

Planning Analyst Lina Portolese reported there is an update and she will discuss it with Mr. Dempsey, offline.

ITEMS FOR PRESENTATION, DISCUSSION OR ACTION

7. Announcements and Updates
   a. General Updates

Consultant Wendy Nowak, Placeworks, announced the Buildout/Land plan methodologies and definitions will be used in the development of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and that the Local Hazards Mitigation Plan (LHMP) has been prepared and will be reviewed by the Public Safety Commission at its meeting on October 21, 2019. She reported it is currently out for public review and the last day to comment is on October 31, 2019, and she addressed next steps.

8. Presentation: Draft Artesia Aviation Corridors Area Plan followed by Large Group Discussion

Consultant Wendy Nowak, Placeworks, addressed the purpose of tonight's meeting and deferred to Halley Grundy for a presentation.

Ms. Grundy presented details of the Draft AACAP addressing background, studying the Artesia and Aviation corridors as North Redondo's most prominent commercial hubs, Prior Planning Efforts, Concurrent Planning Efforts, GPAC Recommendations, the AACAP Analysis relative to existing land uses, parking and development feasibility, Challenges, Opportunities to mitigate some of the challenges. She noted the opportunities form the foundation for the strategies contained in the Area Plan. The Area Plan is intended to be a roadmap to ensure private development and public investments in the corridor are reflective of the community's desires and vision for each corridor.

Ms. Grundy indicated the Area Plan is made up of smaller interventions that need to work together in order to realize significant changes; the change is likely to occur gradually, over time. She addressed the Intent of the Area Plan, Placemaking, Mobility, Funding and Implementation and How the AACAP will be used. In terms of funding, she noted potential incentives for encouraging private developments. Additionally, she detailed Key Concepts for Placemaking and Mobility and addressed how the various elements will work together.
Two Activity Nodes were identified in the Area Plan and Ms. Grundy addressed their locations, uses, improving development feasibility and improving the pedestrian experience along the subject corridors. The latter includes activating sidewalks, engaging storefronts and frontages, a Storefront Improvement Program, identity and streetscape enhancements, focus on gateways, banners and wayfinding, public art, business signage and improving connectivity. In terms of considerations for adding bike lanes, she noted it would require an update to the Circulation Element of the General Plan and discussed the South Bay Bicycle Master Plan, improving transit and parking.

Ms. Grundy discussed Funding Priorities, Funding Key Strategies, Potential Incentives and Implementation.

Ms. Nowak opened the floor for general questions and other ideas or considerations to be addressed.

Member Lamb asked about the data available confirming the community wants a pedestrian-oriented corridor.

Ms. Nowak referenced a parking study, noting it would provide some of the information and a pedestrian/walking survey could be conducted to determine walkability. Evaluation on walkability has not yet been done but she added the matter was prompted at the request of the GPAC.

Member Gaddis commented positively on the idea of outdoor dining but expressed concern the corridor is a major thoroughfare with a lot of traffic. He asked about other similar areas and 2nd Street in Belmont Shores was provided as an example. In addition, Member Gaddis asked about the impacts of changing the FAR and reducing the minimum parking.

Ms. Nowak defined FAR and reported FAR is currently at .5; noted it is not enough and property owners need more space and discussed the possibility of expanding building footprints which would provide less space for parking. She commented on reduced parking standards and the possibility of shared parking.

Michael Kennedy, Fehr & Peers, commented on outdoor dining; noted the characteristics of the corridor are attractive for enhancements and referenced 2nd Street in Belmont Shores as a good example of a four-lane roadway with landscaped medians and outdoor dining.

Member Stodder commented on parking requirements and what that could do to neighborhoods. He noted some areas require less parking and some, more.

Mr. Kennedy stated adjusting parking requirements depends on the uses and how far people are willing to park. He referenced the parking study noting it shows that overall, on the corridor, there is a good amount of vacant parking. Mr. Kennedy reported there are many ways to create flexibility in the plan and one way of incentivizing is to reduce the amount of parking required on a parcel. Additionally, he stated a shared-parking analysis has not yet been conducted but there is opportunity to do so, in the future.

Member Solomon reported restaurants are the most intense uses in terms of parking and asked whether a tiered-analysis based on business uses and parking requirements is considered. Mr. Kennedy responded affirmatively noting they are taken into account.
Member Pinzler asked why this plan would work, noting the last General Plan dealt with the same thing and Ms. Grundy responded an implementation plan has not been done, previously. It is a tool, adopted by the City, that will provide a roadmap to accomplish the plan. Member Pinzler commented on a streetlet that would cut the primary line to the library; noted some areas are not flexible and discussed the need to show progress.

Ms. Nowak indicated these are ideas that will need further studying.

Community Development Director Brandy Forbes interjected this is more than an idea and discussed the progress being made by City staff.

Member Lamb discussed new technology available for parking where underutilized or after-hours parking can be identified, and drivers can reserve a parking space. She asked for whether that has been considered and whether it will require a parking study.

Mr. Kennedy noted the current Municipal Code prohibits landowners from selling spaces and implementing the application would require a Municipal Code change. The idea is to establish a marketplace for parking and allow the matching of an interested seller and a buyer; the app would match the willing parties. He stressed it is one of the many ways available to utilize resources such as parking; the parking study reveals there is a lot of supply, off-street, and a mechanism such as this would allow for increased parking.

Member Lamb asked about the timeline that would put the app into play.

Planning Manager Sean Scully reported staff would need to research the matter; stated harnessing the technology on this level would require monitoring and use of resources would be very intensive. As soon as the information is available, it would be provided to the GPAC.

Mr. Kennedy addressed the various parking apps used by other cities.

McKenzie referenced improvements already taking place in terms of storefront improvements along the Artesia corridor and are showing enthusiasm in the area. With the City backing consistent improvements in the corridor, enthusiasm will continue to grow. She added Beach Cities Health District has done a number of surveys, including walkability and 98% of the people surveyed indicated they want improved walkability. She suggested working with Beach Cities Health District to share their data as an additional source of information.

Member Samaras discussed walking to destinations versus driving where parking would be less of a priority; noted parking is an important factor; reported the GPAC would like assurance there will be no parking spill-off into residential neighborhoods and suggested considering parking permits for residents.

Member Hannon discussed initiatives under the Storefront Improvement Program; commented on driving down the Artesia Corridor in the middle of a parking lot, preventing people from seeing the storefronts and suggested finding other parking areas other than on the streets.

Chair Biro discussed fragmented ownership and asked about incentives that could be provided through the Building Department that would encourage improvements without them having to comply with current Building Code requirements that would discourage improvements. He suggested flexibility in incentives allowing for repairs as opposed to a full-blown retrofit. Chair Biro expressed concern much of the funding puts the burden on the General Fund and asked about the availability of other funding mechanisms.
Planning Manager Scully reported that with respect to the Building Code, there is limited flexibility, but in certain cases, the Building Official may waive certain requirements.

Chair Biro added that most business owners would be intimidated to visit City Hall.

Community Development Director Forbes suggested adjustments in parking requirements may give business owners room and ideas of what they may be able to do on their space. The Building Code does have limitations as to what is and what is not allowed and commented on the possibility of adjusting building fees.

Chair Biro suggested having a Building Department outreach effort to business owners and residents of Redondo Beach.

Member Szymanski commented on the need to optimize supply and demand; discussed hard assets and building owners maximizing their use so that parking could become a constraint and suggested successful businesses could creep into neighborhoods and maximize available parking. He a project in which he was involved and reported they had to start with a model and work backwards to determine how much square footage needs to be devoted to parking. Business owners will want an abundance of parking, not on their property, but right next door and all residents in the area will want an abundance of parking, but not right next door. All of that must be balanced with a plan/model of uses, irrespective of the uses.

Member Sanchez commented on increases in FAR; opined a tiny bump will not create a large impact and suggested property owners will have a huge say in the subject. He asked about plans to reach out to property owners and get them on board.

Planning Manager Scully reported integrating with the revitalization group that works with the City Manager's Office but not all business properties have been noticed, at this time.

Community Development Director Forbes referenced a presentation by the BAE where they mentioned they had had conversations with brokers in the area and discussed that minor changes in the FARs could make a difference. She noted many of the improvements will be done by the City but noted the importance of property owners being aware of what is being done. Notification will be given, per project.

Member Sanchez asked about engaging the people who own the land.

Community Development Director Forbes acknowledged the recommendation and suggested adding it to the implementation part of the plan.

Discussion followed regarding specific notification to property owners and the possibility of generating an on-line survey.

Ms. Nowak added there will be a community workshop and a special "reach-out" to property owners.

Member Solomon referenced activity node locations, streetlets and pass-throughs and asked whether an overlay was created.

Planning Manager Scully reported staff looked at every lot on the corridor and activity nodes were specific to certain mixes in use relative to compatibility and synergy.
Member Solomon requested that staff consider creating charging stations in parking areas, as part of the circulation/parking plan.

Member Simpson reported that was an element of the Revitalization Committee’s recommendation.

Member Solomon commented positively on shared-ride pick up and parking areas, as they will impact circulation. Additionally, he noted the need to create a business-facing component for any grants or programs introduced. In terms of the Storefront Improvement Project, he defined success as investing tax-payer dollars into private property and generating a return on that investment. He disagreed with the idea of people using tax-payer dollars to improve private property which results in a success for them but not to the City.

Member Pinzler noted the property shown in the presentation with upgrades, has been empty. He added the goal of this assignment is to increase office space which would be a dramatic reuse of all of the properties. In many cases the City will be dealing with trusts or property owners who live elsewhere. He referenced Proposition 13 and stated every time the property changes, it will be reassessed, and the properties will be taxed at a much-higher rate. He noted the need to think 25-years into the future. Member Pinzler noted circulation on Artesia will be impossible because of the crowded streets and stressed the need to be very clear as to what the future will be. Nothing will change until the basic structure of the streets change.

Member Moses reported the 1300 block of Aviation Boulevard is currently vacant.

Member Pinzler pointed out the group has decided the corridor is an office/restaurant location and wondered how the structure of the street could be changed.

Ms. Nowak discussed incremental changes and noted the need for more cohesive studies in implementation of the plan.

Ms. Nowak recapped the ideas discussed so far including ensuring property-owner coordination, Building Department ambassadors and charging stations.

Member Samaras thanked City staff and PlaceWorks for their work; opined the plan can be done and suggested staff will need to prioritize mobility improvements in the context of allowing higher FARs and granting parking reductions. He suggested in order to obtain those incentives developers must be required to provide improved walkability options. Member Samaras discussed holding staff accountable after the plan is adopted and provided specific examples of locations with opportunities to create activity nodes and/or open space.

Community Development Director Forbes acknowledged staff still has a lot of work to do; commented on upcoming City Council public hearings where the public can address the plan; noted the need to consider drive-throughs versus providing a destination feel, rather than drive-throughs and reported a project was approved recently for CVS to paint a mural on their blank wall. She added those are areas where the Storefront Improvement Project is making a difference.

Member Samaras suggested making open space a permitted use on some of the corridor’s commercial zones; agreed with the idea of pass-throughs and recommended the plan have language allowing the City get easements and allowing access to parking lots.
Brief discussion followed regarding prohibiting drive-throughs and enhancing walkability.

Member Simpson commented on the opening of a new Chick-Fil-A with a drive-through near one of the activity nodes; suggested new things exist that may not go along with the plan and asked about next steps.

Community Development Director Forbes indicated the ideas and changes suggested will be incorporated into the plan and a community meeting will be held in January. She suggested there could be a drive-through, but a design standard could be implemented also requiring a pedestrian stream.

Discussion followed regarding continuing to allow drive-throughs and the possibility of prohibiting them in activity nodes.

Ms. Nowak added the exploration of drive-throughs as an implementation action item.

Member Hannon spoke about the South Bay Bicycle Coalition and the Bicycle Master Plan and provided a brief history of the project. He reported it was the first interconnected bicycle plan in the nation and noted the desire to see more dining on sidewalks, access and reasons for people to walk. He expressed concerns that walkability will be reduced with the current configuration of Artesia, adding bicycle lanes (sharrows), parking, dining and landscaping. He referenced crash data on major intersections and expressed concerns with traffic and pedestrian safety.

Ms. Nowak reported these are basic concepts and details will be addressed at the appropriate time in the design. These will take into account different median issues and parking as well as others.

Community Development Director Forbes noted these are basic concepts and reported the City has required roadway width to be able to implement many of the concepts.

Member Pinzler commented on deliveries adding another element of what can be on the corridor and noted they need to be put into the mix of what the City wants on the street and how it will make it work for the businesses the City is trying to attract.

Member Ludwig agreed restaurants must have delivery areas.

Member Moses commented on the purpose of the plan and opined if it is 75% achievable, it is a good plan.

Discussion followed regarding establishing a parking district on PCH and Member Bajaj noted it is difficult to achieve and opined it is not a debate at this time.

Member Moses discussed eliminating street parking and creating parking districts and opined it may be the best improvement made on Artesia.

Member Chrzan asked about incentives and Community Development Director Forbes property owners will be able to access the Storefront Improvement Program staff is still considering where to place bicycle parking and other mobility parking. Member Chrzan pined mobility from the corridor into neighborhoods will be a hard challenge to work out.

Ms. Nowak agreed there are no easy solutions.
Member Lamb asked whether there is leadership on Artesia that could partner with the City and move forward rather than waiting on City staff to take action.

Community Development Director Forbes referenced the North Redondo Beach Business Association and spoke about the encouraging Business Improvement Districts.

Member McKenzie stressed the importance of getting businesses engaged and opined the improvements already taken place will get them more involved and motivated.

Member Lamb noted technology will have a more prominent role in the future and suggested identifying technology as an integral part of the experience, focusing on a more-robust plan for community engagement and considering integrating technology into every-day life.

Discussion followed regarding "smart cities", the fact that technology is always changing adding an acknowledgement of the need to stay abreast of contemporary technology tools.

Mr. Kennedy reported technology can change quickly, stated there are many unknown technological choices and suggested defining a vision for how technology should operate in the City.

Community Development Director Forbes added technology can be used as a tool to inform decision-makers.

Member Sanchez added the market will take care of it.

Discussion followed regarding incentivizing shared working, the effects of traffic patterns, using technology to help implement the vision, useful tools available, small cell towers and sensors.

Community Development Director Forbes discussed opportunities for additional activity nodes.

Member Solomon asked about other locations considered for activity nodes and Ms. Nowak stated the locations shown were the only ones that "rose to the surface".

Ms. Nowak recapped and summarized the ideas presented and discussed. Proposed revisions included:

**Placemaking**

- Building Code Ambassadors
- Opportunities to add additional Activity Nodes (e.g. Rindge: CVS/grocery store, opportunity to add open space, remove barriers between uses)
- Make open space a permitted use commercial areas (purchase / creation of new open space)
- Combine pass-throughs with open space
- Put pass-throughs into regulations/require easements
- Implementation: evaluate how to approach drive-throughs
- Are preferred uses too specific (considering co-working, etc.)?

---
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Mobility

- Comprehensive shared parking studies or models to inform reduced parking standards
- Charging station in parking areas.
- Develop a technology framework
  - Autonomous vehicles/ride share pick up or holding areas.
  - Parking demand management strategies
  - Sensors / monitoring technologies
  - Future technology
- Curb management: delivery – next step
- Develop complete streets strategy including phasing

Funding

- All programs: grants/incentives/ etc. need a public-facing or outreach effort
- Public investment into private property improvements should yield returns for the community
- Fiscal evaluation of funding sources during implementation

Implementation

- Outreach / Engagement
  - Property owner coordination
  - Community members
- Internal Strategy: Prioritization List
- Hold community and City accountable for ensuring that public improvements happen
  - City Council strategic plan is updated every 6 months

Relative to drive-throughs, implementation will be revisited through design.

Member Waller suggested adding parking-demand management under technology and discussed developing complete-streets strategies including phasing.

Discussion followed regarding increased property taxes, tracking sales tax, consider all funding options including their practicality and developing parking strategies.

Member Pinzler expressed concerns regarding moving from free parking to metered or permitted parking and suggested adding a statement regarding the theory and practical implementation of the different funding options.

Community Development Director Forbes reported the funding section of the document shows the different funding possibilities. Upon evaluation of specific options, City Council will consider how those funds will be raised.

Community Development Director Forbes suggested adding a statement under funding that as the plan moves towards implementation, a fiscal evaluation be done in terms of the funding sources.

Ms. Nowak indicated funding sources may become available that are yet unknown.
Member Pinzler noted the need for foresight and prioritizing to ensure the ideas can be implemented, in terms of funding.

Member Samaras discussed parking districts and their feasibility; noted other cities have been successful in raising funds and felt some of the ideas are feasible.

Ms. Nowak continued summarizing the ideas discussed; reported the plan does not rest only on the people who created it but, on the City, and the community to ensure inclusion of the plan into the City's Strategic Plan.

Motion by Chair Biro, seconded by Member Solomon, to receive and file the Blue Folder item. Motion carried, unanimously.

9. Legislative and Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) Update

Planning Manager Scully provided an update of today's meeting of SCAG noting they are developing a methodology for allocating the number of households that will be assigned to the Southern California region. The City of Redondo Beach submitted a letter documenting concerns with the previous methodology and Planning Manager Scully reported it will be several months before the City gets a definitive number from the State. It will have an effect on the Land Plan so that will cause a pause in moving forward. Planning Manager Scully reported SB 330 has not been signed yet, but it is another move by the State to promote and implement more housing across the State.

Member Kilroy discussed SB 330 and its potential effects on the South Bay Galleria and ADUs.

Planning Manager Scully reported ADUs are very limited and would not be impacted by SB 330.

Community Development Director Forbes noted the City will have a better feel for the implications once the City is assigned its RHNA numbers.

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

Ms. Nowak described the process to arrive at a Land Use Plan; addressed the Tentative Schedule and noted many of the items will occur concurrently.

Community Development Director Forbes announced the Local Hazard Mitigation Plan will be reviewed by the Public Safety Commission on October 21, 2019.

PUBLIC COMMENT – 2ND SESSION

Chair Biro opened public comments.

Grace Peng, League of Women Voters, L.A. County, spoke in support of reducing air pollution, water pollution and reducing the effects of climate change. She discussed bike lanes and stated the basic structure of the Artesia corridor is auto-supremacy; commented on planning 25-years in advance but stressed there will be a drier, hotter planet in 25 years. She opined the City should be leading in this effort and reassuring businesses that their customers will not be arriving in cars, but they will have customers. Ms. Peng stressed the need to make every street bike-able for children and the elderly.
Jaclyn Mullen reported the Artesia corridor is home to her; commented on its walkability and likes the GPACs vision to improve walkability. She opined the City will need to make a major investment, up front, to demonstrate to the community and property owners that the City is serious in implementing the plan. She reported the City of Torrance will be taking over Metro 130 along Artesia and plans to increase the frequency; noted public parking and outdoor dining were key pieces to the revitalization of Culver City and referenced an article by UCLA Professor Donald Schutz on The High Cost of Free Parking. Ms. Mullen opined a public parking garage would be a much-better alternative than parking on streets.

Holly Osborn discussed the possibility of obtaining information about what stores are frequented on the Artesia corridor. She stated she would not like for it to turn into all restaurants and office spaces but rather keep the wide variety of stores currently on Artesia.

Doug Boswell hoped the Artesia corridor will not be just restaurants and offices; opined the City should incentivize property owners do improve their properties; suggested outdoor dining will not be popular versus roof-top dining and discussed the possibility of underground parking. He felt there are many options that have not been discussed that could be solutions to move the plan forward.

John Gran, City Council Member, District 4, thanked the GPAC for their excellent work and efforts.

Lisa Garland, District 3, spoke in favor of the North Redondo Beach Bike Path Extension Project but disagreed with the location of the proposed parking. She suggested locating it south of Artesia, along Vanderbilt.

GPAC MEMBERS REFERRALS TO STAFF - None

ADJOURNMENT

The GPAC was asked to choose a meeting date for the next meeting of the GPAC. A hand-count resulted in the majority of Members choosing Wednesday, December 11, 2019 as the next meeting date.

Motion to adjourn by Chair Biro, seconded by Member Sanchez, at 10:06 p.m. to a Regular Meeting to be held at 6:30 p.m. on Wednesday, December 11, 2019 in the Redondo Beach Public Library, Second Floor Meeting Room, 303 N. Pacific Coast Highway, Redondo Beach, CA 90277. Motion carried unanimously.

_________________________________
Brandy Forbes, AICP
Community Development Director