City of Redondo Beach
General Plan Advisory Committee
Meeting #22 | December 3, 2020

General Plan Update

Impact of RHNA & SB 330 on Preferred Land Use Plan
Virtual Protocol

GENERAL

• Recommend all GPAC members mute themselves during the presentation and encourage participants to turn cameras on

• To speak, raise your hand, and you will be invited to speak

• Hold questions until pauses in the presentation or until the group discussion

• GPAC members will be able to mute and unmute themselves during the large group discussion

TECHNICAL ISSUES?

• Email: Lina.Portolese@redondo.org
Virtual Protocol

CHAT

• GPAC members will be able to provide questions directly to Lina via the chat function in Zoom and she will share them with the group to respond as appropriate
Agenda

- Opening Remarks
  - Call to Order
  - Roll Call
  - Salute to Flag
- Approval of the Order of Agenda & Meeting Minutes from December 11, 2019
- Public Comment (Session 1)
- Announcements & Updates (Staff and Consultant team)
- Presentation: Impacts of State Law on the recommended Land Use Plan
  - SB 330 overview
  - Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) overview

*continued next slide*
Agenda (cont’d)

• Large Group Discussion
  – Where and how do we reintroduce housing into the Land Use Plan to meet RHNA requirements?

• Next Steps

• Public Comment (Session 2)

• GPAC Referrals to Staff

• Adjournment
Virtual Protocols – Public Comment

HOW PUBLIC CAN PROVIDE COMMENTS OR PARTICIPATE

All committee members are participating by virtual meeting. Members of the public may participate by Zoom, Email or eCOMMENT.

This GPAC meeting will be broadcast live through Spectrum Cable, Channel 8, and Frontier Communications, Channel 41. Live streams and archives of meetings are available on the City’s website at www.Redondo.org/rbtv

eCOMMENT: Comments may be entered directly on the website agenda page

- Public comments can be entered before and during the meeting.
- Specific instructions for submitting an eComment are included on the first page of the agenda.
- Select a SPECIFIC AGENDA ITEM to enter your comment.
- eComments will become part of the official meeting record, and comments may be read out loud during the meeting.
Virtual Protocols – Public Comment

HOW PUBLIC CAN PROVIDE COMMENTS OR PARTICIPATE

TO JOIN ZOOM MEETING (FOR PROVIDING PUBLIC COMMENT ONLY):

• Register in advance or during the meeting by going to the following link:
  • https://us02web.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_nV4WAlh-Qi6RDv9_bDpHrQ
  • Go to www.Redondo.org/rbtv select tonight's agenda and follow instructions to register for the zoom meeting. E-comments can also be submitted through this link.

• After registering, you will receive a confirmation email containing information about joining the meeting.

• If you are participating by phone, be sure to provide your phone # when registering. You will be provided a Toll-Free number and a Meeting ID to access the meeting. Note; press # to bypass Participant ID. Attendees will be muted until the public participation period is opened.

• When you are called on to speak, press *6 to unmute your line. Note, comments from the public are limited to 3 minutes per speaker.
Public Comment
Session 1
Announcements and Updates

GENERAL PLAN PROGRESS IN 2020

• AACAP
  – Public Meeting in Feb
  – Planning Commission this Summer
  – City Council reviewed in October
  – Requested follow up information re: Establishing an arts district, costs/process for a parking analysis, and additional direction regarding preferred uses in the Corridor
  – Reviewing again Dec 8th

• LHMP Adopted in July, and approved by FEMA / CalOES

• GPAC Open Space & Conservation Element and Survey
  – Shared results in Sept
  – Will revisit the element and suggested refinements as a group in an upcoming meeting based on feedback from GPAC

• RHNA
  – Conducted Housing Sites Inventory and evaluated draft RHNA (issued Sept 2020) and SB330 impacts on the GPAC’s recommended LUP
  – RHNA Appeal filed on October 26th
  – Final RHNA allocations expected early February 2021
SIX TOTAL MEETINGS REMAINING

GPAC 22: revisit of GPAC Land Use Plan recommendations (responding to DRAFT RHNA allocation)
  • **Community Meeting 3:** Presentation of Land Use Plan (media format to be determined)
  • **Planning Commission/City Council:** Confirm Draft Land Use Plan for study in environmental documents (initiate technical studies)
  • **EIR Scoping Meeting**

GPAC 23: Goal & Policy Review – Land Use

GPAC 24: Goal & Policy Review – Open Space

GPAC 25: Goal & Policy Review – Open Space

GPAC 26: Goal & Policy Review – Noise & Safety

GPAC 27: Final Review of Document
  • **Community Meeting 4:** Goals and Policies
  • **Planning Commission and City Council:** Adoption Hearings
  • **Citywide Vote** and **Coastal Commission Review**
Purpose of the Meeting

TONIGHT’S PRIMARY TASKS:

- Review how new state laws and RHNA requirements have affected the recommended Land Use Plan

  **Bottom Line:** Recommended plan (as proposed) does not meet RHNA and City needs to make additional edits to satisfy obligations because the Plan is short on units

- Provide direction to refine to GPAC’s land use recommendations to comply with requirements

  Specifically, asking GPAC to provide direction on seven separate options identified to meet RHNA requirements
NEW STATE LAWS AFFECTING HOUSING
SB 330 - Housing Crisis Act

- State law mandates that Cities cannot go below planned housing capacities that existed as of Jan 1, 2018 (Current General Plan)
- If housing capacity is reduced in one location it must be replaced in another
- GPAC’s Recommended Land Use plan reduced residential densities in some designations and removed the Mixed-Use Designation specific locations
- This resulted in a net loss in housing capacity (compared to General Plan in effect as of Jan 1, 2018)
- City has to address lost housing capacity to meet SB 330 requirements, regardless of RHNA.
- However, if City meets RHNA requirements it effectively addresses SB 330 requirement
How Proposed LUP Revisions Affected Existing GP LUP

Option A
Reduced maximum capacity by ~1,600 units

Option B
Reduced maximum capacity by ~1,800 units
SB 166 & AB 72

SB 166 - No Net Loss

• If sites are being developed with fewer total units and/or are not in the income levels assumed in Housing Element

• If a shortfall
  – City must identify replacement sites; or
  – Make more sites available through rezoning within 6 months

• Galleria Example

• State guidance to plan for 20% more units than required by the RHNA

• In comparison, SB 330 addresses under planning for capacity vs SB 166 addresses under development of sites

AB 72 - Increased HCD Enforcement

• HCD may revoke certification and report violations to Attorney General to enforce
HOW RHNA APPLIES IN REDONDO BEACH
What is RHNA?

- Requirement of State housing law
- Process defines projected and existing housing need for all jurisdictions (city or unincorporated county) in California
- SCAG allocates how many units affordable to different income levels each City must plan to accommodate
- Every jurisdiction must plan for its RHNA in its Housing Element by ensuring there are enough sites to accommodate their RHNA allocation
RHNA Requirements

- Not an obligation to build the units
- But must demonstrate adequate capacity for various income levels along with presence of appropriate zoning/development standards
- Process to demonstrate ability to provide units, but it does not constitute approval of a housing project (separate submittal, review and approval process required)
- State has established a default density that demonstrates what is “Feasible” for lower income – Minimum 30 dwelling units per acre
Solving RHNA: Considerations

ONLY SOME SITES QUALIFY FOR RHNA

• Not all sites qualify

• Must have potential for near-term development
  • Vacant and underutilized
  • Trend of recycling or likelihood to transition to a new use within 8-year RHNA cycle

• State law prohibits the concentration of affordable housing in one location; it must be spread throughout City
City’s Draft RHNA Allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income*</th>
<th>RHNA Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low (&lt;50% AMI) &lt;= $56,300</td>
<td>933</td>
<td>37.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (50%-80% AMI) $56,300 - $90,100</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate (80%-120% AMI) $90,100 - $92,750</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Moderate (&gt; =120% AMI) &gt; = $92,750</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,483</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AMI = Area Median Income

*2020 Income Limits for a family of 4 in Los Angeles County (source: HCD, April 2020)
Providing a buffer RHNA Allocation

Requires us to plan for 2,483 units + 20% SB 166 buffer of Very Low + Low income units

2,771 Additional Units

as of 9/3/2020
(Final allocations are anticipated early 2021)
## Breakdown of Draft Allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</th>
<th>Allocation</th>
<th>Density Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low + Low</td>
<td>1,440 units+ 20% = 1,728</td>
<td>Must be ≥ 30 du/ac ≥ 0.5 ac site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate + Above Moderate</td>
<td>1,043 units</td>
<td>Can be &lt; 30 du/ac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,771 units</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

City has excess capacity for Moderate and above Moderate levels, so focus of HE efforts will be on identifying sites at a minimum of 30 du/ac to accommodate affordable housing (VL & L categories).
THE STARTING POINT: A refresher on the Proposed LUP

- Preserve GPAC recommendations to greatest extent possible:
  - Reduce density from 35 du/ac to 30 du/ac for Mixed Use
  - Eliminate Mixed Use from Artesia
  - Eliminate Mixed Use from PCH Central and, if Option B confirmed, remove HD/replace with Commercial uses
  - Removed Mixed Use south of Galleria (created Industrial Flex)
  - North Tech District: Leave as General Industrial (but had conversations about possibly including residential due to proximity to Metro Station, etc.)
## RHNA Strategy
### Standard Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Units Needed</th>
<th>Very Low + Low</th>
<th>Moderate + Above Moderate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADUs</strong></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residential Recycling (R2-R3)</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residential (R1 Vacant)</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Galleria (Project)</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Galleria-Kingsdale (Density 28 du/ac) (less extg units)</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PCH South (Density 30 du/ac)</strong></td>
<td>177</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Artesia (No MU)</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PCH Central (No MU)</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Galleria-Industrial Flex Area (No MU)</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tech District</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Units Accommodated</strong></td>
<td>265</td>
<td>1,312</td>
<td>1,577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shortfall / Surplus</strong></td>
<td><strong>-1,463</strong></td>
<td><strong>+269</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Still need sites to accommodate **1,463**

Additional units for Very Low + Low income housing (30+ du/ac) than provided in GPAC-recommended land use plan.
## Accommodating Our RHNA Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Units Needed</th>
<th>Very Low + Low</th>
<th>Moderate + Above Moderate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADUs</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Recycling (R2-R3)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential (R1 Vacant)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galleria (Project)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galleria-Kingsdale (Density 28 du/ac) (less extg units)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCH South (Density 30 du/ac)</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artesia (No MU)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCH Central (No MU)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galleria-Industrial Flex Area</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech District</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Units Accommodated</strong></td>
<td><strong>265</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,312</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,577</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Shortfall / Surplus**

- **-1,463**
  - Additional units for Very Low + Low income housing (30+ du/ac) than provided in GPAC-recommended land use plan

Still need sites to accommodate **1,463**
Galleria – Industrial Flex Area

RECOMMENDATION
Add residential overlay to the Industrial Flex area south of the Galleria (51 acres)

A maximum of 30% of acreage allowed to be developed at a maximum 45 du/ac

Results in: 600 potential units
## RHNA Strategy Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Units Needed</th>
<th>Very Low + Low</th>
<th>Moderate + Above Moderate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADUs</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Recycling (R2-R3)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential (R1 Vacant)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galleria (Project)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galleria-Kingsdale (Density 28 du/ac) (less extg units)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCH South (Density 30 du/ac)</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artesia (No MU)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCH Central (No MU)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galleria-Industrial Flex Area (Residential Overlay: 45 du/ac on 30% of acreage)</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech District</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Units Accommodated</strong></td>
<td><strong>865</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,312</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,577</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shortfall / Surplus</strong></td>
<td><strong>-863</strong></td>
<td><strong>+269</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Still need sites to accommodate **863**

Additional units for **Very Low + Low income housing (30+ du/ac)** than provided in GPAC-recommended land use plan.
North Tech District

RECOMMENDATION

• Add residential overlay to the General Industrial area in a portion of the Tech District (87 acres)

  A maximum of 30% of acreage allowed to be developed at a maximum 45 du/ac

Results in: 1,000 potential units
## Accommodating Our RHNA Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Low + Low</th>
<th>Moderate + Above Moderate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Units Needed</strong></td>
<td>1,728</td>
<td>1,043</td>
<td>2,771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADUs</strong></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residential Recycling (R2-R3)</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residential (R1 Vacant)</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Galleria (Project)</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Galleria-Kingsdale</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Density 28 du/ac) (less extg units)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PCH South</strong> (Density 30 du/ac)</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Artesia (No MU)</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PCH Central (No MU)</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Galleria-Industrial Flex Area (Residential Overlay: 45 du/ac on 30% of acreage)</strong></td>
<td>600</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tech District (Residential Overlay: 45 du/ac on 30% of acreage)</strong></td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Units Accommodated</strong></td>
<td>1,865</td>
<td>1,312</td>
<td>1,577</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Shortfall / Surplus**

+137 +269

**RHNA Achieved**

Preserves all other GPAC recommendations
Other Options: Capacity Comparison

Capacities in other areas that could be applied:

- **Artesia MU**: 212 potential units
- **PCH Central MU**: 162 potential units
- Increase Density (RH) in Kingsdale Area. However, needs to be at a density of 60 du/ac as HCD will want to see that there is enough incentive to owners to consolidate lots 350 potential units (if built at max)
- Select Opt. A (with increased RH density/church properties): 113 potential units
- **Restore Density (MU) South PCH (30 du/ac to 35 du/ac)**: 38 potential units

*Estimates are based on preliminary analysis*
Items for GPAC Vote

Artesia: Add back Mixed Use to the Land Use Plan? **212 units**

A “no” vote retains GPAC’s current recommendations that show the corridor with predominantly commercial uses and ancillary Public and MU uses (existing)

A “yes” vote reintroduces residential back into the corridor by adding back in the MU designation

If yes, take secondary vote – leave MU in current location or add residential overlay to the entire corridor to allow flexibility of placement down the road?

PCH Central: Add back Mixed Use to the Land Use Plan (in original location)? **162 Units**

A “yes” vote would retain original location and acres of Mixed Use from existing GP

A “no” vote would maintain Commercial Flex Designation proposed by GPAC

PCH Central: Keep RH (with increased RH density from 28 du/ac to 30 du/ac): **113 potential units**

A “yes” vote would retain original location and acres of RH and increase density from 28 du/ac to 30 du/ac

A “no” vote would maintain the Commercial Flex Designation proposed by GPAC
Items for GPAC Vote

Kingsdale: Increase RH Density to 60 du/ac (current GPAC recommendation is 28 du/ac): **350 potential units**

- A “yes” vote would increase the density of the Kingsdale neighborhood to 60 du/ac
- A “no” vote would maintain the 28 du/ac designation proposed by GPAC

Restore MU Density on South PCH (put back at 35 du/ac vs 30 du/ac)? **38 units**

- A “yes” vote leaves the land use locations the same, but changes the density to 35 du/ac
- A “no” vote leaves the land use locations the same and retains the density at 30 du/ac
Items for GPAC Vote

Industrial Flex south of Galleria: Add residential overlay to Industrial Flex use allowing 30% of acreage at 45 du/acre? 600 potential units

A “yes” vote adds the overlay, which allows for up to 45 du/acre on no more than 30% of the acres of Industrial Flex uses located south of the Galleria project.

A “no” vote leaves the Industrial Flex designation as is (or identifies a different % acreage or density that is offset by changes made in other areas)

North Tech District: Add residential overlay to Industrial General use (area east of Redondo Beach Blvd) allowing 30% of acreage at 45 du/acre? 1,000 potential units

A “yes” vote adds the overlay, which allows for up to 45 du/acre on no more than 30% of the acres of IG located east of Redondo Beach Boulevard.

A “no” vote leaves the Industrial Flex designation as is (or identifies a different % acreage or density that is offset by changes made in other areas)
Artesia – maintain GPAC recommendation (No MU)

Current GP = 212 units (VL + L)

GPAC recommended GP = zero units
PCH Central - maintain GPAC recommendation (No MU)

Current GP
162 units (VL + L)

GPAC Opt. B
zero units (VL + L)

GPAC Opt. A
zero units (VL + L)
Public Comment Session 2
Next Steps
Next Steps for Land Use

• Revise recommended Land Use Plan & Land Use Designations
• Update buildout assumptions
• Forward recommended Land Use Plan to PC/CC for review
• Kick off GP EIR and technical studies
• Housing Element moves forward on separate track for submittal to HCD (separate Environmental)
• Draft Land Use Element / review with GPAC
• Forward to Planning Commission & City Council along with Land Use Element, Open Space & Conservation, Safety, and Noise Elements
Next Meeting (Tentative)

To Be Determined
6:30 P.M.
Zoom Webinar or
Redondo Beach Public Library
Second Floor Meeting Room
303 N. Pacific Coast Highway
Redondo Beach, CA 90277

Please visit the project website: www.redondo.org/PLANredondo