TO: PLANNING COMMISSION
FROM: SEAN SCULLY, PLANNING MANAGER
SUBJECT: RECOMMENDED GENERAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE (GPAC) LAND USE PLAN AND MAP

TITLE
DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON THE GENERAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE (GPAC) RECOMMENDED LAND USE PLAN AND MAP

Discuss, receive public input/comments, consider, and make a recommendation to the Mayor and City Council on the Draft General Plan Land Use Plan/Map which will support and inform the Draft Housing Element Update and serve as the basis for the required environmental analysis (California Environmental Quality Act - CEQA) of the City’s ongoing General Plan Update.

BACKGROUND
This “BACKGROUND” section presents brief summary remarks that include a description of GPAC’s makeup and role, an identification of the areas where GPAC determined to recommend changes to the City’s existing General Plan Land Use Plan/Map, the consistency of their recommended draft land use plan/map with State Housing Laws, the role of the public and the Planning Commission at the April 15, 2021 public hearing, and information concerning the City’s recent community meeting (April 7, 2021) where the GPAC’s Draft General Plan Land Use Plan/Map was presented to the public.

Following the brief summary remarks noted above is a link to the most relevant webpage on the City’s PLANredondo website that discusses the April 15, 2021 Planning Commission meeting and includes numerous important links to the documents that City Staff requests the Planning Commissioners review in preparation for this public hearing.

Summary
The “Recommended Land Use Plan/Map” captures the GPAC’s recommended amendments to the City’s existing General Plan Land Use Plan/Map. The GPAC is a 27-member advisory committee appointed by the City Council and Mayor charged with supporting the City’s ongoing General Plan Update. The GPAC has been meeting for nearly 4 years and has held 22 meetings to date. Their recommendations for amendments to the City’s existing General Plan Land Use Plan/Map focused on most of the City’s commercial corridors, larger commercial centers, and industrial areas while largely preserving and maintaining the City’s existing residential neighborhoods with their current
land use designations. The GPAC’s “Recommended Land Use Plan/Map” is compliant with recent changes in State Housing Law and as recommended provides capacity for meeting the City’s recently issued Regional Housing Needs Assessment allocation of 2,490 residential units. The public has been invited to this “Virtual Planning Commission” public hearing to submit e-mail and live-stream questions and/or comments concerning the “Recommended Land Use Plan/Map” by public notice in the Daily Breeze, Beach Reporter, Easy Reader, cable message on the City’s local cable channel, the City’s website, the City’s Community Services Department Ezine and e-blast, a PlanRedondo e-blast, and social media posts. This “Virtual Planning Commission Meeting” will provide an additional opportunity for the community to provide input and allow the City’s Planning Commission to conduct their discussions, consider confirming and/or recommending alternatives to the GPAC recommended Draft General Plan Land Use Plan/Map, and ultimately make a recommendation to the Mayor and City Council on this critical Draft Land Use Plan/Map.

- Due to the recent assignment of the City’s RHNA (February 2021) by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) and the upcoming deadline (October 15, 2021) for the submittal to the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) of the City’s Housing Element, the City Council determined at their meeting on April 6, 2021, that the Planning Commission will have this single meeting to consider the Draft General Plan Land Use Plan/Map and make their recommendation to the Mayor and City Council.

A community meeting was held on April 7, 2021 where City Staff and the City’s consultants presented the GPAC’s recommended land use plan/map and solicited comments. Additionally, at that community meeting the City launched the “Social PinPoint Website”. The Social PinPoint website is essentially an interactive map that allows the public to comment on GPAC’s recommended changes. As noted above City Staff will compile all the comments on the map and provide them to the Planning Commission prior to the public hearing on the 15th of April, 2021.

**Link to Webpage Entitled “Recommended GPAC Land Use Plan will be discussed by Planning Commission on April 15th”**

Herein is the link to the most relevant webpage on the City’s PLANredondo website that discusses the April 15, 2021 Planning Commission meeting and includes numerous important links, listed below, to the documents that City Staff requests the Planning Commissioners review in preparation for this public hearing.

- FAQs Redondo Beach Housing Element
- Recommended Land Use Plan/Map
- Recommended Land Use Definition Matrix
- Recommended Land Use Plan Buildout and Comparison to Current General Plan
- PowerPoint Presentation April 7, 2021 Virtual Community Meeting
- Social Pinpoint Website - public comment map open through April 11, 2021
  - Comments received on the map will be provided to the Planning Commission prior to the April 15, 2021 under Blue Folder
The social pinpoint map also includes descriptions of the each of the GPAC’s focus areas and summaries of the concepts for each area as well as the changes from the existing General Plan map that GPAC recommends.

- Meeting Video April 7, 2021 Community Meeting - to present the Draft Land Use Plan

- Meeting Video from GPAC meeting December 3, 2020 - where the recommended plan was discussed and approved by GPAC


**RECOMMENDATION**
The Planning Division recommends that the Planning Commission accept a staff report and presentation, take and consider any public comments/input, review, discuss, and reach consensus on any recommended comments or changes/edits/alternatives to the General Plan Advisory Committee’s (GPAC’s) recommended Draft General Plan Land Use Plan that will then be forwarded to the City Council for their consideration.

**ATTACHMENTS**
FAQs Redondo Beach Housing Element
Recommended Land Use Plan/Map
Recommended Land Use Definition Matrix
Recommended Land Use Plan Buildout and Comparison to Current General Plan
PowerPoint Presentation April 7, 2021 Virtual Community Meeting
GPAC Minutes December 3, 2020 (Draft)
Written public comments received up to the time of agenda release
1. What is the General Plan Housing Element and why does the City have to update it?

The Housing Element of the General Plan is a State-mandated policy document that identifies Redondo Beach’s existing and future housing needs and establishes clear goals to inform future housing decisions. The City’s Housing Element provides goals, policies and programs that address:

- Conserving and improving existing housing
- Providing adequate housing sites
- Assisting in the provision of affordable housing
- Removing governmental constraints to housing development
- Promoting fair housing opportunities

Unlike other elements of the General Plan, State law requires the Housing Element to be updated every eight years, and in some cases every four years. The City’s current Housing Element (5th Cycle) was adopted by the City Council in August 2013, and updated in 2017, and covers the period 2014-2021. The next housing cycle (6th Cycle) will cover the eight-year planning period from October 2021 to October 2029.

2. Is the Housing Element a separate stand-alone plan?

The Housing Element is one of seven State-mandated elements of the General Plan, and is required to be internally consistent with other parts of the General Plan. To function as a useful statement of local policy, the various components of the General Plan need to "comprise an integrated, internally consistent and compatible statement of policies for the adopting agency" (Government Code section 65300.5). So, for example, if the Housing Element identifies additional areas for housing, the Land Use Element would need to be amended for internal consistency.

3. What is Included in the Housing Element?

The Housing Element is comprised of the following major components:

- Community context, the Housing Elements relationship to other General Plan Elements, and data sources
- Review of effectiveness of existing Housing Element
- Assessment of existing population, demographics, housing stock, and projected housing needs
- Identification of resources – financial, land, administrative
FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

- Evaluation of constraints to housing
- Housing Plan – goals, policies and programs

Results from each of the key components of the analysis – community context, effectiveness of the existing Housing Element, projected housing needs, resources, and constraints -- are reflected in the goals, policies and programs in the implementation plan. The entire process must reflect public participation from the draft stage to final adoption.

4. Why does Redondo Beach have to plan for more housing?

California law requires each city and county to plan for their “fair share” of the State’s housing growth needs. Based on economic and demographic forecasts, the State has determined that the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) region needs to have the ability (through local zoning) to accommodate 1,341,827 housing units between 2021 and 2029 (6th Cycle) to meet the State’s forecasted housing demand. SCAG is the agency responsible for distributing the fair share allocation among its six counties (Imperial, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, Ventura) and 191 cities in the Southern California region.

5. How much new housing does Redondo Beach have to allow?

SCAG has allocated the region’s 1,341,827 housing unit growth needs to each city and county through a process called the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA). Redondo Beach’s final RHNA for the 2021-2029 planning period (6th cycle) is 2,490 units, distributed among the following income categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income*</th>
<th>RHNA Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Very Low (<50% AMI)  
< $56,300 | 936 | 37.6 |
| Low (50% - 80% AMI)  
$56,300 - $90,100 | 508 | 20.4 |
| Moderate (80% - 120% AMI)  
$90,100 - $92,750 | 490 | 19.7 |
| Above Moderate (> = 120% AMI)  
> = $92,750 | 556 | 22.3 |
| Total | 2,490 | 100.0 |

AMI = Area Median Income
*2020 Income Limits for a family of 4 in Los Angeles County (source: HCD, April 2020)
The RHNA represents the *minimum* number of housing units Redondo Beach is required to plan for in its housing element by providing “adequate sites” through general plan and zoning. As described in the response to question #9 below, the State requires that jurisdictions create a sufficient buffer in the Housing Element sites inventory beyond that required by the RHNA to ensure adequate sites capacity exists throughout the planning period.

6. **How is a City’s RHNA determined?**

This is a complex process that begins with the State of California. The State prepares projections about expected population growth in the state and then allocates a portion of the total state population growth to each region. Regional planning organizations in turn distribute the regional allocation among local jurisdictions. There are three primary objectives in allocating the units to local jurisdictions: increasing housing supply, affordability and housing type, encouraging infill and efficient development, and promoting a jobs/housing balance.

Southern California Association of Governments’ methodology for determining a city or county’s RHNA starts with the total regional determination provided by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) and separates existing need from projected need. In determining the existing and projected need for the region, the methodology applies a three-step process to determine a jurisdiction’s RHNA allocation by income category. This process involves determining a jurisdiction’s projected housing need, existing housing need, and total housing need in order to determine four (4) RHNA income categories.

7. **What is the City’s obligation to accommodate its Regional Housing Need (RHNA), and what happens if at the end of the Housing Element cycle the City falls short of its RHNA goals?**

The City’s RHNA represents a planning target and is not a building quota. However, the City must provide sufficient sites, which are realistic and could accommodate housing development within the prescribed timeframe, and the City cannot impose constraints to development. The City can demonstrate the availability of adequate sites using a combination of the following methods:

- Already approved residential development projects (having zoning entitlements)
- Vacant residentially zoned sites (including undeveloped residentially zoned lots within existing residential subdivisions)
- Underutilized residential and mixed-use sites, as well as underutilized sites with a residential overlay
- Second residential units (now referred to as Accessory Dwelling Units)
If the City does not have enough sites to accommodate its RHNA the City can be penalized. For example, in jurisdictions that did not plan for enough housing in their Housing Element and Land Use Element consistent with RHNA goals for the current (5th Cycle) planning period, HCD and the State Attorney’s General required those municipalities to approve residential projects meeting certain conditions under a streamlined approval process with no public hearings. There is no penalty if the units the City is required to plan for aren’t actually built during the 6th cycle.

8. Is there a way to reduce the number of units that are allocated to the City of Redondo Beach?

The City of Redondo Beach (as well as several other jurisdictions) appealed the allocation assigned to the City through the SCAG appeal process. The SCAG Appeal Board did not approve the City’s appeal for a reduction; therefore, the City must address its RHNA as assigned to be considered in compliance with State Law.

9. Can sites that remain undeveloped from the existing Housing Element be reused in the sites inventory for the 2021-2029 Housing Element?

Yes, but new State housing laws make this more difficult. Although this was allowable in the previous Housing Element Update (5th RHNA Cycle), it is only partially allowable for this new 6th cycle. Recent changes in Housing Element law have tightened the parameters for including sites in the Element and require substantial additional analysis to justify sites as suitable and available for development within the planning period.

Layering these new requirements on a jurisdiction’s sites inventory will both reduce the number of suitable sites and will reduce the presumed unit capacity on sites deemed appropriate and available for development. Lastly, the “No Net Loss” Law (Government Code section 65863) requires enough sites be maintained to meet the RHNA for all income levels throughout the planning period. Therefore, State HCD will require jurisdictions create a sufficient buffer in the inventory to ensure adequate sites capacity exists throughout the planning period. As a result, the City is planning for a 20% buffer for low/very low-income units, which will require identification of sites for a total of 2,775 units (20% more units than the number of units allocated by SCAG to the City of Redondo Beach identified in question 5).

10. How is affordable housing defined?

The RNHA process attempts to encourage development of housing at all income levels, with a focus on affordable housing. There is a presumed correlation between density (i.e. the number of housing units per acre) and affordability (i.e., housing built at higher densities is affordable to a greater segment of the population). However, it should be noted that the RHNA process does not establish rental rates or sales prices. Ultimately, the type of housing built on these sites will depend on the housing market and local economy.
State and Federal definitions of housing affordability are generally based on the standard of spending no greater than 30% of household income on housing costs, including utility payments, taxes, insurance, homeowner association fees, etc. Affordable housing is relative to the amount households of different income levels and sizes can afford to pay for housing. For example, the 2020 maximum affordable rent for a very-low income, 3-person household (2-bedroom unit) in Los Angeles County is approximately $1,268, whereas affordable rent for a 3-person, low-income household is approximately $2,028.

11. In addition to providing sufficient sites to address the total RHNA, how does the City’s zoning translate to providing adequate sites for each RHNA income category?

Housing Element law provides for the use of “default densities” to assess affordability when evaluating the adequacy of sites to address the RHNA affordability targets. Based on its population within Los Angeles County, Redondo Beach falls within the default density of 30 units per acre for providing sites suitable for development of housing for very low-income, low-income, and moderate-income households. This is generally consistent with the default density approach that applied when the City updated the prior Housing Element, except that for this new 6th RHNA cycle housing sites will need to be designated and zoned with a minimum allowable density at these levels to count toward the associated lower and moderate-income categories.

12. What do communities do when they run out of vacant and buildable land?

Communities with little or no remaining vacant land cannot escape RHNA -- they must still update their Housing Element to accommodate the RHNA. In these cases, the Housing Element may evaluate existing developed properties as “underutilized sites”. Such properties may be available for intensification, or they may be non-residential sites with potential for re-designation and redevelopment for housing or mixed-use development. Examples of land with potential for recycling may include fragmented sites suitable for assembly, publicly owned surplus land, areas with mixed-use potential, properties facing substantial functional obsolescence, and blighted areas with abandoned or vacant buildings. Second units (aka “accessory dwelling units”) also provide a means of accommodating additional housing in built-out communities. Under limited circumstances, a portion of the City’s RHNA may be met through conversion of existing market rate apartments to affordable levels; preservation of affordable units at-risk of conversion to market rate; and substantial rehabilitation of substandard apartment units combined with long term affordability covenants.

13. What happens if Redondo Beach does not have its Housing Element certified by the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD)?

There are a number of potentially significant consequences:

- Risk of litigation from housing advocacy groups, an aggrieved housing developer, or other entity or person based on the City having a legally inadequate General Plan. If
they rule the Housing Element invalid, courts can impose a range of sanctions including placing State HCD into the role of reviewing and approving housing development projects in the City, or having such matters decided ministerially (no hearings) via a court-appointed official; and placing a moratorium on non-residential development and other local land use authorities until the Housing Element is brought into compliance. Furthermore, the jurisdiction is responsible for paying the litigant’s attorney fees. Settlement agreements between the parties often include stipulations for mandatory rezoning and affordable housing production requirements.

- State housing and related parks and infrastructure grant and loan funds typically require verification of Housing Element compliance for eligibility, so failure to secure an HCD certification can result in a loss of funding.
- And where a jurisdiction’s prior Housing Element failed to identify adequate sites to address the RHNA, this unmet RHNA carries over to the next Housing Element, rendering HCD compliance in future housing element cycles significantly more challenging.

California Assembly Bill 72, adopted in 2017, now expands HCDs enforcement authority to refer non-compliant jurisdictions to the State Attorney General’s Office for litigation, as evidenced by the recent lawsuit the State brought against the City of Huntington Beach ².

**FOOTNOTES:**

1 For example, if a city used the default density to count a site towards its lower income RHNA need in its Housing Element but approved a market rate development, they would need to make a finding they still have sufficient site capacity to meet their lower income RHNA or make a new site available within 180 days.

2 Huntington Beach subsequently amended its Housing Element to accommodate over 400 new affordable units, and the State dismissed the lawsuit.
Recommended Land Use Plan

Focus Areas

1) Tech District
2) Artesia Boulevard
3) Aviation Boulevard
4) Galleria District
5) PCH North
6) PCH Central (Option A)
7) PCH South
8) Terrance Boulevard

Recommended Land Use Categories

Single-Family Residential
- RSF: Single Family Residential (0-0.8 du/ac)
- RSL: Small Lot Residential (0-17.5 du/ac)

Multi-Family Residential
- RL: Residential Low (0-14.6 du/ac)
- RM: Residential Medium (0-17.5 du/ac)
- RMH: Residential Medium-High (0-23.3 du/ac)
- RH: Residential High (0-30 du/ac)

Commercial
- CN: Neighborhood Commercial (max 0.50 FAR | max 0.60 FAR in Artesia Blvd Focus Area)
- CF: Commercial Flex (max 1.00 FAR)
- CC: Coastal Commercial (FAR per Local Coastal Program)

Mixed-Use
- MU-1: Mixed-Use (max 0.50/1.50 FAR; 0-30 du/ac)
- MU-2: Mixed-Use (max 1.00/1.50 FAR; 0-35 du/ac)
- MU-TC: Mixed-Use Transit Center (max 1.50 FAR; 0-30 du/ac)

Industrial
- IF: Industrial Flex (max 1.00 FAR)
- IG: General Industrial (max 1.00 FAR)

Public/Institutional/Open Space
- PI: Public/Institutional
- PP: Public/Utility
- OS: Parks and Open Space (max 0.05 FAR)

Areas Requiring Additional Consideration
- Opt A: RH (0-30 du/ac) | Opt B: CN (max 0.50 FAR)

Overlay Districts
- Residential Overlay (30-45 du/ac)
### Recommended General Plan Land Use Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended LUC</th>
<th>Recommended Density/Intensity</th>
<th>Recommended Description</th>
<th>Development Typology Common to Each Designation</th>
<th>Potential Implementing Zone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RESIDENTIAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Residential (SFR)</td>
<td>Up to and including 8.8 du/ac</td>
<td>Provides for complete neighborhoods composed primarily of single-family detached residential units with neighborhood-serving uses, such as corner commercial, and community serving facilities, such as public open space and institutional uses. Density range is up to and including 8.8 dwelling units per acre.</td>
<td>• Single Family Detached</td>
<td>R-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Lot Residential (RSF)</td>
<td>Up to and including 17.5 du/ac</td>
<td>Provides for single-family small lot residential, with a density range up to and including 17.5 dwelling units per acre.</td>
<td>• Single Family Detached Small Lot</td>
<td>R-1A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Residential</td>
<td>Up to and including 17.5 du/ac</td>
<td>Provides for complete neighborhoods that contain a diversity of housing types and complementary neighborhood-serving uses, such as corner commercial, and community serving facilities, such as public open space and institutional uses. Single-family attached and detached units and multi-family units such as duplexes, triplexes, townhomes, stacked flats, apartments, courtyard homes, and patio homes are allowed in this designation. Density range is up to and including 24.6 dwelling units per acre.</td>
<td>• Single Family Detached Multi-Family Low [2 stories]</td>
<td>R-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Low (RL)</td>
<td>Up to and including 14.6 du/ac</td>
<td>Provides for complete neighborhoods that contain a diversity of housing types and complementary neighborhood-serving uses, such as corner commercial, and community serving facilities, such as public open space and institutional uses. Single-family attached and detached units and multi-family units such as duplexes, triplexes, townhomes, stacked flats, apartments, courtyard homes, and patio homes are allowed in this designation. Density range is up to and including 17.5 dwelling units per acre.</td>
<td>• Single Family Detached Multi-Family Low [2 stories]</td>
<td>R-3, R-3A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Medium (RM)</td>
<td>Up to and including 17.5 du/ac</td>
<td>Provides for complete neighborhoods that contain a diversity of housing types and complementary neighborhood-serving uses, such as corner commercial, and community serving facilities, such as public open space and institutional uses. Single-family attached and detached units and multi-family units such as duplexes, triplexes, townhomes, stacked flats, apartments, courtyard homes, and patio homes are allowed in this designation. Density range is up to and including 23.3 dwelling units per acre.</td>
<td>• Single Family Detached Multi-Family Low [2 stories]</td>
<td>RMD, R-MHP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Medium-High (RMH)</td>
<td>Up to and including 23.3 du/ac</td>
<td>Provides for complete neighborhoods that contain a diversity of housing types and complementary neighborhood-serving uses, such as corner commercial, and community serving facilities, such as public open space and institutional uses. Single-family attached and detached units and multi-family units such as duplexes, triplexes, townhomes, stacked flats, apartments, courtyard homes, and patio homes are allowed in this designation. Density range is up to and including 23.3 dwelling units per acre.</td>
<td>• Single Family Detached Multi-Family Low [2 stories]</td>
<td>RMD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential High (RH)</td>
<td>Up to and including 30.0 du/ac</td>
<td>Provides for complete neighborhoods that contain a diversity of housing types and complementary neighborhood-serving uses, such as corner commercial, and community serving facilities, such as public open space and institutional uses. Single-family attached and detached units and multi-family units such as duplexes, triplexes, townhomes, stacked flats, apartments, courtyard homes, and patio homes are allowed in this designation. Density range is up to and including 28.0 dwelling units per acre.</td>
<td>• Single Family Detached Multi-Family Low [2 stories]</td>
<td>RH-1, RH-2, RH-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COMMERCIAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Commercial (CN)</td>
<td>Max. FAR 0.50 (Max FAR 0.60 in Arteria Blvd, Focus Area)</td>
<td>Provides for commercial districts with uses that complement adjacent residential neighborhoods. Allowed uses include retail, restaurants, personal services, office and similar uses. The intent of this designation is to provide goods and services that meet the needs of residents and businesses. Buildings in the CN districts should front the street with rear, alley loaded parking where feasible. Where CN designations contain existing residential uses, they shall be allowed to remain and shall be considered conforming; however, no new residential units are permitted. Maximum FAR 0.10 (except for the Arteria Blvd, Focus Area, where the Maximum FAR is 0.20).</td>
<td>• Neighborhood Commercial • Pedestrian-Oriented Commercial Districts • Office Line (1-3 stories)</td>
<td>C-1, C-2, C-2A, C-3B, C-2-PD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Flex (CF)</td>
<td>Max. FAR 1.00</td>
<td>Provides for an integrated mix of commercial and/or office uses including, commercial, retail, personal services, hotels, office, research and development, incubator space, and creative or technology based businesses. The overall character of all properties in this designation is intended to promote the operation of commercial and/or office uses within an area. Developments may be confused with ground floor commercial with commercial, office or hotel on upper floors, or an stand-alone projects with a single primary use. Where CF designations contain existing residential uses, they shall be allowed to remain and shall be considered conforming; however, no new residential units are permitted. Maximum FAR 1.00.</td>
<td>• Highways-Oriented Commercial • Multi-Tenant Commercial Centers • Pedestrian-Oriented Commercial Districts • Office Line (1-3 stories) • Creative Industry/Office</td>
<td>C-3, C-3A, C-3B, C-3-PD, C-3-PD(Riv), C-4, C-4A-C-4B, C-3-PD, C-4-PD(Riv), C-5A, CC-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Commercial (CC)</td>
<td>Per Redondo Beach Pier Master Plan and Local Coastal Program (LCP)</td>
<td>Provides for coastal and recreation-oriented commercial retail and service uses.</td>
<td>• Coastal and Recreation-Oriented Commercial</td>
<td>CC-1, CC-2, CC-3, CC-4, CC-5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Equivalent Land Use Categories in the Current General Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current LUC</th>
<th>Current Density/Intensity</th>
<th>Current Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>Up to and including 8.8 du/ac</td>
<td>Single-family residential uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-1A</td>
<td>Up to and including 17.5 du/ac</td>
<td>Single-family residential uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-2</td>
<td>Up to and including 14.6 du/ac</td>
<td>Single-family residential uses, duplexes, townhomes, condominiums, apartments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-3</td>
<td>Up to and including 17.5 du/ac</td>
<td>Single-family residential uses, duplexes, townhomes, condominiums, apartments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMD</td>
<td>Up to and including 23.3 du/ac</td>
<td>Single-family residential uses, duplexes, townhomes, condominiums, apartments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RH</td>
<td>Up to and including 28.0 du/ac</td>
<td>Single-family residential uses, duplexes, townhomes, condominiums, apartments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:** 1. Neighborhood-serving uses” allow for a limited number of non-residential uses within residential designations that have a defined set of conditions in which they can occur, and performance standards that must be met. They are intended to be ancillary to the residential uses and location, square footage, FARs, and Parking Requirements for these uses will be detailed in the zoning code as part of the followup work required to insure the zoning code is consistent with the General Plan. The zoning code will also further define the allowable uses with conditions and standards required for approval. 2. “Community serving facilities” refers to public community centers (i.e., youth, senior, etc.), libraries, parks, and similar facilities.

### Commercial Recommendations

- Provides for commercial districts with uses that complement adjacent residential neighborhoods. Allowed uses include retail, restaurants, personal services, office and similar uses. The intent of this designation is to provide goods and services that meet the needs of residents and businesses. Buildings in the CN districts should front the street with rear, alley loaded parking where feasible. Where CN designations contain existing residential uses, they shall be allowed to remain and shall be considered conforming; however, no new residential units are permitted. Maximum FAR 0.10 (except for the Arteria Blvd, Focus Area, where the Maximum FAR is 0.20).
- Provides for an integrated mix of commercial and/or office uses including, commercial, retail, personal services, hotels, office, research and development, incubator space, and creative or technology based businesses. The overall character of all properties in this designation is intended to promote the operation of commercial and/or office uses within an area. Developments may be confused with ground floor commercial with commercial, office or hotel on upper floors, or an stand-alone projects with a single primary use. Where CF designations contain existing residential uses, they shall be allowed to remain and shall be considered conforming; however, no new residential units are permitted. Maximum FAR 1.00.

### Commercial Current Recommendations

- Provides for commercial districts with uses that complement adjacent residential neighborhoods. Allowed uses include retail, restaurants, personal services, office and similar uses. The intent of this designation is to provide goods and services that meet the needs of residents and businesses. Buildings in the CN districts should front the street with rear, alley loaded parking where feasible. Where CN designations contain existing residential uses, they shall be allowed to remain and shall be considered conforming; however, no new residential units are permitted. Maximum FAR 0.10 (except for the Arteria Blvd, Focus Area, where the Maximum FAR is 0.20).
- Provides for an integrated mix of commercial and/or office uses including, commercial, retail, personal services, hotels, office, research and development, incubator space, and creative or technology based businesses. The overall character of all properties in this designation is intended to promote the operation of commercial and/or office uses within an area. Developments may be confused with ground floor commercial with commercial, office or hotel on upper floors, or an stand-alone projects with a single primary use. Where CF designations contain existing residential uses, they shall be allowed to remain and shall be considered conforming; however, no new residential units are permitted. Maximum FAR 1.00.

### Commercial Current Recommendations

- Provides for commercial districts with uses that complement adjacent residential neighborhoods. Allowed uses include retail, restaurants, personal services, office and similar uses. The intent of this designation is to provide goods and services that meet the needs of residents and businesses. Buildings in the CN districts should front the street with rear, alley loaded parking where feasible. Where CN designations contain existing residential uses, they shall be allowed to remain and shall be considered conforming; however, no new residential units are permitted. Maximum FAR 0.10 (except for the Arteria Blvd, Focus Area, where the Maximum FAR is 0.20).
- Provides for an integrated mix of commercial and/or office uses including, commercial, retail, personal services, hotels, office, research and development, incubator space, and creative or technology based businesses. The overall character of all properties in this designation is intended to promote the operation of commercial and/or office uses within an area. Developments may be confused with ground floor commercial with commercial, office or hotel on upper floors, or an stand-alone projects with a single primary use. Where CF designations contain existing residential uses, they shall be allowed to remain and shall be considered conforming; however, no new residential units are permitted. Maximum FAR 1.00.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended General Plan Land Use Categories</th>
<th>Equivalent Land Use Categories in the Current General Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MIXED-USE RECOMMENDED</strong></td>
<td><strong>MIXED-USE CURRENT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-Use Transit Center (MU-TC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. FAR 1.5</td>
<td>a. MIXED-USE CR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up to and including 30 du/ac</td>
<td>a. Regional-serving commercial and ancillary uses;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. department stores, promotional/discount retail,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. eating and drinking establishments, entertainment,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d. movie theaters, financial institutions, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>professional offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-Use Low (MU-1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Only:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. FAR 1.50</td>
<td>a. FAR 0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(all density exceeding 0.70 FAR must be</td>
<td>b. FAR 0.70/1.50 and 35 du/ac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>residential units) Up to and including</td>
<td>c. Max 35 du/ac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 du/ac</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-Use Low (MU-2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial and Residential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. FAR 1.50</td>
<td>a. FAR 0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(all density exceeding 0.70 FAR must be</td>
<td>b. FAR 0.70/1.50 and 35 du/ac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>residential units) Up to and including</td>
<td>c. Max 35 du/ac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 du/ac</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-Use Medium Low (MU-3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial and Residential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. FAR 1.50</td>
<td>a. FAR 1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(all density exceeding 0.70 FAR must be</td>
<td>b. FAR 1.50 provided that all density exceeding 0.7 is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>residential units) Up to and including</td>
<td>developed for residential units and densities exceeding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 du/ac</td>
<td>35 du/ac, are developed as affordable units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INDUSTRIAL RECOMMENDED</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Industrial (IG)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. FAR 1.00</td>
<td>i-1: FAR 0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides for light industrial and</td>
<td>Light industrial, research and development, “office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>light manufacturing for industries such as</td>
<td>park” facilities, manufacture of spacecraft and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aerospace, creative art, technology and</td>
<td>associated aerospace systems, supporting commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>software development, and bio medical.</td>
<td>uses (e.g., restaurants, banks, copiers, and similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other complimentary uses include</td>
<td>uses), educational and governmental facilities, and day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>research and development, technology based</td>
<td>care centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>businesses, office park, warehousing,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wholesale, vehicle sales and services,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maintenance and repair services, ancillary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>educational and governmental facilities,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supporting commercial uses. Maximum FAR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Flex (IF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. FAR 1.00</td>
<td>i-2, i-3: FAR 1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides for an integrated mix of light</td>
<td>Same uses as i-1, and building material sales,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>industrial and commercial and/or office</td>
<td>furniture stores, vehicles sales and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uses such as commercial, research and</td>
<td>services, maintenance and repair services, restaurants,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development, incubator space, creative or</td>
<td>banks, photocopies, and similar uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>technology based businesses, offices,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hotel, and supporting commercial uses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The overall character in this</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>designation is intended to create a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>creative/tech-incubator district with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supporting uses. Minimum FAR 1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Updated 4/7/2021
### Recommended General Plan Land Use Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended LUC</th>
<th>Recommended Density/Intensity</th>
<th>Recommended Description</th>
<th>Development Typology Common to Each Designation</th>
<th>Potential Implementing Zone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PUBLIC / INSTITUTIONAL / OPEN SPACE RECOMMENDED</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/Institutional (PI)</td>
<td>Max. FAR 1.25 (subject to Planning Commission Design Review)</td>
<td>Provides for governmental administrative and capital facilities, schools, libraries, hospitals and associated medical offices, public cultural facilities, and other public uses including residential care facilities for the elderly, ancillary parks, recreation and open spaces. Maximum FAR 1.25 (subject to Planning Commission Design Review)</td>
<td>+ Civic Buildings + Schools</td>
<td>P-SF, P-ZF, P-CIV, P-RVP(RIV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/Utility (U)</td>
<td>Max. FAR 0.10</td>
<td>Provides for utility uses including easements with public access for recreation and parking. Maximum FAR 0.10.</td>
<td>+ Active Recreation</td>
<td>P-ROW, P-GP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Open Space (OS)</td>
<td>Max. FAR 0.25</td>
<td>Provides for public open space, passive park uses, sports fields, active recreation uses, and coastal-related recreational activities as well as accompanying public facilities such as restrooms, picnic pavilions, parking facilities, and lifeguard towers. Maximum FAR 0.25.</td>
<td>+ Community/Neighborhood Park, Active Recreation + Neighborhood Park, Urban Infill [Park / Open Space]</td>
<td>P-PRO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Equivalent Land Use Categories in the Current General Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current LUC</th>
<th>Current Density/Intensity</th>
<th>Current Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PUBLIC / INSTITUTIONAL / OPEN SPACE CURRENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Governmental administrative and capital facilities, parks, schools, libraries, hospitals and associated medical offices, public cultural facilities, public open space, utility easements, and other public uses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Residential Overlay Recommended

- An overlay is a planning tool used to provide flexibility in land use designations. This designation allows uses that differ from or are in addition to, the underlying General Plan land use. This flexibility can help the City respond to State-mandated housing requirements and increase development options in different market conditions. The Residential Overlay allows residential infill projects in three areas of the City: the North Tech District, the Galleria area, and in the Industrial Areas along 190th Street. The North Tech District, and the Galleria area are both located adjacent to existing or future Metro Station stops, which provides access to existing or planned transportation alternatives. The Residential Overlay designation may be developed as the underlying land use designation (industrial, industrial flex, or commercial depending on the location) and also has the option of developing as infill residential without the need for a General Plan amendment. The Residential Overlay is intended to encourage the development of affordable housing by providing added land use flexibility that could allow for the integration of new residential housing opportunities in close proximity to transit and job centers. Residential uses may be stand-alone projects in the overlay area; they must have a minimum density of 30 dwelling units per acre, and they cannot exceed 45 dwelling units per acre.

| Residential Overlay (-R) | Max. FAR 1.25 (subject to Planning Commission Design Review) | Provides for governmental administrative and capital facilities, schools, libraries, hospitals and associated medical offices, public cultural facilities, and other public uses. Maximum FAR 1.25 (subject to Planning Commission Design Review) | + Civic Buildings + Schools | P-SF, P-ZF, P-CIV, P-RVP(RIV) |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| Max. FAR 0.10 | Provides for utility uses including easements with public access for recreation and parking. Maximum FAR 0.10. | + Active Recreation | P-ROW, P-GP |
| Max. FAR 0.25 | Provides for public open space, passive park uses, sports fields, active recreation uses, and coastal-related recreational activities as well as accompanying public facilities such as restrooms, picnic pavilions, parking facilities, and lifeguard towers. Maximum FAR 0.25. | + Community/Neighborhood Park, Active Recreation + Neighborhood Park, Urban Infill [Park / Open Space] | P-PRO |

| Resilient Overlay (-R) | Max. FAR 1.25 (subject to Planning Commission Design Review) | Provides for governmental administrative and capital facilities, schools, libraries, hospitals and associated medical offices, public cultural facilities, and other public uses. Maximum FAR 1.25 (subject to Planning Commission Design Review) | + Civic Buildings + Schools | P-SF, P-ZF, P-CIV, P-RVP(RIV) |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| Max. FAR 0.10 | Provides for utility uses including easements with public access for recreation and parking. Maximum FAR 0.10. | + Active Recreation | P-ROW, P-GP |
| Max. FAR 0.25 | Provides for public open space, passive park uses, sports fields, active recreation uses, and coastal-related recreational activities as well as accompanying public facilities such as restrooms, picnic pavilions, parking facilities, and lifeguard towers. Maximum FAR 0.25. | + Community/Neighborhood Park, Active Recreation + Neighborhood Park, Urban Infill [Park / Open Space] | P-PRO |
1) 25 Acres from the AES site are projected to convert from utility (U) to parkland (OS).

2) The reduction of non-residential building square footage in the RM and RH land use categories is due to the conversion of 50% of the non-conforming and conditionally permitted uses (such as commercial and institutional) to residential.

3) Changes in the Public/Institutional Land Use Category is the result of the approved Kensington Project, including 96 memory care and assisted living units, which are considered dwelling units for the purposes of the General Plan analysis.

4) The area requiring further consideration on PCH-Central would add 5 acres and approx. 25 dwelling units if Option A is selected or 5 acres and no other changes if Option B is selected.

5) The projected housing units in the residential overlays shown here are initial estimates intended to give a sense of magnitude. The final number of units that may be recommended in the residential overlay areas is subject to the finalization of the Housing Element sites inventory.

6) Buildout projections for the Recommended Land Use Plan and Current GP reflect the best data available in 2021. The assumptions used to estimate buildout of the Recommended Plan have been updated to reflect current market conditions, anticipated trends, and current regulatory requirements.
City of Redondo Beach
Community Meeting #2
April 7, 2021

General Plan Update:
Recommended Land Use Plan
• Introductions
  • City Staff
  • Consultant Team: PlaceWorks Staff
  • General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC) Chair

• Virtual Protocols
Purpose of the Workshop

PURPOSE OF THE WORKSHOP

Provide an overview of the recommended changes to the draft land use plan/map, provide opportunities for attendees to ask questions of City Staff about the changes, and describe how participants can provide comments (virtually) on the map via the Social Pinpoint engagement platform.

The meeting presentation will also include:

- A brief introduction and background remarks to include the purpose of a general plan,
- An overview of the process and tasks completed to date, including the general plan draft vision and guiding principles,
- A review of issues and opportunities facing the City in the next twenty years,
- Highlights of recent changes in State Housing Laws that have shaped the recommendations proposed for the draft land use plan/map.
Schedule of Events for this Evening

• Presentation (45-60 min)

• Open House Q & A
  
  City Staff and Consultant team will take questions via chat over the course of the presentation and provide answers at the end of the meeting

• Virtual Commenting
  
  Participants may remain in the Workshop to listen to the discussion or may leave when convenient and can review materials and provide comments virtually using a link that will be provided after the presentation
Questions? Enter them in the chat

Please enter your questions in the chat and they will be sent to the meeting panelists who will respond to verbally at the end of the presentation.
Virtual Protocols

GENERAL

• All attendees will be muted during the presentation
• Attendees will not be able to unmute themselves during the question and answer period
• Pose questions in the chat which will be forwarded to our panelists
• Please do not provide comments in the chat; comments will be collected via email or the online mapping portal to be forwarded to Planning Commission and City Council

TECHNICAL ISSUES?

• Email: Lina.Portolese@redondo.org
A Word from the GPAC Chair

• 27-member Advisory Committee
• 5 members from each district; 2 selected at large
• 22 meetings held over past 4 years
• Members have volunteered over 200 hours each
Role of the GPAC

The GPAC “IS”:

• A source of insight on the community, its interests and expectations.
• A source of ideas to achieve a responsible and responsive plan.
• A vehicle for achieving a sampling of community opinions and attitudes.
• A sounding board for ideas and plan proposals presented by city staff and its consultants.
• A vehicle for communication to and from the planning process.

The GPAC “IS NOT”:

• A replacement for either the City Council or Planning Commission.
• A decision-making body, except as it may offer advice and direction to City staff and the consultant team regarding General Plan policy.
• A forum for political position taking.
• A substitute for the public hearing process required by law.
Who has been involved

**GPAC MEMBERS**

Nick Biro, Chair
Phil Sanchez, Vice-Chair
Bhuvan Bajaj
Leslie Chrzan
Howard Eller
Craig Funabashi
Rob Gaddis
Jennifer Glad*
Jim Hannon
Kiran Hashmi*
Sam Kartounian*
Matt Kilroy
Sheila Lamb

**CITY STAFF**

Jim Light
Sue Ludwig
Tonya McKenzie
Paul Moses
Candace Nafissi
Bob Pinzler
Paul Samaras
John Simpson
Eugene Solomon
Matt Stodder
Charlie Szymanski
Sybilla Turner
Chris Voisey
Brad Waller

Brandy Forbes
Sean Scully
Lina Portolese
Antonio Gardea
Marianne Gastelum
Stacy Kinsella
Aaron Jones (ret.)

*Former Members
State Law & the Land Use Plan: A Moving Target
OVERVIEW:
What is a General Plan?
What is a General Plan?

The General Plan represents the community’s view of its future. It is...

- A blueprint for a city evolves over time
- A comprehensive, long-term general plan for the physical development of the county or city
- A guiding document for administrative & legislative functions (policy guidance)
Required General Plan Elements

Housing Element has state mandated adoption deadline of October 15, 2021; ahead of all other elements
What is a General Plan?

**Required Content...**

- Covers all areas and uses within the city
- Plan diagrams (maps)
- Goals – general, abstract
- Policies – action-oriented, represents city commitment
- Implementation Programs – actions carrying out policies
What is a General Plan?

What it is not…

• Zoning

• Development standards (building heights, property setbacks, parking requirements, driveway locations, landscape requirements…)
  • *Though, it must establish general standards for housing and non-residential density and quantify development capacity*

• Design Guidelines

• A guarantee for project approvals
  • Each project must be reviewed independently on its own merit
  • Address site design, traffic, school fees, etc.
Why Update?

Issues important to the community (as directed by City Council):

• Revisited mixed-use (what it means and where it applies)
• Address open space needs
• Rethink commercial corridors including Artesia Boulevard (AACAP Adopted)
• Legislative Changes
  • Housing
  • Environmental Justice
  • Greenhouse Gas reduction
  • Climate Adaptation
  • Complete Streets (planning for pedestrians, bikes, transit, etc.)
WHERE ARE WE NOW?

Work Completed to Date
Progress to Date

• Drafted General Plan Vision 2040

• Drafted Guiding Principles
  - Community Character & Livability
  - Economic Prosperity & Sustainability
  - Health & Vitality

• Prepared and adopted Artesia Aviation Corridors Area Plan (AACAP)

• Conducted Market Studies

• Prepared and adopted Local Hazard Mitigation Plan

• Outreach (online, community workshops, pop ups, State of City)

• General Plan Advisory Committee Meetings (22 complete of 27 planned)
BRIEF OVERVIEW:

*Future Planning Considerations*
Future Planning Considerations

• Five main topics or trends rose to top of priority list to address in General Plan:
  • Population Growth
  • Aging population/loss of working-age residents
  • Housing Affordability
  • Changes in the retail environment
  • Availability of Jobs in the City
Future Planning Considerations

3,002
Number of people that it is anticipated the City’s population will naturally grow by over the next 20 years (71,820 persons by 2040)

64
Approximate number of new units needed per year to meet projected population growth over the 20-year timeline of the General Plan (about 1,280 additional housing units)

1.2%
Percentage of homes that are affordable to buy in Redondo Beach for a person making median income ($106,638) assuming a 20% down payment could be made

92.5%
Percent of working residents that leave Redondo Beach for work each day.
Housing Considerations

• Statewide Housing Demands: State law requires every City have the capacity to accommodate housing for persons of all income levels, including affordable/low-income

• Recent State Legislation
  • SB330 (Housing Crisis Act of 2019)
    Prohibits the City from enacting a development policy, standard, or condition that would have the effect of changing the general plan land use designation or zoning of a parcel to:
    o A less intensive use than was allowed on January 1, 2018
    o If any changes that reduce housing capacity in one area of the city are made, concurrent changes to density elsewhere must offset the reduction to ensure there is no net loss in residential capacity citywide compared potential capacity on January 1, 2018

  • “No Net Loss” of affordable housing units (SB 166)
Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA)

• Population growth outpacing housing production and availability

• State determines housing needs and divides up by region

• Region determines methodology to assign city with its fair share of housing (Regional Housing Needs Assessment, or RHNA)
## Breakdown of Draft Allocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCOME LEVEL</th>
<th>ALLOCATION</th>
<th>OTHER REQUIREMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low + Low</td>
<td>1,444 units + 20% buffer = <strong>1,729</strong></td>
<td>Must be 30 du/ac or greater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate + Above Moderate</td>
<td><strong>1,046 units</strong></td>
<td>Must be at least a 0.5 ac site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,775 units</strong></td>
<td>Can be less than 30 du/ac</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) + 20% SB 166 buffer of Very Low + Low income units.
Housing Element Considerations

**What a Housing Element Does:**
• Demonstrates a jurisdiction has the capacity to build the number of units identified in RHNA

**What a Housing Element Does Not Do:**
• Require the City (or anyone else) to build the units
• Force construction or close any business (or churches)
• Require a property owner to sell a property
• Provide funding for housing
• Does not authorize construction of new units (needs separate approval)

Additional information on the Housing Element, including a series of Frequently Asked Questions can be found on the City’s website: www.redondo.org/PLANredondo
Redondo Beach 2040:
Recommended Land Use Changes
GPAC Approach to Land Use

BIG IDEAS

• Retain existing residential neighborhoods and principal commercial districts

• Allow for infill development and recycling of uses for compatible development (function and scale)

• Allow for changes of use on selected sites (Focus Areas) versus Citywide to accommodate housing requirements and improve their economic viability

• Allow for modest intensification of key sites that are underutilized or contain marginal uses
Foundation for Recommendations

- Must achieve General Plan Vision
- Identifies areas where mixing of uses is appropriate and specify the mix (residential/retail, commercial/office/hotel, etc.)
- Builds upon opportunities associated with the southerly extension of the Metro Green Line (existing and near South Bay Galleria)
- Must meet State Housing requirements
- Preserves GPAC recommendations to greatest extent possible (the “goal post was moved”)
Recommended Land Definitions

• Renamed, refined and simplified definitions to be more straightforward to administer as part of the GP (commercial & industrial), including allowing for corner commercial uses in residential designations

• Added a new Mixed Use Medium Low (MU-2) definition (allows 35 du/ac; other MU areas have max. 30 du/ac) – PCH Central only

• Added a new Residential Overlay definition
Focus Areas

- 190th (Removed)
- Artesia Boulevard
- Aviation Boulevard
- Tech District
- Galleria District
- PCH North
- PCH Central
- PCH South
- Torrance Boulevard
## Total Acres & Types of Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Change</th>
<th>Acres Affected</th>
<th>Percent Affected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Change</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Change</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition Change</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires Additional Consideration</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL Area Affected</strong></td>
<td><strong>470 ac</strong></td>
<td><strong>11.8%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Land Use Change. Areas where the mix of allowed uses changed, as well as areas where the density (du/ac) or intensity (FAR) of uses were intentionally changed. (Ex. Galleria, North Tech District)

### Administrative Change. Areas where the types of uses allowed were changed, as well as areas where the density (du/ac) or intensity (FAR) of uses were changed. These changes are intended to more accurately reflect and preserve current uses that are consistent with the City’s long-term goals, as well as consolidate land use designations on properties with consistent ownership and uses. (Ex. Shopping Ctr next to Beach Cities HD; CN to CF to be reflective of use)

### Definition Change. Revised land use definitions were drafted for nearly all land use categories. In some cases, current designations were combined, and minor changes, like allowing slightly larger non-residential buildings or slightly less intense mixed-use projects resulted from changing the definitions. (Ex. Northrop – FAR increase because of new definitions)

### Areas Under Consideration. Area where there was a considerable amount of debate about the appropriate mix of land uses. Planning Commission and City Council will be asked to make a selection between two options (PCH Central)
How is the Recommended Plan different than our Current Plan?

Compared to the Current General Plan, The Recommended LU Plan:

- **Allows more housing** primarily in areas that meet the State's criteria for the Housing Element
- **Reduces the amount of housing allowed** in most remaining mixed-use areas
- **Eliminates mixed use designations on Artesia** (except one existing Mixed Use project that will remain) and at PCH and Diamond
OVERVIEW OF FOCUS AREAS:

Recommended Land Use Changes
Recommended Land Use Plan

Total Residential:

**34,508 units**

Total Non-Residential (commercial and industrial):

**15,049,289 sq. ft**
Recommended Land Use Plan

DIFFERENCE FROM CURRENT GP

Residential:

2,004 units

Total Non-Residential (commercial and industrial):

41,035 sq. ft
NEXT STEPS
Timeline of Remaining Tasks

2017-2018
Setting the Framework

GETTING SMART
- Review data & base mapping
- Review existing goals & policies
- Market study & economic trends
- Urban form analysis

DEVELOP GENERAL PLAN
GUIDING PRINCIPLES & VISION
- Community input: GPAC & community survey

Guiding Principles & Vision

LAND USE PLANNING
- Existing land use validation
- Land use options for focus areas

LOCAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN (complete)

2019-2021
GP & EIR Preparation

LAND USE PLANNING
- Explore land use alternatives
- Prepare land use plan
- Statistical assumptions & buildout
- Community land use & policy workshop

Preferred Land Use Plan

DRAFT GENERAL PLAN & EIR
- General Plan preparation: element and policy writing
  - Land Use
  - Parks, Recreation, and Open Space
  - Noise and Safety
- EIR initiation and technical studies

DRAFT HOUSING ELEMENT
Draft General Plan Elements & Initiate EIR

2021-2022
Adoption & Implementation

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN AND FINALIZE GENERAL PLAN
- Implementation Plan
- Zoning consistency

FINALIZE EIR
- Environmental analysis
- Public review
- Response to comments
- Mitigation monitoring / findings

Hearing Draft GP & Final EIR

CITY ADOPTS GP (BALLOT MEASURE)
CERTIFY EIR
COASTAL COMMISSION

POST ADOPTION IMPLEMENTATION
- Prioritize actions/departments responsible
- Obtain funding
Future GPAC Meetings

Five Remaining Meetings:
Policy Review for:
• Land Use Element
• Open Space Element
• Safety Element
• Review of the consolidated plan (all elements compiled into a draft)

Anticipated to be held Summer/Fall 2021

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

April 11, 2021
Midnight
Virtual Comments Due on Map

April 15, 2021
7:00 P.M.
Planning Commission Meeting

April 20, 2021
6:00 P.M.
City Council Meeting

Please visit the project website: www.redondo.org/PLANredondo
Q&A and Providing Comments

Attendees may remain in meeting to listen to responses to questions asked in the chat

TO PROVIDE COMMENTS

• Provide your comments on the map virtually by going to: https://redondobeach.mysocialpinpoint.com/planredondo#

• Or send comments and questions via email to: PLANredondo@redondo.org

• Please do not provide comments in the meeting chat; reserving that area for questions and ask that formal comments be provided in one of the options listed above.

Please visit the project website: www.redondo.org/PLANredondo
THANK YOU!
A. CALL TO ORDER

A Special, Virtual Meeting of the Redondo Beach General Plan Advisory Committee was called to order by Chair Biro at 6:30 p.m. This virtual meeting is held pursuant to Executive Order N-29-20 issued by Governor Newsom on March 17, 2020.

B. ROLL CALL

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

Members Absent: Szymanski, and Turner

Officials Present: Brandy Forbes, Community Development Director
Sean Scully, Planning Manager
Lina Portolese, Planning Analyst

Consultants Present: Wendy Nowak, Placeworks
Halley Grundy, Placeworks
Veronica Tam, Veronica Tam & Associates

C. SALUTE TO FLAG AND INVOCATION

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

D. APPROVE THE ORDER OF AGENDA

Motion by Member Waller, seconded by Member Ludwig, to approve the Order of the Agenda, as presented. Motion carried unanimously, by roll call vote.

E. BLUE FOLDER ITEMS – ADDITIONAL BACK-UP MATERIALS

E.1. RECEIVE AND FILE BLUE FOLDER ITEMS

Motion by Chair Biro, seconded by Member Pinzler, to receive and file Blue Folder Items. Motion carried unanimously, without objection.

F. CONSENT CALENDAR

F.1. APPROVE AFFIDAVIT OF POSTING OF THE GENERAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE SPECIAL MEETING OF DECEMBER 3, 2020

F.2. APPROVE MINUTES OF THE GENERAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING OF DECEMBER 11, 2019

Motion by Chair Biro, seconded by Member Pinzler, to approve the Consent Calendar. Motion carried unanimously, without objection.
G. PUBLIC COMMENT SESSION – 1ST SESSION

Wendy Nowak, Placeworks, reviewed the virtual protocols for public comment.

Zen Obagi (CHECK SPELLING) introduced himself and noted he is running for City Council for District 4.

Planning Analyst Lina Portolese announced there were no other public comments or eComments received.

H. ITEMS FOR PRESENTATION, DISCUSSION OR ACTION

H.1. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND OVERVIEW OF TENTATIVE GPAC SCHEDULE FOR REMAINING MEETINGS

Wendy Nowak presented announcements and an overview of the General Plan progress in 2020. She addressed the AACAP, adoption and approval of the LHMP, the GPAC Open Space and Conversation Element and Survey and RHNA. Ms. Nowak discussed future meetings and topics of discussion for each; addressed tonight’s primary tasks and noted the need to refine the land plan. In response to an inquiry from a member, she speculated the process will take another six-to-eight months.

H.2. DISCUSSION REGARDING HOUSING ELEMENT, SB330, AND REGIONAL HOUSING NEEDS ALLOCATION (RHNA) IMPLICATIONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED LAND USE PLAN.

RECOMMENDATION: Reach consensus on where additional housing should be accommodated to meet Housing Element, SB330, and RHNA Requirements

Ms. Nowak discussed new State laws and how they affect housing; addressed details of SB 330; spoke about the need to address housing capacity to meet SB 330 requirements; provided details of SB 166 and AB 72.

Housing consultant Veronica Tam responded to questions about enforcement, the technique of enforcement, and penalties, including the inability to issue building permits.

Ms. Nowak defined RHNA; reported in the South Bay area, SCAG is responsible for allocating how many units affordable to different income levels each city must plan to accommodate; discussed RHNA requirements; spoke about solving RHNA considerations; presented the City’s draft RHNA allocation and talked about providing a buffer RHNA allocation. She presented a breakdown of the draft allocation and noted that focus, going forward will be on how to accommodate very low- and low-income units.

Ms. Tam addressed questions regarding creating capacity; explained the RHNA timeline and how that matches with the General Plan; addressed the need for rezoning and up zoning; discussed the SCAG process for arriving at the RHNA allocation including evaluation to access to opportunities (transportation and employment); spoke about SB 166 offering guidance versus requirements; addressed new SCAG studies showing California’s allocation is too high; and noted the chances of reducing RHNA are very limited. She offered to send Members the SCAG calculator for generating RHNA numbers; reported HCD requires the City to submit a plan to certify the Housing Element; stated the City is limited in terms of the amount of vacant
available that is greater or equal to half an acre in size but relies on structures on land that is over 30 years old. Additionally, she reported RHNA is primarily, new construction; noted the State law allows to count some existing units and stated the requirements are stringent.

In reply to Member Kilroy’s question regarding whether MTA property can be rezoned or be assigned an over-zone layer, Ms. Tam noted the need to look at ownership issues and spoke about challenges with properties owned by public agencies.

Member Light mentioned results of a lawsuit by the City of Huntington Beach in terms of a reduction in RHNA numbers and Ms. Tam reported there is no negotiation in RHNA and offered to send draft RHNA allocation information for every city in the SCAG region.

Community Development Director Brandy Forbes added that the City submitted its appeal and filing a lawsuit is under the City Council’s jurisdiction. She noted that is not the subject of discussion for this meeting.

Member Light felt RHNA numbers for Redondo Beach are ridiculously high; opined the City is getting unfairly targeted and noted areas that were ruled out by the City that were not addressed by the GPAC.

Member Samaras suggested reversing the density changes and the mixed-use changes the GPAC made.

Ms. Nowak discussed the foundation for recommendations; addressed standard considerations under the RHNA strategy including the number of area/use-specific units needed under the various income levels and detailed recommendations for accommodating the City’s RHNA. She discussed recommendations for the Galleria-Industrial Flex Area, North Tech District, the ability to trade off in other areas; addressed other options including capacity comparison; noted there are trade-offs for each option and asked for the Committee’s feedback.

Member Waller expressed concerns with potential ADUs not counting towards RHNA considering the most current trends. Ms. Tam addressed the HCD guidelines as they relate to ADUs noting they specify to look at the three-year average from 2018 to 2020 and discussed the possibility of inflating the numbers depending on the City’s efforts to facilitate them. It will not, however, be the sole change that will help the City meet its RHNA.

Community Development Director Forbes spoke about the number of applications for ADU’s before and after State regulation changes. She added City Council will review he updated ordinance at its next regular meeting.

Member Solomon referenced the proposed Healthy Cities campus at the Health District and asked whether there has been consideration as to whether they would qualify as living units. Ms. Tam noted the qualification is based on whether the unit qualifies as a living unit under the California Building Code, which requires cooking and plumbing facilities and reported some facilities have independent living facilities that may be counted versus beds. In terms of future potential, she noted the need to consider with the Health District permits housing and reported that as far as the State is concerned, it does not consider if a unit is an assisted-living unit not. Member Solomon discussed potential versus the actual ability to build.

Member Gaddis referenced the North Tech District and suggested considering the north east area as well. Ms. Nowak noted the need to review the uses in the area. Member Gaddis noted
the site has excellent access to transportation as the rail station is across the street and has an on-ramp to the north and south 405 Freeway.

Planning Manager Sean Scully reported the area just south of the 405 Freeway has new hotel developments and listed existing businesses across the freeway. Ms. Nowak acknowledged there may be some limited opportunities north of the 405 Freeway.

Member Kilroy spoke about developments north of Manhattan Beach Boulevard not being appropriate for children as there are no schools close by and would require long commutes. He discussed the Galleria as mixed-use and meeting RHNA numbers in the past; stated his preference would be to challenge the State; suggested that density is key; stressed the need to increase the number of units allowed, per acre to impact the fewest number of acres in the City; recommended building 90 units/acre at Pacific Crest Cemetery and stated the City should look at open pieces of land.

Member Sanchez referenced church properties that were mentioned and the potential for 113 units and asked for clarification in terms of building on church parking lots. Ms. Tam announced the State just passed a law to allow religious facilities to partner with a non-profit to provide housing on their properties, provided they are zoned for residential uses, meeting the density requirement of 30 units/acre and with the ability to consolidate to a given size. If they provide affordable housing, they are not required to meet parking requirements for the assembly; but it would be a shared parking between the assembly and residential uses.

Member Pinzler pointed out the units must be spread throughout the City and not just in North Redondo and expressed concerns North Redondo is being burdened. Ms. Nowak noted some of the housing is being satisfied throughout the City, but consideration is being given to larger sites that can accommodate and can transition. Member Pinzler asked about the percentage distribution of RHNA numbers as they apply to all areas in the City and expressed concern about voter approval. Ms. Tam added that HCD will first look at whether the City is concentrating all units into one area.

Community Development Director Forbes highlighted the area of PCH south and stated ADUs will be spread throughout the City as well.

Planning Manager Scully added that transit-oriented areas add themselves to concentration and spoke about HCD being opened to converting industrial areas.

Ms. Tam addressed the process if the initiative is not approved by voters noting that HCD will not certify the Housing Element and the City will need to work on it and resubmit it.

Member Samaras agreed with the need to spread units out throughout the City; referenced Member Kilroy’s concerns about the lack of schools in some areas and suggested considering a planned development area with schools, park space and other amenities.

Member Light noted shortfalls in Very Low and Low units and Ms. Tam stated RHNA is not a requirement to build units but rather feasibility (capacity) and density is used as a proxy for what is feasible for developing lower income housing. Member Light stated a lot of the City’s overcapacity is in recycling R2 and R3 and asked if the City could require that any new units on those properties must meet affordability requirements. Ms. Tam reported is the inclusionary requirement the City is considering but inclusionary units cannot be counted until they are built. Member Light commented on the City losing affordable housing.
Community Development Director Forbes reported that SB 330 has a requirement for replacing units by demonstrating affordability and developers must provide relocation assistance or right of first refusal to existing tenants.

Member Light spoke about the reason for changing zoning because of the imbalance of workforce and jobs, the loss of parkland, residential buildups and traffic and schools. He suggested having the Planning Commission and Council determine what to do with the plan.

Chair Biro referenced North Redondo around the 405 Freeway and commented on opportunities to redo the area and provide incentives for developers; commented on possible opportunities at the Northrop/Grumman campus and agreed with Member Kilroy in terms having the Planning Commission and Council determine what to do, blanket entire areas, and let the market come in with projects and other opportunities.

Member Ludwig suggested providing alternatives listing ways in which the City can comply with RHNA while retaining the original objective. She discussed efforts to keep jobs in the City; spoke about the impacts of COVID-19 to employees and the increasing trend to work from home; suggested the demand for commercial/retail/office space is decreasing; opined most commercial developers will welcome mixed uses and suggested revisiting commercial areas along PCH Central and Artesia for residential opportunities.

Member Samaras opposed putting all high-density low-income housing in North Redondo; noted there are no schools nearby; recommended spreading the potential of housing throughout the City, moving forward, and discussed challenges in requiring R2 and R3 lots to have an affordable component, as they are private lots.

Member Nafissi expressed disappointment the information was shared so close to the meeting, noting she did not have an opportunity to review it; noted the need to consider how local schools will be impacted and stated she cannot vote on this matter, in good conscience, without those considerations.

Member Waller discussed challenges when considering building a new school; stated he is unsure as to the long-term effects of COVID-19 but agreed impacts to schools must be considered when adding new housing units.

Ms. Nowak reported impacts to schools is considered under the EIR.

Member Lamb stated challenges include finding opportunities for low- and low-moderate income; noted the City is overly abundant in the upper income categories; suggested waiting until the matter of inclusionary housing has been resolved by City Council; reported increased needs for seniors, talked about considering people who downsize and discussed the need for senior housing (55+).

Ms. Tam reported inclusionary housing cannot be counted on until it is built and reiterated that RHNA is based on capacity, by zoning.

Member Lamb declared the State has advised the City of its need to increase density but market rate in Redondo Beach is high and will continue increasing; felt the State is giving carte blanch to developers who want to develop at high end and opined this does not seem to meet the spirit of the law as the need is in the lower income levels.
Ms. Tam commented on that State’s position that inclusionary housing constrains development and noted the need for market-rate development to accommodate affordable housing through an inclusionary policy.

Member Chrzan stated it would be helpful to see a map of where pieces are in the tally and a map of where the options are that meet all the criteria; suggested challenging the State to look at the issue, holistically, letting the State know the City will focus on low-income housing and detailing steps to accomplish it.

Community Development Director Forbes acknowledged the frustrations with the subject; discussed SB 330 and RHNA; addressed the methodology for determining RHNA and reported the City pushed back.

Ms. Nowak discussed trade-offs; noted the task of the GPAC is to address the Land-Use Plan and make recommendations to Council for their consideration.

Member Simpson summarized staff and the consultant’s proposal to keep everything the GPAC has agreed to, so far, address the additional required units and show capacity without the expectations they will be built and voiced support for staff’s recommendations.

Member Eller asserted that expanded mixed-use is the simplest, minimal change to what the GPAC has done, so far; opined the City should protect commercial zones; discussed overlay zones and recommended calling the question and voting.

Holly Osborne stated she would have liked to see the baseline before making any changes and opined items should not be considered piecemeal.

Motion by Member Kilroy, seconded by Chair Biro, to extend the speaker’s time. Motion carried unanimously, without objection.

Ms. Osborne discussed a study by the Embarcadero Institute showing RHNA allocations to SCAG were too high. SCAG is considering holding a closed session to discuss the matter and offered to fight the issue.

Ms. Nowak provided details of items and options on which the GPAC is being asked to vote.

A roll call vote was taken on each of the items for consideration as follows:

- **Artesia:** Add back Mixed Use to the Land Use Plan (212 units) – Yes: 11; No: 11
- **PCH Central:** Add back Mixed Use to the Land Use Plan (in original location) (162 units) – Yes: 14; No: 8
- **PCH Central:** Keep RH (with increased RH density from 28 du/ac to 30 du/ac): (13 potential units) – Yes: 14; No: 8
- **Kingsdale:** Increase RH Density to 60 du/ac (current GPAC recommendation is 28 du/ac): (350 potential units) – Yes: 13; No: 9

Member Light expressed concerns that all the work done in the last three years by the GPAC is being undone; suggested keeping everything as was agreed to and only dealing with the added
requirements; stressed the City’s RHNA is unfairly high and voiced his support of challenging the State in court.

Chair Biro stated that all the GPAC’s work is not being erased; added there will be opportunities at the Planning Commission and Council for further deliberation.

Member Light felt there is significant dissension that is not being represented on a majority vote.

Community Development Director Forbes announced the actions taken have reduced the number of units to accommodate to 838.

Discussion followed regarding having flexibility in the allocations.

Member Samaras agreed with voting, in general, regarding adding residential units, talking out the details and allowing Members to suggest alternate locations.

In reply to Member Gaddis’s question regarding the zoning of the Industrial Flex south of the Galleria, Ms. Nowak reported the original zoning of the area was mixed-use but the GPAC changed it which removed the residential.

Member Voisey noted the GPAC is working with the information available and on-hand; affirmed the future is unknown; agreed with the need to distribute dwelling units throughout the City, as much as possible; acknowledged “do not touch” areas and suggested there may be the ability to use those areas as overflow and make that part of a contingency.

Member Solomon discussed on further exploring all available options; urged Members not to be in a hurry, as now is the time to do it right and be respectful to one another.

In response to Member Ludwig’s comments, Community Development Director Forbes reported the area is zoned mixed use in the current General Plan and stated the GPAC has proposed removing the residential component.

Ms. Nowak added that within mixed use, there is a flexibility in terms of the range of uses.

Member Ludwig felt the future should be flexible to respond to the market.

Member Light spoke about developers maximizing residential and under mixed use, maximizing commercial where it will underperform in the future.

Member Waller reminded the group that what the GPAC voted on was near unanimous and the group agreed on having the Industrial Flex separate from residential.

Member Nafissi stated this is a rare opportunity to decide what to do with the City; opined the City should not leave land-use choices up to developers and reminded Members that each wants to do what is right for the community.

In terms of the Galleria, Member Pinzler expressed concerns with changes in retail, noting what has occurred during the past year has made it more likely the Galleria will fail; believed the area will be a wasteland, filled primarily, by residential and felt it premature to consider it.

Member Bajaj confirmed there is a changing landscape; felt the City is being backed into a corner to choose the least of two evils and noted the current vote is not to change any of the numbers but for the consideration of adding residential to the area.

Member Kilroy clarified he opposes going back to 1992 zoning and changing the units to 30 noting it has not worked.
Chair Biro suggested taking the acreage from the North Tech District and the acreage of the Galleria, pro rate the remainder and use it as a baseline, moving forward.

Member Chrzan felt the discussion of the area must be independent from the numbers as there is no agreement on the baseline.

Member Gaddis felt the nature of the vote should not be changed.

The Committee voted on whether to add a residential overlay to the Industrial Flex area south of the Galleria: Yes - 14; No – 8

The Committee voted on whether residential should be allowed in the North Tech District (100 acres): Yes: 17; No – 5

Member Kilroy discussed the North Tech District and reported when GPAC voted “no” there was concern regarding SB 350 and stated he would prefer raising the number of units per acre, with a height limit and keeping the units, small and more affordable. In terms of finding new areas, he reiterated his suggestion of rezoning the Pacific Crest Cemetery and noted mixed-use has been successful in Redondo Beach. He suggested rezoning Wiley Sump and City Hall. Chair Biro agreed that City Hall would provide a great opportunity for residential.

Planning Analyst Portolese announced there were no public or eComments at this time.

In reply to Member Gaddis’s question, Ms. Nowak addressed the feasibility of rezoning the cemetery.

Member Solomon discussed considering what can be done in collaboration with the Beach Cities Health District and commented on the possibility of expanding the small, industrial corridor in the area off 190th, near the trailer park.

Ms. Tam suggested developing a list as information is not available on the specific properties suggested.

Member Samaras pointed out that any discussion regarding the AES property should include the Edison right-of-way.

Planning Manager Scully reported the AES property is not up for consideration at this point. Member Gaddis added there is no way to build on the right-of-way.

Member Waller stated the City may be able to argue that there is potential for the right-of-way becoming something other than power lines.

Discussion followed regarding what the City needs now, versus in the future, challenges with rezoning City Hall and opportunity areas including the trailer park and the Beach Cities Health District.

Member Chrzan spoke about letting Council know the GPAC discussed not changing anything from previous recommendations, that the GPAC was only allowed to vote on the locations suggested and asking that Council push back to the State.

Ms. Tam discussed an unsuccessful lawsuit by the City of Irvine were the court decided they have no jurisdiction over the matter.

Member Hannon suggested that staff find out more information regarding the 400 proposed units at the BCHD; spoke about the possibility of areas that could be freed up on church properties and discussed a study regarding pre- and post- COVID-19 and how the world is changing.
Member Moses spoke about a potential location at the Federal building on North Aviation, noting the building has been vacant for a long time. It was noted the building is not in the City of Redondo Beach and is listed as a Historical property.

Member Samaras suggested the property across City Hall where the McDonald’s restaurant is currently located.

Ms. Nowak addressed proposed residential in the two industrial areas.

In terms of the property across City Hall, Community Development Director Forbes reported McDonald’s just invested in expanding their drive-through area and is more-than-likely, not available.

Ms. Tam noted City Hall has a lot of open space that could be used as residential. It was noted the only available open space would be the staff parking lot.

Regarding the BCHD it was noted there is a question as to whether it will be built or not.

Ms. Nowak suggested considering BCHD and the area near the trailer park and proportionally splitting the remaining units between the two industrial areas in North Redondo Beach.

Member Solomon reported the State has funding for programs that allow for low-income and affordable housing at assisted living locations and could help with other funding.

Discussion followed regarding the proposed density in the area near the trailer park, taking inventory of what has been discussed so far and adding options including BCHD and the trailer park area and including the 20% in the final RHNA number.

Member Light suggested looking at fixing some of the 1992 zoning noting some of the elements in mixed-use have proven unsuccessful and not viable.

Discussion followed regarding the possibility of changing the percentage of commercial and residential under mixed-use.

Ms. Tam reported State law indicates that if a city will use mixed-use for its low-income RHNA, it cannot require more than 50% of the square footage to be commercial.

Community Development Director Forbes reported changing mixed-use can be considered when considering goals and policies.

Member Waller noted City Council will ultimately make the call and suggested giving Council options to consider.

Member Ludwig reported the GPAC’s objective is to look twenty years ahead and include flexibility to meet market demands and needs in the future.

Ms. Nowak felt the GPAC could offer new solutions but note the group was split on the issue of residential on Artesia.

Ms. Nowak summarized the actions and discussions in an Excel sheet.

Discussion followed regarding including consideration of ADUs, Mary Anne industrial and BCHD.

Motion by Member Simpson, seconded by Member Waller, to recommend to City Council consideration of where additional housing should be accommodated to meet Housing Element, SB330, and RHNA requirements, as discussed, with options to consider ADU’s, Mary Anne industrial and BCHD. Motion carried (13 - 4) with Members Chrzan, Gaddis, Light, and Solomon, opposed, and Members Lamb, Ludwig, Funabashi and Pinzler, absent, by roll call vote.
Ms. Nowak addressed next steps.

Chair Biro thanked Committee Members for their work.

Discussion followed regarding including chats as part of the record.

I. PUBLIC COMMENT – 2ND SESSION - None

J. GPAC MEMBERS REFERRALS TO STAFF - None

K. ADJOURNMENT

The next meeting of the General Plan Advisory Committee will be scheduled on a date to be determined.

Motion to adjourn by Member Simpson, seconded by Member Funabashi, at 11:10 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.
From: Cindy Ginn
To: Planredondo
Subject: Where to build 2490 houses
Date: Sunday, March 28, 2021 8:54:21 AM

ATTN: Email is from an external source; Stop, Look, and Think before opening attachments or links.

I think the power plant area should be used for the required dwellings. If that is not possible, at minimum, the units should be evenly split between N.Redondo and S. Redondo.

From
Cynthia Ginn
2916 Perkins Lane
Redondo Beach, 90278
I appreciate and support district 5 councilwoman in her fight to insure future housing is equitably distributed throughout the city. Too frequently North Redondo has been the dumping ground while South Redondo remains untouched. It has negatively impacted our quality of life in North Redondo with additional traffic, noise and other issues caused by the increased density and population. Clearly the Power Plant is an excellent alternative for this reason. Thank you.
Pennie Fien
1213 Steinhart

Sent from my iPhone
Since there are 5 districts, why aren’t you dividing up the required additional housing evenly by each district?
Add 2,490 housing units required, we have 1,278 currently planned leaving 1,212 to be added.
Five districts, each gets 243 additional units. If not, why not?

William & Karen Baird
2121 Nelson Ave # 1
Redondo Beach CA 90278
Planning Division

I’ll be very interested to hear why Bill Brand didn’t want to put any of these housing quotas on the AES site or in any of the South Redondo districts but it was okay to assign the majority of them in North Redondo.

Bill Baird

From: Planredondo <Planredondo@redondo.org>
Sent: Tuesday, April 6, 2021 9:15 AM
To: bill@realestatesobay.com
Subject: RE: New Housing Requirements

Thank you for the comments and questions. Why the determinations were made, and why splitting it evenly between the districts wasn’t ideal, will be addressed in the presentation Wednesday evening.

PLANNING DIVISION
Community Development Department
415 Diamond St. Door 2 Redondo Beach, CA 90277

City Offices are closed to the public until further notice to help slow the spread of COVID-19. All City business will be conducted by electronic means only. Assistance is available by email during the normal operating hours of 7:30 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. Monday through Thursday and every other Friday.
Since there are 5 districts, why aren’t you dividing up the required additional housing evenly by each district? Add 2,490 housing units required, we have 1,278 currently planned leaving 1,212 to be added. Five districts, each gets 243 additional units. If not, why not?

William & Karen Baird
2121 Nelson Ave # 1
Redondo Beach CA 90278

Please note that email correspondence with the City of Redondo Beach, along with attachments, may be subject to the California Public Records Act, and therefore may be subject to disclosure unless otherwise exempt. The City of Redondo Beach shall not be responsible for any claims, losses or damages resulting from the use of digital data that may be contained in this email.
North Redondo Beach is already doing its share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site.
I am deeply concerned that there is not a plan to distribute the increase in housing equitably between 90277 and 90278. The current plan seems to be to shove all the increased housing into 90278 to appease the more affluent homeowners in 90277 (and who likely contribute more to the campaigns of our elected officials). We demand that an equitable approach is taken to rezone for this increased footprint that the state is burdening us with.

-Ryan Kelly
Concerned Redondo Beach resident
From: Susan Conley
To: Planredondo
Subject: Housing needs to go in 90277
Date: Tuesday, April 6, 2021 4:12:03 PM

[City Logo] ATTN: Email is from an external source; Stop, Look, and Think before opening attachments or links.

North Redondo Beach is already doing its share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site. I know South Redondo never steps up to the plate, however it is so unfair for North Redondo to take all the housing, are we one city or NOT. It is also very wrong of the City Council to make these decisions in the wee hours.

Resident of 90278

Sent from my iPad
North Redondo Beach is already doing its share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site.

If that site is not available, we need to find another. It is unfair to crowd schools in one section of the city with no impact to the other!
Hi Plan Redondo,

North Redondo Beach is already doing its share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site.

I am a 20 year resident/homeowner in 90278 and I am extremely upset that the city is not considering equal distribution of the housing units between North and South Redondo. District 5, where I live, has seen more population growth since 2010 than any other district in Redondo. North Redondo schools are already at or over capacity, while South Redondo schools are not. North Redondo, particularly the Dow Johnston Triangle, has seen increased traffic over the past several years as commuters cut through the neighborhood from Manhattan Beach Blvd. Enough is enough. South Redondo must share the responsibility of the new required units equal to North Redondo.

My questions for the meeting on April 7th:
1. Will Redondo Beach consider zoning 1,245 additional units in South Redondo in order to equally distribute the new required housing units between South and North Redondo? If not, why not?
2. Will the city consider the 50 acre power plant site as a possible location for the additional units in South Redondo? If not, why not?
3. Are there plans to increase North Redondo school capacity and/or add schools in North Redondo in order to account for the potential 1000 new housing units in the industrial/commercial zone of District 5?
4. What traffic calming measures would be planned for District 5 due to increased traffic from the potential 1000 new housing units, to protect our residents and children?

Thank you,
Alisa Beeli
To whom it may concern:

North Redondo Beach is already doing its share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. Anytime a small beach house is torn down, 3 or 4 additional units come in its place. It has happened multiple times on my street alone. We need to be this in it together as a community...not just one area. Please zone more in 90277. They need to absorb more on their end.

Thank you,

Lois Pavlica
2415 Mathews Ave, #2 Redondo Beach, CA 90278
ATTN: Email is from an external source; Stop, Look, and Think before opening attachments or links.

Dear Planning Commission,

From my perspective, it seems that North Redondo has many working residents and young families - i.e. very busy people that have jobs and are caring for children. North Redondo attracts this demographic due to highway proximity for commuting. Meanwhile South Redondo, has a higher number of older and retired residents, who don’t need proximity to freeway and commuting.

In critical issues such as this - the only way to have our voice heard, is to show up to meetings, write letters etc. I imagine that South Redondo has a much higher level of citizen activism due to those folks having more time on their hands, on not relying on jobs for income, or caring for children.

I live in North Redondo, have a full-time job, and 3 young children. I care deeply about our community, and am tired of North Redondo always getting burdened with housing, while South Redondo gets more open space and parks. I think this is driven in part by louder and more active voices in South Redondo, while North Redondo residents have a harder time having their voice heard, without putting their livelihood or parenting responsibilities aside.

Please don’t only consider the older retired resident voices of South Redondo in your decision making. Please do consider the quieter, but less visible working and parenting communities of North Redondo - who do not want to see even more crowding and density thrust upon us.

North Redondo Beach is already doing it's share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site. This site is only being protected by loud, active retired citizenry of South Redondo, while the working and time-strapped North Redondo citizenry is not getting their voice heard.

Having been on the Board of BCHD - I also observed, when it came to development - it was a much higher ratio of S. Redondo to N. Redondo voices that were expressed, and definitely more a retired community voice than the active working, younger community.

Sincerely,

Vish Chatterji
Former Board Member Beach Cities Health District
I am a 24+ year resident of the beautiful city of Redondo Beach. I am fortunate to live in the 90278 and only 1 mile from my long term employer Northrop Grumman. North Redondo Beach is already doing it's share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site.

Thank you,
Ashley Danial
Question:  
With the addition of 1900+ housing units designated just within the 90278/North Redondo area, how will you handle the overcrowding in the elementary and middle schools?
Hey Folks,

NRB is not the Red Hair step-child, quit treating as such. Any notice where lots of tax revenue is generated, think NRG?

Let’s share the wealth if that’s what you call it. Agree w/ the message below.

**North Redondo Beach is already doing it’s share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site.**

Stephen Walsh
90278 and proud of it
To Mayor Bill Brand and the City of Redondo Beach,

I am emailing to say that I cannot contain myself with regard to the inequity that you thrust upon North Redondo. First it was using the South Redondo Majority on the City Council to put homeless shelters in North Redondo when there we better options in South Redondo, where the homeless predominantly reside. Then there is the multi-family zoning that you have disproportionally established in North Redondo versus South Redondo.

Now you are proposing putting all of the 2,490 new units being mandated by the State in North Redondo, which has already been dubbed Condo Redondo. North Redondo is heavily over-crowded as it is, unlike South Redondo, where there is plenty of room. This needs to stop. There is simply no excuse for putting any more than half of the new units in North Redondo. You City Council members that live in South Redondo need to start supporting North Redondo.

John Calcagnini -
I have been a resident of Redondo Beach from 1983 to 1994, and again from 2004 to now. I have watched my neighborhood go from many single-family homes and survived builds on all but 3 on our street that are now 2 units, if not larger. The areas of District 4 and 5 are saturated with multi-unit properties, impacted parking, crowded schools and corresponding morning school traffic. Additionally, it could only help all of Redondo to encourage equal growth in South Redondo with commuters to all the shops and restaurants along the way from the freeways to 90277 neighborhoods.

Thank you,

Janet Vickers  
D&J Media Solutions  
2228 Gates Ave  
Redondo Beach, CA 90278 (District 5)
North Redondo Beach is already doing its share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site. This would be a fair and equitable way of resolving this new housing situation.

Thank you,
Larry Sherman
North Redondo Beach is already doing it's share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site. This is important to do in order to have a fair and equitable way of resolving this new housing situation.

Sincerely,

Alice Zaleon
North Redondo Beach is already doing its share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site.

Please do NOT put all new housing in Redondo in zip code 90278.

Thanks,

Melissa K. Dagodag
REsident of 1525 Wollacott Street, Redondo Beach, CA 90278
North Redondo Beach is already doing its share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site.

Brian Herlihy
North Redondo Beach is already doing its share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site.
North Redondo Beach is already doing its share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site.
North Redondo Beach is already doing its share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site.

Thank you,
David Evans
3507 McBain Ave.
Redondo Beach, Ca. 90278

Sent from my iPhone
North Redondo Beach is already doing its share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site.

90278 is so packed with multiple units in single family lots and not enough parking space for all the residents as it is. Adding more units is unacceptable.
We are writing to express our view that new zoning should be shared equitably between the 90277 and 90278 zip codes in Redondo Beach. It would not be just nor fair for North Redondo Beach to absorb all of the new zoning. Therefore, we feel that it should be split between North and South Redondo.

Respectfully,

C. Christian and Jon A. Hendershot
1925 Voorhees Avenue, Unit A
Redondo Beach, CA 90278
ATTN: Email is from an external source; Stop, Look, and Think before opening attachments or links.

North Redondo Beach is already doing it's share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site.

Split the burden evenly. Why would you put everyone in the same district?

DK
North Redondo Beach is already doing its share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site.
As a 90278 resident (1638 Goodman), I strongly urge that South Redondo be zoned to equitably distribute housing density.

Respectfully,
Richard Tuey
North Redondo Beach is already doing its share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site.

This is not fair or equitable. I support dividing those units across Redondo Beach.

Gene Siciliano
Your CFO for Rent
Sent from my iPhone
North Redondo Beach is already doing its share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site.

Merrill Harrington
North Redondo Beach is already doing its share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site.
Get Outlook for iOS
North Redondo Beach is already doing it's share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site.

Susan Jones
North Redondo Beach is already doing its share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site.

Thank you
Joanne Galin
Hello,
I live at 3506 Mcbain Ave in North Redondo and I demand zoning equality.

North Redondo Beach is already doing it's share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site.

Please respond.

Thanks!
Mike
From: Barry Solomon
To: Planredondo
Subject: Housing needs to go in 90277
Date: Tuesday, April 6, 2021 8:18:05 PM

[City Logo] ATTN: Email is from an external source; Stop, Look, and Think before opening attachments or links.

North Redondo Beach is already doing its share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site.

Sent from my iPhone
ATTN: Email is from an external source; Stop, Look, and Think before opening attachments or links.

North Redondo Beach is already doing its share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site.

Thank you.

Ginger Conrad (aka Dorothy M. Conrad), owner, Unit #14, 2120 Dufour, Redondo Beach, CA 90278
North Redondo Beach is already doing its share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site.

Please register me for the April 7 meeting.

Thank you,

Thomas Kjolsing
2402 Thomas Ave
Redondo Beach, CA 90278
From: Robin
To: Planredondo
Subject: Extra housing
Date: Tuesday, April 6, 2021 8:26:09 PM

[City Logo] ATTN: Email is from an external source; Stop, Look, and Think before opening attachments or links.

This should be split between north, central and south Redondo. I’m tired of always getting all the crap here in north/central Redondo. Do the right thing - please!

Robin Crocker

Sent from my iPhone
To whom it may concern,

Since the State is requiring Redondo Beach to zone 2,490 dwelling units over the next 8 years to make for more affordable housing, please make sure this is done fairly, by splitting evenly between North Redondo (90278) and South Redondo (90277).

Sincerely,

Juliana Gross

Redondo Beach resident

Sent from my iPhone
PLANRedondo,

I am writing to demand zoning equity between North and South Redondo for the additional 2,490 dwelling units being required by the state over the next 8 years. Specifically, I demand that at least half of the new units be located in South Redondo.

Currently, the only additional zoning being proposed is in the 90278:

- 1,000 dwelling units in the industrial/commercial zone of District 5. East of Redondo Avenue, North of MB Blvd, 87 acres.
- 600 MORE at the Galleria, 50 acres. District 4. Which means the Galleria area will have a total of 900 units.

To be fair between North and South Redondo,

- 1,245 should go in the 90277 and
- 1,245 should go in 90278.

**District 5 has grown more than any other district.** We did our fair share for the region, and the rest of the city needs to participate as the same level.

I concur with Laura Emdee’s recommendation below:

### 2010-2019 population difference:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Redondo Beach</td>
<td>1524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Redondo Beach</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>District 5 only</strong></td>
<td><strong>657</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

District 5 industrial area should be zoned as a park/industrial space since we have grown so much.

**What does equitable look like?:**

In 90278:

- 504 Residential Recycling
- + 120 ADUs
- + 300 at the Galleria North (already entitled)
- = **920**

Therefore if we add
325 to Galleria South (The Galleria was originally zoned for 650 but was scaled down.)
= 1,245

In 90277:
204 Residential Recycling
So 1,041 Should go in 90277
= 1,245

We can determine other 90277 locations for the 1,041 to go but the biggest land available is the Power Plant area with 50 acres. Further, in order to be affordable according to RHNA rules it must be zoned at 30 dwelling units/acre. The geography will allow some height, there can still be space for a park, commercial and office.

Best,

Patty Fry
North Redondo Beach is already doing its share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site.

Sent from my iPad
This email is regarding the State requirement for Redondo Beach to zone for 2,490 dwelling units over the next 8 years. North Redondo Beach (90278) has been doing its share to accommodate more housing, and especially District 5, which has grown more than any other District. From 2010-2019, the North Redondo Beach dwelling increase was 1,524, whereas during the same time period, South Redondo increased by a mere 280. The additional 2,490 dwelling unit requirement must, at a minimum, be equitably split between North (90278) and South (90277) Redondo Beach. Please zone at least 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50-acre power plant site.

Thank you,

Anthea Koutroulis
North Redondo Beach is already doing its share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site.

Sent from my iPhone
North Redondo Beach is already doing its share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site.

Sincerely,

James Mueller
Patricia Digre
2010 Mathews Ave
90278

Sent from my iPhone
North Redondo Beach is already doing its share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site. Double that number is too much for either zip code to handle in its entirety. Please consider this proposal as the right thing to do for Redondo Beach.

Sincerely,

Suzy Royds
North Redondo Beach is already doing it's share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site.

Tom Royds
My family has lived in Redondo Beach for 20 years and we support development of new housing to meet demand.

North Redondo Beach has grown rapidly to accommodate more housing during our time here and we understand that we need to add 2,500 more units to the city. Please consider zoning 1,245 units in the southern side of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site.

Thank you.

Andrew Beauchamp
2608 Gates Ave
North Redondo Beach is already doing it's share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site.

Zoning equity is not only fair, but it’s essential. 90278 has been carrying it’s fair share. Now it’s time to spread the “Wealth”. 90278 is densely populated and has insufficient parking, as it is, for the existing housing. 90277 has acreage to accommodate more housing, as well as the additional parking generated by increased residential housing. It’s a no brainer.

Sincerely,
Terri Arnold

Sent from my iPhone
From: John Nemeth
To: Planredondo
Subject: Housing needs to go in 90277
Date: Tuesday, April 6, 2021 9:12:45 PM

North Redondo Beach is already doing it's share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site.

Thank you,

John Nemeth
North Redondo Beach Resident Since 1999
North Redondo Beach is already doing it's share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site.

Cyndi Wicks
2707 Curtis Ave
Redondo Beach, CA 90278
From: Ana Steenson
To: Planredondo
Subject: Housing needs to go in 90277
Date: Tuesday, April 6, 2021 9:32:55 PM

[City Logo] ATTN: Email is from an external source; Stop, Look, and Think before opening attachments or links.

North Redondo Beach is already doing its share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site.

Sent from my iPhone
North Redondo Beach is already doing its share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site.

Tania Gillepie
North Redondo Beach is already doing its share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site.
North Redondo Beach is already doing its share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site. There should also be more ADU's encouraged in South Redondo. Perhaps with streamlined, fast, planning permission, and/or prefab construction recommended by the Planning Dept. North Redondo is already doing its part with the Galleria site. Density should be spread overall Redondo equitably.

Sent from my iPad
To Whom May Concern,

It’s always been apparent that south Redondo will do everything to keep its aesthetic (rich) and will try to put anything resembling affordable housing in north Redondo. Place affordable housing equally throughout the city. Placing all the units in one area stinks of classism and racism. Placing them all in one area would continue to uphold those systems. North Redondo Beach is already doing its share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 area.

Thanks,
Katie
ATTN: Email is from an external source; Stop, Look, and Think before opening attachments or links.

The housing units being mandated by the state must be evenly divided between North & South Redondo.

That is 1,245 for 90277 & 1,245 for 90278.

90278 has picked up more housing units than 90277.

Thank you!

Glendee Madden
North Redondo Beach is already doing it's share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site.
Hello,

As a North RB resident, I am voicing my demand for housing zoned equitably throughout the city. If we are to be equitable, at least half of the state required additional dwelling units over the next 8 years should be in South RB. The population in the north (1524) is way higher than the south (280) and there are 50 acres at the South RB Power Plant area to absorb more people. It would not be fair to add the majority of required housing in the north.

Thanks,
Christine Ng
ATTN: Email is from an external source; Stop, Look, and Think before opening attachments or links.

North Redondo Beach is already doing it's share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site.
North Redondo Beach is already doing it's share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site.
[City Logo] ATTN: Email is from an external source; Stop, Look, and Think before opening attachments or links.

There is a desperate need for an additional 1,245 units in the 90277 area code. Thanks for your consideration.
Good Morning,

Please take an inclusive look at all of Redondo Beach when zoning. North Redondo Beach is already doing its share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site.

Thank you for your time,
Julie
There is a desperate need for an additional affordable housing in the 90277 area code. The rules to building homes need to be eased to allow MORE homes with greater heights, ADU’s, and multi-unit properties to meet the needs of the community. There are bullies and old folk who have lived in the 90277 zip code who will vote against new housing because they want to maintain the high priced cost of their homes (which they bought 30 years ago for $30,000). It’s NOT FAIR for North Redondo to bear the brunt of building all the additional homes. Thank you.
ATTN: Email is from an external source; Stop, Look, and Think before opening attachments or links.

Hello Laura,

Thanks for your efforts! I am demanding zoning equity. Please see short message below. I have more to say, but wanted to keep short.

As a resident of North Redondo I’m AGAINST the proposed addition dwelling requirements for 90278. I can see splitting it equitably between North & South Redondo Beach. But, why do we have to bear the burden of ALL of THE PROPOSED 2490 units? It will substantially increase traffic flow, noise, pollution, wear and tear on resources that are already dwindling. If we are to put these units here what happens to the schools too. Shouldn’t it be noted that there is only one high school in all of Redondo Beach. That high school is located in 90277 as is the main post office, the police station and city hall. So, why is it that most of the money is spent on beautification of South Redondo Beach & the infrastructure. But, when it comes to housing they don’t want share the additional burden. Now homeowners in North Redondo are finally advocating for ourselves and I think we would agree this is unfair. Why don’t we take some of that land to open up a high school for our children...our future or a park so we have some land left that’s open??? Instead of Re-condo Beach 90278, all of the apartments and all of the new housing that is being proposed why not think about the future...what impacts will this have on North Redondo Beach & it’s current families/tax payers.

Sincerely,

Alicia Evans
3507 McBain Ave.
Redondo Beach, CA 90278

Sent from my iPhone
North Redondo Beach is already doing its share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site.

Thank you,
Melinda Khindri
North Redondo Beach is already doing its share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site.
Dear Plan Redondo,

I live in North Redondo Beach, and appreciate a small town charm. However, overtime, North Redondo Beach, is clustering with development, clutter of cars parking on the street, driveways are full.

Artesia Blvd is growing with traffic, and soon to be streets in the vicinity of the Galleria and Target, resulting from the current development behind Target, and another location across the way from the Galleria, on Grant Ave, a corner lot.

North Redondo Beach is already doing it's share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site.

Appreciate the consideration of relocating the development of more housing elsewhere, than North Redondo. At what point, is the City of Redondo Beach going to put a cap on overdeveloping a community?

Sincerely,

Mary Schurr
North Redondo Beach is already doing its share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site.

Srinivas Vangala
North Redondo Beach is already doing its share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site.

Ramani S Vangala
North Redondo Beach is already doing its share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site.

Sent from Ken Bender
I am a homeowner in the 90278 area - I am opposed to the idea of saddling my area with all the “affordable” housing units in Redondo Beach. Split between 90277 and 90278 - or fight the entire idea with the state due to existing density issues.

Sent from my iPhone
North Redondo Beach is already doing it's share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site.

Personally, I don't understand why North Redondo is the 'go-to' site for these kinds of plans. It would seem to me the Planning Commission is incredibly prejudicial in just considering only North Redondo, and that any kind of planning like this needs to 'spread the wealth' and not just target one section of a community.

Since we've moved here I've been shocked to discover that North Redondo appears to be the step-child of the South Bay, particularly the 90277 area. As a homeowner who has worked hard for what we have, this is very very distressing.

Please reconsider your plans and figure out how to be fair to all of Redondo.

Best,
Linda Marr

2225 Graham Avenue
Redondo Beach, CA 90278
I'd like to express my concern about putting 2,500 additional housing units in North Redondo. As anyone who lives in North Redondo knows, our neighborhood is already congested with many 2-3 on a lots, as well as apartments. Adding an additional 2,500 would be crazy without equitably distributing that throughout Redondo Beach. South Redondo does not have the same neighborhood congestion that North Redondo currently experiences, and as such, should help shoulder this additional housing that is being thrust upon us. I recognize we live in a wonderful and highly desirable community and we want to be inclusive to more people and allow others to join our community. We just need to be mindful how that population is distributed.

Sincerely,

John Nguyen
North Redondo Beach is already doing its share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site.

Putting all the housing in 90278 is incredibly unfair. Why should North Redondo carry the entire burden at its expense and South Redondo remains unaffected. Personally, I don't agree with additional housing anywhere in Redondo but the ridiculous rules should affect all of Redondo Beach fairly.

2010-2019 population difference:
North Redondo Beach   1524
South Redondo Beach   280
District 5 only       657

Thanks,
Dawn K. Une
Currently, the only additional zoning being proposed is in the 90278:
1,000 dwelling units in the industrial/commercial zone of District 5. East of Redondo Avenue, North of MB Blvd, 87 acres.

600 MORE at the Galleria, 50 acres. District 4. Which means the Galleria area will have a total of 900 units.

90277 needs to zone at least half of the 2,490 housing required.

If we are equitable,
1,245 should go in the 90277 and
1,245 should go in 90278:

Residential Recycling means a lot that is zoned for 2 or more units but only has 1 house in it.
Residential Recycling already zoned in Redondo Beach but not yet realized is 788 units:
504 in 90278
204 in 90277

ADUs (Accessory Dwelling Units or Granny Flats):
240 is the assumption we are allowed.

What does equitable look like?:
In 90278:
504 Residential Recycling
+ 120 ADUs
+ 300 at the Galleria North (already entitled)
= 920
Therefore if we add
325 to Galleria South (The Galleria was originally zoned for 650 but was scaled down.)
= 1,245

In 90277:
204 Residential Recycling
So 1,041 Should go in 90277
= 1,245

We can determine other 90277 locations for the 1,041 to go but the biggest land available is the Power Plant area with 50 acres. Further, in order to be affordable according to RHNA rules it must be zoned at 30 dwelling units/acre. The geography will allow some height, there can still be space for a park, commercial and office.

District 5 has grown more than any other district.

We did our fair share for the region, and we should be proud. Very few high opportunity neighborhoods made room.

2010-2019 population difference:
North Redondo Beach 1524
South Redondo Beach 280
District 5 only 657

We should zone our District 5 industrial area as a park/Industrial space since we have grown so much.

Thank you,
Steve Goldstein
District 4 Resident
Your current plan is ridiculous. You are being grossly unfair to 90278. New housing should be divided equitably and that means many more units allocated to 90277 in your plan.

North Redondo is already doing its share. Please zone 1,245 units in 90277. It would make a great deal of sense to use some of the 50 acre power plant site.

John Oester
2401 Graham Avenue
To Plan Redondo:

Incredibly short sighted to jam all the housing into the 90278 Redondo Beach Districts 4 & 5.

The areas considered, 1,000 dwelling units in the industrial/commercial zone of District 5 east of Redondo Avenue, North of MB Blvd 87 acres. 600 MORE at the Galleria, 50 acres in District 4, are incredibly crowded and a traffic nightmare.

Adding more housing to these areas will only exacerbate the problems which the current infrastructure cannot handle and create a living nightmare for the local residents and businesses.

The Inglewood Avenue, Marine Ave, Manhattan Beach Boulevard corridor is a nightmare for traffic congestion during most of the day, and increasing density will aggravate the situation with congestion and pollution.

A similar problem will persist around the Galleria which already has more traffic than it can handle.

The planning commission should consider the impact the high density plan for the 90278 area will have on the surrounding communities. Torrance, Lawndale, Hawthorne and

El Segundo will not stand idle while the Redondo Beach RHNA Plan causes unwanted and unwelcome traffic congestion in their neighborhoods.

Witness the issues and problems caused by the recent Beach Cities Health District redevelopment fiasco.

Consideration should also be given to the probable environmental cleanup required for the 87 acres in District 5 since this area has been an industrial compound for a very long time. Also are you going to kick out NGC from its facilities located in this area?

District 5 Councilwoman Laura Emdee has eloquently presented the facts:

District 5 has grown more than any other district. We did our fair share for the region, and we should be proud. Very few high opportunity neighborhoods made room.
2010-2019 Population Difference:

North Redondo Beach     1524
South Redondo Beach     280
District 5 only         657

*District 5 has grown more than any other district!!!*

We should zone our District 5 industrial area as a park/industrial space since we have grown so much.

For the past 20 years the AES Power Plant site has been a sacred cow held hostage by the whims of Mayor Brand and his cronies in Districts 1, 2 and 3 for their narrow concept of development to benefit their districts.

To be equitable and prove that Redondo Beach is a community for all, the AES Power plant and Districts 1, 2 & 3 have to engage and become part of the solution and accept zoning changes and half of the proposed housing required by the RHNA rules!

Respectfully,

Oscar & Joanne Pichardo

Redondo Beach, CA
Hello

I am a resident of 90278 District 3. I am writing to voice my concerns and am requesting that the city zone all new housing equally.

If we are equitable,
1,245 should go in the 90277 and
1,245 should go in 90278

I also believe we as a city should zone our District 5 industrial area as a park/industrial space since we have grown so much.

North Redondo should not have to take on all the new housing.

With gratitude,
Marisa Clayton-Rivera
2713 Ralston Lane
Redondo Beach 90278
We have been Redondo residents for 61 years in N. Redondo and have see our city grow to the point of being so crowded we can’t even have company because of the street parking. I can’t even imagine adding ANY more units to our end of the city. The police dept can’t keep up with the parking hogs as it is so, what will happen with way more units are added to our community. South Redondo, 90277 has been spared the pain of the crowding of multi family dwellings for long enough. That area needs to join in and take at least their fair share. I think their share of the 2,490 addition should, by rights be much more than N. Redondo 90278. We had a shopping center that was convenient for most of us and now we have more housing and less shopping. We don’t have any large chain grocery stores anymore or local shopping. More people + more cars, more kids for our schools etc = a more crowded area for all of us. Maybe they should add some Hugh parking structures to go along with all of the extra cars to use. We have lots of parking hogs already in our city and they are not controlled, why would we want more. South Redondo definitely has way more space to donate than N. Redondo 90278. So let us be fair when we are dividing the pie.
Please allow us to breath.
Sincerely, Ron and Rochelle Sutherland, N. Redondo 90278

Sent from Mail for Windows 10
North Redondo Beach is already doing it's share to accommodate more housing.

Our streets, schools, parks etc are already over crowded.

Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site.

Thank you,

Jennifer Pope
Redondo Beach is 1 city, 1 community, not 2 zip codes.

Adding the additional state required housing only to 90278 is unfair and does not promote a 1 Redondo. This burden imposed by the state should be distributed between 90278 and 90277.

North Redondo Beach is already doing its share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site.

You are our city representatives, not 90277 representatives. Fight for fairness for all Redondo Beach residents.
Hello,

My name is Kim Weiss, and I am a North Redondo Beach resident. I am extremely concerned about the additional housing being proposed, with ALL of the units crowding the already-crowded 90278 footprint. As I’m sure you’re aware, this is NOT an equitable distribution of housing in the city of Redondo Beach.

North Redondo Beach is already doing it's share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site.

Thank you,
Kim Weiss
We have been residents & homeowners here in N. Redondo Beach just off Artesia Blvd for over 22 years. We have had Beach cottages bulldozed next door 4 years ago. A 3 Unit Gianormous Complex built, which was purchased as a rental complex. This complex, not only blocks our views, it was constructed with views directly into our home from their balconies & rooftop deck from approx 18ft away. Due to this complex being a rental we’ve had noise issues, garbage issues with their trash flying onto our property as well as parking issues because the 4 bedroom units who are rentals choose not to park in their garages & driveways and park in the street. Cars are unable to travel East & Westbound at the same time and we have to pull to the side or back into our driveways to let one another pass.

The area is not constructed for so many more constructed units, traffic has increased exponentially in the area and accidents are on the rise due to this issue. Please refrain from building additional numerous complexes, etc.

Thank-you in advance for your understanding.

Sent from my Galaxy
Well, it’s not surprising to me that no additional housing is planned to be added to districts 1 and 2. As a life time resident in district 5, I have become accustomed to the knee jerk reaction our city continues to have when it comes to community issues, without any regard to the residents in the North Redondo districts. I don’t believe it’s fair to place all “proposed required” housing in 3 of the 5 districts. I believe a more equitable plan is needed to space all the new units over all 5 districts.

There are major safety concerns in adding all the additional housing to two currently dense areas: Artesia Boulevard and Inglewood Avenue/Manhattan Beach Boulevard. Both of these areas currently experience high traffic on a daily basis, as well as accidents on a weekly basis. Adding more housing will add more vehicles to these areas that are currently problematic. How many fatal accidents have occurred on Artesia? And the freeway and train traffic at Inglewood Avenue cause a ridiculous back up on the existing two lane roads! (Not to mention the “cut through” to the freeway traffic that neighboring residents experience every morning and evening!)

Another concern is adding more population to areas without any thought to the effect it will have to area schools and emergency services. There needs to be a population study of residents in each district, based on square footage. A comprehensive study may result in a fair analysis in using open space available in the other districts to accommodate the proposed housing. (For example, the open area near the mini storage site on Herondo or part of the power plant area.)

At the very least, please present valid reasons why all these units cannot be equally distributed throughout all Redondo Beach. Thank you.

Sincerely, Valerie Lee
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For most of my 42 years living in Redondo Beach it has appeared that the 90277 area has been favored over the 90278 area in which I have lived for 39 of those years. Considering what I know about the plans for zoning additional housing required by California State law, this favoritism of the south Redondo is continuing with most of the required units to be zoned being proposed in the 90278 zip code.

I request that you consider zoning an equal number of additional housing units in each part of Redondo Beach. The northern part of the city is already more densely populated and has already zoned additional units at the South Bay Galleria site. Adding additional units to our industrial area is a bad option as there are no schools in that area and any potential students would need to cross Manhattan Beach Blvd. or we would need to build an additional school.

I know that voters were against adding housing units at the AES site, but that was prior to the current State mandate. I think that area must be considered as a potential location for additional housing, unless other locations in the 90277 zip code can be identified.
North Redondo Beach is already doing its share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site.

I am a 27 year resident of North Redondo and have seen 2 and 3 units condos replace SFD's in my neighborhood none stop since 1994. How about a little rezoning down South to even things up? Or perhaps we should just take our Galleria and new motels and Secede from the Union.

Tom Dempsey
2518 Huntington Ln, Redondo Beach, CA 90278
Hello,

North Redondo Beach is already doing its share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site.

Thank you,
Janille P. Miyake
Axenty Way
Hello,

I am a resident of 90278 District 3 and find the current recommendations to zone a
disappropriate amount of housing in North Redondo to be offensive. I am requesting that the
city zone equitably and zone for 1,245 in 90277 as well as 90278.

The power plant site is 50 acres and is perfectly suited to take on 600 units alone in 90277.

I also believe we as a city should zone our District 5 industrial area as a park/industrial space
since we have grown so much.

North Redondo should not have to take on all the new housing and everything else South
Redondo does not want.

Becky Kim
Firmona Ave, 90278
Redondo Beach must plan for equity in meeting the State requirements on additional housing. Rezoning So Redondo to accommodate 2 houses on a lot can easily be done, increase the housing supply and match all the hard work already done by North Redondo. South Redondo must absorb at least 50% of the required increase in housing. Do not dump all the housing on those of us in the North, it is an unfair burden in an already congested area. Thanks.

Annette Sumrall
No Redondo Home Owner
Hello,

I am a resident of 90278 District 3 and find the current recommendations to zone a disproportionate amount of housing in North Redondo to be offensive. I am requesting that the city zone equitably and zone for 1,245 in 90277 as well as 90278.

The power plant site is 50 acres and is perfectly suited to take on 600 units alone in 90277.

I also believe we as a city should zone our District 5 industrial area as a park/industrial space since we have grown so much.

North Redondo should not have to take on all the new housing and everything else South Redondo does not want.

Haol Yao
Good afternoon,

We are 19 year residents of North Redondo, in our 3rd home in same neighborhood! Property taxes for us (which benefits all of Redondo is $10k a year!) We strongly urge the Planning Committee to ensure that 90277 shares equally in the zoning distribution for the mandated new housing.

We have seen our neighborhood support many wonderful changes which have given rise to better schools and quality of living in our 19 years living here. There is no reason only one zip code should bear the burden of the entire 100% of this new housing mandate. If there is a reason or multiple reasons please detail them out to us so we can understand why this is even up for debate.

Please let us know what else can be done to make this situation more equitable.

Thank you,
Jayme Robinson

Sent from Jay's iPhone
Hello,

I am a resident of 90278 District 4.

I am requesting that the city zone equitably and zone for 1245 in both 90277 and 90278. I find it absolutely ludicrous that North Redondo is expected to take on all the new housing and everything else that South Redondo does not want.

The power plant site is 50 acres and is perfectly suited to take on 600 units alone in 90277.

I also believe we as a city should zone our District 5 industrial area as a park/industrial space since we have grown so much.

Susie Kim
Huntingtin Ln, 90278
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North Redondo Beach is already doing its share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site. I am not a robot...I am not a robot!! stick the new housing at the power plant!!!! all of you lying ass politicians, corrupt as hell....stick the housing at the power plant!!!!’ I live in north redondo....stick it elsewhere!!!!
Here’s my questions/comments for tonight’s meeting:

As a N Redondo resident for 20+ years, and directly impacted by the uncontrolled growth over the past years, can you explain why this area is allocated for the majority of new housing units? Am I correct that only 12% of the required units are being allocated to 90277 in the current plan? Let's re-work the inequitable allocation.

Why isn't more being done to consider re-zoning 90277 to accommodate more of the units? Seems like the City ALWAYS defaults to N Redondo on the more unpopular decisions.

AES location is an obvious choice but I understand the State is pushing to extend the operation. Is there an option to negotiate with the State to eliminate and/or extend some of the housing requirements/deadline if they are successful with the extension?

<Not sure how this works but I don't want my name mentioned if you elect to read all or part of this email>

Bev Saks
Hello, I am a Redondo Beach Resident. It is my belief that both North and South Redondo should EQUALLY share the burden of accommodating more housing for the RHNA numbers. Some sites have not been sufficiently considered, such as the 50 ACRE POWER PLANT site. North Redondo Beach is already doing it's share to accommodate more housing, and already contains much more density than south Redondo. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town.

Thanks for your consideration.
As a tax-paying house owner in north Redondo Beach, I demand that the plans for low-income housing be split evenly across both north and south Redondo beach to alleviate the community impact. Those of us in north Redondo pay the same tax rates as those in south Redondo so it absolutely makes no sense that we are left to bear all the impact of such an influx of residents.

Regards,

Jean Mayhew
3013 Johnston Ave, Redondo Beach, CA 90278

--
Jean Mayhew jean.mayhew@gmail.com
Currently, the only additional zoning being proposed is in the 90278:
1,000 dwelling units in the industrial/commercial zone of District 5. East of Redondo Avenue, North of MB Blvd, 87 acres.

600 MORE at the Galleria, 50 acres. District 4. Which means the Galleria area will have a total of 900 units.

90277 needs to zone at least half of the 2,490 housing required.

If we are equitable,
1,245 should go in the 90277 and
1,245 should go in 90278:

Residential Recycling means a lot that is zoned for 2 or more units but only has 1 house in it.
Residential Recycling already zoned in Redondo Beach but not yet realized is 788 units:
504 in 90278
204 in 90277

ADUs (Accessory Dwelling Units or Granny Flats):
240 is the assumption we are allowed.

What does equitable look like?:
In 90278:
504 Residential Recycling
+ 120 ADUs
+ 300 at the Galleria North (already entitled)
= 920
Therefore if we add

Please BE FAIR. North Redondo should not be the only place for additional zoning.
325 to Galleria South (The Galleria was originally zoned for 650 but was scaled down.)
= 1,245

In 90277:
204 Residential Recycling
So 1,041 Should go in 90277
= 1,245

We can determine other 90277 locations for the 1,041 to go but the biggest land available is the Power Plant area with 50 acres. Further, in order to be affordable according to RHNA rules it must be zoned at 30 dwelling units/acre. The geography will allow some height, there can still be space for a park, commercial and office.

**District 5 has grown more than any other district.**

We did our fair share for the region, and we should be proud. Very few high opportunity neighborhoods made room.

**2010-2019 population difference:**
- North Redondo Beach 1524
- South Redondo Beach 280
- **District 5 only 657**

We should zone our District 5 industrial area as a park/industrial space since we have grown so much.

Thank you,
Donna Capraro
District 4 Resident

Sent from Mail for Windows 10
Dear City Council:

We oppose the Draft Land Use Plan that will add an additional 1,600 units to 90278. We advocate either rezoning or splitting the requirement between 90278 and 90277. North Redondo is already very dense and parking is very difficult as it is. In addition, traffic on Artesia will increase to unsustainable levels, and our schools will become more crowded than they already are. This is unacceptable. We choose to live in Redondo because we do not want to deal with issues like this that are already prevalent in other parts of Los Angeles, like Santa Monica and Brentwood. Please consider rezoning or an equitable distribution of the proposed housing units.

Thank you,

Kelly and Mike Silverman
In response to the 2,940 new homes required in Redondo Beach by the Regional Housing Needs Assessment, North Redondo Beach (90278) is already zoned to take 1,200 units, therefore, it is critical that South Redondo Beach (90277) be required to find more areas to accommodate this mandate. This is the fair and equitable way to handle this matter in our city. As a suggestion, the Redondo Beach Power Plant site has 50 acres and can accommodate the additional required housing.

North Redondo Beach (90278) is already extremely crowded, impacted and it is very difficult to find street parking. This problem will be much worse with the 1,200 units that we are zoned to build. Good neighbors need to work together to solve this issue, therefore, we feel that South Redondo Beach (90277) needs to step up and share the additional new housing mandate.

Leslie Sutphin/Kevin O'Connor
Hello,

As a 10 year homeowner in North Redondo Beach, I am asking that the distribution of additional homes be spread over South and North Redondo. It is not fair or sensible to overload the already stressed area of North Redondo with even more housing.

90277 needs to zone at least half of the 2,490 housing required. The time for action is NOW! If we are equitable, 1,245 should go in the 90277 and 1,245 should go in 90278

With Regards,

Connie Tan
North Redondo Beach is already doing its share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site. I live on Ruxton between Rockefeller and Carnegie and we are so overfull it's insane. Not to mention we have extended temporary housing for the homeless population just south of Target on Kingsdale. We are already fighting to try to remove the option for Metro to use the existing ROW behind our complex for the Green Line extension. Let's give south Redondo a chance to pull their own weight. Thanks,
Marisol Shankar
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We own a home on Nelson Ave. Redondo is so crowded to begin with, but it is absolutely ridiculous to think that all of the state-required housing units would land in 90278. Please share the pain, inconvenience and school crowding equally with South Redondo. It is not fair to treat North Redondo as the dumping ground for all unwanted things.

Thank you,
Stacey Brucia
--
Stacey Brucia
Redondo Beach HOUSING ZONED EQUITABLY THROUGHOUT THE CITY
90277=90278

If we are equitable,
1,245 should go in the 90277 and
1,245 should go in 90278

Thank You
Monika Olmos
2609 182nd Street
RB 90278

Sent from my iPhone
I believe that the new housing amounts need to be distributed equitably between both North and South Redondo neighborhoods. It is unfair for North Redondo alone to take on all the increased traffic, parking and social issues that are the result of more dense housing.

Andrea Sampson
The new housing plan should distribute units roughly equally across north & south RB. The delay in phasing out the AES plant will complicate this, but future housing there should be counted in this plan.

Thanks,
David Newkirk
To Whom it May Concern,

The new housing in Redondo Beach must be split between the 2 zip codes. It’s unfair for one (which always seems to be NRB) to take on all the burden to the neighborhood, including more traffic and impacted schools. Please let everyone in Redondo Beach take on this responsibility, as that is only fair.

Thank you,
Jaimie Ponsiglione

Sent from my iPhone
From: Dawn Frederick
To: Planredondo
Subject: Housing needs to go in 90277
Date: Wednesday, April 7, 2021 10:10:00 PM
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North Redondo Beach is already doing its share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site.

Sent from my iPhone
Please ensure zoning is equitable!

1,245 should go in the 90277 and 1,245 should go in 90278

What does equitable look like?: In 90278: 504 Residential Recycling + 120 ADUs + 300 at the Galleria North (already entitled) = 920 Therefore if we add 325 to Galleria South (The Galleria was originally zoned for 650 but was scaled down.) = 1,245 In 90277: 204 Residential Recycling
So 1,041 Should go in 90277 = 1,245

Thank you,
Marianne Brooks
To Whom it May Concern,

I am a current South Redondo Beach resident living in the 90277 area of District 3. I am in escrow on a property in the 90278 area of District 3. There is already a big distinction on property lines and zoning between the two zip codes. North Redondo is much more crowded with units right up against the lot lines. With the new CA law on increasing zoning units, the focus should be in the South Redondo area which has not kept up with North Redondo. Even a direct split 50/50 would still be less equitable given the current zoning differences in our city.

Please focus attention on increasing the number of units in South Redondo. The prime target being the unsightly power plant that keeps getting extended.

Jessica Kenahan
ATTN: Email is from an external source; Stop, Look, and Think before opening attachments or links.

We are a bedroom community. I see some industrial spaces and housing spaces being added, but very little plans for commercial / office spaces. How do we get more businesses to come to our city so people can work here?

Thank you,
Heather
From: Gobruins
To: Planredondo
Subject: Planned housing
Date: Wednesday, April 7, 2021 8:19:04 PM
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I object to the current plan as it puts the burden on NRB. It should be evenly divided amongst the different regions. NRB is always carrying the weight for the city bc its wealthiest residents are in SRB.

Reena Villegas

Sent from Reena's iPhone
North Redondo Beach is already doing its share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site.
It appears from the presentation all of the lower income housing is in the north. Are you trying too continue making us the step-child?  This is just wrong.

Sent from my iPhone
I was on the call on 4/7/21. It wasn't really what I thought it was going to be. I thought that the main concern was over the state telling us that we have to build additional housing. It seems like it's already been decided that we will. I don't think we should let the state tell us what we have to do, when they don't live here.

My main concern is that housing is already overcrowded in North Redondo. You can't drive down any street and find a place to park. Single family homes are being torn down and replaced with 2 story, 2 on a lot. It's too much and needs to stop. Don't even get me started on how North Redondo is treated vs South. If we have to build all these units then they need to split evenly between North & South.

Please stop the overcrowding in North Redondo!!!
The sweet talk notwithstanding, South Redondo Beach needs to be brought to heel. It is getting off absolutely scot free while North Redondo is being stomped. North Redondo has Northrop Grumman, the Galleria, a large Hotel complex, and puts in a substantial contribution to the tax base. Yet ALL the proposed housing density is going there? This makes NO sense.

The elephant in the room is AES. It has to be put in play NOW and the PCH corridor needs to feel the pain. Leave Manhattan Beach Boulevard alone and finally spruce up Artesia to be worthy of the surrounding neighborhood.

Ravi Narasimhan
From: ROBERTA KNUTSON
To: Planredondo
Subject: 90278 zoning
Date: Wednesday, April 7, 2021 7:49:54 PM
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I can honestly say I have never lived in an area where I constantly have to fight for equity and what is right. I moved down from northern California over a year ago and since then there seems to always be something that everyone in N. Redondo has to fight the city, county or other commissions on.

Why was all the homeless housing put in N. Redondo and required us to fight about it and of course we lost? Why now do we have to fight to put half of the 2490 units in S. Redondo. Do all the politicians in Redondo live in S. Redondo and so it is a situation of 'not in my area'? There is no reason to not handle the zoning equitably throughout Redondo Beach.

I would like to stay in Redondo but if this continues I will sell and move to Hermosa or Manhattan Beach as they don't seem to have these constant battles with the city.

What exactly is the reasoning you are using to make these decisions as it isn't possible that any study performed always turns up that all the things that are negative for the city ends up as N. Redondo is the solution.

Roberta Knutson-Ratto
From: Karen R  
To: Planredondo  
Subject: Housing  
Date: Wednesday, April 7, 2021 7:01:42 PM
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I am completely against having all the new housing dwelling units in only one area of town. Housing needs to be evenly distributed throughout the city.

Thank you,

Karen Rock

(Born, raised and lived in SRB and NRB for close to 55 yrs)
This current proposed plan of building an additional 2000+ just in the 90278/North Redondo area is unfair and not supported by the local community for the following reasons.

1.) Violation of State law: State law prohibits the concentration of affordable housing in one location; it must be spread throughout the City.

2.) School Impact/Overcrowding: Development is not the only reason schools become overcrowded, but we are mostly talking about residential development when it comes to school impact. The Residential and CID Development School Fee Justification Study states under Section IV. Facilities Capacity and Student Enrollment "That the RBUSD School District's student enrollment exceeds facilities capacity at the elementary school level."

In the current proposed housing unit plan, the following areas and # of units have been identified as potential locations: Tech District - estimate 1000 units, Artesia Blvd. - estimate 350 units, Galleria - estimate 600 units

- A total of 1950 housing units happened to be located not only in the North Redondo Beach area but all in the same area as the following elementary and middle schools:

  NORTH REDONDO BEACH - Lincoln Elementary, Madison, Birney, Washington, Jefferson and Adams Middle School will be negatively impacted by excessive overcrowding.

- These are the same elementary and middle schools that the Residential and CID Development School Fee Justification Study recognized as "enrollment exceeds facilities capacity." The translation is overcrowding of school sites.

3.) School Ranking/Home Sales: increased housing, increasing enrollment directly impacts classroom sizes. Overcrowding and large classroom sizes negatively affect learning; therefore, grades and school rankings drop. When school rankings drop, then home sales are affected.
North Redondo Beach is already doing its share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site.
Committee for Planning,

Please do not add too many new units in 90278. Overcrowding will bring more problems and stress on our infrastructure. More units can be added to vacant or soon to be vacant areas such as the closed sea lab or “dirt farm”. I am a Redondo Resident in the 90278.

Thank you,
Christina Martin

Sent from my iPhone
It is ridiculous that our General Plan fails to have sufficient specificity that a developer would even propose a 103-foot tall, 800,000 sqft development.
I would like to state my opposition to the planned additional zoning being proposed for zip code 90278:

1,000 dwelling units in the industrial/commercial zone of District 5. East of Redondo Avenue, North of MB Blvd, 87 acres.

600 MORE at the Galleria, 50 acres. District 4. Which means the Galleria area will have a total of 900 units.

This is UNFAIR to the residents of North Redondo Beach. Half the proposed buildings should be in South Redondo!

Thank you!
C Del Rosario
1719 Axent Way
Redondo Beach, Ca 90278
North Redondo Beach is already doing its share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site.

Enough is enough. Split the new homes between north and south Redondo! There is room in south Redondo as well.

Martha Bettis
3302 Gibson place
2500 alvord lane. No room for 2 on a lot here or tons of cars.

D evans

Sent from my iPad
Redondo really needs to share the housing load. North Redondo Beach is already doing its share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site.

Thomas Novak
562.338.5012
Hi,

I am Britton Ertman and am the homeowner at 1523 Steinhart Ave. I would like the new housing split evenly between 90278 and 90277.

Thank You,

Britton Ertman
I am sending my concern as a resident in north redondo at 2404 Rockefeller Lane redondo beach ca 90278 that we should be spreading out the required zone housing. Asking that zip code 90277 needs to zone at least half of the 2,490 housing required. Concerned on behalf of our community
Thank you
Anita Singh
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Having all the housing in North Redondo is a burden on North Redondo Beach. South Redondo Beach should be sharing the burden and zone at least half of the required zoning.

Thanks

Jingli Newkirk
Dear city planning committee,

Please consider splitting the new housing units between both zip codes 90277 and 90278. I'm sure you are aware that housing is already packed in so tight in 90278 that it has been dubbed “North Recondo.” Please help to lessen the burden by not adding all the new homes to just our zip code.

Much appreciated,
Amy Sy

Sent from my iPhone
To Whom it May Concern,

The new housing in Redondo Beach must be split between the 2 zip codes. It’s unfair for one (which always seems to be NRB) to take on all the burden to the neighborhood, including more traffic and impacted schools. Please let everyone in Redondo Beach take on this responsibility, as that is only fair.

Thank you,
Jaimie Ponsiglione

Sent from my iPhone
In all fairness, I feel that the housing should be split evenly between 90277 and 90278. I am a resident of 90278.

Thank you,

Lena Ng

Sent from my iPhone
I would like the housing split between 90278 and 90277. Let’s be fair

Sent from my iPhone
Dear City Council,

After attending the GPAC April 7, 2021 meeting it has come to my attention that a preferred site for new housing would be the 182nd & Kingsdale Ave area. How many businesses would be displaced if building commenced there? My husband and I own La Cienega Manufacturing at 1304 Kingsdale Ave., and in our corner plaza there are at least 8 other small businesses (plus others like Ralph’s and TJ Max, etc).

Surely there must be other areas that do not have active businesses where we can build housing. I implore you to look at all options. It was mentioned at the GPAC meeting that people had felt pressured into voting quickly after a consulting firm gave its potential housing recommendations. Might we review all the recommendations and/or new sites thoroughly before any decisions are made?

Our business has been at that location for almost 50 years. We live a mile from it in Redondo Beach in a house our family has owned since it was built in 1955. We’re in this for the long haul. Please consider the impact your decisions will have on the whole Redondo Beach community before voting.

Warmly,
Keith and April Kubachka
2718 Spreckels Lane
Redondo Beach, CA  90278

Sent from my iPhone
Be fair and reasonable. Please disperse the required housing fairly between 90277 and 90278

If we are equitable,
1,245 should go in the 90277 and
1,245 should go in 90278

Thank you,

Karen Alexander
Hello - As a North Redondo Beach resident, I demand that housing be zoned equitably throughout the city. Any new zoning projects, including the required zone for 2,490 dwelling units over the next 8 years should be allocated equally between the 90277 and 90278 zip codes.

North Redondo is already very crowded. We have narrow streets packed with cars, houses close together (with most being 2 or 3 on a lot) and full schools. If we are forced to add 2,000 homes, where will all the kids go to school? The elementary/middle schools will be over crowded. South Redondo should share this additional housing burden equally. Thank you for your consideration.

Concerned resident,

Andy Hottovy
1906 Farrell Ave. Unit B
90278
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At this time zip code 90277 needs to pickup their share for additional housing....90278 has already allocated for half of the requirements. 90277 needs to open up more to make it a fair & equitable solution to the state mandate.

Sent from my iPhone
Traffic in the beach cities is already a problem. 34,000 residential time 3 people in each residents equals 100,000 new people and consequently cars. No thank you
To Whom Is concerned:

I've lived in Redondo Beach for over 11 years. We are very happy here, but would like to express our concern and frustration with the proposed housing project.

I would like new housing split evenly between 90278 and 90277.

Respectfully,

Vera Jimenez Herlihy
Dear Redondo City Council,

Currently, the only additional zoning being proposed is in the 90278:
1,000 dwelling units in the industrial/commercial zone of District 5. East of Redondo Avenue, North of MB Blvd, 87 acres.

600 MORE at the Galleria, 50 acres. District 4. Which means the Galleria area will have a total of 900 units.

Half should go to 90277 and half should go to 90278,

If we are equitable,
1,245 should go in the 90277 and
1,245 should go in 90278:

Residential Recycling means a lot that is zoned for 2 or more units but only has 1 house in it. Residential Recycling already zoned in Redondo Beach but not yet realized is 788 units:
504 in 90278
204 in 90277

ADUs (Accessory Dwelling Units or Granny Flats):
240 is the assumption we are allowed.

What does equitable look like?:
In 90278:
504 Residential Recycling
+ 120 ADUs
+ 300 at the Galleria North (already entitled)
= 920
Therefore if we add
325 to Galleria South (The Galleria was originally zoned for 650 but was scaled down.)
= 1,245

In 90277:
204 Residential Recycling
So 1,041 Should go in 90277
= 1,245

We can determine other 90277 locations for the 1,041 to go but the biggest land available is the Power Plant area with 50 acres. Further, in order to be affordable according to RHNA rules it must be zoned at 30 dwelling units/acre. The geography will allow some height, there can still be space for a park, commercial and office.
THIS IS RIDICULOUS to only have this housing zoned in 90278. it should 100% be divided EQUALLY among both 90277 and 90278.
i'm a proud homeowner in North Redondo and strongly feel this decision you are making is selfish and unfair.

Yvonne Wagoner
North Redondo Beach is already doing it's share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site.
Please register me for the zoning meeting being held in April.
Thank you
Margarita Hussain
I wanted to comment on the plan presented on April 7th. The additional housing element should at least be distributed equally between North and South Redondo. Therefore, you should consider adding additional housing at the AES site and removing it from the Tech or Galleria District. In addition, North Redondo is already overburdened with housing since most of its lots are split for R2, R3, or R1A.

Mark Narain D4 Redondo Resident
It is time to stop treating 90278 as the unwanted stepchild of Redondo Beach. The city gladly accepts our property taxes into their coffers, but disproportionately dispenses that money. The city seems to rubber stamp zoning variances in 90278, but not so much in 90277. I could go on and on, but in the 40 years I have lived in the beach area, our quality of living has deteriorated significantly. Over-crowding in our neighborhoods has made parking impossible. If we choose to have a guest or guests visit, we have to start looking for places to park our cars on the street two days in advance to find a spot so our guests can park in our driveway. Eight people with eight cars now reside in the two “mini-mansions” that have been built on one side of us on a single lot, where once lived a single neighbor. This scenario has been repeated up and down the streets of 90278 with no end in sight. I have no doubt that when we sell our 1600 sq. ft. house it will be bulldozed and replaced by two “mini mansions”, thus contributing to further quality of life deterioration for our neighbors. This is certainly not happening in 90277 to this extent, further evidence of our stepchild reputation.

North Redondo Beach is already doing its share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site.

Perhaps our next step should be to cede from the city and form our own city with its own tax base. Neither section of the city wants to accommodate more housing, but the inequity of disproportionate assignment will not be taken lightly. That is a promise.

Sincerely,

Beverly Conover
Resident of 90278
From: Martha Edmundson
To: Planredondo
Subject: zone housing
Date: Thursday, April 8, 2021 9:30:09 AM
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90278 should not be the only zone housing for Redondo. 90277 should get zoned for 1/2 this housing. We are one city. Our leaders need to look out for North Redondo as well as South Redondo!
North Redondo Beach is already doing its share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site. And other creative spots can be utilized.

Thank you, Laura Frederick

Sent from my iPhone
I attended the zoom meeting last night. Thank you all for including the community and inviting our comments.

I’m a homeowner in District 5 near the Galleria. I’ve owned my house here for 15 years and love the Redondo neighborhood and my neighbors. I’m very concerned about adding more housing to our already over crowded area. I know this proposed additional housing is mandated by the state. So, I want to make sure it’s distributed equally through the north and south of Redondo.

Please make sure 90278 and 90277 receives an equal amount of new additional housing units.

Thank you

Warm Regards,
Patricia Lott
North Redondo Beach is already doing its share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site.

I have questions and concerns regarding this new zoning mandate.

I am in a somewhat unique position, I am an early/mid career engineer in a specialized field that owns a home and works in your district. Part of the area that will potentially be rezoned into housing is in the same area where I work. The facility I am talking about is 2410 Santa Fe Ave, which is a specialized facility that is being *leased* by Northrop Grumman. If this housing rezone happens, I am worried there is a possibility this building will no longer exist. Northrop has invested a substantial amount of recently into upgrading and expanding this facility and I worry that this is really my lifeline - NG would likely either stop pursuing this kind of business altogether or relocate the business unit to a more affordable location (not in CA).

Is this worry substantiated? What is the likelihood that if this area was rezoned that it would be developed into housing? There are many NG buildings in the area being rezoned and I am concerned about potential impact there as well.

Thanks,
Carly
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It has been brought up to my attention that the city is not being equitable regarding the house zoning requirements. South Redondo, Zip code 90277 needs to zone at least half of the 2,490 housing required. It hasn't been equitable thus far and it should be.

Thank you for your attention to this matter,

Maria
ATTN: Email is from an external source; Stop, Look, and Think before opening attachments or links.

--

Or more people, and finally traffic! We don’t need any more of those 3 things.

It is not our responsibility to find housing for everyone and hopefully this is not a way for the city to generate more money! We have had enough!

Don't do it!

Le Valley Pattison
To Whom It May Concern:

As a resident of the 90278 and one of the neighborhoods that will be affected by increased housing in MY neighborhood, I am strongly advising my city to take another look at this issue. We have a hard time getting in and out of our tract as it is (directly across the street from the business park on Manhattan Beach Blvd. ). That whole quadrant from Manhattan Beach Blvd to Marine and Inglewood Ave on the East is an unholy terror of traffic now! We are currently sharing the traffic load with our neighboring cities, how can we carry the load of more residences? We do not want our area turned into the zoning debacle that is Central Redondo - no offense to my beautiful neighbors there. This is a load that needs to be shared equitably by ALL residents. Between the South Bay Galleria site and a site in the 90277, we should be able to manage things. With 50 acres of available land, the 90277 area should be able to share the load with us.

Kindest Regards,
Susan Rams-Stoltz
2616 159th Street
Redondo Beach, CA. 90278
North Redondo Beach is already doing its share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site.

Angela Bernier
Commission/Council Members,

I live in North Redondo Beach in District 5 and am tired of seeing the disparity between treatment of the North and South. North Redondo (District 5 in particular) has taken the brunt of new and proposed new housing, while South Redondo continues to escape with the bare minimum.

The upcoming RHNA requirement numbers AT MINIMUM (unless hopefully successfully fought), need to be split between North and South-- not pawned off on North Redondo as has been the case all too often. Accepting even half of the RHNA would already be a concession on the part of North Redondo in not insisting that South take the majority or all to equalize the imbalance in past housing additions. South Redondo needs to do their fair share by planning for at least 1,245 (half) of the absurd number of units required. (CA's bad math and statistical analysis aside.) The Power Plant area is the best location-- why is this not a prominent agenda item??

The 1,000 units being pushed in the current Industrial area between Inglewood/Redondo Ave. and Manhattan Beach Blvd./Marine Ave would create unmitigated traffic on a major artery that isn't built to sustain it (including 405 access), noise pollution, parking issues, and removal of many current businesses. The Power Plant area, if used for at least part of the required zoning would do none of the same.

We don't want to turn Redondo into another Santa Monica, and forcing all housing into one small area is doing just that in North Redondo.

Hoping for your honest consideration,
Valerie Fernandes
The additional housing planned for Redondo Beach is unfairly allocated so that north Redondo Beach will be required to add the vast majority of new units.

There should be an allocation change to add housing to the AES power plant area, as well as other areas in south Redondo. The 300 units already approved as part of the Galleria will already increase traffic and infrastructure use. The addition of hundreds of additional units will make it unbearably crowded. Please also consider the services such as schools that will be negatively impacted. South Redondo Beach should share the burden of the state requirements and require more housing than is currently in the GPAC draft plan.

Thank you for your consideration.

Lisa Soncotski
As a resident of Redondo for 30 plus years you can imagine I’ve seen some changes. What you are proposing now to add more housing in an already impacted area is not right. These should be split between The areas in the city. In my area there has already been the R2 zoning and the addition of the homeless shelter palette houses, the proposed skatepark along with low income housing at the galleria, none of which helps our home values. If some of South Redondo was changed to R2 zoning you could double the amount of houses just like has been done on my street now. Maybe then you might understand some of my frustration with finding parking if I had someone over or on the off chance I would ever want to park in front of my house. It’s impossible! If what I am reading is right there are proposed multi family housing on a lot? I’m tired of hearing that there is no place to do this in South Redondo. If you represent Redondo then you should consider all of our issues.
For the record, I’m opposed to any additional changes that allow more units per lot!
Thank you,
Shyanne Guth

Sent from my iPhone
Hello,

> I am a resident of 90278 District 3 and find the current recommendations to zone a disappropriate amount of housing in North Redondo to be offensive. I am requesting that the city zone equitably and zone for 1,245 in 90277 as well as 90278.

> The power plant site is 50 acres and is perfectly suited to take on 600 units alone in 90277.

> I also believe we as a city should zone our District 5 industrial area as a park/industrial space since we have grown so much.

> North Redondo should not have to take on all the new housing and everything else South Redondo does not want.

> Peter Chong
> Huntington Ln, 90278
North Redondo Beach is already doing its share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site.
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Our 90278 could not possibly accommodate all these units!!

North Redondo Beach is already doing it's share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site.

Susan Cooper
A helping hand South Bay

Sent from my iPhone
I understand that this is a State mandate and we have few to zero options on this. It is also natural to look at Redondo Beach as divided into North and South due to its geography with 190th Street and separate zip codes. North Redondo has added more housing in the past few years and has added the pallet housing as well. What are the parameters for dividing the housing between North & South Redondo for this and when does the other half step up to their civic responsibility?

Frederick Hahn
District 5
North Redondo is already very dense. We have narrow streets packed with cars, houses close together (most 2 on a lot) and full schools. If we are forced to add over 2,000 homes, where will all of the kids go to school? The elementary schools will be over crowded. Why is South Redondo not participating and sharing this housing burden? We all pay taxes for the same city services and South Redondo has more amenities but North Redondo is more dense with homes.

North Redondo Beach is already doing it's share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site.

Regards,
Laura Hottovy
Low income housing and transit, throughout the city, limited high income density, more equity between north and south, more integration of types of neighborhoods near each other.

Please maximize low income, affordable, and senior housing, throughout the city, and require any new high density developments to have more than a token low income and middle income units. Minimize high income and luxury housing and make developers pay for transit and community enhancements which should be invested throughout the city. Prioritize investments in North Redondo and minimize continued density. Emphasize collaboration between north and south Redondo. Maximize bike lanes and transit opportunities throughout the city. AES property should include restored wetlands, coastal use and limited housing/office/hotel.

Thank you,
Jane Affonso
1919 Belmont Lane
To Whom It May Concern,

I am a homeowner in North Redondo, and I am sick and tired of the north getting dumped on. Between the homeless pallet housing and now having to house more people, I have had it.

North Redondo Beach is already doing it's share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site. Let’s hold South Redondo accountable for their responsibilities to the city.

Thank you,

Mariam P. Butler DPT
Sent from my iPhone
Dear Committee Members,

North Redondo Beach is already doing its share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site.

Thank you,

Dan Sy
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North Redondo Beach is already doing its share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site.

The planning commission and city government has historically punished Districts 4 and 5. We will not stand for a decision by the commission to place all of the housing in our districts. There will be citizen action if the plan is not equitable.

Thank you,
James Melton
Redondo Beach
District 5