

Planning Commission on 2024-07-18 6:30 PM - CITY COUNCIL CHAMBER

Meeting Time: 07-18-24 18:30


eComments Report

Meetings	Meeting Time	Agenda Items	Comments	Support	Oppose	Neutral
Planning Commission on 2024-07-18 6:30 PM - CITY COUNCIL CHAMBER	07-18-24 18:30	24	4	0	4	0

Sentiments for All Meetings

The following graphs display sentiments for comments that have location data. Only locations of users who have commented will be shown.

Overall Sentiment



Planning Commission on 2024-07-18 6:30 PM - CITY COUNCIL CHAMBER

07-18-24 18:30


Agenda Name	Comments	Support	Oppose	Neutral
J.2. PC24-1208 PUBLIC HEARING TO INTRODUCE UPDATES TO THE CITY'S GENERAL PLAN LAND USE, OPEN SPACE & CONSERVATION, NOISE, AND SAFETY ELEMENTS	4	0	4	0

- RECOMMENDATION:
1. Open the public hearing, administer oath, take testimony from staff, the public and other interested parties, and deliberate; and
 2. Continue the public hearing to August 15, 2024.

Sentiments for All Agenda Items

The following graphs display sentiments for comments that have location data. Only locations of users who have commented will be shown.

Overall Sentiment




Agenda Item: eComments for J.2. PC24-1208 PUBLIC HEARING TO INTRODUCE UPDATES TO THE CITY'S GENERAL PLAN LAND USE, OPEN SPACE & CONSERVATION, NOISE, AND SAFETY ELEMENTS

RECOMMENDATION:

1. Open the public hearing, administer oath, take testimony from staff, the public and other interested parties, and deliberate; and
2. Continue the public hearing to August 15, 2024.

Overall Sentiment

Support (0%) Oppose (100%) Neutral (0%)
No Response (0%)



Executive Director StopBCHD.com

Location:

Submitted At: 1:00pm 07-18-24

On behalf of StopBCHD.com, I provide the following comment into the Council and GPAC records:

0.75 FAR is appropriate for Public Land Use. We agree with the initial City finding that for most Public land uses, a maximum 0.75 FAR (proportion of the development sqft to the overall lot sqft) is appropriate. 0.75 FAR is greater than the surrounding explicit or imputed FARs on most public land, especially single family residential.

1.25 FAR is appropriate for limited City-owned Public Land. We also agree with the initial City finding that two City-owned sites that can provide services nearly exclusively for City residents and taxpayers should be allowed a 1.25 FAR. Because this is a Redondo Beach General Plan, the appropriate consideration for Public land use should be the benefit to Redondo Beach residents and taxpayers.

Prior to the State's requirement of objective planning standards, Public sites were limited only by Planning Commission vote. State requirements for objective standards require upfront, measurable standards.

BCHD is a District public agency in name only. The proposed use for the BCHD Public land is to develop for a supermajority of non-resident use with the Healthy Living Campus.

--allcove is a regional, 91% non-resident service area operation that BCHD is required to operate and fund for 30 years by BCHD contract with the State with an estimated District taxpayer liability of \$175M across the 30 years.

--Assisted Living will be a 100% privately owned PMB LLC facility for 80% non-resident tenants of 90254, 90266, 90277 and 90278 per BCHD's MDS consultant report.

--PACE (medical adult daycare) will be 95% non-resident enrollees, as the National PACE Association data shows

that only 1 in 1000 seniors uses PACE, and that implies only 17 District residents. BCHD's investment banker is planning a facility for 400 enrollees.

BCHD will bring 5% to 20% District benefits and 80% to 95% Redondo Beach damages with its development. I urge you to limit BCHD's FAR to the earlier proposed 0.75 FAR to protect Redondo Beach residents from excessive, non-resident, commercial development by BCHD on public land.

Daniel Elder

Location:

Submitted At: 3:28pm 07-17-24

There are currently multiple RBUSD owned properties which are incorrectly designated as Open Space (OS) instead of Public/Institutional (PI) including Lincoln Elementary, Alta Vista Elementary, and the former Franklin School site. The land use designation must be corrected to reflect their current use and intended purpose.

The new addition of a maximum FAR to the General Plan for PI and OS make it even more critical to correctly identify land use in the zoning map. The inconsistent and inequitable FAR for PI zoned properties should also be corrected to be at least 1.25 to avoid punitive and arbitrary limits on non-City owned PI properties.

Dennis Heck

Location:

Submitted At: 2:57pm 07-17-24

As a resident, senior citizen, Center for Health & Fitness member and a 10-year BCHD volunteer & supporter, I strongly urge the City Council to consider approving the allowable Floor Area Ratio (F.A.R) of 1.25 for ALL Redondo Beach public facilities. (Disallowing the exemption).

Since there is an attempt by unknown persons for unknown reasons to specifically exempt BCHD from the public 1.25 FAR, there needs to be public disclosure of who initiated this exemption and the "reasoning", or lack thereof, behind this attempt. Transparency seems to be lacking. Full disclosure needs to be shared with our community and the Council before moving forward with the Council's decision. Keep in mind that your decision will effect not just Redondo Beach residents, but all Beach City residents who are current and/or prospective members and clients of the over 40 different BCHD programs currently being offered.

Hopefully our City Council will ensure consistent rules apply to all public areas, by eliminating the BCHD F.A.R exemption.

And as a reminder, there are likely many more residents, BCHD supporters, employees, clients and members that will vote favoring BCHD.

Respectfully submitted.

Marie Puterbaugh

Location:

Submitted At: 12:51pm 07-14-24

I strongly oppose limiting the FAR for BCHD to below 1.25. This is clearly targeting a beloved organization that provides so much to so many.