



Minutes Regular Meeting
Planning Commission
December 18, 2025

**CITY OF REDONDO BEACH
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
Thursday, December 18, 2025**

REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION – 6:30 PM

A. CALL TO ORDER

A regular meeting of the Planning Commission, held in the Redondo Beach Council Chambers at 415 Diamond Street, Redondo Beach, California was called to order by Chair Craig.

B. ROLL CALL

Commissioners Present: Boswell, Gaddis, Hazeltine, Light, Young, Chair Craig

Commissioners Absent: Conroy

Officials Present: Mark Wiener, Community Development Director
Diana Veret, City Attorney, via Zoom
Cheryl Park, Assistant City Attorney
Sean Scully, Planning Manager
Steven Giang, Senior Planner
Jamaal Brown, Planning Analyst

C. SALUTE TO THE FLAG

Chair Craig led in the Salute to the Flag.

D. APPROVE ORDER OF AGENDA

Motion by Commissioner Gaddis, seconded by Commissioner Hazeltine, and approved by voice vote, the order of the agenda, as presented.

The motion carried 6-0. Commissioner Conroy was absent.

E. BLUE FOLDER ITEMS – ADDITIONAL BACK UP MATERIALS

E.1. RECEIVE AND FILE BLUE FOLDER ITEMS

Motion by Commissioner Gaddis, seconded by Commissioner Hazeltine, and approved by voice vote, to receive and file Blue Folder Items.

The motion carried 6-0. Commissioner Conroy was absent.

F. CONSENT CALENDAR

F.1. APPROVE THE AFFIDAVIT OF POSTING FOR THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF DECEMBER 18, 2025.

F.2. This Item was pulled from the Consent Calendar by Commissioner Gaddis, for separate discussion.

F.3. This Item was pulled from the Consent Calendar by Commissioner Gaddis, for separate discussion.

There were no public comments on the Consent Calendar.

Commissioner Gaddis pulled Items No. F.2 and F.3 for separate discussion.

Motion by Commissioner Gaddis, seconded by Commissioner Hazeltine, and approved by voice vote, the Consent Calendar, as amended, pulling Items No. F.2 and F.3 for separate discussion.

The motion carried 6-0. Commissioner Conroy was absent.

G. EXCLUDED CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS

F.2. ORDINANCE NO. 3298-25 AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF REDONDO BEACH, CALIFORNIA, AMENDING TITLE 2, CHAPTER 9, ARTICLE 1, SECTIONS 2-9.100, 2-9.101, 2-9.102, 2-9.103, 2-9.106, 2-9.107 AND 2-9.109 AND ADDING SECTIONS 2-9.110 AND 2-9.111 AND DELETING IN ITS ENTIRETY SECTION 2-9.108 PERTAINING TO UNIFORM REGULATIONS OF COMMISSIONS

F.3. ORDINANCE NO. 3301-25 AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF REDONDO BEACH, CALIFORNIA, AMENDING TITLE 2, CHAPTER 9, ARTICLE 10, SECTIONS 2-9.1002 AND 2-9.1003 PERTAINING TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION

Commissioner Gaddis requested an explanation of Items No. F.2 and F.3.

Planning Manager Scully explained these were ordinances recently enacted by City Council and were included in the agenda for the Planning Commission's information. He added there were some changes from prior rules, but they are not itemized and stated there were no significant changes.

Assistant City Attorney Park reported they are amendments to the Municipal Code regarding certain Commissions that Council considered. The Rules of Conduct of meetings has not been acted upon but will be considered next year.

Community Development Director Wiener added that no action is required other than receive and file.

Commissioner Boswell referenced a section ordinance relative to “not review, evaluate, investigate or otherwise comment upon matters that are solely within the duties and functions of other commissions or committees”; mentioned the Commission is barred from commenting and therefore, it is a violation of freedom of speech and stressed the need for legal vetting.

Community Development Director Wiener reiterated the items are for informational purposes only; noted he will not debate their merits and pointed out that the Commission is appointed at the pleasure of the City Council, and these are the rules that they have established.

Commissioner Boswell felt the ordinance could be worded differently to indicate that as Commissioners, members cannot comment but that as a member of the public, they may.

Assistant City Attorney Park confirmed that the City Attorney’s office reviewed the ordinances that are currently before the Commission. She added that Commissioner Boswell is welcome to state his issues now and at a Council meeting.

Commissioner Gaddis requested placing the item back on the January agenda in order to get an itemization of the changes made to the ordinances.

Community Development Director Wiener agreed that it would be helpful to go through the rules and have the Commission review the changes made.

Motion by Commissioner Gaddis, seconded by Commissioner Hazeltine, and approved by voice vote, to pull Items No. F.2 and F.3 from the agenda.

The motion carried 6-0. Commissioner Conroy was absent.

H. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

H.1. RECEIVE AND FILE PUBLIC WRITTEN COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

Chair Craig invited public comments.

Holly Osborne, District 5, referenced an item on a recent City Council agenda regarding the growing the City’s tree canopy and AB 2251; hoped the Commission will examine future projects with that in mind and urged the Planning Commission to consider the tree canopy, parking and anti-hedge funds.

David Farney, District 5, via Zoom, referenced AB 1893 and SB 330 and the City's loss of a lawsuit striking down the Redondo Beach Housing Element sixth cycle and opening up Builder's Remedy to help the City meet its RHNA requirements; expressed concerns about the additional housing that will be allowed and how soon the Planning Department will begin to receive submissions for up to 10 units on a family lot (R1) and asked that the City consider developing a summary for residents to understand and provide feedback.

There were no other public comments.

I. EX PARTE COMMUNICATION

Commissioner Young reported speaking to members of the public regarding Item No. J.1.

Commissioner Gaddis reported speaking with Chair Craig, members of staff and members of the public.

Commissioner Hazeltine reported speaking with Chair Craig, members of staff, members of the public, Councilmember Obagi and Mayor Light.

Chair Craig reported speaking with Commissioners Gaddis and Hazeltine, Mayor Light, Councilmember Obagi and staff.

J. PUBLIC HEARINGS

J.1. Public hearing for consideration of an Exemption Declaration and Coastal Development Permit to permit the construction of a Mixed-Use Residential Condominium Project with 49 Units, 5 of which are affordable to very low income and 3 of which are affordable to moderate-income households, 4 stories and 45 feet in height, with 17,000 square feet of commercial uses on the ground floor, and 2 floors of subterranean parking with up to 105 parking spaces, located on five parcels (7508012013, 7508012012, 7508012011, 7508012010, 7508012009) within a Commercial zone (C-2) 401-417 S. Pacific Coast Highway.

**PROPERTY OWNER: Redondo Seaside Living, LLC
APPLICANT: Redondo Seaside Living, LLC
LOCATION: 401 - 417 S. Pacific Coast Highway
CASE NO: 2025-0074**

RECOMMENDATION:

- 1. Open the public hearing and take testimony;**
- 2. Close the public hearing;**
- 3. Adopt the attached resolution by title only, waiving further reading.**

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF REDONDO BEACH ADOPTING A CEQA EXEMPTION DECLARATION, APPROVING REQUESTS UNDER STATE DENSITY BONUS LAW, AND APPROVING THE REQUEST FOR A COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT PURSUANT TO GOVERNMENT CODE § 65912.124(e) BASED UPON A DETERMINATION THAT THE PROJECT -- CONSTRUCTION OF A MIXED-USE RESIDENTIAL CONDOMINIUM PROJECT WITH 49 UNITS, 5 OF WHICH ARE AFFORDABLE TO VERY LOW INCOME & 3 OF WHICH ARE AFFORDABLE TO MODERATE-INCOME HOUSEHOLDS, 4 STORIES AND 45 FEET IN HEIGHT, WITH 17,000 SQUARE FEET OF COMMERCIAL USES ON THE GROUND FLOOR, AND 2 FLOORS OF SUBTERRANEAN PARKING WITH UP TO 105 PARKING SPACES, LOCATED ON FIVE PARCELS (7508012013, 7508012012, 7508012011, 7508012010, 7508012009) WITHIN A COMMERCIAL ZONE (C-2) AT 401-417 S. PACIFIC COAST HIGHWAY (CASE NO. 2025-0074) IS "CONSISTENT WITH ALL OBJECTIVE STANDARDS" IN THE CERTIFIED LCP WITH THE APPLICATION OF ALLOWABLE CONCESSIONS AND WAIVERS PERMITTED BY DENSITY BONUS LAW

Motion by Commissioner Gaddis, seconded by Commissioner Hazeltine, and approved by voice vote, to open the public hearing.

The motion carried 6-0. Commissioner Conroy was absent.

Community Development Director Wiener introduced the item and deferred to City staff for a report.

Planning Manager Scully and Senior Planner Giang narrated a PowerPoint presentation with details of the proposed project and reviewed the Planning Commission's purview, CDP findings, CEQA exemptions and staff recommendations.

Community Development Director Wiener added that the presentation highlights the complexity involved in reviewing these applications and legal vetting.

Chair Craig invited the applicant to address the Commission and administered the oath.

Elisa Pastor, Attorney, Rand, Pastor, Nelson, representing the applicant, spoke about the property owners; discussed the proposed design; noted the project is replacing a blighted property and addressed benefits for the City as well as concerns about parking. She responded to questions from the Commission regarding the allocations for low-income and moderate-income units, the mix of one- and two-bedroom units, rent schedules, compliance with housing laws and working with the City's Housing Department to identify tenants and to ensure they income qualify, the possibility of prioritizing Redondo Beach City employees or residents, parking calculations, formulas for-rent and for-sale rate calculations, covenants and options.

Discussion followed regarding determining whether the units will be for rent or for sale, and whether the City has approved that option to developers in the past.

Planning Manager Scully noted that moderate-income units have to be for sale; reported the City is processing a condominium map and there will be separate units by condominium subdivision, and the City does not require those to be sold, except for the moderate-income units.

Elisa Pastor, Attorney, did not believe there is a requirement that moderate-income units must be for sale.

Assistant City Attorney Park agreed and noted that the way staff evaluated this project is that all the units will be for sale.

Commissioner Young shared her experience living in an affordable housing project; explained there is a deed restriction on the property for 30 years and it must remain the owner's primary residence.

Elisa Pastor, Attorney, reported that under state density bonus law, they have to do a 55-year deed restriction; explained the application is for a condominium map and the intention is to sell the units and noted that with any condominium map, an owner can always decide not to sell them.

Community Development Director Wiener talked about limitations and reported the applicant is required to enter into an agreement with the City dictating the sale or rental of the affordable units.

Commissioner Hazeltine spoke about differences between apartments and condominiums and the way the project is being presented.

City Attorney Veret, via Zoom, confirmed this will be a for-sale project; addressed AB 2011 and understood that the applicant is seeking to provide deeper affordability through the for-sale provision for lower income units. The applicant is offering 15% of the base units for very low income in the for-sale context, in order to maximize the benefits from density bonus law, get to tier 2 provide 3 moderate units and get the extreme density that allows them to build the number of units they are proposing in this project. She added that it only works in the for-sale context of AB 2011, that the required affordability for rental projects would be different and that the applicant must understand this must be a for sale project to be approved as an AB 2011 project.

Elisa Pastor, Attorney, confirmed with her client that this will be a condominium project.

In further responding to questions from the Commission, Assistant City Attorney Park recalled that the units cannot be transferred to anyone else unless they meet the affordability standards and cannot be rented. Additionally, she reported the need to get

approval from the City prior to selling the units, that there is a lot of control over how the units are transferred and managed and addressed enforcement.

Community Development Director Wiener interjected that enforcement is handled by the City's Housing Division in the Community Services Department.

Commissioner Hazeltine spoke about the condition of the property; discussed access to the pier and beach; expressed concerns with the lack of parking in the area and explained the Commission's role relative to the Coastal Development Permit (CDP) and guaranteeing coastal access. She talked about the Commission's need to review objective findings; questioned whether there were any parking surveys were done; asked regarding calculations for parking and commented on the possibility of setting a precedent for all other properties in the Local Coastal Zone. Commissioner Hazeltine stressed the need for additional information including a parking survey in order to make objective findings and findings of consistency with all subjective Local Coastal Plan standards and announced she cannot make a decision without the missing information.

Elisa Pastor, Attorney, spoke about this being a specific law and a specific situation; discussed "gives and takes" under AB 2011 such as prevailing wage and the need for a specific number of affordable units; reported that the State has declared that if those things are met, the applicant only needs to comply with objective standards but also says the applicant is consistent with the objective standards through an incentive or concession which may deviate those standards. She added that a parking survey was not required and stressed that this is a different and specific project and it is how state law allowed them to be permitted.

Commissioner Hazeltine pointed out that she cannot approve a permit, based on subjective standards and felt she is being asked to approve something that the Coastal Commission would oppose.

Elisa Pastor defined what it means to comply with objective standards and reiterated that a parking survey was not required for the Commission to approve the project.

Community Development Director Wiener confirmed that one of their three concessions is a waiver of the parking study.

Commissioner Hazeltine disagreed noting she looked for one but was unable to find it.

Community Development Director Wiener explained compliance with zoning standards would be considered complying with objective standards and in this case, parking is being set by density bonus law. He added that concessions or waivers through density bonus law shall not constitute a basis to find the project inconsistent with the City's Local Coastal Program.

Planning Manager Scully addressed AB 2243 relative to the requirements within the Coastal Zone and specific state density bonus law requests.

Motion by Commissioner Young, seconded by Commissioner Gaddis, and approved by voice vote, to invite public comment.

The motion carried 6-0. Commissioner Conroy was absent.

Chair Craig invited public comments.

Mary Hall mentioned that her neighborhood is an Historic District and would be negatively impacted by development and would destroy the historic look and feel of the neighborhood; believed the development interferes with the protections of ownership including the quiet enjoyment of their property; expressed concerns regarding the lack of parking and blocking ocean views; wondered whether there was an EIR prepared for the project and about potential negative impacts to wildlife in Redondo Beach and opined there seems to be a bait and switch in terms of whether the units will be apartments or condominiums.

Sheila Lamb addressed parking as it relates to coastal access; felt that the report does not analyze how the reduction in commercial parking affects coastal access; noted that a parking survey is missing and requested that the applicant provide objective information addressing weekend and peak period parking demand and potential street overflow; opined the City is obligated to provide those findings, according to the LCP.

Motion by Chair Craig, seconded by Commissioner Gaddis, and approved by voice vote, to extend the Sheila Lamb's time for commenting.

The motion carried 6-0. Commissioner Conroy was absent.

Sheila Lamb addressed the need for consistency with objective Local Coastal Program standards including providing coastal access and believed the analysis missing from the record.

Anaka Blair expressed concerns about the confusion as to whether the units are for sale or for rent; challenged the finding that there are no safety issues; noted the lack of a parking study and the introduction of valet on a fire lane and asserted that the project creates a specific adverse impact on public health and safety; listed issues with the proposal in terms of a valet system, location of the queue, the use of golf carts and a threat to vulnerable children and urged the Commission to deny the application.

Eric Herald, voiced opposition to the project; talked about protecting the City; mentioned problems with public safety in term of changing the setbacks and talked about the lack of parking in the area.

Simon Finebaum, M.D., expressed concerns about the negative impacts of building the four-story mixed-use development as proposed; noted significant safety and quality of life issues; reported the proposed location is one of the most congested corridors in the City;

talked about the lack of on-site parking and unsafe turning in the area; mentioned the height and massing of the structure is out of scale with the surrounding; worried about blocking coastal views; suggested reducing the height and adjusting parking and felt today is not the day to move ahead with the project.

Aaron Bumitra, Rolling Hills, spoke in support of the project and of the property owner; shared his experience developing a location on the southwest corner of Hawthorne and Lomita and urged the Commission to give the developer an opportunity in the City.

Dr. Andy Lesser mentioned the noticing was not a legal posting of notice as it was printed on two pages but stapled and the second page was not posted; opined the project is harming the residents of Redondo Beach; talked about the City having discretion but not using any of it; noted concerns with the driveway on Pearl; agreed this is a public safety issue and spoke about the lack of parking.

Motion by Commissioner Hazeltine, seconded by Commissioner Gaddis, and approved by voice vote, to extend the Dr. Andy Lesser's time for commenting.

The motion carried 6-0. Commissioner Conroy was absent.

Dr. Andy Lesser expressed concerns about losing coastal views and diminishing property values and urged the Commission to deny the project.

Karen Ford Cole spoke in opposition to the project; worried about losing her view and noted the area is a historic area that is losing its character.

Arianne O'Brien expressed concerns that the proposed development driveway access will compromise emergency vehicle access; opined that allowing the project is dangerous and negligible and will result in declining property values in the area; worried about protecting public and private views and believed the developer should provide more parking and address the building height.

Brian Lane opposed the proposed development and asked that the Commission consider residents and find and address the impacts that will make a real objection.

Alex Fineman spoke in favor of the project; talked about the need for affordable housing in the area and urged the Commission to approve the project and start supporting building housing that would be appropriate for young, working Redondo Beach residents.

Bill Davis, via Zoom, spoke in opposition to the project; expressed concerns about the proposed heights; talked about the lack of parking and good ideas to address it and mentioned the uncertainty of whether this will be a for sale or for rent development.

David Farnigan, District 5, via Zoom, support providing more coastal access by providing more housing to the coast and pointed out there are 12 spaces proposed for valet queuing.

Brianna Egan, via Zoom, expressed support for the project and appreciation for the due diligence of the Planning Commission and talked about the benefits of building more projects like this in the City. Additionally, she pointed out the development is near several bus lines and other public transportation options and felt that parking is appropriate and that the commercial spaces will add value to the neighborhood and referenced a letter from South Bay Forward.

Mark Finnegan, via Zoom, listed concerns related to public health, safety and environmental issues related to the proposed project; talked about traffic congestion in the area; felt the size and scale do not match the aesthetics of the neighborhood and that the design is not thoughtful, relative to the entrance on Pearl and suggested the need to redesign the project.

Motion by Commissioner Hazeltine, seconded by Commissioner Gaddis, and approved by voice vote, to extend the Mark Finnegan's time for commenting.

The motion carried 6-0. Commissioner Conroy was absent.

Mark Finnegan, via Zoom, added that there is not enough space to place the entrance driveway on Pearl and urged the Commission to consider the entrance to the proposed development.

Judith Lawnsdale, via Zoom, agreed this project would have a negative impact on public safety, traffic and access to the nearby Fire Station and felt the size and massing is not in keeping with the character of the neighborhood.

Motion by Commissioner Young, seconded by Chair Craig, and approved by voice vote, to extend the Judith Lawnsdale's time for commenting.

The motion carried 6-0. Commissioner Conroy was absent.

Judith Lawnsdale, via Zoom, expressed concerns with a drain on City resources.

Christopher Truman, via Zoom, spoke in favor of the project; urged the City to think about ways to make the specific intersection, safer and asked the Commission to make this a safe and enjoyable spot for businesses and residents.

Holly Osborne, District 5, worried about the developer not knowing whether the units will be for sale or for rent and stated she has lost all respect for the developer.

Planning Analyst Brown announced receiving 12 emails in opposition to and 13 emails in support of the proposed project.

There were no other public comments on this item.

Commissioner Hazeltine spoke about how parking is a problem in that the Coastal Commission requires coastal access; mentioned the need for objective findings and the historical component in terms of the garages not being big enough to park large cars. She stressed the need for a parking survey and felt she could not make a decision without having objective information.

Chair Craig referenced the report relative to calculating and rounding up of the density bonus units and Planning Manager Scully noted rounding up is within the provisions of the state density bonus law.

Chair Craig reviewed base units and total units and felt it appears the developer does not have the required number of low income units to qualify for some of the concessions.

City Attorney Veret, via Zoom, explained the base units are defined the same as total units in state density bonus law and noted that the term “total units” for purposes of state density bonus law refers to the maximum allowable density before adding the density they are allowed through the density bonuses they get. She added that affordability percentage is calculated on the maximum density before the additional density is added and addressed AB 2011 as amended by AB 2243.

Commissioner Light talked about adverse safety being the exception and the absence of evidence in terms of a missing parking study; felt that potential public safety risks could exist when considering access on Pearl and the proximity of the Fire Station and schools; addressed the lack of parking in the area; stated he would like to see a valet parking plan and spoke in support of continuing the item until those issues can be dealt with.

Chair Craig reiterated his concerns regarding base units and total units and the fact that the proposal does not offer enough low income units to qualify for certain concessions.

City Attorney Veret via Zoom, noted the import is the definition of the term “total units”; read it into the record and explained that it refers to the number of units that would be in the project before adding any units from density bonuses that could be granted.

Commissioner Boswell felt this is a project that the state says the City can do nothing to stop; talked about blatant disregard for the community’s issues with parking, golf carts, proximity to a Fire Station and a school and opined this is a money-making project from a predatory developer without consideration of the surrounding community.

Discussion followed staff support of the access to Pearl, impacts on parking, the width of the proposed driveway and a proforma of what the different units will sell for.

Elisa Pastor, Attorney, spoke about the valet plan and addressed the valet queueing area; discussed the findings needed to deny the project and noted that none of the concerns discussed rise to the level of a specific adverse impact under the law.

Commissioner Hazeltine noted that most comments involved public safety relative to the proximity of the Fire Station and the school to the proposed driveway on Pearl.

City Attorney Veret, via Zoom, discussed the findings needed to deny the project; felt there is a level of health and safety impacts that need to be quantifiable and objective.

Community Development Director Wiener listed examples of specific adverse impact that may be considered in denying a project.

Commissioner Light talked about a deficit of 24 parking spaces for commercial properties and how it could impact access to a Fire Station; stated he was unsure that would not be an adverse safety standard has heard nothing that would mediate that.

Assistant City Attorney Park suggested closing the public hearing and deliberating and directed the Commission's attention to Page 10 of the staff report for options available to the Planning Commission at this time.

Commissioner Boswell noted that in the face of a clearly unsafe project, there is nothing the City can do because there is nothing in writing that defines it and brings it up as an adverse safety issue and suggested it should be codified in order for the City to deny the project and tell the developer to fix those issues before approving it. Additionally, he agreed with Commissioner Hazeltine regarding the need for a parking/traffic study and suggested continuing the item to another meeting so that these matters can be resolved.

Elisa Pastor, Attorney, reported this project is vested to the laws, policies and ordinances that were in place at the time they filed their SB 330 (preliminary application), so any safety standards that would be applied in the future would not apply to this project and asserted this is a CEQA exempt project so there is no requirement for a traffic or parking study. She addressed the tasks of the Planning Commission at this time; noted this is a ministerial process and felt it is beyond the jurisdiction of the Commission to make a decision based on those bases.

Commissioner Boswell reported that the standard is not written, because the City did not feel it rose to the level of having to do so, but noted that once the development is built, there will be adverse safety impacts. He reiterated his suggestion noting that even though it is not required, the developer should proceed with a traffic study to "make the City happy".

Commissioner Gaddis mentioned hearing a lot of disapproval of the project; talked about the project being on a timeline and the missing traffic/parking study; pointed out that the Commission does not have the data necessary to approve it; noted the location is a dangerous area where many accidents have occurred and that the City is not charged with quantifying it and stated he would not approve the project because he knows it has health and safety impacts. He added that there is no luxury to continuing this matter.

Assistant City Attorney Park reiterated her suggestion to the Commission to close the public hearing and deliberate and noted possible actions for the Commission to take at this time.

Discussion followed regarding the beginning of the timeline and the lack of objective information needed to make a good decision.

Elisa Pastor, Attorney, claimed that the state requires the City to make a determination without 60 days of consistency. She added that the Commission can opine that the project does not qualify with the objective standards, but the state law says they can modify the standards, and it is deemed consistent with those standards under density bonus law. Additionally, she stated that AB 2011 supersedes that portion of the Coastal Act in that the project will be deemed consistent with the LCA if the density bonus incentive or waiver is granted.

Assistant City Attorney Park pointed out that the concessions, incentives and waivers can be denied if the Commission finds that there are specific adverse impacts based on identifiable objective standards, and another ground would be based on state or federal law. She added that consistency with the Coastal Act would be a ground to deny the concession or incentive based on the lack of information regarding the specific adverse impact.

Commissioner Light believed that having a restriction on Emergency Responders getting out of a Fire Station would be a specific adverse impact and Assistant City Attorney Park agreed that it would be another basis for denying the project.

Motion by Commissioner Gaddis, seconded by Commissioner Hazeltine, and approved by voice vote, to close the public hearing.

The motion carried 6-0. Commissioner Conroy was absent.

Commissioner Hazeltine commented on the Commission's responsibility to the LCP and felt it is unfortunate that the Commission does not have the information needed to approve the project.

Commissioner Gaddis reiterated the Commission does not need to quantify or know the specific laws, but it makes sense that you cannot impede Emergency Responders by having increased congestion at a key point to access the major thoroughfare.

Commissioner Young commented on ingress and egress challenges with the proposed driveway on Pearl and noted the location of the driveway is not consistent with safety in any manner.

Motion by Commissioner Gaddis, seconded by Commissioner Hazeltine, to direct the City Attorney to draft a resolution to deny the project, based on the LCP expressly requiring evidence of complying with state law and the lack of a parking/traffic survey, information

about safety and impacts to emergency vehicles and nearby school, created by egress and ingress challenges on the proposed driveway on Pearl.

Discussion followed regarding addressing valet parking, the use of golf carts and safety issues related to school and emergency vehicle traffic.

Motion by Commissioner Gaddis, seconded by Commissioner Hazeltine, and approved by voice vote, to recess for 15 minutes at 9:52 p.m.

The motion carried 6-0. Commissioner Conroy was absent.

Motion by Commissioner Gaddis, seconded by Commissioner Hazeltine, and approved by voice vote, to reconvene the meeting at 10:37 p.m.

The motion carried 6-0. Commissioner Conroy was absent.

Members of the Planning Commission reviewed the resolution and Assistant City Attorney Park noted the findings are in Sections 3 and 4 and pointed out revisions to the recitals and details of how the resolution addresses the Commission's concerns.

Commissioner Hazeltine suggested adding that consistency with the Coastal Act was not demonstrated and including the coast, harbor and pier.

Discussion followed regarding the City's action being exempt from CEQA under Section C.7 and suggested edits to the resolution.

Motion by Commissioner Gaddis, seconded by Commissioner Hazeltine, and approved by roll call vote, to approve a resolution of the Planning Commission for the City of Redondo Beach denying a request for concession under state density bonus law related to reduced commercial parking and therefore, denying the request for coastal development permit pursuant to Government Code Section 65912.124.e for a mixed-use residential condominium project with 49 units, five of which would be affordable to very low income, and three of which would be affordable to moderate income households, 4 stories and 45 feet in height with 17,000 square feet of commercial uses on the ground floor and two floors of subterranean parking, with 105 parking spaces located on five parcels (7508012013, 7508012012, 7508012011, 7508012010, 7508012009), within a commercial zone C2 at 401 through 417 S Pacific Coast Highway, Case #2025-0074.

The motion carried, 6-0 by roll call vote, as follows:

AYES: Boswell, Gaddis, Hazeltine, Light, Young, Chair Craig
NOES: None
ABSENT: Conroy

K. ITEMS CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS AGENDAS - None

L. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION PRIOR TO ACTION - None

M. ITEMS FROM STAFF

Community Development Director Wiener reported that City Council will be reviewing the Land Use Element of the General Plan focusing on Historic Preservation on January 6, 2026, and the recommendations of the Planning Commission will be forwarded to Council.

N. COMMISSION MEMBER ITEMS AND FUTURE COMMISSION AGENDA TOPICS – None

O. ADJOURNMENT – 11:00 p.m.

Motion by Commissioner Gaddis, seconded by Commissioner Hazeltine, and approved by voice vote, to adjourn the meeting at 11:00 p.m.

The motion carried 6-0. Commissioner Conroy was absent.

The next meeting of the Redondo Beach Planning Commission will be a regular meeting to be held at 6:30 p.m. on January 15, 2026, in the Redondo Beach Council Chambers, at 415 Diamond Street, Redondo Beach, California.

All written comments submitted via eComment are included in the record and available for public review on the City website.

Respectfully submitted,

Marc Wiener
Community Development Director