



Minutes Regular Meeting  
Planning Commission  
February 19, 2026

**CITY OF REDONDO BEACH  
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES  
Thursday, February 19, 2026**

**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, Conroy, Gaddis, Hazeltine, Light, Young, Chair Craig

Officials Present: Mark Wiener, Community Development Director  
Sean Scully, Planning Manager  
John Ciampa, Planner  
Jamaal Brown, Planning Analyst

**C. SALUTE TO THE FLAG**

Commissioner Conroy 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, 7-0-0.

**E. BLUE FOLDER ITEMS – ADDITIONAL BACK UP MATERIALS**

**E.1. RECEIVE AND FILE BLUE FOLDER ITEMS**

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

The motion carried, 7-0-0.

**F. CONSENT CALENDAR**

**F.1. APPROVE THE AFFIDAVIT OF POSTING FOR THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF FEBRUARY 19, 2026.**

**F.2. This item was pulled from the Consent Calendar for separate discussion by Commissioner Conroy.**

Commissioner Conroy pulled Item No. F.2 for separate discussion.

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

The motion carried, 7-0-0.

**G. EXCLUDED CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS**

**F.2. APPROVE MINUTES FOR THE PLANNING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING ON FEBRUARY 3, 2025 AND THE REGULAR MEETING OF JUNE 19, 2025, JULY 17, 2025, AND NOVEMBER 20, 2025.**

Brief discussion followed regarding a correction to the minutes of November 20, 2025 and the reason past meetings are just now being presented.

Motion by Commissioner Conroy, seconded by Commissioner Gaddis and approved by voice vote, Item No. F.2, correcting the minutes of November 20, 2025.

The motion carried 7-0-0.

**H. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS**

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

Chair Craig invited public comments.

Sheila Lamb, District 4, spoke about the City being under pressure to increase density; mentioned the importance of open space to quality of life; talked about best practices in other cities and protection of public lands; voiced in support of responsible growth and urged the City to strengthen implementation with the use of legitimate planning tools that can be written into the General Plan and offered to share information about those tools.

Steve Hague agreed with Sheila Lamb in terms of the importance of parks and open spaces; suggested creating an atmosphere that the City stands for; talked about a potential safety issue with art along Artesia Boulevard and questioned the LGBTQ+ sculpture project.

Jesse Lee Willard, IRS Investigation, spoke about current investigations with the Homeland Security Task Force involving child kidnapping, drug trafficking and child poisoning that occurred in Tustin; shared that he was kidnapped from St. James Church when he was five months old; listed his experience working with the government and mentioned he is trying to obtain employment by LAPD, but hiring was obstructed by HR. He asked for consideration as a detective within the City's jurisdiction.

There were no other public comments.

## **I. EX PARTE COMMUNICATION**

Commissioner Young reported speaking with members of the public regarding J.1 and J.2.

Commissioner Gaddis reported speaking with members of the public, Chair Craig and Councilmembers Obagi and Behrendt.

Commissioner Conroy spoke with Councilmembers Obagi and Behrendt.

Commissioner Hazeltine spoke with Councilmember Obagi and Chair Craig.

Chair Craig spoke with Commissioners Gaddis and Hazeltine, Councilmember Obagi and Mayor Light.

## **J. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**J.1. A public hearing to consider an Ordinance amending Title 10 Chapter 2 Zoning and Land Use of the Redondo Beach Municipal Code pertaining to amendments to the C-2 and C-2-PD zones located on properties within the Artesia and Aviation Corridors Area Plan (AACAP).**

### **RECOMMENDATION**

- 1. Open the public hearing and take testimony, receive and file all documents and correspondence on the proposed project;**
- 2. Accept all testimony from staff, and public and deliberate;**
- 3. Close the public hearing;**
- 4. Adopt the attached Resolution recommending that the City Council adopt the CEQA Exemption Declaration, and amend Title 10 Chapter 2 Zoning and Land Use of the Redondo Beach Municipal Code pertaining amendments to the C-2 and C-2-PD zones on properties within the Artesia and Aviation Corridors Area Plan:**

**A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF REDONDO BEACH, CALIFORNIA, RECOMMENDING THAT THE CITY COUNCIL AMEND TITLE 10 CHAPTER 2 ZONING AND LAND USE OF THE REDONDO BEACH MUNICIPAL CODE PERTAINING TO AMENDMENTS TO**

## **THE C-2 AND C-2-PD ZONES LOCATED ON PROPERTIES WITHIN THE ARTESIA AND AVIATION CORRIDORS AREA PLAN.**

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

The motion carried 7-0-0.

Community Development Director Wiener introduced Contract Planner John Ciampa who will join City staff in a few weeks and deferred to him for a presentation.

Planner Ciampa, Contractor, narrated a PowerPoint presentation with details of the Ordinance amending Title 10 Chapter 2 Zoning and Land Use of the Redondo Beach Municipal Code pertaining to amendments to the C-2 and C-2-PD zones located on properties within the Artesia and Aviation Corridors Area Plan.

Community Development Director Wiener talked about ceiling heights, the schedule, and the possibility of a need to schedule additional meetings.

Discussion followed regarding Measure DD, having the public vote on the issue, applicability of upper floor setbacks and rear setbacks and boundaries, allowance for elevators to exceed the height limit required, impacts on property values, evaluating and approving heights on a case-by-case basis versus by-right, defining criteria and options for the Planning Commission to consider.

Community Development Director Wiener responded to questions from Chair Craig regarding the ground floor height requirement of twelve feet, whether that height maximum works for Aviation, upper floors, the differences in the characters of the Artesia and Aviation corridors, ensuring flexibility in design and incentivizing redevelopment.

Commissioner Conroy spoke about focusing on ensuring that the amendments align with the adopted AACAP vision without unintentionally increasing development intensity or eroding compatibility with the adjacent residential neighborhoods. He further stated that if the changes modernize standards and support corridor activation in a controlled way that is consistent with the AACAP's revitalization goals, if they materially expand intensity or introduce higher impact uses, the City needs to clearly understand the cumulative implications.

Community Development Director Wiener reported that the EIR addresses the environmental cumulative effects of the 1.5 FAR ratio; talked about the height limits and the Article 27 Traffic Analysis and noted those documents will discuss the impacts of the amendment. Staff is working on creating photo simulations that would show what some of the buildings might look like.

Discussion followed relying on the prior program EIR, avoiding creating new environmental impacts, elements incorporated into the document, addressing the

cumulative impacts for the entire corridor, the build-out methodology and review of future projects by the Planning Commission. Additionally, discussion continued regarding removing the required open space (10% of FAR) on the property versus public open space to achieve a higher FAR.

Commissioner Hazeltine questioned the need to triple the FAR in the area; mentioned concerns regarding eliminating 10% of open space impacting bike racks, walkability and sitting and asked about comparable projects in other cities. In addition, she requested that the FAR be listed for all Sketcher buildings; expressed concerns that the City is creating a tunnel and expressed disappointment.

Community Development Director Wiener spoke about walkability being a subjective term; mentioned it is dependent on the building height and that what makes an area walkable is the width of the sidewalks including the amenities, furniture on the sidewalks and courtyards and talked about the City of Santa Cruz Main Street area.

Discussion followed regarding Avenue I in Riviera Village as an example, setbacks, and reviewing each project, independently.

Community Development Director Wiener reported that the standards will help with the decision-making process and help support it and felt requirements could be codified in terms of step setbacks and being more specific regarding breaks and wall planes and noted there are other ideas in order to get the desired design.

Commissioner Hazeltine commented on communicating to City Council the concerns of the Commission.

Planning Manager Scully reported that the Commission's comments will be incorporated into recommendations and could mirror the City's mixed use zoning standard and reported the elevator shaft could be set back an additional amount.

In response to questions from Commissioner Light, Community Development Director Wiener discussed results of a survey the City conducted of property owners along Artesia and Aviation; spoke about property owners considering redevelopment if regulations were relaxed; reported the City is working with real estate professionals who support incentivizing redevelopment on Artesia and Aviation and reported City Council's intent to be bold with trying to promote investment in these properties.

Commissioner Light indicated he likes the three levels of setbacks rather than "boxes".

Commissioner Boswell talked about the options of a cooler building or a larger building; mentioned the twelve foot ground floor because other cities have done it or because it is expected to attract more retail; noted that retail is dying and impacts on the Galleria; questioned the need for a ground floor of twelve feet in height; wondered if the additional height on the top floor could be allowed only if there is a certain type of economic or business activity on the top floor (i.e. rooftop dining). He felt the Commission is being fed

information that has been shoehorned to meet the agenda and did not find it in the interest of the residents of Redondo Beach. He suggested determining what the Planning Commission can do to make recommendations to make Artesia and Aviation the kind of places where residents of Redondo and surrounding areas will want to go.

Discussion followed regarding other reasons for which to require a height of twelve feet on the first floor, putting emphasis on the commercial ground use, heating and cooling unused spaces and opportunities to create cool buildings.

Commissioner Young commented favorably on the 70% open windows in the front; preferred additional setbacks on the back sides of buildings facing residential uses and feared development may get out of hand before the City knows what is happening.

Motion by Commissioner Young, seconded by Commissioner Hazeltine and approved by voice vote, to invite public comments.

The motion carried 7-0-0.

Theresa Mitchell, District 4, noted her experience as a Planner; felt the City has a good framework and listed her concerns including that the Artesia corridor and Aviation corridor have different profiles; identified special planning areas and felt it would be prudent to address them separately because it seems the focus is on Artesia but is being applied to Aviation and suggested looking at them differently. She referenced an email she sent to the City that did not get included in Blue Folder Items and read from it; noted to have the full FAR, 45 feet is not needed and recommended looking into restricting encroachments into the setback.

Motion by Commissioner Gaddis, seconded by Commissioner Hazeltine and approved by voice vote, to extend Theresa Mitchell's time for commenting.

The motion carried 7-0-0.

Theresa Mitchell, District 4, expressed concerns with the elimination of the public open space; noted that North Redondo Beach is park-poor and mentioned existing large lots where open space may be kept.

In response to Commissioner Hazeltine's question, Theresa Mitchell explained the bulking analysis she submitted in her email and stated with a FAR of 1.5, you could not get above two stories. She stated that when you have additional height, the ground floor commercial ends up being used for other uses such as parking and talked about prioritizing the ground floor commercial.

Steve Hague felt that some places in South Redondo are cool and some in North Redondo are not; questioned development of the plan within ten years; expressed concerns with noise, parking issues and changes in the plan; talked about the importance of quality of life and opined that some of the concepts presented degrade Artesia.

Motion by Commissioner Gaddis, seconded by Commissioner Hazeltine and approved by voice vote, to extend Steve Hague's time for commenting.

The motion carried 7-0-0.

Steve Hague complained about lack of parking, big dogs and opposed high dining on Artesia; felt the City cannot take care of what it currently has.

Sheila Lamb, District 4, spoke about the proposal being discussed along Artesia Boulevard; stated that this may look like a technical zoning adjustment, but it is actually a structural decision about the future form of the entire corridor; noted this is not one project and felt this a decision about what Artesia Boulevard becomes for the next generation. She mentioned that process matters; talked about changes in the FAR and high corridor changing the physical DNA of the City; felt that residents deserve a chance to weigh in on that future before it happens, that this is the kind of decision that calls for corridor visioning process, a public charrette or design workshop where people can see visual options, two stories versus three stories, step backs, shadows, sidewalk scale, and what this actually feels like at a street level. She further talked about cumulative impacts mattering and noted that individually, each policy change may sound reasonable, but together they stack, increase FAR, increase the height to 45 feet, and other allowances function as a de facto four-story entitlement along a major corridor. She suggested asking for a cumulative build out model to show what Artesia Boulevard will look like if all of the entitlements are fully used.

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

The motion carried 7-0-0.

Sheila Lamb spoke about how consistency matters; stated the City owes the community a coherent, predictable street form; noted the importance of developing corridor standards; felt that if the City increases intensity, it should also adopt corridor-wide design standards and speak of them as an entire, cohesive whole and asked that before moving forward that the City pause for a public corridor visioning process so residents can help shape the future of this place, require a commutative build-out analysis so residents can see what these policies do together, not separately, and pair any increase in intensity with clear corridor design standards so Artesia evolves coherently and predictably, not dependent on what is in the budget for that year. Additionally, she claimed this is not about stopping growth but rather guiding growth with intention.

There were no other public comments on this item.

Community Development Director Wiener responded to comments expressed by Theresa Mitchell; displayed an exhibited submitted by her; reported the exhibit shows there being a 5 foot and 20 foot rear setback and assumes that basically the first level is

almost the same size as the second and includes the 5 foot side step required. He added that the City anticipates that with these projects, there is no City-imposed parking requirement, but will likely see projects develop with parking. He added that parking is required in the back, and it is anticipated to have a drive aisle leading to parking in the rear. He explained that the City is not assuming that on most of these sites they will not be providing any parking at least for new developments; noted that the exhibit does not account for if the applicants opt to provide a courtyard or another type of outdoor space on the property and asserted that for that reason, staff is recommending three stories to provide the applicant and developer with more flexibility and so they could have a smaller building footprint and go more vertically than horizontally. Additionally, he addressed the first-level garages and reported there is a requirement in the standards that state that the storefronts need to be designed as the frontage of the building facing the street, need to be designed as a storefront, should be at grade level, meaning that you cannot have the storefront up above a first level parking garage and offered to look at making that more mandatory and a little less optional because it should be in there.

Community Development Director Wiener spoke about the root of this being the 1.5 FAR, which was a direction given by City Council; reported that when the City's Land Use Element was being reviewed several years ago, it got incorporated into the draft document. The City is working with that baseline, and these development standards are looking to express that 1.5 FAR. He commented on nuances and options and ways to ensure a high-quality design.

Discussion followed regarding setback requirements in the proposed zoning, the parking corridor and the likelihood of the applicant providing on-site parking and providing parking within the 20 foot buffer.

Commissioner Conroy pointed out that residences could likely have cars coming and going right on the other side of their property line and Community Development Director Wiener responded affirmatively. In reply to Chair Craig's question regarding the 5 foot setbacks, Community Development Director Wiener explained that aside from the private setback, it would apply on corner sites and that the City anticipates the land is going to be devoted to other things than just building.

Commissioner Hazeltine voiced support for not eliminating the 10% open space requirement; felt it is important to maintain the open space which makes the neighborhood friendly and engaged; talked about using vegetation in the rear to screen residential uses in the rear; suggested being specific in terms of screening methods and commented on ensuring the project is not just a three-floor rectangle.

Community Development Director Wiener talked about giving staff guidance to return to the Commission with language that captures and refines the requirements for screening and other recommendations and including treating Artesia and Aviation, differently, noting that the maximum height is not automatic, setbacks on each floor and vegetative screening.

Commissioner Hazeltine reiterated her concern about the corridor looking like a “tunnel” and spoke about the need for Council to have a vision for Artesia and having the Planning Department guide developers.

Commissioner Conroy agreed; talked about needing to study the cumulative effects such as multiple parcels building to the extent possible and commented on needing to see examples of what the development will look like when it is fully built out.;

Commissioner Boswell mentioned the possibility of a ground-floor setback of 10 feet, creating a wider sidewalk with big windows that are partially covered and spoke about opportunities to make an interesting ground floor; expressed concerns regarding creating tunnels along Aviation and felt it can be avoided by being more creative on the ground floor. He felt that there are great opportunities that are not included in the presentation.

Commissioner Light was intrigued by the statement that many uses are preferred but they were not identified and wondered if there is anything that can be done to make it a tiered system in terms of exceptions regarding the number of stories for highly preferred uses.

Community Development Director Wiener suggested it could work but the only concern is that the use of the building could change and noted additional challenges. He added that it would be important to put some restrictions when tying the design of the building to the use.

Commissioner Gaddis spoke about the possibility of communicating to Council that this is a wonderful opportunity, that the goal is to attract development money to build nicer businesses and more walkable friendly businesses, but that the piecemealing of the FAR and height limits could result in many unintended consequences. He suggested specifying a no more than a three story limit and the possibility of recommending that Council hold a public visioning workshop to obtain community feedback and noted that importance of gaining community input and buy-in. He acknowledged that changes would occur and standards must be put in place, now.

Community Development Director Wiener agreed it would be a good recommendation; stated he wants to explore whether there is more time for this matter to address whether particular zoning standards need to go to a vote. He announced he needs to work on the November election but that based on the Commission’s comments tonight, currently the matter is in a rough stage; agreed that some community engagement would serve the City well and offered to develop photo simulations and refine the vision for the future of the corridor.

Chair Craig mentioned the City of Santa Barbara and Whittier’s Main Street as examples for the Artesia corridor and spoke about the need for the Article 27 vote.

Community Development Director Wiener stated that this is more of setting the building envelope and the setbacks; that the driver of Article 27 is the FAR limit and commented on bifurcating them but noted the need to conduct research.

Commissioner Gaddis responded to Commissioner Hazeltine's question regarding setting parameters relative to the 45 foot height and 1.5 FAR and to attract investment and acknowledged the need to set a vision.

Commissioner Hazeltine opined that this item seems rushed; mentioned the 45 foot height and 1.5 FAR are new.

Community Development Director Wiener listed recommendations discussed by the Planning Commission including treating Artesia and Aviation differently, allowing three stories but possibly limiting Aviation Boulevard to two, reducing the FAR on Aviation, taking a closer look at height limits and tying standards to preferred uses, looking at the setbacks of each floor, finding a way to articulate providing variation of wall plane to help break up the mass of the building as desired, looking at doing a 10 foot front setback to help expand the right-of-way and that would be more pedestrian-oriented, producing photo simulations that would be tied to the recommendations and holding more public engagement for a visioning process for the corridor. He added that the City could potentially have something in the Land Use Element that sets the FAR limits and stated that it could note that the 1.5 FAR goes into effect upon the adoption of this zoning ordinance. He agreed that staff is moving quickly and suggested splitting the items to move forward expeditiously.

Community Development Director Wiener referenced one of the public comments; talked about state housing laws and AB 2011 which are concerning but noted that state housing laws may change and talked about the importance of creating standards that support local control to the extent possible.

Discussion followed scheduling a workshop design charrette with the public.

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

The motion carried 7-0-0.

Motion by Commissioner Gaddis, seconded by Commissioner Hazeltine, and approved by roll call vote, to request that staff communicate to City Council, the Commission's recommendations regarding treating Artesia and Aviation differently, allowing three stories but possibly limiting Aviation Boulevard to two, reducing the FAR on Aviation, taking a closer look at height limits and tying standards to preferred uses, looking at the setbacks of each floor, finding a way to articulate providing variation of wall plane to help break up the mass of the building as desired, looking at doing a 10 foot front setback to help expand the right-of-way and that would be more pedestrian-oriented, producing photo simulations that would be tied to the recommendations and holding more public engagement for a visioning process for the corridor.

The motion carried 7-0-0 as follows:

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

**J.2. A public hearing to consider an Ordinance amending Title 10 Chapter 2 Zoning and Land Use of the Redondo Beach Municipal Code pertaining to amendments to establish regulations permitting rooftop dining within the Artesia and Aviation Corridors Area Plan (AACAP).**

**RECOMMENDATION**

- 1. Open the public hearing and take testimony, receive and file all documents and correspondence on the proposed project;**
- 2. Accept all testimony from staff and public and deliberate;**
- 3. Close the public hearing;**
- 4. Adopt the attached Resolution:**

**A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF REDONDO BEACH, CALIFORNIA, RECOMMENDING THAT THE CITY COUNCIL AMEND TITLE 10 CHAPTER 2 ZONING AND LAND USE OF THE REDONDO BEACH MUNICIPAL CODE PERTAINING TO ESTABLISH REGULATIONS PERMITTING ROOFTOP DINING LOCATED ON PROPERTIES WITHIN THE ARTESIA AND AVIATION CORRIDORS AREA PLAN**

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

The motion carried 7-0-0.

Community Development Director Wiener introduced the item; noted it ties into the larger effort of revitalization and deferred to staff for a presentation.

Planner Ciampa, Contractor, narrated a PowerPoint presentation with details of the Administrative Report.

Commissioner Hazeltine noted there are residential uses next to commercial uses and felt that screening rooftop dining from nearby residential uses to protect privacy must be addressed.

Commissioner Light pointed out that this needs to be voted on in terms of the FAR and Community Development Director Wiener agreed, as an increase in the FAR would impact traffic and commercial areas.

Planner Ciampa addressed setbacks, sitting areas, separations for privacy and sound mitigation, screening and roof top dining decks.

Discussion followed regarding whether they should be considered as part of the 1.5 FAR, making the FAR part of the maximum height of the building, a requirement for a noise mitigation plan and continuous noise monitoring, the Legado development, maintenance considerations and enforcement of requirements, placing the responsibility of operators to monitor noise, other rooftop activities and landscaping.

Commissioner Conroy expressed concerns with setting up for an AUP to be handled by staff; opined that a CUP should be required to ensure that site-specific evaluations of noise, lighting and residential compatibility take place and wondered why it was set up as an AUP.

Community Development Director Wiener reported that Council recommended the AUP, but the Commission can recommend that a CUP be warranted and distinguished between the two.

Commissioner Conroy recommended that wherever roof-top dining is permitted, that the total height, including the elevator structure be under the total maximum building height and the addition of compliance language allowing review of modifications of approvals if recurrent nuisance issues occur.

Discussion followed regarding outdoor dining at ground level versus outdoor rooftop dining and examples of other outdoor dining uses in the City that abut residential uses.

Motion by Commissioner Gaddis, seconded by Commissioner Hazeltine and approved by voice vote, to invite public comments.

The motion carried 7-0-0.

Theresa Mitchell, District 4, expressed concerns with the cumulative effect of the previous zoning amendment and this one; felt it is appropriate to include FAR calculations on the height limit that absorbs the cumulative effect; suggested being explicit with the hours of operation and amplified sound in relation to roof-top dining; addressed visual screening for privacy as well as for mechanical equipment; loved the green roof idea and opined this should be considered as a CUP instead of an AUP because it has a huge public impact.

Steve Hague announced that the hookah lounge was gone; complained about falling pine cones, existing decrepit businesses and wind; spoke against rooftop dining on Artesia and urged the Commission not to give away quality of life.

There were no other public comments.

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

The motion carried 7-0-0.

Community Development Director Wiener recommended receiving the Commission's comments, having staff update the ordinance and returning to the Commission for another review and summarized the Commission's discussions.

Discussion followed regarding placemaking and making the Artesia corridor a destination, having the rooftop deck within the FAR, including "shall" relative to visual screening, developing standards for the hours of operation, putting the onus on the operator to monitor noise and making it a CUP instead of an AUP. Additionally, discussion continued regarding increasing setbacks in the back from rooftop dining to nearby residential uses, doing a line-of-site analysis and allowing (i.e., movies) or prohibiting (i.e., storage) other uses on the rooftop deck and tabling this item or amending it now.

Motion by Commissioner Young, seconded by Commissioner Hazeltine and approved by roll call vote, to continue this item to a future meeting, so that staff can return with updates as discussed by the Planning Commission and approve it.

The motion carried 7-0-0, as follows:

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

**K. ITEMS CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS AGENDAS - None**

**L. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION PRIOR TO ACTION - None**

**M. ITEMS FROM STAFF**

**M.1. ITEMS FROM STAFF - RECEIVE AND FILE**

**RE: Commission Rule Updates - Effective November 15, 2025**

Discussion followed regarding Commission rules for all Commissions and the roles and responsibilities of the Planning Commission

Motion by Commissioner Gaddis, seconded by Chair Craig and approved by voice vote, to receive and file Commission Rule Updates effective November 15, 2025.

The motion carried 7-0-0.

**N. COMMISSION MEMBER ITEMS AND FUTURE COMMISSION AGENDA TOPICS**

Commissioner Conroy asked that staff provide the Commission with .pdf versions of the PowerPoint slides to be presented during meetings, prior to them and asked about public speaking times.

Commissioner Hazeltine shared an email from a resident regarding driveways and aprons and ensuring homeowners restore sidewalks.

**O. ADJOURNMENT – 9:49 p.m.**

Motion by Commissioner Gaddis, seconded by Commissioner Hazeltine, and approved by voice vote, to adjourn the meeting at 9:49 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 March 19, 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