



Minutes Regular Meeting
Planning Commission
August 21, 2025

**CITY OF REDONDO BEACH
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
Thursday, August 21, 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, Conroy, Gaddis, Hazeltine, Light, Young, Chair Craig

Officials Present: Marc Wiener, Community Development Director
Cheryl Park, City Attorney
Sean Scully, Planning Manager
Jamaal Brown, Planning Analyst

C. SALUTE TO THE FLAG

Commissioner Young 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.

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 7-0.

F. CONSENT CALENDAR

F.1. APPROVE THE AFFIDAVIT OF POSTING FOR THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF AUGUST 21, 2025.

There were no public comments on the Consent Calendar.

Motion by Commissioner Gaddis, seconded by Commissioner Hazeltine, and approved by voice vote, the Consent Calendar, as presented.

The motion carried 7-0.

G. EXCLUDE CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS - None

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 a recent City Council meeting and the last Planning Commission meeting regarding a proposed bike path going through Torrance to El Camino College via Redondo Beach Boulevard; noted the biggest obstacle to the bike path is Torrance, as they have concern about losing street parking and commented on a quote by Mayor Light that this is what happens when there is not enough parking in the apartment complex, itself. Additionally, she spoke about Council's consideration of Artesia Boulevard and how a FAR of 1.5 could be accommodated on various side lots and what the parking would look like and expressed concerns that the solution presented was to have no parking requirements, at all. She addressed other possible solutions and urged the Commission to develop a logical plan that includes parking and a reduced FAR.

There were no other public comments.

I. EX PARTE COMMUNICATION

Commissioner Gaddis reported speaking with staff, Mayor Light, Councilmembers Obagi and Behrendt, Chair Craig and the public.

Commissioner Boswell reported speaking with people during the model presentation of Phase 2 at the Galleria.

Commissioner Conroy spoke with Councilmembers Waller and Obagi.

Chery Park provided additional guidance and clarified to the Planning Commission that their ex parte communications were concerning “Phase 2” of the Galleria project and not the original approval of the Galleria project back in 2019.

Commissioner Hazeltine reported speaking with Mayor Light, Councilmember Obagi, the developer of the project to view the “model”, the public and Chair Craig.

Chair Craig reported speaking to Commissioners Gaddis and Hazeltine, Mayor Light, Councilmembers Behrendt and Obagi, members of the public, and attending many meetings that have occurred throughout the history of the Galleria project but only attended the various meetings and didn’t speak at those meetings.

J. PUBLIC HEARINGS

Public hearing for consideration of an Addendum to the Environmental Impact Report for the South Bay Galleria Mixed-Use Project (State Clearinghouse No. 2015101009), an Amendment of the Conditional Use Permit and Planning Commission Design Review approved by the City Council (Resolution No. CC-1901-004) on January 15, 2019, a Subdivision (Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 84931), a One Year Extension of the Vesting Period of Tract Map No. 74481, and “Waivers” of some Development Standards pursuant to State Density Bonus Law to allow the development of Phase 2 of the South Bay Social District (formerly the South Bay Galleria Mixed-Use Project) to construct an 8-story mixed-use building consisting of 15 residential Townhomes (apartments or condominiums) and 335 residential apartments inclusive of 10% very low income affordable units with up to 843 parking spaces within a garage (below and above grade), 8,300 square feet of commercial, and associated amenities on two parcels (Lot 7 and Lot 15 of Tract Map No. 74481) totaling 3.26 acres within the Regional Commercial (CR) zone located at 1815 Hawthorne Boulevard (Kingsdale and 177th Street).

PROPERTY OWNER: KW-F SBG OWNER LLC

APPLICANT: KW-F SBG OWNER LLC c/o Stuart Miller

LOCATION: 1815 Hawthorne Boulevard

CASE NOS: 20250068 (Amendment to CUP; PCDR); VTTM No. 84931; TM No. 74481 (One Year Extension of Vesting); State Density Bonus Law Waivers

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, applicant, and public and deliberate;**
- 3. Close the public hearing;**

4. Adopt the attached Resolution by title only, waiving further reading, adopting an Addendum to an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and granting an Amendment to a Conditional Use Permit and Planning Commission Design Review, and approving Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 84931, a One Year Extension of the Vesting Period for the Recorded Final Vesting Tract Map No. 74481, and Concessions/Waivers of development standards pursuant to State Density Bonus Law to construct “Phase 2” of the South Bay Social District (formerly the South Bay Galleria Mixed-Use Project) on property located within a Regional Commercial (CR) Zone:

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF REDONDO BEACH, CALIFORNIA, ADOPTING AN ADDENDUM TO THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE SOUTH BAY GALLERIA MIXED-USE PROJECT (STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NO. 2015101009) CERTIFIED BY THE CITY OF REDONDO BEACH ON JANUARY 15, 2019, AND GRANTING THE REQUESTS FOR AN AMENDMENT OF THE CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT AND PLANNING COMMISSION DESIGN REVIEW APPROVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL (RESOLUTION NO. CC-1901-004) FOR THE SOUTH BAY GALLERIA MIXED-USE PROJECT ON JANUARY 15, 2019, AND APPROVING VESTING TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 84931, A ONE YEAR EXTENSION OF THE VESTING PERIOD FOR THE RECORDED FINAL VESTING TRACT MAP NO. 74481, AND CONCESSIONS/WAIVERS OF DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS PURSUANT TO GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 65915 (DENSITY BONUS LAW) TO ALLOW THE DEVELOPMENT OF PHASE 2 OF THE SOUTH BAY SOCIAL DISTRICT (FORMERLY THE SOUTH BAY GALLERIA MIXED-USE PROJECT) TO CONSTRUCT AN 8-STORY MIXED-USE BUILDING CONSISTING OF 15 RESIDENTIAL TOWNHOMES (APARTMENTS OR CONDOMINIUMS) AND 335 RESIDENTIAL APARTMENT UNITS, INCLUSIVE OF 10% VERY LOW INCOME AFFORDABLE UNITS, UP TO ONE LEVEL OF UNDERGROUND PARKING AND 3 LEVELS OF ABOVE GRADE PARKING TOTALING UP TO 845 PARKING SPACES (350 PARKING SPACES EXCLUSIVELY FOR RESIDENCES AND UP TO 495 PARKING SPACES (REPLACEMENT PARKING) FOR COMMERCIAL USES), 8,300 SQUARE FEET OF GRADE LEVEL COMMERCIAL USES, AND ASSOCIATED AMENITIES ON PROPERTY (3.26 ACRES) LOCATED WITHIN THE REGIONAL COMMERCIAL (CR) ZONE LOCATED AT 1815 HAWTHORNE BOULEVARD

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

The motion carried 7-0.

Chair Craig read the complete title for the public hearing item, clarified some misinformation that had been circulating about the project in the past and provided a brief background and summary of the events and public hearings that were held back in 2019 when the original Galleria project was approved by the Planning Commission, in a single meeting, appealed to City Council and then after multiple meetings before the City Council finally approved. Chair Craig also summarized some reasons for the delays of the project, namely ownership changes, Covid, and financing.

Planning Manager Scully narrated a PowerPoint presentation with details of the project. The presentation covered the following "agenda":

1. Project Summary
 - a. Project Summary
 - b. Required Entitlements
2. Background
 - a. South Bay Galleria Mixed Use Project – Phase 1
 - b. Legal Background – SB 330
 - c. Legal Background – State Density Bonus Law
 - d. City of RB 6th Cycle 2021-2029 Housing Element – Sites Inventory
3. Project Description (Details)
 - a. Architecture
 - b. Landscaping
 - c. Public Open Space
 - d. Outdoor Living Space
4. Required Findings
 - a. CUP; PCDR; VTTM; 1 Year Extension of Vesting; Density Bonus Law Requested Waivers
5. Environmental
6. Recommendation

Planning Manager Scully also introduced the additional experts with the City, City Attorney Park and Consulting Contract Attorney (Housing Law Subject Matter Expert), Diana Varat, and also noted that the applicants entire development team was available and planned to make a presentation.

Discussion followed regarding entrances and access into the project and whether access to the project was directly from Kingsdale Avenue. Planning Manager clarified that the project did not have direct driveway access to Kingsdale other than the existing Grant Avenue extension on the north side of the project and the 177th Street to the south of the project. Planning Manager Scully also discussed the general mitigation of potential traffic impacts and some traffic related details within the origin EIR for the project.

Commissioner Boswell wondered how Phase 2 came to be; noted no mention of a second phase was made in the original project presentation and residents were concerned with the size of the project; addressed the purpose of the appeal relative to eliminating the

housing portion; felt the traffic study was disingenuous and incorrect and opined that Phase 2 seems to be nothing more than “claw back” on the original deal.

Commissioner Hazeltine referenced the City’s Housing Element through which it has committed to having the capacity for housing throughout Redondo Beach and this location was added to have additional housing identified as “Phase 2”.

Commissioner Boswell added that the City committed to allowing for the original housing to be built only; said the developers gave up the option for additional housing on this site when they negotiated on the original deal and talked about other areas in the City where housing can be built and the City’s responsibility to hold developers to their commitments and the promises they made. He mentioned damage to quality of life with the added units from this Phase 2, surrounding F-rated intersections, compounding un-mitigatable traffic issues and asserted this is a bad project for that site.

Commissioner Boswell acknowledged pressures from Sacramento to build housing; referenced the Commission’s role and basing decisions on protecting quality of life; noted the City can at least, deny abuses and demand that housing be spread throughout the City and suggested starting over including a new EIR, a new development plan that does not take advantage of Redondo Beach residents.

Commissioner Hazeltine acknowledged, understands, and agrees with Commissioner Boswell’s sentiments generally, however stated that those issues are related to the Housing Element and not this project.

Commissioner Boswell acknowledged and stated he understands all the pressure upon the City from Sacramento regarding housing, but opined that the Planning Commission should deny the abuses from Sacramento and that in his opinion housing should be spread all over the City and overconcentrated at this location.

Chair Craig redirected the decision to the subject at hand; noted what the developers are proposing is within the laws coming out of Sacramento and the City has already committed to building housing on the site; claimed that if the City reneges it is at risk of Sacramento taking control of the City.

Commissioner Gaddis asked about the limits of the Commissions authorities on this project. In response to Commissioner Gaddis’s inquiry, Planning Manager Scully reported this is a discretionary entitlement but there are significant limits on the purview of conditioning it, additionally, or denying the project.

Commissioner Gaddis requested separating the resolution to parcel out things that are and things that are not mandated by State law and referenced upcoming protests and rapidly changing State law.

Community Development Director Wiener suggested allowing staff to review that during the applicant presentation and addressed areas where the City could apply discretion to the project and limitations in the City's ability to reduce density.

Discussion followed regarding financial feasibility and State's takeover of zoning control.

Community Development Director Wiener mentioned the past history of the project; noted the legal landscape for housing has changed; Stated that if the City is inconsistent with State law there is a risk that the City will be overwritten by the courts and be compelled to entitle the project. He suggested listening to the applicant's presentation and addressing those topics for which the City could use discretion.

Commissioner Gaddis stated wanting to shine a light on the laws being passed in Sacramento to limit planning within the City and how they apply to this project, specifically, wanting the public to know the limitations under which the City must act and talked about the need to change the State Constitution.

Community Development Director Wiener agreed that the State puts cities, Community Development Departments and Planning Commissions in challenging positions and understood the frustration.

Assistant City Attorney Park reported the City's outside counsel on housing is on Zoom but noted she was not tasked to separate issues that are or are not mandated by State law; did not believe she prepared to go through every section of the resolution and tell the Commission how much discretion it has; referenced the presentation and offered to provide clarity on specific items that are questioned. She addressed density bonus, waivers of development standards; explained that the City cannot impede their ability to development the project if there is a residential component and reminded the Commission of its ability to deny the project only when specific findings are made. Additionally, she reported that different findings must be made for each section which will take time for counsel to do.

Commissioner Gaddis reiterated his request to communicate the City's limitations and challenges to the public and mentioned subdividing the parcel and requested from staff whether the Commission had the authority to deny the subdivision.

Community Development Director Wiener explained the general rule of thumb in evaluating findings would be whether it causes an adverse impact to public health and safety.

Commissioner Boswell referenced the original deal and Chair Craig suggested listening to the applicant's presentation at this time.

Chair Craig administered the oath to those planning on speaking about this item.

Stewart Miller, narrated a PowerPoint presentation with details of the project including ownership, the project team, an update on Phase 1, a request by the City to add housing, details of Phase 2, community outreach, connections to Artesia Boulevard, traffic circulation and allowing for additional public activation.

Stewart Miller responded to questions from the Commission regarding who from the City, made the request for additional housing and Commissioner Boswell confirmed that the City made the request and spoke about challenges with financing unless housing was not included. In further response to Commissioner Boswell's question, Stewart Miller affirmed they are committed to delivering what is entitled; spoke about increased interest in the project and increasing the amount of housing mixed with residents living, working and playing and commuting from the site became the right solution.

Commissioner Boswell referenced the Mayor's comments that mixed use has been a mixed blessing as retail vacancies have been a challenge; noted that people buy online; felt that the retail aspect of the project should be smaller; questioned whether a residential component is necessary and spoke about considering what will bring people to a property of that size (i.e. a sporting/entertainment venue); opined the residential option is the most destructive thing to build on that corner and asked about considering other options to make the project feasible and not hurt the community.

In response to questions from Commissioner Gaddis, Stewart Miller discussed parking for both the residential and commercial components of the project and contingency plans.

Commissioner Hazeltine asked whether consideration was ever given to eliminating the mall and questioned whether people will shop there and Stewart Miller reported they have retailers and loyal tenants who have long leases and there are many people who want to establish businesses in that part of Redondo Beach. Commissioner Hazeltine commented on similar malls experiencing increased vacancies; did not believe the project will be successful and shared that she spoke to an expert who suggested building a large park with surrounding amenities focused on attracting the public.

In reply to questions from Commissioner Conroy, Stewart Miller spoke about adaptive reuse of the mall, other considerations given, the concept of an outdoor park/space, externalizing the building, unbundling parking from the unit rent, EV-capable stalls, disbursement of affordable units through the complex and open space for those units, storage, plans for providing additional storage and the possibility of installing a dead-end on Kingsdale and Grant to reduce traffic.

Planning Manager Scully interjected concerning the closing or blocking a public street and stated that the matter should be considered by City Council and studied by the Public Works Director and the City Engineer and wasn't under the Planning Commission's purview as it applied to this project; noted that the Planning Commission could request

that staff look into it with the City Engineer and the Public Works and Sustainability Commission.

In reply to Commissioner Young's questions, Stewart Miller addressed the height of the AMC Theater and the type of units under the affordable component and removal of the option for 20% low income housing.

Commissioner Gaddis continued with questions about the number of proposed and potential parking spaces and Stewart Miller noted there would be no prohibition on residents being able to park in parking areas that are not exclusively assigned to residents; confirmed that Macy's does not own their building; discussed parking commitments to retail tenants and estimated the retail vacancy rate at the Americana at Brand in Glendale.

Commissioner Boswell shared his experience having an office near Brand Boulevard in Glendale and stated the amount of development that has been successful there is something he would like to see in Redondo Beach and hoped the developer can make it happen.

Commissioner Conroy mentioned there is no need for more chicken strip restaurants and nail salons and in response to his question about desired anchor stores, Stewart Miller mentioned categories of businesses currently in negotiations including office use, fitness and wellness operations, unique restaurants and lifestyle activities, apparel and family entertainment.

In further response to Commissioner Gaddis's question, Stewart Miller addressed the purpose and process of subdividing the site; noted the entire site is under a master CUP and there is no prohibition on selling parts of the project and a decision will be finalized when plans are presented to the Planning Department.

Planning Manager Scully confirmed that the Planning Commission is being asked to approve the reconfiguration of the two maps and stated both lots will still be subject to the 2019 resolution and the resolution tonight.

Discussion followed regarding allowing for the sale of some of the lots, impacts to the development and community with the subsequent sale of lots, situations where new owners would need to apply for specific entitlements related to the property.

Community Development Director Wiener spoke about limitations to density bonuses and about the potential to develop more housing on the site, which does not change by subdividing it and about limitations based on lot size.

Discussion followed regarding not being able to configure Parcel 2 without amending the entitlement, making a decision whether the units will be for sale, as condominiums or rent

once plans are submitted. Commissioner Gaddis asked that the developer return before the Commission prior to requesting the re-parcelization of the lot.

Joshua Gottheim, Land Use Attorney for the Applicant, explained there are two lots on the property, on the final, recorded map; noted the potential for selling off part of a lot, still exists and new owners could return with a new entitlement proposal; talked about the reason the lot lines are being moved from east/west to north/south and claimed it is important for the financial feasibility of the project and financing and that having the townhomes sellable, is an important mechanism for paying off part of the development loan and making the project financeable. In terms of the cohesive nature of the project, he referenced Condition No. 44 in the original resolution that requires that the entire 30 acres of the Galleria remain in a cohesive plan having cohesive signage, identity, branding and coordinated architectural styles. He added that the structures will remain townhomes unless someone, in the future, comes in with a new development application.

Commissioner Boswell commented on the possibility of Phase 3 coming in to make them all, townhomes; questioned the use of the word, "intent" in terms of the reality, and talked about the original deal involving keeping the site as one property and stipulating that it cannot be sold off in pieces. He added that the City needs concrete assurances going forward.

Joshua Gottheim explained that Phase 2 came out of a collaborative process where the City asked for increased opportunities for housing as result of changes in State law and viewed this as delivering on the Housing Element decision of the community.

Commissioner Gaddis opined that the public and the Commission would be better informed after hearing the constraints that the City is under.

Motion by Commissioner Gaddis, seconded by Commissioner Young, and approved by voice vote, to receive information regarding State law and specific constraints placed on the City.

The motion carried 7-0.

City Attorney Park introduced and deferred to Outside Legal Counsel Diana Varat.

Outside Legal Counsel Varat, via Zoom, provided an overview of the restrictive housing laws under which the City is operating and are applicable to this project, specifically; noted the Commission's review of this project is limited by different provisions in State law; mentioned parking provisions, AB 2097 and the City's inability to impose any parking requirements on the project; added that with respect to housing related issues, the developer has agreed to reserve 35 units, which is 10% of the total units of the project as affordable for very low income households for the required period and claimed that under Density Bonus Law, the applicant by virtue of the fact of this agreement receives a number

of benefits/advantages and listed them. In terms of waivers, the question is can the City make a specific adverse impact finding on public health or safety? She added that the term is a defined term, which is more stringent than it sounds and essentially requires that an agency finds that there would be a significant quantifiable, direct and unavoidable impacts based on objective identified written public healthcare safety standards that were in place before the project application was deemed complete; affirmed this is not the type of finding the City can make under general welfare, that it has to be based on public health or safety and objective standards in place; listed other reasons for denial and noted the applicant has agreed to construct the 10% very low income units making them eligible for benefits of Density Bonus Law. She spoke about the Housing Accountability Act; reported that if the project complies with all of the objective standards for the project it is the burden of the City to make specific findings for denial; talked about legislative bills having the intent of increasing the production of housing and specifically affordable housing in exchange for the additional production of housing and said those are the parameters under which the Commission is reviewing the proposed project.

She confirmed that the applicant is allowed to request to deviate from development standards in State law unless one of the three listed findings for denial are made. Relative to subdividing the parcels and in thinking about the approval of a housing development project, there are cases that address the entitlements and the subdivision together as part of the project as whole. She noted that if the City were to deny that and it would make the project infeasible, that would put the City in a difficult position.

Outside Legal Counsel Varat stated that's what she believed the Applicant's Attorney is requesting, either doing the tentative track amendment now or return for a lot line adjustment, ministerially.

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

The motion carried 7-0.

Jennifer Dodge reported assisting Mr. Boswell in drafting the appeal in 2019 requesting additional benefits to the City; expressed concern with the proposed additional 350 units; noted that after listening to the information, it does not sound like the 350 units are a requirement for the project to be approved; wondered whether there was a separate EIR for Phase 2; claimed that most of the community is unaware of this proposal; talked about the project being close to public transit and referenced the Metro line extension Hawthorne Boulevard option.

Motion by Commissioner Gaddis, seconded by Chair Craig, and approved by voice vote, to extend Jennifer Dodge's time for public comment.

The motion carried 7-0.

Jennifer Dodge reiterated her concern there was no separate EIR for Phase 2 of the project.

Holly Osborne, District 5, mentioned she does not want to do anything that will put the City's Housing Element in jeopardy; talked about the owners of the Galleria having trouble getting financing; presented her idea that instead of increasing residential, the development decrease commercial use; mentioned Macy's limitations and felt deceived and misled, especially by developers.

Susie Boise, District 4, noted she has seen a lot of change in the area; listed concerns with the impacts of constructing 600 apartments across the street, including traffic and quality of life; talked about starting a petition and groups to raise awareness of the plan; opined that the residential units at the Galleria should have been located on Hawthorne; spoke about traffic and speed and use of Kingsdale as a cut through to avoid Hawthorne; and addressed making Artesia a focal point but reported there is not access to the Galleria from Artesia. Additionally, she agreed with the idea of making Kingsdale a dead end street but indicated that people use Kingsdale to access Target and talked about traffic and safety concerns.

Motion by Commissioner Gaddis, seconded by Chair Craig, and approved by voice vote, to extend Susie Boise's time for public comment.

The motion carried 7-0.

Susie Boise asserted this is her community and expressed appreciation to the Commission and offered her help in finding solutions.

Tom Boise felt that this is an entirely new project; noted he took the time to read all of the information; expressed concerns with accuracy of the information; addressed intersections on the impact survey, impacts to parking and traffic, increased crime and access from Grant Avenue.

Motion by Commissioner Boswell, seconded by Commissioner Hazeltine, and approved by voice vote, to extend Tom Boise's time for public comment.

The motion carried 7-0.

Tom Boise commented on the agreed upon and approved plan; felt that it should not change just because the developers are unable to get financing and felt they are not being completely honest.

Motion by Commissioner Boswell, seconded by Commissioner Light, and approved by voice vote, to extend Tom Boise's time for public comment.

The motion carried 7-0.

Tom Boise urged the Commission to do what is right for the community.

Sofia Basta, via Zoom, NRBBA Board Member, spoke about doing everything the City can, to ensure the project is successful; felt that it will spur new investment along the Artesia Corridor and improve the economic vitality of residents and businesses and expressed concerns with the mall's foreclosure. She urged the Commission to continue supporting local businesses and bring positive change and opportunity to the businesses of the mall.

Planning Analyst Brown reported receiving 6 eComments in support of the project and one neutral.

Discussion followed regarding obtaining proof that if the resolution is not approved it will jeopardize the financial feasibility of the project.

Community Development Director Wiener added that Density Bonus Law specifically addresses financial feasibility, and it prohibits the City requiring a pro forma in analyzing that, so the decision is based on what the applicant provides the City and with accepting their statements. As it pertains to the other aspects of the project like the subdivision, he indicated that it is regulated to some extent by the Housing Accountability Act.

Assistant City Attorney Park stated she does not have any information on the Housing Accountability Act touching on financial issues and basically noted that limits the City's ability to deny, make infeasible or reduce the density of housing.

In terms of the subdivision request, Community Development Director Wiener felt the Commission should also evaluate whether it meets the standards because that would be the findings, not based on the potential for something else being done on the property; stated the typical process would be if somebody applies for a subdivision, there are certain criteria that would need to be met.

Planning Manager Scully confirmed that the findings, as described by the subdivision ordinance have been met pursuant to zoning development standards for the lot.

Joshua Gottheim, Land Use Attorney for the Applicant, interjected that under the Subdivision Map Act, the lot line adjustment is generally, ministerial.

Planning Manager Scully reported that in the City's subdivision ordinance it is discretionary.

Joshua Gottheim added that the subdivision maps also creates the optionality for the

condominiums and affects the financial feasibility.

In response to Commissioner Gaddis's question, Community Development Director Wiener indicated that if the developer wanted to build something else, they would have to return to the Planning Commission or be approved by the City, administratively.

Discussion followed regarding having no guarantee that townhomes will be built, the size of the parcel in question and the related maximum density per the underlying code, limits to the housing code and the importance of the certified Housing Element in preventing builders remedy.

Community Development Director Wiener recommended approving the subdivision request.

Discussion followed regarding the need to make the required adverse impact findings in order to deny the project.

Commissioner Light explained the burden is on the City to prove that there are adverse impacts for the Commission to deny the project.

Commissioner Hazeltine suggested edits to Conditions 15 and 16 of the resolution, specifying a minimum of 30% mature tree canopy, Condition 17 specifying that affordable units are to be spaced throughout the site and ensuring outdoor spaces are proportional to the number of units with private open space at market rate and spoke about landscaping being California native but making sure it does not end up being desert scape.

Planning Manager Scully reported their plant palette does not include cacti.

Commissioner Hazeltine mentioned drainage and capturing storm water under Condition 25 and Planning Manager Scully reported there would be on-site stormwater retention for whatever rainfall hits the site, up to a 25-year storm. Additionally, Commissioner Hazeltine talked about the number of replacement trees in Condition 15 and stating a minimum of 130 smaller trees and suggested adding permeable surfaces where feasible.

Assistant City Attorney Park referenced Condition 33 on the last sentence and noted that it talks about trees and landscaping, irrigation system and that specific to the public right away and it says impervious surfaces should be minimized to reduce storm water runoff.

The Commission agreed to add the same language to Condition 15 that impervious surfaces should be minimized to reduce storm water runoff, where feasible.

In response to Commissioner Hazeltine's inquiry, Planning Manager Scully noted the resolution includes approval of the conceptual landscape plans and talked about ensuring substantial conformance.

Discussion followed regarding verification by the Community Development Director that final plans maintain the Kingsdale setbacks, height, transition, screening and privacy measures and are in substantially conformance with the plan.

Planning Manager Scully reported that any changes need to be reviewed by the Planning Commission.

Assistant City Attorney Park referenced and read Condition 43 relative to approval of conformity to the conceptual plan by the Community Development Department.

Commissioner Young referenced Condition 17 and the number of studio and one bedroom units that are affordable; shared that she lived in an affordable housing unit home that she purchased and noted that while this language was written how our builder built, the three units that were affordable housing were 30% smaller, in the back corner of the property.

Discussion followed regarding affordable units being studio, one-bedroom and two-bedroom units and determining the proportional ratio among the three types.

Assistant City Attorney Park said the solution would be to have a proportional amount of studios, one-bedrooms and two-bedrooms that compared to the ratios of non-affordable housing units.

Commissioner Conroy mentioned that another way to say it would be the unit mix of the affordable units would match the unit mix of the overall project.

Assistant City Attorney Park read the proposed edits to Condition 17 regarding the unit mix as discussed and announced the applicant was agreeable to the affordability mix in the amended provision.

There were no other public comments on this item.

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

The motion carried 7-0.

Commissioner Conroy wondered about adding a condition to the resolution regarding bundling parking spaces and ensuring that 40% of the spaces are EV charging stations and Planning Manager Scully reported those requirements are in the Building Code.

Commissioner Conroy talked about the possibility of those with multiple vehicles parking on the streets while there are empty parking spaces in the development and Planning Manager Scully read a condition, he crafted for addressing residential parking in the commercial area; felt it would cover the concern and labeled it Condition 51. He continued incorporating edits suggested by the Commission.

Discussion followed regarding Condition 2, assigned and overflow parking, stating that parking is not bundled with the unit and reassigning unwanted parking spaces.

Assistant City Attorney Park reported that Condition 51 specifies “one parking space for each of the 350 residential units is proposed. However, parking can be unbundled from the residential units, as necessary. Additionally, residents shall be allowed to park in the phase two commercial parking spaces” and she announced that the applicant has agreed to that.

Motion by Councilmember Hazeltine and seconded by Commissioner Conroy, and approved by roll call vote to adopt the following Resolution by title only, waiving further reading, adopting an Addendum to an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and granting an Amendment to a Conditional Use Permit and Planning Commission Design Review, and approving Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 84931, a One Year Extension of the Vesting Period for the Recorded Final Vesting Tract Map No. 74481, and Concessions/Waivers of development standards pursuant to State Density Bonus Law to construct “Phase 2” of the South Bay Social District (formerly the South Bay Galleria Mixed-Use Project) on property located within a Regional Commercial (CR) Zone: A resolution of the planning commission of the city of Redondo Beach, California, adopting an addendum to the environmental impact report for the South Bay Galleria mixed-use project (State Clearinghouse No. 2015101009) certified by the City of Redondo Beach on January 15, 2019, and granting the requests for an amendment of the Conditional Use Permit and Planning Commission Design Review approved by the City Council (Resolution No. CC-1901-004) for the South Bay Galleria mixed-use project on January 15, 2019, and approving Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 84931, a one year extension of the vesting period for the recorded final Vesting Tract Map No. 74481, and concessions/waivers of development standards pursuant to Government Code Section 65915 (Density Bonus Law) to allow the development of phase 2 of the South Bay Social District (formerly the South Bay Galleria mixed-use project) to construct an 8-story mixed-use building consisting of 15 residential townhomes (apartments or condominiums) and 335 residential apartment units, inclusive of 10% very low income affordable units, up to one level of underground parking and 3 levels of above grade parking totaling up to 845 parking spaces (350 parking spaces exclusively for residences and up to 495 parking spaces (replacement parking) for commercial uses), 8,300 square feet of grade level commercial uses, and associated amenities on property (3.26 acres) located within the Regional Commercial (CR) zone located at 1815 Hawthorne boulevard as amended.

The motion carried, 6-1-0, by the following roll call vote:

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

- K. ITEMS CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS AGENDAS - None**
- L. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION PRIOR TO ACTION - None**
- M. ITEMS FROM STAFF - None**
- N. COMMISSION MEMBER ITEMS AND FUTURE COMMISSION AGENDA TOPICS - None**
- O. ADJOURNMENT – 10:52 p.m.**

Motion by Commissioner Gaddis, seconded by Commissioner Hazeltine, and approved by voice vote, to adjourn the meeting at 10:52 p.m.

The motion carried 7-0.

The next meeting of the Redondo Beach Planning Commission will be a regular meeting to be held at 6:30 p.m. on September 19, 2025, 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