

# **BLUE FOLDER ITEM**

*Blue folder items are additional back up material to administrative reports and/or public comments received after the printing and distribution of the agenda packet for receive and file.*

## **CITY COUNCIL MEETING MAY 5, 2026**

- L.1. A PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER AMENDMENTS TO THE CITY'S CERTIFIED 2021-2029 (6TH CYCLE) HOUSING ELEMENT AND ASSOCIATED AMENDMENTS TO THE CITY'S ZONING AND SUBDIVISION ORDINANCES REQUIRED FOR IMPLEMENTATION AND CONSISTENCY REPLACING THE AFFORDABLE HOUSING OVERLAY DISTRICTS ON THE CITY'S IDENTIFIED "HOUSING SITES" WITH HIGH-DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (65 DU/AC) AND MIXED-USE ZONING DISTRICTS (65 TO 80 DU/AC)

ADOPT BY TITLE ONLY RESOLUTION NO. CC-2605-027, A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF REDONDO BEACH, CALIFORNIA, APPROVING, PURSUANT TO THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT, AN ADDENDUM TO THE CERTIFIED "REDONDO BEACH FOCUSED GENERAL PLAN UPDATE, ZONING ORDINANCE UPDATE AND LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM AMENDMENT PROGRAM EIR" AND AMENDING THE CITY'S CERTIFIED 6TH CYCLE 2021-2029 HOUSING ELEMENT TO REPLACE THE AFFORDABLE HOUSING OVERLAY DISTRICTS ON THE CITY'S IDENTIFIED "HOUSING SITES" WITH HIGH-DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (65 DU/AC) AND MIXED-USE ZONING DISTRICTS (65 TO 80 DU/AC).

INTRODUCE BY TITLE ONLY ORDINANCE NO. 3311-26, AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF REDONDO BEACH, CALIFORNIA, AMENDING TITLE 10 PLANNING AND ZONING, CHAPTER 2 ZONING AND LAND USE OF THE REDONDO BEACH MUNICIPAL CODE TO IMPLEMENT AMENDMENTS TO THE CITY'S CERTIFIED 6TH CYCLE 2021-2029 HOUSING ELEMENT THAT REPLACE THE AFFORDABLE HOUSING OVERLAY DISTRICTS ON THE CITY'S IDENTIFIED "HOUSING SITES" WITH HIGH-DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (65 DU/AC) AND MIXED-USE ZONING DISTRICTS (65 TO 80 DU/AC). FOR INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

INTRODUCE BY TITLE ONLY ORDINANCE NO. 3312-26, AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF REDONDO BEACH, CALIFORNIA, AMENDING TITLE 10 PLANNING AND ZONING, CHAPTER 1 SUBDIVISIONS OF THE REDONDO BEACH MUNICIPAL CODE TO IMPLEMENT AMENDMENTS TO THE CITY'S CERTIFIED 6TH CYCLE 2021-2029 HOUSING ELEMENT THAT REPLACE THE AFFORDABLE HOUSING OVERLAY DISTRICTS ON THE CITY'S IDENTIFIED "HOUSING SITES" WITH HIGH-DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (65 DU/AC) AND MIXED-USE ZONING DISTRICTS (65 TO 80 DU/AC). FOR INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

CONTACT: Marc Wiener, Community Development Director

- **Public Comments Received on the Housing Element Update**

**From:** [Patrick Healy](#)  
**To:** [RBHousingElement](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment on Housing Element Draft Update  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 14, 2026 2:53:47 PM

---

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

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

Dear Planning Commission and City Council Members,

## **Public Comment on Housing Element Draft Update: Process and Public Engagement Concerns**

I understand the City's obligation to maintain compliance with state housing law and the importance of implementing a certified Housing Element. My concern is not with the housing mandate itself, but with the process by which this Draft Update is being advanced.

This amendment includes substantive zoning implementation changes—expanded by-right capacity, revised zoning tools, and updated site designations—that will shape future land-use outcomes well before any project-level hearings occur. Processing these policy-level changes on a compressed seven-day public review timeline limits meaningful public engagement at the stage when decisions still matter most.

This concern is heightened by the fact that Measure RB shifted final land-use approval authority from voters to commissions and the City Council. With that shift comes a greater responsibility to ensure transparency, adequate notice, and sufficient time for public review. While the City may meet minimum legal requirements, the

combination of reduced voter oversight and highly compressed comment periods risks undermining public confidence in the process and increases the potential for procedural challenges under CEQA or state housing law. Extending engagement at this stage would help strengthen the administrative record and protect both the City and the public interest.

I also request clearer explanation of how cumulative impacts—traffic, schools, infrastructure, and emergency services—will be evaluated across multiple Housing Element sites, and how the City will ensure preservation of at-risk affordable and senior housing before displacement occurs.

For these reasons, I urge the City to extend public engagement, clarify the scope and implications of these implementation changes, and more clearly demonstrate how public input will meaningfully inform decisions prior to adoption.

Pat Healy

Redondo Beach (District 1)

**From:** [Sean Scully](#)  
**To:** [RBHousingElement](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Housing Element Amendment  
**Date:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 5:30:05 PM  
**Attachments:** [Comment to the Housing Element Amendment 2026.docx](#)  
[image001.png](#)

---

**Sean Scully**

Planning Manager

310.697.3194

[sean.scully@redondo.org](mailto:sean.scully@redondo.org)

-  
*We value and welcome your feedback! Please take our short survey so that we can understand how to better serve you (click [here](#)).*



---

**From:** Sheila Lamb <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 8, 2026 4:36 PM  
**To:** Sean Scully <[Sean.Scully@redondo.org](mailto:Sean.Scully@redondo.org)>  
**Subject:** Housing Element Amendment

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

Hi Sean,

I attempted to send the comment to the address cited in the communication, but it wasn't recognized so I'm sending it to you.

With respect,

Sheila

Comment to the Housing Element Amendment 2026

Sheila W. Lamb

January 8, 2026

I want to begin by stating clearly that I do not oppose this amendment. I understand that the City is operating under very real legal constraints from the California Department of Housing and Community Development, and that compliance with RHNA requirements is not optional.

However, I am writing to address not the outcome, but the **process**.

When major zoning changes are made—changes that remove overlays, embed housing directly into base zoning, increase allowable density, and expand by-right development—the City’s ethical responsibility does not diminish simply because its legal discretion is limited. In many ways, it becomes even more important.

Residents can accept difficult and even disruptive changes when they understand them. What they struggle with is feeling that those changes are occurring without clear, site-level information about what they actually mean for neighborhoods and future development patterns.

When the public is given only high-level descriptions and very short comment windows, participation risks becoming procedural rather than meaningful. That may satisfy the letter of public process, but it does not fully meet the spirit of democratic governance.

Transparency is not optional simply because an outcome feels inevitable. When this amendment comes before the council, I urge staff to be fully candid about real impacts—on density, development incentives, neighborhood character, traffic and the pace of change—especially when decisions carry long-term consequences for the community.

My hope is that, going forward, the City will view clarity as a responsibility, particularly when legal mandates require significant policy shifts. Doing so strengthens public trust and ultimately supports the success and efforts that the City staff is trying to achieve.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment and for your continued service to the community.

Respectfully,  
**Sheila W. Lamb**

---

**From:** [Alex Fineman](#)  
**To:** [RBHousingElement](#)  
**Cc:** [South Bay Forward](#); [Jacob Pierce](#); [Grace Peng](#); [REDACTED] [James Lloyd](#);  
**Subject:** Redondo Beach Housing Element Draft Update comments - South Bay Forward, AHLA, LWBC  
**Date:** Tuesday, January 13, 2026 4:24:20 PM  
**Attachments:** [Redondo Beach Housing Element Comments.pdf](#)

---

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

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

Dear Redondo Beach Planning Commission and City Council,

Please find attached a letter from South Bay Forward, Abundant Housing LA, and League of Women Voters - Beach Cities including our comments on the Draft Update to the Redondo Beach Housing Element (6th Cycle). We appreciate your consideration.

Thank you,

Alex Fineman  
South Bay Forward



January 12, 2026

VIA EMAIL

Redondo Beach Planning Commission & City Council  
415 Diamond St.  
Redondo Beach, CA 90277

**RE:** Public Comment on the 2021–2029 Housing Element Draft Update (January 2026 Revision)

**Dear Redondo Beach Planning Commission and City Council:**

On behalf of South Bay Forward, a grassroots organization of neighbors focused on expanding access to housing, transit, and mobility in the South Bay LA region, the housing advocacy nonprofit Abundant Housing LA, and the League of Women Voters Beach Cities, we submit the following comments regarding the Draft Update to the 6th Cycle Housing Element. While the City has taken technical steps to address the 2025 California Court of Appeal ruling in *New Commune DTLA LLC v. City of Redondo Beach*, the current draft at best achieves only the minimum to remain compliant with RHNA obligations, and fails to equitably distribute housing or leverage the City’s unique coastal infrastructure for the regional good. The document also relies on outdated information and lists at least one site where the City is actively blocking housing.

**Inequity and the North-South Divide**

The updated sites inventory (shown in Figures H-8 and H-9) continues an unsustainable pattern: concentrating nearly all new density in North Redondo while shielding South Redondo from meaningful change.

- Under Gov. Code § 65583(c)(10), the City is legally mandated to replace “[segregated living patterns with integrated and balanced living patterns](#).” By placing the majority of potential units in the areas with highest minority concentrations and near high-pollution “stroads” like Hawthorne Blvd., the City is failing this mandate.
- South Redondo schools face declining enrollment as residents age and families are priced out. Conversely, North Redondo bears the infrastructure burden of new residents. Too often, parents are required to drive students out of their home school area from North to South to maintain enrollment, inconveniencing residents who must deal with increased traffic, which the Draft Update acknowledges on pp. 119-120. A balanced approach would place denser housing near South Redondo’s schools, parks, and walkable corridors, allowing families to live near amenities and their children’s schools.

**Realistic Availability: Moving Toward By-Right Approval**

The City was recently penalized by the courts for including sites that were not “realistically available.” This draft risks repeating the same mistake.

- The draft lists the 49-unit 401 S. PCH project as “Progress Toward RHNA” (p. 82), yet the

Planning Commission recently [denied its coastal permit](#). Under Gov. Code § 65583.2(c), sites must be “available” and have “[realistic development capacity](#).”

- If a site is identified in the Housing Element, its approval should be ministerial (by-right). The City cannot claim credit for a site on one hand while using the permitting process to block it with the other.
- Will the City continue to count applications received towards Housing Element progress and then later deny them? This continues a troubling pattern of housing project denials within the coastal zone of the City, including the Catalina Village project, the AES Power Plant site, and dating back decades to the Heart of the City project.

### **Reconsidering the AES and BCHD Sites**

The most glaring omission remains the approximately 50-acre AES Power Plant site. The City’s justification for its exclusion (p. 11) is outdated.

- The plant shuttered on December 31, 2023. It is no longer mandated to operate as the Housing Element Draft Update continues to describe it; it is the largest infill opportunity in the South Bay.
- The City cites past “voter rejections” of housing at AES as a justification for not considering the site. However, in 2024, Redondo Beach voters passed Measure RB, specifically exempting RHNA-compliance actions from the voter-approval requirements of Measure DD. Moreover, there is no site in Redondo Beach where voters have approved a specific dense residential development; using lack of voter approval as justification here alone is willfully selective.
- The Builder’s Remedy application received for the AES site has the potential to fulfill the City’s entire RHNA obligation with over 2,300 units and the City should welcome an adaptive reuse and infill [project](#) that provides hundreds of affordable units and also restores wetlands habitats.

The Draft Update additionally mentions 150 additional units being considered by Beach Cities Health District on p. 13, but the site is never otherwise mentioned as a potential location for further development. During the previous public outreach period for the Housing Element, the residents of Redondo Beach overwhelmingly favored building senior housing on the BCHD campus.

### **The Climate and Environmental Imperative**

Redondo Beach should refrain from viewing state housing mandates as a burden to be fought and start viewing them as an environmental necessity and economic opportunity.

- It is precisely because Redondo Beach is already developed with proximity to job centers that it is a prime candidate for growth. When coastal cities refuse to add housing, [development is pushed](#) to the Wildland-Urban Interface - exurbs that face extreme fire risk and require hours-long commutes.
- Adding housing here leverages existing jobs, infrastructure, and increasing access to transit. This reduces regional greenhouse gas emissions by allowing people to live where they work.

### **Conclusion**

Redondo Beach must move beyond a “bare minimum” approach to the housing element update that could risk additional litigation. When it comes to creating diverse housing options, the City

has done commendable work in a few key areas, as it is one of few beach cities with a Section 8 program, to go with a successful and award-winning homelessness program with pallet shelter, interim housing, and permanent supportive housing. The City's Housing Element Update is an opportunity to better reflect these values of equity and inclusion by embracing housing at all levels of affordability and distributed throughout the city. We urge the City to adopt a Housing Element that:

1. **Distributes density equitably** across North and South Redondo to support local schools and meet Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing goals. Avoids concentrating dense housing on high-pollution corridors such as Hawthorne Blvd and I-405.
2. **Includes the now-shuttered AES site** as a key parkland and residential infill project in the Coastal Zone.
3. **Allows the Beach Cities Health District** to build senior independent and assisted living housing on their site to complement the existing memory care facility.
4. **Codifies ministerial review** for all identified RHNA sites to ensure they are truly "available" when applications are submitted and not rejected due to subjective findings and with questionable legal justification.
5. **Introduces new programs and strengthens current practices to address housing affordability** such as renter protections programs and rental assistance. As an example, such programs are available in the City of Gardena and funded through Measure A local solutions funds.

We thank you for considering our input and for your work to update the Housing Element in the City of Redondo Beach.

Sincerely,

Alex Fineman, **South Bay Forward, Redondo Beach Lead**

Brianna Egan, **South Bay Forward, Chapter Chair**

Teri Neustaedter, **LWV Beach Cities, President**

Jacob Pierce, **Abundant Housing LA, Housing Elements Analyst**

CC:

California HCD  
California Housing Defense Fund  
YIMBY Law  
Attorney General Bonta

**From:** [Leo Pustilnikov](#)  
**To:** [RBHousingElement](#); [McDougall, Paul@HCD](mailto:McDougall.Paul@HCD); [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]; [Dave Rand](#); [Howell, Peter](#); [Ryan Patterson](#); [Sonja Trauss](#); [Matt Gelfand](#)  
**Subject:** Redondo HE Comments  
**Date:** Monday, February 16, 2026 2:39:46 PM  
**Attachments:** [Ltr to HCD \(2.16.26\).pdf](#)

---

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

Dear Paul,

Please see attached regarding the Redondo Beach Housing Element.

Let me know if you have any questions.

best,  
Leo

February 16, 2026

Paul McDougall  
Housing and Community Development  
2020 W. El Camino Avenue, Suite 500  
Sacramento, CA 95833

RE: Public Comment on the 2021–2029 Housing Element Draft Update (2-12-26)

It is unfortunate that the City of Redondo Beach (“City”) continues to submit woefully inadequate and deficient plans to comply with state housing element law, despite the serious consequences it now faces having had its previously approved housing element deemed deficient by the courts.

The City now seeks to concentrate its very low income (“VLI”) obligations in an even more egregious manner than previously, with 90% of such units concentrated on a single block bound by 182<sup>nd</sup>, Kingsdale, Artesia, and Hawthorne<sup>1</sup> and 2/3s fronting areas outside the City.

The proposed housing element already shows significant disparities between the Suitable Site Inventory (“SSI”) and actual potential development as with the site at 2901 W. 182<sup>nd</sup> Street at the northeast corner of 182<sup>nd</sup> and Kingsdale<sup>2</sup> (APN 4082-019-037)<sup>3</sup>. Per Table H-42, the site is proposed for 158 units with only 27 VLI units while listed in the SSI as 165 VLI units. As such, the SSI as only a 25 unit VLI buffer before other questionable inclusions detailed below are assessed.<sup>4</sup>

The other sites in the MU-TCH zone are a 2006 built Living Spaces retail store (APN 4082-019-042) and parking lots (APN 4082-019-048 and 049 now 051) serving a 95% leased class A shopping center built in 2011 with national tenants such as Nordstrom Rack, Sprouts Marketplace, Total Wine and ULTA.

When a City seeks to accommodate 50% or more of the lower income requirements with nonvacant sites, it must provide substantial evidence that the use is likely to be discontinued during the planning period.<sup>5</sup> Furthermore, an analysis of any existing leases or other contracts (e.g. Reciprocal Easement Agreement (“REA”)) is required to ensure they would not perpetuate the existing use or prevent redevelopment.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> South Bay Galleria (65 VL units), South Bay Marketplace (757 VL units), 2901 W. 182<sup>nd</sup> (27 VL units)

<sup>2</sup> No details of the January 2026 application have been made public.

<sup>3</sup> The site is listed in the SSI as 1601 Kingsdale (wrong address used – 1601 is a 6+ acre parcel with a Target retail store). The correct address is 1300 Kingsdale aka 2901-2925 W 182<sup>nd</sup> which matches the APN and site characteristics.

<sup>4</sup> The City counts both the 27 and 165. Netting out the 165 leaves the City with an alleged capacity of 1,210.

<sup>5</sup> Government Code 65583.2(g)(2)

<sup>6</sup> Government Code 65582.2(g)(1)

In this case, the City has not done any such analysis including but not limited to:

1. Confirm the property owner is open to redevelopment;
2. Confirm no leases or REA over the subject sites prevents redevelopment;
3. Confirm the redevelopment would include the number of VLI units in the SSI.

In fact, looking at redevelopment trends, there is no near term likelihood of redevelopment and any such future redevelopment would include only a fraction of the anticipated VLI units.

Similarly, it is highly unlikely that any of the MU-1, RVH and MU-H sites would be redeveloped in the near term, much less as 100% VLI developments given the following :

1. 2301 190<sup>th</sup> is 80% occupied with multiple tenants and only 1 vacancy;
2. 598 Meyer has an existing lease with a flower shop;
3. 612 Meyer has multiple tenants;<sup>7</sup>
4. 1770 S PCH is occupied by LensCrafters;
5. 1880 S PCH is occupied by CVS Pharmacy;
6. 1870 S PCH is occupied by the Original Pancake House.

Excluding these 6 sites plus the 4 MU-TCH sites discussed above,<sup>8</sup> the proposed housing element is deficient by 868 Lower Income units assuming no buffer.<sup>9</sup>

I therefore strongly urge HCD to reject this revision and request the City provide a sincere and realistic housing element that does not concentrate all its affordable requirements in pipe dream projects in a corner of the City.

Lastly, HCD should correct the Housing Element designation as the City is “Out” of Compliance given the Appeals Court decision noting significant violations and the rejection by the Supreme Court denying the City’s request for review and depublication (B336042/S294028).

Sincerely,

Leo Pustilnikov

---

<sup>7</sup> APN listed matches 612 Meyer even though property is listed in SSI as 512 Meyer.

<sup>8</sup> Counting the development application for the 182<sup>nd</sup> Street property.

<sup>9</sup> Again, assuming the smaller sites qualify which they likely do not being nonvacant occupied sites encumbered with leases.

**From:** [Brian Clark](#)  
**To:** [RBHousingElement](#)  
**Subject:** housing element comment  
**Date:** Friday, January 9, 2026 11:40:22 PM

---

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

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

Thank you for posting the housing element for resident review.

I have two comments:

1) Why is there no mention of the LGBTQIA+ community in Redondo Beach? There are statistics and lists of services for elderly, minorities, single parent families and even a repeated mention of farmers, of which there are none in Redondo. But there are zero mentions of the gay or lesbian population. This is disturbing considering there are gay people living here and given the pressures and prejudices that gay families, residents and children face. Also, Redondo Beach has the only gay bar in the South Bay. Why aren't these tax payers given services or mention in city documents. They face just as many challenges as other groups that are called out by age, race or family structure.

2) Given that nearly all of the building will occur on the Artesia corridor. How does the city plan to effectively handle the massive influx of traffic between Hawthorne Boulevard and the ocean? I am primarily thinking of Golden Hills where traffic and accidents by Mira Costa high school are already very intense.

Brian Clark

[REDACTED]  
Redondo Beach, CA 90278

May 5, 2026

To: Redondo Beach City Council  
Topic: Housing and Zoning change Comments  
From: Thomas Eisner, [REDACTED]

Hi:

Here are some comments for/on the Housing and Zoning Changes (May 5)

To begin with, I'm recently retired Aerospace. I've lived in Redondo most of the last 41 years, split roughly between North and South Redondo. (I worked at the Charleston Naval Weapons Station for 3 of those years).

It's pretty hard for a common person to read and disseminate the more than 300 pages of these documents. I believe that I've read most of them. In general, I feel it's unfortunate that Sacramento has sort of forced Redondo (and many other towns/cities), into building, or planning to build so many more Housing Units than comfortably fits. I think many of us feel that traffic and general congestion is already pretty bad. While I realize that it's very hard for lower income households to find proper housing in many areas, I'd like to Sacramento put more effort into bringing and keeping higher income jobs to/in California. I've also seen many "For Rent" signs around Redondo and Torrance, as well as in Craigslist, so do we really need more housing?

OK, I believe Redondo did a good job identifying areas that could be used for more housing. I think it was almost too good. Page 86, of the 2021-29 Housing Element report, suggests we need 1,661 more ADUs. I tried to add up how many more units this updated Zoning could provide, so did we overreach? Looks like we're over 2500 Units, (not counting North Tech, which might be all commercial?).

Site	New Zoning?	Stories	Height	Max du/Ac	Size Acres <sup>*1</sup>	Potential ADUs?
North Tech (Marine & Aviation?)	?	?	?	?	8	
Kingsdale - Southern	RH-4	5	55'	65	2.4	156
Kingsdale - Northern	MU-H	4	45'	65		
South of Transit Center	RH-4	5	55'	65	6.2	403
190th Street (between Phelan & Meyer?)	RH-4	5	55'	65	7.9	513.5
South Bay Marketplace	CR-H	7	90'	80	17.2	1376
FedEx (~ 1760 PCH?)	MU-H	4	45	65	1.8	117
*1 from page 27 of Exhibit A, Amendments...						<b>2565.5</b>

(Feel free to update this Table as needed.)

From what I recall in these Reports, Redondo did a pretty good job allocating adequate Parking. Maybe I missed something but I think it's important to make sure every Unit has 1 or 2 dedicated parking spots (depending on the size). I did see that Senior housing only needs 1 spot for every 2 units, or something like that, which seems to be ok.

These Redondo Zoning reports didn't seem to have the latest population of Redondo, the "Elements" report (p. 17), has the 2020 population as 70,242. A Google search says Redondo is "approximately 66,433 to 70,059 as of early 2026, with estimates indicating a slight annual decline of about -1.22% from recent years." Google also says the population of Los Angeles County has gone down since 2020. Losing over 60,000 residents between 2024 – 2025 alone. I guess this is more a Sacramento question of why we're trying to overbuild established cities.

OK, back to the Redondo reports... Page 5 of the 2021-29 Housing Element report talks about Parks. It says CA State has established a minimum standard of 3 acres/1,000 residents, and Redondo only has 1.4. I believe this is a good target to shoot for and it seems one of the best ways to fulfill this is to eventually convert the bulk of the AES site to Parks.

Thank you for your time.

Let me know if you have any questions for me.

Thomas Eisner