

City Council on 2025-01-21 6:00 PM - CITY COUNCIL CHAMBER

Meeting Time: 01-21-25 18:00


eComments Report

Meetings	Meeting Time	Agenda Items	Comments	Support	Oppose	Neutral
City Council on 2025-01-21 6:00 PM - CITY COUNCIL CHAMBER	01-21-25 18:00	74	8	1	7	0

Sentiments for All Meetings

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

Overall Sentiment



City Council on 2025-01-21 6:00 PM - CITY COUNCIL CHAMBER


01-21-25 18:00

Agenda Name	Comments	Support	Oppose	Neutral
H.3. 25-0039 APPROVE THE FOLLOWING CITY COUNCIL MINUTES: A. SEPTEMBER 17, 2024 ADJOURNED AND REGULAR MEETING B. OCTOBER 1, 2024 ADJOURNED AND REGULAR MEETING	1	0	1	0
N.1. 25-0080 DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON THE CITY'S DRAFT CANNABIS REGULATORY ORDINANCES APPROVE THE DRAFT LANGUAGE IN THE CANNABIS REGULATORY ORDINANCES AND DIRECT STAFF TO SCHEDULE A PUBLIC HEARING BEFORE THE PLANNING COMMISSION ON FEBRUARY 3, 2025 TO PROVIDE RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE CITY COUNCIL PURSUANT TO STATE LAW PRIOR TO FORMAL CONSIDERATION OF INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING OF THE ORDINANCES DIRECT STAFF TO SCHEDULE A PUBLIC HEARING AND RETURN TO THE CITY COUNCIL ON FEBRUARY 11, 2025 FOR CONSIDERATION OF INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING OF THE PROPOSED ORDINANCES	6	0	6	0
N.2. 25-0066 DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING UPDATES TO THE REDONDO BEACH MUNICIPAL CODE TO CONSIDER MODIFYING THE LAND USE REGULATIONS AND BUSINESS PERMITTING STANDARDS PERTAINING TO SMOKE SHOPS CITYWIDE AND NOTARY SERVICES IN THE RIVIERA VILLAGE DISTRICT	1	1	0	0

Sentiments for All Agenda Items

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

Overall Sentiment




Agenda Item: eComments for H.3. 25-0039 APPROVE THE FOLLOWING CITY COUNCIL MINUTES:

A. SEPTEMBER 17, 2024 ADJOURNED AND REGULAR MEETING

B. OCTOBER 1, 2024 ADJOURNED AND REGULAR MEETING

Overall Sentiment



Executive Director StopBCHD.com

Location:

Submitted At: 1:09pm 01-19-25

The minutes of the October 1 2024 meeting are in error. They fail to recognize and document that Ms Poster falsely accused the City Attorney's office of admonishing the Planning Commission for targeting BCHD. That is plainly FALSE. Further BCHD in a CPRA response stated that Ms. Poster relied on the record of the 9-19-24 Planning Commission Meeting, and that record CLEARLY DEMONSTRATES that no such admonition of the Planning Commission occurred. As such, the records of the Minutes for 10-1-24 are MATERIALLY INCOMPLETE and must be amended.

They state:

"Vanessa Poster, BCHD Board member, spoke in opposition to a .5 FAR; requested a uniform FAR for all institutional uses; listed the benefits of collaborating with Redondo Beach, Manhattan Beach and Hermosa Beach cities and schools; noted BCHD and Redondo Beach do not have competing interests; spoke about prior elections; stated the proposed .5 FAR strangles BCHD's ability to meet changing health needs; talked about the importance of working together and reiterated her request to increase the FAR and make it uniform for all institutional uses."


Agenda Item: eComments for N.1. 25-0080 DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON THE CITY'S DRAFT CANNABIS REGULATORY ORDINANCES

APPROVE THE DRAFT LANGUAGE IN THE CANNABIS REGULATORY ORDINANCES AND DIRECT STAFF TO SCHEDULE A PUBLIC HEARING BEFORE THE PLANNING COMMISSION ON FEBRUARY 3, 2025 TO PROVIDE RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE CITY COUNCIL PURSUANT TO STATE LAW PRIOR TO FORMAL CONSIDERATION OF INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING OF THE ORDINANCES

DIRECT STAFF TO SCHEDULE A PUBLIC HEARING AND RETURN TO THE CITY COUNCIL ON FEBRUARY 11, 2025 FOR CONSIDERATION OF INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING OF THE PROPOSED ORDINANCES

Overall Sentiment

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



Jimena Cabrera

Location:
Submitted At: 7:10pm 01-21-25

The corporate world will do anything to influence our children in a negative way if they can make a buck. In this instance the council has the opportunity to do the right thing and protect them. I strongly oppose storefront cannabis.

Pastora Cayuri

Location:
Submitted At: 7:02pm 01-21-25

We need leaders who do the right thing for our children. I strongly oppose store front cannabis in any part of Redondo Beach.

Grace Peng

Location:
Submitted At: 6:20pm 01-21-25

I voted for Prop 64 because I didn't think it was fair that poor kids lost eligibility for college financial aid over small amounts of pot. I support a small legal and regulated market for medical cannabis. I do not support recreational cannabis. LA Times has documented the issues with pesticide safety, slavery, water withdrawal (which exacerbates fire risk throughout CA). We should have no part in that.

Furthermore, I have seen people in North Redondo smoke marijuana cigarettes in their car, and then drive off when they are done. We don't need more DUI in our city. Please don't allow our city to become a drug marketplace.

Lynn Silver

Location:

Submitted At: 3:20pm 01-21-25

It is concerning what the public health impacts of allowing storefronts will be compared to only allowing delivery of cannabis from outside of the jurisdiction. Local policy should prioritize health and social equity from the start, or it may be safer not to license local businesses. We recommend not proceeding until these elements are integrated into proposed law. See our model local ordinance, and the recent CDPH convened Scientific Committee on High Potency Cannabis.

We strongly support restriction to ≤ 2 retail locations, and 1500 ft school buffer. Our research clearly shows increased harmful use during pregnancy and by teens in proportion to retailer density.

- 1) Prohibit cannabis billboards and restrict other public-facing advertisements, as these are seen by children, and further restrict marketing attractive to youth.
- 2) Rather than launching for-profit licenses, to facilitate legal access, either open a public store, or contract with a single nonprofit entity to operate 1-2 stores, to minimize aggressive marketing to vulnerable groups and sale of more harmful products.
- 2) If a private model is pursued, any licenses should be first offered to social equity applicants.
- 4) Limit product potency, not allowing flower $> 25\%$ THC or concentrates $> 60\%$ THC or lower & require retailers to stock lower potency products. Flavored inhaled products should not be allowed, including names, images and packaging that imply non-cannabis flavors.
- 5) Cannabis tax revenue should be clearly allocated to support youth, substance abuse prevention, and social equity.
- 6) Clear health warning information should be posted in storefronts and provided to consumers at sale or delivery.
- 7) Deliveries should require independent electronic ID checking of legal age.
- 8) Because workers cannot be effectively protected from secondhand cannabis smoke, which is similarly deleterious to tobacco smoke, on-site consumption should not be allowed, nor should cannabis restaurants, clubs or temporary events.

Until such time as far more of these provisions are included we recommended not passing this ordinance as is.

Respectfully, Lynn Silver, MD, MPH Prevention Policy Group of PHI

lsilver@phi.org

Susan Graz

Location:

Submitted At: 1:39pm 01-21-25

I am opposed to cannabis shops in Redondo Beach

Heidi J. Swan

Location:

Submitted At: 5:12pm 01-17-25

My son graduated from RUHS. Our family spends a lot of money shopping & eating in Redondo. Although I'm a citizen of Hermosa Beach, I have a lot invested in our awesome neighbors in RB.

In the last couple of years, the LA Times (who is in favor of legal pot) has done a number of well-researched pieces on the failures of Prop 64. Most recently, they have done several articles about how there are illegal pesticides in legal pot. How you can't tell the source of the pot. So "seed to sale" does not exist. "Regulation" does not exist.

<https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2024-12-19/california-weed-cleanup>

<https://www.latimes.com/california/newsletter/2024-06-17/cannabis-investigation-la-times-weedweek-toxic-pot-essential-california>

<https://www.latimes.com/california/newsletter/2024-12-21/california-struggles-to-keep-pesticides-out-of-weed-essential-california>

<https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2024-06-29/the-dirty-dangerous-secret-of-californias-legal-weed>

<https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2024-09-18/california-legal-weed-industry-in-tumult-after-times-pesticide-investigation>

<https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2024-06-25/cannabis-industry-leaders-call-for-action-on-pesticide-contamination>

We have a booming illegal marijuana market that has eclipsed the legal market. This is not what we voted for. We were told the illegal market would go away. That the products would be safe. They are not. We have cartels, slave labor, illegal pesticides, etc. This is in plain sight. There aren't enough regulators or enforcement!

Any local retail normalizes use to youth. Read results of a recent massive study on youth use:

<https://learnaboutsam.org/2024/10/massive-study-shows-legalization-associated-with-significant-increase-in-adolescent-and-young-adult-marijuana-use/>

Pro pot advocates talk about how great it is--but leave out the health risks. If it was regulated, there would be warnings --like cigarettes!


Youth ER visits up:
<https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/72/wr/mm7228a1.htm>

Senior ER visits skyrocket too:
<https://nypost.com/2023/01/12/california-ers-report-1800-rise-in-pot-related-senior-visits/>

RB should be a Blue Zone. Not a pot zone.

Agenda Item: eComments for N.2. 25-0066 DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING UPDATES TO THE REDONDO BEACH MUNICIPAL CODE TO CONSIDER MODIFYING THE LAND USE REGULATIONS AND BUSINESS PERMITTING STANDARDS PERTAINING TO SMOKE SHOPS CITYWIDE AND NOTARY SERVICES IN THE RIVIERA VILLAGE DISTRICT

Overall Sentiment



Maricela Guillermo

Location:

Submitted At: 7:50pm 01-21-25

Thank you to the city staff for bringing this item forward to seek direction from this body. Allowing smoke shops, massage parlors, and potential retail cannabis stores—without a vote from Redondo Beach residents—diminishes our quality of life and negatively impacts property values.

Smoke shops, massage parlors, and potential cannabis retail stores should not be located within at least 0.25 miles of each other, high schools, daycare centers, or the beautiful esplanade. Additionally, a subcommittee alone will not suffice; it is important to hear from each City Council member on this issue through open discussion. We also need to regulate the signing of these businesses.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.