

January 6, 2026 Council Meeting
Agenda Item N2

Dear Mayor and Council,

Some notes and questions for your consideration on tonight's agenda item as it relates to Land Use Element amendments and Preservation ordinance.

- 1) Goal LU-7 (Historic Preservation) specifies "...buildings, streets, landscapes, neighborhoods and story.." (of Redondo) but does not include "signs" which are also eligible for preservation. Should the goal state any and all resources by name or wording "resources including and but not limited to...."? LU-7.1 actually uses the word "resources".
- 2) LU 7.2 suggests that a COA would be needed for "projects" slated for demolition or alteration ...is this for "historic resource" projects or any project?
- 3) LU 7.3 It is not just facilities but "resources" including and not limited to trees (such as by the Old Redondo Library) and signs.
- 4) LU 7.5 "Places" does not take into account all resources.
- 5) LU 7.8 "Consider providing restoration assistance....in return for agreements and deed restrictions..." I don't think this can actually be done unless by contract? This line needs to be amended.

Next:

LU 7.1 and IM LU 66: Regarding Marc Weiner's question, "Do we continue to support "voluntary" designation";

The city has been operating for 40 years under the original windshield survey used to identify these "resources" which are all residences. This list does not include other potential resources (landscapes, signs etc). Without this list, property owners may, or may not know, that their property, primarily due to its age, but then substantiated through other factors, would be considered a valuable part of Redondo history. This list was created with the intention to ensure that these properties were not demolished or "inappropriately" altered without a review process. I have asked but there is no evidence to indicate if the city has ever notified these property owners that their property is on the list of potential historic resources (aka "the survey"). Throughout these 40 years the only way a homeowner would have known is through purchase of the property and being notified by the realtor - if the realtor had such knowledge.

There are two big issues:

- 1) Lack of notification and education for potential resource owners regarding the survey, including how to remove a property from such a survey, which has always been possible through a public hearing.
- 2) The very real issue of disappearing historical resources via inappropriate alterations (because the owners did not know their property was listed on the survey, or on purpose

through unpermitted alterations), willfully allowing a potential historic resource to deteriorate (due to financial issues or to force a removal from the list).

Having served on Preservation and Public Amenities I recognize the issues from both the owner and city side. It's complex and both are notable.

I do believe that the city provides protections for the rights of owners of potential resources through the voluntary landmarking and Mills Act process, the right to removal from the "historical resources survey" list via public hearing. There are also protections afforded to owners of already designated landmark properties for removal of the landmark designation however, with additional scrutiny.

In regards to the survey:

- 1) The current ordinance states that to be eligible to be "considered" as a "landmark" a resource must be at least 50 years or older, or 30 or older if it is deemed exceptional or at risk for demolition or inappropriate alteration.
- 2) The PAC Preservation subcommittee is currently working on community outreach efforts to educate the community on preservation, the benefits of the Mills Act, the pride in owning a piece of Redondo history, and if necessary and warranted, how to remove a property from the survey. Through these efforts we aim to correct misconceptions that owners cannot do "anything" to their properties, that only the exterior of the home is within purview of preservation ordinance and Secretary of The Interior guidelines, and that there is no financial assistance to preserving a landmarked property (AKA utilizing the substantial tax benefit of the Mills Act to offset maintenance costs).
- 3) If the council decides to forgo a new survey, owners of any and all properties 50 years and older (or 30 years or older as noted above) could go down to the city offices and fill out an application for landmark designation consideration and their property may not even retain any original elements which would not be known until staff does their research and presents the property to the PAC. This could cause a LOT of work for city staff and would bottleneck the PAC. **The survey acts as a first look at a property and determines by age AND by visual inspection if a property retains enough architectural elements to be further considered for actual designation. I would recommend proceeding with the survey in conjunction with a substantial notification and education campaign. Question: Instead of forgoing the survey altogether, can an amendment be made that the survey be conducted every 10 years ? (Our original survey was 1986, updated 1996).

Finally, the Historical Context document's Statement of Purpose states that it is the foundation for (among other things) "...the re-evaluation of building ranking, including the large percentage of buildings currently holding a "C" ranking. Those holding "A" or "B" rankings may also be re-evaluated for possible landmark or National Register." The ordinance only 10-4.104 only references A or B rated properties and makes no reference to the historical context statement to which Preservation also refers in their work. This is notable because certain properties on the

current survey listed as C (such as a property on Helberta which is slated for demolition) could be re-evaluated. Please also take this into consideration in your deliberations and perhaps consider some modification to the ordinance.

Thank you for your time and consideration
Desiree Galassi