

RESOLUTION NO. 2025-09-PCR-09

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 PARKING REGULATIONS FOR NON-RESIDENTIAL USES LOCATED ON PROPERTIES WITHIN THE ARTESIA AND AVIATION CORRIDORS AREA PLAN.

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Redondo Beach at their duly noticed public hearing on December 8, 2020, adopted the “Artesia & Aviation Corridors Area Plan” (AACAP); and

WHEREAS, the purpose of the AACAP is to identify policy approaches and explicit actions that can be used by City staff or property owners to activate, energize, and revitalize the Artesia and Aviation Corridors in a coordinated and consistent manner; and

WHEREAS, the purpose and intention of the “mobility objectives” within the Artesia and Aviation Corridor Area Plan are to provide a concentration of office, restaurant, and retail activity that is community/neighborhood serving and to create a “park once and walk” corridor that meets parking needs and promotes the use of active transportation (e.g., walking, bicycling, and scooter riding); and

WHEREAS, to better understand the current parking capacity within the AACAP area, a parking study was conducted that identified a total of 2,877 parking spaces, of which 688 are on-street, public spaces, and 2,189 are private, off-street spaces. Further analysis revealed that both on- and off-street parking spaces are generally underutilized, suggesting that the current supply can accommodate higher demand. An efficiently parked area maintains an 85 percent utilization rate, but current on-street and off-street parking rarely exceeds 68 percent and 50 percent utilization, respectively; and

WHEREAS, on August 5, 2025, the City Council held a meeting to discuss the City’s General Plan – Land Use Element update with a specific focus on policies related to the “revitalization of the Artesia and Aviation Corridor”. The City Council discussed, took public testimony, and considered numerous revitalization strategies, including but not limited to, increasing the Floor Area Ratio (FAR) for properties within the AACAP area from 0.6 to 1.5, potential mixed-use development within AACAP, development “caps” with increased FAR’s as incentives for early revitalization projects, reduced or eliminated open space requirements, and various additional future parking strategies. At the conclusion of all discussions and public comments, the City Council directed staff to move forward, as a priority item, with an amendment to the City’s Zoning Ordinance eliminating required parking for non-residential uses; and

WHEREAS, on September 9, 2025, staff presented a draft Zoning Ordinance eliminating parking requirements for new development of non-residential uses within the AACAP area for the City Council's review and direction. City Council took public testimony, discussed the proposed ordinance, and provided the following direction to city staff:

1. Remove the existing language in Section 10-2.1707 that prohibits "restaurant (fast food) and a restaurant with drive-through use" within the AACAP area.
2. Revise the draft ordinance to apply to all nonresidential uses, including restaurant (fast food) and restaurants with drive-throughs.
 - a. Staff's original draft ordinance included a "carve out" of the parking elimination regulation for restaurant (fast food) and restaurants with drive-throughs.
3. Incorporate language to encourage parking areas, if provided, to be located to the rear of proposed structures.
 - a. Include language that addresses potential compatibility concerns with parking areas adjacent to residential and adding additional buffering requirements for parking areas that choose to locate in front of new developments adjacent to Artesia or Aviation Boulevards.
4. Incorporate future and regular progress reports on redevelopment metrics within the AACAP area into the City's Strategic Plan to measure effectiveness of this revitalization strategy and avoidance of unintended consequences such as impacting the street parking within adjacent residential and private parking on neighboring commercial properties.
5. Present the draft Zoning Ordinance to the Planning Commission at a public hearing for their review, comment, discussion, and recommendation(s).

NOW, THEREFORE, THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF REDONDO BEACH, CALIFORNIA DOES HEREBY FIND AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. FINDINGS

1. In compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) of 1970, as amended, and State and local guidelines adopted pursuant thereto, the zoning amendment is Categorically Exempt from further environmental review, pursuant to Section 15060(c)(2), as the project is not expected to result in a reasonably foreseeable change in the environment, and Section 15061(b)(3) that refers to activities where it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that the activity in question may have a significant effect on the environment ("common-sense exemption"), of the Guidelines of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), therefore, the action is not subject to CEQA.
2. The amendment to the Zoning ordinance is consistent with the General Plan.

- a. Land Use Element Goal 1H: Continue and enhance existing commercial districts which contribute revenue to the City and are compatible with adjacent residential neighborhoods.
 - b. Land Use Element Policy 1.15.2: Publicly initiate and allow for the private sector development of municipal or shared parking lots, which incorporate bicycle storage facilities, along the street frontages to provide for joint use of adjacent commercial properties and allow for the incorporation of commercial uses into the structure along the street frontage (except for areas required for access).
 - c. Land Use Element Policy 1.15.7: Integrate improvements which facilitate transit use of Artesia Boulevard, such as bus shelters and recessed access points.
 - d. Land Use Element Objective 1.17: Provide for the development of uses which predominantly serve and are accessible to local residents, create a distinctive pedestrian activity area of the City, and are compatible with adjacent residential neighborhoods.
 - e. Land Use Element Policy 1.17.1: Accommodate a mix of commercial uses which provide for the needs of nearby residents (as defined by Policy 1.16.1) and enhance pedestrian activity on parcels designated as "C-2-PD".
 - f. Land Use Element Policy 1.17.3: Encourage the development of outdoor dining and other similar uses which do not impede pedestrian circulation on the sidewalks.
 - g. Land Use Element Policy 1.19: Provide for the development of uses which predominantly serve and are accessible to local residents and compatible with adjacent residential neighborhoods.
3. These amendments do not require a vote of the people under Article XXVII of the City Charter.

SECTION 2. RECITALS. The above recitals are true and correct, and the recitals are incorporated herein by reference as if set forth in full.

NOW, THEREFORE, THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF REDONDO BEACH, CALIFORNIA, DOES HEREBY RESOLVE AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. Pursuant to Section 10-5.2504(f)(1) Zoning amendments, the Planning Commission recommends that the City Council adopt the amendments to the Redondo Beach Municipal Code pertaining to the elimination of required parking for non-residential uses within the AACAP area.

SECTION 2. AMENDMENT OF CODE. Title 10, Chapter 2 (Zoning and Land Use) amending Section 10-2.1707 as follows:

§ 10-2.1707. Nonresidential parking standards within the Artesia and Aviation Corridors Area Plan.

- (a) Purpose and intent. The mobility objectives of the Artesia and Aviation Corridors Area Plan are to provide a concentration of office, restaurant, and retail activity that is community/neighborhood serving. The intent is to create a "park once and walk" corridor that meets parking needs and promotes the use of active transportation (e.g., walking, bicycling, and scooter riding). Restaurant and office uses ~~are~~ identified as "preferred uses" within the corridor plan are envisioned to attract a mix of people from the surrounding neighborhoods who may arrive on foot, bike, e-bike and other alternative modes, or by car. The segments of Artesia and Aviation Boulevards included in the Artesia and Aviation Corridor Area Plan runs from the transportation easement (rail line) east of Inglewood Avenue to the western City boundary at Aviation Boulevard.
- (b) Number of Parking Spaces Required. All permitted non-residential uses, with the exception of a restaurant (fast food) and/or restaurant with a drive-through, business offices uses, medical and dental offices uses, and restaurant uses that have frontage on either the Artesia or Aviation ~~Corridors~~ Boulevards within the Artesia and Aviation Corridors Area Plan ~~shall are not required to have a parking~~provide parking requirement of one (1) space per three hundred (300) square feet of gross floor area. A restaurant use within the Artesia and Aviation Corridors Area Plan subject to this section shall include the following use classifications listed in Section 10-2.1706; food and beverage sales and snack shops, restaurant (sit down), restaurant (fast food), restaurant (delivery), restaurant (take out), restaurant (pedestrian oriented), and restaurant (unclassified). A restaurant (fast food) and a restaurant with drive through use is not included and is not permitted on properties with frontage on either the Artesia or Aviation Corridors within the Area Plan. All other nonresidential uses are subject to the minimum parking requirements pursuant to Section 10-2.1706.
- ~~(1) Any fractional requirement of a parking space equal to or greater than one-half of a parking space shall be interpreted as a requirement for a total parking space.~~
- ~~(2)~~(1) Outdoor Seating for Restaurant Uses. No additional parking is required ~~for the first sixteen (16) outdoor seats or 30 percent of the number of indoor seats, whichever is greater. Thereafter, one parking space shall be provided for every six (6) seats.~~ The provisions as referenced in Section 10-2.1622, which requires outdoor seating to meet the parking requirements of Section 10-2.1706 and a Conditional Use Permit for outdoor seating areas greater than 150 square feet does not apply to restaurant uses, ~~as noted above,~~ within the Artesia and Aviation Corridors Area Plan. All outdoor dining areas for restaurants in the Area Plan shall be subject to approval by Administrative Design Review pursuant to Section 10-2.2500. All other provisions within Section 10-2.1622 shall apply.

~~(3)(2)~~ If provided, the Design of nonresidential off-street parking lots, common parking garages, driveway approaches, driveways, and aisles are subject to the requirements pursuant to Section 10-2.1706. Additionally, any future parking areas are preferred to be developed in the rear of properties behind structure(s). Special lighting, pedestrian pass throughs to adjacent residential neighborhoods, driveway access to adjacent parking lots, noise reduction measures, and other compatibility and design measures as determined by the Community Development Director or his/her assigned, may be required in rear parking areas. In the event parking is to be developed with frontage along Artesia or Aviation Boulevards additional design features between the parking areas fronting the public right-of-way may be incorporated, including but not limited to, additional landscaped setbacks, decorative walls, incorporation of open spaces/public plazas for outdoor uses of the adjacent businesses, and pedestrian pathways. For properties that include frontage along a side street (corner lots), only landscaping areas between the side street and the parking area may be required, additionally, driveway access is preferred from the side street to minimize or eliminate driveways along Aviation or Artesia Boulevard.

- (c) Provisions for ~~Parking Space Reduction or~~ Parking Lot Designs Not Compliant with Section 10-2.1706. Overlap (on-site or off-site) parking, valet parking, tandem parking, and mechanical lifts for all nonresidential uses located within the Artesia and Aviation Corridors Area Plan may apply for an Administrative Design Review pursuant to Section 10-2.2500.

(1) Administrative Design Review may be approved for:

~~a. A reduction in the number of spaces specified in Section 10-2.1707(b) or 10-2.1706;~~

~~b.a.~~ Overlap ~~provision of~~ parking serving more than one (1) use or site;

~~c.b.~~ Provision of v Valet parking;

~~d.c.~~ Provision of t Tandem parking;

~~e.d.~~ Provision of m Mechanical lifts; or

~~f.e.~~ Any combination of the above, subject to specific findings and conditions of approval.

- (2) In approving an Administrative Design Review for ~~parking space reduction and/or~~ parking lot design not compliant with Section 10-2.1706, overlap parking (on-site or off-site), valet parking, tandem parking, and/or mechanical lifts, the Community Development Director (or assigned) shall find:

~~a. In regard to a reduction in parking spaces:~~

- ~~1. There is clear and convincing evidence that the parking demand will be less than the requirement in Section 10-2.1707(b) or 10-2.1706. In reaching a decision, the Community Development Director (or assigned) shall consider survey data submitted by an applicant or collected at the applicant's request and expense.~~

b.a. In regard to overlap (on-site or off-site) parking:

1. The peak-hour parking demand from all uses does not coincide and/or the uses are such that the hours of operation are different for various portions of the business. If the site is in a pedestrian-oriented commercial zone, the Community Development Department may also approve overlap parking subject to a determination that the use mix is conducive to customers parking and walking to visit more than one business on the same trip; and
- ~~2. The total parking provided for the uses sharing parking shall not be less than fifty (50%) percent of the parking requirement for the same uses with no shared parking; and~~
- ~~3. The total parking provided for the uses sharing parking shall not be less than the parking requirement applicable to any single use with no shared parking; and~~
- 4.2. The adjacent or nearby properties will not be adversely affected relative to parking; and
- 5.3. The proposed traffic circulation will not be detrimental to the health, safety, and welfare of residents residing or working in or adjacent to the neighborhood; and
- 6.4. The off-site parking is within a reasonable distance of the premises upon which the building or use is located; and
- 7.5. In reaching a decision, the Community Development Director (or assigned) ~~shall~~ may consider survey data submitted by an applicant or collected at the applicant's request and expense.

c.b. In regard to valet parking, tandem parking, and mechanical lifts:

1. The location for valet services, tandem parking, and mechanical lifts does not severely impede on-site or off-site traffic or pedestrian circulation; and
2. The adjacent or nearby properties will not be adversely affected by noise associated with the mechanical lifts and/or valet parking services; and
3. Mechanical lifts shall be operated by an employee and shall be screened from view from the adjacent public right-of-way to the

extent feasible.

- (3) Mechanical Lift Design Standards. A mechanical lift is an elevator-like mechanical system allowing full-size passenger cars or sport utility vehicles to be placed in the lift and mechanically raised or lowered, creating space for more full-size passenger cars or sport utility vehicles to be parked in a vertical configuration. Mechanical lifts shall be operated solely by parking attendants. Mechanical lifts shall be screened from view from adjacent public streets to the extent feasible. ~~Mechanical lifts shall be located only in parking structures/lots where they will be fully or substantially obstructed from view from adjacent public streets.~~
- (4) As a condition of such Administrative Design Review approval for overlap parking (off-site), the Community Development Director (or assigned) shall require a written agreement between landowner(s) and the City, in a form satisfactory to the City Attorney, which shall include:
 - ~~a. A guarantee that there will be no substantial alteration in the uses that will create a greater demand for parking; and~~
 - ~~b.a.~~ A guarantee among the landowner(s) for access to and use of the off-site overlap parking facilities ~~for a term not less than 20 years and provisions for extensions in five (5) year terms; and~~
 - ~~c.b.~~ Remedies in the event that there is a change in use on the property or in the event that the off-site overlap parking is lost; and
 - ~~d.c.~~ A provision that the City may require parking facilities in addition to those originally approved, after notice and administrative hearing, upon a finding by the Community Development Director (or assigned) that adequate parking to serve the use(s) has not been provided; and
 - ~~e.d.~~ A provision stating that the City, acting through the Community Development Director (or assigned), may, for due cause and upon notice and administrative hearing, modify, amend, or unilaterally terminate the agreement at any time.
- (5) Notwithstanding the foregoing, if such parking reduction, parking lot design, overlap (on-site or off-site) parking, valet parking, tandem parking, or mechanical lift request also includes other discretionary actions to be considered by the Planning Commission, the Community Development Director shall refer the parking request to the Planning Commission in conjunction with such other discretionary actions. The Planning Commission, in considering the parking request, shall make such findings and include necessary conditions as provided in this section.
- (6) Performance. It is a violation of this section for use of valet and/or mechanical lift parking spaces and queuing to access those spaces, to be operated in a

manner that causes either: (a) significant congestion on adjacent streets or intersections; (b) any other significant impediment to City intersections, streets or adjacent off-street parking areas; or (c) significant interference with the self-park operations elsewhere on site. Violations of this section are subject to enforcement pursuant to Article 15 (Enforcement) of Part IV (Administration) of Chapter 2 (Zoning) of Title 10 (Planning and Zoning) of the Redondo Beach Municipal Code. In addition, the Community Development Director may impose conditions if the Community Development Director determines that doing so is necessary to eliminate any such violation

SECTION 3. INCONSISTENT PROVISIONS. Any provisions of the Redondo Beach Municipal Code, or appendices thereto, or any other ordinances of the City inconsistent herewith, to the extent of such inconsistencies and no further, are hereby repealed.

SECTION 4. SEVERANCE. If any section, subsection, sentence, clause, or phrase of this ordinance is for any reason held to be invalid or unconstitutional by the decision of any court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of the ordinance. The Planning Commission recommends that the City Council shall declare that it would have passed this ordinance and each section, subsection, sentence, clause, and phrase thereof, irrespective of the fact that any one or more sections, subsections, sentences, clauses, or phrases be declared invalid or unconstitutional.

FINALLY RESOLVED, that the Planning Commission forward a copy of this resolution to the City Council so the Council will be informed of the action of the Planning Commission.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 18th day of September, 2025.

Wayne Craig, Chair
Planning Commission
City of Redondo Beach

ATTEST:

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES) SS
CITY OF REDONDO BEACH)

I, Sean Scully of the City of Redondo Beach, California, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution No. 2025-09-PCR-09 was duly passed, approved and adopted by the Planning Commission of the City of Redondo Beach, California, at a regular meeting of said Planning Commission held on the 18th day of September, 2025, by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

Sean Scully
Planning Manager

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

City Attorney's Office