

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Nils Nehrenheim](#); [Todd Loewenstein](#); [Paige Kaluderovic](#); [Zein Obagi](#); [Scott Behrendt](#); [Marc Wiener](#); [Sean Scully](#)  
**Cc:** [CityClerk](#)  
**Subject:** AGENDA ITEM L2 - Public Hearing on General Plan - Keep FAR at 0.50 to 0.75 for P/I Zone  
**Date:** Tuesday, November 5, 2024 3:11:32 PM

---

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

Good Afternoon City Council Members and Staff,

We SUPPORT keeping the FAR for Public Institutional (P/I) land at 0.75 as stated in the updated General Plan, or at 0.50 as the Planning Commission recommended.

Public land use should be compatible with surrounding residential areas. An increase to 1.25 FAR for BCHD or ALL P/I land use would be highly damaging to the character and quality of life of residents in the City.

Thanks for your consideration.

Marcie Guillermo  
20+ Redondo Beach Resident

**From:** [Mark Nelson \(Home Gmail\)](#)  
**To:** [CityClerk](#)  
**Cc:** [Sean Scully](#); [Marc Wiener](#); [Planredondo](#); [Planning Redondo](#)  
**Subject:** CPRA - Upzoning EIR Study  
**Date:** Tuesday, November 5, 2024 7:44:48 PM

---

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

Provide the contract and scope of work for the analysis of the PI land use to 1.25 FAR.

**From:** [Stop BCHD](#)  
**To:** [CityClerk](#); [Paige Kaluderovic](#); [Nils Nehrenheim](#); [Todd Loewenstein](#); [Scott Behrendt](#); [Sean Scully](#); [Marc Wiener](#); [Kevin Cody](#); [Zein Obagi](#); [Garth Meyer](#); [Michael Webb](#)  
**Subject:** Formal Opposition to SPOT ZONING of BCHD to 1.25 FAR  
**Date:** Tuesday, November 5, 2024 7:24:52 PM

---

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

BCHD is not even an essential service, it is an optional agency. It is clearly not a public safety service.

If BCHD is going to receive 1.25 FAR for convenience, then ALL P-I land use must be up zoned to 1.25 FAR as well.

The City study needs to include the 1.25 FAR upgrade for ALL P-I land uses. If it does not, then the City is wide open to litigation.

--

StopBCHD.com ([StopBCHD@gmail.com](mailto:StopBCHD@gmail.com)) is a Neighborhood Quality-of-Life Community concerned about the quality-of-life, health, and economic damages that BCHDs 110-foot above the street, 800,000 sqft commercial development will inflict for the next 50-100 years. Our neighborhoods have been burdened since 1960 by the failed South Bay Hospital project and have not received the benefit of the voter-approved acute care public hospital since 1984. Yet we still suffer 100% of the damages and we will suffer 100% of the damages of BCHDs proposal.

**From:** [luv2wcsdance](#)  
**To:** [CityClerk](#); [Scott Behrendt](#); [Todd Loewenstein](#); [Zein Obagi](#); [Paige Kaluderovic](#); [Nils Nehrenheim](#); [Marc Wiener](#); [Sean Scully](#)  
**Cc:** [luv2wcsdance](#)  
**Subject:** Public Comment to L2 - Keep FAR at 0.50 to 0.75 for P/I Zone  
**Date:** Tuesday, November 5, 2024 5:57:20 PM

---

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

I SUPPORT keeping the FAR for Public Institutional (P/I) land at 0.75 as stated in the updated General Plan, or at 0.50 as the Planning Commission recommended. Public land use should be compatible with surrounding residential areas. An increase to 1.25 FAR for BCHD or ALL P/I land use would be highly damaging to the character and quality of life of residents in the City. My overall preference is the Planning Commission's recommendation of 0.50.

Suzanne McCune  
District 1