



Minutes Regular Meeting  
Planning Commission  
September 19, 2024

**CITY OF REDONDO BEACH  
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES  
Thursday, September 19, 2024**

**REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION – 6:30 PM**

**A. CALL TO ORDER**

A Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission, held in the Redondo Beach Council Chambers at 415 Diamond Street, Redondo Beach, California was called to order by Chairperson Hazeltine.

**B. ROLL CALL**

Commissioners Present: Light, Craig, Gaddis, Conroy, Lamb, Chairperson Hazeltine, Commissioner Boswell (Arrived 6:32 PM)

Commissioners Absent: None

Officials Present: Marc Wiener, Community Development Director  
Jamaal Brown, Planning Analyst

**C. SALUTE TO THE FLAG**

Chairperson Hazeltine led in the Salute to the Flag.

**D. APPROVE ORDER OF AGENDA**

Motion by Commissioner Gaddis, seconded by Commissioner Conroy, to approve the order of the agenda as presented.

The motion carried 6-0-1 by voice vote. Commissioner Boswell was absent.

**E. BLUE FOLDER ITEMS – ADDITIONAL BACK UP MATERIALS**

**E.1. RECEIVE AND FILE BLUE FOLDER ITEMS**

Chairperson Hazeltine reported there were some Blue Folder items in two different attachments.

Commissioner Lamb stated she is aware of the communications in the Blue Folder items and other communications that have been presented to members of the staff; stated this meeting is not a quasi-judicial meeting nor is the Commission reviewing a project; reported she had conferred with the City Attorney, and she will not be recusing herself from the meeting.

Motion by Commissioner Gaddis, seconded by Chair Hazeltine, to receive and file the Blue Folder Items.

The motion carried 7-0.

Commissioner Boswell joined the meeting at 6:32 PM.

## **F. CONSENT CALENDAR**

### **F.1. APPROVE THE AFFIDAVIT OF POSTING FOR THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 19, 2024**

Analyst Brown reported no one online and no one on Zoom.

Motion by Commissioner Gaddis, seconded by Commissioner Conroy, to approve the Consent Calendar.

Motion carried 7-0 by voice vote.

## **G. EXCLUDED CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS - None**

## **H. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS**

Lori Zarenski, 3221 Gibson Place, stated she was there to express her strong opposition for Beach Cities Health District's proposed use of Redondo Beach tax dollars on a horrible overdevelopment project; felt the project would be inconsistent and detrimental for the quality of life for the Redondo Beach residents due to the dust, contaminants, the threat of fuel storage and stress created by such a long-term project; pointed out that the project is not for the benefit of the Beach Cities residents; Googled the Beach Cities mission statement and highlighted that they speak of enhancing the community health of the Beach Cities' residents and to prevent health problems to optimize health and serve the community; listed integrity, ethics, problem solving and transparency and to comply with government codes; stated she does not feel this project follows their mission statement and their purpose in the Redondo Beach community.

Motion by Chairperson Craig, seconded by Commissioner Gaddis, to extend Lori Zarenski's time for an extra minute.

Motion carried 7-0 by voice vote.

Analyst Brown reported one e-attendee wanting to speak.

Mark Nelson, representing stopbchd.com, stated the following is a comment regarding a potential BCHD CUP and/or PCDR for the 100% privately-owned and operated PMB facility that's proposed for the public land on the prospect site; reported that, in 2022, they brought forward a draft CUP that has not been processed yet; in December 2020, his group provided comments to Council, Commission and BCHD on how the existing 312,000 foot facility had damaged property values of the surrounding residential area; stated the current damage estimate exceeds \$150 million in reduced value based on econometric models, and the proposed 793,000 sq ft Beach Cities facility will increase those damaged levels; also in December 2020, they provided an analysis of the properties zoned P-CF, complete with site photos, and stated that it is similar to what the Commission will see tonight; mentioned that analysis concluded that Beach Cities was inconsistent with all other P-CF facilities in height, square feet, and density; stated in December 2021, his group issued a "white paper" detailing the 80% to 95% non-resident usage of the proposed Beach Cities facility, 80% non-resident tenants and assisted living according to Beach Cities' MDS report and gave more details on the report; stated Beach Cities is ignoring that funding requirement and spending 74% of Alcove resources on less than 20% of the SPA 8 service area; spoke of it not being sustainable and in violation of the funding requirements; reported they are currently petitioning the state for enforcement of the socioeconomic and racial diversity requirements; stated the Beach Cities PACE facility will be 95% non-resident enrollees, according to the National PACE Association analysis; noted that based on unbiased surveys of LA County Health 2023, Beach Cities \$15 million annual spend does not result in improved health outcomes for district residents; mentioned they will provide all the documentation to support his statements in a separate communication.

Nancy Skiba, District 4 and Public Safety Commissioner, hoped that all Redondo Beach residents will support and vote for the Police and Fire Station renovation and rebuilding.

Analyst Brown reported no other e-attendees to speak.

## **H.1. RECEIVE AND FILE WRITTEN COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS**

Motion by Commissioner Gaddis, seconded by Commissioner Craig, to receive and file written comments on non-agenda items.

Motion carried 7-0 by voice vote.

## **I. EX PARTE COMMUNICATION**

Commissioner Lamb reported speaking with Planning Manager Sean Scully in regards to the DEIR, General Plan and Administrative Report questions and spoke to Commissioner

Hazeltine regarding meeting process, land use regulations, General Plan and the draft EIR; stated, for this meeting, she has received emails and phone calls from members of the public and the main concern is increasing density and intensity of land use throughout the City.

Chairperson Hazeltine reported speaking with Planning Manager Sean Scully, Commissioner Lamb, Mayor Light and the general public.

Commissioner Lamb added that she also spoke with Councilmember Nehrenheim.

Motion by Commissioner Gaddis, seconded by Commissioner Craig, to reopen or maintain open the public hearing.

Motion carried 7-0 by voice vote.

## **J. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

### **J.1. PUBLIC HEARING TO consider, discuss, receive public input and make recommendations to the City Council on updates to five (5) General Plan Elements (Land Use, Open Space & Conservation, Noise, and Safety), associated amendments to the City's Zoning Ordinances and Local Coastal Program, and certification of the Environmental Impact Report**

**CONTACT: SEAN SCULLY PLANNING MANAGER**

Planning Manager Scully reported this is their fourth meeting and third public hearing on the matter; announced that Mark Teague (principal from PlaceWorks) and Jennifer Kelley (the project manager) were in attendance on Zoom and Halley Grundy, also from PlaceWorks was there that evening, and Diana Varat (Outside Legal Counsel), via Zoom; provided a slide presentation that included:

- Announcements – Schedule Forward
  - o June 20, 2024 – Regular Meeting (Discussion Item)
  - o August 1, 2024 – Special Meeting (Public Hearing)
  - o August 15, 2024 – Regular Meeting (Public Hearing)
  - o September 19, 2024 – Regular Meeting (Public Hearing)
    - General Plan update
    - Zoning Ordinances
    - Local Coastal Program Amendments
    - Draft Program EIR
    - Required for consistency and to implement the Housing Element
  - o October 1, 15, and 29, 2024 – City Council Meetings (Public Hearings)
- Tonight's Focus

- Approve Resolution No. 2024-\*\*-PCR-\*\*\* - Listed recommendations for the Mayor and City Council
- Additional Considerations/Recommendations
  - Public Institutional Zone
  - Mixed-Use Zone
  - Draft Program Environmental EIR
- Housing Element – Driving Updates
  - Housing Sites
  - Housing Programs
- How HE Affects Zoning Ordinance Updates – Housing Programs
  - Highlighted Programs 8, 9, 10, and 13
  - Revisited Housing Sites
- Additional Considerations – PI Zone – seeking Commission recommendations
  - Floor Area Ratio (FAR)
  - School sites
  - AES Site and SCE Right-Of-Way (ROW)
- Additional Considerations – PI Zone – FAR
  - Updated GP proposes maintaining the 1.25 FAR at City Hall and the Annex, and place a .75 FAR cap on the remaining PI designations
  - Staff is asking the Planning Commission to decide on two options:
    - Maintain the FAR as currently proposed
    - Increase the FAR to 1.25 for all PI zones, or increase the FAR so that it is greater than .75, but still less than 1.25
  - Staff notes that the EIR and associated buildout methodology would need to be updated and recirculated for an increase of above .85 FAR.
  - Presented slides with some FAR examples to show the Commission what certain FARs would look like
  - Presented a slide with FAR analysis
    - City Facilities – average .48 FAR
    - School Facilities – average .26 FAR
    - Kensington/BCHD – average .71 FAR
  - Presented slide with School Sites information
    - 3 sites in question
    - The 3 sites are not factored into the open space calculations
    - Reverting the properties back to their original designation will have no effect on the EIR or GP policies
  - Presented slide on AES/SCE ROW
    - Existing GP includes a “P” designation for the AES and the SCE ROW
    - Proposed GP proposes to change these properties to a newly created Public Utility (PU) designation
    - Provided information since the PU designation was created changes have happened
      - Staff recommends maintaining the “P” designation

- Presented slide on Mixed Use
  - Both the GP and ZO give equal preference to commercial and residential
  - Commercial uses are important for maintaining an adequate job/housing balance
  - Staff recommends that PC recommends:
    - Minimum commercial floor area ratio be increased to .40
    - Minor modifications to the text of the ZO to place some importance of the commercial component in a mixed-use project
- Purpose of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)
- Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR)
- CEQA Process – provided a flow chart
- Notice of Availability (NOA)
- Issues Analyzed in EIR
- Focused Technical Studies
  - Air Quality
  - Cultural Resources
  - Greenhouse Gas Emissions
  - Noise
  - Transportation
  - Utilities
- Impacts – reviewed types of impacts

Community Development Director Wiener pointed out that the impacts category is being driven by the state and housing mandates.

- Opportunities for Public Comment
  - Final EIR – October 2024
  - Adoption Hearings
- Recommendation
  - 1) Open the public hearing, administer the oath, take testimony from staff, the public and other interested parties, and deliberate
  - 2) Approve Resolution No. 2024-\*\*-PCR-\*\*\*
  - 3) Make recommendations to the City Council concerning: PI and Mixed Use

Community Development Director Wiener reminded the Commission that tonight the Planning Commission is not being ask to approve the policy changes, but to vote on the resolutions staff has provided that will formalize the Commission's recommendation to City Council; noted it is a requirement under state law, that when a city makes changes to its General Plan, the Planning Commission must provide written comments or recommendations to the City Council, and that is why staff included resolutions as attachments.

Chairperson Hazeltine asked that any person who would like to speak that evening, to stand, and raise their right hand, so she could administer the Oath; asked Commissioner Lamb if she would like to ask her questions before inviting the public to speak.

Commissioner Lamb referenced the Greenhouse Gas Emissions, mentioned the relationship between the buildout as required by the HE, and the impact that has on the GHG emissions and asked if staff would mind explaining that to the residents and the Commission.

Planning Manager Scully pulled in the consultants from PlaceWorks to address these specific CEQA and EIR related questions.

Mark Teague, Managing Principal with PlaceWorks, stated some of the most significant drivers of greenhouse gases are vehicle emissions and the RHNA mandates a certain number of housing units within the city limits; reported in order to comply, an estimate of the traffic associated with that needs to be done and mentioned modeling software shows more people will drive than take transit so they always estimate that will be a significant and unavoidable impact; stated GHG reduction measures including vehicle miles travel reduction measures are usually a list of things that may or may not apply to a project; noted that they can not speculate so they have to estimate the potential for reduction.

Commissioner Lamb wanted to clarify that at the end of the studied period, the GHG emissions will be lower than they are now, but they won't meet the standard of the state's goals.

Mark Teague stated that was correct.

Commissioner Lamb asked if the higher intensity allows for greater population which increases the GHG.

Mark Teague responded that it is not that simple; stated higher density implies people will be able to walk places, that commerce and jobs will be closer to where they live and that they would use transit to get to places but it is not fair to say that increased density leads to more GHG at a significant level; stated that depending on the design, the better density, and the more compact urban form you have, can lead to reductions in GHG.

Commissioner Lamb stated that according to this document, and the circumstances in the South Bay, PlaceWorks is showing the greater intensity creates a condition where there is more GHG created and that at the end of the studied period Redondo Beach will not meet the state's targets and because of that the City is required to come up with some mitigation efforts that are currently not in place.

Mark Teague stated that is correct, CEQA requires the City to look at all feasible mitigation; noted that many agencies adopt a climate action and adaptation plan; explained that lists the type of mitigation that might be included and stated that is a study the City would then adopt.

Commissioner Craig referenced land use maps and stated they have found several properties belonging to the School District that should have been classified differently and asked a question about the Alta Vista property and the section that was not classified as Open Space since it is under the control of the School District.

Planning Manager Scully stated that he did not believe it is the tennis courts or the clubhouse as Commissioner Craig mentioned, and noted that it is City property and will remain with an Open Space designation; mentioned the area that they are referring to at Alta Vista is actually to the east of the Cul de sac that goes into the school.

More discussion followed regarding the area in question.

Commissioner Craig mentioned that the City is doing a DEIR, which is a seven-week period, and asked if that would prevent the City from getting their whole Housing Element approved in time.

Community Development Director Wiener stated that the Housing Element is approved and certified; noted that what they are proposing now are amendments to the Land Use element and zoning ordinance to effectuate it; reported that what staff is presenting to the Council is an option to bifurcate the project and move forward with the housing components and certification of the full EIR; noted, then, they could spend more time on the remaining balance of the General Plan issues such as the PI FAR and any other items that come up during the review; reported the City is on a tight schedule with the housing requirements and, at a minimum, would like to have that adopted by the end of October beginning of November.

Commissioner Light asked about the FAR going to a .4.

Planning Manager Scully addressed it stating the mixed-use zoning regulation development standards required a minimum of .3 and the initial proposal has been to gain more balance and up the commercial minimum to .35 and then they went to .4.

More discussion followed regarding the mixed-use availability, the AACAP and the commercial areas and ideas to make the commercial use more attractive and restoring balance to the area.

Community Development Director Wiener added that the City is trying to create overlay zones that turn commercial and industrial into residential so there is some anticipated loss of that use in other parts of the City; stated that is why the City is reconsidering this



and looking to restore that balance; noted it does not limit the amount of residential but it does require a certain amount of commercial.

Commissioner Lamb asked if the ratio would change but the FAR would remain the same and if so, does that mean the ratios would reverse.

Community Development Director Wiener stated it is not reversing the ratio; noted currently, as proposed, the ratio with the original proposal would be 65% residential and 35% commercial and they are now proposing a shift of 40% commercial and 60% residential; mentioned that the proposal also includes more language that emphasizes that commercial component; stated that it has been reported to staff that they have had projects where the commercial aspect of these mixed-use buildings were more of an afterthought so they are trying to show that the commercial is just as important as the residential side.

Commissioner Lamb asked if the ROI is greater in the residential for the developer than the commercial aspect.

Planning Manager Scully said it appears that way, but he can't really speak on it.

More discussion followed.

Commissioner Conroy referenced the 60/40 split and asked if that is a guideline or is there a range on it and how it will be enforced.

Planning Manager Scully stated it will be enforced through the development review process and stated they do have hard numbers; explained the projects that come in must comply or they will not approve it.

More discussion followed.

Commissioner Gaddis referenced page 317 of the agenda packet and focused on the proposed zoning areas of change of South Redondo and asked if staff could explain the changes colored in red.

Planning Manager Scully explained they are existing shopping centers, and the proposal is recognizing the shopping centers and allowing for more intensity and a change in the FAR.

Commissioner Gaddis asked for more explanation and thought for the change in the FAR.

Halley Grundy stated the current FAR on C2 is 0.5 and the proposed FAR on the C4 is 1.0.

More discussion followed on the other portions in red and Halley Grundy stated that the sites in red are going from a C2 to a C4.

Commissioner Gaddis asked when these decisions occurred since he couldn't recall ever discussing them.

Halley Grundy stated it was discussed during GPAC and other Council meetings.

More discussion followed.

Commissioner Gaddis asked about the pink areas.

Planning Manager Scully stated they are residential and currently RH; answered Commissioner Gaddis' question and stated they would become commercial C2.

Commissioner Lamb asked what the height limit is on the C4.

Planning Manager Scully stated it would be two-story and 30 feet.

More discussion followed regarding the AACAP and the development plans, and regarding changes the new amendments would have on legal non-conforming property.

Commissioner Gaddis asked during GPAC if the parcels on the northern part of PCH were to be doubled in intensity on those parcels or was it there was a general leaning towards more commercial on this outside of GPAC proceedings.

Planning Manager Scully stated the latter.

Halley Grundy mentioned the original GPAC recommended land use plan went to Council and Council made some changes to the definitions for the commercial uses and stated there was a little bit of interpretation after Council chose not to accept all of the GPAC recommended definitions for commercial uses; stated the changes were based on Council direction.

Commissioner Gaddis asked if they have the option, in their recommendations tonight to the Council, to say that doubling the intensity of those lots is probably not desirable.

Planning Manager Scully stated they could.

Community Development Director Wiener informed the Commission that they are not limited to the recommendations that staff have provided; stated if they recommend any new ones at this meeting staff will carry those forward to City Council.

Commissioner Conroy asked staff if the updated General Plan accounts for long-term water supply needs given the City's anticipated population growth and are there any specific infrastructure projects planned to support sustainable water management.

Planning Manager Scully stated the Water District and water purveyors were consulted in the analysis through the EIR; asked Mark Teague, PlaceWorks, to respond to the questions.

Mark Teague confirmed that the Water District was consulted given the growth numbers that are anticipated; stated that the Water District assured them that they will work with them to ensure water use is efficient; pointed out the more compact urban form you have the less water is used and provisions of the state coming down from building code for water efficient units has reduced that; stated that any projects over a certain size have to do a water supply assessment with the District to look at long-term water use and demand based on multiple years of drought and any ordinances and provisions in place to ensure the water is used effectively; noted that it is a population estimate and an industry estimate that is based on a project level situation and the Water District itself develops its own Water Master Plans consistent with their state directive; stated so there is nothing specific through any of the plans just basically the district will figure it out during the process.

More discussion followed.

Linda Zelik stated she and friends are vehemently opposed to Beach Cities Board's overbuilding proposal; provided some reasons why: it only serves 5-10% of Beach Cities' residents it is supposed to serve, it is inconsistent with the surrounding residential neighborhood, the existing hospital structures are 52 feet or less and BC wants to double that, they want to increase the FAR from .75 to 1.25, it is detrimental to the health and safety of residents and school children in six nearby schools, the noise, the traffic, and the hazardous materials involved with the construction will impact them for many, many years to come; asked if anyone has fact checked the earthquake retrofit costs vs the tear down and rebuild that BC talks about; and wondered why BCHD's board is so hellbent on this unnecessary, unpopular, overbuilding and suggested the City should follow the money.

Tom Bakaly, CEO of BCHD, mentioned he was involved in the General Plan early on and commended everyone for the work they have done; expressed concern about a non-uniform FAR for public institutional use and stated his major concern is that it is not uniform; stated there is no FAR for public institutional use at this time, so to treat one entity differently than others causes them legal concerns; spoke of there being no actual debate over FAR during GPAC except for some members expressing some concerns and support of BCHD's position as well as written comments, including GPAC and current Mayor about concerns for the tack that is currently being taken; suggested that the City not plan out of fear tonight and stated BCHD has completed an EIR and it had no significant permanent impacts and was certified and unchallenged; mentioned

compatibility is subjective and can be discussed; urged the Commission to keep a FAR of 1.25 for public institutional use.

Community Development Director Wiener asked Chairperson Hazeltine if he could make a comment; stated he was reminded by the City Attorney to make a statement to the audience to remind them that the purpose of tonight's hearing is about the General Plan update and the policy document the City is working on and not on BCHD.

Laura Duke, District 3, mentioned that BCHD's plan is part of the GP so she will be speaking about it; spoke about the increase in public zones' FAR from .75 to 1.25 and one of the major motivators for her is BCHD's Healthy Living Campus plan; described the area she moved into as mellow and a block from a public zoned property with some medical offices, gym and a senior care facility and spoke of attending some of the gym classes BC offers; stated that now BCHD wants to build outside of the intent of what the property is zoned for, which is public community facility; stated a huge bulked-out series of developments, especially private not public ones, should not go on this site and said it matters because it will affect the neighborhood's property values and will affect the current population living near it who never anticipated they would live near a development of the size BCHD is proposing.

Motion by Boswell, seconded by Commissioner Lamb, to extend Laura Duke's time for an additional minute.

Motion carried

Laura Duke continued to list reasons why the BCHD's development, no matter what they offer will be enough to offset the challenges the overdevelopment would bring to the area; stated the area in question is a special public zone and should not have its FAR increased to 1.25.

Monica Suua, CFO for BCHD, stated she would like to do everything she can for the financial sustainability so the BCHD can provide critically needed health services into the future; felt that anyone working in the public field needs to have a responsibility for public health and stated BCHD is asking the group to consider the recommendation to increase the FAR to the 1.25 like every other public entity; gave some background on the history of BCHD and stated people from all over come to use the hospital and it is not only for the surrounding residents; stated the facility is outdated and not seismically sound and it too costly to operate and said retrofitting is not a feasible option; pointed out that the services are provided in Redondo Beach but it is used by many others outside the district; mentioned that if they do not adapt to the changing times they will not be able to provide services needed.

Motion by Commissioner Boswell, seconded by Commissioner Lamb, to extend Monica Suua's time by one minute.

Motion carried by voice vote.

Monica Suua continued and mentioned she wanted to address some of the comments from the last meeting; spoke BCHD's unique ability to partner with private entities in order to generate income so the community can benefit from free services offered by the City; stated they are listening to feedback and reduced the amount of units and are providing two acres of open space and moving the building site away from Torrance; reiterated the comment made by Tom Bakaly, that it is an unchallenged certified EIR with no material impact.

Holly Osborne, District 5, spoke of attending several GPAC meetings; stated she is very interested in park ratios and the Metro; spoke about the County doing all the ratios and Redondo Beach is listed at 1.37 acres per 1,000 population as their park ratio with 92 acres; remembered that parks used to be where people played; spoke about how open space has now become more than just areas to play and explained its environmental considerations; noted that the City has Aviation Park at 14 acres and the County has it at 2.9 and wanted to know the difference between open space and park space and also wanted to make sure that Redondo Beach is being fairly compared to other cities.

Tom Bauer, District 1, stated he owns a mixed-use, legal, non-conforming property in a C2 zoning district on PCH; mentioned that staff said if the property burns down or is 100% destroyed or 50% destroyed you can build it back to what it was and stated that is not what the zoning says; reported the zoning says if the property is over 50% destroyed, the owner would need to put something on the property that is zoned C2, which is completely commercial; stated that is a huge issue for anybody down there because it affects financing, insurance, and increases risk so it is really hard on the building owners; asked the Commission to put as a recommendation to put in a grandfather-clause to allow the rebuild of what is currently there; mentioned the idea of going from .3 to .4 commercial in a mixed-use zone, and stated the issue there is you might get a vacant commercial building in front of residential and suggested to have some flexibility since commercial leasing is tough these days.

Discussion followed that the City has already added a grandfather-clause on mixed-use commercial buildings and whether that is reversed if residential units are more than 50% destroyed.

Community Development Director Wiener stated that currently the non-conforming section of the City's code does allow for the replacement of residential if destroyed but they did add a provision to the proposed zoning ordinance that states non-conforming commercial uses in areas designated as residential in the General Plan which are totally or partially destroyed may be reestablished to the original use; stated that adds some protection for legal nonconforming commercial uses.

Community Development Director Wiener stated that tonight, they are doing a broad overview of the General Plan update zoning ordinance amendment; noted at the last Planning Commission meeting they got into the details of the zoning ordinance and touched on some of those different amendments.

Discussion followed that what Tom Bauer asked for the Commission to recommend was already recently added.

Mary Ewell, District 2, spoke about the EIR that Tom Bakaly mentioned was approved by their Board so it would not be the objective EIR that the City should be accepting; mentioned there are a number of items she would like to see stopped such as BCHD's 793,000 sq ft facility, their use of private developers to use the City's PI land and then charge residents high rates, BCHD's plan for 100% privately owned, 80% district non-resident assisted living facility on the City's PI land, BCHD's 74% wealthy, white, City use of Alcove Mental Health Services when BCHD is obligated to service a 91% non-residential service area by contrast, which is their commitment to the service area and mentioned their spending needs to be questioned; noted that BCHD spends \$2.4 million annually on executive pay and stated it is in part from public funding; hoped the City would hold BCHD to the .75 FAR.

Motion by Chairperson Hazeltine, seconded by Commissioner Conroy, to extend Mary Ewell's time for another minute.

Motion carried by voice vote.

Mary Ewell wanted to make a special appeal for the commercial areas that are being given some preference on PCH because the new generation of parents that grew up in Redondo Beach can not afford housing in Redondo Beach; stated she can't understand why the City is favoring commercial use even in the small corridors where residential housing is needed; asked the City to look at their priorities.

Bob Pinzler wanted to congratulate his colleagues on the GPAC for producing a 400 plus page document; spoke of selective memory and selective forgetting and that if people did not read the document and missed something it is not the GPAC's fault; stated that not everything in the document was discussed but that everyone involved in the recommendations should have read all of it, including those who had some other relationships with one of the complaining parties; recommended that the Commission should approve the GPAC recommendation and approve the General Plan as it is presented now; spoke of all the work and compromises that were made.

Georgette Gantner asked that people try to have a visual concept of what Beach Cities is proposing; noted that BCHD has 10.5 and 11 acres and the building they are tearing down is 157,000 sq ft; spoke more of the BCHD proposed plan and mentioned maybe there

could be a compromise of 1.0 for the FAR; mentioned public art is her passion and asked if Artesia is a mixed-use commercial corridor.

Chairperson Hazeltine stated that the Artesia/Aviation zoning is on the General Plan on the website.

Mark Nelson (via Zoom) agreed with the CFO for BCHD that the purpose is not just for residents but stated, unfortunately, the district told the Superior Court that is was for the residents who reside in the district; noted if the benefits flow out to non-residents and the damages are all done in Redondo Beach there is no real reason to assume there is any net benefit; reported that LA County did a survey in 2023 of health outcomes and found that Beach Cities had no health outcomes that were any better than other top 50 income LA County cities; stated that the CEO of BCHD's statement regarding the EIR has no bearing on City ordinances, policies, or General Plan; stated that financial need is not a reason to expand the FAR; noted that BCHD also proposed a 1.95 FAR for their Healthy Living Campus.

Motion by Commissioner Conroy, seconded by Commissioner Lamb, to extend Mark Hansen's time.

Motion carried 7-0 by voice vote.

Mark Nelson continued saying that absent the Planning Commission and City Council actually putting some rails around this, Beach Cities wants to go way beyond anything they can imagine; noted that BCHD had a \$200,000 paid consultant as the Chair of GPAC; agreed with Mr. Pinzler; reported that BCHD had to provide emergency services due to funding they accepted from Bill Burton which required the hospital to offer it.

Ann Wilson stated she supports the .75 for institutional land; spoke of the Planning Commission having the onus to ensure responsible development and this can be the blueprint for the City for the next 30 years; mentioned that most of the activities BCHD offers do not need an increased FAR; stated the only need in BCHD's master plan that would require an increased FAR would be for the supersized, 100% privately owned, RCFE structure; reported that they would turn over about 3 acres of public land to private developers for 95 years; mentioned this structure was never tried to meet the municipal codes or design codes for compatibility, mass, or scale; went on to say their pre-CUP application to the City not only did not pass it flunked; stated they not only want to increase density for their project but now they have pushed for a high density FAR of 1.25 for all 20 plus parcels of public land; noted that if the City allows this to happen, imagine a future Redondo Beach stripped of its beach town character where rare public land in open space is now supersized.

Motion by Commissioner Boswell, seconded by Commissioner Craig, to extend Ann Wilson for an additional minute.

Motion carried 7-0 by voice vote.

Ann Wilson asked why the Planning Commission would want to open Pandora's box; stated public land is rare and should be left for the public.

Analyst Brown reported no one on Zoom and no eComments.

Commissioner Conroy spoke about PI zone and asked what the definition of "community" is for a healthcare facility.

Planning Manager Scully responded saying the City does not have a definition for "community".

Commissioner Conroy thought he heard someone from the public say that the City's PI FAR is not consistent but thought what the City presented was that in no case the PI FAR is over .71.

Planning Manger Scully stated as far as current City facilities that is correct.

More discussion followed.

Commissioner Craig asked for clarification, prior to this new process, whether the City had a requirement for PI before.

Planning Manager Scully said that is correct and it was the P designation, which was named Public or Institutional; noted that the General Plan did not specify an FAR.

More discussion followed regarding the state's requirements.

Commissioner Lamb felt it is important that they take a look at the General Plan vision statement and guiding principles; noted they have been approved by the City Council and there were multiple opportunities for residents to speak; read the framework and guiding principles of the General Plan; stated it is the Planning Commission and City Council's duty to follow the General Plan; spoke of the blueprint that the residents want for their future and again read from the General Plan what the intention should be; referenced what a speaker that night said about having adequate housing for the City's middle and lower income individuals and that would also mean to preserve the historical aspect of the City.

Commissioner Gaddis wondered if the list of inconsistencies that Planning Manager Scully mentioned should be brought forward before they close the public hearing so whatever the Commission adopts would be corrections to those.



Planning Manager Scully said it is probably better after they close the public hearing and begin their deliberations.

Community Development Director added that it is only the public that cannot ask questions after the public hearing is closed but the Commission can ask staff questions during that time.

Commissioner Conroy asked Director Wiener to clarify the C2 designation that was brought up earlier; asked how is it written to protect the owner of a mixed-use property to be able to rebuild residential if needed.

Community Development Director Wiener stated currently the non-conforming section in the City's code addresses single-family and multi-family and provides that allowance to replace if destroyed.

Commissioner Conroy asked if there would be any downside to adding "mixed-use" to the description.

Community Development Director Wiener opined there would not be any downside and might help with clarity of use and felt it would be a good idea.

Commissioner Gaddis interjected that he sees a downside to it; felt "mixed-use" involves different levels of commercial and residential use, whereas if you protect them individually then they get replaced but mixed-use is amorphous in terms of definition; explained that the percentages can be flipped around and have more commercial instead of residential; and stated it is already covered in the current language.

Commissioner Conroy suggested language to make it more specific.

Community Development Director Wiener stated the existing zoning code, along with the proposed, provides the allowance for the replacement of residential and commercial, so he felt that would cover a mixed-use project; stated, if they wanted to be more specific, the City can add another category of mixed-use and provide the identical language to that as well; felt either way a mixed-use project would be covered but could see the confusion in interpretation as it is currently written.

Chairperson Hazeltine did not want to get into a piecemeal conversation and felt the Commission had decided that they want PCH from north to south to have a plan; felt they need to be very careful about taking something out like that and adding mixed-use.

Commissioner Conroy stated he is not suggesting to change the zoning to mixed use, he is saying that the City allows current residential on these lots zoned C2 and they could rebuild it as residential; noted that a lot of people that own residential own it as a part of a mixed-use improvement and he wanted to afford them the same protection; felt as it is

currently written it is for 100% commercial or 100% residential and wanted to cover the mixed-use.

More discussion followed on the use of the term, the definition of it, and whether there needs to be more clarification from what is already written.

Community Development Director Wiener felt the intent overall, with the changing of zoning over time, is that the City wants to see commercial in that zone but there is protection for owners for their existing non-conforming use.

Commissioner Craig asked to share 1B and mentioned threats of legal action if they do what they are recommending or not do what they are recommending in their plan; referred to an attorney that came to a prior meeting that threatened to sue the City if they recommend for a FAR stating they are discriminating against all types of things; pulled up an article on a recent post from The Marin Post about “spot zoning” and if it is illegal; said the article states the California Court of Appeals clarified that it is not as long as it is for the public interest; wanted to know if the article is correct in saying that “spot zoning” is perfectly legal whether or not a particular incident is permissible depends on the facts and circumstances.

Community Development Director Wiener said yes, that is correct and evidence supporting that finding is needed.

Chairperson Hazeltine asked if any other members of the public would like to speak.

Motion by Commissioner Gaddis, seconded by Commissioner Craig, to close the public hearing.

Motion carried 7-0 by voice vote.

## **J. ITEMS CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS AGENDAS**

Chairperson Hazeltine thanked staff for all their work on the FAR comparison and the charts; mentioned it is also terrifying and asked if all the properties in the report would go from their existing square footage and then go to a .75 is really huge and referenced pages 110-113; referenced the Kensington property as an example and spoke about the square footage being about 46,000 and, if it went to the new FAR, the size of the building would more than double; mentioned the current Legado project and stated it is massive and very dense and with the new FAR would be even larger but also said the Legado Hotel would decrease; spoke about the Montecito and that it would have been cut in half given the new FAR; recommended to the Planning Commission that they increase the FAR to .50 and not .75 based on the amazing work the City did for them; stated that she doesn't really know where the .75 came from and after listening to Commissioner Lamb and thinking about what happened in the 70's regarding the apartments or condo

buildings on the Esplanade and mentioned how out of scale it is from the surrounding area; mentioned that people have asked how that happened and felt they are at the same crossroad where they can okay .75 and 20 years down the line the residents will ask how that happened; felt it was important and hoped the rest of the Planning Commission would support her in asking City Council to consider a .50 FAR vs .75 FAR.

Commissioner Light asked where the .75 came from if not from the GPAC.

Planning Manager Scully stated it came from City Council's recommendation.

More discussion followed.

Chairperson Hazeltine said that, now that staff has given them something to look at, it does not make sense to allow these buildings in their City because they don't fit; noted the .75 will change what public land will look like forever and again referenced past mistakes the City has made; felt strongly about how it will affect the children of the community.

Commissioner Craig said it was May 18, 2021, around the 5-hour, 22-minute mark where the .75 FAR was mentioned.

More discussion followed regarding the chart and the changes that would happen if a .75 FAR were to be approved.

Community Development Director Wiener mentioned the spot zoning concern that was raised does not apply to only one property, it does not only apply to Beach Cities Health but it would apply to all the PI zone properties; noted that the 1.25 proposed is only for City Hall and the Annex is because that is what has been historically in the City's zoning ordinance.

Commissioner Lamb asked if the proposal is to keep the Civic Center and the Annex at the proposed 1.25 and instead of the .75 for the other parcels that are PI to have them at .50 or is there something else.

Chairperson Hazeltine asked how the Commission feels about the areas that front PCH and City Hall to be at the 1.25.

Commissioner Lamb felt comfortable with the 1.25 for City Hall.

More discussion followed regarding the 1.25 for the Annex, and that currently the area between Vincent and PCH is at 1.37.

Commissioner Craig pointed out that it is at 1.37 but the City is using it for office space now and asked if the School District decided to put condos there wouldn't they have to go to a Measure DD vote and the public would have to vote on it.

Discussion followed on there being an incorrect calculation on the chart.

Planning Manager Scully stated it got confusing on the sites because they had to rely on assessment parcel data and noted, on public property, they won't provide square footage so the City had to do aerial calculations and attempted to assess different floors.

Commissioner Light mentioned that Beach Cities is at .77 now and is concerned if they went to .50, they could not rebuild what they have there now; worried that is puts them at legal risk.

Commissioner Gaddis asked staff if the existing buildings are somehow grandfathered.

Community Development Director Wiener stated they went over that earlier in the meeting when they discussed non-conforming; noted there is a safety net with these projects that requires a discretionary review process and would rely on decisions by the City and Planning Commission; stated zoning codes can add some additional limits even below what is in the General Plan to an extent.

Commissioner Conroy reported he did a quick calculation of the current FAR for the Annex and that if the square footage is right on the building it would be .16.

Commissioner Craig asked to have his screen shared again and wanted to show the difference of what the Kensington building would look like at 1.25; then showed a property called Heritage Point on surplus school land which is at 1.23 and showed how large the property is and stated that is what the City would have if they did not have Measure DD; mentioned that is what they are trying to prevent from happening.

Chairperson Hazeltine noted that the Kensington building at two-stories fits into the neighborhood but if it went up in size that would be the beginning of bigger buildings; spoke about the AACAP and how they need to approach that project.

Commissioner Gaddis recommended striking out the change to double the intensity from a FAR of .5 to 1.0 on the northern part of PCH and stated that the intersection of Herondo and PCH is already bottlenecked and increasing the intensity would make it much worse.

Chairperson Hazeltine stated a conversation regarding what the City and residents want PCH to look like needs to happen and piecemealing it will not have a good outcome.

More discussion followed regarding the intensity and density of the area.

Chairperson Hazeltine took a straw poll on Commissioner Gaddis' recommendation to strike out the change to double the intensity of the FAR from .5 to 1.0.

Commissioner Lamb said Yes.

Commissioner Conroy said No, he is open to some change.

Commissioner Gaddis said Yes,

Chairperson Hazeltine said she is a Yes.

Commissioner Craig stated he is 50/50 and Chair Hazeltine said she will come back to him.

Commissioner Boswell did not like the straw poll and questioned what it is that they are voting on.

It was clarified that the City Council and staff came up with 1.0 and that the Commission is only recommending that they not make this change.

More discussion followed and more questions arose regarding where the numbers came from.

Community Development Director Wiener stated he was not at the GPAC meetings or at the origin of the plan; noted there is a directive in the General Plan to focus on PCH and to create a plan for that; suggested the Commission recommend to the City Council that they take a closer look at the FAR for PCH and don't make any changes right now.

Discussion followed regarding Director Wiener's suggestion, and more clarification on the motion they were proposing and the straw poll.

Commissioner Lamb asked if their intent is that the Commission wants to revert back to their existing FAR with the caveat that the Council, as they move forward, develop a comprehensive plan and then the FAR can be reconsidered.

Commissioner Conroy said originally, they were considering increasing it by 100% and Chair Hazeltine said no, we should reduce it to only 0% and explained why he said no and asked if they have shifted from that.

Commissioner Gaddis spoke about PCH being very congested and all of a sudden the General Plan, which the Commission is submitting to Council with their recommendations, has a FAR and they are not sure where the number came from and felt it is a really bad idea; stated somehow there is a recommendation that doubles the density for all of PCH and felt that needs to be taken out.

Commissioner Conroy voiced that he did not want their recommendation to Council to be zero change.

Community Development Director Wiener stated that another thing to consider is the City can still certify the EIR at the one FAR and still have the ability to go up between the range of .50 to 1.0 at some point down the road and the City can study the plan more and develop a plan for PCH.

More discussion ensued.

Chairperson Hazeltine asked if they could have the straw poll on her recommendation that the Commission not increase the PI FAR to .75 but instead to .50.

Commissioner Lamb asked staff what are the problems that they see with doing that.

Planning Manager Scully stated that there are a couple of fire station sites or at least one that exceeds a .50 that would then be legal non-conforming so there's that issue and they would want to look at what the potential impact would be on the PI properties; wondered if they would then become legal non-conforming.

Commissioner Gaddis stated if they came up with a fire station that was .75 and asked if they could get a conditional use type of exception that the Planning Commission and Council could approve.

Planning Manager Scully stated they would have to do a General Plan amendment to change the designation.

Community Development Director corrected Planning Manager Scully that they were discussing maintaining the C4.

Planning Manager Scully stated he didn't realize they moved onto the PI site; asked if the Planning Commission was planning to recommend to keep the 1.25 at City Hall and the Annex and .5 everywhere else.

Commissioner Craig mentioned that the Grant Avenue fire station is under .5 and, due to the bond measure, they need to put four bays there; felt for the Annex, they can consider 1.25 and the fire station would be the only other properties impacted by this and they can be under the same category as City Hall and the Annex.

Chairperson Hazeltine asked if they could say Fire could be .75 or would that cause a problem.

Community Development Director Wiener said, at this point, staff doesn't have enough information on the FAR for public institutional; suggested the Commission could simply recommend that the Council reconsider what the FAR is; stated that earlier in the meeting he said he anticipated that this is going to be bifurcated, where the housing will move forward and some of the outstanding items are going to be given more analysis; felt the

.5 is a bit arbitrary and the City doesn't know what the consequences will be for the PI sites and the future services for the community.

Commissioner Light agreed with Director Wiener and said it would make more sense to give a recommendation that the .75 needs to be reexamined.

Commissioner Lamb stated that having the document staff provided with all the square footage and the build-out square footage per parcel is a big advantage; went on to comment on the draft EIR the legal expectation is that if you set a FAR they will go to the FAR.

Planning Manager Scully stated not necessarily with the PI land use and said it is a different animal in terms of build-out methodology and analysis; noted it is a service driven land use and not a market driven one and gave examples to support his comment.

Commissioner Lamb mentioned that school districts have surplus land that moves into the market forces and asked if they can talk about properties that are exclusively for service to the community vs PI property that has marketability.

Community Development Director Wiener stated the zoning ordinance could have a standard that reverts to what normal standard would be in a residential district, so they wouldn't have to treat all properties equally in terms of the development standards.

More discussion followed regarding schools, surplus land, and the leasing of that land for 99 years; went over the list of school properties in the report and the current FARs.

Commissioner Lamb referred to the General Plan and the intent of the community and voiced her concern over the size of some of the properties doubling or tripling in size; spoke of the City having the ability to align itself with the General Plan and the wishes of the residents but at the same time, be able to have the service properties adequate for their use.

Commissioner Craig asked to share his screen again; showed a spreadsheet of the fire stations and stated they should consider treating them like City Hall and the Annex in terms of allowing them to be renovated and updated as needed.

More discussion followed regarding the Fire Stations and that no plans have been drawn yet, but that they should tie in the Fire Stations with City Hall and the Annex so it gives them some flexibility.

Commissioner Lamb brought up Director Wiener's statement about a bifurcation of the approval process and asked how exactly it would be split up in terms of the specific documents.

Community Development Director Wiener stated it is pretty straightforward with the zoning ordinance, since it connects directly to the housing element and then for the housing programs, they will have to put those aside in a separate document and Council can approve it; wanted to point out in this discussion on the PI zones and the public service uses it is important to note that with the school district the City is actually preempted by state law from imposing a FAR cap on their site if it impedes their ability to deliver their services.

More discussion followed regarding the surplus sites on school property, the fact that the Annex is surplus property owned by the school district and it has a 1.25 FAR, noted that in order to have a surplus site it has to be certified by the state, and that these sites are taken from the children and the sites don't actually make that much money to benefit the community.

Commissioner Craig pointed out that once the surplus property is recategorized as surplus, it does not fall under school property and is no longer being used for educational purposes so the City could impose a .50 FAR on the property.

Commissioner Lamb asked how the City codifies it into the document.

Community Development Director Wiener asked the Commission if they want to recommend a FAR for these properties or would the Commission prefer to recommend that they have concerns.

Discussion ensued and they said they wanted to make it clear that .75 is arbitrary and too dense and they feel the only way to do that is to send back another arbitrary number.

Planning Manager Scully stated he has the general motion the Commission made initially, and if they would like to work from it; read the motion as: "Chair Hazeltine's recommendation is to maintain the proposed 1.25 for the City Hall property and the Annex and include the two fire stations in the City and a .50 FAR for all other public institutional properties."

Commissioner Lamb interjected that this would be the default FAR in the event that they have it certified as "surplus".

Planning Manager Scully clarified that if school property was surplus, and turned over, that subsequent development would be subject to local control.

Commissioner Conroy wondered why the PI class has two categories: Public Services and Park and School.



Community Development Director Wiener suggested that the City can distinguish the classification of properties and better define them in the General Plan and they all don't have to be under the umbrella of a single PI designation.

Commissioner Lamb pointed out that the Health District also uses surplus land and that is where they want to put the RCFE.

Commissioner Conroy brought up that the birth rates are normally cyclical, so they know the overall population of the City is increasing.

Chairperson Hazeltine interjected that she agrees with him but that is not what the school district agrees to and they say it is decreasing.

More discussion followed.

Commissioner Boswell said that his neighborhood is filled with young families with school age kids and stated the school district has been selling off surplus land for a long time, out of greed, and should be stopped; stated limiting their FAR to stop them from using it for market forces would help stop the practice.

More discussion followed regarding what properties fall under the definition of public services and if their changes would affect the EIR.

Mark Teague, PlaceWorks, stated no, it would not affect it and they would take care of it in the final EIR.

Chairperson Hazeltine took a straw poll on the recommendation by the Planning Commission to maintain the proposed 1.25 for City Hall, the Annex, the fire stations and police stations in the City and a .50 FAR for all other public institutional properties.

Motion carried 7-0 by voice vote.

Chairperson Hazeltine asked the Planning Manager to fix a typo in IM LU-44, and a typo in IM LU-45.

Planning Manager Scully mentioned a previous motion made earlier and asked if that was carried; read, "motion to make a change to maintain .50 for the C4 along PCH with a recommendation to develop a comprehensive plan."; pointed out they have a mixed-use change from .35 to .40 and wanted to know if everyone was in agreement on those changes as well.

Chairperson Hazeltine took a straw poll on that motion.

Motion carried 7-0 with the straw poll.

Planning Manager Scully went over a few more typos that needed to be corrected, including the changes on the AES site, and the school sites being changed to PI.

The Commission agreed to the changes.

Commissioner Lamb asked if they are referencing that they do not have authority over the school district land and they are only asking to change the surplus property in their recommendation to Council.

Planning Manager Scully stated he will add language in the recommendation to incorporate that.

Commissioner Lamb referred to an abridged statement and read from it, "Commission recommends that the City Council in the exercise of its independent judgement and pursuant CEQA, certify the final program Environmental Impact Report inclusive of its referenced appendices for the Redondo Beach focus General Plan update and zoning ordinance update and local coastal program amendment and approve the appropriate environmental findings, a statement of overriding consideration, and a mitigation monitoring and reporting program; and asked if that was sufficient for Resolution No. 2024-PCR.

Planning Manager Scully offered to bring up the slide with the recommendation.

The recommendation slide was put on the screen.

Motion by Commissioner Lamb, seconded by Commissioner Gaddis, to approve Resolution No. 2024-\*\*-PCR-\*\*\* recommending that the City Council:

- Certify the Final Program Environmental Impact Report for the Redondo Beach Focused General Plan Update, Zoning Ordinance Update, and Local Coastal Program Amendment
- Adopt a General Plan Amendment to update the City's Land Use, Open Space and Conservation, Noise, and Safety Elements "Exhibit A", with proposed changes/edits attached as "Exhibit B"
- Adopt amendments to the Redondo Beach Municipal Code, Title 10 Planning and Zoning, Chapter 1 Subdivisions attached as "Exhibit C"
- Adopt amendments to the Redondo Beach Municipal Code, Title 10 Planning and Zoning, Chapter 2 Zoning and Land Use attached as "Exhibit D"
- Adopt amendments to the Redondo Beach Municipal Code, Title 10 Planning and Zoning, Chapter 5 Coastal Land Use Plan Implementing Ordinance attached as "Exhibit E"
- Adopt amendments to the City of Redondo Beach's Coastal Land Use Plan of the Local Coastal Program attached as "Exhibit F"

Diana Varat, Outside Special Counsel, interjected at this point to say they can do that subject to the changes proposed by the Planning Commission this evening, as described to Planning Manager Scully and that would be the end of the motion.

Commissioner Lamb continued the motion:

Make recommendations to the City Council subject to the changes made by the Planning Commission communicated to Planning Manager Scully.

**ROLL CALL:**

**AYES:** Light, Boswell, Craig, Gaddis, Conroy, Lamb, Chairperson Hazeltine

**NOES** None

**ABSTAIN:** None

**ABSENT:** None

Motion carried 7-0 by roll call vote.

**L. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION PRIOR TO ACTION - None**

**M. ITEMS FROM STAFF**

Community Development Director Wiener stated a while back the City undertook an organizational assessment of the Community Development Department and he received the results and developed an action plan to help implement some of the recommendations from that assessment; reported he will be presenting that to the City Council in November and will share that staff report and action plan with the Planning Commission as they lead up to that meeting; gave some highlights that the report will have in it.

Commissioner Lamb mentioned in 2017 she had a conversation with Planning Manager Scully in his office, and they discussed how wonderful it would be to use technology.

Commissioner Craig wanted to acknowledge former Mayor Bill Brand's birthday tonight.

Chairperson Hazeltine stated they need to recommend a new Chair and wanted to recommend the Commission to go back to taking turns on being Chair.

**N. COMMISSION ITEMS AND REFERRALS TO STAFF - None**

**O. ADJOURNMENT – 10:16 p.m.**

Motion by Commissioner Gaddis, seconded by Commissioner Conroy, to adjourn the meeting at 10:16 p.m.

Motion carried 7-0 by voice vote.

The next meeting of the Redondo Beach Planning Commission will be a Regular Meeting to be held at 6:30 p.m. on October 17, 2024, in the Redondo Beach Council Chambers, at 415 Diamond Street, Redondo Beach, California.

All written comments submitted via eComment are included in the record and available for public review on the City website.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Marc Wiener  
Community Development Director