

Public Comments Received on Draft General Plan, Zoning Ordinance, and LCP Amendments

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING AUGUST 15, 2024

J.2 PUBLIC HEARING TO CONTINUE DELIBERATIONS ON UPDATES TO THE CITY'S GENERAL PLAN LAND USE, OPEN SPACE & CONSERVATION, NOISE, AND SAFETY ELEMENT, AND TO INTRODUCE REVISIONS TO THE CITY'S ZONING ORDINANCES AND LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM (LCP) REQUIRED FOR CONSISTENCY AND TO IMPLEMENT THE CITY'S HOUSING ELEMENT

CONTACT: MARC WIENER, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR

1. Public Comments Received from August 1, 2024 to August 8, 2024 on Draft General Plan, Zoning Ordinance, and LCP Amendments.

From: [Stop BCHD](#)
To: [Planredondo](#); [Gale Hazeltine](#); [Sean Scully](#)
Subject: BCHD current FAR - Blue Folder Item
Date: Thursday, August 1, 2024 8:25:08 PM

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

312,000 sqft per the EIR
457,000 sqft per the county assessor

0.7 FAR (rounded)

--

StopBCHD.com ([REDACTED]) 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: [Stop BCHD](#)
To: [Planredondo](#)
Subject: BCHD does NOT provide ESSENTIAL SERVICES
Date: Thursday, August 1, 2024 7:30:38 PM

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

BLUE FOLDER

Health Districts are NOT essential services. By definition in legislation, it is not essential to have Health Districts. In fact, the overwhelming majority of residents of Los Angeles County are not served. Therefore, BCHD is clearly NOT ESSENTIAL.

--

StopBCHD.com ([REDACTED]) 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: [ree](#)
To: [Planredondo](#)
Subject: BCHD proposed plan
Date: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 9:52:03 PM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

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

Subject: SUPPORT 0.75 FAR for P/I Land Use

I support the City's proposed 0.75 floor area ratio (FAR) for Public/Institutional land. To the extent that the City of Redondo Beach, which serves nearly 100% residents, requires more density, then it should be allowed to build to the proposed 1.25 FAR.

I oppose BCHD's request for spot zoning on the hospital site of 1.25 FAR. BCHD should be required to maintain 0.75 FAR.

BCHD's published plan for the Healthy Living Campus (HLC) is for 80% District non-resident tenants in the assisted living (per BCHD MDS study); 95% District non-resident enrollees in the PACE facility (per National PACE Association data); and a service area of 91% District non-residents in allcove (per BCHD 30-year service contract for all of LA County SPA8 from Long Beach to Catalina Island to the LAX area).

At 80% to 95% non-resident services for its HLC, BCHD cannot be eligible for any greater FAR than 0.75 in order to minimize its damage to the surrounding neighborhoods that are largely 0.5 FAR or equivalent.

Maher Sesi, MD

From: [Jim Mueller](#)
To: [Planredondo](#)
Subject: Blue Folder Item For Planning Commission Meeting
Date: Sunday, August 4, 2024 3:15:15 PM
Attachments: [Proposed Code For Chronically Vacant Buildings.pdf](#)

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

Per suggestion of the Planning Commission Chairperson, please include the attached proposed Municipal Code amendment in the Blue Folder for the next meeting. If further information needed, please contact me.

Thanks,
Jim Mueller



From: [Stop BCHD](#)
To: [Planredondo](#)
Subject: Fwd: Public Comment - Redondo Beach General Plan
Date: Thursday, August 1, 2024 7:25:02 PM

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

BLUE FOLDER

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Stop BCHD <[REDACTED]>
Date: Thu, Aug 1, 2024 at 1:37 PM
Subject: Public Comment - Redondo Beach General Plan
To: Eleanor Manzano <[REDACTED]> Sean Scully <[REDACTED]>
<[REDACTED]>
Cc: Kevin Cody <[REDACTED]> <[REDACTED]>

We strongly support the 0.75 FAR for P/I land uses. Neighborhoods are ravaged by excessive construction, traffic, noise, emissions and chronic stress. The 0.75 FAR still exceeds the 0.5 FAR of commercial development and the implied 0.5 FAR of residential development.

In the special case of the City of Redondo Beach, a government entity that provides services to nearly 100% Redondo Beach residents, a "bonus" to 1.25 FAR is acceptable. In the special case of the City, residents are directly benefitted, excess traffic is not created, and the damages from the 1.25 FAR more intensive development can be offset by benefits.

Since BCHD is requesting spot zoning or special dispensation from land use regulations, a discussion is in order. BCHD provided only 50% of its services to Redondo Beach based on the population distribution of the District. As BCHD has proposed reuse of the site, it has become increasingly clear that BCHD's intent is to become a pseudo-commercial entity.

BCHD's Healthy Living Campus is a clear example with its 80% to 95% non-resident services focus.

BCHD's consultant, MDS, conducted 3 extensive studies and found that overall, 80% of the prospective tenants for BCHD's proposed RCFE assisted living will be non-residents of the zip codes 90277, 90278, 90254 and 90266. Furthermore, over 90% of tenants will be non-residents of Redondo Beach 90277, 90278.

BCHD's contract for allcove is for LA County SPA8, an area of 1.4M population. Of that, 91% are non-residents of the District and 95% are non-residents of Redondo Beach.

BCHD's investment bankers proposed a 400 enrollee PACE facility. The National PACE Association data shows that 95% of the PACE facility will be non-residents of the District and 97% will be non-residents of Redondo Beach.

Clearly, using BCHD's own data along with expert trade associations, it can easily be demonstrated that BCHD's HLC should be limited to 0.75 FAR, as are most other P/I land

uses, due to the 80% to 95% District non-resident planned use. The City of Redondo Beach NON-RESIDENT usage is 90% to 97% and does not deserve any "bonus" to 1.25 FAR due to its high damages to benefits propensity for Redondo Beach residents.

--

StopBCHD.com ([REDACTED]) 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: [REDACTED]
To: [Planredondo](#)
Subject: NO To Beach City Health District Buildout
Date: Thursday, August 1, 2024 8:13:33 AM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

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

Planning Commission Of Redondo Beach,

As residents on the 1400 Block of Diamond Street in Redondo beach, **my family along with my neighbors are against having BCHD going beyond the 0.75 FAR with their proposed Residential Care Facility.**

The BCHD development / overbuild is harmful to the environment, residents, homeowners and will add more vehicle traffic in the area. We have young school children and parents walking and riding bicycles to and from Redondo Union High School, Parras Middle School, Beryl Elementary, Towers Elementary and we are concerned for their safety regarding more fast-moving vehicles and pollution if this project over exceeds the build.

BCHD has not been conscientious nor on the side of the surrounding neighborhood and the residents. The for-profit project only serves BCHD's personal and financial interests, not the community. This why my wife and I oppose a build out larger than the allowed 0.75 FAR.

BCHD knows their plan for The Residential Care Facility For The Elderly is a **FOR PROFIT DEVELOPMENT** under the guise of building a "Healthy Living Campus For The People." This is not a project to serve and benefit the surrounding community. Again, the over development of the facility would cause a bigger health risk to all pedestrians, motorist, residents, school age children and the surrounding neighborhood.

In summation, I stand with my neighbors that the City Of Redondo Beach should not grant a waiver or give an exception to BCHD that goes beyond the 0.75 FAR.

Thank you.

Edward and Menaka Evans

From: [Barbara Kiyokane](#)
To: [Planredondo](#)
Subject: Proposed BCHD Development
Date: Thursday, August 1, 2024 11:15:24 AM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

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

We strongly oppose BCHD's request for spot zoning on the hospital site of 1.25 FAR. BCHD should be required to maintain 0.75 FAR. The negative impact on our neighborhood is too great to ignore.

**Sincerely,
Phil and Barbara Kiyokane**

From: [char](#)
To: [Sean Scully](#); [Planredondo](#); [CityClerk](#)
Subject: Proposed FAR and BCHD
Date: Thursday, August 1, 2024 2:54:49 PM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

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

Dear Planning Commission;

Subject: SUPPORT 0.75 FAR for P/I Land Use

I support the City's proposed 0.75 floor area ratio (FAR) for Public/Institutional land. To the extent that the City of Redondo Beach, which serves nearly 100% residents, requires more density, then it should be allowed to build to the proposed 1.25 FAR.

I oppose BCHD's request for spot zoning on the hospital site of 1.25 FAR. BCHD should be required to maintain 0.75 FAR.

BCHD's published plan for the Healthy Living Campus (HLC) is for 80% District non-resident tenants in the assisted living (per BCHD MDS study); 95% District non-resident enrollees in the PACE facility (per National PACE Association data); and a service area of 91% District non-residents in allcove (per BCHD 30-year service contract for all of LA County SPA8 from Long Beach to Catalina Island to the LAX area).

At 80% to 95% non-resident services for its HLC, BCHD cannot be eligible for any greater FAR than 0.75 in order to minimize its damage to the surrounding neighborhoods that are largely 0.5 FAR or equivalent

**Sincerely ,
Charlene Gilbert
Redondo beach**

From: [Mark Nelson \(Home Gmail\)](#)
To: [Planredondo](#); [Sean Scully](#)
Subject: Public Comment - BCHD Planned Buildings and Heights - Blue Folder
Date: Thursday, August 1, 2024 10:18:35 PM
Attachments: [image.png](#)

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

As local residents were aware and stated during the 8/1/24 special meeting, BCHD intends to build all new buildings on the edge of the campus up against residential property.

The Gold colored Phase 1 building will run from Flagler up to behind Vons and be 103-feet above the surrounding R-2 and RMD neighborhoods Redondo and the C-2 Vons Plaza.

The Flagler side will be 110-150 feet above the Torrance homes to the east that are in the Torrance Hillside Overlay.

The blue parking structure behind the 510 building is an 8-10 story parking ramp at Prospect and Diamond and will be 80 ft to 100 ft above the homes on Diamond and much further above the homes on Tomlee in the Torrance Hillside Overlay.

The remaining blue multipurpose building the the north of the parking ramp is approximately 75-feet tall and facing R-1 homes to the west.

To be clear, only the 952-sqft "penthouse" on BCHD is at 75-feet. All the rest is 52-feet or lower.

Phase 1 & 2



From: [Stop BCHD](#)
To: [Planredondo](#)
Subject: Public Comment - Blue Folder - BCHD is expanding services TO NON-RESIDENTS by DAMAGING RESIDENTS.
Date: Thursday, August 1, 2024 7:40:40 PM

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

BCHD tested 84% NON-RESIDENTS during Covid and cost the District taxpayers \$2.3M in NON-REIMBURSED COSTS. BCHD by observation prefers to service NON-RESIDENTS.

Phase 1 of the HLC - allowe Beach Cities is 91% non-residents of the District as it services 91% non-residents.

Phase 1 of the HLC is an 80% non-resident tenant assisted living.

Phase 1 of the HLC includes a 95% non-resident enrollee in the PACE program

--

StopBCHD.com ([REDACTED]) 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: [Stop BCHD](#)
To: [Planredondo](#)
Subject: Public Comment - Blue Folder - The HLC is located at the perimeter of the site against homes
Date: Thursday, August 1, 2024 8:01:23 PM

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

The RCFE will be 100-feet above Beryl and Flagler and tower above homes.
The Parking will be a 10-story parking ramp next to Diamond St at Diamond and Prospect.
The aquaplex, if it is built, would be up against Prospect.

Plainly - the City has the Pre-CUP for the HLC and must be 100% clearly understood. The statements of the public were generally wrong..

--

StopBCHD.com ([REDACTED]) 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: [Stop BCHD](#)
To: [CityClerk](#); [Planredondo](#); [Planning Redondo](#); [Sean Scully](#)
Subject: Public Comment - Council and Planning Commission
Date: Thursday, August 1, 2024 1:13:13 AM

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

FAST FACTS ABOUT BCHD

- 1. BCHD WANTS TO TRIPLE THE SIZE OF CAMPUS BUILDING** – BCHD plans to nearly triple the size of the campus buildings from 300,000 sqft to nearly 800,000 sqft of buildings, creating noise, traffic, visual blight, and damage to surrounding residents, health, safety and property values. (source: BCHD FEIR, BCHD Pre-CUP Filing, Blue Zones LLC Chronic Stress “silent killer”)
- 2. BCHD PLANS TO BUILD ON THE SITE EDGE UP AGAINST HOMES** - BCHD plans to build the majority of buildings on the edges of the site, adjacent to residential and Torrance hillside overlay zones. (Source: BCHD FEIR, RBMC, TMC) Previously, the tallest buildings were nearly dead center in the site, minimizing negative impacts to surrounding residents and property.
- 3. BCHD PLANS A 100% PRIVATE ASSISTED LIVING FOR 80% NON-RESIDENTS ON PUBLIC LAND** - BCHD plans to lease 3 acres to a 100% private developer to build a market-priced assisted living for 80% non-residents of the District. (Source: Cain Bros., MDS Consultants) BCHD has no updated Non-Resident tenant forecast. (Source: BCHD Public Records Response (PRR))
- 4. BCHD PLANS A PACE FACILITY FOR 95% NON-RESIDENT ENROLLEES** - BCHD plans a 400 enrollee PACE facility for 95% non-resident enrollees of the District (Source: Cain Bros., National PACE Assoc.)
- 5. BCHD ADDED 1.2M RESIDENTS TO THE BCHD SERVICE AREA FOR ITS ALLCOVE PROPOSAL** – The application for a \$2M State grant for allcove was scored on service to disadvantaged communities and mental healthcare provider shortage areas. BCHD is neither, in fact, the District is wealthier and is not a shortage area. As a result, BCHD was obligated to provide allcove service to LA County Planning Area 8 of 1.4M population. (Source: BCHD MHSA \$2M funding agreement and application)
- 6. ALLCOVE IS A 91% NON-RESIDENT SERVICE AREA** – According to BCHD’s list of SPA8 allcove service cities, it is 1.4M population, while the District is 120,000. BCHD has an obligation to service a 91% NON-RESIDENT allcove area. (Source: BCHD Press Releases, US Census)
- 7. BCHD ACCEPTED A 30-YEAR, \$175M UNFUNDED ALLCOVE OBLIGATION** – In return for a \$6M grant for use building an allcove building, BCHD was required to operate the building and its services for a minimum of 30 years. The estimated cost is \$175M for those 30 years. (Source: BCHD MHSA \$6M grant, Independent Estimate of Costs, BCHD has conducted NO 30 year cost analysis itself)

8. BCHD FAILED TO CONDUCT A COST ANALYSIS OF ALLCOVE'S 30-YEAR OBLIGATION TO TAXPAYERS – Prior to agreeing to accept the \$6M building grant with its 30-year obligation to serve, BCHD conducted no 30-year analysis of the debt and obligation to District taxpayers. (Source: BCHD PRR)

9. BCHD EXECUTIVE MANAGEMENT IS PAID \$2.4M ANNUALLY -BCHD has 13 directors and other executives for an organization with only 80 total FTEs. That means that the 13 executives manage a total of 67 employees, or only 5 employees each. The total budget of BCHD is about \$15M annually, which means that after removing the executive salaries, each executive has a total average budget under \$1M. (Source: BCHD financial reports, TransparentCalifornia)

From: [Stop BCHD](#)
To: [Planredondo](#)
Subject: Public Comment - Mrs Brand's comments were incorrect - Blue Folder
Date: Thursday, August 1, 2024 7:33:23 PM

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

The only properties that are subject to Planning Commission Design Review are the 1.25 FAR properties. Her statement was simply backwards and incorrect.

--

StopBCHD.com ([REDACTED]) 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: [Mark Nelson \(Home Gmail\)](#)
To: [Planredondo](#); [Sean Scully](#)
Subject: Public Comment - Planning Commission, General Plan, Blue Folder
Date: Thursday, August 1, 2024 9:44:23 PM

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

The example of Kensington was very good to explain 0.75 vs 1.25 FAR.

If the City folds to BCHDs pressure campaign, then add a 40-foot hard cap maximum height limit to the FAR 1.25 in order to protect surrounding neighborhoods.

From: [Stop BCHD](#)
To: [CityClerk](#); [Sean Scully](#); [Planredondo](#)
Cc: [Kevin Cody](#); [REDACTED]
Subject: Public Comment - Redondo Beach General Plan
Date: Thursday, August 1, 2024 1:37:22 PM

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

We strongly support the 0.75 FAR for P/I land uses. Neighborhoods are ravaged by excessive construction, traffic, noise, emissions and chronic stress. The 0.75 FAR still exceeds the 0.5 FAR of commercial development and the implied 0.5 FAR of residential development.

In the special case of the City of Redondo Beach, a government entity that provides services to nearly 100% Redondo Beach residents, a "bonus" to 1.25 FAR is acceptable. In the special case of the City, residents are directly benefitted, excess traffic is not created, and the damages from the 1.25 FAR more intensive development can be offset by benefits.

Since BCHD is requesting spot zoning or special dispensation from land use regulations, a discussion is in order. BCHD provided only 50% of its services to Redondo Beach based on the population distribution of the District. As BCHD has proposed reuse of the site, it has become increasingly clear that BCHD's intent is to become a pseudo-commercial entity.

BCHD's Healthy Living Campus is a clear example with its 80% to 95% non-resident services focus.

BCHD's consultant, MDS, conducted 3 extensive studies and found that overall, 80% of the prospective tenants for BCHD's proposed RCFE assisted living will be non-residents of the zip codes 90277, 90278, 90254 and 90266. Furthermore, over 90% of tenants will be non-residents of Redondo Beach 90277, 90278.

BCHD's contract for allcove is for LA County SPA8, an area of 1.4M population. Of that, 91% are non-residents of the District and 95% are non-residents of Redondo Beach.

BCHD's investment bankers proposed a 400 enrollee PACE facility. The National PACE Association data shows that 95% of the PACE facility will be non-residents of the District and 97% will be non-residents of Redondo Beach.

Clearly, using BCHD's own data along with expert trade associations, it can easily be demonstrated that BCHD's HLC should be limited to 0.75 FAR, as are most other P/I land uses, due to the 80% to 95% District non-resident planned use. The City of Redondo Beach NON-RESIDENT usage is 90% to 97% and does not deserve any "bonus" to 1.25 FAR due to its high damages to benefits propensity for Redondo Beach residents.

--

StopBCHD.com ([REDACTED]) is a Neighborhood Quality-of-Life Community concerned about the quality-of-life, health, and economic damages that BCHD's 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: [Lara Duke](#)
To: [Planredondo](#); [Sean Scully](#); [CityClerk](#)
Subject: Re: SUPPORT 0.75 FAR
Date: Thursday, August 1, 2024 6:23:35 PM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

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

The big picture getting missed is that this land is supposed to be public, but it's not. BCHD should not be building what they propose at all, given the wholly commercial angle. Everyone forgets this is P-CF land, which stands for Public - Community Facility. I've been in meetings (BCHD and city) where people clearly don't know that, and some even taking a guess that it's Private - Commercial Facility (I wish I were joking). So, lets not lose sight of this fact. The whole area I don't suggest should be open space (though that is literally the very first use when you look up P-CF), but it should all benefit the whole community.

We know right now that doesn't take place, given existing for profit commercial structures there have been granted exception over the years (e.g. Silverado). But that doesn't mean going forward we can't honor what the zoning intended. If you're going to make it actually for the public, then the condition should be to build a facility for the community (it's right in the zoning name). And the only time a variance for an FAR increase should take place is if you're going to build a massive structure(s) for everyone's use on this land. It would be a density bonus allowed with the tradeoff being the public benefits. Think, dedicated low-cost spay/neuter clinic (a critical need to reduce the epidemic of animal shelter overcrowding), or any number of the other public-focused uses for this type of zoning. We can do better and we should.

Lara Duke

From: [Tom McGarry](#)
To: [Planredondo](#)
Subject: Subject: SUPPORT 0.75 FAR for P/I Land Use
Date: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 3:29:41 PM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

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

I support the City's proposed 0.75 floor area ratio (FAR) for Public/Institutional land. To the extent that the City of Redondo Beach, which serves nearly 100% residents, requires more density, then it should be allowed to build to the proposed 1.25 FAR.

I oppose BCHD's request for spot zoning on the hospital site of 1.25 FAR. BCHD should be required to maintain 0.75 FAR.

BCHD's published plan for the Healthy Living Campus (HLC) is for 80% District non-resident tenants in the assisted living (per BCHD MDS study); 95% District non-resident enrollees in the PACE facility (per National PACE Association data); and a service area of 91% District non-residents in allcove (per BCHD 30-year service contract for all of LA County SPA8 from Long Beach to Catalina Island to the LAX area).

At 80% to 95% non-resident services for its HLC, BCHD cannot be eligible for any greater FAR than 0.75 in order to minimize its damage to the surrounding neighborhoods that are largely 0.5 FAR or equivalent.

Tom McGarry
Redondo Beach



Virus-free www.avg.com

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Planredondo](#); [Sean Scully](#); [CityClerk](#)
Subject: SUPPORT 0.75 FAR for P/I Land Use
Date: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 5:11:04 PM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

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

Hello,

I support the City's proposed 0.75 floor area ratio (FAR) for Public/Institutional land. To the extent that the City of Redondo Beach, which serves nearly 100% residents, requires more density, then it should be allowed to build to the proposed 1.25 FAR.

I oppose BCHD's request for spot zoning on the hospital site of 1.25 FAR. BCHD should be required to maintain 0.75 FAR.

BCHD's published plan for the Healthy Living Campus (HLC) is for 80% District non-resident tenants in the assisted living (per BCHD MDS study); 95% District non-resident enrollees in the PACE facility (per National PACE Association data); and a service area of 91% District non-residents in allcove (per BCHD 30-year service contract for all of LA County SPA8 from Long Beach to Catalina Island to the LAX area).

At 80% to 95% non-resident services for its HLC, BCHD cannot be eligible for any greater FAR than 0.75 in order to minimize its damage to the surrounding neighborhoods that are largely 0.5 FAR or equivalent.

Best regards,
George & Pam Afremow
Long time south bay residents

From: [James Ecklund](#)
To: [Planredondo](#)
Subject: SUPPORT 0.75 FAR for P/I Land Use
Date: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 7:15:15 PM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

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

To Whom It May Concern,

Rules exist to maintain regulatory standards and we should prevent developers from changing rules at all costs for their benefit. I support the City's position to preserve a 0.75 floor area ratio (FAR) for Public/Institutional land.

I oppose BCHD's request for spot zoning on the hospital site of 1.25 FAR. BCHD should be required to maintain 0.75 FAR for public institutional land use.

The higher density zoning would be out of character for the surrounding neighborhoods and serve no benefit to the general public.

BCHD's published plan for the Healthy Living Campus (HLC) is for 80% District non-resident tenants in the assisted living (per BCHD MDS study); 95% District non-resident enrollees in the PACE facility (per National PACE Association data); and a service area of 91% District non-residents in allcove (per BCHD 30-year service contract for all of LA County SPA8 from Long Beach to Catalina Island to the LAX area).

Again, please oppose BCHD's request for spot zoning on the hospital site of 1.25 FAR for public institutional land use.

Sincerely,
James Ecklund

From: [Sinsheimer](#)
To: [Sean Scully](#); [CityClerk](#); [Planredondo](#)
Subject: SUPPORT 0.75 FAR for P/I Land Use
Date: Thursday, August 1, 2024 3:36:10 AM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

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

I support the City's proposed 0.75 floor area ratio (FAR) for Public/Institutional land. To the extent that the City of Redondo Beach, which serves nearly 100% residents, requires more density, then it should be allowed to build to the proposed 1.25 FAR.

I oppose BCHD's request for spot zoning on the hospital site of 1.25 FAR. BCHD should be required to maintain 0.75 FAR.

BCHD's published plan for the Healthy Living Campus (HLC) is for 80% District non-resident tenants in the assisted living (per BCHD MDS study); 95% District non-resident enrollees in the PACE facility (per National PACE Association data); and a service area of 91% District non-residents in allcove (per BCHD 30-year service contract for all of LA County SPA8 from Long Beach to Catalina Island to the LAX area).

At 80% to 95% non-resident services for its HLC, BCHD cannot be eligible for any greater FAR than 0.75 in order to minimize its damage to the surrounding neighborhoods that are largely 0.5 FAR or equivalent.

Thank you for your time. I have been a resident of Redondo Beach since 1986.

Jeanne Sinsheimer
[REDACTED]
Redondo Beach, CA. 90278
[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPad

From: [Jacqueline Caro](#)
To: [Planredondo](#); [CityClerk](#)
Subject: SUPPORT 0.75 FAR for P/I Land Use
Date: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 3:34:44 PM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

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

To Whom It May Concern,

I support the City's proposed 0.75 floor area ratio (FAR) for Public/Institutional land.

I oppose BCHD's request for spot zoning on the hospital site of 1.25 FAR. BCHD should be required to maintain 0.75 FAR.

The higher density zoning would be out of character for the surrounding neighborhoods.

BCHD's published plan for the Healthy Living Campus (HLC) is for 80% District non-resident tenants in the assisted living (per BCHD MDS study); 95% District non-resident enrollees in the PACE facility (per National PACE Association data); and a service area of 91% District non-residents in allcove (per BCHD 30-year service contract for all of LA County SPA8 from Long Beach to Catalina Island to the LAX area).

**Respectfully,
Jackie Ecklund**

Here's Wishing You the Bluest Skies...!

Jackie Caro Ecklund

F.A.I.T.H. Ministry, Chair (Freedom And Intervention for the Trafficking of Humans)

From: [Lara Duke](#)
To: [Planredondo](#); [Sean Scully](#); [CityClerk](#)
Subject: SUPPORT 0.75 FAR
Date: Thursday, August 1, 2024 5:19:58 PM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

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

I support the City's proposed 0.75 floor area ratio (FAR) for Public/Institutional land. To the extent that the City of Redondo Beach, which serves nearly 100% residents, requires more density, then it should be allowed to build to the proposed 1.25 FAR.

I oppose BCHD's request for spot zoning on the hospital site of 1.25 FAR. BCHD should be required to maintain 0.75 FAR.

BCHD's published plan for the Healthy Living Campus (HLC) is for 80% District non-resident tenants in the assisted living (per BCHD MDS study); 95% District non-resident enrollees in the PACE facility (per National PACE Association data); and a service area of 91% District non-residents in allcove (per BCHD 30-year service contract for all of LA County SPA8 from Long Beach to Catalina Island to the LAX area).

At 80% to 95% non-resident services for its HLC, BCHD cannot be eligible for any greater FAR than 0.75 in order to minimize its damage to the surrounding neighborhoods that are largely 0.5 FAR or equivalent.

**Lara Duke
Redondo Beach**

From: [Kathy McLeod](#)
To: [CityClerk](#); [Planredondo](#); [Sean Scully](#)
Subject: SUPPORT 0.75 FAR - BCHD Land Use
Date: Thursday, August 1, 2024 8:30:30 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

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

I support the City's proposed 0.75 floor area ratio (FAR) for Public/Institutional land. To the extent that the City of Redondo Beach, which serves nearly 100% residents, requires more density, then it should be allowed to build to the proposed 1.25 FAR.

I oppose BCHD's request for spot zoning on the hospital site of 1.25 FAR. BCHD should be required to maintain 0.75 FAR.

Kathy McLeod
[REDACTED]
Redondo Beach

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Skye](#)
To: [Planredondo](#); [CityClerk](#); [Sean Scully](#)
Subject: SUPPORT 0.75 FAR for P/I Land Use
Date: Thursday, August 1, 2024 8:11:55 AM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

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

I oppose BCHD's request for spot zoning on the hospital site of 1.25 FAR. BCHD should be required to maintain 0.75 FAR.

**Thank you,
Skye**

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Planredondo](#); [Sean Scully](#); [CityClerk](#)
Subject: SUPPORT 0.75 FAR for P/I Land Use
Date: Thursday, August 1, 2024 2:08:02 PM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

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

Good Afternoon City Planning Commissioners,

I STRONGLY SUPPORT the City's proposed 0.75 floor area ratio (FAR) for public/institutional land zoning. This 0.75 FAR is in the best interest of the residents of Redondo Beach.

I also STRONGLY SUPPORT the flexibility to increase the FAR to 1.25 if the City of Redondo Beach I/P land will be used to serve nearly 100% of Redondo Beach residents.

Both zonings are beneficial for the residents of Redondo Beach.

I OPPOSE BCHD's request for spot zoning on the hospital site with a 1.25 FAR. BCHD should be required to maintain the 0.75 FAR. Their proposed programs and existing programs will primarily serve non-district residents.

BCHD needs to stop squandering our tax money. If their business model can't generate its own revenue, BCHD should not expand and perhaps consider downsizing or shutting down.

Let's think about what the residents of Redondo Beach can do with that land.

Respectfully,

Marcie Guillermo
20+ years Redondo Beach Resident

From: [J. Garcia](#)
To: [CityClerk](#); [Planredondo](#); [Sean Scully](#)
Subject: SUPPORT 0.75 FAR for P/I Land Use
Date: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 5:16:58 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

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

Dear City Council members,

As a 38 year home owner in Redondo Beach and a life-long South Bay resident, I strongly support the rationale behind supporting a 0.75 FAR. I have lived within a 1 mile radius of the old "South Bay Hospital" my entire life, and do not want to see the city give-up our land usage on a 99 year lease to the self-serving developers. I understand BCHD wants to better serve "our community", but based on their MDS study only 5-10% of our community will be able to afford their long-term housing facility. I truly believe they can downsize their grand plan and still provide for a more than adequate facility.

Our former mayor, Mr. Bill Brand fought so very hard to save our city from the AES debacle, and succeeded by hearing the voices and votes of our community to stop the growth madness. I kindly ask that you do not allow BCHD and their developers to damage our housing values and life-style while supersizing their development over a 10 year period, which is clearly not in the best interest for the vast majority of Redondo Beach and the South Bay community.

Thank you,
Jaime F. Garcia

From: [Lisa Falk](#)
To: [Planredondo](#); [Sean Scully](#); [CityClerk](#)
Subject: SUPPORT 0.75 FAR for P/I Land Use
Date: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 3:44:13 PM

Some people who received this message don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

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

I support the City's proposed 0.75 floor area ratio (FAR) for Public/Institutional land.

I oppose BCHD's request for spot zoning on the hospital site of 1.25 FAR: BCHD should be required to maintain 0.75 FAR.

BCHD's published plan for the Healthy Living Campus (HLC) is for 80% District non-resident tenants in the assisted living (per BCHD MDS study); 95% District non-resident enrollees in the PACE facility (per National PACE Association data); and a service area of 91% District non-residents in allcove (per BCHD 30-year service contract for all of LA County SPA8 from Long Beach to Catalina Island to the LAX area).

At 80% to 95% non-resident services for its HLC, BCHD cannot be eligible for any greater FAR than 0.75 in order to minimize its damage to the surrounding neighborhoods that are largely 0.5 FAR or equivalent.

Please do not jeopardize our way of life and property values by allowing invasive overdevelopment and overuse!

**35 Year Residents and Home Owners
Marty & Lisa Falk**

From: [Bethany Johnson](#)
To: [Planredondo](#)
Subject: Support to keep 0.75 Floor Area Ratio
Date: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 6:24:37 PM

[You don't often get email from [REDACTED] Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

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

I strongly urge you to keep the 0.75 Floor Area Ratio. It should definitely NOT be increased. Increasing FAR negatively impacts our Redondo Beach neighborhoods.

Sincerely and with great concern,

Bethany Johnson

[REDACTED]
Redondo Beach

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Alan Israel](#)
To: [Planning Redondo](#)
Subject: 0.75 FAR limit
Date: Thursday, August 1, 2024 5:39:56 PM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

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

I support the 0.75 FAR limit on Public Institutional land for all non-City-owned parcels as written in the updated General Plan.

Alan Israel
Redondo Beach
alan [REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Paige Kaluderovic](#); [Zein Obaqi](#)
Cc: [REDACTED] [Planning Redondo](#); [REDACTED]
Subject: BCHD Agenda
Date: Saturday, August 3, 2024 12:41:33 PM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

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

I am contacting you because my pleas to use common sense, with regards to the BCHD Board of unelected officials, are falling on deaf ears. At the August 1, 2024, public meeting, their latest agenda item to discuss the demolition of the existing BCHD facility and the approval for its funding, the majority of attendees voicing their concerns agreed with my analysis, attached email. BCHD's silent response was appalling! My latest communication, sent to them prior to the meeting, has elicited no response, as usual.

Contrast that with all communications from the BCHD board, including CEO Tom Bakaly, who promotes fear. As an example, if we residents do not approve this project, the consequences will be catastrophic disruptions to services and added costs. Their attempt to further grab power can be seen in Bakaly's rabid support of Proposition 5, on the November 5 ballot, which would lower the voter required approval level, from 66% to 55%, for raising general obligation bonds. These inflammatory statements are being made in a highly inflationary environment with stagnant income growth. These additional costs to all residents are not de minimis, as claimed

As elected officials I am asking you to please restore sanity and accountability to our community. Money is not FREE, and we residents of this community are continuously being asked to pay the piper, for projects that we do not imitate or support.

Finally, thank you for your support in keeping the Redondo Beach's Fire Department in Redondo Beach.

Fred Lukin, CMA

[REDACTED]
Redondo Beach, CA 90278

From: [levyclann \(null\)](#)
To: [Planning Redondo](#)
Subject: BCHD Item Agenda Proposal
Date: Thursday, August 1, 2024 4:51:48 PM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

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

Dear Planning Commission,

I'd like to give voice to our feelings as residents and voters.

“I SUPPORT the 0.75 FAR limit on Public Institutional (PI) land as written in the updated General Plan.”

“The 0.75 FAR limit is already generous and supports substantial development. It provides the appropriate balance between growth and preserving compatibility with surrounding neighborhoods.”

“Going beyond a 0.75 FAR will negatively alter our quality of life and forever change the character of our city.

**Thank you,
LuJean Levy**

Sent from my iPhone

From: [levyclann \(null\)](#)
To: [Planning Redondo](#)
Subject: BCHD Proposal
Date: Thursday, August 1, 2024 4:58:20 PM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

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

Dear planning commission,

I SUPPORT the 0.75 FAR limit on Public Institutional (PI) land as written in the updated General Plan.

The 0.75 FAR limit is already generous and supports substantial development. It provides the appropriate balance between growth and preserving compatibility with surrounding neighborhoods.

Going beyond a 0.75 FAR will negatively alter our quality of life and forever change the character of our city.

**Sincerely,
LuJean Levy**

Sent from my iPhone

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Zein Obagi](#); [Paige Kaluderovic](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]; [REDACTED] [Planning Redondo](#)
Subject: Fw: August 1, 2024 Public Meeting
Date: Saturday, August 3, 2024 1:13:50 PM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

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

This is the e-mail I sent to the Planning Board, in preparation for their 8/1/24 meeting.

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]; Gina Lukin <[REDACTED]>
 Nancy Henningsen <[REDACTED]>
 <[REDACTED]>

Sent: Wednesday, July 31, 2024 at 07:16:51 PM PDT
Subject: August 1, 2024 Public Meeting

Dan,

Following are questions submitted to the Redondo Beach Planning Board.

Question to BCHD	BCHD Response	My Opinion
Is this proposal a done deal?		Public hearings are for appearance purposes only.
Are the Board of Directors elected officials?		No, they are appointed!
Does BCHD facility meet LA county Earthquake ordinance?	Not applicable. Earthquake ordinance has not been adopted into law in Redondo Beach.	The latest communications clarified this question's misinterpretation.
If this proposal is voluntary, safety is a moral concern , why is the facility still operational and not immediately condemned?		No major structural defects identified, as of this date.
Why was Floor Area Ratio of facility reduced by 40%, 1.25 to .75?	No one knows how this revision got into the proposal.	The reduction is unconscionable
What is the total cost of the current proposal? How many years to pay	Borrow \$30 million, Collect \$1.7 million per	Borrowed funds should only be used for this proposal.

loan off?	year.	
What is payback period, in years?	Not known at this time.	
What is the cost per Redondo Beach household?	\$3 per \$100,000 of assessed real estate value, for everyone.	This is a low-ball estimate. All citizens of Redondo Beach, homeowners and renters will pay. This is not an acceptable financial burden in this inflationary period.
Why not select a different location for its youth center?		Venice Beach has a Youth Center on its beach.
Who benefits from the BCHD's proposal?		Young progressive liberals not the tax paying adults. It should be self-evident that everyone needs physical activities and socialization. Video services do not have positive results as on-site activities, as proven with the decline of these skills in school age kids during the COVID pandemic.
Is Consultant report biased?		Probably, since it is a known fact that these types of reports are written to support the views of the commission requesting the report.
Is the news media invited to objectively report BCHD issues and concerns?	Unknown.	

Today, 7/31/24 I asked my gym mates (class of 25) if they were aware of the demolition of BCHD facility by 2027, with **70% saying yes.**

No one agreed with the decision to eliminate all gym services at the current facility.

Finally, where, when and what are the estimated costs of the new gym facilities? And is it time to suspend the current proposal? **I vote to suspend** it until all questions are answered satisfactorily

I will not be able to attend meeting, so can you follow up, so all questions are answered satisfactorily.

Fred Lukin, CMA

[REDACTED]
Redondo Beach, CA 90278

Mobile phone [REDACTED]

From: [Ann Wolfson](#)
To: [Planning Redondo](#)
Subject: Fwd: Comments to Agenda item J2
Date: Thursday, August 1, 2024 3:00:32 PM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

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

----- Forwarded message -----
Subject: Comments to Agenda item J2

To the Planning Commission,

I strongly support keeping the 0.75 maximum FAR limit on Public Institutional (PI) land. This issue is important for the future of the City. Public institutional land should be preserved and responsibly guided by city policy. Any development on public land should be compatible with the character, mass, and scale of the surrounding neighborhoods, and directly support residents.

Why it's important to preserve the 0.75 FAR limit for Public Institutional land:

- The standard provides more than ample room for growth, while preserving open space and adding protections for the City, the environment, and residents. The 0.75 FAR will help to ensure compatibility with surrounding areas.
- Increasing the FAR for public institutional land would set an irreversible **precedence for overdevelopment** on public land now, and for the future.
- Public land is designated to serve the residents, not private developers and a majority of non-residents.

Unfortunately, a special district is pushing hard to have a massive, 100% privately owned RCFE structure built up against the edge of its 30 ft. elevated site. BCHD's development plans **have always been in conflict** with Redondo Beach municipal code in scale, mass and

compatibility with the surrounding neighborhoods that encompass the site.

Though the RCFE project is counter to the Redondo Beach municipal code, will be 100% privately owned, and is has not stopped their efforts.

Respectfully,
Ann Wolfson