

Redondo Beach Objective Residential Standards

City Council Public Hearing
August 15, 2023



Goals for Tonight

- Public Hearing on resolution to adopt Objective Residential Standards and introduction of ordinances for implementation
- Presentation on how the Residential Design Guidelines have transformed to Objective Residential Standards
- Discussion of revisions to Objective Residential Standards document based on July 18, 2023 direction
- Public testimony
- For consideration:
 - Inland ordinance for introduction to implement ORS
 - Coastal ordinance for introduction to implement ORS
 - Resolution to forward coastal ordinance to Coastal Commission

Resolution for adoption of ORS

Why Update our Residential Guidelines?

- **City Council Strategic Plan** identified a need to update Residential Design Guidelines (last updated in 2003).
- **Funding from Senate Bill 2 (SB2) Planning Grants Program**
 - For California cities and counties to prepare, adopt, and implement plans and process improvements that streamline housing approvals and accelerate housing production.
- **City Council hired Consultant** Cityworks Design to update the City's Residential Design Guidelines, with input from a Focus Group, Planning Commission, Community Workshops and online survey.
- **Senate Bill 330 (SB330)** adopted in 2019 restricts any development requirements adopted after January 1, 2020 to be objective, quantifiable, and written development standards.

Overall Goal for ORS

To streamline the residential application process and achieve compatible development through objective building and landscaping standards

Proposed to be achieved by...

- Replacing the 2003 Residential Design Guidelines with Objective Residential Standards (turning subjective into objective)
- Adding Standards for R-1A Zone
- Eliminating confusion and uncertainty of existing guidelines
- Clarifying Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) Ordinance

Process to Date

July – Nov 2021	Background/Existing Conditions Research, Content Development for Initial Engagement Events
December 2021	Focus Group #1 and Planning Commission #1
Early - Mid 2022	Community Meeting #1, Public Survey, Prepare Draft ORS
Fall 2022 - Spring 2023	Planning Commission Subcommittee Input
January - March 2023	ORS Public Draft and FAQs Released, Input on Public Draft
March 2023	Focus Group #2, Joint Planning Commission #2 and Community Meeting #2
May 18, 2023	Planning Commission #3
May - June 2023	Staff Prepared Zoning Amendments
June 15, 2023	Planning Commission #4 - recommendations to City Council on Zoning Amendments and Final Draft ORS
July 18, 2023	City Council discussion and input on draft
August - Sept 2023	City Council / Public Hearing: Zoning Amendments and Adopting ORS

Note: Schedule is driven by SB2 Grant

What are “Objective” Standards?

Using **straight-forward criteria** that aim to reflect existing character of neighborhood so new buildings are compatible with old buildings

“involve no personal or subjective judgment by a public official and are uniformly verifiable by reference to an external and uniform benchmark or criterion available and knowable by both the development applicant or proponent and the public official before submittal.”

Government Code Sections 65913.4 and 66300(a)(7)

How Standards differ from Guidelines

Enforceability

- Use of “shall” or “must” – indicates “REQUIRED”
- Use of “should” or “may” – indicates “RECOMMENDED”

EXAMPLE 1: Existing Guideline for Roof Deck Location (R-1)

- *Should be stepped back from the building edge above the second floor;*
- *Should be oriented away from neighbors’ yards as much as possible;*

Proposed Standard

- *A roof deck shall be set back at least 10 feet from the required first story setbacks on all sides.*

EXAMPLE 2: Existing Guideline for Multi-Family Landscaping

- *Landscaping shall emphasize water-efficient plants.*

Proposed Standard

- *Multi-Family landscaped areas shall include drought tolerant live plants in 75% of the area.*

Outline of Objective Residential Standards

- **SECTION I: Introduction**
- **SECTION II: Standards Applicable to All Residential Districts**
- **SECTION III: R-1 Single Family Zoning District Standards**
- **SECTION IV: R-1A Single Family Zoning District Standards**
- **SECTION V: R-2 and R-3 Multi-Family Zoning District Standards**
- **SECTION VI: RMD and RH Multi-Family Zoning District Standards**
- **SECTION VII: R-1 Character Area Design Guidelines**
- **SECTION VIII: Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs)**

Council Direction on Draft ORS Document at July 18th Meeting

ITEMS REMOVED FROM DRAFT ORS DOCUMENT FOR FURTHER STUDY:

- Second story additional rear and front setbacks (R-1)
- Second story additional side setbacks (R-1)
- Setbacks for neighborhood (R-2 & R-3, RMD & RH)
- Variation upper story setbacks (R-2 & R-3)
- Mezzanine setbacks (R-1, R-1A, R-2 & R-3, RMD & RH)
- Restricting balcony access from a mezzanine (R-1, R-1A)
- Restricting balcony on side of dwelling (R-1, R-1A)
- Roof deck setbacks (R-1, R-1A, R-2 & R-3, RMD & RH)
- Restricting stairs/elevators to roof decks (R-1, R-1A)
- Private Open Space (duplicative of zoning code) (R-2 & R-3, RMD & RH)
- Balconies open to sky requirement (R-2 & R-3, RMD & RH)

ITEMS REMOVED FROM DRAFT ORS DOCUMENT WITH NO FURTHER STUDY:

- Second story window placement (R-1, R-1A, R-2 & R-3, RMD & RH)
- Comparison drawing requirement (R-1, R-1A, R-2 & R-3, RMD & RH)
- Removed TRW and Firmona South as character areas

Council Direction on Planning Commission Recommendations at July 18th Meeting

PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS COUNCIL ADDED TO ORS DOCUMENT:

- For permeable surfaces, artificial turf is not permitted.
- For irrigation, also allow a bubbler system as an alternative to the drip system option, as recommended by the water district.
- Add green roofs, bioswales, and greywater capture systems in the point systems in the Landscaping Matrices.
- Specify no artificial plants or artificial turf in parkways.
- Revisit whether to limit the building materials for modular construction to add composites or other materials, or consider eliminating this standard that is limiting the materials.
- Add definition of MWELO requirements in ORS to the “Applicability” description of the Front Yard Permeability and Landscaping.
- Add rain sensor monitor as another option for irrigation system in the point systems in the Landscaping Matrices.

Council Direction on Planning Commission Recommendations at July 18th Meeting (Cont.)

PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS COUNCIL REQUESTED TO FURTHER STUDY:

- To objectify the requirement that R-2 and R-3 multifamily have the appearance of a single family residence, consider the garage of the front unit (R-2, R-3) shall be located at the “rear” of the front unit (not visible from the street).
- Consider adding objective standards in the R-1 Standards section for the Faye & Susana character area regarding pitched roof parallel to the street; garages set forward shall have a pitched roof
 - A single peak roof ridge required parallel to the street/front property line.
 - If the garage is set forward of the main structure then the roof shall be pitched (Define “pitched”)
- Consider streamlining or reconciling the definition of “story” and the determination of “basement” gross floor area included in the FAR to be the same, utilizing whichever measurement is more restrictive.
- Consider swimming pool setbacks of a minimum of 3’ from the property lines.

Remaining Planning Commission Recommendations

PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS NOT CONSIDERED BY COUNCIL:

The following Planning Commission recommendations were not addressed in the motion approved by City Council at the July 18, 2023 meeting. As discussed and per the presentation at that meeting, these items would require additional study to determine impacts and require legal analysis to determine if allowable per current state laws.

- Eliminate FAR bonuses where that option in the zoning code would now be required in the ORS (e.g., for 2nd story rear and side setbacks).
- Consider eliminating all FAR bonuses in the R-1 zones (e.g., side parking and front porch bonuses).
- To provide an objective standard to address the current subjective guidelines regarding “bulk and mass” and “compatible with the neighborhood”, add FAR limits for R-1A, R-2, and R-3 zones. The recommended FAR levels are 0.94 for R-1A zones and 1.14 for R-2 and R-3 zones.
- Add additional objective standard in R2 and R3:
 - Only mezzanines open to the first floor shall be permitted in R2 and R3. Mezzanines open to the second floor are not permitted, to maintain compatibility with the neighborhood character.

Remaining Planning Commission Recommendations (Cont.)

PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS NOT CONSIDERED BY COUNCIL (Cont.):

- To meet the general plan and municipal code requirement of light, air, and privacy, prohibit cantilever of second story for front unit in R-2 and R-3 for the width of the driveway, and a maximum overhang over driveway of 2' for middle units.
- Add a standard in RMD and RH multi-family zoning that states that “buildings shall not cast shadows onto adjacent residential uses on Winter Solstice.”
- Add additional objective standards in R-1A regarding maximum height flat roof and pitched roof; no mezzanines since these are distinctly different in traditional development in R-1A than in R-1:
 - To maintain the compatibility with the established neighborhood character, revise maximum height to 24' for flat roof designs in R-1A and revise maximum height to 28' for pitched roof designs in R-1A. Define “flat roof” and “pitched roof.”
 - Only mezzanines open to the first floor shall be permitted in R-1A. Mezzanines open to the second floor are not permitted, to maintain compatibility with the neighborhood character.
- Add an overall structure height limit on upsloping and side sloping lots to be measured from the property line at the street level.

Housing Defense Fund Letter from July 18th Meeting

- Section IV.D.5. Guard Rails – concern with language “...solid barrier that is designed to be consistent with the overall style of the building”. This could be revised to state that “...the solid barrier must be constructed of the same façade materials of the main building”.
- Section V.B.5. Vehicular/Pedestrian Path Intersections – concern with “or similar materials as approved by the Director.” This could be revised to remove this language and just require decorative paving of the pedestrian path that is different than the paving utilized for the automobile paths.
- Section V.C.1. Architectural Style—concern with style not being defined. This could be removed or otherwise re-defined.
- Section V.C.2. 360-Degree Design—concern with language “consistent design feature or patterns. This section could be revised to say, “The project shall have around the entire development the same level of architectural detail and articulation as the front elevation.”
- Section V.F.2. Carport Roofs – concern with consistency of style. This could be revised to say, “Carport Roofs shall be designed with the same materials. Flat carport roofs shall be permitted.”

Housing Defense Fund Letter from July 18th Meeting (Cont.)

- Section V.F.4. Gutter/Downspout Color—concern about architectural theme language. This could be revised to say, “Exposed gutters and downspouts shall be colored to match one of the the colors of the main structure.” Or it could just be removed.
- Section V.I.15. Tree Planting—concern with ambiguity of “young trees”. Per Public Works recommendation, revise to say, “Any transplanted tree from a box or any field grown tree shall be securely staked with double stakes.”
- Section VI.B.3. Pedestrian Paths—concern with Director’s discretion regarding gates and pathways. Instead, this could be revised to remove the first part of the paragraph and say only, “For projects located near compatible land uses, gates and pathways are required to shorten the walking distance for residents to access these uses.”
- Section VI.D.5. Durable Materials on Ground Floor-concern with reference to style. This could be revised to remove the language at end of the sentence “for contemporary/modern styles.”
- Section VI.D.8 Accessory Structures—concern with the language “architectural style”. Could revise to say, “...shall be constructed with the same materials as primary buildings in the complex.”

When to use the new ORS - Implementation

Current Zoning Code references “intent” of Residential Design Guidelines :

- The project shall be consistent with the intent of residential design guidelines adopted by resolution of the City Council.

Revisions proposed to reference “comply” with Objective Residential Standards:

- 10-2.2500 [and 10-5 for coastal] Administrative Design Review.
(b) Criteria. The following criteria shall be used in determining a project’s consistency with the intent and purpose of this section:
(7) The project shall comply with the Objective Residential Standards ~~be consistent with the intent of residential design guidelines~~ adopted by resolution of the City Council.
- 10-2.2502 [and 10-5 for coastal] Planning Commission Design Review.
(b) Criteria. The following criteria shall be used in determining a project’s consistency with the intent and purpose of this section:
(7) Consistency with residential design guidelines. The project shall comply with the Objective Residential Standards ~~be consistent with the intent of residential design guidelines~~ adopted by resolution of the City Council.

City Council Action for Consideration Tonight

1. Open public hearing and take testimony;
2. Close the public hearing and deliberate;
3. Introduce the following two ordinances by title only;
4. Adopt by title only the resolution adopting the Objective Residential Standards; and
5. Adopt by title only the resolution submitting ordinance to the Coastal Commission.

INTRODUCE BY TITLE ONLY ORDINANCE NO. 3259-23 AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF REDONDO BEACH, CALIFORNIA, ADOPTING AN ORDINANCE AMENDING TITLE 10, CHAPTER 2, ZONING AND LAND USE PERTAINING TO ADMINISTRATIVE DESIGN REVIEW AND PLANNING COMMISSION DESIGN REVIEW COMPLIANCE WITH OBJECTIVE RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND DETERMINING SUCH AMENDMENTS AS EXEMPT FROM THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT

INTRODUCE BY TITLE ONLY ORDINANCE NO. 3260-23 AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF REDONDO BEACH, CALIFORNIA, ADOPTING AN ORDINANCE AMENDING TITLE 10, CHAPTER 5, COASTAL LAND USE IMPLEMENTING ORDINANCE PERTAINING TO ADMINISTRATIVE DESIGN REVIEW AND PLANNING COMMISSION DESIGN REVIEW COMPLIANCE WITH OBJECTIVE RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS AND DETERMINING SUCH AMENDMENTS AS EXEMPT FROM THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT

ADOPT RESOLUTION NO. CC-2308-081 A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF REDONDO BEACH, CALIFORNIA, ADOPTING OBJECTIVE RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS

ADOPT RESOLUTION NO. CC-2308-082 A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF REDONDO BEACH, CALIFORNIA REQUESTING CERTIFICATION BY THE CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION OF AMENDMENTS TO THE COASTAL LAND USE PLAN IMPLEMENTATION ORDINANCE (TITLE 10, CHAPTER 5 OF THE MUNICIPAL CODE)
PERTAINING TO ADMINISTRATIVE DESIGN REVIEW AND PLANNING COMMISSION DESIGN REVIEW COMPLIANCE WITH OBJECTIVE RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS CONSISTENT WITH STATE LAW, WHICH IS INTENDED TO BE CARRIED OUT IN A MANNER FULLY IN CONFORMITY WITH THE COASTAL ACT; AND PROVIDING THAT THE AMENDMENTS TO THE CITY'S LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM WILL TAKE EFFECT AUTOMATICALLY UPON COASTAL COMMISSION APPROVAL PURSUANT TO PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE SECTION 30514 AND TITLE 14, SECTION 13551 OF THE CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS