

City Council on 2024-10-29 6:00 PM - CITY COUNCIL CHAMBER

Meeting Time: 10-29-24 18:00


eComments Report

Meetings	Meeting Time	Agenda Items	Comments	Support	Oppose	Neutral
City Council on 2024-10-29 6:00 PM - CITY COUNCIL CHAMBER	10-29-24 18:00	76	46	9	34	1

Sentiments for All Meetings

The following graphs display sentiments for comments that have location data. Only locations of users who have commented will be shown.

Overall Sentiment



City Council on 2024-10-29 6:00 PM - CITY COUNCIL CHAMBER
10-29-24 18:00


Agenda Name	Comments	Support	Oppose	Neutral
J.1. 24-1712 For eComments and Emails Received from the Public	1	0	0	0

Agenda Name	Comments	Support	Oppose	Neutral
<p>L.1. 24-1754 CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER LAND USE ELEMENT, ZONING ORDINANCE, AND LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM AMENDMENTS, AND CERTIFICATION OF A PROGRAM ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (EIR) THAT SERVE TO IMPLEMENT THE CITY'S CERTIFIED 6TH CYCLE HOUSING ELEMENT</p> <p>ADOPT BY TITLE ONLY RESOLUTION NO. CC-2410-105, CERTIFYING THE FINAL PROGRAM ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NUMBER 2023050732), ADOPTING FINDINGS PURSUANT TO THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT, ADOPTING A STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS, AND ADOPTING A MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR THE REDONDO BEACH FOCUSED GENERAL PLAN UPDATE, ZONING ORDINANCE UPDATE AND LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM AMENDMENT</p> <p>ADOPT BY TITLE ONLY RESOLUTION NO. CC-2410-106, AMENDING THE GENERAL PLAN LAND USE ELEMENT TO IMPLEMENT THE CITY'S CERTIFIED 6TH CYCLE 2021-2029 HOUSING ELEMENT AND OTHER AMENDMENTS REGARDING RESIDENTIALLY DESIGNATED PROPERTIES NOT IDENTIFIED AS PROGRAM ACTIONS IN THE CITY'S HOUSING ELEMENT</p> <p>ADOPT BY TITLE ONLY RESOLUTION NO. CC-2410-107, AMENDING THE COASTAL LAND USE PLAN OF THE CITY'S LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM TO IMPLEMENT THE CITY'S CERTIFIED 6TH CYCLE 2021-2029 HOUSING ELEMENT AND OTHER AMENDMENTS REGARDING RESIDENTIALLY DESIGNATED PROPERTIES NOT IDENTIFIED AS PROGRAM ACTIONS IN THE CITY'S HOUSING ELEMENT</p> <p>INTRODUCE BY TITLE ONLY ORDINANCE NO. CC-3281-24, AMENDING TITLE 10, CHAPTER 1 SUBDIVISIONS OF THE REDONDO BEACH MUNICIPAL CODE FOR CONSISTENCY WITH THE GENERAL PLAN LAND USE ELEMENT AND TO IMPLEMENT THE CITY'S CERTIFIED 6TH CYCLE 2021-2029 HOUSING ELEMENT AND OTHER AMENDMENTS REGARDING RESIDENTIALLY DESIGNATED PROPERTIES NOT IDENTIFIED AS PROGRAM ACTIONS IN THE CITY'S HOUSING ELEMENT. FOR INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING.</p> <p>INTRODUCE BY TITLE ONLY ORDINANCE NO. 3282-24, AMENDING TITLE 10 PLANNING AND ZONING, CHAPTER 2 ZONING AND LAND USE OF THE REDONDO BEACH MUNICIPAL CODE FOR CONSISTENCY WITH THE GENERAL PLAN LAND USE ELEMENT AND TO IMPLEMENT THE CITY'S CERTIFIED 6TH CYCLE 2021-2029 HOUSING ELEMENT AND OTHER AMENDMENTS REGARDING RESIDENTIALLY DESIGNATED PROPERTIES NOT IDENTIFIED AS PROGRAM ACTIONS IN THE CITY'S HOUSING ELEMENT. FOR INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING.</p> <p>INTRODUCE BY TITLE ONLY ORDINANCE NO. 3283-24, AMENDING TITLE 10 PLANNING AND ZONING, CHAPTER 5 COASTAL LAND USE PLAN IMPLEMENTING ORDINANCE OF THE REDONDO BEACH MUNICIPAL CODE FOR CONSISTENCY WITH THE GENERAL PLAN LAND USE ELEMENT AND TO IMPLEMENT THE CITY'S CERTIFIED 6TH CYCLE 2021-2029 HOUSING ELEMENT AND OTHER AMENDMENTS REGARDING RESIDENTIALLY DESIGNATED PROPERTIES NOT IDENTIFIED AS PROGRAM ACTIONS IN THE CITY'S HOUSING ELEMENT. FOR INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING.</p> <p>PROCEDURES:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Open the public hearing, take testimony 2. Close the public hearing 3. Adopt Resolution No. CC-2410-105, certifying the Final Program EIR, adopting findings pursuant to CEQA, adopting a Statement of Overriding Considerations, and adopting a mitigation monitoring and reporting program 4. Adopt Resolution No. CC-2410-106, amending the General Plan 	45	9	34	1

Sentiments for All Agenda Items


The following graphs display sentiments for comments that have location data. Only locations of users who have commented will be shown.

Overall Sentiment



Agenda Item: eComments for J.1. 24-1712 For eComments and Emails Received from the Public

Overall Sentiment



Location:

Submitted At: 4:53pm 10-29-24

Oppose FAR 1.25 (Except for RBPB and RBFD), SUPPORT FAR 0.5

Over 40 persons have signed onto the letter discussing BCHD current and proposed density of construction. See the main letter that was provided to the Council as public record. The key points are below.

PROTECT PROPERTY VALUES

It is common for property values around large developments to fall. The existing FAR 0.77 BCHD site has deteriorated local property values within one-half mile by over \$170M. An increase to FAR 1.25, especially with BCHD's proposed high-rise, edge-of-the-site construction will further deteriorate property values.

PROTECT HEALTH AND SAFETY FOR THE CITY

BCHD's proposed development project is a FAR 1.95, 800,000 square foot, 100+ foot tall commercial rental development for non-resident use. The 300,000 square foot private assisted living (RCFE) is for 80% non-resident use according to BCHD's own MDS study. The allcove building is for 91% non-resident use by all LA County SPA8, and that use and comes with no long-term 30-year funding to match the required BCHD-funded operation. The PACE facility is 95% non-resident use according to the National PACE Association's data. The 5% to 10% Redondo Beach resident use will not offset the HEALTH AND SAFETY damages to residents.

BCHD MAY NOT BE PROVIDING ANY NET HEALTH BENEFITS TO THE DISTRICT

BCHD's GALLUP consultants (paid \$400,000 in taxpayer funds) were unable to state if BCHD provided any health benefits. In its public relations release, Gallup could only say that it was "The good health exhibited by many adults in the Beach Cities area is likely in part the result of efforts of the Beach Cities Health District." LIKELY, IN PART is not a ringing endorsement from a large national consultant paid \$400K by BCHD. According to other statistical analysis, BCHD provides no net health benefits beyond those enjoyed by other Californians and SPA8 residents based on California Policy and local income levels.

Agenda Item: eComments for L.1. 24-1754 CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER LAND USE ELEMENT, ZONING ORDINANCE, AND LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM AMENDMENTS, AND CERTIFICATION OF A PROGRAM ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (EIR) THAT SERVE TO IMPLEMENT THE CITY'S CERTIFIED 6TH CYCLE HOUSING ELEMENT

ADOPT BY TITLE ONLY RESOLUTION NO. CC-2410-105, CERTIFYING THE FINAL PROGRAM ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NUMBER 2023050732), ADOPTING FINDINGS PURSUANT TO THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT, ADOPTING A STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS, AND ADOPTING A MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM FOR THE REDONDO BEACH FOCUSED GENERAL PLAN UPDATE, ZONING ORDINANCE UPDATE AND LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM AMENDMENT

ADOPT BY TITLE ONLY RESOLUTION NO. CC-2410-106, AMENDING THE GENERAL PLAN LAND USE ELEMENT TO IMPLEMENT THE CITY'S CERTIFIED 6TH CYCLE 2021-2029 HOUSING ELEMENT AND OTHER AMENDMENTS REGARDING RESIDENTIALLY DESIGNATED PROPERTIES NOT IDENTIFIED AS PROGRAM ACTIONS IN THE CITY'S HOUSING ELEMENT

ADOPT BY TITLE ONLY RESOLUTION NO. CC-2410-107, AMENDING THE COASTAL LAND USE PLAN OF THE CITY'S LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM TO IMPLEMENT THE CITY'S CERTIFIED 6TH CYCLE 2021-2029 HOUSING ELEMENT AND OTHER AMENDMENTS REGARDING RESIDENTIALLY DESIGNATED PROPERTIES NOT IDENTIFIED AS PROGRAM ACTIONS IN THE CITY'S HOUSING ELEMENT

INTRODUCE BY TITLE ONLY ORDINANCE NO. CC-3281-24, AMENDING TITLE 10, CHAPTER 1 SUBDIVISIONS OF THE REDONDO BEACH MUNICIPAL CODE FOR CONSISTENCY WITH THE GENERAL PLAN LAND USE ELEMENT AND TO IMPLEMENT THE CITY'S CERTIFIED 6TH CYCLE 2021-2029 HOUSING ELEMENT AND OTHER AMENDMENTS REGARDING RESIDENTIALLY DESIGNATED PROPERTIES NOT IDENTIFIED AS PROGRAM ACTIONS IN THE CITY'S HOUSING ELEMENT. FOR INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING.

INTRODUCE BY TITLE ONLY ORDINANCE NO. 3282-24, AMENDING TITLE 10 PLANNING AND ZONING, CHAPTER 2 ZONING AND LAND USE OF THE REDONDO BEACH MUNICIPAL CODE FOR CONSISTENCY WITH THE GENERAL PLAN LAND USE ELEMENT AND TO IMPLEMENT THE CITY'S CERTIFIED 6TH CYCLE 2021-2029 HOUSING ELEMENT AND OTHER AMENDMENTS REGARDING RESIDENTIALLY DESIGNATED PROPERTIES NOT IDENTIFIED AS PROGRAM ACTIONS IN THE CITY'S HOUSING ELEMENT. FOR INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING.


INTRODUCE BY TITLE ONLY ORDINANCE NO. 3283-24, AMENDING TITLE 10 PLANNING AND ZONING, CHAPTER 5 COASTAL LAND USE PLAN IMPLEMENTING ORDINANCE OF THE REDONDO BEACH MUNICIPAL CODE FOR CONSISTENCY WITH THE GENERAL PLAN LAND USE ELEMENT AND TO IMPLEMENT THE CITY'S CERTIFIED 6TH CYCLE 2021-2029 HOUSING ELEMENT AND OTHER AMENDMENTS REGARDING RESIDENTIALLY DESIGNATED PROPERTIES NOT IDENTIFIED AS PROGRAM ACTIONS IN THE CITY'S HOUSING ELEMENT. FOR INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING.

PROCEDURES:

1. Open the public hearing, take testimony
2. Close the public hearing
3. Adopt Resolution No. CC-2410-105, certifying the Final Program EIR, adopting findings pursuant to CEQA, adopting a Statement of Overriding Considerations, and adopting a mitigation monitoring and reporting program
4. Adopt Resolution No. CC-2410-106, amending the General Plan Land Use Element
5. Adopt Resolution No. CC-2410-107, amending the Land Use Plan of the City's Certified Local Coastal Program
6. Introduce for first reading Ordinance No. CC-3281-24, amending Title 10, Chapter 1 Subdivisions of the Redondo Beach Municipal Code
7. Introduce for first reading Ordinance No. CC-3282-24, amending Title 10, Chapter 2 Zoning and Land Use of the Redondo Beach Municipal Code
8. Introduce for first reading Ordinance No. CC-3283-24, amending Title 10, Chapter 5 Coastal Land Use Plan Implementing Ordinance of the Redondo Municipal Code, and
9. Provide staff with direction regarding the proposed re-zoning from R-1 to C-2 on Torrance Boulevard and RH to C-2 on Pacific Coast Highway

Overall Sentiment

Support (20%) Oppose (75%) Neutral (2%)
No Response (2%)



Maricela Guillermo

Location:

Submitted At: 9:02pm 10-29-24

I strongly SUPPORT the Planning Commission's recommendation of a 0.5 FAR for PI land use in our city's General Plan to PROTECT our public lands. The BCHD and School District should NOT receive special allowances for a FAR exceeding 0.5. If anything, these institutions should consider returning or dedicating the land back to our city for the benefit of all residents. Perhaps it is time to consider relocating the hotdog stand and exploring private funding options for the free services provided by BCHD.

Allowing a uniform FAR greater than 0.5 DISREGARDS the surrounding environment and its impact on infrastructure. Preserving any remaining open space is crucial, as is expanding gardens and tree cover. A 0.5 FAR supports responsible growth while safeguarding our infrastructure, environmental health, and quality of life. Please vote NO on BC!!

FRED LUKIN

Location:

Submitted At: 7:35pm 10-29-24

Regarding Agenda Item L1, I OPPOSE certification of the EIR as presented. I SUPPORT a uniform 1.25 FAR for BCHD and all public institutions. Reducing FAR to 0.50 is a 60% reduction, which would force BCHD to eliminate services, specifically the gym facilities.

Everyone needs physical activities and socialization. We do not want to be a burden on our families or a drain on societies resources. This matters a lot to me and I don't want to lose it.

Mark Nelson

Location:

Submitted At: 6:22pm 10-29-24

I support the planning commission's FAR recommendation for 0.5 FAR for PI land use. I oppose 1.25 FAR except for RBFD and RBPd use. Residential neighborhoods should not be destroyed and have property reductions by high density development on PUBLIC land.

Brian Wolfson

Location:

Submitted At: 6:20pm 10-29-24

I don't believe the Redondo Beach city council should make a zoning exception for the BCHD and shouldn't expand the FAR for P/I zones within the city of Redondo Beach.

Under threat of a lawsuit, the BCHD is seeking preferential treatment from the city of Redondo Beach even though they haven't submitted an application for a project. When questioned by the city regarding their planned development of the South Bay hospital site, the BCHD CEO has repeatedly said they don't have a specific project in place. It is unclear whether they will have a specific project in the future. On the other hand, the city council has a clear mandate to minimize over development and to ensure future projects retain the character of the neighborhoods surrounding any potential development. The city council has a responsibility to the community to make sure the decisions made regarding density adhere to the guidelines as outlined in the updated general plan. Do not make decisions for special interests. Keep public and institutional land free from commercial development.

Do not expand the FAR for public and institutional property in Redondo Beach. Safeguard the limited public land for current and future generations. Do not abandon a vision for the city that so many support and so many have worked to protect.

Kim Wong

Location:

Submitted At: 6:08pm 10-29-24

Regarding Agenda Item L1, I OPPOSE certification of the EIR as presented. I SUPPORT a uniform 1.25 FAR for BCHD and all public institutions. BCHD is a very useful resource for me to engage with my community. I became a garden angel volunteer to help in all of the elementary schools in Redondo Beach, Hermosa Beach, and one in Manhattan Beach. I also participate in other activities in my community. BCHD's success makes my life better.

Christine Ng

Location:

Submitted At: 5:45pm 10-29-24

Regarding Agenda Item L1, I OPPOSE certification of the EIR as presented. I SUPPORT a uniform 1.25 FAR for BCHD and all public institutions.

Paula Dobin

Location:

Submitted At: 5:42pm 10-29-24

Regarding Agenda Item L1 – Is anyone reading all the comments your constituents are making and actively listening? It's quite frustrating to have to plead with our elected City Council members and representatives to whom we have entrusted our community, to do the right thing. Please implement a uniformly applied 1.25 FAR for all public institutions, including BCHD.

Jenna Shahid

Location:

Submitted At: 5:05pm 10-29-24

In response to Agenda Item L1, I oppose the limitations of the floor area ratio of the BCHD property as stated in the EIR. I believe the allcove is a fundamental resource for teens and young adults struggling with mental health, and therefore should be allocated a ratio of more than 1.25, preferably 1.5 - 2. As a 17 year old member of the Youth Advisory Group at the allcove, and resident of Redondo Beach, I have seen first hand the effects the allcove has on my peers and how many depend on it as a source of support, hope, and safety. By limiting the floor area ratio, you are inhibiting the essential role the allcove plays in hundreds of people's lives, including myself. I hope to see this resource grow and continue to provide meaningful support to individuals in our community, and by expanding the floor area ratio of said building, I believe it will greatly enhance the scope and effectiveness of this mental health facility.

Tim Ryan

Location:

Submitted At: 5:04pm 10-29-24

Like other rational Redondo Beach voters I say keep the FAR at 0.5 and approve what you have in front of you "as is". There is no need to make special side deals for BCHD. Frankly I am appalled at the misinformation being spread by them and the fact that some council members and the mayor are even considering raising it as a special favor to BCHD. Isn't making those kind of changes why the mayor worked so hard to pass measure DD years ago? What happened to him now he's acting mayor, did he drink the coolaid?

Tory Lehrer

Location:

Submitted At: 4:58pm 10-29-24

I have had enough of the misinformation spread out by BCHD. Nothing that has been presented to the council in general plan prevents them from building their wasteful Campus for "Rich Dying People". They just don't want to face the public scrutiny of voters casting a ballot to decide their fate because they know it won't be approved. Keep the FAR a 0.5 and approve the general plan as is. Stop the insanity already.

Jessica Gonzales

Location:

Submitted At: 4:54pm 10-29-24

The planning commission got it right - don't change their recommendation. Just because a bunch of ditto heads who copy and past comments from the BCHD mothership email is no reason to destroy the zoning of the city. If BCHD wants to build something let them go through the same process as anyone else. It worked for Kensington! Keep the FAR at 0.5!

JB Abrahams

Location:

Submitted At: 4:50pm 10-29-24

I support the recommendation made by the planning commission at a 0.5 FAR. It makes sense for the community to allow city emergency services to have a higher FAR as they ARE VITAL SERVICES.

BCHD and School District are NOT and should not be allowed special treatment.

Zach Sniderman

Location:

Submitted At: 4:11pm 10-29-24

Regarding Agenda Item L1, I OPPOSE certification of the EIR as presented. I SUPPORT a uniform 1.25 FAR for BCHD and all public institutions. As a 17 year old advocate for Youth Mental Health and member of the Allcove Youth Advisory Group, I unequivocally believe that a FAR of 1.25 or above is a necessary provision to support an organization which has been instrumental to providing youth that suffer from depression, such as my own best friend, with a reason to remain hopeful. A reduction of the FAR for BCHD would significantly alter its ability to maintain the wonderful services it currently provides, and would be a slap in the face to all those who presently depend on their life-changing aid.

Olivia Guzman

Location:

Submitted At: 3:59pm 10-29-24

I support a uniform 1.25 FAR for BCHD, and therefore, I oppose certification of the EIR as presented. I oppose this item which seeks to limit the amount of space needed to retrofit and rebuild/update a new Beach Cities Health District compound. The BCDH serves all of the beach cities, especially the elderly. But, it also helps teens and their parents who need resources and guidance during what can be a challenging time in life. It will be unfortunate if the Health District cannot rebuild to its current capacity. I am also a resident of Redondo Beach, living near the BCHD, and see no threat to the community by allowing the District to rebuild to its current size. The Center for Health and Fitness is a welcome and much-needed alternative to attending a gym for many of us that are seniors. The other programs are valuable for the community as well.

Ron Werner

Location:

Submitted At: 3:57pm 10-29-24

Regarding Agenda Item L1, I OPPOSE certification of the EIR as presented. I SUPPORT a uniform 1.25 FAR for BCHD and all public institutions. Reducing the EIR decreases the value of the property and will result in BCHD not having the financial resources to allow it to operate offering its services to the community. I have been a member of Center of Health and Fitness visiting the facility for over 200 days every year. It is not only a gym but a community to us seniors.

Eugenie Lewis

Location:

Submitted At: 3:08pm 10-29-24

Regarding Agenda Item L1, I OPPOSE certification of the EIR as presented. I SUPPORT a uniform 1.25 FAR for BCHD and all public institutions.

Good evening, my name is Eugenie Lewis and I am a proud resident of Redondo Beach and passionate supporter of the Beach Cities Health District. Since moving to the south bay community 28 years ago, I have been committed to making the community a better place. I am parent of two children who attended Redondo Schools.

As PTA leader, school counselor, and mental health professional I have had the opportunity to observe first-hand the great contributions the Beach Cities Health District has made to our community. Through their prevention programming they have brought nutrition education, physical fitness and substance use prevention to our community and more. The Blue Zones project created opportunities for the community to get together in walking groups, purpose workshops, mindfulness activities, and healthy gatherings.

The opening of allcove Beach Cities has greatly improved access to a range of needed youth services at time of great need following the COVID pandemic. The center is staffed by highly trained professional staff and community organizations who have responded to the need for services in a welcoming space.

I salute BCHD for having the leadership and foresight to bring a model of preventative services to the South Bay. I urge people to support Measure BC, the General Obligation Bond on the November ballot. I also ask that the Redondo Beach City Council vote to maintain a 1.25 Floor Area Ratio (FAR) for public institution use in the General Plan. This will enable BCHD to move forward with plans to renovate the campus, meet current seismic standards and maintain this great service for our community.

Patricia Bellas

Location:

Submitted At: 2:42pm 10-29-24

Regarding Agenda Item L1, I OPPOSE certification of the EIR as presented. I would SUPPORT a uniform 1.25 FAR for BCHD and all public institutions. I am glad that surrounding communities also benefit from the programs that BCHD offers, especially for the youth, as we do not live in a bubble. Our community benefits from the strength of the greater community.

krista allen

Location:

Submitted At: 2:27pm 10-29-24

Beach Cities Hospital District wants a higher FAR to 1.25 so that they can release the 11 acres we paid for, to a developer for high occupancy development.

BCHD is NOT an institution that is for RB only, therefore, it should remain with recommendation of Plannings.

BCHD deserves 0.50 FAR

Amy Kim

Location:

Submitted At: 1:48pm 10-29-24

BCHD has been instrumental in helping people of all ages within and outside the community. As a member of the allcove Youth Advisory Group, I know firsthand the impacts that the BCHD team create on others. Even though it is only one pillar of the many powerful resources BCHD provides, allcove makes a tremendous impact to the upcoming generations by its unique ability to provide free, accommodating care to the youth regardless of background. Supporting BCHD ensures that programs like these are not limited in their potential to reach many.

Steve Goldstein

Location:

Submitted At: 10:59am 10-29-24

Regarding Agenda Item L1, I OPPOSE certification of the EIR as presented. I SUPPORT a uniform 1.25 FAR for BCHD and all public institutions.

Diane Yu

Location:

Submitted At: 10:53am 10-29-24

Regarding Agenda Item L1, I OPPOSE certification of the EIR as presented. I SUPPORT a uniform 1.25 FAR for BCHD and all public institutions. BCHD provides a tremendous amount of resources and support to our community. It's one of the main benefits of being a Beach Cities resident. It would be a shame to lose it.

Isabel Boroch

Location:

Submitted At: 10:36am 10-29-24

Regarding Agenda Item L1, I OPPOSE certification of the EIR as presented. I SUPPORT a uniform 1.25 FAR for BCHD and all public institutions. As a Mira Costa High School student, BCHD's resources have had a profound impact on me and my peers, specifically in the form of allcove. Simply knowing we are supported by our community with this center for youth is a comforting thought and unique to the Beach Cities. A FAR of 1.25 is essential to provide BCHD with the space and ability to maintain its vital support for the community.

Howard Darvey

Location:

Submitted At: 9:51am 10-29-24

I have been a volunteer at "The Center for Health and Fitness" (a part of BCHD) for many years. I have seen the benefits that BCHD and the Center provide for the community. This is a nonprofit, community based, health facility and organization dedicated to providing and improving health outcomes for all in our community. Please help continue to provide best services by supporting a 1.25 FAR for this and all public institutions.

Rafael McMaster

Location:

Submitted At: 9:36am 10-29-24

I support BCHD fully and am disappointed and discouraged by the impact of loud community members who don't necessarily have their facts straight. If this means needing to comment on here once a week, then I am happy to do so - it's the least we can do to show support for a community cornerstone that supports so many facets and segments of our community. I am grateful to BCHD and its teams of workers that stay in their integrity and steadfast in their commitment to serve our community, despite having to defend their position to serve and help others. Thank you BCHD for all you do, on behalf of all of the local families you impact and support.

Maggie Healy

Location:

Submitted At: 9:11am 10-29-24

We oppose certification of the EIR as presented and support a uniform 1.25 FAR for BCHD and all public institutions. Limiting the BCHD in this unfair and discriminatory manner makes no sense and goes against the best interests and demands of the residents.

Darlene Guerrero

Location:

Submitted At: 8:42am 10-29-24

"Regarding Agenda Item L1, I OPPOSE certification of the EIR as presented. I SUPPORT a uniform 1.25 FAR for BCHD and all public institutions"

BCHS has been an invaluable support system by helping me find resources and provide memory care for my loved one. Their services have not only improved my loved one's quality of life but also allowed me to continue working full-time without added stress. Without their support, it would be difficult to maintain the stability and

quality of life my whole family enjoy today, which also benefits the community as a whole.

Linda Buck

Location:

Submitted At: 8:13am 10-29-24

I OPPOSE certification of the EIR as presented. I SUPPORT a uniform 1.25 FAR for BCHD and all public institutions. BCHD is a vital service to our community. They offer so many School and Youth Programs through LiveWell Kids, School Gardens, 8-Minute Exercises, Classroom Activity Breaks, Walk to School, and Streets for All. These programs offer our youth nutritional and physical resources that have lead to the reduction of obesity in the Beach Cities. They offer Social, Emotional, and Mental Health Services and Resources for our youth aged 12-25 through allcove Beach Cities. BCHD provides our youth with empowering opportunities (Beach Cities Partnership for Youth, Youth Advisory Council, and Volunteer Opportunities) which all promote social and emotional stability among our youth. BCHD also provides Substance Use Prevention, Parent Education (Device Use and Social Media, Talk About It, Parents' Guide to Raising Happy, Healthy and Resilient Children), and so many Free Community Programs (Moai Walking Groups, Fitness classes, Mindfulness, Social Hour, Purpose workshops, to just name a few). The Blue Zone Project has reached everyone in our community through restaurants, grocery stores, workshops, and their 9 Power Principles. The Center for Health and Fitness and Adventureplex are unique resources available to our community. BCHD CANNOT OFFER ALL OF THESE PROGRAMS IF THEIR FAR IS REDUCED. Could the other public resources in our community provide the same service if their FAR are reduced? If so, why are they not being placed under the same restriction? It should be ONE FAR FOR ALL!

Vicky Oetzell

Location:

Submitted At: 8:09am 10-29-24

I oppose certification of the EIR as presented. I support a uniform 1.25 FAR for BCHD AND ALL public institutions. The public will be watching carefully those city council members that support the certification of this unfair EIR, and will remember at election time in March.

Theresa Cannon

Location:

Submitted At: 10:45pm 10-28-24

Regarding Agenda Item L1, I OPPOSE certification of the EIR as presented. I SUPPORT a uniform 1.25 FAR for BCHD and all public institutions

Debra Lotstein

Location:

Submitted At: 10:10pm 10-28-24

Regarding Agenda Item L1, I OPPOSE certification of the EIR as presented. I SUPPORT a uniform 1.25 FAR for BCHD and all public institutions. As a physician and community member, I have seen first hand the value of BCHD's work for our community. They are providing innovative services that especially support the more vulnerable population, including older individuals who need more support to stay independent, and preventative and accessible mental health services for adolescents through Allcove. These programs are huge assets for the Beach Cities, and help build a more cohesive community; modernizing their facilities allows them to continue to expand the reach of these services. Debra Lotstein, MD, MPH

Cheryl Kahnamoui

Location:

Submitted At: 8:57pm 10-28-24

I oppose certification of the EIR as presented. I support a uniform 1.25 FAR for BCHD - and all public institutions. BCHD is an integral and important part of the south bay. The good that BCHD does in our community should not be undervalued or overlooked.

They have programs that benefit people of all ages. Almost all of their programs are helped by volunteers which saves money and engages residents.

The facility needs to be upgraded. Let's continue to support BCHD and all of the services they offer our community.

Alyssa Finigan

Location:

Submitted At: 6:38pm 10-28-24

Regarding Agenda Item L1, I respectfully oppose the certification of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) as it currently stands. Instead, I advocate for a uniform Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 1.25 for the Beach Cities Health District (BCHD) and all public institutions, fostering a balanced and community-friendly development approach.

One particularly valuable program BCHD provides is the Allcove facility. This center offers essential support for young adults, providing mental health services, an inviting space for academic work, and a safe area for social interaction. As a dedicated member of Allcove's Youth Advisory Group and co-lead of the BCHD Youth Advisory Council, I have spent the past five years directly engaging with and witnessing the transformative impact of BCHD's services. Through my work, I've seen firsthand how Allcove's support creates a nurturing environment for students, contributing positively to their academic success and emotional well-being.

Susan Brilliant

Location:

Submitted At: 6:38pm 10-28-24

Regarding Agenda Item L1, I OPPOSE certification of the EIR as presented. I SUPPORT a uniform 1.25 FAR for BCHD and all public institutions. The District is an important thread stitching together the beach cities fabric, and one of the reasons my family chooses to live here and serve the community.

Brenda OLeary

Location:

Submitted At: 5:53pm 10-28-24

I'm writing in support of Beach Cities Health District, especially the allcove mental health program for young people ages 12-25. Our kid are experiencing a mental health crisis and community support is so important. I am also in support of offering BCHD a fair FAR that is commensurate with surrounding similar properties.

James Vita

Location:

Submitted At: 5:50pm 10-28-24

I support a 1.25 FAR for BCHD and other entities that provide beneficial services to the community.

Mariam Butler

Location:

Submitted At: 4:46pm 10-28-24

I am so sick and tired of the selfish antics of certain people in the city attempting to "stop BCHD." Stop them from what?? Providing much-needed mental health services to our community? The fact that Allcove has increasingly high attendance tells you it was much needed and well utilized. Stop them from provided much-needed senior services? Providing services to our local schools? Beach Cities health district is a valuable asset to our community. I totally oppose them getting a lower FAR than everyone else. it also puts our city at risk for a lawsuit. I oppose the EIR as presented, and I am asking BCHD get a 1.25 FAR

I am also asking the council and mayor to take a firm stance and and tell those that oppose BCHD that just like we have the friendship foundation going up on Inglewood Ave to serve a vulnerable population, BCHD Will also need to update their infrastructure and expand to provide THEIR services to the vulnerable population they serve.

Karen Reed

Location:

Submitted At: 4:33pm 10-28-24

Regarding Agenda Item L1, I OPPOSE certification of the EIR as presented. I SUPPORT a uniform 1.25 FAR for BCHD and all public institutions. Why does our City continue to stifle growth? Why do we allow important facilities to fall into disrepair? Please allow BCHD to modernize and update their facilities. Youth mental health services have never been more crucial for our community. Public scoping for the project started in 2019, why are we still going back and forth on this after 5 YEARS!?

Cindy Smith

Location:

Submitted At: 4:11pm 10-28-24

Regarding Agenda Item L1, I OPPOSE certification of the EIR as presented. I SUPPORT a uniform 1.25 FAR for BCHD and all public institutions.

Jill Millstein

Location:

Submitted At: 3:38pm 10-28-24

Regarding Agenda Item L1, I OPPOSE certification of the EIR as presented. I SUPPORT a uniform 1.25 FAR for BCHD and all public institutions. My entire family has used various BCHD services and attended their events. We value the support and guidance provided and have benefited greatly from them. Allcove's attendance and use of services alone is staggering and demonstrates the need for such services in our community.

Marie Puterbaugh

Location:

Submitted At: 3:10pm 10-28-24

Once I again, we must plead with our council to do the right thing and approve a fair FAR for all. Do you realize how exhausting this is? Have you not heard all the residents talk about how much they appreciate BCHD? Is Council not tired of the blight? Is the plan to just let buildings fall to disrepair as Council has allowed for our FD and PD? It is really epically annoying to have to keep asking our council, who was on the cover of the LA Times for nastiness, to not pander to "Stop BCHD" people which literally are asking people to email "YESTOFAR50@Gmail.com" to "Stop BCHD" - not work with, not compromise but stop. It is a disgrace that this is the third time I've commented FAR for one, FAR for all, but I guess there is no embarrassing Redondo City Council majority.

Amy Huh

Location:

Submitted At: 12:52pm 10-28-24

Regarding Agenda Item L1, I OPPOSE certification of the EIR as presented. I SUPPORT a uniform 1.25 FAR for BCHD and all public institutions. Allcove is a very important resource for the young people of the South Bay. Please don't jepordize this and please do support BCHD services.

Mary Drummer

Location:

Submitted At: 12:35pm 10-28-24

I support the uniform assignment of FAR assignments for all Public institutions in Redondo Beach. Full stop!

Steve Randall

Location:

Submitted At: 12:32pm 10-28-24

Getting really tired of the BCHD false market spin that they need to be SAVED and the implication that if the FAR isn't increased their services will go away. That's not true. And when they're being dishonest about that, it begs the question what else are they being dishonest about? Then they pull this 'fairness' talk that isn't logical as not all properties with the same zoning are the same size with the same impacts to neighborhoods. That's what EIRs are for. And that's what CUPs are for. And that's what variances are for. And they're not the lone ranger for consideration here on everything included in this item. Really dishonest of BCHD. And then to threaten to sue the city! Same old tired game plan of the past that wastes time and money needlessly.

Aditi Crosby

Location:

Submitted At: 12:09pm 10-28-24

Regarding Agenda Item L1, I OPPOSE certification of the EIR as presented. I SUPPORT a uniform 1.25 FAR for BCHD and all public institutions.

Executive Director StopBCHD.com

Location:

Submitted At: 8:50pm 10-27-24

It is inappropriate to even consider raising ONLY the BCHD FAR to 1.25, while denying 1.25 to the RBUSD and all other public land. As such, any EIR analysis requires an review and certification of FAR 1.25 for ALL PUBLIC LAND, not just BCHD. This is a likely point of litigation if the City cherry picks BCHD, a largely outside of Redondo Beach public agency for preferential treatment.