

**CITY OF REDONDO BEACH  
PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA  
Thursday, July 17, 2025**

**415 DIAMOND STREET, REDONDO BEACH**

**CITY COUNCIL CHAMBER**

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

**ALL PUBLIC MEETINGS HAVE RESUMED IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER.  
MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC MAY PARTICIPATE IN-PERSON, BY ZOOM,  
EMAIL OR eCOMMENT.**

Planning Commission meetings are broadcast live through Spectrum Cable, Channel 8, and Frontier Communications, Channel 41. Live streams and indexed archives of meetings are available via internet. Visit the City's office website at [www.Redondo.org/rbtv](http://www.Redondo.org/rbtv).

TO WATCH MEETING LIVE ON CITY'S WEBSITE:

<https://redondo.legistar.com/Calendar.aspx>

\*Click "In Progress" hyperlink under Video section of meeting

TO WATCH MEETING LIVE ON YOUTUBE:

<https://www.youtube.com/c/CityofRedondoBeachIT>

TO JOIN ZOOM MEETING (FOR PUBLIC COMMENT ONLY):

Register in advance for this meeting:

[https://www.zoomgov.com/webinar/register/WN\\_\\_s648-MDRriOtr4nSvUbYg#/registration](https://www.zoomgov.com/webinar/register/WN__s648-MDRriOtr4nSvUbYg#/registration)

After registering, you will receive a confirmation email containing information about joining the meeting.

If you are participating by phone, be sure to provide your phone # when registering. You will be provided a Toll Free number and a Meeting ID to access the meeting. Note; press # to bypass Participant ID. Attendees will be muted until the public participation period is opened. When you are called on to speak, press \*6 to unmute your line. Note, comments from the public are limited to 3 minutes per speaker.

eCOMMENT: COMMENTS MAY BE ENTERED DIRECTLY ON WEBSITE AGENDA PAGE:

<https://redondo.granicusideas.com/meetings>

- 1) Public comments can be entered before and during the meeting.
- 2) Select a SPECIFIC AGENDA ITEM to enter your comment;
- 3) Public will be prompted to Sign-Up to create a free personal account (one-time) and then comments may be added to each Agenda item of interest.
- 4) Public comments entered into eComment (up to 2200 characters; equal to approximately 3 minutes of oral comments) will become part of the official meeting record. Comments may be read out loud during the meeting.

EMAIL: TO PARTICIPATE BY WRITTEN COMMUNICATION WITH ATTACHED DOCUMENTS BEFORE 3PM DAY OF MEETING:

Written materials that include attachments pertaining to matters listed on the posted agenda received after the agenda has been published will be added as supplemental materials under

the relevant agenda item. PlanningRedondo@redondo.org

## **REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION - 6:30 PM**

### **A. CALL TO ORDER**

### **B. ROLL CALL**

### **C. SALUTE TO THE FLAG**

### **D. APPROVE ORDER OF AGENDA**

### **E. BLUE FOLDER ITEMS - ADDITIONAL BACK UP MATERIALS**

*Blue folder items are additional back up material to administrative reports and/or public comments received after the printing and distribution of the agenda packet for receive and file.*

#### **E.1. [RECEIVE AND FILE BLUE FOLDER ITEMS- Placeholder for items received after the release of the agenda](#)**

### **F. CONSENT CALENDAR**

*Business items, except those formally noticed for public hearing, or those pulled for discussion are assigned to the Consent Calendar. The Commission Members may request that any Consent Calendar item(s) be removed, discussed, and acted upon separately. Items removed from the Consent Calendar will be taken up under the "Excluded Consent Calendar" section below. Those items remaining on the Consent Calendar will be approved in one motion. The Chair will call on anyone wishing to address the Commission on any Consent Calendar item on the agenda, which has not been pulled by the Commission for discussion. Each speaker will be permitted to speak only once and comments will be limited to a total of three minutes.*

#### **F.1. [APPROVE THE AFFIDAVIT OF POSTING FOR THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF JULY 17, 2025.](#)**

#### **F.2. [APPROVE MINUTES FOR THE PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING OF FEBRUARY 20, 2025.](#)**

### **G. EXCLUDED CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS**

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

*This section is intended to provide members of the public with the opportunity to comment on any subject that does not appear on this agenda for action. This section is limited to 30 minutes. Each speaker will be afforded three minutes to address the Commission. Each speaker will be permitted to speak only once. Written requests, if any, will be considered first under this section.*

#### **H.1. [RECEIVE AND FILE WRITTEN COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS](#)**

### **I. EX PARTE COMMUNICATION**

*This section is intended to allow all officials the opportunity to reveal any disclosure or ex parte communication about the following public hearings.*

### **J. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

#### **J.1. [Public hearing to consider Ordinances amending Title 10 Chapter 2 Zoning and Land Use, and Title 10 Chapter 5 Coastal Land Use Plan Implementing Ordinance of the Redondo Beach Municipal Code pertaining to regulations for smoke shops.](#)**

**K. ITEMS CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS AGENDAS**

**L. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION PRIOR TO ACTION**

**M. ITEMS FROM STAFF**

**N. COMMISSION MEMBER ITEMS AND FUTURE COMMISSION AGENDA TOPICS**

**O. ADJOURNMENT**

*The next meeting of the Redondo Beach Planning Commission will be a regular meeting to be held at 6:30 p.m. on August 21, 2025, in the Redondo Beach Council Chambers, at 415 Diamond Street, Redondo Beach.*

*It is the intention of the City of Redondo Beach to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) in all respects. If, as an attendee or a participant at this meeting you will need special assistance beyond what is normally provided, the City will attempt to accommodate you in every reasonable manner. Please contact the City Clerk's Office at (310) 318-0656 at least forty-eight (48) hours prior to the meeting to inform us of your particular needs and to determine if accommodation is feasible. Please advise us at that time if you will need accommodations to attend or participate in meetings on a regular basis.*

*An agenda packet is available 24 hours at [www.redondo.org](http://www.redondo.org) under the City Clerk.*



# Administrative Report

---

E.1., File # PC25-1027

Meeting Date: 7/17/2025

---

**TITLE**

RECEIVE AND FILE BLUE FOLDER ITEMS- Placeholder for items received after the release of the agenda



# Administrative Report

---

F.1., File # PC25-1028

Meeting Date: 7/17/2025

---

**TITLE**

APPROVE THE AFFIDAVIT OF POSTING FOR THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF JUNE 19, 2025.



Community Development  
Planning Division

415 Diamond Street, P.O. Box 270  
Redondo Beach, California 90277-0270  
www.redondo.org

tel 310 318-0637  
fax 310 372-8021

STATE OF CALIFORNIA           )  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES    )     SS  
CITY OF REDONDO BEACH       )

### **AFFIDAVIT OF POSTING**

In compliance with the Brown Act, the following materials have been posted at the locations indicated below.

Legislative Body               Planning Commission

Posting Type                    Regular Meeting Agenda

Posting Locations               415 Diamond Street, Redondo Beach, CA 90277  
✓ Bulletin Board Adjacent to Council Chambers  
✓ City Clerk's Office, Door 1

Meeting Date & Time          Thursday July 17, 2025               6:30 p.m.

As Planning Technician of the City of Redondo Beach, I declare, under penalty of perjury, the document noted above was posted at the date displayed below.

*Daisy Canales, Planning Technician*

Date: July 10, 2025



# Administrative Report

---

F.2., File # PC25-1029

Meeting Date: 7/17/2025

---

**TITLE**

APPROVE MINUTES FOR THE PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING OF FEBRUARY 20, 2025.



Minutes Regular Meeting  
Planning Commission  
February 20, 2025

**CITY OF REDONDO BEACH  
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES  
Thursday, February 20, 2025**

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

**A. CALL TO ORDER**

A regular meeting of the Planning Commission, held in the Redondo Beach Council Chambers at 415 Diamond Street, Redondo Beach, California was called to order by Chair Lamb at 6:30 p.m.

**B. ROLL CALL**

Commissioners Present: Boswell (arrived at 6:38 p.m.), Conroy, Craig, Gaddis, Hazeltine, Light and Chair Lamb

Officials Present: Marc Wiener, Community Development Director  
Cheryl Park, Assistant City Attorney  
Diana Varat, Contract Counsel  
Sean Scully, Planning Manager  
Steven Giang, Senior Planner  
Jamaal Brown, Planning Analyst

**C. SALUTE TO THE FLAG**

Commissioner Conroy led in the Salute to the Flag.

**D. APPROVE ORDER OF AGENDA**

Motion by Commissioner Gaddis, seconded by Commissioner Conroy, and approved by voice vote, the order of the agenda, as presented.

The motion carried 6-0-1, with Commissioner Boswell, absent.

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

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

Jamaal Brown, Planning Analyst, reported there was one Blue Folder Item.



Motion by Commissioner Gaddis, seconded by Commissioner Craig and carried by voice vote, to receive and file Blue Folder Items.

The motion carried 6-0-1, with Commissioner Boswell, absent.

## **F. CONSENT CALENDAR**

### **F.1. APPROVE AFFIDAVIT OF POSTING FOR THE PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING OF FEBRUARY 20, 2025**

There were no public comments on Consent Calendar items.

Motion by Commissioner Gaddis, seconded by Commissioner Conroy, and approved by voice vote, the Consent Calendar, as presented.

The motion carried 6-0-1, with Commissioner Boswell, absent.

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

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

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

Chair Lamb invited public comments.

Commissioner Boswell arrived at 6:38 p.m.

Rich McQuillin presented a status update of North Redondo Beach activities along Artesia Boulevard; talked about programing events and forming a BID; discussed the need for commercial businesses; expressed concerns about the loss of retail and noted his intent to elevate the commerce experience by enabling merchants to help customers accomplish their goals and fulfill needs instead of just buying products and reported his plan is to reactivate Artesia Boulevard and the Galleria as flagship sites.

Chair Lamb thanked Rich McQuillin for his continued involvement.

Discussion followed regarding making Artesia Boulevard into a Redondo Beach “Main Street”.

Holly Osborne (via Zoom) spoke favorably about having a movie theater on Artesia Boulevard; wondered about five-foot setbacks for fire code compliance and whether the Board of Supervisors is thinking of suspending RHNA in light of the fires.

There were no other public comments on non-agenda items.

## **I. EX PARTE COMMUNICATION**

Commissioner Craig reported speaking with Commissioner Gaddis, members of the public and staff regarding Item No. J.1.

Commissioner Gaddis reported speaking with Commissioner Craig and Councilmember Loewenstein.

Commissioner Conroy reported speaking with Mayor Light and Councilmember Loewenstein.

Commissioner Hazeltine reported speaking with Chair Lamb.

Chair Lamb reported speaking with Commissioner Hazeltine, Planning Manager Scully and a proponent.

## **J. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**J.1. Public hearing for consideration of an Exemption Declaration, Conditional Use Permit (CUP-2024-0044), Planning Commission Design Review, and Subdivision (Vesting Tentative Tract Map No. 84401) to permit the construction of a Residential Condominium Project with 43 Units (three (3) of which are affordable to very low income households), located on three parcels (7505-010-015, 7505-010-036, and 7505-010-035) within a High Density Multiple-Family Residential (RH-2) zone and Low Density Multi-Family Residential (R-3) zone at 122 N. Pacific Coast Highway and 126 N. Pacific Coast Highway.**

**PROPERTY OWNER: Archdiocese of Los Angeles**

**APPLICANT: City Ventures**

**LOCATION: 122 & 126 N. Pacific Coast Highway**

**CASE NO: CUP-2024-0044; VTTM No. 84401**

**RECOMMENDATION:**

- 1. Open the public hearing and take testimony;**
- 2. Close the public hearing;**
- 3. Adopt the attached resolution by title only, waiving further reading.**

**A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF REDONDO BEACH ADOPTING A CEQA EXEMPTION DECLARATION AND APPROVING THE REQUEST FOR A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT, PLANNING COMMISSION DESIGN REVIEW, AND SUBDIVISION (VESTING TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 84401) TO PERMIT THE CONSTRUCTION OF A**

**RESIDENTIAL CONDOMINIUM PROJECT WITH 43 UNITS, THREE OF WHICH ARE AFFORDABLE TO VERY LOW INCOME HOUSEHOLDS, LOCATED ON THREE PARCELS (7505-010-015, 7505-010-036, AND 7505-010-035) WITHIN A HIGH DENSITY MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL (RH-2) ZONE AND LOW DENSITY MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL (R-3) ZONE AT 122 AND 126 N. PACIFIC COAST HIGHWAY AND 208 CENTRAL COURT (CASE NO. CUP-2024-0044)**

Motion by Commissioner Gaddis, seconded by Commissioner Craig, and approved by voice vote, to open the public hearing.

The motion carried 7-0.

Community Development Director Wiener introduced the item; presented a brief background; addressed SB 330, objective and subjective standards and the Planning Commission's role and deferred to staff for a presentation.

Senior Planner Giang narrated a PowerPoint presentation with details of the proposed project.

Chair Lamb administered an oath to those planning on speaking regarding this item.

Patrick Chen, City Ventures Development, narrated a PowerPoint presentation with details of their proposal.

Discussion followed regarding including the site in the Housing Element as a Designated Housing site, income requirements for affordable housing units, having one project entry, using drought resistant landscaping, location of the garages, setbacks, cutting down into the site three or four feet, the length of the affordable housing covenant (45 years) and disbursing affordable housing units mixed with market rate units.

In response to an inquiry from the Commission, Community Development Director Wiener reported there is no requirement that the units be uniform in design.

Commissioner Boswell mentioned lesser units would normally be less expensive and talked about distinctions between affordable units and market rate units.

Chris Bert, Cox Castle, Land Use Counsel, addressed the term of affordability and design of the units.

Community Development Director Wiener reported Diana Varat, from the City Attorney's office, is online, representing the City and explained the economic realities of affordable housing projects and the need to make them affordable by design.

Discussion followed regarding State law requirements for buyers, deed restrictions, changes in affordability levels, site constraints, additional development incentives, conversations with residents regarding parking and whether the City would consider permitted parking, visitor parking, impacts on street parking, daily vehicle trips generated by the project, left turn restrictions, guest parking spaces, school trips generated and addressing additional traffic from people taking their kids to school.

Abby Pal, Transportation Planner, City Ventures, discussed traffic and parking impact study guidelines and requirements; talked about studies that were not required and reported the only analysis done was a VMT screening analysis relative to trip generation impacts.

Commissioner Conroy talked about the number of vehicles that will be added to the surrounding streets by the project and wondered where the additional cars will park.

Community Development Director Wiener explained the Municipal Code provides for a certain number of parking spaces required for this many units; reported in this case, 100 parking spaces are required by Code, the applicant is proposing 93 as 7 have been reduced due to density bonus law and stated if the City is interested in finding out impacts to parking in the surrounding neighborhoods, staff would need to formulate something to change the Code and have it be a development standard requirement.

Discussion followed regarding the possibility of adding diagonal parking, ensuring no action is taken that would reduce the footprint of the buildings and developing a creative solution to provide additional parking on the site.

Commissioner Craig noted existing traffic problems in the area and opined the project will aggravate an existing problem.

Traffic Consultant Pal acknowledged the existence of heavy traffic during school drop-offs and pick-ups; discussed peak hours and trips generated and stated the experience of traffic will be much less than what is being experienced on the site, presently.

Planning Manager Scully pointed out that the City's Traffic Engineer vetted the report closely with the Traffic Consultant and confirmed this will reduce morning congestion time because of the current daycare use and there will be a significant net reduction in traffic and parking need at the project site as a result of the change in use from children's daycare to the proposed residential development.

Commissioner Hazeltine spoke about the addition of a "no left hand turn" condition which she felt will move traffic into nearby residential neighborhoods and noted that is a concern.

Discussion followed regarding when the survey was conducted, trips during peak hours, without and with the project, left hand restrictions for safety, the proximity of the driveway

to PCH and circulation, the number of guest parking spaces, exceeding the State density bonus law, height limits, trip generation surveys, impacts on elementary and middle schools.

Chris Bert, Cox Castle, Land Use Counsel, referenced materials in the agenda packet specifically as it relates to Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) generated by the analysis for specific uses and noted that standard measures were used.

Commissioner Boswell stated he would like to understand where the study may not be complete; concluded that unless the applicant is forced to do something, they do not do it; asserted the project needs a larger lot in a less trafficked environment and noted he sees an effort to maximize the developer's profits at the expense of the quality of life of the people in the general residential neighborhood and that once it is done, it will be too late.

The applicant responded to questions from Commissioner Conroy regarding the minimum ceiling heights, the reason for proposing nine feet, waivers provided as part of the density bonus law and the need to offset the loss of income from the affordable units.

Planning Manager Scully reported the City has identified this site as one where it would like to see affordable housing within the Housing Element, and this was a joint decision by the City and the applicant.

In reply to Commissioner Hazeltine's question, Assistant City Attorney Park reported that under the density bonus law, a developer can build without the advantage of that, but once they add affordable units, the density bonus law kicks in. She added that if the developer requests concessions for waivers, the City is restricted, by law, on denying those concessions for waivers; addressed calculations regarding parking per unit types and noted the City is constrained in terms of what it can require. She reported in this instance, they are not requesting concessions, but they are requesting waivers, which are unlimited, at this point.

Commissioner Craig summarized that because of the law, unless there is extreme, solid objective reasons to say that something cannot be done, the Planning Commission is basically here to review a project that has already been approved and there is not a whole lot the Commission can do with respect to waivers and parking.

In response to Commissioner Conroy's question, Assistant City Attorney Park reported the City Code requires 100 parking spaces, however, because the density bonus law kicks in, the maximum they have to provide is 65, but in this case, they are providing 91. She added that the only way the City can deny a project, is if there is an objective standard that they are not meeting.

Community Development Director Wiener added that in addition to the density bonus law, SB 330 limits the City's decision-making ability.

Discussion continued regarding denying waivers and Redondo Beach being in the top 10% of dense cities.

Commissioner Hazeltine talked about the importance of each unit looking the same in order not to distinguish between affordable units and market-rate units in design and materials used and spoke against clustering affordable units in one location.

Patrick Chen reported the materials for the affordable units are comparable to those used for the market-rate units.

Commissioner Boswell spoke about parking demands from Redondo Union High School during events and the proposed project exacerbating the problem of insufficient parking and discussed a smaller project with parking for residents and visitors contained within the site.

Chair Lamb invited public comments and administered the oath to speakers prior to them addressing the Commission.

Patrick Cunningham, St. James parishioner and architect, spoke in favor of the project; noted the City needs the additional housing and thanked the Planning Commission for its consideration.

Vince Barbare, St. James parishioner, spoke in favor of the project; discussed affordability and felt it is the right thing to do for the next generation.

Carl Hinkle spoke in support of the project; noted the need for more housing in the City; reported it has taken years in planning to get to this stage of the project and urged the Commission to approve it.

Joanne Modic reported she lives on St. Vincent; voiced support for the project; listed some of its benefits and urged the Commission to approve it.

Father Matt Murphy, Pastor, St. James, provided a brief history of the parish; noted it is a landmark in the community and spoke in support of the project.

Davis Hunt spoke in favor of the project and the need for affordable housing in the City; stated he has a law degree and still cannot afford to buy a house in Redondo Beach and urged the Commission to approve the project and give young adults opportunities for purchasing a home in the City.

Alex Fineman voiced support for the proposed project; discussed the need for affordable housing in Redondo Beach, especially in light of people being displaced by the recent fires; felt the new households will help combat declining enrollment in schools; urged the Commission to address affordable housing, specifically, rather than using the need for affordable housing as a fig leaf to conceal opposition to new housing, generally; encouraged the Commission to support affordable housing but any new housing is critical to begin addressing the City's housing needs.

Helen DeGrass talked about the project being categorically exempt from CEQA guidelines and that approval of the project would not result in significant impacts related to traffic noise, water, and air quality; reported that City Ventures has multiple lawsuits in various cities, specific to water pollution and harmful business practices during construction that were proven to violate environmental laws. She noted her opposition and questioned the number of proposed stories; expressed concerns over obstructed views, increased traffic congestion, inadequate guest parking and changes to the character of the neighborhood and urged the Commission to give consideration to nearby homeowners in the neighborhood and oppose the project.

Jeff Goldman, Owner, 413 Emerald Street and speaking on behalf of two of his neighbors, all living in historic homes and asserted that the neighborhood is threatened by the proposed development; acknowledged the City's limitations; addressed the City's Historic Preservation Plan; noted the historic homes are at the mercy of street parking and expressed concerns that the project will make it virtually impossible for anyone to live in the area.

Motion by Commissioner Hazeltine, seconded by Commissioner Gaddis, and approved by voice vote, to extend Jeff Goldman's time for commenting.

The motion carried 7-0.

Jeff Goldman hoped that the Commission would consider issuing residential parking permits for residents in the neighborhood with 6 spots directly in front of the 3 subject properties to serve the people who reside in the 3 historical homes.

Chris Bert, Cox Castle, Land Use Counsel, asserted that imposing a residential parking permit as a condition on this project would be inappropriate and would be a separate City issue.

Ethan Cole, 62 Beryl, talked about a community being built in the area and families with small children living there; addressed typical hours of drop-offs and pick-ups from nearby schools and spoke in support of the project.

Brianna Egan, South Bay Forward, referenced a letter of support submitted by the organization and listed points of concern and potential solutions for each, including

addressing the lack of parking with a parking permit program; noted homeowners are looking for walkable and bike-able neighborhoods; reiterated the Commission's obligation to approve the project and asked that the Commission approve the project to address the local housing crisis.

Beth Blyther and Frank Gibbs, residing on the corner of Redondo and Francisco, narrated a PowerPoint presentation listing significant impacts to parking, traffic and low density zoning by the proposed project.

Motion by Commissioner Hazeltine, seconded by Commissioner Gaddis, and approved by voice vote, to extend Beth Blyther's and Frank Gibbs's time for commenting.

The motion carried 7-0.

Beth Blyther and Frank Gibbs continued with their presentation and noted the City is not meeting its General Plan objectives and that the project has no "upside" and benefits only the developer.

Jeff Balec (via Zoom), Civil Engineer, listed concerns in terms of separation of power; talked about the Commission being powerless and staff making a decision to offer affordable housing; wondered if the requirement for affordable housing needs to be in the particular area; reported he contacted staff but was unable to get all technical information on the project; questioned whether the parcels will be combined or remain as separate parcels; felt that the affordable units should be offered; pointed out that all variances apply to the larger parcels because of the affordable units across the street and noted it is not comparable and the affordable units should be offered on that particular parcel. He opined the developer would be creating a ghetto out of the seven units if the larger parcel is getting all the benefits.

Motion by Commissioner Boswell, to extend Jeff Balec's time for commenting.

The motion died for lack of a second.

It was noted that the speaker has 30 seconds to conclude his comments.

Jeff Balec (via Zoom) talked about the effects of the project on the quality of life of nearby neighborhoods and impacts to water quality.

Holly Osborne (via Zoom) questioned whether the two-car garages really hold two cars; understood the HOA will require that residents park in the garages; noticed that the proposed units are missing middle-income housing and spoke favorably about the developers.



Anna Hinkle spoke about the importance community; shared her background coming to this country from Brazil and noted that Redondo Beach is her home because the community embraced her and her son when they moved here. Now, her son is a Stanford graduate but is unable to return to Redondo Beach because he cannot afford a house here and spoke in support of the project as a way to give back to the community.

Michael Schneider opposed the project; felt they are not providing much in terms of affordable housing (3%); talked about the waivers causing damage to the community; expressed concerns with obstructed views and questioned why there needs to be affordable housing in the most expensive part of the City.

Ellen, M.D. expressed disappointment with the project; noted the proposed affordable housing is only 3% and rising housing costs; opined there are no benefits for the community market rate units will not be affordable for young people and discussed high traffic volumes in the area.

Linda Dufraim and neighbor, Susan, thanked the Commission for trying to address neighbors' concerns; stated there is no permit parking in her neighborhood; reported she will lose her view and expressed concerns about decreased property values. She and Susan reported they are seriously considering moving out of Redondo Beach and thanked the Commission for trying.

Frank Gibbs mentioned that the Administrative Report calls the three affordable units, "insignificant"; referenced State RHNA mandates; added the project provides .002% of the City's RHNA units and understood the City must follow State mandates, but the City decides where those units are located. He pointed out the property is not within the affordable housing overlay and did not believe the City has no choice.

In reply to Chair Lamb's inquiry, Planning Manager Scully reported the City has a number of sites that were identified in the Housing Element that provide the capacity to accommodate the 1,900 affordable housing units assigned to the City under RHNA, and this site is one of those. He added this is a location that would accommodate affordable housing and discussed the findings needed to deny the project.

In reply to Commissioner Boswell's question, Planning Manager Scully noted that the Housing Element identifies this site for 12 very-low income units and pointed out that the City is not mandated to require it.

Community Development Director Wiener added there is a program within the Housing Element that requires the City to evaluate an inclusionary housing ordinance where the City may be able to impose requirements in the future, on a certain percentage that need to be affordable and reported the City has not yet adopted such an ordinance, that State HCD is viewing those ordinances less favorably. Additionally, he addressed the

affordable housing component of this project and noted the major factor involves SB 330 and how it limits the City to review or deny the project more than density bonus law.

Commissioner Light summarized discussions noting that the City's hands are tied but wondered what the Commission can do to help.

Community Development Director Wiener deferred to Legal Counsel Diana Varat.

Legal Counsel Varat (via Zoom) reported the Commission could consider adding a reasonable condition of approval that would improve the project; stated that given that the application complies with the applicable objective standards, the hands of the Commission are tied, but the Commission needs to make findings of approval in order to approve the project.

Chair Lamb stated it appears that the major complaint is parking, and the City cannot continue to ignore that parking in the area will be an issue; believed it adds stress to the community and wondered about the mechanisms the City can use to relieve the stress and problems associated with parking on adjacent streets.

Community Development Director Wiener spoke about the possibility of implementing a resident parking permit program and mentioned that long term, the City may want to look at increasing the parking standards.

Planning Manager Scully reported that parking permit procedures are handled by the City's Public Works Department and addressed the process for implementing a residential parking permit program.

Chair Lamb addressed members of the St. James Parish and hoped they understand the impact this development is making on the neighborhood; suggested working together to initiate a parking permit program; talked about being one community, accepting the responsibility and developing solutions that will cause less stress than the project is causing.

Commissioner Hazeltine asked for information about storm water capturing on the property.

Ryan Bitner, CNV Consulting, Civil Engineer, discussed preparation of a preliminary hydrology study and a preliminary low impact development plan and noted they are included in the reports and are part of the design.

Commissioner Hazeltine talked about preventing water from going into the gutter.

Ryan Bitner reported they were required to make a direct connection to the County public storm drain; noted they capture the water, on-site with a series of catch basins, the flows

enter a pipe which enters the water quality treatment facilities to dry wells that infiltrate the water.

Commissioner Hazeltine called to ensure that landscaping uses California-native, drought-tolerant plants.

Jose Casares, C2 Collaborative, Landscape Architect, spoke about the proposed plant palette; noted the need to consider proximity to the coast and felt the proposed pallet will perform well long term. He agreed to ensure that California-native, drought-tolerant landscaping is used and responded to questions from Commissioner Hazeltine regarding the proposed passive recreation area.

Commissioner Hazeltine asked that the developer consider moving the 3 affordable units within the 6 market-rate units to avoid the stigma of living in low-income housing.

Patrick Chen, City Ventures Development, stated that to change the design at this point would not be feasible.

The Project Architect, reiterated that affordable units are already mixed in with market-rate units and reported that building materials will be the same inside and out.

Assistant City Attorney Park suggested that since the developer has indicated that they will make a requirement that cars be parked inside garages, within the CC&Rs, the Commission may want to ask the developer if there is a problem including that as a condition in the entire entitlement resolution and in addition, memorialize, as a condition, the use of the same materials for the outside and the inside for both the affordable units and the market-rate units.

Chair Lamb spoke about climate change and considering the ultimate height and canopy of the proposed trees and wondered how the proposed trees will mitigate the impacts of climate change on this project.

Jose Casares, C2 Collaborative, Landscape Architect, discussed the process of developing a plant palate, the use of trees for screening and shade opportunities and considering plants/trees in the design.

Discussion followed regarding the lack of provisions or standards regarding shade, placing conditions that would ensure adequate shade and having the applicant work with staff to craft the appropriate language.

Assistant City Attorney Park suggested including language that, "All landscaping shall be in accordance with the City's landscape regulations including compliance with the Redondo Beach Water Efficient Landscape Ordinance and providing a shade canopy will

be discussed, if feasible". She added that Planning Manager Scully can produce correct verbiage for the condition.

Patrick Chen offered to review that with staff.

Assistant City Attorney Park summarized the issues of concern involve use of California-native drought-tolerant plants, requiring residents to park in their garages to be included in the CC&Rs and addressing shade and benches.

Chair Lamb pointed out the location of the proposed project has many historical homes surrounding it and suggested that the project be integrated into that historical context.

Patrick Chen stated they feel this design fits in better (seacoast modern) with the aesthetic of the City.

Discussion followed regarding the seacoast modern design, the possibility of changing the color scheme to integrate the project into the historical context and whether the project fits in the neighborhood.

Chris Bert, Cox Castle, Land Use Counsel mentioned that to mandate changes in design would require substantial costs.

Assistant City Attorney Park added that as long as the developer is open to having a discussion about the issues discussed and the possibility of investigating different components of the design that would be more in line with the historical homes in the neighborhood.

Patrick Chen noted they are willing to investigate different designs, but stated it is inappropriate to mandate it.

Assistant City Attorney Park asked the developer to have a dialogue with staff regarding those items and Patrick Chen, voiced his agreement.

Discussion followed regarding the feasibility of changing the color palette, having a sensitivity to the historical context, leaving a lot to interpretation, existing old Spanish style homes in the neighborhood, the possibility of all-white units and the possibility of the Planning Commission's input making the project more marketable.

Discussion continued regarding setting the prices for the market-rate units.

Commissioner Conroy asked about the estimated sales price of market-rate units and Patrick Chen reported home sales in the area are over \$1.5 million.

Commissioner Conroy questioned the size of the units if the goal of the City is to expand housing options for first-time buyers in Redondo Beach; believed the community would benefit more from studios, one-bedroom and two-bedroom units, helping them qualify for loans, build credit and gain equity toward upgrading to larger homes; asserted that these oversized units do little to help people; talked about using this experience to consider first-time buyers in the future and felt the developer can still achieve strong returns while providing affordable housing and staying within the City's zoning restrictions.

Discussion followed regarding retaining walls, locations and sites.

Commissioner Craig spoke about the low percentage of affordable units being offered by the developer; discussed transfer taxes and benefits to the City; talked about public services needed to support additional residents and diminished returns as the City gets to a certain density; addressed the costs of the units and asserted one cannot provide affordable housing unless it is subsidized in some way. Additionally, he asserted that members of the Commission care about the City.

Patrick Chen stated he has nothing more to add; noted working closely with staff to present a good product and thanked the Commission for its consideration.

Commissioner Boswell talked about homeownership and affordability in the City; discussed people buying "starter" homes and working up and opined the project is damaging the community, building something too big for the lot into a community that is already dense. He discussed the need to address the lack of parking; commented on the three affordable units not being sufficient and another project having to "pick up the slack" and mentioned a domino effect of what the project is doing to the City. Additionally, he claimed that if the developer wants to be a good neighbor, he/she needs to reduce the number of units to accommodate enough parking for the people who buy these units or suggested that St. James offer its parking lot.

In response to a question from Commissioner Gaddis, Community Development Director Wiener, discussed the appeal process if the Planning Commission decides to deny the project.

Assistant City Attorney Park reiterated that if the Commission is inclined to deny the project, it must make the findings and these would need to be included in the resolution; suggested that before proceeding, the Commission should continue the matter, provide direction regarding on what grounds the Commission is denying the project and staff would return to the Commission with a resolution of denial. At that point, she added that the applicant could appeal to City Council, that Council's decision is final and depending on the decision, the parties may file suit. She noted there will need to be specific references to objective design standards not met by the project and where there are impacts to health and safety that cannot be mitigated.

Chair Lamb pointed out that so far, there are no findings that the project is a threat to health and safety and therefore, the City does not have the requisite findings to deny the project.

Motion by Commissioner Conroy, seconded by Commissioner Hazeltine, and approved by voice vote, to close the public hearing.

The motion carried 6-1. Commissioner Boswell was opposed.

Commissioner Hazeltine reiterated the Commission has no grounds to deny the project.

Discussion followed regarding liability to the City if the project is denied.

Motion by Commissioner Hazeltine to approve the project with the added conditions.

Planning Manager Scully reviewed the proposed strikethroughs and additions as shown on the slide.

Chair Lamb talked about the Commission not being able to direct staff and asked for clarification.

Assistant City Attorney Park suggested completing this discussion first.

Planning Manager Scully continued addressing the changes reflecting the conditions discussed earlier and Assistant City Attorney Park and members of the Commission offered edits made directly on the screen.

Discussion followed regarding the CC&Rs, enforcement by the HOA, having residents work with staff to request a parking permit program, recommendations to Council, whether CC&Rs can keep an individual from parking on a public street and stating that the garage shall only be used for parking.

Commissioner Craig seconded the motion, which carried, 6-0-1, with the following roll call vote:

AYES:	Conroy, Craig, Gaddis, Hazeltine, Light and Chair Lamb
NOES:	None
ABSTAIN:	Boswell
ABSENT:	None

**K. ITEMS CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS AGENDAS - None**

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

**M. ITEMS FROM STAFF - None**

**N. COMMISSION MEMBER ITEMS AND FUTURE COMMISSION AGENDA TOPICS**

Assistant City Attorney Park suggested the Commission could move to have staff address, during the strategic plan, to have the City Council consider parking, traffic and permit parking in certain neighborhoods in the City.

Commissioner Light stated that any project triggering waivers of reduced parking should be ones that Council mitigates.

Assistant City Attorney Park talked about parcels that have been identified for affordable housing in the Housing Element and reiterated that the Commission can direct staff to, during strategic planning, bring up the issues that the Planning Commission have around parking, or it can be brought up during City Manager Items or Commission members can attend City Council meetings to talk about the issue, as a member of the public.

Community Development Director Wiener talked about development of objective standards; noted developers have shown a willingness to work with the City and mentioned the possibility of providing incentives to developers for addressing neighborhood compatibility such as a reduction in building permit fees. He suggested placing an item on the next agenda to have a special discussion on this topic.

In response to Chair Lamb's inquiry, Assistant City Attorney Park reiterated ways in which the Commission could refer this matter to the City Council, including having staff return with a resolution.

Community Development Director Wiener announced he will check with the City Manager for clarification and inform the Commission in an upcoming meeting.

**O. ADJOURNMENT – 11:27 p.m.**

Motion by Commissioner Conroy, seconded by Commissioner Gaddis, and approved by voice vote, to adjourn the meeting at 11:27 p.m.

The motion carried 7-0.

The next meeting of the Redondo Beach Planning Commission will be a regular meeting to be held at 6:30 p.m. on March 20, 2025, in the Redondo Beach Council Chambers, at 415 Diamond Street, Redondo Beach, California.

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

Respectfully submitted,

---

Marc Wiener  
Community Development Director





# Administrative Report

---

H.1., File # PC25-1030

Meeting Date: 7/17/2025

---

**TITLE**

RECEIVE AND FILE WRITTEN COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS



# Administrative Report

---

J.1., File # PC25-1025

Meeting Date: 7/17/2025

---

**TO:** PLANNING COMMISSION  
**FROM:** Marc Wiener, Community Development Director

## **TITLE**

Public hearing to consider Ordinances amending Title 10 Chapter 2 Zoning and Land Use, and Title 10 Chapter 5 Coastal Land Use Plan Implementing Ordinance of the Redondo Beach Municipal Code pertaining to regulations for smoke shops.

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

According to the federal Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, nicotine is highly addictive and can harm brain development, which continues until 25 years of age and poses a unique risk to youth. The state has passed recent legislation strengthening tobacco oversight programs and expanding the seizure of illegal tobacco products which it has deemed essential to achieving the state's public health goal of lowering youth tobacco use.

In addition to the health risks associated with the sale of tobacco, there has also been a track record of compliance issues associated with smoke shops. On March 19, 2025, the Redondo Beach Police Department inspected smoke shops located in the 2400 block of 190th Street and the 2200 block of Artesia Boulevard, and identified that they were selling cannabis and illegal flavored tobacco products. Other cities throughout the state are also encountering compliance issues. For example, the City of Modesto inspected its 47 smoke shops and found that all were selling flavored tobacco products, which were outlawed in 2022. The City of Fresno conducted inspections of its 67 smoke shops and found that 79% were selling illegal cannabis products, which resulted in the issuance of \$5 million in citations to the non-compliant businesses.

On April 15, 2025, the City Council reviewed and provided input on a draft Ordinance intended more effectively regulate smoke shops. The Council directed the City Attorney to return with a draft Urgency Ordinance imposing a temporary moratorium on the establishment of new smoke shops, to be in effect while the permanent ordinance is being developed. A 45-Day Urgency Ordinance was adopted on May 6, 2025 and extended for an additional year on June 10, 2025.

At this meeting staff is presenting the proposed permanent Smoke Shop Ordinance to the Planning Commission so that it may provide recommendations to the City Council via the attached Resolution (Attachment 1).

## **BACKGROUND**

The Municipal Code does not currently include a definition or specific regulations for smoke shops.

They are treated as a standard retail business that is permitted-by-right, meaning that an applicant only needs to obtain a business license to open and operate within the City. The North American Industrial Classification System (NAICS) defines smoke shops as establishments primarily engaged in retailing cigarettes, cigars, tobacco, pipes, and other smokers' supplies. There are approximately 15-17 smoke shops in Redondo Beach, six of which have opened since 2019.

Staff is proposing a draft ordinance that would create a definition for smoke shops and tobacco retailers, adding Section 10-2.1642, Article 4 (Special Use Regulations) to the Redondo Beach Municipal Code (RBMC) to regulate these types of businesses. The draft Ordinance would require all new smoke shops to obtain a Conditional Use Permit (CUP), which would provide the City with more discretion and authority over business permitting and operations for smoke shops.

The Draft Ordinance requires existing smoke shops to come into compliance with the new regulations by stating that "all smoke shops wishing to operate within the above zones after the effective date of the ordinance codified in this chapter must obtain a conditional use permit within five (5) years." The Conditional Use Permit for a smoke shop would be valid for a maximum of three (3) years from the date of approval of the permit, at which time the permit shall expire and be of no further force and effect unless renewed.

The Draft Ordinance also seeks to reduce the number of smoke shops over time by setting a cap on the allowed number of businesses while phasing out existing ones. A maximum of five (5) smoke shops would be permitted city-wide, with the exception of legal nonconforming smoke shops established prior to the effective date of the Ordinance for which the following applies:

- a. Legal nonconforming smoke shops may continue to operate, at their existing location, in accordance with Section 10-2.2002 and must obtain a Conditional Use Permit within a period of five (5) years from the effective date of this ordinance.
- b. A maximum of ten (10) Conditional Use Permits may be issued on a first come first serve basis to existing legal nonconforming smoke shops and shall be counted against the maximum allowance of five (5) city-wide.
- c. As legal nonconforming smoke shops abandon their use, either through change of use or expiration of operating permits, no new Conditional Use Permits shall be issued unless the City is at or below the maximum of allowance of five (5) smoke shops city-wide.

The draft Ordinance also includes operational standards that apply to all existing and new smoke shops and expressly prohibits the sale or distribution of "cannabis or cannabinoid products, drug paraphernalia not directly related to legal smoke and vapor products, nitrous oxide, flavored tobacco products, or other products prohibited by law." The draft Ordinance also includes enforcement provisions allowing unannounced inspections by City officials and authorizes the City to apply criminal penalties as well as authority to revoke the operator's business license and/or CUP in response to violations.

## **ATTACHMENTS**

1. PC Resolution
2. Draft Amendments



**RESOLUTION NO. 2025-1-PCR-\*\*\***

**A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF REDONDO BEACH, CALIFORNIA, RECOMMENDING THAT THE CITY COUNCIL AMEND TITLE 10 CHAPTER 2 ZONING AND LAND USE, AND TITLE 10 CHAPTER 5 COASTAL LAND USE PLAN IMPLEMENTING ORDINANCE OF THE REDONDO BEACH MUNICIPAL CODE PERTAINING TO THE REGULATION OF SMOKE SHOPS**

WHEREAS, according to the federal Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, nicotine is highly addictive and can harm brain development, which continues until about 25 years of age and poses a unique risk to youth; and

WHEREAS, according to the 2023 National Youth Tobacco Survey conducted by the federal Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the United States Food and Drug Administration, approximately 2,800,000 high school students and middle school students reported using a tobacco product in the past year, and nearly 90 percent of youth electronic cigarette users used flavored products; and

WHEREAS, sales data has shown a surge in illegal, unregulated flavored tobacco products, such as flavored disposable electronic cigarettes, being imported into the United States from foreign countries in recent years, and in December 2023, the United States Food and Drug Administration and the United States Customs and Border Protection announced the seizure of approximately 1,400,000 units of unauthorized electronic cigarette products worth over \$18,000,000 at Los Angeles International Airport; and

WHEREAS, the state has passed recent legislation strengthening tobacco oversight programs and expanding the seizure of illegal tobacco products which it has deemed essential to achieving the state's public health goal of lowering youth tobacco use; and

WHEREAS, the Redondo Beach Police Department has received complaints about the selling of illegal flavored tobacco and cannabis products throughout the City, which were confirmed through two recent inspections, conducted on March 6, 2025 of a smoke shop located in the 2400 block of 190th Street and on March 19, 2025 of a smoke shop on in the 2200 block of Artesia Boulevard; and

WHEREAS, on January 21, 2025, the City Council held a meeting to discuss potential updates to the City Municipal Code that would enhance the regulation of smoke shops and tobacco retailers, and directed staff to return with a draft ordinance; and,

WHEREAS, on April 15, 2025, staff presented a draft Ordinance to the City Council that includes a new requirement for a conditional use permit, limits the number and location of smoke shops, and includes operating standards and enforcement provisions and;

WHEREAS, a 45-Day Urgency Ordinance was adopted on May 6, 2025 and extended for an additional year on June 10, 2025 to be in effect while the City develops a permanent Ordinance;

NOW, THEREFORE, THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF REDONDO BEACH, CALIFORNIA DOES HEREBY FIND AS FOLLOWS:

#### SECTION 1. FINDINGS

1. In compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act of 1970, as amended (CEQA), and State and local guidelines adopted pursuant thereto, the zoning amendment is Categorically Exempt from further environmental review, pursuant to Section 15061(b)(3) of the Guidelines of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) that refers to activities where it can be seen with certainty that there is no possibility that the activity in question may have a significant effect on the environment (common-sense exemption), then the activity is not subject to CEQA.
2. The amendments to the Zoning ordinance are consistent with the General Plan.
  - a. Land Use Element Goal 1E: Ensure that the types of land uses developed in the City complement and do not adversely affect the quality of life and health of the City's residents, businesses, and visitors.
  - b. Land Use Element Goal 1H: Continue to enhance existing commercial districts which contribute revenue to the City and are compatible with adjacent residential neighborhoods.
  - c. Land Use Element Goal 1O: Ensure the compatibility among the various types and densities of land uses to be accommodated in the City.
  - d. Land Use Element Goal 1J: Provide for the continued use of the City's coastal-related recreational facilities as resources for the residents of Redondo Beach and surrounding communities; ensuring that these uses and activities are compatible with adjacent residential neighborhoods and commercial districts and maintain a high level of quality and safety.
  - e. Land Use Element Goal 1K: Provide for public uses which support the needs and functions of the residents and businesses of the City.
3. These amendments do not require a vote of the people under Article XXVII of the City Charter.

SECTION 2. RECITALS. The above recitals are true and correct, and the recitals are incorporated herein by reference as if set forth in full.

NOW, THEREFORE, THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF REDONDO BEACH, CALIFORNIA, DOES HEREBY RESOLVE AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. The Planning Commission recommends that the City Council adopt the amendments to the Redondo Beach Municipal Code pertaining to the display of electronic signs on City-owned properties.

SECTION 2. AMENDMENT OF CODE. Title 10, Chapter 2 (Zoning and Land Use) and Chapter 5 (Coastal Land Use Plan) amending Section 10-2.402(a) as follows:

(168) "Smoke shop and tobacco store" shall mean any premises dedicated to the display, sale, distribution, delivery, offering, furnishing, or marketing of tobacco, tobacco

products, or tobacco paraphernalia; provided, however, that any grocery store, supermarket, convenience store or similar retail use that only sells conventional cigars, cigarettes or tobacco as an ancillary sale shall not be defined as a “smoke shop and tobacco store” and shall not be subject to the restrictions in this chapter (See Section 10-2.1642 for additional definitions).

SECTION 3. AMENDMENT OF CODE. Title 10, Chapter 2 (Zoning and Land Use) and Chapter 5 (Coastal Land Use Plan) adding Section 10-2.1642, Article 4 (Special Use Regulations) to the Redondo Beach Municipal Code as follows:

Smoke Shops and Tobacco Sales.

(a) Purpose. The regulation of smoke shops and tobacco stores is necessary and in the interests of the public health, safety and general welfare as the expansion of smoke shops and tobacco stores in the city could result in undesirable impacts to the community. Among these impacts are increased potential for tobacco sales to minors along with greater opportunity for the sale of cannabis, illegal drugs and associated paraphernalia. These regulations address such negative impacts of smoke shops and tobacco stores while providing a reasonable number of locations and zones for such shops to locate within the city.

(b) Definitions. For the purpose of this section, unless the context clearly indicates otherwise, the words, terms, and phrases shall have the following meanings:

“Ancillary sale” shall mean where a grocery store, supermarket, convenience store or similar market uses no more than two percent of its gross floor area, or 200 square feet, whichever is less, for the display, sale, distribution, delivery, offering, furnishing, or marketing of conventional cigars, cigarettes or tobacco. For any grocery store, convenience store, retail kiosk or similar use consisting of 250 square feet or less, “ancillary sale” shall mean where no more than five square feet are used for the display, sale, distribution, delivery, offering, furnishing, or marketing of conventional cigars, cigarettes or tobacco.

“E-cigarette” shall mean any electronically actuated device or inhaler meant to simulate cigarette smoking that uses a heating element to vaporize a liquid solution, popularly referred to as “juice,” and that causes the user to exhale any smoke, vapor, or substance other than that produced by unenhanced human exhalation. The juice used in e-cigarettes typically contains nicotine, and for this reason e-cigarettes and their juice can be classified as both tobacco products and tobacco paraphernalia.

“Smoke shop and tobacco store” shall mean any premises dedicated to the display, sale, distribution, delivery, offering, furnishing, or marketing of tobacco, tobacco products, or tobacco paraphernalia; provided, however, that any grocery store, supermarket, convenience store or similar retail use that only sells conventional cigars, cigarettes or tobacco as an ancillary sale shall not be defined as a “smoke shop and tobacco store” and shall not be subject to the restrictions in this chapter.

“Tobacco” shall mean any preparation of the nicotine-rich leaves of the tobacco plant, which are cured by a process of drying and fermentation for use in smoking, chewing,

absorbing, dissolving, inhaling, snorting, sniffing, or ingesting by any other means into the body.

“Tobacco paraphernalia” shall mean any paraphernalia, equipment, device, or instrument that is primarily designed or manufactured for the smoking, chewing, absorbing, dissolving, inhaling, snorting, sniffing, or ingesting by any other means into the body of tobacco, tobacco products, or other controlled substances as defined in California Health and Safety Code Section 11054 et seq. Items or devices classified as tobacco paraphernalia include but are not limited to the following: pipes, punctured metal bowls, bongs, water bongs, electric pipes, e-cigarettes, e-cigarette juice, buzz bombs, vaporizers, hookahs, and devices for holding burning material. Lighters and matches shall be excluded from the definition of tobacco paraphernalia.

“Tobacco product” shall mean any product in leaf, flake, plug, liquid, or any other form, containing nicotine derived from the tobacco plant, or otherwise derived, which is intended to enable human consumption of the tobacco or nicotine in the product, whether smoked, chewed, absorbed, dissolved, inhaled, snorted, sniffed, or ingested by any other means. For the purposes of this chapter, the term “tobacco product” excludes any product that has been specifically approved by the United States Food and Drug Administration (FDA) for sale as a tobacco/smoking cessation product or for other medical purposes, where such product is marketed and sold solely for such an approved purpose.

(c) Zoning and land use standards for smoke shops and tobacco stores (*hereinafter referred to as “smoke shops”*).

1. Notwithstanding any other provision of this title to the contrary, smoke shops shall be a conditionally permitted use only in the following zones, subject to the regulations contained in this chapter:

a. Smoke shops are only permitted in commercial zones, specifically limited to C-2, C-2A, C-2B, C-2PD, C-3, C-3A, C-3B, C-3PD, C-4, C-4A, C-4B, C-4PD, C-5A.

b. Smoke shops are prohibited in any industrial, public-institutional zone or mixed-use zone, or zone where residential uses are permitted, or within any coastal commercial zones.

2. All smoke shops wishing to operate within the above zones after the effective date of the ordinance codified in this chapter must obtain a conditional use permit within five (5) years in accordance with Section 10-2.2506 of the Municipal Code. Conditional Use Permits shall be processed as first come first served, on the basis of the date the application is deemed complete. The Conditional Use Permit for a smoke shop is valid for a maximum of three (3) years from the date of approval of the permit, at which time the permit shall expire and be of no further force and effect unless renewed.

3. The permitted concentration and location of new smoke shops be as follows:

a. No smoke shop shall be established or located within 600 feet from public or private elementary schools, day cares, and youth centers, as defined in 10-2.1626, measured from the nearest property lines of each of the affected parcels.



- b. Smoke shops shall not be located within 1000 feet, measured property line to property line, from another smoke shop.
- c. No retailer shall be established or located within 150 feet of Dale Page Park, measured from the nearest property lines of each of the affected parcels.

4. A maximum of five (5) smoke shops are permitted city-wide, with the exception of legal nonconforming smoke shops established prior to the effective date of this Ordinance for which the following applies:

- a. Legal nonconforming smoke shops may continue to operate, at their existing location, in accordance with Section 10-2.2002 and must obtain a Conditional Use Permit within a period of five (5) years from the effective date of this ordinance.
- b. A maximum of ten (10) Conditional Use Permits may be issued on a first come first serve basis to existing legal nonconforming smoke shops and shall be counted against the maximum allowance of five (5) city-wide.
- c. As legal nonconforming smoke shops abandon their use, either through change of use or expiration of operating permits, no new Conditional Use Permits shall be issued unless the City is at or below the maximum of allowance of five (5) smoke shops city-wide.

(d) Additional zoning and land use standards applying to all existing and new smoke shops shall include the following:

- 1. Smoke shops must obtain a Conditional Use Permit pursuant to Section 10-2.2506 and are subject to Planning Commission Design Review pursuant to Section 10-2.2502.
- 2. A smoke shop must obtain and maintain at all times a valid Tobacco Retailer license as required pursuant to Redondo Beach Municipal Code Title 5, Chapter 9, Article 2.
- 3. It is unlawful for a smoke shop to knowingly allow or permit minor, not accompanied by his or her parent or legal guardian, to enter or remain within any smoke shop.
- 4. Smoke shops shall post clear signage stating that minors may not enter the premises unless accompanied by a parent or legal guardian. At least one such sign shall be placed in a conspicuous location near each public entrance to the smoke shop and tobacco store. It shall be unlawful for a smoke shop to fail to display and maintain, or fail to cause to be displayed or maintained, such signage.
- 5. The Smoke Shop must remain in compliance with all local, State, and federal laws, regulations, and orders, as well as all conditions of approval imposed on the use. This includes compliance with annual City business license fees. In the event of non-compliance, the smoke shop operator shall be given written notice by the City and opportunity to cure the violation. Failure to cure the violation can result in the revocation of the business license, tobacco retailer license and conditional use permit if applicable.
- 6. No smoke shop shall sell or distribute cannabis or cannabinoid products, drug paraphernalia not directly related to legal smoke and vapor products, nitrous oxide, flavored tobacco products, or other products prohibited by law.

(e) The Conditional Use Permit shall be processed in accordance with Section 10-2.2506 and shall include the following standard conditions:

1. No smoking shall be permitted on the premises at any time.
2. No sales may be solicited or conducted on the premises by minors.
3. No self-service tobacco, tobacco product, or tobacco paraphernalia displays shall be permitted.
4. No distribution of free or low-cost tobacco, tobacco products or tobacco paraphernalia, as well as coupons for said items, shall be permitted.
5. No advertising or signage indicating the availability of tobacco products shall be visible from the exterior nor from entry of the retail establishment to the maximum extent possible.
6. Smoke shops may be open for access to the public between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 9:00 p.m., Monday through Sunday, unless modified by the Planning Commission.

(g) Enforcement of smoke shops.

1. Inspections. All smoke shops shall be subject to routine unannounced inspections by City Officials to ensure compliance with this section and any additional conditions of the Conditional Use Permit.
2. Criminal Penalties. Violations of provisions of this section may be deemed a misdemeanor and shall be enforced pursuant to Title 1, Chapter 2 of Redondo Beach Municipal Code.
3. Separate offense for each day. Any person who violates any provision of this section shall be guilty of a separate offense for each and every day during any portion of which any such person commits, continues, permits, or causes a violation thereof, and shall be penalized accordingly.
4. Use or activity prohibited by State law. Nothing in this section shall be deemed to permit or authorize any use or activity which is otherwise prohibited by State law.
5. Revocation. If verified that a Smoke Shop Operator is in violation with either the provisions of this section, or the specific conditions of the Conditional Use Permit, that finding may be used as a basis for amending or revoking the Conditional Use Permit, pursuant to Section 10-2.2506(f) of the Redondo Beach Municipal Code and/or Business License pursuant to Section 6-1.26 and 6-1.27.

SECTION 4. INCONSISTENT PROVISIONS. Any provisions of the Redondo Beach Municipal Code, or appendices thereto, or any other ordinances of the City inconsistent herewith, to the extent of such inconsistencies and no further, are hereby repealed.

SECTION 5. SEVERANCE. If any section, subsection, sentence, clause, or phrase of this ordinance is for any reason held to be invalid or unconstitutional by the decision of any court of competent jurisdiction, such decision shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of the ordinance. The City Council shall declare that it would have passed this ordinance and each section, subsection, sentence, clause, and phrase thereof, irrespective of the fact that any one or more sections, subsections, sentences, clauses, or phrases be declared invalid or unconstitutional.

FINALLY RESOLVED, that the Planning Commission forward a copy of this resolution to the City Council so the Council will be informed of the action of the Planning Commission.

PASSED, APPROVED AND ADOPTED this 17<sup>TH</sup> day of July, 2025.

---

Chair  
Planning Commission  
City of Redondo Beach

ATTEST:

STATE OF CALIFORNIA       )  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES   )   SS  
CITY OF REDONDO BEACH    )

I, Sean Scully, Planning Manager of the City of Redondo Beach, California, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution No. 2025-1-PCR-\*\* was duly passed, approved and adopted by the Planning Commission of the City of Redondo Beach, California, at a regular meeting of said Planning Commission held on the 17<sup>th</sup> Day of July, 2025 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

ABSTAIN:

---

Marc Wiener  
Community Development Director

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

---

City Attorney's Office

ORDINANCE NO.  
AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF REDONDO BEACH,  
CALIFORNIA, AMENDING SECTIONS 10-2.402 AND 10-2.1642  
OF THE REDONDO BEACH MUNICIPAL CODE, RELATING TO  
SMOKE SHOPS AND TOBACCO SALES

THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF REDONDO BEACH DOES ORDAIN AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. Section 10-2.402(a) of the Redondo Beach Municipal Code is amended to read as follows:

(168) "Smoke shop and tobacco store" shall mean any premises dedicated to the display, sale, distribution, delivery, offering, furnishing, or marketing of tobacco, tobacco products, or tobacco paraphernalia; provided, however, that any grocery store, supermarket, convenience store or similar retail use that only sells conventional cigars, cigarettes or tobacco as an ancillary sale shall not be defined as a "smoke shop and tobacco store" and shall not be subject to the restrictions in this chapter (See Section 10-2.1642 for additional definitions).

SECTION 2. Section 10-2.1642 of the Redondo Beach Municipal Ordinance is amended to read as follows:

Smoke Shops and Tobacco Sales.

(a) Purpose. The regulation of smoke shops and tobacco stores is necessary and in the interests of the public health, safety and general welfare as the expansion of smoke shops and tobacco stores in the city could result in undesirable impacts to the community. Among these impacts are increased potential for tobacco sales to minors along with greater opportunity for the sale of cannabis, illegal drugs and associated paraphernalia. These regulations address such negative impacts of smoke shops and tobacco stores while providing a reasonable number of locations and zones for such shops to locate within the city.

(b) Definitions. For the purpose of this section, unless the context clearly indicates otherwise, the words, terms, and phrases shall have the following meanings:

"Ancillary sale" shall mean where a grocery store, supermarket, convenience store or similar market uses no more than two percent of its gross floor area, or 200 square feet, whichever is less, for the display, sale, distribution, delivery, offering, furnishing, or marketing of conventional cigars, cigarettes or tobacco. For any grocery store, convenience store, retail kiosk or similar use consisting of 250 square feet or less, "ancillary sale" shall mean where no more than five square feet are used for the display, sale, distribution, delivery, offering, furnishing, or marketing of conventional cigars, cigarettes or tobacco.

"E-cigarette" shall mean any electronically actuated device or inhaler meant to simulate cigarette smoking that uses a heating element to vaporize a liquid solution, popularly referred to as "juice," and that causes the user to exhale any smoke, vapor, or substance other than that produced by unenhanced human exhalation. The juice used in e-cigarettes typically contains nicotine, and for this reason e-cigarettes and their juice can be classified as both tobacco products and tobacco paraphernalia.

"Smoke shop and tobacco store" shall mean any premises dedicated to the display, sale, distribution, delivery, offering, furnishing, or marketing of tobacco, tobacco products, or

tobacco paraphernalia; provided, however, that any grocery store, supermarket, convenience store or similar retail use that only sells conventional cigars, cigarettes or tobacco as an ancillary sale shall not be defined as a “smoke shop and tobacco store” and shall not be subject to the restrictions in this chapter.

“Tobacco” shall mean any preparation of the nicotine-rich leaves of the tobacco plant, which are cured by a process of drying and fermentation for use in smoking, chewing, absorbing, dissolving, inhaling, snorting, sniffing, or ingesting by any other means into the body.

“Tobacco paraphernalia” shall mean any paraphernalia, equipment, device, or instrument that is primarily designed or manufactured for the smoking, chewing, absorbing, dissolving, inhaling, snorting, sniffing, or ingesting by any other means into the body of tobacco, tobacco products, or other controlled substances as defined in California Health and Safety Code Section 11054 et seq. Items or devices classified as tobacco paraphernalia include but are not limited to the following: pipes, punctured metal bowls, bongs, water bongs, electric pipes, e-cigarettes, e-cigarette juice, buzz bombs, vaporizers, hookahs, and devices for holding burning material. Lighters and matches shall be excluded from the definition of tobacco paraphernalia.

“Tobacco product” shall mean any product in leaf, flake, plug, liquid, or any other form, containing nicotine derived from the tobacco plant, or otherwise derived, which is intended to enable human consumption of the tobacco or nicotine in the product, whether smoked, chewed, absorbed, dissolved, inhaled, snorted, sniffed, or ingested by any other means. For the purposes of this chapter, the term “tobacco product” excludes any product that has been specifically approved by the United States Food and Drug Administration (FDA) for sale as a tobacco/smoking cessation product or for other medical purposes, where such product is marketed and sold solely for such an approved purpose.

(c) Zoning and land use standards for smoke shops and tobacco stores (*hereinafter referred to as “smoke shops”*).

1. Notwithstanding any other provision of this title to the contrary, smoke shops shall be a conditionally permitted use only in the following zones, subject to the regulations contained in this chapter:

- a. Smoke shops are only permitted in commercial zones, specifically limited to C-2, C-2A, C-2B, C-2PD, C-3, C-3A, C-3B, C-3PD, C-4, C-4A, C-4B, C-4PD, C-5A.
- b. Smoke shops are prohibited in any industrial, public-institutional zone or mixed-use zone, or zone where residential uses are permitted, or within any coastal commercial zones.

2. All smoke shops wishing to operate within the above zones after the effective date of the ordinance codified in this chapter must obtain a conditional use permit within five (5) years in accordance with Section 10-2.2506 of the Municipal Code. Conditional Use Permits shall be processed as first come first served, on the basis of the date the application is deemed complete. The Conditional Use Permit for a smoke shop is valid for a maximum of three (3) years from the date of approval of the permit, at which time the permit shall expire and be of no further force and effect unless renewed.

3. The permitted concentration and location of new smoke shops be as follows:

- a. No smoke shop shall be established or located within 600 feet from public or private elementary schools, day cares, and youth centers, as defined in 10-2.1626,

measured from the nearest property lines of each of the affected parcels.

b. Smoke shops shall not be located within 1000 feet, measured property line to property line, from another smoke shop.

c. No retailer shall be established or located within 150 feet of Dale Page Park, measured from the nearest property lines of each of the affected parcels.

4. A maximum of five (5) smoke shops are permitted city-wide, with the exception of legal nonconforming smoke shops established prior to the effective date of this Ordinance for which the following applies:

a. Legal nonconforming smoke shops may continue to operate, at their existing location, in accordance with Section 10-2.2002 and must obtain a Conditional Use Permit within a period of five (5) years from the effective date of this ordinance.

b. A maximum of ten (10) Conditional Use Permits may be issued on a first come first serve basis to existing legal nonconforming smoke shops and shall be counted against the maximum allowance of five (5) city-wide.

c. As legal nonconforming smoke shops abandon their use, either through change of use or expiration of operating permits, no new Conditional Use Permits shall be issued unless the City is at or below the maximum of allowance of five (5) smoke shops city-wide.

(d) Additional zoning and land use standards applying to all existing and new smoke shops shall include the following:

1. Smoke shops must obtain a Conditional Use Permit pursuant to Section 10-2.2506 and are subject to Planning Commission Design Review pursuant to Section 10-2.2502.

2. A smoke shop must obtain and maintain at all times a valid Tobacco Retailer license as required pursuant to Redondo Beach Municipal Code Title 5, Chapter 9, Article 2.

3. It is unlawful for a smoke shop to knowingly allow or permit minor, not accompanied by his or her parent or legal guardian, to enter or remain within any smoke shop.

4. Smoke shops shall post clear signage stating that minors may not enter the premises unless accompanied by a parent or legal guardian. At least one such sign shall be placed in a conspicuous location near each public entrance to the smoke shop and tobacco store. It shall be unlawful for a smoke shop to fail to display and maintain, or fail to cause to be displayed or maintained, such signage.

5. The Smoke Shop must remain in compliance with all local, State, and federal laws, regulations, and orders, as well as all conditions of approval imposed on the use. This includes compliance with annual City business license fees. In the event of non-compliance, the smoke shop operator shall be given written notice by the City and opportunity to cure the violation. Failure to cure the violation can result in the revocation of the business license, tobacco retailer license and conditional use permit if applicable.

6. No smoke shop shall sell or distribute cannabis or cannabinoid products, drug paraphernalia not directly related to legal smoke and vapor products, nitrous oxide, flavored tobacco products, or other products prohibited by law.

(e) The Conditional Use Permit shall be processed in accordance with Section 10-2.2506 and shall include the following standard conditions:

1. No smoking shall be permitted on the premises at any time.

2. No sales may be solicited or conducted on the premises by minors.

3. No self-service tobacco, tobacco product, or tobacco paraphernalia displays shall be permitted.

4. No distribution of free or low-cost tobacco, tobacco products or tobacco paraphernalia, as well as coupons for said items, shall be permitted.
5. No advertising or signage indicating the availability of tobacco products shall be visible from the exterior nor from entry of the retail establishment to the maximum extent possible.
6. Smoke shops may be open for access to the public between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 9:00 p.m., Monday through Sunday, unless modified by the Planning Commission.

(g) Enforcement of smoke shops.

1. Inspections. All smoke shops shall be subject to routine unannounced inspections by City Officials to ensure compliance with this section and any additional conditions of the Conditional Use Permit.
2. Criminal Penalties. Violations of provisions of this section may be deemed a misdemeanor and shall be enforced pursuant to Title 1, Chapter 2 of Redondo Beach Municipal Code.
3. Separate offense for each day. Any person who violates any provision of this section shall be guilty of a separate offense for each and every day during any portion of which any such person commits, continues, permits, or causes a violation thereof, and shall be penalized accordingly.
4. Use or activity prohibited by State law. Nothing in this section shall be deemed to permit or authorize any use or activity which is otherwise prohibited by State law.
5. Revocation. If verified that a Smoke Shop Operator is in violation with either the provisions of this section, or the specific conditions of the Conditional Use Permit, that finding may be used as a basis for amending or revoking the Conditional Use Permit, pursuant to Section 10-2.2506(f) of the Redondo Beach Municipal Code and/or Business License pursuant to Section 6-1.26 and 6-1.27.