

BLUE FOLDER ITEM

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.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING May 19, 2022

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

- Public Comments on Non-Agenda Items received after release of agenda

From: [Farah K](#)
To: [CityClerk](#); CityClerk@torranceca.gov; stopbchd@gmail.com
Subject: Comments to the legislative bodies above for their next general meeting as permitted by the Brown Act.
Date: Saturday, May 14, 2022 10:10:33 PM
Attachments: [BCHD NonCompliance May 2022 Comments.pdf](#)

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

Honorable Mayor, Councilpersons, and Planning Commissioners of Redondo Beach and Torrance:

These are non-agenda item comments to the legislative bodies above for their next general meeting as permitted by the Brown Act.

I am concerned about Beach Cities Health District's proposed Phase 1 development plan that will be commercially DEVELOPED/OWNED/OPERATED. Phase 1 is proposed to be 110-feet above the surrounding streets and 300,000 sqft in size. Phase 2 will bring the total BCHD site up to nearly 800,000 sqft, which is 250% its current size. That is larger than the entire adjacent Beryl Heights neighborhood's homes' sizes all added together. BCHDs proposed plan is also 3-times the height and 150% as large as the voter-rejected CenterCal Mall-by-the-Sea.

I am also concerned that BCHD continues to spend from a \$16M taxpayer fund, preparing inconsistent, incompatible, and irresponsible plans on an elevated site in the center of residential, 30-foot or lower maximum height neighborhoods.

BCHDs 2017 design committed to protecting neighborhoods with buildings in the center and surface parking around the edges buffering homes from damages.

BCHDs 2019 design (June EIR) was 60-feet tall and ringed the site on the edge. The 2020 design (June Board) was 76-feet tall and also on the edge. The 2021 design (March EIR) was 103-feet tall and also on the edge. The current design is claimed to be 83-feet tall and also on the edge of the site and still meets NONE of the comments regarding excessive height and size from 100s of surrounding neighbors and 1000s of petitioners against the project.

The attachment specifically calls out BCHDs plan's noncompliance with specific sections of RBMC CUP and PCDR and on TMC Hillside Overlay.

I ask that the Mayors, Councils and Planning Commissioners provide guidance to their respective Staff and lawyers to convey the public's disapproval of the current plan that BCHD is pouring our tax funding into. Thank you.

-Farah Kreutz
Redondo Beach Resident

NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENTS

The following is provided regarding BCHDs proposed 3rd party DEVELOPER/OWNER/ OPERATOR development project that BCHD will be filing a formal Conditional Use Permit and Planning Commission Design Review application for during the first half of 2022.

These comments are filed to agencies as non-agenda comments of the public, in the interest of the public, and under Cal Gov Code 54954.3."regular meetings shall provide an opportunity for members of the public to directly address the legislative body on any item of interest to the public" there is an affirmative obligation to provide these comments to the Planning Commission, City Council or other "legislative" bodies upon receipt.

Summary Table of BCHD Project Non-Compliance with Municipal Codes		
PERMIT	CONDITION	BCHD PROJECT NON-COMPLIANCE
1. CUP	"will not adversely affect surrounding uses and properties"	As supported by over 1,200 petition signers and 100s, if not 1,000 surrounding resident comments to BCHD, surrounding residential uses are adversely impacted in reduced privacy, property value, aesthetics, noise, traffic and toxic emissions.
2. CUP	"for the proposed use ... shall be adequate in size and shape to accommodate such use"	Given the proposed project plan to locate buildings at the elevated site's perimeter, the elevated site is not adequate to accommodate the proposed use.
3. CUP	"no adverse effect on abutting property"	The properties on the 1400 Block of Diamond are subjected to the storage of explosive liquid fuels, a 2,000 kW combustion power plant, and a 16,000 to 4,000 V substation. These mechanical and explosion hazards adversely impact safety, safe air, local emissions, noise, and vibration.
4. PCDR	"ensure compatibility ... in the community"	Based on the City of Redondo Beach's finding that the design of The Kensington was consistent and compatible with the surrounding residential uses, the 110-foot above Beryl St., Miami Beach commercial styled facility cannot also be deemed compatible with similar, 30-foot and under residential uses in the community.
5. PCDR	"protect property values ... of neighborhoods"	Statistical modeling demonstrates that neighborhoods nearer to BCHD have reduced property values compared to neighborhoods further from BCHD. BCHD is proposing to increase height from 99% under 52-feet to 103-feet and to increase over building size from 312,000 sqft to nearly 800,000 sqft.
6. PCDR	"shall consider the impact ... of the user in respect to circulation, parking, traffic, etc."	BCHD proposed design will require the 8-10 story parking ramp at Prospect and Diamond to enter/exit on Prospect northbound. Further, the proposed height of the RCFE and location on the perimeter damages the privacy, aesthetics, excess nighttime lighting, noise impacts and other basic attributes of the surrounding uses and properties.
7. PCDR	"location of buildings and structures shall respect the natural terrain of the site"	The elevated site has from 30-feet to 70-feet elevation gain over surrounding residential uses. As a result, creation of a 110-foot rise over Beryl St., a 10-story parking ramp over Tomlee and Diamond Sts, and a 4-story, flat wall toward Prospect fails to respect the natural elevated terrain. The original 52-foot, 4 story building and its 0.3%, 968 sqft penthouse were nearly centered in the site, thereby respecting the natural terrain.
8. PCDR	"overall design shall be integrated and compatible with the neighborhood and shall strive to be in harmony with the scale and bulk of surrounding properties"	A 300,000 sqft, 110-foot above the street concrete and glass commercial building makes no attempt to integrate and be compatible with the neighborhood in scale or bulk. Further, unlike The Kensington and its Santa Barbara style, the Miami Beach condominium/hotel style proposed, when coupled with the excessive height and mass is thoroughly non-compatible with surrounding properties.

9. PCDR	“shall be consistent with the intent of residential design guidelines”	The residential design guidelines are intended to increase the quality of life of the neighborhood of the construction. It is very clear from the 1,200 petition signatories regarding the height and size of the project that it does not increase the quality of life. Further, there have been 100s, if not 1,000s of comments and concerns regarding the impacts of noise, emissions, traffic, glare, lighting, excess non-directed nighttime lighting, nighttime elevated signage and other factors that diminish quality of life.
10. RDG	“to improve the quality of life in residential neighborhoods ... [t]hese design guidelines are intended to help accomplish this objective”	The BCHD project reduces the quality of life in surrounding neighborhoods. The BCHD commercial Developer/Owner/Operator is targeting 90% non-Redondo Beach residents and 80% non-residents of the 3 beach cities (HB/RB/MB). The PACE facility is scaled for 400 participants with only 17 expected to be from the 3 beach cities according to National PACE Assoc. statistics. The BCHD project nearly triples the size of campus buildings from 312,000 sqft to 800,000 sqft and more than doubles the effective height from 99% less than 52-feet to 109.7-ft. The quality of life of surrounding neighborhoods will be reduced by the commercial, non-resident services as all damages will accrue to the neighborhoods.
11. THO	“The development has been located, planned and designed so as to cause the least intrusion on the views, light, air and privacy of other properties in the vicinity”	The adjoining Torrance neighborhoods are in the Hillside Overlay. The BCHD would not be allowed in overlay, and the City of Torrance has an obligation to protect its residents. The BCHD project is located to maximize damages to views, light, air and privacy based on height, size and perimeter location.
12. THO	“the design will not have a harmful impact upon the land value and investment of other properties in the vicinity”	Statistical analysis demonstrates that surrounding property values are lower, the closer the properties are to the BCHD site. Peer-reviewed research demonstrates that larger, taller developments, such as BCHDs proposal, will have equal or larger negative impacts on property values.
RBMC 10-2.2506 Conditional Use Permits (CUP) RBMC 10-2.2502 Planning Commission Design Review (PCDR) Redondo Beach Residential Design Guidelines (RDG) Redondo Beach Beryl Heights Neighborhood Specific Guidelines (BH RDG) TMC 91.41.6 Planning and Design (Torrance Hillside Overlay, THO)		

From: [Conna C](#)
To: [CityClerk](#); CityClerk@torranceca.gov; stopbchd@gmail.com
Subject: Fw: Public Comment - Forward to Mayors, Councils, Planning Commissions
Date: Saturday, May 14, 2022 3:36:37 PM
Attachments: [BCHD NonCompliance May 2022 Comments.pdf](#)

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

Honorable Mayor, Councilpersons, and Planning Commissioners of Redondo Beach and Torrance:

These are non-agenda item comments to the legislative bodies above for their next general meeting as permitted by the Brown Act.

I was born and raised in Redondo Beach in the house my father built on Avenue E at the crest of the hill with a view of the ocean. I raised my own children in my family home. I was there when fake signatures were used to allow the building of Condos that stole our ocean views. I was there when the seniors were kicked out of their homes by eminent domain and the Villages were built as the promise of new homes for them, but at prices they could not afford. I see the government of Redondo Beach failing it's current citizens again in the BCHD plans.

I am concerned about Beach Cities Health District's proposed Phase 1 development plan that will be commercially DEVELOPED/OWNED/OPERATED. Phase 1 is proposed to be 110-feet above the surrounding streets and 300,000 sqft in size. Phase 2 will bring the total BCHD site up to nearly 800,000 sqft, which is 250% its current size. That is larger than the entire adjacent Beryl Heights neighborhood's homes' sizes all added together. BCHDs proposed plan is also 3-times the height and 150% as large as the voter-rejected CenterCal Mall-by-the-Sea.

I am also concerned that BCHD continues to spend from a \$16M taxpayer fund, preparing inconsistent, incompatible, and irresponsible plans on an elevated site in the center of residential, 30-foot or lower maximum height neighborhoods.

BCHDs 2017 design committed to protecting neighborhoods with buildings in the center and surface parking around the edges buffering homes from damages.

BCHDs 2019 design (June EIR) was 60-feet tall and ringed the site on the edge. The 2020 design (June Board) was 76-feet tall and also on the edge. The 2021 design (March EIR) was 103-feet tall and also on the edge. The current design is claimed to be 83-feet tall and also on the edge of the site and still meets NONE of the comments regarding excessive height and size

from 100s of surrounding neighbors and 1000s of petitioners against the project.

The attachment specifically calls out BCHD's plan's noncompliance with specific sections of RBMC CUP and PCDR and on TMC Hillside Overlay.

I ask that the Mayors, Councils and Planning Commissioners provide guidance to their respective Staff and lawyers to convey the public's disapproval of the current plan that BCHD is pouring our tax funding into. Thank you.

I beg of you! Please!! STOP BCHD

Conna Condon

NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENTS

The following is provided regarding BCHDs proposed 3rd party DEVELOPER/OWNER/ OPERATOR development project that BCHD will be filing a formal Conditional Use Permit and Planning Commission Design Review application for during the first half of 2022.

These comments are filed to agencies as non-agenda comments of the public, in the interest of the public, and under Cal Gov Code 54954.3."regular meetings shall provide an opportunity for members of the public to directly address the legislative body on any item of interest to the public" there is an affirmative obligation to provide these comments to the Planning Commission, City Council or other "legislative" bodies upon receipt.

Summary Table of BCHD Project Non-Compliance with Municipal Codes		
PERMIT	CONDITION	BCHD PROJECT NON-COMPLIANCE
1. CUP	"will not adversely affect surrounding uses and properties"	As supported by over 1,200 petition signers and 100s, if not 1,000 surrounding resident comments to BCHD, surrounding residential uses are adversely impacted in reduced privacy, property value, aesthetics, noise, traffic and toxic emissions.
2. CUP	"for the proposed use ... shall be adequate in size and shape to accommodate such use"	Given the proposed project plan to locate buildings at the elevated site's perimeter, the elevated site is not adequate to accommodate the proposed use.
3. CUP	"no adverse effect on abutting property"	The properties on the 1400 Block of Diamond are subjected to the storage of explosive liquid fuels, a 2,000 kW combustion power plant, and a 16,000 to 4,000 V substation. These mechanical and explosion hazards adversely impact safety, safe air, local emissions, noise, and vibration.
4. PCDR	"ensure compatibility ... in the community"	Based on the City of Redondo Beach's finding that the design of The Kensington was consistent and compatible with the surrounding residential uses, the 110-foot above Beryl St., Miami Beach commercial styled facility cannot also be deemed compatible with similar, 30-foot and under residential uses in the community.
5. PCDR	"protect property values ... of neighborhoods"	Statistical modeling demonstrates that neighborhoods nearer to BCHD have reduced property values compared to neighborhoods further from BCHD. BCHD is proposing to increase height from 99% under 52-feet to 103-feet and to increase over building size from 312,000 sqft to nearly 800,000 sqft.
6. PCDR	"shall consider the impact ... of the user in respect to circulation, parking, traffic, etc."	BCHD proposed design will require the 8-10 story parking ramp at Prospect and Diamond to enter/exit on Prospect northbound. Further, the proposed height of the RCFE and location on the perimeter damages the privacy, aesthetics, excess nighttime lighting, noise impacts and other basic attributes of the surrounding uses and properties.
7. PCDR	"location of buildings and structures shall respect the natural terrain of the site"	The elevated site has from 30-feet to 70-feet elevation gain over surrounding residential uses. As a result, creation of a 110-foot rise over Beryl St., a 10-story parking ramp over Tomlee and Diamond Sts, and a 4-story, flat wall toward Prospect fails to respect the natural elevated terrain. The original 52-foot, 4 story building and its 0.3%, 968 sqft penthouse were nearly centered in the site, thereby respecting the natural terrain.
8. PCDR	"overall design shall be integrated and compatible with the neighborhood and shall strive to be in harmony with the scale and bulk of surrounding properties"	A 300,000 sqft, 110-foot above the street concrete and glass commercial building makes no attempt to integrate and be compatible with the neighborhood in scale or bulk. Further, unlike The Kensington and its Santa Barbara style, the Miami Beach condominium/hotel style proposed, when coupled with the excessive height and mass is thoroughly non-compatible with surrounding properties.

9. PCDR	“shall be consistent with the intent of residential design guidelines”	The residential design guidelines are intended to increase the quality of life of the neighborhood of the construction. It is very clear from the 1,200 petition signatories regarding the height and size of the project that it does not increase the quality of life. Further, there have been 100s, if not 1,000s of comments and concerns regarding the impacts of noise, emissions, traffic, glare, lighting, excess non-directed nighttime lighting, nighttime elevated signage and other factors that diminish quality of life.
10. RDG	“to improve the quality of life in residential neighborhoods ... [t]hese design guidelines are intended to help accomplish this objective”	The BCHD project reduces the quality of life in surrounding neighborhoods. The BCHD commercial Developer/Owner/Operator is targeting 90% non-Redondo Beach residents and 80% non-residents of the 3 beach cities (HB/RB/MB). The PACE facility is scaled for 400 participants with only 17 expected to be from the 3 beach cities according to National PACE Assoc. statistics. The BCHD project nearly triples the size of campus buildings from 312,000 sqft to 800,000 sqft and more than doubles the effective height from 99% less than 52-feet to 109.7-ft. The quality of life of surrounding neighborhoods will be reduced by the commercial, non-resident services as all damages will accrue to the neighborhoods.
11. THO	“The development has been located, planned and designed so as to cause the least intrusion on the views, light, air and privacy of other properties in the vicinity”	The adjoining Torrance neighborhoods are in the Hillside Overlay. The BCHD would not be allowed in overlay, and the City of Torrance has an obligation to protect its residents. The BCHD project is located to maximize damages to views, light, air and privacy based on height, size and perimeter location.
12. THO	“the design will not have a harmful impact upon the land value and investment of other properties in the vicinity”	Statistical analysis demonstrates that surrounding property values are lower, the closer the properties are to the BCHD site. Peer-reviewed research demonstrates that larger, taller developments, such as BCHDs proposal, will have equal or larger negative impacts on property values.
RBMC 10-2.2506 Conditional Use Permits (CUP) RBMC 10-2.2502 Planning Commission Design Review (PCDR) Redondo Beach Residential Design Guidelines (RDG) Redondo Beach Beryl Heights Neighborhood Specific Guidelines (BH RDG) TMC 91.41.6 Planning and Design (Torrance Hillside Overlay, THO)		

From: [v.minami](#)
To: [CityClerk](#); CityClerk@torranceca.gov; stopbchd@gmail.com
Subject: Fw: Public Comment - Forward to Mayors, Councils, Planning Commissions
Date: Sunday, May 15, 2022 7:34:56 PM
Attachments: [BCHD NonCompliance May 2022 Comments.pdf](#)

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

Honorable Mayor, Councilpersons, and Planning Commissioners of Redondo Beach and Torrance:

These are non-agenda item comments to the legislative bodies above for their next general meeting as permitted by the Brown Act.

I am concerned about Beach Cities Health District's proposed Phase 1 development plan that will be commercially DEVELOPED/OWNED/OPERATED. Phase 1 is proposed to be 110-feet above the surrounding streets and 300,000 sqft in size. Phase 2 will bring the total BCHD site up to nearly 800,000 sqft, which is 250% its current size. That is larger than the entire adjacent Beryl Heights neighborhood's homes' sizes all added together. BCHDs proposed plan is also 3-times the height and 150% as large as the voter-rejected CenterCal Mall-by-the-Sea.

I am also concerned that BCHD continues to spend from a \$16M taxpayer fund, preparing inconsistent, incompatible, and irresponsible plans on an elevated site in the center of residential, 30-foot or lower maximum height neighborhoods.

BCHDs 2017 design committed to protecting neighborhoods with buildings in the center and surface parking around the edges buffering homes from damages.

BCHDs 2019 design (June EIR) was 60-feet tall and ringed the site on the edge. The 2020 design (June Board) was 76-feet tall and also on the edge. The 2021 design (March EIR) was 103-feet tall and also on the edge. The current design is claimed to be 83-feet tall and also on the edge of the site and still meets NONE of the comments regarding excessive height and size from 100s of surrounding neighbors and 1000s of petitioners against the project.

The attachment specifically calls out BCHDs plan's noncompliance with specific sections of RBMC CUP and PCDR and on TMC Hillside Overlay.

I ask that the Mayors, Councils and Planning Commissioners provide guidance to their respective Staff and lawyers to convey the public's disapproval of the current plan that BCHD is pouring our tax funding into.

Thank you.

Virginia Minami

NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENTS

The following is provided regarding BCHDs proposed 3rd party DEVELOPER/OWNER/ OPERATOR development project that BCHD will be filing a formal Conditional Use Permit and Planning Commission Design Review application for during the first half of 2022.

These comments are filed to agencies as non-agenda comments of the public, in the interest of the public, and under Cal Gov Code 54954.3."regular meetings shall provide an opportunity for members of the public to directly address the legislative body on any item of interest to the public" there is an affirmative obligation to provide these comments to the Planning Commission, City Council or other "legislative" bodies upon receipt.

Summary Table of BCHD Project Non-Compliance with Municipal Codes		
PERMIT	CONDITION	BCHD PROJECT NON-COMPLIANCE
1. CUP	"will not adversely affect surrounding uses and properties"	As supported by over 1,200 petition signers and 100s, if not 1,000 surrounding resident comments to BCHD, surrounding residential uses are adversely impacted in reduced privacy, property value, aesthetics, noise, traffic and toxic emissions.
2. CUP	"for the proposed use ... shall be adequate in size and shape to accommodate such use"	Given the proposed project plan to locate buildings at the elevated site's perimeter, the elevated site is not adequate to accommodate the proposed use.
3. CUP	"no adverse effect on abutting property"	The properties on the 1400 Block of Diamond are subjected to the storage of explosive liquid fuels, a 2,000 kW combustion power plant, and a 16,000 to 4,000 V substation. These mechanical and explosion hazards adversely impact safety, safe air, local emissions, noise, and vibration.
4. PCDR	"ensure compatibility ... in the community"	Based on the City of Redondo Beach's finding that the design of The Kensington was consistent and compatible with the surrounding residential uses, the 110-foot above Beryl St., Miami Beach commercial styled facility cannot also be deemed compatible with similar, 30-foot and under residential uses in the community.
5. PCDR	"protect property values ... of neighborhoods"	Statistical modeling demonstrates that neighborhoods nearer to BCHD have reduced property values compared to neighborhoods further from BCHD. BCHD is proposing to increase height from 99% under 52-feet to 103-feet and to increase over building size from 312,000 sqft to nearly 800,000 sqft.
6. PCDR	"shall consider the impact ... of the user in respect to circulation, parking, traffic, etc."	BCHD proposed design will require the 8-10 story parking ramp at Prospect and Diamond to enter/exit on Prospect northbound. Further, the proposed height of the RCFE and location on the perimeter damages the privacy, aesthetics, excess nighttime lighting, noise impacts and other basic attributes of the surrounding uses and properties.
7. PCDR	"location of buildings and structures shall respect the natural terrain of the site"	The elevated site has from 30-feet to 70-feet elevation gain over surrounding residential uses. As a result, creation of a 110-foot rise over Beryl St., a 10-story parking ramp over Tomlee and Diamond Sts, and a 4-story, flat wall toward Prospect fails to respect the natural elevated terrain. The original 52-foot, 4 story building and its 0.3%, 968 sqft penthouse were nearly centered in the site, thereby respecting the natural terrain.
8. PCDR	"overall design shall be integrated and compatible with the neighborhood and shall strive to be in harmony with the scale and bulk of surrounding properties"	A 300,000 sqft, 110-foot above the street concrete and glass commercial building makes no attempt to integrate and be compatible with the neighborhood in scale or bulk. Further, unlike The Kensington and its Santa Barbara style, the Miami Beach condominium/hotel style proposed, when coupled with the excessive height and mass is thoroughly non-compatible with surrounding properties.

9. PCDR	“shall be consistent with the intent of residential design guidelines”	The residential design guidelines are intended to increase the quality of life of the neighborhood of the construction. It is very clear from the 1,200 petition signatories regarding the height and size of the project that it does not increase the quality of life. Further, there have been 100s, if not 1,000s of comments and concerns regarding the impacts of noise, emissions, traffic, glare, lighting, excess non-directed nighttime lighting, nighttime elevated signage and other factors that diminish quality of life.
10. RDG	“to improve the quality of life in residential neighborhoods ... [t]hese design guidelines are intended to help accomplish this objective”	The BCHD project reduces the quality of life in surrounding neighborhoods. The BCHD commercial Developer/Owner/Operator is targeting 90% non-Redondo Beach residents and 80% non-residents of the 3 beach cities (HB/RB/MB). The PACE facility is scaled for 400 participants with only 17 expected to be from the 3 beach cities according to National PACE Assoc. statistics. The BCHD project nearly triples the size of campus buildings from 312,000 sqft to 800,000 sqft and more than doubles the effective height from 99% less than 52-feet to 109.7-ft. The quality of life of surrounding neighborhoods will be reduced by the commercial, non-resident services as all damages will accrue to the neighborhoods.
11. THO	“The development has been located, planned and designed so as to cause the least intrusion on the views, light, air and privacy of other properties in the vicinity”	The adjoining Torrance neighborhoods are in the Hillside Overlay. The BCHD would not be allowed in overlay, and the City of Torrance has an obligation to protect its residents. The BCHD project is located to maximize damages to views, light, air and privacy based on height, size and perimeter location.
12. THO	“the design will not have a harmful impact upon the land value and investment of other properties in the vicinity”	Statistical analysis demonstrates that surrounding property values are lower, the closer the properties are to the BCHD site. Peer-reviewed research demonstrates that larger, taller developments, such as BCHDs proposal, will have equal or larger negative impacts on property values.
RBMC 10-2.2506 Conditional Use Permits (CUP) RBMC 10-2.2502 Planning Commission Design Review (PCDR) Redondo Beach Residential Design Guidelines (RDG) Redondo Beach Beryl Heights Neighborhood Specific Guidelines (BH RDG) TMC 91.41.6 Planning and Design (Torrance Hillside Overlay, THO)		

From: [ROBERT LEVY](#)
To: [CityClerk](#); CityClerk@torranceca.gov; stopbchd@gmail.com
Subject: Fwd: Public Comment - Forward to Mayors, Councils, Planning Commissions
Date: Saturday, May 14, 2022 2:24:45 PM
Attachments: [BCHD NonCompliance May 2022 Comments.pdf](#)

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

Honorable Mayor, Councilpersons, and Planning Commissioners of Redondo Beach and Torrance:

These are non-agenda item comments to the legislative bodies above for their next general meeting as permitted by the Brown Act.

I am concerned about Beach Cities Health District's proposed Phase 1 development plan that will be commercially DEVELOPED/OWNED/OPERATED. Phase 1 is proposed to be 110-feet above the surrounding streets and 300,000 sqft in size. Phase 2 will bring the total BCHD site up to nearly 800,000 sqft, which is 250% its current size. That is larger than the entire adjacent Beryl Heights neighborhood's homes' sizes all added together. BCHDs proposed plan is also 3-times the height and 150% as large as the voter-rejected CenterCal Mall-by-the-Sea.

I am also concerned that BCHD continues to spend from a \$16M taxpayer fund, preparing inconsistent, incompatible, and irresponsible plans on an elevated site in the center of residential, 30-foot or lower maximum height neighborhoods.

BCHDs 2017 design committed to protecting neighborhoods with buildings in the center and surface parking around the edges buffering homes from damages.

BCHDs 2019 design (June EIR) was 60-feet tall and ringed the site on the edge. The 2020 design (June Board) was 76-feet tall and also on the edge. The 2021 design (March EIR) was 103-feet tall and also on the edge. The current design is claimed to be 83-feet tall and also on the edge of the site and still meets NONE of the comments regarding excessive height and size from 100s of surrounding neighbors and 1000s of petitioners against the project.

The attachment specifically calls out BCHDs plan's noncompliance with specific sections of RBMC CUP and PCDR and on TMC Hillside Overlay.

I ask that the Mayors, Councils and Planning Commissioners provide guidance to their respective Staff and lawyers to convey the public's disapproval of the current plan that BCHD is pouring our tax funding into. Thank you.

Robert & LuJean Levy
South Bay homeowners since 1984

--

STOP BCHD (StopBCHD@gmail.com) is a neighborhood community of residents concerned about the economic and quality-of-life damages that BCHDs 110-foot above the street, 800,000 sqft commercial development will inflict on our families for the next 50-100 years. Our neighborhoods have been burdened since 1960 and the damages outweigh any benefits.

NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENTS

The following is provided regarding BCHDs proposed 3rd party DEVELOPER/OWNER/ OPERATOR development project that BCHD will be filing a formal Conditional Use Permit and Planning Commission Design Review application for during the first half of 2022.

These comments are filed to agencies as non-agenda comments of the public, in the interest of the public, and under Cal Gov Code 54954.3."regular meetings shall provide an opportunity for members of the public to directly address the legislative body on any item of interest to the public" there is an affirmative obligation to provide these comments to the Planning Commission, City Council or other "legislative" bodies upon receipt.

Summary Table of BCHD Project Non-Compliance with Municipal Codes		
PERMIT	CONDITION	BCHD PROJECT NON-COMPLIANCE
1. CUP	"will not adversely affect surrounding uses and properties"	As supported by over 1,200 petition signers and 100s, if not 1,000 surrounding resident comments to BCHD, surrounding residential uses are adversely impacted in reduced privacy, property value, aesthetics, noise, traffic and toxic emissions.
2. CUP	"for the proposed use ... shall be adequate in size and shape to accommodate such use"	Given the proposed project plan to locate buildings at the elevated site's perimeter, the elevated site is not adequate to accommodate the proposed use.
3. CUP	"no adverse effect on abutting property"	The properties on the 1400 Block of Diamond are subjected to the storage of explosive liquid fuels, a 2,000 kW combustion power plant, and a 16,000 to 4,000 V substation. These mechanical and explosion hazards adversely impact safety, safe air, local emissions, noise, and vibration.
4. PCDR	"ensure compatibility ... in the community"	Based on the City of Redondo Beach's finding that the design of The Kensington was consistent and compatible with the surrounding residential uses, the 110-foot above Beryl St., Miami Beach commercial styled facility cannot also be deemed compatible with similar, 30-foot and under residential uses in the community.
5. PCDR	"protect property values ... of neighborhoods"	Statistical modeling demonstrates that neighborhoods nearer to BCHD have reduced property values compared to neighborhoods further from BCHD. BCHD is proposing to increase height from 99% under 52-feet to 103-feet and to increase over building size from 312,000 sqft to nearly 800,000 sqft.
6. PCDR	"shall consider the impact ... of the user in respect to circulation, parking, traffic, etc."	BCHD proposed design will require the 8-10 story parking ramp at Prospect and Diamond to enter/exit on Prospect northbound. Further, the proposed height of the RCFE and location on the perimeter damages the privacy, aesthetics, excess nighttime lighting, noise impacts and other basic attributes of the surrounding uses and properties.
7. PCDR	"location of buildings and structures shall respect the natural terrain of the site"	The elevated site has from 30-feet to 70-feet elevation gain over surrounding residential uses. As a result, creation of a 110-foot rise over Beryl St., a 10-story parking ramp over Tomlee and Diamond Sts, and a 4-story, flat wall toward Prospect fails to respect the natural elevated terrain. The original 52-foot, 4 story building and its 0.3%, 968 sqft penthouse were nearly centered in the site, thereby respecting the natural terrain.
8. PCDR	"overall design shall be integrated and compatible with the neighborhood and shall strive to be in harmony with the scale and bulk of surrounding properties"	A 300,000 sqft, 110-foot above the street concrete and glass commercial building makes no attempt to integrate and be compatible with the neighborhood in scale or bulk. Further, unlike The Kensington and its Santa Barbara style, the Miami Beach condominium/hotel style proposed, when coupled with the excessive height and mass is thoroughly non-compatible with surrounding properties.

9. PCDR	“shall be consistent with the intent of residential design guidelines”	The residential design guidelines are intended to increase the quality of life of the neighborhood of the construction. It is very clear from the 1,200 petition signatories regarding the height and size of the project that it does not increase the quality of life. Further, there have been 100s, if not 1,000s of comments and concerns regarding the impacts of noise, emissions, traffic, glare, lighting, excess non-directed nighttime lighting, nighttime elevated signage and other factors that diminish quality of life.
10. RDG	“to improve the quality of life in residential neighborhoods ... [t]hese design guidelines are intended to help accomplish this objective”	The BCHD project reduces the quality of life in surrounding neighborhoods. The BCHD commercial Developer/Owner/Operator is targeting 90% non-Redondo Beach residents and 80% non-residents of the 3 beach cities (HB/RB/MB). The PACE facility is scaled for 400 participants with only 17 expected to be from the 3 beach cities according to National PACE Assoc. statistics. The BCHD project nearly triples the size of campus buildings from 312,000 sqft to 800,000 sqft and more than doubles the effective height from 99% less than 52-feet to 109.7-ft. The quality of life of surrounding neighborhoods will be reduced by the commercial, non-resident services as all damages will accrue to the neighborhoods.
11. THO	“The development has been located, planned and designed so as to cause the least intrusion on the views, light, air and privacy of other properties in the vicinity”	The adjoining Torrance neighborhoods are in the Hillside Overlay. The BCHD would not be allowed in overlay, and the City of Torrance has an obligation to protect its residents. The BCHD project is located to maximize damages to views, light, air and privacy based on height, size and perimeter location.
12. THO	“the design will not have a harmful impact upon the land value and investment of other properties in the vicinity”	Statistical analysis demonstrates that surrounding property values are lower, the closer the properties are to the BCHD site. Peer-reviewed research demonstrates that larger, taller developments, such as BCHDs proposal, will have equal or larger negative impacts on property values.
RBMC 10-2.2506 Conditional Use Permits (CUP) RBMC 10-2.2502 Planning Commission Design Review (PCDR) Redondo Beach Residential Design Guidelines (RDG) Redondo Beach Beryl Heights Neighborhood Specific Guidelines (BH RDG) TMC 91.41.6 Planning and Design (Torrance Hillside Overlay, THO)		

From: [William Shanney](#)
To: [CityClerk](#); CityClerk@torranceca.gov; stopbchd@gmail.com
Subject: Fwd: Public Comment - Forward to Mayors, Councils, Planning Commissions
Date: Saturday, May 14, 2022 2:34:29 PM
Attachments: [BCHD NonCompliance May 2022 Comments.pdf](#)

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

Honorable Mayor, Councilpersons, and Planning Commissioners of Redondo Beach and Torrance:

These are non-agenda item comments to the legislative bodies above for their next general meeting as permitted by the Brown Act.

I am concerned about Beach Cities Health District's proposed Phase 1 development plan that will be commercially DEVELOPED/OWNED/OPERATED. Phase 1 is proposed to be 110-feet above the surrounding streets and 300,000 sqft in size. Phase 2 will bring the total BCHD site up to nearly 800,000 sqft, which is 250% its current size. That is larger than the entire adjacent Beryl Heights neighborhood's homes' sizes all added together. BCHDs proposed plan is also 3-times the height and 150% as large as the voter-rejected CenterCal Mall-by-the-Sea.

I am also concerned that BCHD continues to spend from a \$16M taxpayer fund, preparing inconsistent, incompatible, and irresponsible plans on an elevated site in the center of residential, 30-foot or lower maximum height neighborhoods.

BCHDs 2017 design committed to protecting neighborhoods with buildings in the center and surface parking around the edges buffering homes from damages.

BCHDs 2019 design (June EIR) was 60-feet tall and ringed the site on the edge. The 2020 design (June Board) was 76-feet tall and also on the edge. The 2021 design (March EIR) was 103-feet tall and also on the edge. The current design is claimed to be 83-feet tall and also on the edge of the site and still meets NONE of the comments regarding excessive height and size from 100s of surrounding neighbors and 1000s of petitioners against the project.

The attachment specifically calls out BCHDs plan's noncompliance with specific sections of RBMC CUP and PCDR and on TMC Hillside Overlay.

I ask that the Mayors, Councils and Planning Commissioners provide guidance to their respective Staff and lawyers to convey the public's disapproval of the current plan that BCHD is pouring our tax funding into. Thank you.

William and Vivian Shanney

--

STOP BCHD (StopBCHD@gmail.com) is a neighborhood community of residents concerned about the economic and quality-of-life damages that BCHDs 110-foot above the street, 800,000 sqft commercial development will inflict on our families for the next 50-100 years. Our neighborhoods have been burdened since 1960 and the damages outweigh any benefits.

NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENTS

The following is provided regarding BCHDs proposed 3rd party DEVELOPER/OWNER/ OPERATOR development project that BCHD will be filing a formal Conditional Use Permit and Planning Commission Design Review application for during the first half of 2022.

These comments are filed to agencies as non-agenda comments of the public, in the interest of the public, and under Cal Gov Code 54954.3."regular meetings shall provide an opportunity for members of the public to directly address the legislative body on any item of interest to the public" there is an affirmative obligation to provide these comments to the Planning Commission, City Council or other "legislative" bodies upon receipt.

Summary Table of BCHD Project Non-Compliance with Municipal Codes		
PERMIT	CONDITION	BCHD PROJECT NON-COMPLIANCE
1. CUP	"will not adversely affect surrounding uses and properties"	As supported by over 1,200 petition signers and 100s, if not 1,000 surrounding resident comments to BCHD, surrounding residential uses are adversely impacted in reduced privacy, property value, aesthetics, noise, traffic and toxic emissions.
2. CUP	"for the proposed use ... shall be adequate in size and shape to accommodate such use"	Given the proposed project plan to locate buildings at the elevated site's perimeter, the elevated site is not adequate to accommodate the proposed use.
3. CUP	"no adverse effect on abutting property"	The properties on the 1400 Block of Diamond are subjected to the storage of explosive liquid fuels, a 2,000 kW combustion power plant, and a 16,000 to 4,000 V substation. These mechanical and explosion hazards adversely impact safety, safe air, local emissions, noise, and vibration.
4. PCDR	"ensure compatibility ... in the community"	Based on the City of Redondo Beach's finding that the design of The Kensington was consistent and compatible with the surrounding residential uses, the 110-foot above Beryl St., Miami Beach commercial styled facility cannot also be deemed compatible with similar, 30-foot and under residential uses in the community.
5. PCDR	"protect property values ... of neighborhoods"	Statistical modeling demonstrates that neighborhoods nearer to BCHD have reduced property values compared to neighborhoods further from BCHD. BCHD is proposing to increase height from 99% under 52-feet to 103-feet and to increase over building size from 312,000 sqft to nearly 800,000 sqft.
6. PCDR	"shall consider the impact ... of the user in respect to circulation, parking, traffic, etc."	BCHD proposed design will require the 8-10 story parking ramp at Prospect and Diamond to enter/exit on Prospect northbound. Further, the proposed height of the RCFE and location on the perimeter damages the privacy, aesthetics, excess nighttime lighting, noise impacts and other basic attributes of the surrounding uses and properties.
7. PCDR	"location of buildings and structures shall respect the natural terrain of the site"	The elevated site has from 30-feet to 70-feet elevation gain over surrounding residential uses. As a result, creation of a 110-foot rise over Beryl St., a 10-story parking ramp over Tomlee and Diamond Sts, and a 4-story, flat wall toward Prospect fails to respect the natural elevated terrain. The original 52-foot, 4 story building and its 0.3%, 968 sqft penthouse were nearly centered in the site, thereby respecting the natural terrain.
8. PCDR	"overall design shall be integrated and compatible with the neighborhood and shall strive to be in harmony with the scale and bulk of surrounding properties"	A 300,000 sqft, 110-foot above the street concrete and glass commercial building makes no attempt to integrate and be compatible with the neighborhood in scale or bulk. Further, unlike The Kensington and its Santa Barbara style, the Miami Beach condominium/hotel style proposed, when coupled with the excessive height and mass is thoroughly non-compatible with surrounding properties.

9. PCDR	“shall be consistent with the intent of residential design guidelines”	The residential design guidelines are intended to increase the quality of life of the neighborhood of the construction. It is very clear from the 1,200 petition signatories regarding the height and size of the project that it does not increase the quality of life. Further, there have been 100s, if not 1,000s of comments and concerns regarding the impacts of noise, emissions, traffic, glare, lighting, excess non-directed nighttime lighting, nighttime elevated signage and other factors that diminish quality of life.
10. RDG	“to improve the quality of life in residential neighborhoods ... [t]hese design guidelines are intended to help accomplish this objective”	The BCHD project reduces the quality of life in surrounding neighborhoods. The BCHD commercial Developer/Owner/Operator is targeting 90% non-Redondo Beach residents and 80% non-residents of the 3 beach cities (HB/RB/MB). The PACE facility is scaled for 400 participants with only 17 expected to be from the 3 beach cities according to National PACE Assoc. statistics. The BCHD project nearly triples the size of campus buildings from 312,000 sqft to 800,000 sqft and more than doubles the effective height from 99% less than 52-feet to 109.7-ft. The quality of life of surrounding neighborhoods will be reduced by the commercial, non-resident services as all damages will accrue to the neighborhoods.
11. THO	“The development has been located, planned and designed so as to cause the least intrusion on the views, light, air and privacy of other properties in the vicinity”	The adjoining Torrance neighborhoods are in the Hillside Overlay. The BCHD would not be allowed in overlay, and the City of Torrance has an obligation to protect its residents. The BCHD project is located to maximize damages to views, light, air and privacy based on height, size and perimeter location.
12. THO	“the design will not have a harmful impact upon the land value and investment of other properties in the vicinity”	Statistical analysis demonstrates that surrounding property values are lower, the closer the properties are to the BCHD site. Peer-reviewed research demonstrates that larger, taller developments, such as BCHDs proposal, will have equal or larger negative impacts on property values.
RBMC 10-2.2506 Conditional Use Permits (CUP) RBMC 10-2.2502 Planning Commission Design Review (PCDR) Redondo Beach Residential Design Guidelines (RDG) Redondo Beach Beryl Heights Neighborhood Specific Guidelines (BH RDG) TMC 91.41.6 Planning and Design (Torrance Hillside Overlay, THO)		

From: [Aileen Pavlin](#)
To: [CityClerk](#); CityClerk@torranceca.gov; stopbchd@gmail.com
Subject: Fwd: Public Comment - Forward to Mayors, Councils, Planning Commissions
Date: Saturday, May 14, 2022 3:23:32 PM
Attachments: [BCHD NonCompliance May 2022 Comments.pdf](#)

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

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

From: Stop BCHD <stop.bchd@gmail.com>
Date: Sat, May 14, 2022 at 2:06 PM
Subject: Public Comment - Forward to Mayors, Councils, Planning Commissions
To: Stop BCHD <StopBCHD@gmail.com>

FORWARD this (including attachment) to: CityClerk@redondo.org,
CityClerk@torranceca.gov, stopbchd@gmail.com

Honorable Mayor, Councilpersons, and Planning Commissioners of Redondo Beach and Torrance:

These are non-agenda item comments to the legislative bodies above for their next general meeting as permitted by the Brown Act.

I am concerned about Beach Cities Health District's proposed Phase 1 development plan that will be commercially DEVELOPED/OWNED/OPERATED. Phase 1 is proposed to be 110-feet above the surrounding streets and 300,000 sqft in size. Phase 2 will bring the total BCHD site up to nearly 800,000 sqft, which is 250% its current size. That is larger than the entire adjacent Beryl Heights neighborhood's homes' sizes all added together. BCHDs proposed plan is also 3-times the height and 150% as large as the voter-rejected CenterCal Mall-by-the-Sea.

I am also concerned that BCHD continues to spend from a \$16M taxpayer fund, preparing inconsistent, incompatible, and irresponsible plans on an elevated site in the center of residential, 30-foot or lower maximum height neighborhoods.

BCHDs 2017 design committed to protecting neighborhoods with buildings in the center and surface parking around the edges buffering homes from damages.

BCHDs 2019 design (June EIR) was 60-feet tall and ringed the site on the edge. The 2020 design (June Board) was 76-feet tall and also on the edge. The 2021 design (March EIR) was 103-feet tall and also on the edge. The current design is claimed to be 83-feet tall and also on the edge of the site and still meets NONE of the comments regarding excessive height and size from 100s of surrounding neighbors and 1000s of petitioners against the project.

The attachment specifically calls out BCHDs plan's noncompliance with specific sections of RBMC CUP and PCDR and on TMC Hillside Overlay.

I ask that the Mayors, Councils and Planning Commissioners provide guidance to their respective Staff and lawyers to convey the public's disapproval of the current plan that BCHD is pouring our tax funding into. Thank you.

--

STOP BCHD (StopBCHD@gmail.com) is a neighborhood community of residents concerned about the economic and quality-of-life damages that BCHDs 110-foot above the street, 800,000 sqft commercial development will inflict on our families for the next 50-100 years. Our neighborhoods have been burdened since 1960 and the damages outweigh any benefits.

NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENTS

The following is provided regarding BCHDs proposed 3rd party DEVELOPER/OWNER/ OPERATOR development project that BCHD will be filing a formal Conditional Use Permit and Planning Commission Design Review application for during the first half of 2022.

These comments are filed to agencies as non-agenda comments of the public, in the interest of the public, and under Cal Gov Code 54954.3."regular meetings shall provide an opportunity for members of the public to directly address the legislative body on any item of interest to the public" there is an affirmative obligation to provide these comments to the Planning Commission, City Council or other "legislative" bodies upon receipt.

Summary Table of BCHD Project Non-Compliance with Municipal Codes		
PERMIT	CONDITION	BCHD PROJECT NON-COMPLIANCE
1. CUP	"will not adversely affect surrounding uses and properties"	As supported by over 1,200 petition signers and 100s, if not 1,000 surrounding resident comments to BCHD, surrounding residential uses are adversely impacted in reduced privacy, property value, aesthetics, noise, traffic and toxic emissions.
2. CUP	"for the proposed use ... shall be adequate in size and shape to accommodate such use"	Given the proposed project plan to locate buildings at the elevated site's perimeter, the elevated site is not adequate to accommodate the proposed use.
3. CUP	"no adverse effect on abutting property"	The properties on the 1400 Block of Diamond are subjected to the storage of explosive liquid fuels, a 2,000 kW combustion power plant, and a 16,000 to 4,000 V substation. These mechanical and explosion hazards adversely impact safety, safe air, local emissions, noise, and vibration.
4. PCDR	"ensure compatibility ... in the community"	Based on the City of Redondo Beach's finding that the design of The Kensington was consistent and compatible with the surrounding residential uses, the 110-foot above Beryl St., Miami Beach commercial styled facility cannot also be deemed compatible with similar, 30-foot and under residential uses in the community.
5. PCDR	"protect property values ... of neighborhoods"	Statistical modeling demonstrates that neighborhoods nearer to BCHD have reduced property values compared to neighborhoods further from BCHD. BCHD is proposing to increase height from 99% under 52-feet to 103-feet and to increase over building size from 312,000 sqft to nearly 800,000 sqft.
6. PCDR	"shall consider the impact ... of the user in respect to circulation, parking, traffic, etc."	BCHD proposed design will require the 8-10 story parking ramp at Prospect and Diamond to enter/exit on Prospect northbound. Further, the proposed height of the RCFE and location on the perimeter damages the privacy, aesthetics, excess nighttime lighting, noise impacts and other basic attributes of the surrounding uses and properties.
7. PCDR	"location of buildings and structures shall respect the natural terrain of the site"	The elevated site has from 30-feet to 70-feet elevation gain over surrounding residential uses. As a result, creation of a 110-foot rise over Beryl St., a 10-story parking ramp over Tomlee and Diamond Sts, and a 4-story, flat wall toward Prospect fails to respect the natural elevated terrain. The original 52-foot, 4 story building and its 0.3%, 968 sqft penthouse were nearly centered in the site, thereby respecting the natural terrain.
8. PCDR	"overall design shall be integrated and compatible with the neighborhood and shall strive to be in harmony with the scale and bulk of surrounding properties"	A 300,000 sqft, 110-foot above the street concrete and glass commercial building makes no attempt to integrate and be compatible with the neighborhood in scale or bulk. Further, unlike The Kensington and its Santa Barbara style, the Miami Beach condominium/hotel style proposed, when coupled with the excessive height and mass is thoroughly non-compatible with surrounding properties.

9. PCDR	“shall be consistent with the intent of residential design guidelines”	The residential design guidelines are intended to increase the quality of life of the neighborhood of the construction. It is very clear from the 1,200 petition signatories regarding the height and size of the project that it does not increase the quality of life. Further, there have been 100s, if not 1,000s of comments and concerns regarding the impacts of noise, emissions, traffic, glare, lighting, excess non-directed nighttime lighting, nighttime elevated signage and other factors that diminish quality of life.
10. RDG	“to improve the quality of life in residential neighborhoods ... [t]hese design guidelines are intended to help accomplish this objective”	The BCHD project reduces the quality of life in surrounding neighborhoods. The BCHD commercial Developer/Owner/Operator is targeting 90% non-Redondo Beach residents and 80% non-residents of the 3 beach cities (HB/RB/MB). The PACE facility is scaled for 400 participants with only 17 expected to be from the 3 beach cities according to National PACE Assoc. statistics. The BCHD project nearly triples the size of campus buildings from 312,000 sqft to 800,000 sqft and more than doubles the effective height from 99% less than 52-feet to 109.7-ft. The quality of life of surrounding neighborhoods will be reduced by the commercial, non-resident services as all damages will accrue to the neighborhoods.
11. THO	“The development has been located, planned and designed so as to cause the least intrusion on the views, light, air and privacy of other properties in the vicinity”	The adjoining Torrance neighborhoods are in the Hillside Overlay. The BCHD would not be allowed in overlay, and the City of Torrance has an obligation to protect its residents. The BCHD project is located to maximize damages to views, light, air and privacy based on height, size and perimeter location.
12. THO	“the design will not have a harmful impact upon the land value and investment of other properties in the vicinity”	Statistical analysis demonstrates that surrounding property values are lower, the closer the properties are to the BCHD site. Peer-reviewed research demonstrates that larger, taller developments, such as BCHDs proposal, will have equal or larger negative impacts on property values.
RBMC 10-2.2506 Conditional Use Permits (CUP) RBMC 10-2.2502 Planning Commission Design Review (PCDR) Redondo Beach Residential Design Guidelines (RDG) Redondo Beach Beryl Heights Neighborhood Specific Guidelines (BH RDG) TMC 91.41.6 Planning and Design (Torrance Hillside Overlay, THO)		

From: [joyce field](#)
To: [CityClerk](#); CityClerk@torranceca.gov; stopbchd@gmail.com
Subject: Fwd: Public Comment - Forward to Mayors, Councils, Planning Commissions
Date: Saturday, May 14, 2022 3:43:29 PM
Attachments: [BCHD NonCompliance May 2022 Comments.pdf](#)

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

Honorable Mayor, Councilpersons, and Planning Commissioners of Redondo Beach and Torrance:

These are non-agenda item comments to the legislative bodies above for their next general meeting as permitted by the Brown Act.

I am concerned about Beach Cities Health District's proposed Phase 1 development plan that will be commercially DEVELOPED/OWNED/OPERATED. Phase 1 is proposed to be 110-feet above the surrounding streets and 300,000 sqft in size. Phase 2 will bring the total BCHD site up to nearly 800,000 sqft, which is 250% its current size. That is larger than the entire adjacent Beryl Heights neighborhood's homes' sizes all added together. BCHDs proposed plan is also 3-times the height and 150% as large as the voter-rejected CenterCal Mall-by-the-Sea.

I am also concerned that BCHD continues to spend from a \$16M taxpayer fund, preparing inconsistent, incompatible, and irresponsible plans on an elevated site in the center of residential, 30-foot or lower maximum height neighborhoods.

BCHDs 2017 design committed to protecting neighborhoods with buildings in the center and surface parking around the edges buffering homes from damages.

BCHDs 2019 design (June EIR) was 60-feet tall and ringed the site on the edge. The 2020 design (June Board) was 76-feet tall and also on the edge. The 2021 design (March EIR) was 103-feet tall and also on the edge. The current design is claimed to be 83-feet tall and also on the edge of the site and still meets NONE of the comments regarding excessive height and size from 100s of surrounding neighbors and 1000s of petitioners against the project.

The attachment specifically calls out BCHDs plan's noncompliance with specific sections of RBMC CUP and PCDR and on TMC Hillside Overlay.

I ask that the Mayors, Councils and Planning Commissioners provide guidance to their respective Staff and lawyers to convey the public's disapproval of the current plan that BCHD is pouring our tax funding into. Thank you.

--

STOP BCHD (StopBCHD@gmail.com) is a neighborhood community of residents concerned about the economic and quality-of-life damages that BCHDs 110-foot above the street, 800,000 sqft commercial development will inflict on our families for the next 50-100 years. Our neighborhoods have been burdened since 1960 and the damages outweigh any benefits.

NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENTS

The following is provided regarding BCHDs proposed 3rd party DEVELOPER/OWNER/ OPERATOR development project that BCHD will be filing a formal Conditional Use Permit and Planning Commission Design Review application for during the first half of 2022.

These comments are filed to agencies as non-agenda comments of the public, in the interest of the public, and under Cal Gov Code 54954.3."regular meetings shall provide an opportunity for members of the public to directly address the legislative body on any item of interest to the public" there is an affirmative obligation to provide these comments to the Planning Commission, City Council or other "legislative" bodies upon receipt.

Summary Table of BCHD Project Non-Compliance with Municipal Codes		
PERMIT	CONDITION	BCHD PROJECT NON-COMPLIANCE
1. CUP	"will not adversely affect surrounding uses and properties"	As supported by over 1,200 petition signers and 100s, if not 1,000 surrounding resident comments to BCHD, surrounding residential uses are adversely impacted in reduced privacy, property value, aesthetics, noise, traffic and toxic emissions.
2. CUP	"for the proposed use ... shall be adequate in size and shape to accommodate such use"	Given the proposed project plan to locate buildings at the elevated site's perimeter, the elevated site is not adequate to accommodate the proposed use.
3. CUP	"no adverse effect on abutting property"	The properties on the 1400 Block of Diamond are subjected to the storage of explosive liquid fuels, a 2,000 kW combustion power plant, and a 16,000 to 4,000 V substation. These mechanical and explosion hazards adversely impact safety, safe air, local emissions, noise, and vibration.
4. PCDR	"ensure compatibility ... in the community"	Based on the City of Redondo Beach's finding that the design of The Kensington was consistent and compatible with the surrounding residential uses, the 110-foot above Beryl St., Miami Beach commercial styled facility cannot also be deemed compatible with similar, 30-foot and under residential uses in the community.
5. PCDR	"protect property values ... of neighborhoods"	Statistical modeling demonstrates that neighborhoods nearer to BCHD have reduced property values compared to neighborhoods further from BCHD. BCHD is proposing to increase height from 99% under 52-feet to 103-feet and to increase over building size from 312,000 sqft to nearly 800,000 sqft.
6. PCDR	"shall consider the impact ... of the user in respect to circulation, parking, traffic, etc."	BCHD proposed design will require the 8-10 story parking ramp at Prospect and Diamond to enter/exit on Prospect northbound. Further, the proposed height of the RCFE and location on the perimeter damages the privacy, aesthetics, excess nighttime lighting, noise impacts and other basic attributes of the surrounding uses and properties.
7. PCDR	"location of buildings and structures shall respect the natural terrain of the site"	The elevated site has from 30-feet to 70-feet elevation gain over surrounding residential uses. As a result, creation of a 110-foot rise over Beryl St., a 10-story parking ramp over Tomlee and Diamond Sts, and a 4-story, flat wall toward Prospect fails to respect the natural elevated terrain. The original 52-foot, 4 story building and its 0.3%, 968 sqft penthouse were nearly centered in the site, thereby respecting the natural terrain.
8. PCDR	"overall design shall be integrated and compatible with the neighborhood and shall strive to be in harmony with the scale and bulk of surrounding properties"	A 300,000 sqft, 110-foot above the street concrete and glass commercial building makes no attempt to integrate and be compatible with the neighborhood in scale or bulk. Further, unlike The Kensington and its Santa Barbara style, the Miami Beach condominium/hotel style proposed, when coupled with the excessive height and mass is thoroughly non-compatible with surrounding properties.

9. PCDR	“shall be consistent with the intent of residential design guidelines”	The residential design guidelines are intended to increase the quality of life of the neighborhood of the construction. It is very clear from the 1,200 petition signatories regarding the height and size of the project that it does not increase the quality of life. Further, there have been 100s, if not 1,000s of comments and concerns regarding the impacts of noise, emissions, traffic, glare, lighting, excess non-directed nighttime lighting, nighttime elevated signage and other factors that diminish quality of life.
10. RDG	“to improve the quality of life in residential neighborhoods ... [t]hese design guidelines are intended to help accomplish this objective”	The BCHD project reduces the quality of life in surrounding neighborhoods. The BCHD commercial Developer/Owner/Operator is targeting 90% non-Redondo Beach residents and 80% non-residents of the 3 beach cities (HB/RB/MB). The PACE facility is scaled for 400 participants with only 17 expected to be from the 3 beach cities according to National PACE Assoc. statistics. The BCHD project nearly triples the size of campus buildings from 312,000 sqft to 800,000 sqft and more than doubles the effective height from 99% less than 52-feet to 109.7-ft. The quality of life of surrounding neighborhoods will be reduced by the commercial, non-resident services as all damages will accrue to the neighborhoods.
11. THO	“The development has been located, planned and designed so as to cause the least intrusion on the views, light, air and privacy of other properties in the vicinity”	The adjoining Torrance neighborhoods are in the Hillside Overlay. The BCHD would not be allowed in overlay, and the City of Torrance has an obligation to protect its residents. The BCHD project is located to maximize damages to views, light, air and privacy based on height, size and perimeter location.
12. THO	“the design will not have a harmful impact upon the land value and investment of other properties in the vicinity”	Statistical analysis demonstrates that surrounding property values are lower, the closer the properties are to the BCHD site. Peer-reviewed research demonstrates that larger, taller developments, such as BCHDs proposal, will have equal or larger negative impacts on property values.
RBMC 10-2.2506 Conditional Use Permits (CUP) RBMC 10-2.2502 Planning Commission Design Review (PCDR) Redondo Beach Residential Design Guidelines (RDG) Redondo Beach Beryl Heights Neighborhood Specific Guidelines (BH RDG) TMC 91.41.6 Planning and Design (Torrance Hillside Overlay, THO)		

From: [Tim Ozenne](#)
To: [CityClerk](#); [City Clerk](#); stopbchd@gmail.com
Subject: Fwd: Public Comment - Forward to Mayors, Councils, Planning Commissions
Date: Saturday, May 14, 2022 3:58:17 PM
Attachments: [BCHD NonCompliance May 2022 Comments.pdf](#)

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

Honorable Mayor, Councilpersons, and Planning Commissioners of
Redondo Beach and Torrance:

These are non-agenda item comments to the legislative bodies above for their next general meeting as permitted by the Brown Act.

We have lived in Torrance for several decades. From our home, we see much of the former BCHD "hospital" (which quit being a hospital more than two decades ago). If the BCHD development plan goes forward as now proposed, we and many of our neighbors will see a huge increase in the relative sizes of BCHD commercial buildings as we look west. BCHD seems to have designed its real estate development with no concern at all for area residents.

In particular, I am concerned about Beach Cities Health District's proposed Phase 1 development plan that will be commercially DEVELOPED/OWNED/OPERATED. Phase 1 is proposed to be 110-feet above the surrounding streets and 300,000 sqft in size. Phase 2 will bring the total BCHD site up to nearly 800,000 sqft, which is 250% of its current size. That is larger than the entire adjacent Beryl Heights neighborhood's homes' sizes all added together. BCHDs proposed plan is also 3-times the height and 150% as large as the voter-rejected CenterCal Mall-by-the-Sea. BCHD has manipulated the placement and sizes of buildings so as to pretend the project is somehow compatible with the surrounding residential neighborhoods. While RB code requires *compatibility*--not only with homes in Redondo but with neighborhoods that presumably include homes in Torrance. No one can imagine this project is in any way compatible, not with homes in Redondo nor with homes in Torrance. Do RB planners see this differently?

I am also concerned that BCHD continues to spend from a \$16M taxpayer fund, preparing inconsistent, incompatible, and irresponsible plans on an elevated site in the center of residential, 30-foot or lower maximum height neighborhoods.

BCHDs 2017 design committed to protecting neighborhoods with buildings in the center and surface parking around the edges buffering homes from damage. That plan was scrubbed!

BCHDs 2019 design (June EIR) was 60-feet tall and ringed the site on the edge. The 2020 design (June Board) was 76-feet tall and also on the edge. The 2021 design (March EIR) was 103-feet tall and also on the edge. The current design is claimed to be 83-feet tall and also on the edge of the site and still meets NONE of the comments regarding excessive height and size

from 100s of surrounding neighbors and 1000s of petitioners against the project.

The **attachment** specifically calls out BCHD's planned noncompliance with specific sections of RBMC CUP and PCDR and on TMC Hillside Overlay.

And, as a long-term resident of Torrance, I must point out that it looks like BCHD intends to demolish public property in Torrance--the Flagler Lane right-of-way--to accommodate its project overlooking Torrance homes. Apparently, BCHD plans to destroy many mature trees and several existing retaining walls in Torrance to proceed with its "development."

I would also point out that the land for this development project was acquired long ago via eminent domain. It is supposed to remain forever dedicated to public uses, but BCHD appears ready to flaunt California code including CCP 1245.245 by, among other things, erecting a *private* residential facility on the land. Redondo has already ruled, in the case of the Kensington facility, that such facilities are private, not public. I cannot imagine Redondo Beach simply reversing its prior ruling.

I ask that the Mayors, Councils and Planning Commissioners provide guidance to their respective Staff and lawyers to convey the public's disapproval of the current plan that BCHD is pouring our tax funding into. Thank you.

NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENTS

The following is provided regarding BCHDs proposed 3rd party DEVELOPER/OWNER/ OPERATOR development project that BCHD will be filing a formal Conditional Use Permit and Planning Commission Design Review application for during the first half of 2022.

These comments are filed to agencies as non-agenda comments of the public, in the interest of the public, and under Cal Gov Code 54954.3."regular meetings shall provide an opportunity for members of the public to directly address the legislative body on any item of interest to the public" there is an affirmative obligation to provide these comments to the Planning Commission, City Council or other "legislative" bodies upon receipt.

Summary Table of BCHD Project Non-Compliance with Municipal Codes		
PERMIT	CONDITION	BCHD PROJECT NON-COMPLIANCE
1. CUP	"will not adversely affect surrounding uses and properties"	As supported by over 1,200 petition signers and 100s, if not 1,000 surrounding resident comments to BCHD, surrounding residential uses are adversely impacted in reduced privacy, property value, aesthetics, noise, traffic and toxic emissions.
2. CUP	"for the proposed use ... shall be adequate in size and shape to accommodate such use"	Given the proposed project plan to locate buildings at the elevated site's perimeter, the elevated site is not adequate to accommodate the proposed use.
3. CUP	"no adverse effect on abutting property"	The properties on the 1400 Block of Diamond are subjected to the storage of explosive liquid fuels, a 2,000 kW combustion power plant, and a 16,000 to 4,000 V substation. These mechanical and explosion hazards adversely impact safety, safe air, local emissions, noise, and vibration.
4. PCDR	"ensure compatibility ... in the community"	Based on the City of Redondo Beach's finding that the design of The Kensington was consistent and compatible with the surrounding residential uses, the 110-foot above Beryl St., Miami Beach commercial styled facility cannot also be deemed compatible with similar, 30-foot and under residential uses in the community.
5. PCDR	"protect property values ... of neighborhoods"	Statistical modeling demonstrates that neighborhoods nearer to BCHD have reduced property values compared to neighborhoods further from BCHD. BCHD is proposing to increase height from 99% under 52-feet to 103-feet and to increase over building size from 312,000 sqft to nearly 800,000 sqft.
6. PCDR	"shall consider the impact ... of the user in respect to circulation, parking, traffic, etc."	BCHD proposed design will require the 8-10 story parking ramp at Prospect and Diamond to enter/exit on Prospect northbound. Further, the proposed height of the RCFE and location on the perimeter damages the privacy, aesthetics, excess nighttime lighting, noise impacts and other basic attributes of the surrounding uses and properties.
7. PCDR	"location of buildings and structures shall respect the natural terrain of the site"	The elevated site has from 30-feet to 70-feet elevation gain over surrounding residential uses. As a result, creation of a 110-foot rise over Beryl St., a 10-story parking ramp over Tomlee and Diamond Sts, and a 4-story, flat wall toward Prospect fails to respect the natural elevated terrain. The original 52-foot, 4 story building and its 0.3%, 968 sqft penthouse were nearly centered in the site, thereby respecting the natural terrain.
8. PCDR	"overall design shall be integrated and compatible with the neighborhood and shall strive to be in harmony with the scale and bulk of surrounding properties"	A 300,000 sqft, 110-foot above the street concrete and glass commercial building makes no attempt to integrate and be compatible with the neighborhood in scale or bulk. Further, unlike The Kensington and its Santa Barbara style, the Miami Beach condominium/hotel style proposed, when coupled with the excessive height and mass is thoroughly non-compatible with surrounding properties.

9. PCDR	“shall be consistent with the intent of residential design guidelines”	The residential design guidelines are intended to increase the quality of life of the neighborhood of the construction. It is very clear from the 1,200 petition signatories regarding the height and size of the project that it does not increase the quality of life. Further, there have been 100s, if not 1,000s of comments and concerns regarding the impacts of noise, emissions, traffic, glare, lighting, excess non-directed nighttime lighting, nighttime elevated signage and other factors that diminish quality of life.
10. RDG	“to improve the quality of life in residential neighborhoods ... [t]hese design guidelines are intended to help accomplish this objective”	The BCHD project reduces the quality of life in surrounding neighborhoods. The BCHD commercial Developer/Owner/Operator is targeting 90% non-Redondo Beach residents and 80% non-residents of the 3 beach cities (HB/RB/MB). The PACE facility is scaled for 400 participants with only 17 expected to be from the 3 beach cities according to National PACE Assoc. statistics. The BCHD project nearly triples the size of campus buildings from 312,000 sqft to 800,000 sqft and more than doubles the effective height from 99% less than 52-feet to 109.7-ft. The quality of life of surrounding neighborhoods will be reduced by the commercial, non-resident services as all damages will accrue to the neighborhoods.
11. THO	“The development has been located, planned and designed so as to cause the least intrusion on the views, light, air and privacy of other properties in the vicinity”	The adjoining Torrance neighborhoods are in the Hillside Overlay. The BCHD would not be allowed in overlay, and the City of Torrance has an obligation to protect its residents. The BCHD project is located to maximize damages to views, light, air and privacy based on height, size and perimeter location.
12. THO	“the design will not have a harmful impact upon the land value and investment of other properties in the vicinity”	Statistical analysis demonstrates that surrounding property values are lower, the closer the properties are to the BCHD site. Peer-reviewed research demonstrates that larger, taller developments, such as BCHDs proposal, will have equal or larger negative impacts on property values.
RBMC 10-2.2506 Conditional Use Permits (CUP) RBMC 10-2.2502 Planning Commission Design Review (PCDR) Redondo Beach Residential Design Guidelines (RDG) Redondo Beach Beryl Heights Neighborhood Specific Guidelines (BH RDG) TMC 91.41.6 Planning and Design (Torrance Hillside Overlay, THO)		

From: [Stop BCHD](#)
To: [CityClerk: cityclerk@torranceca.gov](#); [Stop BCHD](#)
Subject: Fwd: Public Comment - Forward to Mayors, Councils, Planning Commissions
Date: Saturday, May 14, 2022 4:07:34 PM
Attachments: [BCHD NonCompliance May 2022 Comments.pdf](#)

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

Honorable Mayor, Councilpersons, and Planning Commissioners of Redondo Beach and Torrance:

These are non-agenda item comments to the legislative bodies above for their next general meeting as permitted by the Brown Act.

I am concerned about Beach Cities Health District's proposed Phase 1 development plan that will be commercially DEVELOPED/OWNED/OPERATED. Phase 1 is proposed to be 110-feet above the surrounding streets and 300,000 sqft in size. Phase 2 will bring the total BCHD site up to nearly 800,000 sqft, which is 250% its current size. That is larger than the entire adjacent Beryl Heights neighborhood's homes' sizes all added together. BCHDs proposed plan is also 3-times the height and 150% as large as the voter-rejected CenterCal Mall-by-the-Sea.

I am also concerned that BCHD continues to spend from a \$16M taxpayer fund, preparing inconsistent, incompatible, and irresponsible plans on an elevated site in the center of residential, 30-foot or lower maximum height neighborhoods.

BCHDs 2017 design committed to protecting neighborhoods with buildings in the center and surface parking around the edges buffering homes from damages.

BCHDs 2019 design (June EIR) was 60-feet tall and ringed the site on the edge. The 2020 design (June Board) was 76-feet tall and also on the edge. The 2021 design (March EIR) was 103-feet tall and also on the edge. The current design is claimed to be 83-feet tall and also on the edge of the site and still meets NONE of the comments regarding excessive height and size from 100s of surrounding neighbors and 1000s of petitioners against the project.

The attachment specifically calls out BCHDs plan's noncompliance with specific sections of RBMC CUP and PCDR and on TMC Hillside Overlay.

I ask that the Mayors, Councils and Planning Commissioners provide guidance to their respective Staff and lawyers to convey the public's disapproval of the current plan that BCHD is pouring our tax funding into. Thank you.

--

STOP BCHD (StopBCHD@gmail.com) is a neighborhood community of residents concerned about the economic and quality-of-life damages that BCHDs 110-foot above the street, 800,000 sqft commercial development will inflict on our families for the next 50-100 years. Our neighborhoods have been burdened since 1960 and the damages outweigh any benefits.

NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENTS

The following is provided regarding BCHDs proposed 3rd party DEVELOPER/OWNER/ OPERATOR development project that BCHD will be filing a formal Conditional Use Permit and Planning Commission Design Review application for during the first half of 2022.

These comments are filed to agencies as non-agenda comments of the public, in the interest of the public, and under Cal Gov Code 54954.3."regular meetings shall provide an opportunity for members of the public to directly address the legislative body on any item of interest to the public" there is an affirmative obligation to provide these comments to the Planning Commission, City Council or other "legislative" bodies upon receipt.

Summary Table of BCHD Project Non-Compliance with Municipal Codes		
PERMIT	CONDITION	BCHD PROJECT NON-COMPLIANCE
1. CUP	"will not adversely affect surrounding uses and properties"	As supported by over 1,200 petition signers and 100s, if not 1,000 surrounding resident comments to BCHD, surrounding residential uses are adversely impacted in reduced privacy, property value, aesthetics, noise, traffic and toxic emissions.
2. CUP	"for the proposed use ... shall be adequate in size and shape to accommodate such use"	Given the proposed project plan to locate buildings at the elevated site's perimeter, the elevated site is not adequate to accommodate the proposed use.
3. CUP	"no adverse effect on abutting property"	The properties on the 1400 Block of Diamond are subjected to the storage of explosive liquid fuels, a 2,000 kW combustion power plant, and a 16,000 to 4,000 V substation. These mechanical and explosion hazards adversely impact safety, safe air, local emissions, noise, and vibration.
4. PCDR	"ensure compatibility ... in the community"	Based on the City of Redondo Beach's finding that the design of The Kensington was consistent and compatible with the surrounding residential uses, the 110-foot above Beryl St., Miami Beach commercial styled facility cannot also be deemed compatible with similar, 30-foot and under residential uses in the community.
5. PCDR	"protect property values ... of neighborhoods"	Statistical modeling demonstrates that neighborhoods nearer to BCHD have reduced property values compared to neighborhoods further from BCHD. BCHD is proposing to increase height from 99% under 52-feet to 103-feet and to increase over building size from 312,000 sqft to nearly 800,000 sqft.
6. PCDR	"shall consider the impact ... of the user in respect to circulation, parking, traffic, etc."	BCHD proposed design will require the 8-10 story parking ramp at Prospect and Diamond to enter/exit on Prospect northbound. Further, the proposed height of the RCFE and location on the perimeter damages the privacy, aesthetics, excess nighttime lighting, noise impacts and other basic attributes of the surrounding uses and properties.
7. PCDR	"location of buildings and structures shall respect the natural terrain of the site"	The elevated site has from 30-feet to 70-feet elevation gain over surrounding residential uses. As a result, creation of a 110-foot rise over Beryl St., a 10-story parking ramp over Tomlee and Diamond Sts, and a 4-story, flat wall toward Prospect fails to respect the natural elevated terrain. The original 52-foot, 4 story building and its 0.3%, 968 sqft penthouse were nearly centered in the site, thereby respecting the natural terrain.
8. PCDR	"overall design shall be integrated and compatible with the neighborhood and shall strive to be in harmony with the scale and bulk of surrounding properties"	A 300,000 sqft, 110-foot above the street concrete and glass commercial building makes no attempt to integrate and be compatible with the neighborhood in scale or bulk. Further, unlike The Kensington and its Santa Barbara style, the Miami Beach condominium/hotel style proposed, when coupled with the excessive height and mass is thoroughly non-compatible with surrounding properties.

9. PCDR	“shall be consistent with the intent of residential design guidelines”	The residential design guidelines are intended to increase the quality of life of the neighborhood of the construction. It is very clear from the 1,200 petition signatories regarding the height and size of the project that it does not increase the quality of life. Further, there have been 100s, if not 1,000s of comments and concerns regarding the impacts of noise, emissions, traffic, glare, lighting, excess non-directed nighttime lighting, nighttime elevated signage and other factors that diminish quality of life.
10. RDG	“to improve the quality of life in residential neighborhoods ... [t]hese design guidelines are intended to help accomplish this objective”	The BCHD project reduces the quality of life in surrounding neighborhoods. The BCHD commercial Developer/Owner/Operator is targeting 90% non-Redondo Beach residents and 80% non-residents of the 3 beach cities (HB/RB/MB). The PACE facility is scaled for 400 participants with only 17 expected to be from the 3 beach cities according to National PACE Assoc. statistics. The BCHD project nearly triples the size of campus buildings from 312,000 sqft to 800,000 sqft and more than doubles the effective height from 99% less than 52-feet to 109.7-ft. The quality of life of surrounding neighborhoods will be reduced by the commercial, non-resident services as all damages will accrue to the neighborhoods.
11. THO	“The development has been located, planned and designed so as to cause the least intrusion on the views, light, air and privacy of other properties in the vicinity”	The adjoining Torrance neighborhoods are in the Hillside Overlay. The BCHD would not be allowed in overlay, and the City of Torrance has an obligation to protect its residents. The BCHD project is located to maximize damages to views, light, air and privacy based on height, size and perimeter location.
12. THO	“the design will not have a harmful impact upon the land value and investment of other properties in the vicinity”	Statistical analysis demonstrates that surrounding property values are lower, the closer the properties are to the BCHD site. Peer-reviewed research demonstrates that larger, taller developments, such as BCHDs proposal, will have equal or larger negative impacts on property values.
RBMC 10-2.2506 Conditional Use Permits (CUP) RBMC 10-2.2502 Planning Commission Design Review (PCDR) Redondo Beach Residential Design Guidelines (RDG) Redondo Beach Beryl Heights Neighborhood Specific Guidelines (BH RDG) TMC 91.41.6 Planning and Design (Torrance Hillside Overlay, THO)		

From: [Linda Feldman](#)
To: [CityClerk](#)
Subject: Fwd: Public Comment - Forward to Mayors, Councils, Planning Commissions
Date: Saturday, May 14, 2022 4:35:37 PM
Attachments: [BCHD NonCompliance May 2022 Comments.pdf](#)

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

Sent from Linda's iPad.

Begin forwarded message:

From: Stop BCHD <stop.bchd@gmail.com>
Date: May 14, 2022 at 2:08:11 PM PDT
To: Stop BCHD <StopBCHD@gmail.com>
Subject: Public Comment - Forward to Mayors, Councils, Planning Commissions

FORWARD this (including attachment) to: CityClerk@redondo.org,
CityClerk@torranceca.gov, stopbchd@gmail.com

Honorable Mayor, Councilpersons, and Planning Commissioners of Redondo Beach and Torrance:

These are non-agenda item comments to the legislative bodies above for their next general meeting as permitted by the Brown Act.

I am concerned about Beach Cities Health District's proposed Phase 1 development plan that will be commercially DEVELOPED/OWNED/OPERATED. Phase 1 is proposed to be 110-feet above the surrounding streets and 300,000 sqft in size. Phase 2 will bring the total BCHD site up to nearly 800,000 sqft, which is 250% its current size. That is larger than the entire adjacent Beryl Heights neighborhood's homes' sizes all added together. BCHDs proposed plan is also 3-times the height and 150% as large as the voter-rejected CenterCal Mall-by-the-Sea.

I am also concerned that BCHD continues to spend from a \$16M taxpayer fund, preparing inconsistent, incompatible, and irresponsible plans on an elevated site in the center of residential, 30-foot or lower maximum height neighborhoods.

BCHDs 2017 design committed to protecting neighborhoods with buildings in the center and surface parking around the edges buffering homes from damages.

BCHDs 2019 design (June EIR) was 60-feet tall and ringed the site on the edge.

The 2020 design (June Board) was 76-feet tall and also on the edge. The 2021 design (March EIR) was 103-feet tall and also on the edge. The current design is claimed to be 83-feet tall and also on the edge of the site and still meets NONE of the comments regarding excessive height and size from 100s of surrounding neighbors and 1000s of petitioners against the project.

The attachment specifically calls out BCHDs plan's noncompliance with specific sections of RBMC CUP and PCDR and on TMC Hillside Overlay.

I ask that the Mayors, Councils and Planning Commissioners provide guidance to their respective Staff and lawyers to convey the public's disapproval of the current plan that BCHD is pouring our tax funding into. Thank you.

--

STOP BCHD (StopBCHD@gmail.com) is a neighborhood community of residents concerned about the economic and quality-of-life damages that BCHDs 110-foot above the street, 800,000 sqft commercial development will inflict on our families for the next 50-100 years. Our neighborhoods have been burdened since 1960 and the damages outweigh any benefits.

NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENTS

The following is provided regarding BCHDs proposed 3rd party DEVELOPER/OWNER/ OPERATOR development project that BCHD will be filing a formal Conditional Use Permit and Planning Commission Design Review application for during the first half of 2022.

These comments are filed to agencies as non-agenda comments of the public, in the interest of the public, and under Cal Gov Code 54954.3."regular meetings shall provide an opportunity for members of the public to directly address the legislative body on any item of interest to the public" there is an affirmative obligation to provide these comments to the Planning Commission, City Council or other "legislative" bodies upon receipt.

Summary Table of BCHD Project Non-Compliance with Municipal Codes		
PERMIT	CONDITION	BCHD PROJECT NON-COMPLIANCE
1. CUP	"will not adversely affect surrounding uses and properties"	As supported by over 1,200 petition signers and 100s, if not 1,000 surrounding resident comments to BCHD, surrounding residential uses are adversely impacted in reduced privacy, property value, aesthetics, noise, traffic and toxic emissions.
2. CUP	"for the proposed use ... shall be adequate in size and shape to accommodate such use"	Given the proposed project plan to locate buildings at the elevated site's perimeter, the elevated site is not adequate to accommodate the proposed use.
3. CUP	"no adverse effect on abutting property"	The properties on the 1400 Block of Diamond are subjected to the storage of explosive liquid fuels, a 2,000 kW combustion power plant, and a 16,000 to 4,000 V substation. These mechanical and explosion hazards adversely impact safety, safe air, local emissions, noise, and vibration.
4. PCDR	"ensure compatibility ... in the community"	Based on the City of Redondo Beach's finding that the design of The Kensington was consistent and compatible with the surrounding residential uses, the 110-foot above Beryl St., Miami Beach commercial styled facility cannot also be deemed compatible with similar, 30-foot and under residential uses in the community.
5. PCDR	"protect property values ... of neighborhoods"	Statistical modeling demonstrates that neighborhoods nearer to BCHD have reduced property values compared to neighborhoods further from BCHD. BCHD is proposing to increase height from 99% under 52-feet to 103-feet and to increase over building size from 312,000 sqft to nearly 800,000 sqft.
6. PCDR	"shall consider the impact ... of the user in respect to circulation, parking, traffic, etc."	BCHD proposed design will require the 8-10 story parking ramp at Prospect and Diamond to enter/exit on Prospect northbound. Further, the proposed height of the RCFE and location on the perimeter damages the privacy, aesthetics, excess nighttime lighting, noise impacts and other basic attributes of the surrounding uses and properties.
7. PCDR	"location of buildings and structures shall respect the natural terrain of the site"	The elevated site has from 30-feet to 70-feet elevation gain over surrounding residential uses. As a result, creation of a 110-foot rise over Beryl St., a 10-story parking ramp over Tomlee and Diamond Sts, and a 4-story, flat wall toward Prospect fails to respect the natural elevated terrain. The original 52-foot, 4 story building and its 0.3%, 968 sqft penthouse were nearly centered in the site, thereby respecting the natural terrain.
8. PCDR	"overall design shall be integrated and compatible with the neighborhood and shall strive to be in harmony with the scale and bulk of surrounding properties"	A 300,000 sqft, 110-foot above the street concrete and glass commercial building makes no attempt to integrate and be compatible with the neighborhood in scale or bulk. Further, unlike The Kensington and its Santa Barbara style, the Miami Beach condominium/hotel style proposed, when coupled with the excessive height and mass is thoroughly non-compatible with surrounding properties.

9. PCDR	“shall be consistent with the intent of residential design guidelines”	The residential design guidelines are intended to increase the quality of life of the neighborhood of the construction. It is very clear from the 1,200 petition signatories regarding the height and size of the project that it does not increase the quality of life. Further, there have been 100s, if not 1,000s of comments and concerns regarding the impacts of noise, emissions, traffic, glare, lighting, excess non-directed nighttime lighting, nighttime elevated signage and other factors that diminish quality of life.
10. RDG	“to improve the quality of life in residential neighborhoods ... [t]hese design guidelines are intended to help accomplish this objective”	The BCHD project reduces the quality of life in surrounding neighborhoods. The BCHD commercial Developer/Owner/Operator is targeting 90% non-Redondo Beach residents and 80% non-residents of the 3 beach cities (HB/RB/MB). The PACE facility is scaled for 400 participants with only 17 expected to be from the 3 beach cities according to National PACE Assoc. statistics. The BCHD project nearly triples the size of campus buildings from 312,000 sqft to 800,000 sqft and more than doubles the effective height from 99% less than 52-feet to 109.7-ft. The quality of life of surrounding neighborhoods will be reduced by the commercial, non-resident services as all damages will accrue to the neighborhoods.
11. THO	“The development has been located, planned and designed so as to cause the least intrusion on the views, light, air and privacy of other properties in the vicinity”	The adjoining Torrance neighborhoods are in the Hillside Overlay. The BCHD would not be allowed in overlay, and the City of Torrance has an obligation to protect its residents. The BCHD project is located to maximize damages to views, light, air and privacy based on height, size and perimeter location.
12. THO	“the design will not have a harmful impact upon the land value and investment of other properties in the vicinity”	Statistical analysis demonstrates that surrounding property values are lower, the closer the properties are to the BCHD site. Peer-reviewed research demonstrates that larger, taller developments, such as BCHDs proposal, will have equal or larger negative impacts on property values.
RBMC 10-2.2506 Conditional Use Permits (CUP) RBMC 10-2.2502 Planning Commission Design Review (PCDR) Redondo Beach Residential Design Guidelines (RDG) Redondo Beach Beryl Heights Neighborhood Specific Guidelines (BH RDG) TMC 91.41.6 Planning and Design (Torrance Hillside Overlay, THO)		

From: marinafinearts@aol.com
To: [CityClerk](#)
Cc: cityclerk@torrance.gov; stop.bchd@gmail.com
Subject: Fwd: Public Comment - Forward to Mayors, Councils, Planning Commissions
Date: Saturday, May 14, 2022 5:49:09 PM
Attachments: [BCHD NonCompliance May 2022 Comments.pdf](#)

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

My wife and I are 100% against this proposed project. In this day of increasing cynicism with our government, it is an opportunity to restore our faith in our local government. There is NO one I know of who is in favor of this project. STOP IT NOW

Mike and Laura Woolsey
Tomlee Ave

-----Original Message-----

From: Stop BCHD <stop.bchd@gmail.com>
To: Stop BCHD <StopBCHD@gmail.com>
Sent: Sat, May 14, 2022 2:05 pm
Subject: Public Comment - Forward to Mayors, Councils, Planning Commissions

FORWARD this (including attachment) to: CityClerk@redondo.org, CityClerk@torranceca.gov, stopbchd@gmail.com

Honorable Mayor, Councilpersons, and Planning Commissioners of Redondo Beach and Torrance:

These are non-agenda item comments to the legislative bodies above for their next general meeting as permitted by the Brown Act.

I am concerned about Beach Cities Health District's proposed Phase 1 development plan that will be commercially DEVELOPED/OWNED/OPERATED. Phase 1 is proposed to be 110-feet above the surrounding streets and 300,000 sqft in size. Phase 2 will bring the total BCHD site up to nearly 800,000 sqft, which is 250% its current size. That is larger than the entire adjacent Beryl Heights neighborhood's homes' sizes all added together. BCHDs proposed plan is also 3-times the height and 150% as large as the voter-rejected CenterCal Mall-by-the-Sea.

I am also concerned that BCHD continues to spend from a \$16M taxpayer fund, preparing inconsistent, incompatible, and irresponsible plans on an elevated site in the center of residential, 30-foot or lower maximum height neighborhoods.

BCHDs 2017 design committed to protecting neighborhoods with buildings in the center and surface parking around the edges buffering homes from damages.

BCHDs 2019 design (June EIR) was 60-feet tall and ringed the site on the edge. The 2020 design (June Board) was 76-feet tall and also on the edge. The 2021 design (March EIR) was 103-feet tall and also on the edge. The current design is claimed to be 83-feet tall and also on the edge of the site and still meets NONE of the comments regarding excessive height and size from 100s of surrounding neighbors and 1000s of petitioners against the project.

The attachment specifically calls out BCHDs plan's noncompliance with specific sections of RBMC CUP and PCDR and on TMC Hillside Overlay.

I ask that the Mayors, Councils and Planning Commissioners provide guidance to their respective Staff

and lawyers to convey the public's disapproval of the current plan that BCHD is pouring our tax funding into. Thank you.

--

STOP BCHD (StopBCHD@gmail.com) is a neighborhood community of residents concerned about the economic and quality-of-life damages that BCHDs 110-foot above the street, 800,000 sqft commercial development will inflict on our families for the next 50-100 years. Our neighborhoods have been burdened since 1960 and the damages outweigh any benefits.

NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENTS

The following is provided regarding BCHDs proposed 3rd party DEVELOPER/OWNER/ OPERATOR development project that BCHD will be filing a formal Conditional Use Permit and Planning Commission Design Review application for during the first half of 2022.

These comments are filed to agencies as non-agenda comments of the public, in the interest of the public, and under Cal Gov Code 54954.3."regular meetings shall provide an opportunity for members of the public to directly address the legislative body on any item of interest to the public" there is an affirmative obligation to provide these comments to the Planning Commission, City Council or other "legislative" bodies upon receipt.

Summary Table of BCHD Project Non-Compliance with Municipal Codes		
PERMIT	CONDITION	BCHD PROJECT NON-COMPLIANCE
1. CUP	"will not adversely affect surrounding uses and properties"	As supported by over 1,200 petition signers and 100s, if not 1,000 surrounding resident comments to BCHD, surrounding residential uses are adversely impacted in reduced privacy, property value, aesthetics, noise, traffic and toxic emissions.
2. CUP	"for the proposed use ... shall be adequate in size and shape to accommodate such use"	Given the proposed project plan to locate buildings at the elevated site's perimeter, the elevated site is not adequate to accommodate the proposed use.
3. CUP	"no adverse effect on abutting property"	The properties on the 1400 Block of Diamond are subjected to the storage of explosive liquid fuels, a 2,000 kW combustion power plant, and a 16,000 to 4,000 V substation. These mechanical and explosion hazards adversely impact safety, safe air, local emissions, noise, and vibration.
4. PCDR	"ensure compatibility ... in the community"	Based on the City of Redondo Beach's finding that the design of The Kensington was consistent and compatible with the surrounding residential uses, the 110-foot above Beryl St., Miami Beach commercial styled facility cannot also be deemed compatible with similar, 30-foot and under residential uses in the community.
5. PCDR	"protect property values ... of neighborhoods"	Statistical modeling demonstrates that neighborhoods nearer to BCHD have reduced property values compared to neighborhoods further from BCHD. BCHD is proposing to increase height from 99% under 52-feet to 103-feet and to increase over building size from 312,000 sqft to nearly 800,000 sqft.
6. PCDR	"shall consider the impact ... of the user in respect to circulation, parking, traffic, etc."	BCHD proposed design will require the 8-10 story parking ramp at Prospect and Diamond to enter/exit on Prospect northbound. Further, the proposed height of the RCFE and location on the perimeter damages the privacy, aesthetics, excess nighttime lighting, noise impacts and other basic attributes of the surrounding uses and properties.
7. PCDR	"location of buildings and structures shall respect the natural terrain of the site"	The elevated site has from 30-feet to 70-feet elevation gain over surrounding residential uses. As a result, creation of a 110-foot rise over Beryl St., a 10-story parking ramp over Tomlee and Diamond Sts, and a 4-story, flat wall toward Prospect fails to respect the natural elevated terrain. The original 52-foot, 4 story building and its 0.3%, 968 sqft penthouse were nearly centered in the site, thereby respecting the natural terrain.
8. PCDR	"overall design shall be integrated and compatible with the neighborhood and shall strive to be in harmony with the scale and bulk of surrounding properties"	A 300,000 sqft, 110-foot above the street concrete and glass commercial building makes no attempt to integrate and be compatible with the neighborhood in scale or bulk. Further, unlike The Kensington and its Santa Barbara style, the Miami Beach condominium/hotel style proposed, when coupled with the excessive height and mass is thoroughly non-compatible with surrounding properties.

9. PCDR	“shall be consistent with the intent of residential design guidelines”	The residential design guidelines are intended to increase the quality of life of the neighborhood of the construction. It is very clear from the 1,200 petition signatories regarding the height and size of the project that it does not increase the quality of life. Further, there have been 100s, if not 1,000s of comments and concerns regarding the impacts of noise, emissions, traffic, glare, lighting, excess non-directed nighttime lighting, nighttime elevated signage and other factors that diminish quality of life.
10. RDG	“to improve the quality of life in residential neighborhoods ... [t]hese design guidelines are intended to help accomplish this objective”	The BCHD project reduces the quality of life in surrounding neighborhoods. The BCHD commercial Developer/Owner/Operator is targeting 90% non-Redondo Beach residents and 80% non-residents of the 3 beach cities (HB/RB/MB). The PACE facility is scaled for 400 participants with only 17 expected to be from the 3 beach cities according to National PACE Assoc. statistics. The BCHD project nearly triples the size of campus buildings from 312,000 sqft to 800,000 sqft and more than doubles the effective height from 99% less than 52-feet to 109.7-ft. The quality of life of surrounding neighborhoods will be reduced by the commercial, non-resident services as all damages will accrue to the neighborhoods.
11. THO	“The development has been located, planned and designed so as to cause the least intrusion on the views, light, air and privacy of other properties in the vicinity”	The adjoining Torrance neighborhoods are in the Hillside Overlay. The BCHD would not be allowed in overlay, and the City of Torrance has an obligation to protect its residents. The BCHD project is located to maximize damages to views, light, air and privacy based on height, size and perimeter location.
12. THO	“the design will not have a harmful impact upon the land value and investment of other properties in the vicinity”	Statistical analysis demonstrates that surrounding property values are lower, the closer the properties are to the BCHD site. Peer-reviewed research demonstrates that larger, taller developments, such as BCHDs proposal, will have equal or larger negative impacts on property values.
RBMC 10-2.2506 Conditional Use Permits (CUP) RBMC 10-2.2502 Planning Commission Design Review (PCDR) Redondo Beach Residential Design Guidelines (RDG) Redondo Beach Beryl Heights Neighborhood Specific Guidelines (BH RDG) TMC 91.41.6 Planning and Design (Torrance Hillside Overlay, THO)		

From: [Brian Onizuka](#)
To: [CityClerk](#)
Subject: Fwd: Public Comment - Forward to Mayors, Councils, Planning Commissions
Date: Saturday, May 14, 2022 6:34:40 PM
Attachments: [BCHD NonCompliance May 2022 Comments.pdf](#)

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

Honorable Mayor, Councilpersons, and Planning Commissioners of Redondo Beach and Torrance:

These are non-agenda item comments to the legislative bodies above for their next general meeting as permitted by the Brown Act.

I am concerned about Beach Cities Health District's proposed Phase 1 development plan that will be commercially DEVELOPED/OWNED/OPERATED. Phase 1 is proposed to be 110-feet above the surrounding streets and 300,000 sqft in size. Phase 2 will bring the total BCHD site up to nearly 800,000 sqft, which is 250% its current size. That is larger than the entire adjacent Beryl Heights neighborhood's homes' sizes all added together. BCHDs proposed plan is also 3-times the height and 150% as large as the voter-rejected CenterCal Mall-by-the-Sea.

I am also concerned that BCHD continues to spend from a \$16M taxpayer fund, preparing inconsistent, incompatible, and irresponsible plans on an elevated site in the center of residential, 30-foot or lower maximum height neighborhoods.

BCHDs 2017 design committed to protecting neighborhoods with buildings in the center and surface parking around the edges buffering homes from damages.

BCHDs 2019 design (June EIR) was 60-feet tall and ringed the site on the edge. The 2020 design (June Board) was 76-feet tall and also on the edge. The 2021 design (March EIR) was 103-feet tall and also on the edge. The current design is claimed to be 83-feet tall and also on the edge of the site and still meets NONE of the comments regarding excessive height and size from 100s of surrounding neighbors and 1000s of petitioners against the project.

The attachment specifically calls out BCHDs plan's noncompliance with specific sections of RBMC CUP and PCDR and on TMC Hillside Overlay.

I ask that the Mayors, Councils and Planning Commissioners provide guidance to their respective Staff and lawyers to convey the public's disapproval of the current plan that BCHD is pouring our tax funding into. Thank you.

--

STOP BCHD (StopBCHD@gmail.com) is a neighborhood community of residents concerned about the economic and quality-of-life damages that BCHDs 110-foot above the street, 800,000 sqft commercial development will inflict on our families for the next 50-100 years. Our neighborhoods have been burdened since 1960 and the damages outweigh any benefits.

NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENTS

The following is provided regarding BCHDs proposed 3rd party DEVELOPER/OWNER/ OPERATOR development project that BCHD will be filing a formal Conditional Use Permit and Planning Commission Design Review application for during the first half of 2022.

These comments are filed to agencies as non-agenda comments of the public, in the interest of the public, and under Cal Gov Code 54954.3."regular meetings shall provide an opportunity for members of the public to directly address the legislative body on any item of interest to the public" there is an affirmative obligation to provide these comments to the Planning Commission, City Council or other "legislative" bodies upon receipt.

Summary Table of BCHD Project Non-Compliance with Municipal Codes		
PERMIT	CONDITION	BCHD PROJECT NON-COMPLIANCE
1. CUP	"will not adversely affect surrounding uses and properties"	As supported by over 1,200 petition signers and 100s, if not 1,000 surrounding resident comments to BCHD, surrounding residential uses are adversely impacted in reduced privacy, property value, aesthetics, noise, traffic and toxic emissions.
2. CUP	"for the proposed use ... shall be adequate in size and shape to accommodate such use"	Given the proposed project plan to locate buildings at the elevated site's perimeter, the elevated site is not adequate to accommodate the proposed use.
3. CUP	"no adverse effect on abutting property"	The properties on the 1400 Block of Diamond are subjected to the storage of explosive liquid fuels, a 2,000 kW combustion power plant, and a 16,000 to 4,000 V substation. These mechanical and explosion hazards adversely impact safety, safe air, local emissions, noise, and vibration.
4. PCDR	"ensure compatibility ... in the community"	Based on the City of Redondo Beach's finding that the design of The Kensington was consistent and compatible with the surrounding residential uses, the 110-foot above Beryl St., Miami Beach commercial styled facility cannot also be deemed compatible with similar, 30-foot and under residential uses in the community.
5. PCDR	"protect property values ... of neighborhoods"	Statistical modeling demonstrates that neighborhoods nearer to BCHD have reduced property values compared to neighborhoods further from BCHD. BCHD is proposing to increase height from 99% under 52-feet to 103-feet and to increase over building size from 312,000 sqft to nearly 800,000 sqft.
6. PCDR	"shall consider the impact ... of the user in respect to circulation, parking, traffic, etc."	BCHD proposed design will require the 8-10 story parking ramp at Prospect and Diamond to enter/exit on Prospect northbound. Further, the proposed height of the RCFE and location on the perimeter damages the privacy, aesthetics, excess nighttime lighting, noise impacts and other basic attributes of the surrounding uses and properties.
7. PCDR	"location of buildings and structures shall respect the natural terrain of the site"	The elevated site has from 30-feet to 70-feet elevation gain over surrounding residential uses. As a result, creation of a 110-foot rise over Beryl St., a 10-story parking ramp over Tomlee and Diamond Sts, and a 4-story, flat wall toward Prospect fails to respect the natural elevated terrain. The original 52-foot, 4 story building and its 0.3%, 968 sqft penthouse were nearly centered in the site, thereby respecting the natural terrain.
8. PCDR	"overall design shall be integrated and compatible with the neighborhood and shall strive to be in harmony with the scale and bulk of surrounding properties"	A 300,000 sqft, 110-foot above the street concrete and glass commercial building makes no attempt to integrate and be compatible with the neighborhood in scale or bulk. Further, unlike The Kensington and its Santa Barbara style, the Miami Beach condominium/hotel style proposed, when coupled with the excessive height and mass is thoroughly non-compatible with surrounding properties.

9. PCDR	“shall be consistent with the intent of residential design guidelines”	The residential design guidelines are intended to increase the quality of life of the neighborhood of the construction. It is very clear from the 1,200 petition signatories regarding the height and size of the project that it does not increase the quality of life. Further, there have been 100s, if not 1,000s of comments and concerns regarding the impacts of noise, emissions, traffic, glare, lighting, excess non-directed nighttime lighting, nighttime elevated signage and other factors that diminish quality of life.
10. RDG	“to improve the quality of life in residential neighborhoods ... [t]hese design guidelines are intended to help accomplish this objective”	The BCHD project reduces the quality of life in surrounding neighborhoods. The BCHD commercial Developer/Owner/Operator is targeting 90% non-Redondo Beach residents and 80% non-residents of the 3 beach cities (HB/RB/MB). The PACE facility is scaled for 400 participants with only 17 expected to be from the 3 beach cities according to National PACE Assoc. statistics. The BCHD project nearly triples the size of campus buildings from 312,000 sqft to 800,000 sqft and more than doubles the effective height from 99% less than 52-feet to 109.7-ft. The quality of life of surrounding neighborhoods will be reduced by the commercial, non-resident services as all damages will accrue to the neighborhoods.
11. THO	“The development has been located, planned and designed so as to cause the least intrusion on the views, light, air and privacy of other properties in the vicinity”	The adjoining Torrance neighborhoods are in the Hillside Overlay. The BCHD would not be allowed in overlay, and the City of Torrance has an obligation to protect its residents. The BCHD project is located to maximize damages to views, light, air and privacy based on height, size and perimeter location.
12. THO	“the design will not have a harmful impact upon the land value and investment of other properties in the vicinity”	Statistical analysis demonstrates that surrounding property values are lower, the closer the properties are to the BCHD site. Peer-reviewed research demonstrates that larger, taller developments, such as BCHDs proposal, will have equal or larger negative impacts on property values.
RBMC 10-2.2506 Conditional Use Permits (CUP) RBMC 10-2.2502 Planning Commission Design Review (PCDR) Redondo Beach Residential Design Guidelines (RDG) Redondo Beach Beryl Heights Neighborhood Specific Guidelines (BH RDG) TMC 91.41.6 Planning and Design (Torrance Hillside Overlay, THO)		

From: [David Onizuka](#)
To: [CityClerk](#); CityClerk@torranceca.gov; stopbchd@gmail.com
Subject: Fwd: Public Comment - Forward to Mayors, Councils, Planning Commissions
Date: Saturday, May 14, 2022 8:52:31 PM
Attachments: [BCHD NonCompliance May 2022 Comments.pdf](#)

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

Honorable Mayor, Councilpersons, and Planning Commissioners of Redondo Beach and Torrance:

These are non-agenda item comments to the legislative bodies above for their next general meeting as permitted by the Brown Act.

I am concerned about Beach Cities Health District's proposed Phase 1 development plan that will be commercially DEVELOPED/OWNED/OPERATED. Phase 1 is proposed to be 110-feet above the surrounding streets and 300,000 sqft in size. Phase 2 will bring the total BCHD site up to nearly 800,000 sqft, which is 250% its current size. That is larger than the entire adjacent Beryl Heights neighborhood's homes' sizes all added together. BCHDs proposed plan is also 3-times the height and 150% as large as the voter-rejected CenterCal Mall-by-the-Sea.

I am also concerned that BCHD continues to spend from a \$16M taxpayer fund, preparing inconsistent, incompatible, and irresponsible plans on an elevated site in the center of residential, 30-foot or lower maximum height neighborhoods.

BCHDs 2017 design committed to protecting neighborhoods with buildings in the center and surface parking around the edges buffering homes from damages.

BCHDs 2019 design (June EIR) was 60-feet tall and ringed the site on the edge. The 2020 design (June Board) was 76-feet tall and also on the edge. The 2021 design (March EIR) was 103-feet tall and also on the edge. The current design is claimed to be 83-feet tall and also on the edge of the site and still meets NONE of the comments regarding excessive height and size from 100s of surrounding neighbors and 1000s of petitioners against the project.

The attachment specifically calls out BCHDs plan's noncompliance with specific sections of RBMC CUP and PCDR and on TMC Hillside Overlay.

I ask that the Mayors, Councils and Planning Commissioners provide guidance to their respective Staff and lawyers to convey the public's disapproval of the current plan that BCHD is pouring our tax funding into. Thank you.

--

STOP BCHD (StopBCHD@gmail.com) is a neighborhood community of residents concerned about the economic and quality-of-life damages that BCHDs

110-foot above the street, 800,000 sqft commercial development will inflict on our families for the next 50-100 years. Our neighborhoods have been burdened since 1960 and the damages outweigh any benefits.

NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENTS

The following is provided regarding BCHDs proposed 3rd party DEVELOPER/OWNER/ OPERATOR development project that BCHD will be filing a formal Conditional Use Permit and Planning Commission Design Review application for during the first half of 2022.

These comments are filed to agencies as non-agenda comments of the public, in the interest of the public, and under Cal Gov Code 54954.3."regular meetings shall provide an opportunity for members of the public to directly address the legislative body on any item of interest to the public" there is an affirmative obligation to provide these comments to the Planning Commission, City Council or other "legislative" bodies upon receipt.

Summary Table of BCHD Project Non-Compliance with Municipal Codes		
PERMIT	CONDITION	BCHD PROJECT NON-COMPLIANCE
1. CUP	"will not adversely affect surrounding uses and properties"	As supported by over 1,200 petition signers and 100s, if not 1,000 surrounding resident comments to BCHD, surrounding residential uses are adversely impacted in reduced privacy, property value, aesthetics, noise, traffic and toxic emissions.
2. CUP	"for the proposed use ... shall be adequate in size and shape to accommodate such use"	Given the proposed project plan to locate buildings at the elevated site's perimeter, the elevated site is not adequate to accommodate the proposed use.
3. CUP	"no adverse effect on abutting property"	The properties on the 1400 Block of Diamond are subjected to the storage of explosive liquid fuels, a 2,000 kW combustion power plant, and a 16,000 to 4,000 V substation. These mechanical and explosion hazards adversely impact safety, safe air, local emissions, noise, and vibration.
4. PCDR	"ensure compatibility ... in the community"	Based on the City of Redondo Beach's finding that the design of The Kensington was consistent and compatible with the surrounding residential uses, the 110-foot above Beryl St., Miami Beach commercial styled facility cannot also be deemed compatible with similar, 30-foot and under residential uses in the community.
5. PCDR	"protect property values ... of neighborhoods"	Statistical modeling demonstrates that neighborhoods nearer to BCHD have reduced property values compared to neighborhoods further from BCHD. BCHD is proposing to increase height from 99% under 52-feet to 103-feet and to increase over building size from 312,000 sqft to nearly 800,000 sqft.
6. PCDR	"shall consider the impact ... of the user in respect to circulation, parking, traffic, etc."	BCHD proposed design will require the 8-10 story parking ramp at Prospect and Diamond to enter/exit on Prospect northbound. Further, the proposed height of the RCFE and location on the perimeter damages the privacy, aesthetics, excess nighttime lighting, noise impacts and other basic attributes of the surrounding uses and properties.
7. PCDR	"location of buildings and structures shall respect the natural terrain of the site"	The elevated site has from 30-feet to 70-feet elevation gain over surrounding residential uses. As a result, creation of a 110-foot rise over Beryl St., a 10-story parking ramp over Tomlee and Diamond Sts, and a 4-story, flat wall toward Prospect fails to respect the natural elevated terrain. The original 52-foot, 4 story building and its 0.3%, 968 sqft penthouse were nearly centered in the site, thereby respecting the natural terrain.
8. PCDR	"overall design shall be integrated and compatible with the neighborhood and shall strive to be in harmony with the scale and bulk of surrounding properties"	A 300,000 sqft, 110-foot above the street concrete and glass commercial building makes no attempt to integrate and be compatible with the neighborhood in scale or bulk. Further, unlike The Kensington and its Santa Barbara style, the Miami Beach condominium/hotel style proposed, when coupled with the excessive height and mass is thoroughly non-compatible with surrounding properties.

9. PCDR	“shall be consistent with the intent of residential design guidelines”	The residential design guidelines are intended to increase the quality of life of the neighborhood of the construction. It is very clear from the 1,200 petition signatories regarding the height and size of the project that it does not increase the quality of life. Further, there have been 100s, if not 1,000s of comments and concerns regarding the impacts of noise, emissions, traffic, glare, lighting, excess non-directed nighttime lighting, nighttime elevated signage and other factors that diminish quality of life.
10. RDG	“to improve the quality of life in residential neighborhoods ... [t]hese design guidelines are intended to help accomplish this objective”	The BCHD project reduces the quality of life in surrounding neighborhoods. The BCHD commercial Developer/Owner/Operator is targeting 90% non-Redondo Beach residents and 80% non-residents of the 3 beach cities (HB/RB/MB). The PACE facility is scaled for 400 participants with only 17 expected to be from the 3 beach cities according to National PACE Assoc. statistics. The BCHD project nearly triples the size of campus buildings from 312,000 sqft to 800,000 sqft and more than doubles the effective height from 99% less than 52-feet to 109.7-ft. The quality of life of surrounding neighborhoods will be reduced by the commercial, non-resident services as all damages will accrue to the neighborhoods.
11. THO	“The development has been located, planned and designed so as to cause the least intrusion on the views, light, air and privacy of other properties in the vicinity”	The adjoining Torrance neighborhoods are in the Hillside Overlay. The BCHD would not be allowed in overlay, and the City of Torrance has an obligation to protect its residents. The BCHD project is located to maximize damages to views, light, air and privacy based on height, size and perimeter location.
12. THO	“the design will not have a harmful impact upon the land value and investment of other properties in the vicinity”	Statistical analysis demonstrates that surrounding property values are lower, the closer the properties are to the BCHD site. Peer-reviewed research demonstrates that larger, taller developments, such as BCHDs proposal, will have equal or larger negative impacts on property values.
RBMC 10-2.2506 Conditional Use Permits (CUP) RBMC 10-2.2502 Planning Commission Design Review (PCDR) Redondo Beach Residential Design Guidelines (RDG) Redondo Beach Beryl Heights Neighborhood Specific Guidelines (BH RDG) TMC 91.41.6 Planning and Design (Torrance Hillside Overlay, THO)		

From: [Paul Lieberman](#)
To: [CityClerk](#)
Subject: Fwd: Public Comment - Forward to Mayors, Councils, Planning Commissions
Date: Sunday, May 15, 2022 9:43:50 AM
Attachments: [BCHD NonCompliance May 2022 Comments.pdf](#)

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

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

From: Stop BCHD <stop.bchd@gmail.com>
Date: Sat, May 14, 2022, 2:06 PM
Subject: Public Comment - Forward to Mayors, Councils, Planning Commissions
To: Stop BCHD <StopBCHD@gmail.com>

FORWARD this (including attachment) to: CityClerk@redondo.org,
CityClerk@torranceca.gov, stopbchd@gmail.com

Honorable Mayor, Councilpersons, and Planning Commissioners of Redondo Beach and Torrance:

These are non-agenda item comments to the legislative bodies above for their next general meeting as permitted by the Brown Act.

I am concerned about Beach Cities Health District's proposed Phase 1 development plan that will be commercially DEVELOPED/OWNED/OPERATED. Phase 1 is proposed to be 110-feet above the surrounding streets and 300,000 sqft in size. Phase 2 will bring the total BCHD site up to nearly 800,000 sqft, which is 250% its current size. That is larger than the entire adjacent Beryl Heights neighborhood's homes' sizes all added together. BCHDs proposed plan is also 3-times the height and 150% as large as the voter-rejected CenterCal Mall-by-the-Sea.

I am also concerned that BCHD continues to spend from a \$16M taxpayer fund, preparing inconsistent, incompatible, and irresponsible plans on an elevated site in the center of residential, 30-foot or lower maximum height neighborhoods.

BCHDs 2017 design committed to protecting neighborhoods with buildings in the center and surface parking around the edges buffering homes from damages.

BCHDs 2019 design (June EIR) was 60-feet tall and ringed the site on the edge. The 2020 design (June Board) was 76-feet tall and also on the edge. The 2021 design (March EIR) was 103-feet tall and also on the edge. The current design is claimed to be 83-feet tall and also on the edge of the site and still meets NONE of the comments regarding excessive height and size from 100s of surrounding neighbors and 1000s of petitioners against the project.

The attachment specifically calls out BCHDs plan's noncompliance with specific sections of RBMC CUP and PCDR and on TMC Hillside Overlay.

I ask that the Mayors, Councils and Planning Commissioners provide guidance to their

respective Staff and lawyers to convey the public's disapproval of the current plan that BCHD is pouring our tax funding into. Thank you.

--

STOP BCHD (StopBCHD@gmail.com) is a neighborhood community of residents concerned about the economic and quality-of-life damages that BCHDs 110-foot above the street, 800,000 sqft commercial development will inflict on our families for the next 50-100 years. Our neighborhoods have been burdened since 1960 and the damages outweigh any benefits.

NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENTS

The following is provided regarding BCHDs proposed 3rd party DEVELOPER/OWNER/ OPERATOR development project that BCHD will be filing a formal Conditional Use Permit and Planning Commission Design Review application for during the first half of 2022.

These comments are filed to agencies as non-agenda comments of the public, in the interest of the public, and under Cal Gov Code 54954.3."regular meetings shall provide an opportunity for members of the public to directly address the legislative body on any item of interest to the public" there is an affirmative obligation to provide these comments to the Planning Commission, City Council or other "legislative" bodies upon receipt.

Summary Table of BCHD Project Non-Compliance with Municipal Codes		
PERMIT	CONDITION	BCHD PROJECT NON-COMPLIANCE
1. CUP	"will not adversely affect surrounding uses and properties"	As supported by over 1,200 petition signers and 100s, if not 1,000 surrounding resident comments to BCHD, surrounding residential uses are adversely impacted in reduced privacy, property value, aesthetics, noise, traffic and toxic emissions.
2. CUP	"for the proposed use ... shall be adequate in size and shape to accommodate such use"	Given the proposed project plan to locate buildings at the elevated site's perimeter, the elevated site is not adequate to accommodate the proposed use.
3. CUP	"no adverse effect on abutting property"	The properties on the 1400 Block of Diamond are subjected to the storage of explosive liquid fuels, a 2,000 kW combustion power plant, and a 16,000 to 4,000 V substation. These mechanical and explosion hazards adversely impact safety, safe air, local emissions, noise, and vibration.
4. PCDR	"ensure compatibility ... in the community"	Based on the City of Redondo Beach's finding that the design of The Kensington was consistent and compatible with the surrounding residential uses, the 110-foot above Beryl St., Miami Beach commercial styled facility cannot also be deemed compatible with similar, 30-foot and under residential uses in the community.
5. PCDR	"protect property values ... of neighborhoods"	Statistical modeling demonstrates that neighborhoods nearer to BCHD have reduced property values compared to neighborhoods further from BCHD. BCHD is proposing to increase height from 99% under 52-feet to 103-feet and to increase over building size from 312,000 sqft to nearly 800,000 sqft.
6. PCDR	"shall consider the impact ... of the user in respect to circulation, parking, traffic, etc."	BCHD proposed design will require the 8-10 story parking ramp at Prospect and Diamond to enter/exit on Prospect northbound. Further, the proposed height of the RCFE and location on the perimeter damages the privacy, aesthetics, excess nighttime lighting, noise impacts and other basic attributes of the surrounding uses and properties.
7. PCDR	"location of buildings and structures shall respect the natural terrain of the site"	The elevated site has from 30-feet to 70-feet elevation gain over surrounding residential uses. As a result, creation of a 110-foot rise over Beryl St., a 10-story parking ramp over Tomlee and Diamond Sts, and a 4-story, flat wall toward Prospect fails to respect the natural elevated terrain. The original 52-foot, 4 story building and its 0.3%, 968 sqft penthouse were nearly centered in the site, thereby respecting the natural terrain.
8. PCDR	"overall design shall be integrated and compatible with the neighborhood and shall strive to be in harmony with the scale and bulk of surrounding properties"	A 300,000 sqft, 110-foot above the street concrete and glass commercial building makes no attempt to integrate and be compatible with the neighborhood in scale or bulk. Further, unlike The Kensington and its Santa Barbara style, the Miami Beach condominium/hotel style proposed, when coupled with the excessive height and mass is thoroughly non-compatible with surrounding properties.

9. PCDR	“shall be consistent with the intent of residential design guidelines”	The residential design guidelines are intended to increase the quality of life of the neighborhood of the construction. It is very clear from the 1,200 petition signatories regarding the height and size of the project that it does not increase the quality of life. Further, there have been 100s, if not 1,000s of comments and concerns regarding the impacts of noise, emissions, traffic, glare, lighting, excess non-directed nighttime lighting, nighttime elevated signage and other factors that diminish quality of life.
10. RDG	“to improve the quality of life in residential neighborhoods ... [t]hese design guidelines are intended to help accomplish this objective”	The BCHD project reduces the quality of life in surrounding neighborhoods. The BCHD commercial Developer/Owner/Operator is targeting 90% non-Redondo Beach residents and 80% non-residents of the 3 beach cities (HB/RB/MB). The PACE facility is scaled for 400 participants with only 17 expected to be from the 3 beach cities according to National PACE Assoc. statistics. The BCHD project nearly triples the size of campus buildings from 312,000 sqft to 800,000 sqft and more than doubles the effective height from 99% less than 52-feet to 109.7-ft. The quality of life of surrounding neighborhoods will be reduced by the commercial, non-resident services as all damages will accrue to the neighborhoods.
11. THO	“The development has been located, planned and designed so as to cause the least intrusion on the views, light, air and privacy of other properties in the vicinity”	The adjoining Torrance neighborhoods are in the Hillside Overlay. The BCHD would not be allowed in overlay, and the City of Torrance has an obligation to protect its residents. The BCHD project is located to maximize damages to views, light, air and privacy based on height, size and perimeter location.
12. THO	“the design will not have a harmful impact upon the land value and investment of other properties in the vicinity”	Statistical analysis demonstrates that surrounding property values are lower, the closer the properties are to the BCHD site. Peer-reviewed research demonstrates that larger, taller developments, such as BCHDs proposal, will have equal or larger negative impacts on property values.
RBMC 10-2.2506 Conditional Use Permits (CUP) RBMC 10-2.2502 Planning Commission Design Review (PCDR) Redondo Beach Residential Design Guidelines (RDG) Redondo Beach Beryl Heights Neighborhood Specific Guidelines (BH RDG) TMC 91.41.6 Planning and Design (Torrance Hillside Overlay, THO)		

From: [Hamant and Robin Patel](#)
To: [CityClerk](#); CityClerk@torranceca.gov
Cc: topbchd@gmail.com
Subject: Fwd: Public Comment - Forward to Mayors, Councils, Planning Commissions
Date: Sunday, May 15, 2022 3:04:39 PM
Attachments: [BCHD NonCompliance May 2022 Comments.pdf](#)

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

Honorable Mayor, Councilpersons, and Planning Commissioners of Redondo Beach and Torrance:

These are non-agenda item comments to the legislative bodies above for their next general meeting as permitted by the Brown Act.

We are concerned about Beach Cities Health District's proposed Phase 1 development plan that will be commercially DEVELOPED/OWNED/OPERATED. Phase 1 is proposed to be 110-feet above the surrounding streets and 300,000 sqft in size. Phase 2 will bring the total BCHD site up to nearly 800,000 sqft, which is 250% its current size. That is larger than the entire adjacent Beryl Heights neighborhood's homes' sizes all added together. BCHDs proposed plan is also 3-times the height and 150% as large as the voter-rejected CenterCal Mall-by-the-Sea.

We are also concerned that BCHD continues to spend from a \$16M taxpayer fund, preparing inconsistent, incompatible, and irresponsible plans on an elevated site in the center of residential, 30-foot or lower maximum height neighborhoods.

BCHDs 2017 design committed to protecting neighborhoods with buildings in the center and surface parking around the edges buffering homes from damages.

BCHDs 2019 design (June EIR) was 60-feet tall and ringed the site on the edge. The 2020 design (June Board) was 76-feet tall and also on the edge. The 2021 design (March EIR) was 103-feet tall and also on the edge. The current design is claimed to be 83-feet tall and also on the edge of the site and still meets NONE of the comments regarding excessive height and size from 100s of surrounding neighbors and 1000s of petitioners against the project.

The attachment specifically calls out BCHDs plan's noncompliance with specific sections of RBMC CUP and PCDR and on TMC Hillside Overlay.

We ask that the Mayors, Councils and Planning Commissioners provide guidance to their respective Staff and lawyers to convey the public's disapproval of the current plan that BCHD is pouring our tax funding into. Thank you.

Robin and Hamant Patel

NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENTS

The following is provided regarding BCHDs proposed 3rd party DEVELOPER/OWNER/ OPERATOR development project that BCHD will be filing a formal Conditional Use Permit and Planning Commission Design Review application for during the first half of 2022.

These comments are filed to agencies as non-agenda comments of the public, in the interest of the public, and under Cal Gov Code 54954.3."regular meetings shall provide an opportunity for members of the public to directly address the legislative body on any item of interest to the public" there is an affirmative obligation to provide these comments to the Planning Commission, City Council or other "legislative" bodies upon receipt.

Summary Table of BCHD Project Non-Compliance with Municipal Codes		
PERMIT	CONDITION	BCHD PROJECT NON-COMPLIANCE
1. CUP	"will not adversely affect surrounding uses and properties"	As supported by over 1,200 petition signers and 100s, if not 1,000 surrounding resident comments to BCHD, surrounding residential uses are adversely impacted in reduced privacy, property value, aesthetics, noise, traffic and toxic emissions.
2. CUP	"for the proposed use ... shall be adequate in size and shape to accommodate such use"	Given the proposed project plan to locate buildings at the elevated site's perimeter, the elevated site is not adequate to accommodate the proposed use.
3. CUP	"no adverse effect on abutting property"	The properties on the 1400 Block of Diamond are subjected to the storage of explosive liquid fuels, a 2,000 kW combustion power plant, and a 16,000 to 4,000 V substation. These mechanical and explosion hazards adversely impact safety, safe air, local emissions, noise, and vibration.
4. PCDR	"ensure compatibility ... in the community"	Based on the City of Redondo Beach's finding that the design of The Kensington was consistent and compatible with the surrounding residential uses, the 110-foot above Beryl St., Miami Beach commercial styled facility cannot also be deemed compatible with similar, 30-foot and under residential uses in the community.
5. PCDR	"protect property values ... of neighborhoods"	Statistical modeling demonstrates that neighborhoods nearer to BCHD have reduced property values compared to neighborhoods further from BCHD. BCHD is proposing to increase height from 99% under 52-feet to 103-feet and to increase over building size from 312,000 sqft to nearly 800,000 sqft.
6. PCDR	"shall consider the impact ... of the user in respect to circulation, parking, traffic, etc."	BCHD proposed design will require the 8-10 story parking ramp at Prospect and Diamond to enter/exit on Prospect northbound. Further, the proposed height of the RCFE and location on the perimeter damages the privacy, aesthetics, excess nighttime lighting, noise impacts and other basic attributes of the surrounding uses and properties.
7. PCDR	"location of buildings and structures shall respect the natural terrain of the site"	The elevated site has from 30-feet to 70-feet elevation gain over surrounding residential uses. As a result, creation of a 110-foot rise over Beryl St., a 10-story parking ramp over Tomlee and Diamond Sts, and a 4-story, flat wall toward Prospect fails to respect the natural elevated terrain. The original 52-foot, 4 story building and its 0.3%, 968 sqft penthouse were nearly centered in the site, thereby respecting the natural terrain.
8. PCDR	"overall design shall be integrated and compatible with the neighborhood and shall strive to be in harmony with the scale and bulk of surrounding properties"	A 300,000 sqft, 110-foot above the street concrete and glass commercial building makes no attempt to integrate and be compatible with the neighborhood in scale or bulk. Further, unlike The Kensington and its Santa Barbara style, the Miami Beach condominium/hotel style proposed, when coupled with the excessive height and mass is thoroughly non-compatible with surrounding properties.

9. PCDR	“shall be consistent with the intent of residential design guidelines”	The residential design guidelines are intended to increase the quality of life of the neighborhood of the construction. It is very clear from the 1,200 petition signatories regarding the height and size of the project that it does not increase the quality of life. Further, there have been 100s, if not 1,000s of comments and concerns regarding the impacts of noise, emissions, traffic, glare, lighting, excess non-directed nighttime lighting, nighttime elevated signage and other factors that diminish quality of life.
10. RDG	“to improve the quality of life in residential neighborhoods ... [t]hese design guidelines are intended to help accomplish this objective”	The BCHD project reduces the quality of life in surrounding neighborhoods. The BCHD commercial Developer/Owner/Operator is targeting 90% non-Redondo Beach residents and 80% non-residents of the 3 beach cities (HB/RB/MB). The PACE facility is scaled for 400 participants with only 17 expected to be from the 3 beach cities according to National PACE Assoc. statistics. The BCHD project nearly triples the size of campus buildings from 312,000 sqft to 800,000 sqft and more than doubles the effective height from 99% less than 52-feet to 109.7-ft. The quality of life of surrounding neighborhoods will be reduced by the commercial, non-resident services as all damages will accrue to the neighborhoods.
11. THO	“The development has been located, planned and designed so as to cause the least intrusion on the views, light, air and privacy of other properties in the vicinity”	The adjoining Torrance neighborhoods are in the Hillside Overlay. The BCHD would not be allowed in overlay, and the City of Torrance has an obligation to protect its residents. The BCHD project is located to maximize damages to views, light, air and privacy based on height, size and perimeter location.
12. THO	“the design will not have a harmful impact upon the land value and investment of other properties in the vicinity”	Statistical analysis demonstrates that surrounding property values are lower, the closer the properties are to the BCHD site. Peer-reviewed research demonstrates that larger, taller developments, such as BCHDs proposal, will have equal or larger negative impacts on property values.
RBMC 10-2.2506 Conditional Use Permits (CUP) RBMC 10-2.2502 Planning Commission Design Review (PCDR) Redondo Beach Residential Design Guidelines (RDG) Redondo Beach Beryl Heights Neighborhood Specific Guidelines (BH RDG) TMC 91.41.6 Planning and Design (Torrance Hillside Overlay, THO)		

From: [Linda Choy](#)
To: [CityClerk](#); CityClerk@torranceca.gov; stopbchd@gmail.com
Subject: Fwd: Public Comment - Forward to Mayors, Councils, Planning Commissions
Date: Sunday, May 15, 2022 6:12:15 PM
Attachments: [BCHD NonCompliance May 2022 Comments.pdf](#)

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

Honorable Mayor, Councilpersons, and Planning Commissioners of Redondo Beach and Torrance:

These are non-agenda item comments to the legislative bodies above for their next general meeting as permitted by the Brown Act.

I am concerned about Beach Cities Health District's proposed Phase 1 development plan that will be commercially DEVELOPED/OWNED/OPERATED. Phase 1 is proposed to be 110-feet above the surrounding streets and 300,000 sqft in size. Phase 2 will bring the total BCHD site up to nearly 800,000 sqft, which is 250% its current size. That is larger than the entire adjacent Beryl Heights neighborhood's homes' sizes all added together. BCHDs proposed plan is also 3-times the height and 150% as large as the voter-rejected CenterCal Mall-by-the-Sea.

I am also concerned that BCHD continues to spend from a \$16M taxpayer fund, preparing inconsistent, incompatible, and irresponsible plans on an elevated site in the center of residential, 30-foot or lower maximum height neighborhoods.

BCHDs 2017 design committed to protecting neighborhoods with buildings in the center and surface parking around the edges buffering homes from damages.

BCHDs 2019 design (June EIR) was 60-feet tall and ringed the site on the edge. The 2020 design (June Board) was 76-feet tall and also on the edge. The 2021 design (March EIR) was 103-feet tall and also on the edge. The current design is claimed to be 83-feet tall and also on the edge of the site and still meets NONE of the comments regarding excessive height and size from 100s of surrounding neighbors and 1000s of petitioners against the project.

The attachment specifically calls out BCHDs plan's noncompliance with specific sections of RBMC CUP and PCDR and on TMC Hillside Overlay.

I ask that the Mayors, Councils and Planning Commissioners provide guidance to their respective Staff and lawyers to convey the public's disapproval of the current plan that BCHD is pouring our tax funding into. Thank you.

NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENTS

The following is provided regarding BCHDs proposed 3rd party DEVELOPER/OWNER/ OPERATOR development project that BCHD will be filing a formal Conditional Use Permit and Planning Commission Design Review application for during the first half of 2022.

These comments are filed to agencies as non-agenda comments of the public, in the interest of the public, and under Cal Gov Code 54954.3."regular meetings shall provide an opportunity for members of the public to directly address the legislative body on any item of interest to the public" there is an affirmative obligation to provide these comments to the Planning Commission, City Council or other "legislative" bodies upon receipt.

Summary Table of BCHD Project Non-Compliance with Municipal Codes		
PERMIT	CONDITION	BCHD PROJECT NON-COMPLIANCE
1. CUP	"will not adversely affect surrounding uses and properties"	As supported by over 1,200 petition signers and 100s, if not 1,000 surrounding resident comments to BCHD, surrounding residential uses are adversely impacted in reduced privacy, property value, aesthetics, noise, traffic and toxic emissions.
2. CUP	"for the proposed use ... shall be adequate in size and shape to accommodate such use"	Given the proposed project plan to locate buildings at the elevated site's perimeter, the elevated site is not adequate to accommodate the proposed use.
3. CUP	"no adverse effect on abutting property"	The properties on the 1400 Block of Diamond are subjected to the storage of explosive liquid fuels, a 2,000 kW combustion power plant, and a 16,000 to 4,000 V substation. These mechanical and explosion hazards adversely impact safety, safe air, local emissions, noise, and vibration.
4. PCDR	"ensure compatibility ... in the community"	Based on the City of Redondo Beach's finding that the design of The Kensington was consistent and compatible with the surrounding residential uses, the 110-foot above Beryl St., Miami Beach commercial styled facility cannot also be deemed compatible with similar, 30-foot and under residential uses in the community.
5. PCDR	"protect property values ... of neighborhoods"	Statistical modeling demonstrates that neighborhoods nearer to BCHD have reduced property values compared to neighborhoods further from BCHD. BCHD is proposing to increase height from 99% under 52-feet to 103-feet and to increase over building size from 312,000 sqft to nearly 800,000 sqft.
6. PCDR	"shall consider the impact ... of the user in respect to circulation, parking, traffic, etc."	BCHD proposed design will require the 8-10 story parking ramp at Prospect and Diamond to enter/exit on Prospect northbound. Further, the proposed height of the RCFE and location on the perimeter damages the privacy, aesthetics, excess nighttime lighting, noise impacts and other basic attributes of the surrounding uses and properties.
7. PCDR	"location of buildings and structures shall respect the natural terrain of the site"	The elevated site has from 30-feet to 70-feet elevation gain over surrounding residential uses. As a result, creation of a 110-foot rise over Beryl St., a 10-story parking ramp over Tomlee and Diamond Sts, and a 4-story, flat wall toward Prospect fails to respect the natural elevated terrain. The original 52-foot, 4 story building and its 0.3%, 968 sqft penthouse were nearly centered in the site, thereby respecting the natural terrain.
8. PCDR	"overall design shall be integrated and compatible with the neighborhood and shall strive to be in harmony with the scale and bulk of surrounding properties"	A 300,000 sqft, 110-foot above the street concrete and glass commercial building makes no attempt to integrate and be compatible with the neighborhood in scale or bulk. Further, unlike The Kensington and its Santa Barbara style, the Miami Beach condominium/hotel style proposed, when coupled with the excessive height and mass is thoroughly non-compatible with surrounding properties.

9. PCDR	“shall be consistent with the intent of residential design guidelines”	The residential design guidelines are intended to increase the quality of life of the neighborhood of the construction. It is very clear from the 1,200 petition signatories regarding the height and size of the project that it does not increase the quality of life. Further, there have been 100s, if not 1,000s of comments and concerns regarding the impacts of noise, emissions, traffic, glare, lighting, excess non-directed nighttime lighting, nighttime elevated signage and other factors that diminish quality of life.
10. RDG	“to improve the quality of life in residential neighborhoods ... [t]hese design guidelines are intended to help accomplish this objective”	The BCHD project reduces the quality of life in surrounding neighborhoods. The BCHD commercial Developer/Owner/Operator is targeting 90% non-Redondo Beach residents and 80% non-residents of the 3 beach cities (HB/RB/MB). The PACE facility is scaled for 400 participants with only 17 expected to be from the 3 beach cities according to National PACE Assoc. statistics. The BCHD project nearly triples the size of campus buildings from 312,000 sqft to 800,000 sqft and more than doubles the effective height from 99% less than 52-feet to 109.7-ft. The quality of life of surrounding neighborhoods will be reduced by the commercial, non-resident services as all damages will accrue to the neighborhoods.
11. THO	“The development has been located, planned and designed so as to cause the least intrusion on the views, light, air and privacy of other properties in the vicinity”	The adjoining Torrance neighborhoods are in the Hillside Overlay. The BCHD would not be allowed in overlay, and the City of Torrance has an obligation to protect its residents. The BCHD project is located to maximize damages to views, light, air and privacy based on height, size and perimeter location.
12. THO	“the design will not have a harmful impact upon the land value and investment of other properties in the vicinity”	Statistical analysis demonstrates that surrounding property values are lower, the closer the properties are to the BCHD site. Peer-reviewed research demonstrates that larger, taller developments, such as BCHDs proposal, will have equal or larger negative impacts on property values.
RBMC 10-2.2506 Conditional Use Permits (CUP) RBMC 10-2.2502 Planning Commission Design Review (PCDR) Redondo Beach Residential Design Guidelines (RDG) Redondo Beach Beryl Heights Neighborhood Specific Guidelines (BH RDG) TMC 91.41.6 Planning and Design (Torrance Hillside Overlay, THO)		

From: [Jeff Earnest](#)
To: CityClerk@torranceca.gov; CityClerk; stopbchd@gmail.com
Cc: [Jeff Earnest](#)
Subject: Fwd: Public Comment - Forward to Mayors, Councils, Planning Commissions
Date: Monday, May 16, 2022 12:42:38 AM
Attachments: [BCHD NonCompliance May 2022 Comments.pdf](#)

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

Honorable Mayor, Councilpersons, and Planning Commissioners of Redondo Beach and Torrance:

These are non-agenda item comments to the legislative bodies above for their next general meeting as permitted by the Brown Act.

I am concerned about Beach Cities Health District's proposed Phase 1 development plan that will be commercially DEVELOPED/OWNED/OPERATED. Phase 1 is proposed to be 110-feet above the surrounding streets and 300,000 sqft in size. Phase 2 will bring the total BCHD site up to nearly 800,000 sqft, which is 250% its current size. That is larger than the entire adjacent Beryl Heights neighborhood's homes' sizes all added together. BCHDs proposed plan is also 3-times the height and 150% as large as the voter-rejected CenterCal Mall-by-the-Sea.

I am also concerned that BCHD continues to spend from a \$16M taxpayer fund, preparing inconsistent, incompatible, and irresponsible plans on an elevated site in the center of residential, 30-foot or lower maximum height neighborhoods.

BCHDs 2017 design committed to protecting neighborhoods with buildings in the center and surface parking around the edges buffering homes from damages.

BCHDs 2019 design (June EIR) was 60-feet tall and ringed the site on the edge. The 2020 design (June Board) was 76-feet tall and also on the edge. The 2021 design (March EIR) was 103-feet tall and also on the edge. The current design is claimed to be 83-feet tall and also on the edge of the site and still meets NONE of the comments regarding excessive height and size from 100s of surrounding neighbors and 1000s of petitioners against the project.

The attachment specifically calls out BCHDs plan's noncompliance with specific sections of RBMC CUP and PCDR and on TMC Hillside Overlay.

I ask that the Mayors, Councils and Planning Commissioners provide guidance to their respective Staff and lawyers to convey the public's disapproval of the current plan that BCHD is pouring our tax funding into. Thank you.

Jeff Earnest

--

STOP BCHD (StopBCHD@gmail.com) is a neighborhood community of residents concerned about the economic and quality-of-life damages that BCHDs 110-foot above the street, 800,000 sqft commercial development will inflict on our families for the next 50-100 years. Our neighborhoods have been burdened since 1960 and the damages outweigh any benefits.

NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENTS

The following is provided regarding BCHDs proposed 3rd party DEVELOPER/OWNER/ OPERATOR development project that BCHD will be filing a formal Conditional Use Permit and Planning Commission Design Review application for during the first half of 2022.

These comments are filed to agencies as non-agenda comments of the public, in the interest of the public, and under Cal Gov Code 54954.3."regular meetings shall provide an opportunity for members of the public to directly address the legislative body on any item of interest to the public" there is an affirmative obligation to provide these comments to the Planning Commission, City Council or other "legislative" bodies upon receipt.

Summary Table of BCHD Project Non-Compliance with Municipal Codes		
PERMIT	CONDITION	BCHD PROJECT NON-COMPLIANCE
1. CUP	"will not adversely affect surrounding uses and properties"	As supported by over 1,200 petition signers and 100s, if not 1,000 surrounding resident comments to BCHD, surrounding residential uses are adversely impacted in reduced privacy, property value, aesthetics, noise, traffic and toxic emissions.
2. CUP	"for the proposed use ... shall be adequate in size and shape to accommodate such use"	Given the proposed project plan to locate buildings at the elevated site's perimeter, the elevated site is not adequate to accommodate the proposed use.
3. CUP	"no adverse effect on abutting property"	The properties on the 1400 Block of Diamond are subjected to the storage of explosive liquid fuels, a 2,000 kW combustion power plant, and a 16,000 to 4,000 V substation. These mechanical and explosion hazards adversely impact safety, safe air, local emissions, noise, and vibration.
4. PCDR	"ensure compatibility ... in the community"	Based on the City of Redondo Beach's finding that the design of The Kensington was consistent and compatible with the surrounding residential uses, the 110-foot above Beryl St., Miami Beach commercial styled facility cannot also be deemed compatible with similar, 30-foot and under residential uses in the community.
5. PCDR	"protect property values ... of neighborhoods"	Statistical modeling demonstrates that neighborhoods nearer to BCHD have reduced property values compared to neighborhoods further from BCHD. BCHD is proposing to increase height from 99% under 52-feet to 103-feet and to increase over building size from 312,000 sqft to nearly 800,000 sqft.
6. PCDR	"shall consider the impact ... of the user in respect to circulation, parking, traffic, etc."	BCHD proposed design will require the 8-10 story parking ramp at Prospect and Diamond to enter/exit on Prospect northbound. Further, the proposed height of the RCFE and location on the perimeter damages the privacy, aesthetics, excess nighttime lighting, noise impacts and other basic attributes of the surrounding uses and properties.
7. PCDR	"location of buildings and structures shall respect the natural terrain of the site"	The elevated site has from 30-feet to 70-feet elevation gain over surrounding residential uses. As a result, creation of a 110-foot rise over Beryl St., a 10-story parking ramp over Tomlee and Diamond Sts, and a 4-story, flat wall toward Prospect fails to respect the natural elevated terrain. The original 52-foot, 4 story building and its 0.3%, 968 sqft penthouse were nearly centered in the site, thereby respecting the natural terrain.
8. PCDR	"overall design shall be integrated and compatible with the neighborhood and shall strive to be in harmony with the scale and bulk of surrounding properties"	A 300,000 sqft, 110-foot above the street concrete and glass commercial building makes no attempt to integrate and be compatible with the neighborhood in scale or bulk. Further, unlike The Kensington and its Santa Barbara style, the Miami Beach condominium/hotel style proposed, when coupled with the excessive height and mass is thoroughly non-compatible with surrounding properties.

9. PCDR	“shall be consistent with the intent of residential design guidelines”	The residential design guidelines are intended to increase the quality of life of the neighborhood of the construction. It is very clear from the 1,200 petition signatories regarding the height and size of the project that it does not increase the quality of life. Further, there have been 100s, if not 1,000s of comments and concerns regarding the impacts of noise, emissions, traffic, glare, lighting, excess non-directed nighttime lighting, nighttime elevated signage and other factors that diminish quality of life.
10. RDG	“to improve the quality of life in residential neighborhoods ... [t]hese design guidelines are intended to help accomplish this objective”	The BCHD project reduces the quality of life in surrounding neighborhoods. The BCHD commercial Developer/Owner/Operator is targeting 90% non-Redondo Beach residents and 80% non-residents of the 3 beach cities (HB/RB/MB). The PACE facility is scaled for 400 participants with only 17 expected to be from the 3 beach cities according to National PACE Assoc. statistics. The BCHD project nearly triples the size of campus buildings from 312,000 sqft to 800,000 sqft and more than doubles the effective height from 99% less than 52-feet to 109.7-ft. The quality of life of surrounding neighborhoods will be reduced by the commercial, non-resident services as all damages will accrue to the neighborhoods.
11. THO	“The development has been located, planned and designed so as to cause the least intrusion on the views, light, air and privacy of other properties in the vicinity”	The adjoining Torrance neighborhoods are in the Hillside Overlay. The BCHD would not be allowed in overlay, and the City of Torrance has an obligation to protect its residents. The BCHD project is located to maximize damages to views, light, air and privacy based on height, size and perimeter location.
12. THO	“the design will not have a harmful impact upon the land value and investment of other properties in the vicinity”	Statistical analysis demonstrates that surrounding property values are lower, the closer the properties are to the BCHD site. Peer-reviewed research demonstrates that larger, taller developments, such as BCHDs proposal, will have equal or larger negative impacts on property values.
RBMC 10-2.2506 Conditional Use Permits (CUP) RBMC 10-2.2502 Planning Commission Design Review (PCDR) Redondo Beach Residential Design Guidelines (RDG) Redondo Beach Beryl Heights Neighborhood Specific Guidelines (BH RDG) TMC 91.41.6 Planning and Design (Torrance Hillside Overlay, THO)		

From: [Warren Croft](#)
To: [CityClerk](#); CityClerk@torranceca.gov; stopbchd@gmail.com
Subject: Fwd: Public Comment - Forward to Mayors, Councils, Planning Commissions
Date: Monday, May 16, 2022 6:30:00 AM
Attachments: [BCHD NonCompliance May 2022 Comments.pdf](#)

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

Honorable Mayor, Councilpersons, and Planning Commissioners of Redondo Beach and Torrance:

These are non-agenda item comments to the legislative bodies above for their next general meeting as permitted by the Brown Act.

I am concerned about Beach Cities Health District's proposed Phase 1 development plan that will be commercially DEVELOPED/OWNED/OPERATED. Phase 1 is proposed to be 110-feet above the surrounding streets and 300,000 sqft in size. Phase 2 will bring the total BCHD site up to nearly 800,000 sqft, which is 250% its current size. That is larger than the entire adjacent Beryl Heights neighborhood's homes' sizes all added together. BCHDs proposed plan is also 3-times the height and 150% as large as the voter-rejected CenterCal Mall-by-the-Sea.

I am also concerned that BCHD continues to spend from a \$16M taxpayer fund, preparing inconsistent, incompatible, and irresponsible plans on an elevated site in the center of residential, 30-foot or lower maximum height neighborhoods.

BCHDs 2017 design committed to protecting neighborhoods with buildings in the center and surface parking around the edges buffering homes from damages.

BCHDs 2019 design (June EIR) was 60-feet tall and ringed the site on the edge. The 2020 design (June Board) was 76-feet tall and also on the edge. The 2021 design (March EIR) was 103-feet tall and also on the edge. The current design is claimed to be 83-feet tall and also on the edge of the site and still meets NONE of the comments regarding excessive height and size from 100s of surrounding neighbors and 1000s of petitioners against the project.

The attachment specifically calls out BCHDs plan's noncompliance with specific sections of RBMC CUP and PCDR and on TMC Hillside Overlay.

I ask that the Mayors, Councils and Planning Commissioners provide guidance to their respective Staff and lawyers to convey the public's disapproval of the current plan that BCHD is pouring our tax funding into. Thank you.

Thank you,
Warren Croft

NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENTS

The following is provided regarding BCHDs proposed 3rd party DEVELOPER/OWNER/ OPERATOR development project that BCHD will be filing a formal Conditional Use Permit and Planning Commission Design Review application for during the first half of 2022.

These comments are filed to agencies as non-agenda comments of the public, in the interest of the public, and under Cal Gov Code 54954.3."regular meetings shall provide an opportunity for members of the public to directly address the legislative body on any item of interest to the public" there is an affirmative obligation to provide these comments to the Planning Commission, City Council or other "legislative" bodies upon receipt.

Summary Table of BCHD Project Non-Compliance with Municipal Codes		
PERMIT	CONDITION	BCHD PROJECT NON-COMPLIANCE
1. CUP	"will not adversely affect surrounding uses and properties"	As supported by over 1,200 petition signers and 100s, if not 1,000 surrounding resident comments to BCHD, surrounding residential uses are adversely impacted in reduced privacy, property value, aesthetics, noise, traffic and toxic emissions.
2. CUP	"for the proposed use ... shall be adequate in size and shape to accommodate such use"	Given the proposed project plan to locate buildings at the elevated site's perimeter, the elevated site is not adequate to accommodate the proposed use.
3. CUP	"no adverse effect on abutting property"	The properties on the 1400 Block of Diamond are subjected to the storage of explosive liquid fuels, a 2,000 kW combustion power plant, and a 16,000 to 4,000 V substation. These mechanical and explosion hazards adversely impact safety, safe air, local emissions, noise, and vibration.
4. PCDR	"ensure compatibility ... in the community"	Based on the City of Redondo Beach's finding that the design of The Kensington was consistent and compatible with the surrounding residential uses, the 110-foot above Beryl St., Miami Beach commercial styled facility cannot also be deemed compatible with similar, 30-foot and under residential uses in the community.
5. PCDR	"protect property values ... of neighborhoods"	Statistical modeling demonstrates that neighborhoods nearer to BCHD have reduced property values compared to neighborhoods further from BCHD. BCHD is proposing to increase height from 99% under 52-feet to 103-feet and to increase over building size from 312,000 sqft to nearly 800,000 sqft.
6. PCDR	"shall consider the impact ... of the user in respect to circulation, parking, traffic, etc."	BCHD proposed design will require the 8-10 story parking ramp at Prospect and Diamond to enter/exit on Prospect northbound. Further, the proposed height of the RCFE and location on the perimeter damages the privacy, aesthetics, excess nighttime lighting, noise impacts and other basic attributes of the surrounding uses and properties.
7. PCDR	"location of buildings and structures shall respect the natural terrain of the site"	The elevated site has from 30-feet to 70-feet elevation gain over surrounding residential uses. As a result, creation of a 110-foot rise over Beryl St., a 10-story parking ramp over Tomlee and Diamond Sts, and a 4-story, flat wall toward Prospect fails to respect the natural elevated terrain. The original 52-foot, 4 story building and its 0.3%, 968 sqft penthouse were nearly centered in the site, thereby respecting the natural terrain.
8. PCDR	"overall design shall be integrated and compatible with the neighborhood and shall strive to be in harmony with the scale and bulk of surrounding properties"	A 300,000 sqft, 110-foot above the street concrete and glass commercial building makes no attempt to integrate and be compatible with the neighborhood in scale or bulk. Further, unlike The Kensington and its Santa Barbara style, the Miami Beach condominium/hotel style proposed, when coupled with the excessive height and mass is thoroughly non-compatible with surrounding properties.

9. PCDR	“shall be consistent with the intent of residential design guidelines”	The residential design guidelines are intended to increase the quality of life of the neighborhood of the construction. It is very clear from the 1,200 petition signatories regarding the height and size of the project that it does not increase the quality of life. Further, there have been 100s, if not 1,000s of comments and concerns regarding the impacts of noise, emissions, traffic, glare, lighting, excess non-directed nighttime lighting, nighttime elevated signage and other factors that diminish quality of life.
10. RDG	“to improve the quality of life in residential neighborhoods ... [t]hese design guidelines are intended to help accomplish this objective”	The BCHD project reduces the quality of life in surrounding neighborhoods. The BCHD commercial Developer/Owner/Operator is targeting 90% non-Redondo Beach residents and 80% non-residents of the 3 beach cities (HB/RB/MB). The PACE facility is scaled for 400 participants with only 17 expected to be from the 3 beach cities according to National PACE Assoc. statistics. The BCHD project nearly triples the size of campus buildings from 312,000 sqft to 800,000 sqft and more than doubles the effective height from 99% less than 52-feet to 109.7-ft. The quality of life of surrounding neighborhoods will be reduced by the commercial, non-resident services as all damages will accrue to the neighborhoods.
11. THO	“The development has been located, planned and designed so as to cause the least intrusion on the views, light, air and privacy of other properties in the vicinity”	The adjoining Torrance neighborhoods are in the Hillside Overlay. The BCHD would not be allowed in overlay, and the City of Torrance has an obligation to protect its residents. The BCHD project is located to maximize damages to views, light, air and privacy based on height, size and perimeter location.
12. THO	“the design will not have a harmful impact upon the land value and investment of other properties in the vicinity”	Statistical analysis demonstrates that surrounding property values are lower, the closer the properties are to the BCHD site. Peer-reviewed research demonstrates that larger, taller developments, such as BCHDs proposal, will have equal or larger negative impacts on property values.
RBMC 10-2.2506 Conditional Use Permits (CUP) RBMC 10-2.2502 Planning Commission Design Review (PCDR) Redondo Beach Residential Design Guidelines (RDG) Redondo Beach Beryl Heights Neighborhood Specific Guidelines (BH RDG) TMC 91.41.6 Planning and Design (Torrance Hillside Overlay, THO)		

From: [Ann Cheung](#)
To: cityclerk@torranceca.gov; [CityClerk](#); stopbchd@gmail.com
Subject: Fwd: Public Comment - Forward to Mayors, Councils, Planning Commissions
Date: Monday, May 16, 2022 1:09:11 PM
Attachments: [BCHD NonCompliance May 2022 Comments.pdf](#)

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

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

From: Stop BCHD <stop.bchd@gmail.com>
Date: Sat, May 14, 2022 at 2:06 PM
Subject: Public Comment - Forward to Mayors, Councils, Planning Commissions
To: Stop BCHD <StopBCHD@gmail.com>

FORWARD this (including attachment) to: CityClerk@redondo.org,
CityClerk@torranceca.gov, stopbchd@gmail.com

Honorable Mayor, Councilpersons, and Planning Commissioners of Redondo Beach and Torrance:

These are non-agenda item comments to the legislative bodies above for their next general meeting as permitted by the Brown Act.

I am concerned about Beach Cities Health District's proposed Phase 1 development plan that will be commercially DEVELOPED/OWNED/OPERATED. Phase 1 is proposed to be 110-feet above the surrounding streets and 300,000 sqft in size. Phase 2 will bring the total BCHD site up to nearly 800,000 sqft, which is 250% its current size. That is larger than the entire adjacent Beryl Heights neighborhood's homes' sizes all added together. BCHDs proposed plan is also 3-times the height and 150% as large as the voter-rejected CenterCal Mall-by-the-Sea.

I am also concerned that BCHD continues to spend from a \$16M taxpayer fund, preparing inconsistent, incompatible, and irresponsible plans on an elevated site in the center of residential, 30-foot or lower maximum height neighborhoods.

BCHDs 2017 design committed to protecting neighborhoods with buildings in the center and surface parking around the edges buffering homes from damages.

BCHDs 2019 design (June EIR) was 60-feet tall and ringed the site on the edge. The 2020 design (June Board) was 76-feet tall and also on the edge. The 2021 design (March EIR) was 103-feet tall and also on the edge. The current design is claimed to be 83-feet tall and also on the edge of the site and still meets NONE of the comments regarding excessive height and size from 100s of surrounding neighbors and 1000s of petitioners against the project.

The attachment specifically calls out BCHDs plan's noncompliance with specific sections of RBMC CUP and PCDR and on TMC Hillside Overlay.

I ask that the Mayors, Councils and Planning Commissioners provide guidance to their respective Staff and lawyers to convey the public's disapproval of the current plan that BCHD is pouring our tax funding into. Thank you.

--

STOP BCHD (StopBCHD@gmail.com) is a neighborhood community of residents concerned about the economic and quality-of-life damages that BCHDs 110-foot above the street, 800,000 sqft commercial development will inflict on our families for the next 50-100 years. Our neighborhoods have been burdened since 1960 and the damages outweigh any benefits.

NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENTS

The following is provided regarding BCHDs proposed 3rd party DEVELOPER/OWNER/ OPERATOR development project that BCHD will be filing a formal Conditional Use Permit and Planning Commission Design Review application for during the first half of 2022.

These comments are filed to agencies as non-agenda comments of the public, in the interest of the public, and under Cal Gov Code 54954.3."regular meetings shall provide an opportunity for members of the public to directly address the legislative body on any item of interest to the public" there is an affirmative obligation to provide these comments to the Planning Commission, City Council or other "legislative" bodies upon receipt.

Summary Table of BCHD Project Non-Compliance with Municipal Codes		
PERMIT	CONDITION	BCHD PROJECT NON-COMPLIANCE
1. CUP	"will not adversely affect surrounding uses and properties"	As supported by over 1,200 petition signers and 100s, if not 1,000 surrounding resident comments to BCHD, surrounding residential uses are adversely impacted in reduced privacy, property value, aesthetics, noise, traffic and toxic emissions.
2. CUP	"for the proposed use ... shall be adequate in size and shape to accommodate such use"	Given the proposed project plan to locate buildings at the elevated site's perimeter, the elevated site is not adequate to accommodate the proposed use.
3. CUP	"no adverse effect on abutting property"	The properties on the 1400 Block of Diamond are subjected to the storage of explosive liquid fuels, a 2,000 kW combustion power plant, and a 16,000 to 4,000 V substation. These mechanical and explosion hazards adversely impact safety, safe air, local emissions, noise, and vibration.
4. PCDR	"ensure compatibility ... in the community"	Based on the City of Redondo Beach's finding that the design of The Kensington was consistent and compatible with the surrounding residential uses, the 110-foot above Beryl St., Miami Beach commercial styled facility cannot also be deemed compatible with similar, 30-foot and under residential uses in the community.
5. PCDR	"protect property values ... of neighborhoods"	Statistical modeling demonstrates that neighborhoods nearer to BCHD have reduced property values compared to neighborhoods further from BCHD. BCHD is proposing to increase height from 99% under 52-feet to 103-feet and to increase over building size from 312,000 sqft to nearly 800,000 sqft.
6. PCDR	"shall consider the impact ... of the user in respect to circulation, parking, traffic, etc."	BCHD proposed design will require the 8-10 story parking ramp at Prospect and Diamond to enter/exit on Prospect northbound. Further, the proposed height of the RCFE and location on the perimeter damages the privacy, aesthetics, excess nighttime lighting, noise impacts and other basic attributes of the surrounding uses and properties.
7. PCDR	"location of buildings and structures shall respect the natural terrain of the site"	The elevated site has from 30-feet to 70-feet elevation gain over surrounding residential uses. As a result, creation of a 110-foot rise over Beryl St., a 10-story parking ramp over Tomlee and Diamond Sts, and a 4-story, flat wall toward Prospect fails to respect the natural elevated terrain. The original 52-foot, 4 story building and its 0.3%, 968 sqft penthouse were nearly centered in the site, thereby respecting the natural terrain.
8. PCDR	"overall design shall be integrated and compatible with the neighborhood and shall strive to be in harmony with the scale and bulk of surrounding properties"	A 300,000 sqft, 110-foot above the street concrete and glass commercial building makes no attempt to integrate and be compatible with the neighborhood in scale or bulk. Further, unlike The Kensington and its Santa Barbara style, the Miami Beach condominium/hotel style proposed, when coupled with the excessive height and mass is thoroughly non-compatible with surrounding properties.

9. PCDR	“shall be consistent with the intent of residential design guidelines”	The residential design guidelines are intended to increase the quality of life of the neighborhood of the construction. It is very clear from the 1,200 petition signatories regarding the height and size of the project that it does not increase the quality of life. Further, there have been 100s, if not 1,000s of comments and concerns regarding the impacts of noise, emissions, traffic, glare, lighting, excess non-directed nighttime lighting, nighttime elevated signage and other factors that diminish quality of life.
10. RDG	“to improve the quality of life in residential neighborhoods ... [t]hese design guidelines are intended to help accomplish this objective”	The BCHD project reduces the quality of life in surrounding neighborhoods. The BCHD commercial Developer/Owner/Operator is targeting 90% non-Redondo Beach residents and 80% non-residents of the 3 beach cities (HB/RB/MB). The PACE facility is scaled for 400 participants with only 17 expected to be from the 3 beach cities according to National PACE Assoc. statistics. The BCHD project nearly triples the size of campus buildings from 312,000 sqft to 800,000 sqft and more than doubles the effective height from 99% less than 52-feet to 109.7-ft. The quality of life of surrounding neighborhoods will be reduced by the commercial, non-resident services as all damages will accrue to the neighborhoods.
11. THO	“The development has been located, planned and designed so as to cause the least intrusion on the views, light, air and privacy of other properties in the vicinity”	The adjoining Torrance neighborhoods are in the Hillside Overlay. The BCHD would not be allowed in overlay, and the City of Torrance has an obligation to protect its residents. The BCHD project is located to maximize damages to views, light, air and privacy based on height, size and perimeter location.
12. THO	“the design will not have a harmful impact upon the land value and investment of other properties in the vicinity”	Statistical analysis demonstrates that surrounding property values are lower, the closer the properties are to the BCHD site. Peer-reviewed research demonstrates that larger, taller developments, such as BCHDs proposal, will have equal or larger negative impacts on property values.
RBMC 10-2.2506 Conditional Use Permits (CUP) RBMC 10-2.2502 Planning Commission Design Review (PCDR) Redondo Beach Residential Design Guidelines (RDG) Redondo Beach Beryl Heights Neighborhood Specific Guidelines (BH RDG) TMC 91.41.6 Planning and Design (Torrance Hillside Overlay, THO)		

From: [Mark Nelson \(Home Gmail\)](#)
To: [CityClerk; citycouncil@hermosabeach.gov; cityclerk@manhattanbeach.gov; CityClerk; Ben.Allen@sen.ca.gov; Al.Muratsuchi@asm.ca.gov; HollyJMitchell@bos.lacounty.gov](#)
Cc: [Kevin.Cody; Lisa.Jacobs; stopbchd@gmail.com](#)
Subject: Public Comment - BCHD Development
Date: Saturday, May 14, 2022 6 53:56 PM
Attachments: [image.png](#)
[image.png](#)
[BCHD NonCompliance May 2022 Comments.pdf](#)

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

Mayor, Council, Planning Commissions of Redondo Beach and Torrance
Mayor, Councils of BCHD Owners of Manhattan and Hermosa Beach

This is a public comment under the Brown Act for the next regular meeting of the legislative bodies above.

To whom it may concern:

BACKGROUND

For years now, BCHD has been spending taxpayer money on campus plans that are inconsistent and incompatible with neighboring uses and properties, and in violation of both Redondo Beach and Torrance ordinances. BCHD appears to be continuing that effort, with a \$16M taxpayer funded war chest that includes about \$1M in PR, \$5M in Architects, \$1 in Lawyers, etc. The designs have gone from:

May 2017 BCHD Presentation - Commitment to surrounding the campus buildings with parking and greenspace as a buffer
June 2019 BCHD EIR NOP - 60-foot tall, 160,000 sqft underground parking
June 2020 BCHD Board Project Approval - 76-foot tall, 8-10 story above ground parking ramp
March 2021 BCHD Draft EIR - 103 feet tall, 8 story above ground parking ramp

In short, BCHD has been spending tax money, creating taller and more inappropriate plans, and ignoring surrounding neighbors for years now.

COMMUNITY OPPOSITION

Over 1200 petition signers called for downscaling or elimination
Between 100s and a 1000 letters and comments opposing the plan at BCHD, Redondo Beach, Torrance, Hermosa Beach and Manhattan Beach

REQUIRED CHANGES TO THE PLAN IN ORDER MEETING COMMUNITY OBJECTIONS AND RBMC AND TORRANCE MC

A detailed attachment below demonstrates the objectively true instances of BCHD failing to heed RBMC and TMC, along with objections of residents and neighbors.

The following obvious changes are required to meet minimum compliance with TMC and RBMC:

- 1) Reduce the height to conform with the neighborhood, as was done with The Kensington. Both are surrounded by residential and light commercial with 30-foot height limits.
- 2) Move the development to the center of the parcel as with the original hospital. The site is elevated above residential and Torrance Hillside Overlay properties. Respecting the elevated site requires lower buildings and deeper setbacks, not 110-feet above the streets on the perimeter of the site.
- 3) Reduce the size of Phase 1 and 2 from the current nearly 800,000 sqft. BCHD proposes one-and-a-half times larger, and 3 times taller than CenterCal's voter-cancelled Mall-by-the-Sea. In addition, BCHD proposes a development that is larger than all Beryl Heights homes added together. It is clearly OUT OF SCALE.
- 4) Reduce the local damages by reducing the dependence on non-residents. BCHDs plan requires over 80% non-residents for the RCFE and over 95% non-residents for PACE. The youth center, "allcove" is over 90% non-residents. The associated neighbors have suffered 60 years of damages so far, and BCHD proposes an additional 50-100 years for what are clearly trivial benefits and huge damages for the surrounding areas.
- 5) Increase the local benefits by offering cost-based or subsidized and affordable RCFE, PACE, and all other services to 90277 and 90503 zip codes that suffer the bulk of damages.
- 6) Relocate the generator and fuel storage. Allowing BCHD to move its generators and fuel storage off the center of the campus where it bears the risk to a location that is adjacent to homeowners is unacceptable.
- 7) Reduce construction noise with no construction above noise barriers. BCHD knowingly created health damages by proposing heights above the level of barrier protection and building on the far perimeter of the campus. BCHD must reduce height to no taller than fully mitigated by noise barriers.
- 8) Reduce operations noise through outdoor curfews after 7PM. BCHD is building a horseshoe shaped urban canyon and proposing amplified noise nighttime events outdoors. That is unfair and unacceptable damage to the surrounding neighbors to the south and east.
- 9) Move or underground required parking. The current 8-10 story parking at Prospect and Diamond subjects surrounding neighborhoods to noise, loss of privacy, etc. on a 24/7/365 basis.
- 10) Remove privacy impacting balconies and decks. BCHD plans to line the edges of the compound, on the perimeter of the site, with privacy robbing decks. That is unacceptable and damaging.

BCHDs proposal is clearly damaging to the surrounding neighborhoods and violates RBMC for CUP and PCDR and TMC for the Hillside Overlay.

NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENTS

The following is provided regarding BCHDs proposed 3rd party DEVELOPER/OWNER/ OPERATOR develop project that BCHD will be filing a formal Conditional Use Permit and Planning Commission Design Review application for during the first half of 2022.

These comments are filed to agencies as non-agenda comments of the public, in the interest of the public, and un Cal Gov Code 54954.3."regular meetings shall provide an opportunity for members of the public to directly add the legislative body on any item of interest to the public" there is an affirmative obligation to provide these comments to the Planning Commission, City Council or other "legislative" bodies upon receipt.

Summary Table of BCHD Project Non-Compliance with Municipal Codes		
PERMIT	CONDITION	BCHD PROJECT NON-COMPLIANCE
1. CUP	"will not adversely affect surrounding uses and properties"	As supported by over 1,200 petition signers and 100s, if not 1,000 surrounding resident comments to BCHD, surrounding residential uses are adversely impacted in reduced privacy, property value, aesthetics, noise, traffic and toxic emissions.
2. CUP	"for the proposed use ... shall be adequate in size and shape to accommodate such use"	Given the proposed project plan to locate buildings at the elevated site's perimeter, the elevated site is not adequate to accommodate the proposed use.
3. CUP	"no adverse effect on abutting property"	The properties on the 1400 Block of Diamond are subjected to the storage of explosive liquid fuels, a 2,000 kW combustion power plant, and a 16,000 to 4,000 V substation. These mechanical and explosion hazards adversely impact safety, safe air, local emissions, noise, and vibration.
4. PCDR	"ensure compatibility ... in the community"	Based on the City of Redondo Beach's finding that the design of The Kensington was consistent and compatible with the surrounding residential uses, the 110-foot above Beryl St., Miami Beach commercial styled facility cannot also be deemed compatible with similar, 30-foot and under residential uses in the community.
5. PCDR	"protect property values ... of neighborhoods"	Statistical modeling demonstrates that neighborhoods nearer to BCHD have reduced property values compared to neighborhoods further from BCHD. BCHD is proposing to increase height from 99% under 52-feet to 103-feet and to increase over building size from 312,000 sqft to nearly 800,000 sqft.
6. PCDR	"shall consider the impact ... of the user in respect to circulation, parking, traffic, etc."	BCHD proposed design will require the 8-10 story parking ramp at Prospect and Diamond to enter/exit on Prospect northbound. Further, the proposed height of the RCFE and location on the perimeter damages the privacy, aesthetics, excess nighttime lighting, noise impacts and other basic attributes of the surrounding uses and properties.
7. PCDR	"location of buildings and structures shall respect the natural terrain of the site"	The elevated site has from 30-feet to 70-feet elevation gain over surrounding residential uses. As a result, creation of a 110-foot rise over Beryl St., a 10-story parking ramp over Tomlee and Diamond Sts, and a 4-story, flat wall toward Prospect fails to respect the natural elevated terrain. The original 52-foot, 4 story building and its 0.3%, 968 sqft penthouse were nearly centered in the site, thereby respecting the natural terrain.
8. PCDR	"overall design shall be integrated and compatible with the neighborhood and shall strive to be in harmony with the scale and bulk of surrounding properties"	A 300,000 sqft, 110-foot above the street concrete and glass commercial building makes no attempt to integrate and be compatible with the neighborhood in scale or bulk. Further, unlike The Kensington and its Santa Barbara style, the Miami Beach condominium/hotel style proposed, when coupled with the excessive height and mass is thoroughly non-compatible with surrounding properties.

9. PCDR	“shall be consistent with the intent of residential design guidelines”	The residential design guidelines are intended to increase the quality of life of the neighborhood of the construction. It is very clear from the 1,200 petition signatories regarding the height and size of the project that it does not increase the quality of life. Further, there have been 100s, if not 1,000s of comments and concerns regarding the impacts of noise, emissions, traffic, glare, lighting, excess non-directed nighttime lighting, nighttime elevated signage and other factors that diminish quality of life.
10. RDG	“to improve the quality of life in residential neighborhoods ... [t]hese design guidelines are intended to help accomplish this objective”	The BCHD project reduces the quality of life in surrounding neighborhoods. The BCHD commercial Developer/Owner/Operator is targeting 90% non-Redondo Beach residents and 80% non-residents of the 3 beach cities (HB/RB/MB). The PACE facility is scaled for 400 participants with only 17 expected to be from the 3 beach cities according to National PACE Assoc. statistics. The BCHD project nearly triples the size of campus buildings from 312,000 sqft to 800,000 sqft and more than doubles the effective height from 99% less than 52-feet to 109.7-ft. The quality of life of surrounding neighborhoods will be reduced by the commercial, non-resident services as all damages will accrue to the neighborhoods.
11. THO	“The development has been located, planned and designed so as to cause the least intrusion on the views, light, air and privacy of other properties in the vicinity”	The adjoining Torrance neighborhoods are in the Hillside Overlay. The BCHD would not be allowed in overlay, and the City of Torrance has an obligation to protect its residents. The BCHD project is located to maximize damages to views, light, air and privacy based on height, size and perimeter location.
12. THO	“the design will not have a harmful impact upon the land value and investment of other properties in the vicinity”	Statistical analysis demonstrates that surrounding property values are lower, the closer the properties are to the BCHD site. Peer-reviewed research demonstrates that larger, taller developments, such as BCHDs proposal, will have equal or larger negative impacts on property values.
RBMC 10-2.2506 Conditional Use Permits (CUP) RBMC 10-2.2502 Planning Commission Design Review (PCDR) Redondo Beach Residential Design Guidelines (RDG) Redondo Beach Beryl Heights Neighborhood Specific Guidelines (BH RDG) TMC 91.41.6 Planning and Design (Torrance Hillside Overlay, THO)		

NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENTS

The following is provided regarding BCHDs proposed 3rd party DEVELOPER/OWNER/ OPERATOR development project that BCHD will be filing a formal Conditional Use Permit and Planning Commission Design Review application for during the first half of 2022.

These comments are filed to agencies as non-agenda comments of the public, in the interest of the public, and under Cal Gov Code 54954.3."regular meetings shall provide an opportunity for members of the public to directly address the legislative body on any item of interest to the public" there is an affirmative obligation to provide these comments to the Planning Commission, City Council or other "legislative" bodies upon receipt.

Summary Table of BCHD Project Non-Compliance with Municipal Codes		
PERMIT	CONDITION	BCHD PROJECT NON-COMPLIANCE
1. CUP	"will not adversely affect surrounding uses and properties"	As supported by over 1,200 petition signers and 100s, if not 1,000 surrounding resident comments to BCHD, surrounding residential uses are adversely impacted in reduced privacy, property value, aesthetics, noise, traffic and toxic emissions.
2. CUP	"for the proposed use ... shall be adequate in size and shape to accommodate such use"	Given the proposed project plan to locate buildings at the elevated site's perimeter, the elevated site is not adequate to accommodate the proposed use.
3. CUP	"no adverse effect on abutting property"	The properties on the 1400 Block of Diamond are subjected to the storage of explosive liquid fuels, a 2,000 kW combustion power plant, and a 16,000 to 4,000 V substation. These mechanical and explosion hazards adversely impact safety, safe air, local emissions, noise, and vibration.
4. PCDR	"ensure compatibility ... in the community"	Based on the City of Redondo Beach's finding that the design of The Kensington was consistent and compatible with the surrounding residential uses, the 110-foot above Beryl St., Miami Beach commercial styled facility cannot also be deemed compatible with similar, 30-foot and under residential uses in the community.
5. PCDR	"protect property values ... of neighborhoods"	Statistical modeling demonstrates that neighborhoods nearer to BCHD have reduced property values compared to neighborhoods further from BCHD. BCHD is proposing to increase height from 99% under 52-feet to 103-feet and to increase over building size from 312,000 sqft to nearly 800,000 sqft.
6. PCDR	"shall consider the impact ... of the user in respect to circulation, parking, traffic, etc."	BCHD proposed design will require the 8-10 story parking ramp at Prospect and Diamond to enter/exit on Prospect northbound. Further, the proposed height of the RCFE and location on the perimeter damages the privacy, aesthetics, excess nighttime lighting, noise impacts and other basic attributes of the surrounding uses and properties.
7. PCDR	"location of buildings and structures shall respect the natural terrain of the site"	The elevated site has from 30-feet to 70-feet elevation gain over surrounding residential uses. As a result, creation of a 110-foot rise over Beryl St., a 10-story parking ramp over Tomlee and Diamond Sts, and a 4-story, flat wall toward Prospect fails to respect the natural elevated terrain. The original 52-foot, 4 story building and its 0.3%, 968 sqft penthouse were nearly centered in the site, thereby respecting the natural terrain.
8. PCDR	"overall design shall be integrated and compatible with the neighborhood and shall strive to be in harmony with the scale and bulk of surrounding properties"	A 300,000 sqft, 110-foot above the street concrete and glass commercial building makes no attempt to integrate and be compatible with the neighborhood in scale or bulk. Further, unlike The Kensington and its Santa Barbara style, the Miami Beach condominium/hotel style proposed, when coupled with the excessive height and mass is thoroughly non-compatible with surrounding properties.

9. PCDR	“shall be consistent with the intent of residential design guidelines”	The residential design guidelines are intended to increase the quality of life of the neighborhood of the construction. It is very clear from the 1,200 petition signatories regarding the height and size of the project that it does not increase the quality of life. Further, there have been 100s, if not 1,000s of comments and concerns regarding the impacts of noise, emissions, traffic, glare, lighting, excess non-directed nighttime lighting, nighttime elevated signage and other factors that diminish quality of life.
10. RDG	“to improve the quality of life in residential neighborhoods ... [t]hese design guidelines are intended to help accomplish this objective”	The BCHD project reduces the quality of life in surrounding neighborhoods. The BCHD commercial Developer/Owner/Operator is targeting 90% non-Redondo Beach residents and 80% non-residents of the 3 beach cities (HB/RB/MB). The PACE facility is scaled for 400 participants with only 17 expected to be from the 3 beach cities according to National PACE Assoc. statistics. The BCHD project nearly triples the size of campus buildings from 312,000 sqft to 800,000 sqft and more than doubles the effective height from 99% less than 52-feet to 109.7-ft. The quality of life of surrounding neighborhoods will be reduced by the commercial, non-resident services as all damages will accrue to the neighborhoods.
11. THO	“The development has been located, planned and designed so as to cause the least intrusion on the views, light, air and privacy of other properties in the vicinity”	The adjoining Torrance neighborhoods are in the Hillside Overlay. The BCHD would not be allowed in overlay, and the City of Torrance has an obligation to protect its residents. The BCHD project is located to maximize damages to views, light, air and privacy based on height, size and perimeter location.
12. THO	“the design will not have a harmful impact upon the land value and investment of other properties in the vicinity”	Statistical analysis demonstrates that surrounding property values are lower, the closer the properties are to the BCHD site. Peer-reviewed research demonstrates that larger, taller developments, such as BCHDs proposal, will have equal or larger negative impacts on property values.
RBMC 10-2.2506 Conditional Use Permits (CUP) RBMC 10-2.2502 Planning Commission Design Review (PCDR) Redondo Beach Residential Design Guidelines (RDG) Redondo Beach Beryl Heights Neighborhood Specific Guidelines (BH RDG) TMC 91.41.6 Planning and Design (Torrance Hillside Overlay, THO)		

From: [Lisa Youngworth](#)
To: [CityClerk](#); cityclerk@torranceca.gov; [Stop Bchd](#); [Bill Brand](#); [Nils Nehrenheim](#); [Todd Loewenstein](#); [Zein Obagi](#); [Sheila Lamb](#); [Rob Gaddis](#); doug.boswell@redondo.org
Subject: Public Comment - Forward to Mayors, Councilmembers, Planning Commissions
Date: Monday, May 16, 2022 7:35:32 AM
Attachments: [BCHD NonCompliance May 2022 Comments.pdf](#)

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

Honorable Mayor, Councilpersons, and Planning Commissioners of Redondo Beach and Torrance:

These are non-agenda item comments to the legislative bodies above for their next general meeting as permitted by the Brown Act.

I am concerned about Beach Cities Health District's proposed Phase 1 development plan that will be commercially DEVELOPED/OWNED/OPERATED. Phase 1 is proposed to be 110-feet above the surrounding streets and 300,000 sqft in size. Phase 2 will bring the total BCHD site up to nearly 800,000 sqft, which is 250% its current size. That is larger than the entire adjacent Beryl Heights neighborhood's homes' sizes all added together. BCHDs proposed plan is also 3-times the height and 150% as large as the voter-rejected CenterCal Mall-by-the-Sea.

I am also concerned that BCHD continues to spend from a \$16M taxpayer fund, preparing inconsistent, incompatible, and irresponsible plans on an elevated site in the center of residential, 30-foot or lower maximum height neighborhoods.

BCHDs 2017 design committed to protecting neighborhoods with buildings in the center and surface parking around the edges buffering homes from damages.

BCHDs 2019 design (June EIR) was 60-feet tall and ringed the site on the edge. The 2020 design (June Board) was 76-feet tall and also on the edge. The 2021 design (March EIR) was 103-feet tall and also on the edge. The current design is claimed to be 83-feet tall and also on the edge of the site and still meets NONE of the comments regarding excessive height and size from 100s of surrounding neighbors and 1000s of petitioners against the project.

The attachment specifically calls out BCHDs plan's noncompliance with specific sections of RBMC CUP and PCDR and on TMC Hillside Overlay.

I ask that the Mayors, Councils and Planning Commissioners provide guidance to their respective Staff and lawyers to convey the public's disapproval of the current plan that BCHD is pouring our tax funding into. Thank you.

--

STOP BCHD (StopBCHD@gmail.com) is a neighborhood community of

residents concerned about the economic and quality-of-life damages that BCHDs 110-foot above the street, 800,000 sqft commercial development will inflict on our families for the next 50-100 years. Our neighborhoods have been burdened since 1960 and the damages outweigh any benefits.

NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENTS

The following is provided regarding BCHDs proposed 3rd party DEVELOPER/OWNER/ OPERATOR development project that BCHD will be filing a formal Conditional Use Permit and Planning Commission Design Review application for during the first half of 2022.

These comments are filed to agencies as non-agenda comments of the public, in the interest of the public, and under Cal Gov Code 54954.3."regular meetings shall provide an opportunity for members of the public to directly address the legislative body on any item of interest to the public" there is an affirmative obligation to provide these comments to the Planning Commission, City Council or other "legislative" bodies upon receipt.

Summary Table of BCHD Project Non-Compliance with Municipal Codes		
PERMIT	CONDITION	BCHD PROJECT NON-COMPLIANCE
1. CUP	"will not adversely affect surrounding uses and properties"	As supported by over 1,200 petition signers and 100s, if not 1,000 surrounding resident comments to BCHD, surrounding residential uses are adversely impacted in reduced privacy, property value, aesthetics, noise, traffic and toxic emissions.
2. CUP	"for the proposed use ... shall be adequate in size and shape to accommodate such use"	Given the proposed project plan to locate buildings at the elevated site's perimeter, the elevated site is not adequate to accommodate the proposed use.
3. CUP	"no adverse effect on abutting property"	The properties on the 1400 Block of Diamond are subjected to the storage of explosive liquid fuels, a 2,000 kW combustion power plant, and a 16,000 to 4,000 V substation. These mechanical and explosion hazards adversely impact safety, safe air, local emissions, noise, and vibration.
4. PCDR	"ensure compatibility ... in the community"	Based on the City of Redondo Beach's finding that the design of The Kensington was consistent and compatible with the surrounding residential uses, the 110-foot above Beryl St., Miami Beach commercial styled facility cannot also be deemed compatible with similar, 30-foot and under residential uses in the community.
5. PCDR	"protect property values ... of neighborhoods"	Statistical modeling demonstrates that neighborhoods nearer to BCHD have reduced property values compared to neighborhoods further from BCHD. BCHD is proposing to increase height from 99% under 52-feet to 103-feet and to increase over building size from 312,000 sqft to nearly 800,000 sqft.
6. PCDR	"shall consider the impact ... of the user in respect to circulation, parking, traffic, etc."	BCHD proposed design will require the 8-10 story parking ramp at Prospect and Diamond to enter/exit on Prospect northbound. Further, the proposed height of the RCFE and location on the perimeter damages the privacy, aesthetics, excess nighttime lighting, noise impacts and other basic attributes of the surrounding uses and properties.
7. PCDR	"location of buildings and structures shall respect the natural terrain of the site"	The elevated site has from 30-feet to 70-feet elevation gain over surrounding residential uses. As a result, creation of a 110-foot rise over Beryl St., a 10-story parking ramp over Tomlee and Diamond Sts, and a 4-story, flat wall toward Prospect fails to respect the natural elevated terrain. The original 52-foot, 4 story building and its 0.3%, 968 sqft penthouse were nearly centered in the site, thereby respecting the natural terrain.
8. PCDR	"overall design shall be integrated and compatible with the neighborhood and shall strive to be in harmony with the scale and bulk of surrounding properties"	A 300,000 sqft, 110-foot above the street concrete and glass commercial building makes no attempt to integrate and be compatible with the neighborhood in scale or bulk. Further, unlike The Kensington and its Santa Barbara style, the Miami Beach condominium/hotel style proposed, when coupled with the excessive height and mass is thoroughly non-compatible with surrounding properties.

9. PCDR	“shall be consistent with the intent of residential design guidelines”	The residential design guidelines are intended to increase the quality of life of the neighborhood of the construction. It is very clear from the 1,200 petition signatories regarding the height and size of the project that it does not increase the quality of life. Further, there have been 100s, if not 1,000s of comments and concerns regarding the impacts of noise, emissions, traffic, glare, lighting, excess non-directed nighttime lighting, nighttime elevated signage and other factors that diminish quality of life.
10. RDG	“to improve the quality of life in residential neighborhoods ... [t]hese design guidelines are intended to help accomplish this objective”	The BCHD project reduces the quality of life in surrounding neighborhoods. The BCHD commercial Developer/Owner/Operator is targeting 90% non-Redondo Beach residents and 80% non-residents of the 3 beach cities (HB/RB/MB). The PACE facility is scaled for 400 participants with only 17 expected to be from the 3 beach cities according to National PACE Assoc. statistics. The BCHD project nearly triples the size of campus buildings from 312,000 sqft to 800,000 sqft and more than doubles the effective height from 99% less than 52-feet to 109.7-ft. The quality of life of surrounding neighborhoods will be reduced by the commercial, non-resident services as all damages will accrue to the neighborhoods.
11. THO	“The development has been located, planned and designed so as to cause the least intrusion on the views, light, air and privacy of other properties in the vicinity”	The adjoining Torrance neighborhoods are in the Hillside Overlay. The BCHD would not be allowed in overlay, and the City of Torrance has an obligation to protect its residents. The BCHD project is located to maximize damages to views, light, air and privacy based on height, size and perimeter location.
12. THO	“the design will not have a harmful impact upon the land value and investment of other properties in the vicinity”	Statistical analysis demonstrates that surrounding property values are lower, the closer the properties are to the BCHD site. Peer-reviewed research demonstrates that larger, taller developments, such as BCHDs proposal, will have equal or larger negative impacts on property values.
RBMC 10-2.2506 Conditional Use Permits (CUP) RBMC 10-2.2502 Planning Commission Design Review (PCDR) Redondo Beach Residential Design Guidelines (RDG) Redondo Beach Beryl Heights Neighborhood Specific Guidelines (BH RDG) TMC 91.41.6 Planning and Design (Torrance Hillside Overlay, THO)		

From: gtafremow@verizon.net
To: [CityClerk: CityClerk@torranceca.gov](mailto:CityClerk@torranceca.gov); stopbchd@gmail.com
Subject: Public Comment - Forward to Mayors, Councils, Planning Commissions
Date: Saturday, May 14, 2022 2:28:39 PM
Attachments: [BCHD NonCompliance May 2022 Comments.pdf](#)
Importance: High

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

Honorable Mayor, Councilpersons, and Planning Commissioners of Redondo Beach and Torrance:

These are non-agenda item comments to the legislative bodies above for their next general meeting as permitted by the Brown Act.

I am concerned about Beach Cities Health District's proposed Phase 1 development plan that will be commercially DEVELOPED/OWNED/OPERATED. Phase 1 is proposed to be 110-feet above the surrounding streets and 300,000 sqft in size. Phase 2 will bring the total BCHD site up to nearly 800,000 sqft, which is 250% its current size. That is larger than the entire adjacent Beryl Heights neighborhood's homes' sizes all added together. BCHDs proposed plan is also 3-times the height and 150% as large as the voter-rejected CenterCal Mall-by-the-Sea.

I am also concerned that BCHD continues to spend from a \$16M taxpayer fund, preparing inconsistent, incompatible, and irresponsible plans on an elevated site in the center of residential, 30-foot or lower maximum height neighborhoods.

BCHDs 2017 design committed to protecting neighborhoods with buildings in the center and surface parking around the edges buffering homes from damages.

BCHDs 2019 design (June EIR) was 60-feet tall and ringed the site on the edge. The 2020 design (June Board) was 76-feet tall and also on the edge. The 2021 design (March EIR) was 103-feet tall and also on the edge. The current design is claimed to be 83-feet tall and also on the edge of the site and still meets NONE of the comments regarding excessive height and size from 100s of surrounding neighbors and 1000s of petitioners against the project.

The attachment specifically calls out BCHDs plan's noncompliance with specific sections of RBMC CUP and PCDR and on TMC Hillside Overlay.

I ask that the Mayors, Councils and Planning Commissioners provide guidance to their respective Staff and lawyers to convey the public's disapproval of the current plan that BCHD is pouring our tax funding into. Thank you.

--

STOP BCHD (StopBCHD@gmail.com) is a neighborhood community of residents concerned about the economic and quality-of-life damages that BCHDs 110-foot above the street, 800,000 sqft commercial development will inflict on our families for the next 50-100 years. Our neighborhoods

have been burdened since 1960 and the damages outweigh any benefits.

Long time & concerned West Torrance residents,
Pam & George Afremow

NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENTS

The following is provided regarding BCHDs proposed 3rd party DEVELOPER/OWNER/ OPERATOR development project that BCHD will be filing a formal Conditional Use Permit and Planning Commission Design Review application for during the first half of 2022.

These comments are filed to agencies as non-agenda comments of the public, in the interest of the public, and under Cal Gov Code 54954.3."regular meetings shall provide an opportunity for members of the public to directly address the legislative body on any item of interest to the public" there is an affirmative obligation to provide these comments to the Planning Commission, City Council or other "legislative" bodies upon receipt.

Summary Table of BCHD Project Non-Compliance with Municipal Codes		
PERMIT	CONDITION	BCHD PROJECT NON-COMPLIANCE
1. CUP	"will not adversely affect surrounding uses and properties"	As supported by over 1,200 petition signers and 100s, if not 1,000 surrounding resident comments to BCHD, surrounding residential uses are adversely impacted in reduced privacy, property value, aesthetics, noise, traffic and toxic emissions.
2. CUP	"for the proposed use ... shall be adequate in size and shape to accommodate such use"	Given the proposed project plan to locate buildings at the elevated site's perimeter, the elevated site is not adequate to accommodate the proposed use.
3. CUP	"no adverse effect on abutting property"	The properties on the 1400 Block of Diamond are subjected to the storage of explosive liquid fuels, a 2,000 kW combustion power plant, and a 16,000 to 4,000 V substation. These mechanical and explosion hazards adversely impact safety, safe air, local emissions, noise, and vibration.
4. PCDR	"ensure compatibility ... in the community"	Based on the City of Redondo Beach's finding that the design of The Kensington was consistent and compatible with the surrounding residential uses, the 110-foot above Beryl St., Miami Beach commercial styled facility cannot also be deemed compatible with similar, 30-foot and under residential uses in the community.
5. PCDR	"protect property values ... of neighborhoods"	Statistical modeling demonstrates that neighborhoods nearer to BCHD have reduced property values compared to neighborhoods further from BCHD. BCHD is proposing to increase height from 99% under 52-feet to 103-feet and to increase over building size from 312,000 sqft to nearly 800,000 sqft.
6. PCDR	"shall consider the impact ... of the user in respect to circulation, parking, traffic, etc."	BCHD proposed design will require the 8-10 story parking ramp at Prospect and Diamond to enter/exit on Prospect northbound. Further, the proposed height of the RCFE and location on the perimeter damages the privacy, aesthetics, excess nighttime lighting, noise impacts and other basic attributes of the surrounding uses and properties.
7. PCDR	"location of buildings and structures shall respect the natural terrain of the site"	The elevated site has from 30-feet to 70-feet elevation gain over surrounding residential uses. As a result, creation of a 110-foot rise over Beryl St., a 10-story parking ramp over Tomlee and Diamond Sts, and a 4-story, flat wall toward Prospect fails to respect the natural elevated terrain. The original 52-foot, 4 story building and its 0.3%, 968 sqft penthouse were nearly centered in the site, thereby respecting the natural terrain.
8. PCDR	"overall design shall be integrated and compatible with the neighborhood and shall strive to be in harmony with the scale and bulk of surrounding properties"	A 300,000 sqft, 110-foot above the street concrete and glass commercial building makes no attempt to integrate and be compatible with the neighborhood in scale or bulk. Further, unlike The Kensington and its Santa Barbara style, the Miami Beach condominium/hotel style proposed, when coupled with the excessive height and mass is thoroughly non-compatible with surrounding properties.

9. PCDR	“shall be consistent with the intent of residential design guidelines”	The residential design guidelines are intended to increase the quality of life of the neighborhood of the construction. It is very clear from the 1,200 petition signatories regarding the height and size of the project that it does not increase the quality of life. Further, there have been 100s, if not 1,000s of comments and concerns regarding the impacts of noise, emissions, traffic, glare, lighting, excess non-directed nighttime lighting, nighttime elevated signage and other factors that diminish quality of life.
10. RDG	“to improve the quality of life in residential neighborhoods ... [t]hese design guidelines are intended to help accomplish this objective”	The BCHD project reduces the quality of life in surrounding neighborhoods. The BCHD commercial Developer/Owner/Operator is targeting 90% non-Redondo Beach residents and 80% non-residents of the 3 beach cities (HB/RB/MB). The PACE facility is scaled for 400 participants with only 17 expected to be from the 3 beach cities according to National PACE Assoc. statistics. The BCHD project nearly triples the size of campus buildings from 312,000 sqft to 800,000 sqft and more than doubles the effective height from 99% less than 52-feet to 109.7-ft. The quality of life of surrounding neighborhoods will be reduced by the commercial, non-resident services as all damages will accrue to the neighborhoods.
11. THO	“The development has been located, planned and designed so as to cause the least intrusion on the views, light, air and privacy of other properties in the vicinity”	The adjoining Torrance neighborhoods are in the Hillside Overlay. The BCHD would not be allowed in overlay, and the City of Torrance has an obligation to protect its residents. The BCHD project is located to maximize damages to views, light, air and privacy based on height, size and perimeter location.
12. THO	“the design will not have a harmful impact upon the land value and investment of other properties in the vicinity”	Statistical analysis demonstrates that surrounding property values are lower, the closer the properties are to the BCHD site. Peer-reviewed research demonstrates that larger, taller developments, such as BCHDs proposal, will have equal or larger negative impacts on property values.
RBMC 10-2.2506 Conditional Use Permits (CUP) RBMC 10-2.2502 Planning Commission Design Review (PCDR) Redondo Beach Residential Design Guidelines (RDG) Redondo Beach Beryl Heights Neighborhood Specific Guidelines (BH RDG) TMC 91.41.6 Planning and Design (Torrance Hillside Overlay, THO)		

From: [BARRY SINSHEIMER](#)
To: [CityClerk: stopbchd@gmail.com](#); [CityClerk@torranceca.gov](#)
Subject: Public Comment - Forward to Mayors, Councils, Planning Commissions
Date: Saturday, May 14, 2022 2:59:45 PM
Attachments: [BCHD NonCompliance May 2022 Comments.pdf](#)

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

Honorable Mayor, Councilpersons, and Planning Commissioners of Redondo Beach and Torrance:

These are non-agenda item comments to the legislative bodies above for their next general meeting as permitted by the Brown Act.

I am concerned about Beach Cities Health District's proposed Phase 1 development plan that will be commercially DEVELOPED/OWNED/OPERATED. Phase 1 is proposed to be 110-feet above the surrounding streets and 300,000 sqft in size. Phase 2 will bring the total BCHD site up to nearly 800,000 sqft, which is 250% its current size. That is larger than the entire adjacent Beryl Heights neighborhood's homes' sizes all added together. BCHDs proposed plan is also 3-times the height and 150% as large as the voter-rejected CenterCal Mall-by-the-Sea.

I am also concerned that BCHD continues to spend from a \$16M taxpayer fund, preparing inconsistent, incompatible, and irresponsible plans on an elevated site in the center of residential, 30-foot or lower maximum height neighborhoods.

BCHDs 2017 design committed to protecting neighborhoods with buildings in the center and surface parking around the edges buffering homes from damages.

BCHDs 2019 design (June EIR) was 60-feet tall and ringed the site on the edge. The 2020 design (June Board) was 76-feet tall and also on the edge. The 2021 design (March EIR) was 103-feet tall and also on the edge. The current design is claimed to be 83-feet tall and also on the edge of the site and still meets NONE of the comments regarding excessive height and size from 100s of surrounding neighbors and 1000s of petitioners against the project.

The attachment specifically calls out BCHDs plan's noncompliance with specific sections of RBMC CUP and PCDR and on TMC Hillside Overlay.

I ask that the Mayors, Councils and Planning Commissioners provide guidance to their respective Staff and lawyers to convey the public's disapproval of the current plan that BCHD is pouring our tax funding into. Thank you.

Jeanne Sinsheimer

Redondo Beach Resident

--

STOP BCHD (StopBCHD@gmail.com) is a neighborhood community of residents concerned about the economic and quality-of-life damages that BCHDs 110-foot above the street, 800,000 sqft commercial development will inflict on our families for the next 50-100 years. Our neighborhoods have been burdened since 1960 and the damages outweigh any benefits.

NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENTS

The following is provided regarding BCHDs proposed 3rd party DEVELOPER/OWNER/ OPERATOR development project that BCHD will be filing a formal Conditional Use Permit and Planning Commission Design Review application for during the first half of 2022.

These comments are filed to agencies as non-agenda comments of the public, in the interest of the public, and under Cal Gov Code 54954.3."regular meetings shall provide an opportunity for members of the public to directly address the legislative body on any item of interest to the public" there is an affirmative obligation to provide these comments to the Planning Commission, City Council or other "legislative" bodies upon receipt.

Summary Table of BCHD Project Non-Compliance with Municipal Codes		
PERMIT	CONDITION	BCHD PROJECT NON-COMPLIANCE
1. CUP	"will not adversely affect surrounding uses and properties"	As supported by over 1,200 petition signers and 100s, if not 1,000 surrounding resident comments to BCHD, surrounding residential uses are adversely impacted in reduced privacy, property value, aesthetics, noise, traffic and toxic emissions.
2. CUP	"for the proposed use ... shall be adequate in size and shape to accommodate such use"	Given the proposed project plan to locate buildings at the elevated site's perimeter, the elevated site is not adequate to accommodate the proposed use.
3. CUP	"no adverse effect on abutting property"	The properties on the 1400 Block of Diamond are subjected to the storage of explosive liquid fuels, a 2,000 kW combustion power plant, and a 16,000 to 4,000 V substation. These mechanical and explosion hazards adversely impact safety, safe air, local emissions, noise, and vibration.
4. PCDR	"ensure compatibility ... in the community"	Based on the City of Redondo Beach's finding that the design of The Kensington was consistent and compatible with the surrounding residential uses, the 110-foot above Beryl St., Miami Beach commercial styled facility cannot also be deemed compatible with similar, 30-foot and under residential uses in the community.
5. PCDR	"protect property values ... of neighborhoods"	Statistical modeling demonstrates that neighborhoods nearer to BCHD have reduced property values compared to neighborhoods further from BCHD. BCHD is proposing to increase height from 99% under 52-feet to 103-feet and to increase over building size from 312,000 sqft to nearly 800,000 sqft.
6. PCDR	"shall consider the impact ... of the user in respect to circulation, parking, traffic, etc."	BCHD proposed design will require the 8-10 story parking ramp at Prospect and Diamond to enter/exit on Prospect northbound. Further, the proposed height of the RCFE and location on the perimeter damages the privacy, aesthetics, excess nighttime lighting, noise impacts and other basic attributes of the surrounding uses and properties.
7. PCDR	"location of buildings and structures shall respect the natural terrain of the site"	The elevated site has from 30-feet to 70-feet elevation gain over surrounding residential uses. As a result, creation of a 110-foot rise over Beryl St., a 10-story parking ramp over Tomlee and Diamond Sts, and a 4-story, flat wall toward Prospect fails to respect the natural elevated terrain. The original 52-foot, 4 story building and its 0.3%, 968 sqft penthouse were nearly centered in the site, thereby respecting the natural terrain.
8. PCDR	"overall design shall be integrated and compatible with the neighborhood and shall strive to be in harmony with the scale and bulk of surrounding properties"	A 300,000 sqft, 110-foot above the street concrete and glass commercial building makes no attempt to integrate and be compatible with the neighborhood in scale or bulk. Further, unlike The Kensington and its Santa Barbara style, the Miami Beach condominium/hotel style proposed, when coupled with the excessive height and mass is thoroughly non-compatible with surrounding properties.

9. PCDR	“shall be consistent with the intent of residential design guidelines”	The residential design guidelines are intended to increase the quality of life of the neighborhood of the construction. It is very clear from the 1,200 petition signatories regarding the height and size of the project that it does not increase the quality of life. Further, there have been 100s, if not 1,000s of comments and concerns regarding the impacts of noise, emissions, traffic, glare, lighting, excess non-directed nighttime lighting, nighttime elevated signage and other factors that diminish quality of life.
10. RDG	“to improve the quality of life in residential neighborhoods ... [t]hese design guidelines are intended to help accomplish this objective”	The BCHD project reduces the quality of life in surrounding neighborhoods. The BCHD commercial Developer/Owner/Operator is targeting 90% non-Redondo Beach residents and 80% non-residents of the 3 beach cities (HB/RB/MB). The PACE facility is scaled for 400 participants with only 17 expected to be from the 3 beach cities according to National PACE Assoc. statistics. The BCHD project nearly triples the size of campus buildings from 312,000 sqft to 800,000 sqft and more than doubles the effective height from 99% less than 52-feet to 109.7-ft. The quality of life of surrounding neighborhoods will be reduced by the commercial, non-resident services as all damages will accrue to the neighborhoods.
11. THO	“The development has been located, planned and designed so as to cause the least intrusion on the views, light, air and privacy of other properties in the vicinity”	The adjoining Torrance neighborhoods are in the Hillside Overlay. The BCHD would not be allowed in overlay, and the City of Torrance has an obligation to protect its residents. The BCHD project is located to maximize damages to views, light, air and privacy based on height, size and perimeter location.
12. THO	“the design will not have a harmful impact upon the land value and investment of other properties in the vicinity”	Statistical analysis demonstrates that surrounding property values are lower, the closer the properties are to the BCHD site. Peer-reviewed research demonstrates that larger, taller developments, such as BCHDs proposal, will have equal or larger negative impacts on property values.
RBMC 10-2.2506 Conditional Use Permits (CUP) RBMC 10-2.2502 Planning Commission Design Review (PCDR) Redondo Beach Residential Design Guidelines (RDG) Redondo Beach Beryl Heights Neighborhood Specific Guidelines (BH RDG) TMC 91.41.6 Planning and Design (Torrance Hillside Overlay, THO)		

From: tammytammysugar
To: [CityClerk; cityclerk@torranceca.gov](mailto:cityclerk@torranceca.gov); stopbchd@gmail.com
Subject: Public Comment to Mayors, Councils, Planning Commissions
Date: Saturday, May 14, 2022 7:09:21 PM
Attachments: [BCHD NonCompliance May 2022 Comments.pdf](#)

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

Honorable Mayor, Councilpersons, and Planning Commissioners of Redondo Beach and Torrance:

These are non-agenda item comments to the legislative bodies above for their next general meeting as permitted by the Brown Act.

I am concerned about Beach Cities Health District's proposed Phase 1 development plan that will be commercially DEVELOPED/OWNED/OPERATED. Phase 1 is proposed to be 110-feet above the surrounding streets and 300,000 sqft in size. Phase 2 will bring the total BCHD site up to nearly 800,000 sqft, which is 250% its current size. That is larger than the entire adjacent Beryl Heights neighborhood's homes' sizes all added together. BCHDs proposed plan is also 3-times the height and 150% as large as the voter-rejected CenterCal Mall-by-the-Sea.

I am also concerned that BCHD continues to spend from a \$16M taxpayer fund, preparing inconsistent, incompatible, and irresponsible plans on an elevated site in the center of residential, 30-foot or lower maximum height neighborhoods.

BCHDs 2017 design committed to protecting neighborhoods with buildings in the center and surface parking around the edges buffering homes from damages.

BCHDs 2019 design (June EIR) was 60-feet tall and ringed the site on the edge. The 2020 design (June Board) was 76-feet tall and also on the edge. The 2021 design (March EIR) was 103-feet tall and also on the edge. The current design is claimed to be 83-feet tall and also on the edge of the site and still meets NONE of the comments regarding excessive height and size from 100s of surrounding neighbors and 1000s of petitioners against the project.

The attachment specifically calls out BCHDs plan's noncompliance with specific sections of RBMC CUP and PCDR and on TMC Hillside Overlay.

I ask that the Mayors, Councils and Planning Commissioners provide guidance to their respective Staff and lawyers to convey the public's disapproval of the current plan that BCHD is pouring our tax funding into.

Thank you,

Tamiko & George Wakabayashi (Torrance Residence)

[REDACTED]

--

STOP BCHD (StopBCHD@gmail.com) is a neighborhood community of residents concerned about the economic and quality-of-life damages that BCHDs 110-foot above the street, 800,000 sqft commercial development will inflict on our families for the next 50-100 years. Our neighborhoods have been burdened since 1960 and the damages outweigh any benefits.

NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENTS

The following is provided regarding BCHDs proposed 3rd party DEVELOPER/OWNER/ OPERATOR development project that BCHD will be filing a formal Conditional Use Permit and Planning Commission Design Review application for during the first half of 2022.

These comments are filed to agencies as non-agenda comments of the public, in the interest of the public, and under Cal Gov Code 54954.3."regular meetings shall provide an opportunity for members of the public to directly address the legislative body on any item of interest to the public" there is an affirmative obligation to provide these comments to the Planning Commission, City Council or other "legislative" bodies upon receipt.

Summary Table of BCHD Project Non-Compliance with Municipal Codes		
PERMIT	CONDITION	BCHD PROJECT NON-COMPLIANCE
1. CUP	"will not adversely affect surrounding uses and properties"	As supported by over 1,200 petition signers and 100s, if not 1,000 surrounding resident comments to BCHD, surrounding residential uses are adversely impacted in reduced privacy, property value, aesthetics, noise, traffic and toxic emissions.
2. CUP	"for the proposed use ... shall be adequate in size and shape to accommodate such use"	Given the proposed project plan to locate buildings at the elevated site's perimeter, the elevated site is not adequate to accommodate the proposed use.
3. CUP	"no adverse effect on abutting property"	The properties on the 1400 Block of Diamond are subjected to the storage of explosive liquid fuels, a 2,000 kW combustion power plant, and a 16,000 to 4,000 V substation. These mechanical and explosion hazards adversely impact safety, safe air, local emissions, noise, and vibration.
4. PCDR	"ensure compatibility ... in the community"	Based on the City of Redondo Beach's finding that the design of The Kensington was consistent and compatible with the surrounding residential uses, the 110-foot above Beryl St., Miami Beach commercial styled facility cannot also be deemed compatible with similar, 30-foot and under residential uses in the community.
5. PCDR	"protect property values ... of neighborhoods"	Statistical modeling demonstrates that neighborhoods nearer to BCHD have reduced property values compared to neighborhoods further from BCHD. BCHD is proposing to increase height from 99% under 52-feet to 103-feet and to increase over building size from 312,000 sqft to nearly 800,000 sqft.
6. PCDR	"shall consider the impact ... of the user in respect to circulation, parking, traffic, etc."	BCHD proposed design will require the 8-10 story parking ramp at Prospect and Diamond to enter/exit on Prospect northbound. Further, the proposed height of the RCFE and location on the perimeter damages the privacy, aesthetics, excess nighttime lighting, noise impacts and other basic attributes of the surrounding uses and properties.
7. PCDR	"location of buildings and structures shall respect the natural terrain of the site"	The elevated site has from 30-feet to 70-feet elevation gain over surrounding residential uses. As a result, creation of a 110-foot rise over Beryl St., a 10-story parking ramp over Tomlee and Diamond Sts, and a 4-story, flat wall toward Prospect fails to respect the natural elevated terrain. The original 52-foot, 4 story building and its 0.3%, 968 sqft penthouse were nearly centered in the site, thereby respecting the natural terrain.
8. PCDR	"overall design shall be integrated and compatible with the neighborhood and shall strive to be in harmony with the scale and bulk of surrounding properties"	A 300,000 sqft, 110-foot above the street concrete and glass commercial building makes no attempt to integrate and be compatible with the neighborhood in scale or bulk. Further, unlike The Kensington and its Santa Barbara style, the Miami Beach condominium/hotel style proposed, when coupled with the excessive height and mass is thoroughly non-compatible with surrounding properties.

9. PCDR	“shall be consistent with the intent of residential design guidelines”	The residential design guidelines are intended to increase the quality of life of the neighborhood of the construction. It is very clear from the 1,200 petition signatories regarding the height and size of the project that it does not increase the quality of life. Further, there have been 100s, if not 1,000s of comments and concerns regarding the impacts of noise, emissions, traffic, glare, lighting, excess non-directed nighttime lighting, nighttime elevated signage and other factors that diminish quality of life.
10. RDG	“to improve the quality of life in residential neighborhoods ... [t]hese design guidelines are intended to help accomplish this objective”	The BCHD project reduces the quality of life in surrounding neighborhoods. The BCHD commercial Developer/Owner/Operator is targeting 90% non-Redondo Beach residents and 80% non-residents of the 3 beach cities (HB/RB/MB). The PACE facility is scaled for 400 participants with only 17 expected to be from the 3 beach cities according to National PACE Assoc. statistics. The BCHD project nearly triples the size of campus buildings from 312,000 sqft to 800,000 sqft and more than doubles the effective height from 99% less than 52-feet to 109.7-ft. The quality of life of surrounding neighborhoods will be reduced by the commercial, non-resident services as all damages will accrue to the neighborhoods.
11. THO	“The development has been located, planned and designed so as to cause the least intrusion on the views, light, air and privacy of other properties in the vicinity”	The adjoining Torrance neighborhoods are in the Hillside Overlay. The BCHD would not be allowed in overlay, and the City of Torrance has an obligation to protect its residents. The BCHD project is located to maximize damages to views, light, air and privacy based on height, size and perimeter location.
12. THO	“the design will not have a harmful impact upon the land value and investment of other properties in the vicinity”	Statistical analysis demonstrates that surrounding property values are lower, the closer the properties are to the BCHD site. Peer-reviewed research demonstrates that larger, taller developments, such as BCHDs proposal, will have equal or larger negative impacts on property values.
RBMC 10-2.2506 Conditional Use Permits (CUP) RBMC 10-2.2502 Planning Commission Design Review (PCDR) Redondo Beach Residential Design Guidelines (RDG) Redondo Beach Beryl Heights Neighborhood Specific Guidelines (BH RDG) TMC 91.41.6 Planning and Design (Torrance Hillside Overlay, THO)		

From: [Tom McGarry](#)
To: [CityClerk](#); CityClerk@torranceca.gov; stopbchd@gmail.com
Subject: Public Comment
Date: Sunday, May 15, 2022 12:23:55 PM

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

Honorable Mayor, Councilpersons, and Planning Commissioners of Redondo Beach and Torrance:

These are non-agenda item comments to the legislative bodies above for their next general meeting as permitted by the Brown Act.

I am concerned about Beach Cities Health District's proposed Phase 1 development plan that will be commercially DEVELOPED/OWNED/OPERATED. Phase 1 is proposed to be 110-feet above the surrounding streets and 300,000 sqft in size. Phase 2 will bring the total BCHD site up to nearly 800,000 sqft, which is 250% its current size. That is larger than the entire adjacent Beryl Heights neighborhood's homes' sizes all added together. BCHDs proposed plan is also 3-times the height and 150% as large as the voter-rejected CenterCal Mall-by-the-Sea.

I am also concerned that BCHD continues to spend from a \$16M taxpayer fund, preparing inconsistent, incompatible, and irresponsible plans on an elevated site in the center of residential, 30-foot or lower maximum height neighborhoods.

BCHDs 2017 design committed to protecting neighborhoods with buildings in the center and surface parking around the edges buffering homes from damages.

BCHDs 2019 design (June EIR) was 60-feet tall and ringed the site on the edge. The 2020 design (June Board) was 76-feet tall and also on the edge. The 2021 design (March EIR) was 103-feet tall and also on the edge. The current design is claimed to be 83-feet tall and also on the edge of the site and still meets NONE of the comments regarding excessive height and size from 100s of surrounding neighbors and 1000s of petitioners against the project.

The attachment specifically calls out BCHDs plan's noncompliance with specific sections of RBMC CUP and PCDR and on TMC Hillside Overlay.

I ask that the Mayors, Councils and Planning Commissioners provide guidance to their respective Staff and lawyers to convey the public's disapproval of the current plan that BCHD is pouring our tax funding into. Thank you.

Tom & Carol McGarry
Redondo Beach

--

STOP BCHD (StopBCHD@gmail.com) is a neighborhood community of residents concerned about the economic and quality-of-life damages that BCHDs 110-foot above the street, 800,000 sqft commercial development will inflict on our families for the next 50-100 years. Our neighborhoods have been burdened since 1960 and the damages outweigh any benefits.

- [BCHD NonCompliance May 2022 Comments.pdf](#)
[207kB](#)

From: [Joan Davidson](#)
To: [CityClerk](#); cityclerk@torranceca.gov; [Stop BCHD](#)
Subject: RE: BCHD
Date: Saturday, May 14, 2022 3:55:42 PM

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

Honorable Mayor, Councilpersons, and Planning Commissioners of Redondo Beach and Torrance:

These are non-agenda item comments to the elected bodies above for the next meeting

The Beach Cities Health District's proposed Phase 1 development plan that will be over DEVELOPED/OWNED/OPERATED in a densely populated neighborhood with schools within 1,000 ft.

1- Designed to be 110-feet above all surrounding streets and 300,000 sqft in size.

2- And will bring the total BCHD site up to nearly 800,000 sq ft at 250% its' current size.

3- What that means is that it is bigger than all the Beryl Heights homes added together.

4- The plan is also 3-times the height and 150% as large as the voter-rejected Center Cal Project.

5- While the BCHD continues to spend millions from the taxpayer fund, one might construe this as a 'misuse of public funds.

6- BCHD is creating inconsistent, incompatible, and irresponsible plans on an elevated site in the center of residential, 30-foot or lower maximum height neighborhoods.

7- How will the neighborhoods benefit with buildings in the center and surface parking around the edges buffering homes from damages?

8- BCHDs 2019 design (June EIR) was 60-feet tall and ringed the site on the edge. The 2020 design (June Board) was 76-feet tall and also on the edge. The 2021 design (March EIR) was 103-feet tall and also on the edge.

9- Current design is 83-feet tall and meets NONE of the comments regarding excessive height and size from 100s of surrounding neighbors and 1000s of petitioners against the project. The BCHD is out of noncompliance with specific sections of RBMC CUP and PCDR and on TMC Hillside Overlay.

We ask that the Mayors, Councils and Planning Commissioners provide directives to their cities' Staff and lawyers to communicate the public's outcry of the current plan.

10- Please STOP BCHD from pouring our tax funding into this flawed project.

Damages outweigh any benefits!

Maria Herrera

From: Melissa Villa
Sent: Tuesday, May 17, 2022 8:23 AM
To: Lina Portolese
Cc: Maria Herrera
Subject: FW: Commenting against BCHD bldg permits

2 of 3.....

Melissa Villa
Ext. 2202

From: Krista Allen <kristakallen@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 17, 2022 7:17 AM
To: CityClerk <CityClerk@redondo.org>
Subject: Commenting against BCHD bldg permits

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

To: The City Clerk of Redondo Beach

Please forward this letter to the addressees below.

Dear Honorable Mayor, Councilpersons, and Planning Commissioners of Redondo Beach

I am opposed to the plans of BCHD to build a six-story residential building on the site of the former South Bay Hospital.

It is outside the mandate for Beach Cities Hospital District to partner with a private developer for a \$200 million construction project on the site. District taxpayers are better served by dissolving BCHD and allowing Los Angeles County to administer benefits and help the homeless.

I am astonished that BCHD continues to spend millions of tax dollars on lawyers and public relations while preparing inconsistent, incompatible, and irresponsible building plans.

Since 2012, BCHD has had a problem with handling tax funds. In fact, Sacramento's Committee on Accountability and Administrative Review had six important issues about BCHD from a report dated April 11, 2012.

Number six asks why BCHD had \$72 million on hand at that time. My question is "Where did that \$72 million bank account disappear to?"

These financial issues illustrate BCHD's lack of transparency and honesty. Furthermore, BCHD pretends to care about our neighborhoods yet shows a complete disregard for the residents and voters of Redondo Beach by plowing forward as quickly as they can to get their behemoth HLC built.

I ask that the Mayors, Councils and Planning Commissioners provide guidance to their respective Staff and lawyers to convey the public's disapproval of the current plan that BCHD is pouring our tax funding into.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Krista Allen
607 Esplanade 90277

Maria Herrera

From: Melissa Villa
Sent: Tuesday, May 17, 2022 8:24 AM
To: Lina Portolese
Cc: Maria Herrera
Subject: FW: NO on permit for bchd

3 of 3....

Thank you,

Melissa Villa
Ext. 2202

From: ree <mresi@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 17, 2022 7:33 AM
To: CityClerk <CityClerk@redondo.org>
Subject: NO on permit for bchd

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

To: The City Clerk of Redondo Beach

Kindly forward this letter

Dear Honorable Mayor, Councilpersons, and Planning Commissioners of Redondo Beach

I am opposed to the plans of BCHD to build a six-story residential building on the site of the former South Bay Hospital.

It is outside the mandate for Beach Cities Hospital District to partner with a private developer for a \$200 million construction project on the site. District taxpayers are better served by dissolving BCHD and allowing Los Angeles County to administer benefits and help the homeless.

I am astonished that BCHD continues to spend millions of tax dollars on lawyers and public relations while preparing inconsistent, incompatible, and irresponsible building plans.

Since 2012, BCHD has had a problem with handling tax funds. In fact, Sacramento's Committee on Accountability and Administrative Review had six important issues about BCHD from a report dated April 11, 2012.

Number six asks why BCHD had \$72 million on hand at that time. My question is "Where did that \$72 million bank account disappear to?"

These financial issues illustrate BCHD's lack of transparency and honesty. Furthermore, BCHD pretends to care about our neighborhoods yet shows a complete disregard for the residents and voters of Redondo Beach by plowing forward as quickly as they can to get their behemoth HLC built.

I ask that the Mayors, Councils and Planning Commissioners provide guidance to their respective Staff and lawyers to convey the public's disapproval of the current plan that BCHD is pouring our tax funding into.

Thank you.
Maher Sesi, MD
Redondo Beach Resident

Maria Herrera

From: Melissa Villa
Sent: Tuesday, May 17, 2022 10:39 AM
To: Lina Portolese
Cc: Maria Herrera
Subject: FW: Proposed PRIVATE enterprise of BCHD, "Healthy Living Campus"

Here is another....

Thank you,

Melissa Villa
Ext. 2202

From: Mary Ewell <maryewell@verizon.net>
Sent: Tuesday, May 17, 2022 10:11 AM
To: CityClerk <CityClerk@redondo.org>; CityClerk@torranceca.gov; stopbchd@gmail.com
Subject: Proposed PRIVATE enterprise of BCHD, "Healthy Living Campus"

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

I have attended BCHD meetings re: this proposal even BEFORE their summer "scoping meetings" to which residents of the Beach Cities were invited; no notice was given,(until enough public outcry) to the Torrance residents who would be the most impacted. These were contrived meetings with heavy-handed promotion of their project. I spoke at the one at the Redondo Beach Performing Arts Center citing the impact that their OVERDEVELOPMENT ambitions would have on the surrounding communities, in particular, the 5 neighboring schools that are the most impacted, 2 of them elementary schools, Beryl in Redondo Beach, and Towers Elementary School in Torrance, downwind of the site. Parras Middle School and both West and Redondo Union High School students, also, have to navigate the commuter traffic on Prospect to get to/from school so this "Healthy" living campus only adds to their vulnerability. As a former teacher and Marriage, Family and Child therapist, I advocated for the youth impacted first.

There was never an adequate needs assessment done to justify this private takeover of this P-CF public land, only a statistical market analysis based on the increased number of seniors living longer than their predecessors. AARP (American Assoc. of Retired People)'s statistics of the OVERWHELMING number of seniors choosing to "age in place" did not deter BCHD's claims. Their stated target market are those who can afford the \$12-14, 000. monthly cost for an assisted living unit, WHETHER THOSE SENIORS LIVE IN THE BEACH CITIES OR NOT. THE MEDIAN INCOME FOR THE BEACH CITIES is \$65,000. That means that reputably the majority will be nonresidents of the Beach Cities, in fact, a largely white privileged class. Yet tax payers in the Beach Cities are already subsidizing the BCHD through their property taxes.

Granting even a conditional use permit to a FOR PROFIT entity, is not a fair exchange. This use of P-CF land, reserved for public community usage (a school, hospital, or police/fire services), once justified for the 50 year LEASING of the school property where the Kensington Senior facility for the purpose of that revenue going directly to the R.B. School District, had some merit. You can now review that decision based on how much it has cost the City in infrastructure costs. The surrounding neighborhoods have also paid the cost through traffic noise, I understand, more than traffic congestion that the BCHD would impose, along with other social injustices to surrounding neighborhoods.

Mary R. Ewell,
Redondo resident

From: [Melissa Villa](#)
To: [Lina Portolese](#)
Cc: [Maria Herrera](#)
Subject: FW: Public Comment - Forward to Mayors, Councils, Planning Commissions
Date: Wednesday, May 18, 2022 8:50:17 AM
Attachments: [BCHD NonCompliance May 2022 Comments.pdf](#)

Good morning Lina,

Here is another email, for you.

Thank you,

Melissa Villa
Ext. 2202

From: Gary T <mr-rocky@socal.rr.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 17, 2022 11:41 PM
To: CityClerk <CityClerk@redondo.org>; CityClerk@torranceca.gov
Cc: stopbchd@gmail.com
Subject: Fwd: Public Comment - Forward to Mayors, Councils, Planning Commissions

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

Honorable Mayor, Councilpersons, and Planning Commissioners of Redondo Beach and Torrance:

I just wanted to pass on my concerns about the Beach Cites Health District Phase 1 Development. I live directly east of the proposed development on Redbeam Avenue between Towers and Del Amo.

In addition to the concerns that Stop BCHD has compiled (see below) I also want to recommend that you drive though the neighborhood just east of the development (streets: Tom Lee, Mildred, Redbeam, Linda) and observe how many signs (objecting to the BCHD development) are posted in the neighbors front yards. It looks like "stop BCHD" is running for public office. It will give you a true feeling as to how many residents are objecting to the proposed development.

Wasn't this property taken by eminent domain for the purpose of being a hospital? Why is there not a hospital being built on this property? Right now there is a UCLA urgent care that is available to surrounding residents. I have used this medical facility twice. It is very well equipped and an effective Urgent Care.

Thank your for attention and consideration of the concerns of the local residents,
Gary

Begin forwarded message:

From: Stop BCHD <stop.bchd@gmail.com>

Subject: Public Comment - Forward to Mayors, Councils, Planning Commissions

Date: May 14, 2022 at 2:05:00 PM PDT

To: Stop BCHD <StopBCHD@gmail.com>

FORWARD this (including attachment) to: CityClerk@redondo.org,
CityClerk@torranceca.gov, stopbchd@gmail.com

Honorable Mayor, Councilpersons, and Planning Commissioners of Redondo Beach and Torrance:

These are non-agenda item comments to the legislative bodies above for their next general meeting as permitted by the Brown Act.

I am concerned about Beach Cities Health District's proposed Phase 1 development plan that will be commercially DEVELOPED/OWNED/OPERATED. Phase 1 is proposed to be 110-feet above the surrounding streets and 300,000 sqft in size. Phase 2 will bring the total BCHD site up to nearly 800,000 sqft, which is 250% its current size. That is larger than the entire adjacent Beryl Heights neighborhood's homes' sizes all added together. BCHDs proposed plan is also 3-times the height and 150% as large as the voter-rejected CenterCal Mall-by-the-Sea.

I am also concerned that BCHD continues to spend from a \$16M taxpayer fund, preparing inconsistent, incompatible, and irresponsible plans on an elevated site in the center of residential, 30-foot or lower maximum height neighborhoods.

BCHDs 2017 design committed to protecting neighborhoods with buildings in the center and surface parking around the edges buffering homes from damages.

BCHDs 2019 design (June EIR) was 60-feet tall and ringed the site on the edge. The 2020 design (June Board) was 76-feet tall and also on the edge. The 2021 design (March EIR) was 103-feet tall and also on the edge. The current design is claimed to be 83-feet tall and also on the edge of the site and still meets NONE of the comments regarding excessive height and size from 100s of surrounding neighbors and 1000s of petitioners against the project.

The attachment specifically calls out BCHDs plan's noncompliance with specific sections of RBMC CUP and PCDR and on TMC Hillside Overlay.

I ask that the Mayors, Councils and Planning Commissioners provide guidance to their respective Staff and lawyers to convey the public's disapproval of the current plan that BCHD is pouring our tax funding into. Thank you.

--

STOP BCHD (StopBCHD@gmail.com) is a neighborhood community of residents concerned about the economic and quality-of-life damages that BCHDs 110-foot above the street, 800,000 sqft commercial development will inflict on our families for the next 50-100 years. Our neighborhoods have been burdened since 1960 and the damages outweigh any benefits.

NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENTS

The following is provided regarding BCHDs proposed 3rd party DEVELOPER/OWNER/ OPERATOR development project that BCHD will be filing a formal Conditional Use Permit and Planning Commission Design Review application for during the first half of 2022.

These comments are filed to agencies as non-agenda comments of the public, in the interest of the public, and under Cal Gov Code 54954.3."regular meetings shall provide an opportunity for members of the public to directly address the legislative body on any item of interest to the public" there is an affirmative obligation to provide these comments to the Planning Commission, City Council or other "legislative" bodies upon receipt.

Summary Table of BCHD Project Non-Compliance with Municipal Codes		
PERMIT	CONDITION	BCHD PROJECT NON-COMPLIANCE
1. CUP	"will not adversely affect surrounding uses and properties"	As supported by over 1,200 petition signers and 100s, if not 1,000 surrounding resident comments to BCHD, surrounding residential uses are adversely impacted in reduced privacy, property value, aesthetics, noise, traffic and toxic emissions.
2. CUP	"for the proposed use ... shall be adequate in size and shape to accommodate such use"	Given the proposed project plan to locate buildings at the elevated site's perimeter, the elevated site is not adequate to accommodate the proposed use.
3. CUP	"no adverse effect on abutting property"	The properties on the 1400 Block of Diamond are subjected to the storage of explosive liquid fuels, a 2,000 kW combustion power plant, and a 16,000 to 4,000 V substation. These mechanical and explosion hazards adversely impact safety, safe air, local emissions, noise, and vibration.
4. PCDR	"ensure compatibility ... in the community"	Based on the City of Redondo Beach's finding that the design of The Kensington was consistent and compatible with the surrounding residential uses, the 110-foot above Beryl St., Miami Beach commercial styled facility cannot also be deemed compatible with similar, 30-foot and under residential uses in the community.
5. PCDR	"protect property values ... of neighborhoods"	Statistical modeling demonstrates that neighborhoods nearer to BCHD have reduced property values compared to neighborhoods further from BCHD. BCHD is proposing to increase height from 99% under 52-feet to 103-feet and to increase over building size from 312,000 sqft to nearly 800,000 sqft.
6. PCDR	"shall consider the impact ... of the user in respect to circulation, parking, traffic, etc."	BCHD proposed design will require the 8-10 story parking ramp at Prospect and Diamond to enter/exit on Prospect northbound. Further, the proposed height of the RCFE and location on the perimeter damages the privacy, aesthetics, excess nighttime lighting, noise impacts and other basic attributes of the surrounding uses and properties.
7. PCDR	"location of buildings and structures shall respect the natural terrain of the site"	The elevated site has from 30-feet to 70-feet elevation gain over surrounding residential uses. As a result, creation of a 110-foot rise over Beryl St., a 10-story parking ramp over Tomlee and Diamond Sts, and a 4-story, flat wall toward Prospect fails to respect the natural elevated terrain. The original 52-foot, 4 story building and its 0.3%, 968 sqft penthouse were nearly centered in the site, thereby respecting the natural terrain.
8. PCDR	"overall design shall be integrated and compatible with the neighborhood and shall strive to be in harmony with the scale and bulk of surrounding properties"	A 300,000 sqft, 110-foot above the street concrete and glass commercial building makes no attempt to integrate and be compatible with the neighborhood in scale or bulk. Further, unlike The Kensington and its Santa Barbara style, the Miami Beach condominium/hotel style proposed, when coupled with the excessive height and mass is thoroughly non-compatible with surrounding properties.

9. PCDR	“shall be consistent with the intent of residential design guidelines”	The residential design guidelines are intended to increase the quality of life of the neighborhood of the construction. It is very clear from the 1,200 petition signatories regarding the height and size of the project that it does not increase the quality of life. Further, there have been 100s, if not 1,000s of comments and concerns regarding the impacts of noise, emissions, traffic, glare, lighting, excess non-directed nighttime lighting, nighttime elevated signage and other factors that diminish quality of life.
10. RDG	“to improve the quality of life in residential neighborhoods ... [t]hese design guidelines are intended to help accomplish this objective”	The BCHD project reduces the quality of life in surrounding neighborhoods. The BCHD commercial Developer/Owner/Operator is targeting 90% non-Redondo Beach residents and 80% non-residents of the 3 beach cities (HB/RB/MB). The PACE facility is scaled for 400 participants with only 17 expected to be from the 3 beach cities according to National PACE Assoc. statistics. The BCHD project nearly triples the size of campus buildings from 312,000 sqft to 800,000 sqft and more than doubles the effective height from 99% less than 52-feet to 109.7-ft. The quality of life of surrounding neighborhoods will be reduced by the commercial, non-resident services as all damages will accrue to the neighborhoods.
11. THO	“The development has been located, planned and designed so as to cause the least intrusion on the views, light, air and privacy of other properties in the vicinity”	The adjoining Torrance neighborhoods are in the Hillside Overlay. The BCHD would not be allowed in overlay, and the City of Torrance has an obligation to protect its residents. The BCHD project is located to maximize damages to views, light, air and privacy based on height, size and perimeter location.
12. THO	“the design will not have a harmful impact upon the land value and investment of other properties in the vicinity”	Statistical analysis demonstrates that surrounding property values are lower, the closer the properties are to the BCHD site. Peer-reviewed research demonstrates that larger, taller developments, such as BCHDs proposal, will have equal or larger negative impacts on property values.
RBMC 10-2.2506 Conditional Use Permits (CUP) RBMC 10-2.2502 Planning Commission Design Review (PCDR) Redondo Beach Residential Design Guidelines (RDG) Redondo Beach Beryl Heights Neighborhood Specific Guidelines (BH RDG) TMC 91.41.6 Planning and Design (Torrance Hillside Overlay, THO)		

From: [Glen and Nancy Yokoe](#)
To: [CityClerk](#); cityclerk@torranceca.gov; stopbchd@gmail.com
Subject: Fw: Public Comment - Forward to Mayors, Councils, Planning Commissions
Date: Monday, May 16, 2022 3:29:26 PM
Attachments: [BCHD NonCompliance May 2022 Comments.pdf](#)

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

Honorable Mayor, Councilpersons, and Planning Commissioners of Redondo Beach and Torrance:

These are non-agenda item comments to the legislative bodies above for their next general meeting as permitted by the Brown Act.

I am concerned about Beach Cities Health District's proposed Phase 1 development plan that will be commercially DEVELOPED/OWNED/OPERATED. Phase 1 is proposed to be 110-feet above the surrounding streets and 300,000 sqft in size. Phase 2 will bring the total BCHD site up to nearly 800,000 sqft, which is 250% its current size. That is larger than the entire adjacent Beryl Heights neighborhood's homes' sizes all added together. BCHDs proposed plan is also 3-times the height and 150% as large as the voter-rejected CenterCal Mall-by-the-Sea.

I am also concerned that BCHD continues to spend from a \$16M taxpayer fund, preparing inconsistent, incompatible, and irresponsible plans on an elevated site in the center of residential, 30-foot or lower maximum height neighborhoods.

BCHDs 2017 design committed to protecting neighborhoods with buildings in the center and surface parking around the edges buffering homes from damages.

BCHDs 2019 design (June EIR) was 60-feet tall and ringed the site on the edge. The 2020 design (June Board) was 76-feet tall and also on the edge. The 2021 design (March EIR) was 103-feet tall and also on the edge. The current design is claimed to be 83-feet tall and also on the edge of the site and still meets NONE of the comments regarding excessive height and size from 100s of surrounding neighbors and 1000s of petitioners against the project.

The attachment specifically calls out BCHDs plan's noncompliance with specific sections of RBMC CUP and PCDR and on TMC Hillside Overlay.

I ask that the Mayors, Councils and Planning Commissioners provide guidance to their respective Staff and lawyers to convey the public's disapproval of the current plan that BCHD is pouring our tax funding into. Thank you.

Glen H. and Nancy N. Yokoe


--

STOP BCHD (StopBCHD@gmail.com) is a neighborhood community of residents concerned about the economic and quality-of-life damages that BCHDs 110-foot above the street, 800,000 sqft commercial development will inflict on our families for the next 50-100 years.

Our neighborhoods have been burdened since 1960 and the damages outweigh any benefits.

NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENTS

The following is provided regarding BCHDs proposed 3rd party DEVELOPER/OWNER/ OPERATOR development project that BCHD will be filing a formal Conditional Use Permit and Planning Commission Design Review application for during the first half of 2022.

These comments are filed to agencies as non-agenda comments of the public, in the interest of the public, and under Cal Gov Code 54954.3."regular meetings shall provide an opportunity for members of the public to directly address the legislative body on any item of interest to the public" there is an affirmative obligation to provide these comments to the Planning Commission, City Council or other "legislative" bodies upon receipt.

Summary Table of BCHD Project Non-Compliance with Municipal Codes		
PERMIT	CONDITION	BCHD PROJECT NON-COMPLIANCE
1. CUP	"will not adversely affect surrounding uses and properties"	As supported by over 1,200 petition signers and 100s, if not 1,000 surrounding resident comments to BCHD, surrounding residential uses are adversely impacted in reduced privacy, property value, aesthetics, noise, traffic and toxic emissions.
2. CUP	"for the proposed use ... shall be adequate in size and shape to accommodate such use"	Given the proposed project plan to locate buildings at the elevated site's perimeter, the elevated site is not adequate to accommodate the proposed use.
3. CUP	"no adverse effect on abutting property"	The properties on the 1400 Block of Diamond are subjected to the storage of explosive liquid fuels, a 2,000 kW combustion power plant, and a 16,000 to 4,000 V substation. These mechanical and explosion hazards adversely impact safety, safe air, local emissions, noise, and vibration.
4. PCDR	"ensure compatibility ... in the community"	Based on the City of Redondo Beach's finding that the design of The Kensington was consistent and compatible with the surrounding residential uses, the 110-foot above Beryl St., Miami Beach commercial styled facility cannot also be deemed compatible with similar, 30-foot and under residential uses in the community.
5. PCDR	"protect property values ... of neighborhoods"	Statistical modeling demonstrates that neighborhoods nearer to BCHD have reduced property values compared to neighborhoods further from BCHD. BCHD is proposing to increase height from 99% under 52-feet to 103-feet and to increase over building size from 312,000 sqft to nearly 800,000 sqft.
6. PCDR	"shall consider the impact ... of the user in respect to circulation, parking, traffic, etc."	BCHD proposed design will require the 8-10 story parking ramp at Prospect and Diamond to enter/exit on Prospect northbound. Further, the proposed height of the RCFE and location on the perimeter damages the privacy, aesthetics, excess nighttime lighting, noise impacts and other basic attributes of the surrounding uses and properties.
7. PCDR	"location of buildings and structures shall respect the natural terrain of the site"	The elevated site has from 30-feet to 70-feet elevation gain over surrounding residential uses. As a result, creation of a 110-foot rise over Beryl St., a 10-story parking ramp over Tomlee and Diamond Sts, and a 4-story, flat wall toward Prospect fails to respect the natural elevated terrain. The original 52-foot, 4 story building and its 0.3%, 968 sqft penthouse were nearly centered in the site, thereby respecting the natural terrain.
8. PCDR	"overall design shall be integrated and compatible with the neighborhood and shall strive to be in harmony with the scale and bulk of surrounding properties"	A 300,000 sqft, 110-foot above the street concrete and glass commercial building makes no attempt to integrate and be compatible with the neighborhood in scale or bulk. Further, unlike The Kensington and its Santa Barbara style, the Miami Beach condominium/hotel style proposed, when coupled with the excessive height and mass is thoroughly non-compatible with surrounding properties.

9. PCDR	“shall be consistent with the intent of residential design guidelines”	The residential design guidelines are intended to increase the quality of life of the neighborhood of the construction. It is very clear from the 1,200 petition signatories regarding the height and size of the project that it does not increase the quality of life. Further, there have been 100s, if not 1,000s of comments and concerns regarding the impacts of noise, emissions, traffic, glare, lighting, excess non-directed nighttime lighting, nighttime elevated signage and other factors that diminish quality of life.
10. RDG	“to improve the quality of life in residential neighborhoods ... [t]hese design guidelines are intended to help accomplish this objective”	The BCHD project reduces the quality of life in surrounding neighborhoods. The BCHD commercial Developer/Owner/Operator is targeting 90% non-Redondo Beach residents and 80% non-residents of the 3 beach cities (HB/RB/MB). The PACE facility is scaled for 400 participants with only 17 expected to be from the 3 beach cities according to National PACE Assoc. statistics. The BCHD project nearly triples the size of campus buildings from 312,000 sqft to 800,000 sqft and more than doubles the effective height from 99% less than 52-feet to 109.7-ft. The quality of life of surrounding neighborhoods will be reduced by the commercial, non-resident services as all damages will accrue to the neighborhoods.
11. THO	“The development has been located, planned and designed so as to cause the least intrusion on the views, light, air and privacy of other properties in the vicinity”	The adjoining Torrance neighborhoods are in the Hillside Overlay. The BCHD would not be allowed in overlay, and the City of Torrance has an obligation to protect its residents. The BCHD project is located to maximize damages to views, light, air and privacy based on height, size and perimeter location.
12. THO	“the design will not have a harmful impact upon the land value and investment of other properties in the vicinity”	Statistical analysis demonstrates that surrounding property values are lower, the closer the properties are to the BCHD site. Peer-reviewed research demonstrates that larger, taller developments, such as BCHDs proposal, will have equal or larger negative impacts on property values.
RBMC 10-2.2506 Conditional Use Permits (CUP) RBMC 10-2.2502 Planning Commission Design Review (PCDR) Redondo Beach Residential Design Guidelines (RDG) Redondo Beach Beryl Heights Neighborhood Specific Guidelines (BH RDG) TMC 91.41.6 Planning and Design (Torrance Hillside Overlay, THO)		

From: tammytammysugar
To: [CityClerk; cityclerk@torranceca.gov](mailto:cityclerk@torranceca.gov); stopbchd@gmail.com
Subject: Public Comment to Mayors, Councils, Planning Commissions
Date: Saturday, May 14, 2022 7:09:21 PM
Attachments: [BCHD NonCompliance May 2022 Comments.pdf](#)

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

Honorable Mayor, Councilpersons, and Planning Commissioners of Redondo Beach and Torrance:

These are non-agenda item comments to the legislative bodies above for their next general meeting as permitted by the Brown Act.

I am concerned about Beach Cities Health District's proposed Phase 1 development plan that will be commercially DEVELOPED/OWNED/OPERATED. Phase 1 is proposed to be 110-feet above the surrounding streets and 300,000 sqft in size. Phase 2 will bring the total BCHD site up to nearly 800,000 sqft, which is 250% its current size. That is larger than the entire adjacent Beryl Heights neighborhood's homes' sizes all added together. BCHDs proposed plan is also 3-times the height and 150% as large as the voter-rejected CenterCal Mall-by-the-Sea.

I am also concerned that BCHD continues to spend from a \$16M taxpayer fund, preparing inconsistent, incompatible, and irresponsible plans on an elevated site in the center of residential, 30-foot or lower maximum height neighborhoods.

BCHDs 2017 design committed to protecting neighborhoods with buildings in the center and surface parking around the edges buffering homes from damages.

BCHDs 2019 design (June EIR) was 60-feet tall and ringed the site on the edge. The 2020 design (June Board) was 76-feet tall and also on the edge. The 2021 design (March EIR) was 103-feet tall and also on the edge. The current design is claimed to be 83-feet tall and also on the edge of the site and still meets NONE of the comments regarding excessive height and size from 100s of surrounding neighbors and 1000s of petitioners against the project.

The attachment specifically calls out BCHDs plan's noncompliance with specific sections of RBMC CUP and PCDR and on TMC Hillside Overlay.

I ask that the Mayors, Councils and Planning Commissioners provide guidance to their respective Staff and lawyers to convey the public's disapproval of the current plan that BCHD is pouring our tax funding into.

Thank you,

Tamiko & George Wakabayashi (Torrance Residence)

[REDACTED]

--

STOP BCHD (StopBCHD@gmail.com) is a neighborhood community of residents concerned about the economic and quality-of-life damages that BCHDs 110-foot above the street, 800,000 sqft commercial development will inflict on our families for the next 50-100 years. Our neighborhoods have been burdened since 1960 and the damages outweigh any benefits.

NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENTS

The following is provided regarding BCHDs proposed 3rd party DEVELOPER/OWNER/ OPERATOR development project that BCHD will be filing a formal Conditional Use Permit and Planning Commission Design Review application for during the first half of 2022.

These comments are filed to agencies as non-agenda comments of the public, in the interest of the public, and under Cal Gov Code 54954.3."regular meetings shall provide an opportunity for members of the public to directly address the legislative body on any item of interest to the public" there is an affirmative obligation to provide these comments to the Planning Commission, City Council or other "legislative" bodies upon receipt.

Summary Table of BCHD Project Non-Compliance with Municipal Codes		
PERMIT	CONDITION	BCHD PROJECT NON-COMPLIANCE
1. CUP	"will not adversely affect surrounding uses and properties"	As supported by over 1,200 petition signers and 100s, if not 1,000 surrounding resident comments to BCHD, surrounding residential uses are adversely impacted in reduced privacy, property value, aesthetics, noise, traffic and toxic emissions.
2. CUP	"for the proposed use ... shall be adequate in size and shape to accommodate such use"	Given the proposed project plan to locate buildings at the elevated site's perimeter, the elevated site is not adequate to accommodate the proposed use.
3. CUP	"no adverse effect on abutting property"	The properties on the 1400 Block of Diamond are subjected to the storage of explosive liquid fuels, a 2,000 kW combustion power plant, and a 16,000 to 4,000 V substation. These mechanical and explosion hazards adversely impact safety, safe air, local emissions, noise, and vibration.
4. PCDR	"ensure compatibility ... in the community"	Based on the City of Redondo Beach's finding that the design of The Kensington was consistent and compatible with the surrounding residential uses, the 110-foot above Beryl St., Miami Beach commercial styled facility cannot also be deemed compatible with similar, 30-foot and under residential uses in the community.
5. PCDR	"protect property values ... of neighborhoods"	Statistical modeling demonstrates that neighborhoods nearer to BCHD have reduced property values compared to neighborhoods further from BCHD. BCHD is proposing to increase height from 99% under 52-feet to 103-feet and to increase over building size from 312,000 sqft to nearly 800,000 sqft.
6. PCDR	"shall consider the impact ... of the user in respect to circulation, parking, traffic, etc."	BCHD proposed design will require the 8-10 story parking ramp at Prospect and Diamond to enter/exit on Prospect northbound. Further, the proposed height of the RCFE and location on the perimeter damages the privacy, aesthetics, excess nighttime lighting, noise impacts and other basic attributes of the surrounding uses and properties.
7. PCDR	"location of buildings and structures shall respect the natural terrain of the site"	The elevated site has from 30-feet to 70-feet elevation gain over surrounding residential uses. As a result, creation of a 110-foot rise over Beryl St., a 10-story parking ramp over Tomlee and Diamond Sts, and a 4-story, flat wall toward Prospect fails to respect the natural elevated terrain. The original 52-foot, 4 story building and its 0.3%, 968 sqft penthouse were nearly centered in the site, thereby respecting the natural terrain.
8. PCDR	"overall design shall be integrated and compatible with the neighborhood and shall strive to be in harmony with the scale and bulk of surrounding properties"	A 300,000 sqft, 110-foot above the street concrete and glass commercial building makes no attempt to integrate and be compatible with the neighborhood in scale or bulk. Further, unlike The Kensington and its Santa Barbara style, the Miami Beach condominium/hotel style proposed, when coupled with the excessive height and mass is thoroughly non-compatible with surrounding properties.

9. PCDR	“shall be consistent with the intent of residential design guidelines”	The residential design guidelines are intended to increase the quality of life of the neighborhood of the construction. It is very clear from the 1,200 petition signatories regarding the height and size of the project that it does not increase the quality of life. Further, there have been 100s, if not 1,000s of comments and concerns regarding the impacts of noise, emissions, traffic, glare, lighting, excess non-directed nighttime lighting, nighttime elevated signage and other factors that diminish quality of life.
10. RDG	“to improve the quality of life in residential neighborhoods ... [t]hese design guidelines are intended to help accomplish this objective”	The BCHD project reduces the quality of life in surrounding neighborhoods. The BCHD commercial Developer/Owner/Operator is targeting 90% non-Redondo Beach residents and 80% non-residents of the 3 beach cities (HB/RB/MB). The PACE facility is scaled for 400 participants with only 17 expected to be from the 3 beach cities according to National PACE Assoc. statistics. The BCHD project nearly triples the size of campus buildings from 312,000 sqft to 800,000 sqft and more than doubles the effective height from 99% less than 52-feet to 109.7-ft. The quality of life of surrounding neighborhoods will be reduced by the commercial, non-resident services as all damages will accrue to the neighborhoods.
11. THO	“The development has been located, planned and designed so as to cause the least intrusion on the views, light, air and privacy of other properties in the vicinity”	The adjoining Torrance neighborhoods are in the Hillside Overlay. The BCHD would not be allowed in overlay, and the City of Torrance has an obligation to protect its residents. The BCHD project is located to maximize damages to views, light, air and privacy based on height, size and perimeter location.
12. THO	“the design will not have a harmful impact upon the land value and investment of other properties in the vicinity”	Statistical analysis demonstrates that surrounding property values are lower, the closer the properties are to the BCHD site. Peer-reviewed research demonstrates that larger, taller developments, such as BCHDs proposal, will have equal or larger negative impacts on property values.
RBMC 10-2.2506 Conditional Use Permits (CUP) RBMC 10-2.2502 Planning Commission Design Review (PCDR) Redondo Beach Residential Design Guidelines (RDG) Redondo Beach Beryl Heights Neighborhood Specific Guidelines (BH RDG) TMC 91.41.6 Planning and Design (Torrance Hillside Overlay, THO)		

From: [Vickie Kroneberger](#)
To: [Lina Portolese](#); [Maria Herrera](#)
Subject: FW: Beach Cities Proposed Development
Date: Thursday, May 19, 2022 8:13:00 AM
Attachments: [BCHD NonCompliance May 2022 Comments \(1\).pdf](#)

From: Marcia Gehrt <marciagehrt@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 18, 2022 10:24 PM
To: CityClerk <CityClerk@redondo.org>; CityClerk@torranceca.gov
Subject: Beach Cities Proposed Development

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

Honorable Mayor, Councilpersons, and Planning Commissioners of Redondo Beach and Torrance:

These are non-agenda item comments to the legislative bodies above for their next general meeting as permitted by the Brown Act.

I am concerned about Beach Cities Health District's proposed Phase 1 development plan that will be commercially DEVELOPED/OWNED/OPERATED. Phase 1 is proposed to be 110-feet above the surrounding streets and 300,000 sqft in size. Phase 2 will bring the total BCHD site up to nearly 800,000 sqft, which is 250% its current size. That is larger than the entire adjacent Beryl Heights neighborhood's homes' sizes all added together. BCHDs proposed plan is also 3-times the height and 150% as large as the voter-rejected CenterCal Mall-by-the-Sea.

I am also concerned that BCHD continues to spend from a \$16M taxpayer fund, preparing inconsistent, incompatible, and irresponsible plans on an elevated site in the center of residential, 30-foot or lower maximum height neighborhoods.

BCHDs 2017 design committed to protecting neighborhoods with buildings in the center and surface parking around the edges buffering homes from damages.

BCHDs 2019 design (June EIR) was 60-feet tall and ringed the site on the edge. The 2020 design (June Board) was 76-feet tall and also on the edge. The 2021 design (March EIR) was 103-feet tall and also on the edge. The current design is claimed to be 83-feet tall and also on the edge of the site and still meets NONE of the comments regarding excessive height and size from 100s of surrounding neighbors and 1000s of petitioners against the project.

The attachment specifically calls out BCHDs plan's noncompliance with specific sections of RBMC CUP and PCDR and on TMC Hillside Overlay.

I ask that the Mayors, Councils and Planning Commissioners provide guidance to their respective Staff and lawyers to convey the public's disapproval of the current plan that BCHD is pouring our tax

funding into.

As an over forty year resident of Torrance who will be so adversely affected by this project in terms of traffic, property values, negative impact on our local schools and health, I strongly ask that you reconsider the scope of this project.

Thank you,

Marcia Gehrt
19935 Redbeam Ave.
Torrance, CA 90503

NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENTS

The following is provided regarding BCHDs proposed 3rd party DEVELOPER/OWNER/ OPERATOR development project that BCHD will be filing a formal Conditional Use Permit and Planning Commission Design Review application for during the first half of 2022.

These comments are filed to agencies as non-agenda comments of the public, in the interest of the public, and under Cal Gov Code 54954.3."regular meetings shall provide an opportunity for members of the public to directly address the legislative body on any item of interest to the public" there is an affirmative obligation to provide these comments to the Planning Commission, City Council or other "legislative" bodies upon receipt.

Summary Table of BCHD Project Non-Compliance with Municipal Codes		
PERMIT	CONDITION	BCHD PROJECT NON-COMPLIANCE
1. CUP	"will not adversely affect surrounding uses and properties"	As supported by over 1,200 petition signers and 100s, if not 1,000 surrounding resident comments to BCHD, surrounding residential uses are adversely impacted in reduced privacy, property value, aesthetics, noise, traffic and toxic emissions.
2. CUP	"for the proposed use ... shall be adequate in size and shape to accommodate such use"	Given the proposed project plan to locate buildings at the elevated site's perimeter, the elevated site is not adequate to accommodate the proposed use.
3. CUP	"no adverse effect on abutting property"	The properties on the 1400 Block of Diamond are subjected to the storage of explosive liquid fuels, a 2,000 kW combustion power plant, and a 16,000 to 4,000 V substation. These mechanical and explosion hazards adversely impact safety, safe air, local emissions, noise, and vibration.
4. PCDR	"ensure compatibility ... in the community"	Based on the City of Redondo Beach's finding that the design of The Kensington was consistent and compatible with the surrounding residential uses, the 110-foot above Beryl St., Miami Beach commercial styled facility cannot also be deemed compatible with similar, 30-foot and under residential uses in the community.
5. PCDR	"protect property values ... of neighborhoods"	Statistical modeling demonstrates that neighborhoods nearer to BCHD have reduced property values compared to neighborhoods further from BCHD. BCHD is proposing to increase height from 99% under 52-feet to 103-feet and to increase over building size from 312,000 sqft to nearly 800,000 sqft.
6. PCDR	"shall consider the impact ... of the user in respect to circulation, parking, traffic, etc."	BCHD proposed design will require the 8-10 story parking ramp at Prospect and Diamond to enter/exit on Prospect northbound. Further, the proposed height of the RCFE and location on the perimeter damages the privacy, aesthetics, excess nighttime lighting, noise impacts and other basic attributes of the surrounding uses and properties.
7. PCDR	"location of buildings and structures shall respect the natural terrain of the site"	The elevated site has from 30-feet to 70-feet elevation gain over surrounding residential uses. As a result, creation of a 110-foot rise over Beryl St., a 10-story parking ramp over Tomlee and Diamond Sts, and a 4-story, flat wall toward Prospect fails to respect the natural elevated terrain. The original 52-foot, 4 story building and its 0.3%, 968 sqft penthouse were nearly centered in the site, thereby respecting the natural terrain.
8. PCDR	"overall design shall be integrated and compatible with the neighborhood and shall strive to be in harmony with the scale and bulk of surrounding properties"	A 300,000 sqft, 110-foot above the street concrete and glass commercial building makes no attempt to integrate and be compatible with the neighborhood in scale or bulk. Further, unlike The Kensington and its Santa Barbara style, the Miami Beach condominium/hotel style proposed, when coupled with the excessive height and mass is thoroughly non-compatible with surrounding properties.

9. PCDR	“shall be consistent with the intent of residential design guidelines”	The residential design guidelines are intended to increase the quality of life of the neighborhood of the construction. It is very clear from the 1,200 petition signatories regarding the height and size of the project that it does not increase the quality of life. Further, there have been 100s, if not 1,000s of comments and concerns regarding the impacts of noise, emissions, traffic, glare, lighting, excess non-directed nighttime lighting, nighttime elevated signage and other factors that diminish quality of life.
10. RDG	“to improve the quality of life in residential neighborhoods ... [t]hese design guidelines are intended to help accomplish this objective”	The BCHD project reduces the quality of life in surrounding neighborhoods. The BCHD commercial Developer/Owner/Operator is targeting 90% non-Redondo Beach residents and 80% non-residents of the 3 beach cities (HB/RB/MB). The PACE facility is scaled for 400 participants with only 17 expected to be from the 3 beach cities according to National PACE Assoc. statistics. The BCHD project nearly triples the size of campus buildings from 312,000 sqft to 800,000 sqft and more than doubles the effective height from 99% less than 52-feet to 109.7-ft. The quality of life of surrounding neighborhoods will be reduced by the commercial, non-resident services as all damages will accrue to the neighborhoods.
11. THO	“The development has been located, planned and designed so as to cause the least intrusion on the views, light, air and privacy of other properties in the vicinity”	The adjoining Torrance neighborhoods are in the Hillside Overlay. The BCHD would not be allowed in overlay, and the City of Torrance has an obligation to protect its residents. The BCHD project is located to maximize damages to views, light, air and privacy based on height, size and perimeter location.
12. THO	“the design will not have a harmful impact upon the land value and investment of other properties in the vicinity”	Statistical analysis demonstrates that surrounding property values are lower, the closer the properties are to the BCHD site. Peer-reviewed research demonstrates that larger, taller developments, such as BCHDs proposal, will have equal or larger negative impacts on property values.
RBMC 10-2.2506 Conditional Use Permits (CUP) RBMC 10-2.2502 Planning Commission Design Review (PCDR) Redondo Beach Residential Design Guidelines (RDG) Redondo Beach Beryl Heights Neighborhood Specific Guidelines (BH RDG) TMC 91.41.6 Planning and Design (Torrance Hillside Overlay, THO)		

Lina Portolese

From: Vickie Kroneberger
Sent: Thursday, May 19, 2022 8:12 AM
To: Lina Portolese; Maria Herrera
Subject: FW: Non-Agenda, Public Comment, Planning Commission 5/19/22

From: Mark Nelson (Home Gmail) <menelson@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 18, 2022 10:08 PM
To: CityClerk <CityClerk@redondo.org>
Subject: Non-Agenda, Public Comment, Planning Commission 5/19/22

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

Based on BCHDs drawings that were submitted for the Pre-CUP review, there does not appear to be any computation of an F.A.R. for the structure on the C-2 lot. BCHD is required to comply with the C-2 requirements, and at this time, it is unclear if BCHD is complying. Further, it was unclear if Planning staff required BCHD to provide the FAR in their list of deficiencies. BCHD should be explicitly directed to comply with the FAR for the standalone building on the C-2 lot.