

1. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

A Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission was called to order by Chair Elder at 7:00 p.m. in the City Hall Council Chambers, 415 Diamond Street, Redondo Beach, California.

2. ROLL CALL

Commissioners Present: Hinsley, Rodriguez, Strutzenberg, Toporow, Ung, Vice Chair Glad, Chair Elder

Commissioners Absent: None

Officials Present: Brandy Forbes, Community Development Director
Sean Scully, Planning Manager
Marianne Gastelum, Assistant Planner
Lina Portolese, Planning Analyst
Maria Shafer, Recording Secretary

3. SALUTE TO THE FLAG

Commissioner Toporow led those assembled in the Salute to the Flag.

APPROVAL OF ORDER OF AGENDA

Motion by Commissioner Rodriguez, seconded by Vice Chair Glad, to approve the Order of Agenda as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

CONSENT CALENDAR

4. APPROVAL OF AFFIDAVIT OF POSTING FOR THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF February 20, 2020

5. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM THE REGULAR MEETING OF January 16, 2020

6. RECEIVE AND FILE THE STRATEGIC PLAN UPDATE OF: Discussed under Item No. 10

7. RECEIVE AND FILE WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

Commissioner Strutzenberg pulled Item 5 from the Consent Calendar for separate

discussion and consideration.

Motion by Commissioner Toporow, seconded by Commissioner Rodriguez, to approve the Consent Calendar with the exception of Item No. 5, as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

AUDIENCE OATH

Chair Elder administered the Audience Oath for members of the public sitting in the audience.

EX PARTE COMMUNICATIONS

Chair Elder reported speaking with Holly Osborne regarding Item No. 5; speaking with Councilmember Emdee, staff at the Redwood Animal Hospital regarding Item No. 9; speaking with Councilmember Horvath on Item No. 10 and with Holly Osborne regarding Item No. 11.

Commissioner Hinsley reported speaking with staff regarding Item No. 9.

EXCLUDED CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS

5. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM THE REGULAR MEETING OF January 16, 2020

Commissioner Hinsley reported having edits to the minutes of January 16, 2020 but did not have time to organize them.

Motion by Commissioner Rodriguez, seconded by Vice Chair Glad, to open public comments. Motion carried unanimously.

Holly Osborne read proposed corrections to the minutes of January 16, 2020 and distributed copies of her suggested changes.

Motion by Commissioner Toporow, seconded by Commissioner Rodriguez, to receive and file the written corrections to the minutes of January 16, 2020 distributed by Holly Osborne. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion by Commissioner Hinsley, seconded by Commissioner Rodriguez, to postpone approval of the minutes from the regular meeting of January 16, 2020 to the next Planning Commission meeting. Motion carried unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

8. Public Hearing to consider an Exemption Declaration, Conditional Use Permit, and Coastal Development Permit to allow the operation of a restaurant over

2,000-square feet in size on property located within a Mixed-Use (MU-3C) zone, in the Riviera Village Overlay Zone, in the Coastal Zone.

PROPERTY OWNER: Buena Vista Real Estate Holdings
APPLICANT: Same as owner
LOCATION: 221 Avenue I
CASE NO.: CUP-2020-02; CDP-2020-02

RECOMMENDATION: Adopt a resolution approving the Exemption Declaration, Conditional Use Permit, and Coastal Development Permit subject to the findings and conditions contained therein

Motion by Commissioner Ung, seconded by Vice Chair Glad, to open the public hearing. Motion carried unanimously.

Assistant Planner Marianne Gastelum presented details of the staff report addressing background, previous approval of the design and the addition of a condition requiring a full-time parking attendant on site, rear elevation parking entrance, parking, Coastal Development Permit, proposed layout, capacity, zoning, hours of operation, administrative approvals, and the need for a CUP to allow tenant improvements. She noted there will be no exterior changes, other than signage.

Commissioner Ung noted the hours of operation in the 2015 resolution listed a closing time at 12:00 midnight and the new resolution calls for a closing time at 2:00 a.m. and asked about the discrepancy. Assistant Planner Gastelum reported the application lists the closing time at 2:00 a.m.

Commissioner Hinsley asked whether construction is involved and Assistant Planner Gastelum reported the storage area is already built and the applicant is proposing to install an opening with steps, between the restaurant and the storage area, which will involve minor construction. She added the entrance to subterranean parking is through the existing alley and addressed office and restaurant hours of operation.

Commissioner Strutzenberg's discussed the eight bicycle parking spaces required under the 2015 resolution and Planning Manager Scully reported the conditions are specific to the operation of the restaurant versus the prior resolution. Assistant Planner Gastelum offered to add Conditions No. 25 and 26 from the previous resolution to the subject resolution.

Community Development Director Brandy Forbes explained the current resolution is supplemental to the 2015 resolution and is not meant to replace it other than the hours of operation for the restaurant.

Commissioner Rodriguez noted the 2015 resolution related to the construction of the building, but the current item is a conditional use permit for the restaurant, only and will not replace the original resolution.

Chair Elder suggested adding clarifying language that the new resolution applies only to the restaurant.

Vice Chair Glad added that the new resolution does not negate the 2015 resolution or conditions of approval and it would be simpler to state the new resolution is supplemental.

Commissioner Strutzenberg discussed the expedited area and expressed concerns with the possibility of seating in that area. He suggested adding the following to Condition of Approval No. 2: No interior seating is allowed other than in the main dining area of 749-square feet.

In response to Commissioner Hinsley's question, Assistant Planner Gastelum reported there will be six outside, patio seats.

Community Development Director Forbes noted the addition of Condition of Approval No. 10 as follows: This resolution is supplemental to the previous approval for the site approved in Resolution No. 2015-10-PCR-014 and does not replace that approval unless otherwise specified in this resolution.

In response to Commissioner Strutzenberg's question, Assistant Planner Gastelum reported the building construction project has been finalized, other than the restaurant space, and addressed the customer waiting area.

Commissioner Toporow asked about the bar area and Assistant Planner Gastelum noted the project is a sit-down restaurant and the bar area is for employees to make and pickup drinks.

Chair Elder invited the applicant or his representative to the podium.

Louie Tomaro, Architect, addressed the building completion; identified the customer waiting area; discussed the valet stand, parking signage and venting and grease traps and noted the need to connect the storage area to the restaurant.

Dan Nguyen, Property Owner, addressed hours of operation; reported the restaurant will close at 2:00 a.m. to stay consistent with other restaurants in the area and reported bicycle racks and electric vehicle charging spaces are located underground.

Motion by Commissioner Rodriguez, seconded by Vice Chair Glad, to close the public hearing. Motion carried unanimously.

Motion by Commissioner Rodriguez, seconded by Commissioner Strutzenberg to adopt a resolution approving the Exemption Declaration, Conditional Use Permit, and Coastal Development Permit subject to the findings and conditions contained therein, with Condition No. 2, as amended and with the addition of Condition No. 10.

Commissioner Hinsley offered a friendly amendment to the motion to add Condition No. 11 as follows: Directional signage to the rear parking entrance shall be placed at the front of the building. The friendly amendment was accepted by Commissioners Rodriguez and Strutzenberg.

The motion carried unanimously.

9. Public Hearing to consider amendments to Title 10, Chapter 2 (Zoning Ordinance) and Title 10, Chapter 5 (Coastal Land Use Plan Implementing Ordinance) of the Redondo Beach Municipal Code to add animal kenneling as a conditionally permitted use in certain zoning districts and adopt standards of operation. The Planning Commission will also consider adoption of Resolutions recommending the amendments to the City Council.

PROPERTY OWNER:	N/A
APPLICANT:	City of Redondo Beach
LOCATION:	All Commercial (C) and Industrial (I) Zones
CASE NO.:	ZOA-2020-01

RECOMMENDATION: Provide input and adopt resolutions recommending the ordinance amendments to the City Council

Motion by Commissioner Ung, seconded by Commissioner Toporow, to open the public hearing. Motion carried unanimously.

Planning Analyst Lina Portolese presented details of the staff report addressing background, Council referral of the item to the Planning Commission, current regulations, zoning, options for regulations, other regulations, a survey of other cities, residential buffer regulations, City Council consideration and recommendations.

Community Development Director Forbes added City Council determined the residential buffer would limit the locations to very few areas where kennels would be appropriate and Council is interested in using a minimum separation requirement between kennel businesses instead to limit the number within a geographic area.

Vice Chair Glad asked whether operators would be required to conduct business indoors, without the residential buffer and reported she heard many concerns from residents regarding kennels being close to residential properties and noise.

Community Development Director Forbes stated those are the types of regulations Council asked the Planning Commission to ~~consider~~ **provide feedback**. The Commission could set limits in terms of proximity to residences, requiring sound attenuation, setting the distance from the business rather than the property line and others.

Planning Analyst Portolese noted similar uses currently in the code are from site boundaries, not tenant space boundary.

In reply to Commissioner Strutzenberg's question, Planning Analyst Portolese stated the definition of animal kennel relates specifically to dogs and cats only and reported the suggested buffer distance could be increased beyond 300 feet.

Commissioner Strutzenberg discussed consideration of indoor/outdoor areas, ambient noise and negative impacts to public parks.

Community Development Director Forbes addressed challenges with Code Enforcement.

Commissioner Strutzenberg discussed limiting the number of animals per site, enforcing licensing checks and limiting the total number of facilities within the City.

In response to Commissioner Hinsley's question, Community Development Director Forbes stated that CUP findings are under the zoning code.

Planning Analyst Portolese added the findings would still need to be made under the CUP, aside from what would be incorporated under Title 6 and would incorporate the conditions of approval under Title 6.

Commissioner Hinsley discussed the California Health and Safety Code, ensuring quality of life for residents and having to go about-and-beyond the Safety Code.

In reply to Commissioner Ung's question, Planning Analyst Portolese addressed the number of facilities currently in the City, noting they mostly involve overnight care related to hospitals. She added staff is unaware of complaints related to those facilities.

Commissioner Ung discussed codes from other cities, determining capacity, addressing enclosures, existing standards for enclosures and potential locations and spaces. Among the potential locations as explained by Planing Analyst Portolese showed the currenty city zoning map potential sites that have 500 foot buffer from residential subject to more research. Locations included the North East commercial site, the North Industrial site, 182nd St. Industrial/Commercial site, Hernondo/PCH site, Green St. storange site, and the middle of the Riviera Village commercial zone site.

Commissioner Toporow felt strongly that kennels should not be anywhere near residential properties and discussed facilities needing to meet their breakeven point in terms of capacity and noted odor, health, environmental and noise problems.

Community Development Director Forbes reported the Planning Commission could consider shifting the distance requirement to the distance from residential properties or it could look at the zoning map to determine the areas were kennels would be appropriate.

Chair Elder expressed concerns with quality-of-life impacts and noted there are few locations available in the City for this type of facility.

Vice Chair Glad felt there is no place in the City boundaries were this type of business fits adding that she could not see bringing a business into the City, to the detriment of residents and other businesses. Although the current prospective applicant seems responsible, that does not guarantee that other operators would be.

Discussion followed regarding noise complaints received regarding comparable facilities in other cities.

Commissioner Strutzenberg added that consideration should be given to impacts to other businesses as well. He discussed cities where these types of facilities are not permitted and noted the impacts outweigh the benefits of such businesses.

Commissioner Rodriguez discussed locating such facilities in industrial areas through CUPs which would examine each applicant on a case-by-case basis.

Motion by Vice Chair Glad, seconded by Commissioner Toporow, to open public comments. Motion carried unanimously.

Cami Barth referenced Puppy Academy in Hermosa Beach where residents are happy about the facility with 20-30 dogs; listed her education and background as a certified trainer; explained her plans for the facility and noted she is currently in a residential area and has received no complaints.

Motion by Commissioner Hinsley, seconded by Commissioner Rodriguez, to extend speaker's time. Motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Barth reported each dog will have an individual nook and responded to questions from the Commission regarding the need for outdoor spaces, minimum space requirements of 1,000 to 1,500 sq. ft. indoor and 500 sq. ft. outside space and staffing of 3 to 5 people for a 40 dog kennel.

Commissioner Strutzenberg discussed the need to consider future applicants, difficulties with staffing and challenges with implementation of the plan.

Commissioner Ung noted the issue is about trying to develop an ordinance that would be applicable to anyone wanting such a business in the City. The ordinance cannot be tailored to individual business models but needs to be considered from an overall standpoint.

In response to Commissioner Ung's question, Ms. Barth identified potential properties at the old Tarzan Paddle Board Shop, the corner of P.C.H. at Pearl St. she is considering for her business.

Ms. Barth responded to questions from Commissioner Hinsley regarding the required outdoor space, pickups and drop-offs, the possibility of considering locating in an industrial area and impacts of noise on animals. Reviewed the zoning map for the locations Ms. Barth had identified and were in the coastal zone and or adjacent to residential.

Chair Elder noted the biggest challenge would be noise complaints and the ordinance would need to be very explicit relative to responses to noise complaints.

Ms. Barth distributed written copies of her comments.

Motion by Chair Elder, seconded by Vice Chair Glad, to receive and file Ms. Barth's

written comments. Motion carried unanimously.

Discussion followed regarding the possibility of boarding cats, noise impacts to other animals and determining appropriate areas where such a facility would work. It as noted staff is not proposing this use in the Coastal Zone.

Marilyn Singleton-Brown spoke in opposition to the zoning amendment; discussed quality of life issues; noted enforcement would be difficult; stated the Police have better things to do; stressed this type of business is not a good fit in the City; opposed having such facilities near residential areas and opined it is wrong to consider dogs over people.

Dan Brown referenced the proposed location on Pearl Street and addressed adjacent properties, concerns with public safety, barking and noise, and spoke in opposition to the project.

Peter Barth spoke in support of the zoning amendment and reported that currently, Ms. Barth works out of her home and there has been only one complaint.

Motion by Commissioner Strutzenberg, seconded by Vice Chair Glad, to extend speaker's time. Motion carried unanimously.

Discussion followed regarding whether Ms. Barth's current business violates City codes as it states residents cannot have more than three dogs.

Community Development Director Forbes redirected the discussion to the agenda item, not the particular business.

Motion by Commissioner Rodriguez, seconded by Vice Chair Glad, to close public testimony. Motion carried unanimously.

Commissioner Hinsley discussed allowing the use in commercial or industrial areas with a 300-foot buffer to residential areas and noted the need for an official map indicating where those uses are permitted.

In response to Commissioner Hinsely, Planning Analyst Portolese reviewed the City's zoning map and summarized the commercial and industrial zones which are not immediately adjacent to residential properties. She stated that although limited, there would still be some areas that would allow the use even with a residential buffer distance.

Chair Elder referenced the General Plan update and potential zoning changes and felt that would be a challenge in terms of producing a map of allowed areas.

Vice Chair Glad reiterated her concerns regarding noise; discussed limiting the use to industrial areas but noted challenges with that, as well. She voiced concerns regarding the use also impacting commercial uses such as restaurants in addition to residential. She spoke about the compacted density in the City and felt there is no appropriate place

in the City for the use.

Chair Elder spoke positively about the qualifications of the potential applicant, but reiterated concerns about proximity to residential areas and noted whatever is crafted, must be City-wide.

Commissioner Rodriguez discussed City Council direction to develop guidelines and commented on additional regulations.

Vice Chair Glad recommended not permitting the use in the City but if Council is interested in permitting it, she agreed with providing guidelines and additional regulations including the addition of a buffer to residential and commercial zones.

Commissioner Strutzenberg agreed with Vice Chair Glad and believed Council was not recommending approval of the use, but merely seeking the Planning Commission's input.

Commissioner Hinsley voiced concerns that prohibiting the use in the City would increase illegal uses in residential areas.

Chair Elder asked about the possibility of simplifying enforcement and Community Development Director Forbes acknowledged challenges with enforcement and reported with violations to the noise ordinance, the CUP could be rescinded.

In reply to Commissioner Toporow's question regarding odor enforcement, Planning Manager Scully reported odors fall into the same nuisance abatement ordinance.

Motion by Commissioner Strutzenberg, seconded by Commissioner Toporow, to recommend to the City Council that in consideration of the City's density and zoning configuration, a kennel facility is not practical or feasible in the City of Redondo Beach.

Vice Chair Glad offered a friendly amendment that if the City Council decides it wants to move forward, to recommend a 300-ft. buffer from residential areas, commercial areas, schools, and parks and adequate measures to control noise, odor and dust.

Commissioners Strutzenberg and Toporow accepted the friendly amendment.

Planning Analyst Portolese reported that depending on Council action, a new ordinance would still need to be considered by the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Ung discussed recommending the additional regulations listed in staff report to the City Council.

Discussion followed regarding requiring dog licenses and vaccinations and testing for all dogs, concerns about potential bad operators, limiting facility sizes and the number of animals and on-site overnight personnel.

The amended motion was restated.

Motion by Commissioner Strutzenberg, seconded by Commissioner Toporow, to recommend to the City Council that in consideration of the City's density and zoning configuration, a kennel facility is not practical or feasible in the City of Redondo Beach. If the City Council decides it wants to move forward, to recommend a 300-ft. buffer from residential areas, commercial areas, schools, and parks and adequate measures to control noise, odor and dust as well as additional regulations as listed in the staff report. The motion carried with Commissioners Hinsley and Ung, opposed. The dissenting voters of Hinsley and Ung each acknowledged that they voted no because they did not agree with the recommended 300-foot buffer from commercial.

OLD BUSINESS

10. Commission input related to development of goals and objectives for the City's Strategic Plan

RECOMMENDATION: Receive and file report and provide input to City Council as appropriate

Community Development Director Forbes introduced the item and deferred to Councilmember Horvath for a report.

Council Member Horvath explained the strategic planning process; noted City Council felt it important to get input from the various commissions regarding the need for the City to set long-term strategic goals and presented details of three options for creating 10-year goals covering the 2016-2026 timeframe.

Discussion followed regarding the ability of the Planning Commission as well as individual residents to provide input on this matter.

Commissioner Strutzenberg discussed the list as a to-do list of aspirational goals, the need for goals to be specific, measurable and attainable, and recommended a "pairing down" of Option 3.

Discussion followed regarding addressing jobs and jobs imbalance, sea-level rise and the AES property.

Commissioner Hinsley discussed developing policy directives, examples of what would fall under each, and collection and sources of data.

Vice Chair Glad reported previous ten-year goals were not detailed; offered a happy medium would be appropriate, providing some details, as needed and discussed opportunities to create zoning, the need to change zoning, the need for high-income jobs, parks and open space for older kids, the need to consider the target audience, campuses, traffic, crime and safety, a ban on smoking/cannabis and rent control.

Councilmember Horvath reported the City has a lot of renters and addressed the need for permanent, supportive housing.

Commissioner Ung discussed Option 3 noting there should be some level of detail; noted goals must be measurable and reachable; spoke about prioritizing goals; questioned the use of "create" as implying it does not exist; felt Option 3 is more policy-related and suggested creating an accountability matrix noting difficulties in implementation if policies are not being enacted.

Community Development Director Forbes reported the City Council will look at the bigger picture and make decisions setting direction for staff.

Commissioner Ung discussed the importance of having a connection between goals and policies adding that goals must be attainable.

Commissioner Rodriguez stated his preference of Option 3.

Chair Elder thanked Councilmember Horvath for his presentation and noted his preference for Option 3, as it includes details.

Discussion followed regarding coordinating with other agencies to help the City reach its goals and creating collaboration.

Commissioner Strutzenberg noted the need to consider what can be eliminated, such as Moss Adams and discussed simplifying processes.

In response to Commissioner Hinsley's question, Community Development Director Forbes reported City Council requested written communication, noted taking good notes including the Commission's general consensus for Option 3 and will generate sufficient recommendations and comments provided by the Commission to present at the March meeting and finalize recommendations to Council.

Commissioner Hinsley discussed three-year goals as being more specific than ten-year goals; agreed with including focus on renters and felt ten-year goals should be specific to policies and directives rather than being detailed.

Motion by Commissioner Rodriguez, seconded by Vice Chair Glad, to receive and file the report and direct staff to return with a draft letter summarizing recommendations to City Council with the opportunity for additional input. The motion carried unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS - None

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS - None

COMMISSION ITEMS AND REFERRALS TO STAFF

Commissioners Toporow and Hinsley asked staff about when the Feb. 2020 referral to staff to agendize a discussion of housing and open space would be coming back to the commission. Director Forbes responded due to workload that June would likely be on the agenda.

MINUTES
PLANNING COMMISSION
February 20, 2020
Page No. 11

~~to place a discussion about open space and housing on a future agenda.~~

Chair Elder asked about the impacts of Proposition 13 on approved projects that have not yet been built; inquired about impacts to schools resulting in the elimination of developer impact fees and requested a legal opinion from the City if Proposition 13 passes.

ITEMS FROM STAFF

11. Community Development Director's update on recent Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) State legislation

RECOMMENDATION: Receive and file report

Community Development Director Forbes provided a brief report highlighting changes in the State legislation and reported the ordinances will be considered by the Planning Commission in the near future.

Commissioner Strutzenberg asked about the number of units in the City that will be impacted with the new law.

Community Development Director Forbes reported she will provide detailed information on ADU's at an upcoming meeting and urged Commissioners to email her with questions.

Commissioner Hinsley discussed impacts to sewer and water and Community Development Director Forbes reported the information will be included in the report, especially as it relates to multi-family housing.

Motion by Commissioner Strutzenberg, seconded by Commissioner Toporow, to receive and file the report. The motion carried unanimously.

Chair Elder invited public comments.

Holly Osborne discussed a recent meeting in Torrance, the importance of getting legislators to push back to consider impacts to parking and urged the public to contact their representatives and write letters regarding SB 50 and learn what the City of Torrance is doing to address the subject.

Commissioner Rodriguez motioned, seconded by Vice Chair Glad, to close public comments. The motion carried unanimously.

COUNCIL ACTION ON PLANNING COMMISSION MATTERS - None

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Commission, Commissioner Rodriguez motioned, seconded by Vice Chair Glad, to adjourn at 11:26 p.m. to a Regular

meeting to be held at 7:00 p.m. on Thursday, March 19, 2020, in the Redondo Beach City Council Chambers, 415 Diamond Street, Redondo Beach, California. Motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Brandy Forbes
Community Development Director