



**Community Comments on Recommended Land Use Plan  
(Comments Received on Social PinPoint (April 7 - April 11, 2021))**

Focus Area

**Type of Social PinPoint Comment**

- I have a suggestion
- I like this land use
- I would change this land use

NOTE: See attached spreadsheet to locate each comment by the key number denoted on the map.

**Recommended Land Use Categories**

**Single-Family Residential**

- RSF: Single Family Residential (0-8.8 du/ac)
- RSL: Small Lot Residential (0-17.5 du/ac)

**Multi-Family Residential**

- RL: Residential Low (0-14.6 du/ac)
- RM: Residential Medium (0-17.5 du/ac)
- RMH: Residential Medium-High (0-23.3 du/ac)
- RH: Residential High (0-30 du/ac)

**Commercial**

- CN: Neighborhood Commercial (max 0.50 FAR | max 0.60 FAR in Artesia Blvd Focus Area)
- CF: Commercial Flex (max 1.00 FAR)
- CC: Coastal Commercial (FAR per Local Coastal Program)

**Mixed-Use**

- MU-1: Mixed-Use (max 0.50/1.50 FAR; 0-30 du/ac)
- MU-2: Mixed-Use (max 1.00/1.50 FAR; 0-35 du/ac)
- MU-TC: Mixed-Use Transit Center (max 1.50 FAR; 0-30 du/ac)

**Industrial**

- IF: Industrial Flex (max 1.00 FAR)
- IG: General Industrial (max 1.00 FAR)

**Public/Institutional/Open Space**

- PI: Public/Institutional
- U: Public/Utility
- OS: Parks and Open Space (max 0.05 FAR)

**Areas Requiring Additional Consideration**

- Opt A: RH (0-30 du/ac) | Opt B: CN (max 0.50 FAR)

**Overlay Districts**

- R: Residential Overlay (30-45 du/ac)

Redondo Beach Community Comments on Recommended Land Use Plan

Comments Received on Social PinPoint (April 7 - April 11, 2021)			
Comment No.	Type	Comment	Rec. Land Use Where Comment Was Placed
Comments placed in Tech Distict Focus Area			
17	I would change this land use	Move the 1,000 units from this location to the AES site. South Redondo should bear half of the responsibility	IG-R
20	I would change this land use	Housing should be split equally between SOUTH and North Redondo. Adding high density housing to this site will result in too much strain to local services that are already strained to support existing residents; police, fire, ambulance, etc. Who will pay to support additional residents and their needs...or will our access to tax based services be degraded further?	IG-R
25	I have a suggestion	The housing burden should be shared more fairly with South Redondo. It doesn't make sense to place such an increase in housing here since there is already congestion with traffic. The elementary schools cannot handle this increase either.	IG-R
26	I would change this land use	The aes site should be used for more housing. The North end of the city should not be the easy way out for everything the city does.. while the South end goes untouched. Our schools are already overflowing and the traffic on MBB is already bad enough. Don't destroy our end of the city!!	IG-R
30	I would change this land use	There is no need to cram 1,000 units here. Traffic is already terrible here. Move the 1,000 units to AES site.	IG-R
39	I would change this land use	Any additional housing units will affect the schools in North Redondo, which are already over capacity. In order to be more equitable in the housing density, South Redondo needs to do its part for the community.	IG-R
46	I would change this land use	1000 residential Units in North Redondo is way to many. It would overcrowd our schools and create additional traffic and congestion in an already packed area. South Redondo should share the burden of additional housing to help spread out the congestion and overcrowding.	IG-R
55	I would change this land use	Putting 1000 units here is way too many. It also puts way too much pressure on North Redondo's schools, specifically Lincoln, which is already over crowded. The AES site and South Redondo should share the burden of adding additional housing	IG-R
58	I would change this land use	1000 units in this area is not well thought out. Bad location by the fwy (despite metro access),. school,traffic, and other infrastructure issues need to be evaluated. AES site must be considered. Finally, S Redondo needs to share some of the burden. I'm repeating what others have already noted.	IG-R
66	I would change this land use	I agree that 1,000 is too many units! I recommend that smaller areas be marked for units of no more than 100. Is there a plan for a park (green area) in those areas? How close to the freeway are we looking? There are nice units on Marine near Aviation. Could that be a sample? Where would kids attend school? Could they walk?	IG-R
89	I would change this land use	Add housing here is a nightmare idea. It's too far from schools, Fire, police and parks.	IG-R
112	I would change this land use	Any residential development in this area is going to turn into a dumping ground for distraught low income housing in 5 years, which will have downstream effects on the Northrup site, its footprint, and ultimately the tax base we receive from it. This is NOT the place for housing people.	CF-R
117	I would change this land use	South Redondo needs to share the burden. Putting 1000 units in one spot is a recipe for disaster. No responsible city should put that many homes in one spot.	IG-R
145	I have a suggestion	Use this area as the City Yard/place to park the postal vehicles.	CF-R
146	I would change this land use	Think long-term. Potential residents will be suing the city for health damages in a decade or so.	CF-R
155	I would change this land use	Adding residential units in the middle of this commercial area that's right by the freeway and other heavy traffic areas is a mistake. It places people in an unheathy air quality environment, and it's certainly no place for families. Where will the kids go to play? On the Northrop campus? On major traffic areas like MBB, Redondo Ave, or Marine?	IG-R
156	I would change this land use	I agree putting in 1,000 units here is "overkill" The impacts on schools and traffic will be a disaster. It seems the general planning theme is to dump all new housing, especially low-income, in a concentrated area in North Redondo while South Redondo contributes the bare minimum. Why is the 50 acre power plant site being overlooked? I realize this is a state mandated process. I would encourage everyone to also contact our state representatives to voice your displeasure,	IG-R
175	I would change this land use	I dislike this zoning for residential. There's already lots of traffic problems on MB Blvd, adding more residential use will only make the problem worse. It's also not a walkable area, so parking and car traffic will inevitably be a huge issue.	IG-R
189	I like this land use	This would be a good area for those who work downtown. The upgrades down town along the freeway are liked for commuters.	IG-R
192	I would change this land use	To alleviate Redondo Union High, Adams Middle, and Mira Costa High Schools of overcrowding, I think this spot would be perfect to construct a possible 6-12 school for North Redondo residents.	IG-R
195	I would change this land use	(Changed to red because the pin use wasn't clear) Just because this is near the Metro does NOT mean residents will not have cars! This is still CA, where despite the state's dreams, public transportation isn't popular. This option, if I understand correctly, will allow for a minimum of parking spaces on-site.	IG-R
196	I would change this land use	The proposed 1,000 units here is complete overkill in one location that'll jam traffic on MB Blvd. & Marine, & freeway access on Inglewood, which is already backed up. All new residents of school age would likely be assigned to Lincoln-- an overflow of students at one school. Limited parking plans means hundreds of cars trying to park on already overcrowded streets. Most of the lower cost housing would end up here, very Section 8-esque and not what our neighborhood needs in one large clump.	IG-R
202	I would change this land use	Dear Planning Dept. and consultants-In the information you provide about this Tech District concept you do not include the residential overlay information regarding the addition of 1,000 housing units. This is an omission of important information which makes informed comments impossible.	IG-R
203	I would change this land use	Effective land planning requires a balance of uses within city boundaries. Adding 1000 units in one area is not a balanced approach. The Planning Dept. needs to take more time to find ways to integrate the additional housing needs into all areas of the city in an incremental manner.	IG-R
204	I would change this land use	This should be reduced by half and the new units should be equally distributed between North and SOUTH Redondo.	CF-R
209	I would change this land use	Putting 1000 units here is way too many and would create traffic and parking headaches. It also puts way too much pressure on North Redondo's schools. The AES site and South Redondo should share the burden of adding additional housing	IG-R
221	I would change this land use	Reduce by half!	IG-R
227	I would change this land use	While I do support some mixed commercial/residential use, this area should not shoulder the burden for all of Redondo Beach. Each District should be required to add housing. Adding the proposed units will cause heavier traffic near the freeway; additional traffic to the Redondo schools, cutting through District 5. In addition, if Lawndale adds required housing to their city border, there will be even more traffic issues to the area.	IG-R
238	I like this land use	Just because this is near the Metro does NOT mean residents will not have cars! This is still CA, where despite the state's dreams, public transportation isn't popular. This option, if I understand correctly, will allow for a minimum of parking spaces on-site.	IG-R





Redondo Beach Community Comments on Recommended Land Use Plan

Comments Received on Social PinPoint (April 7 - April 11, 2021)			
Comment No.	Type	Comment	Rec. Land Use Where Comment Was Placed
240	I like this land use	The proposed 1,000 units here is complete overkill in one location that'll jam traffic on MB Blvd. & Marine, & freeway access on Inglewood, which is already backed up. All new residents of school age would likely be assigned to Lincoln-- an overflow of students at one school. Limited parking plans means hundreds of cars trying to park on already overcrowded streets. Most of the lower cost housing would end up here, very Section 8-esque and not what our neighborhood needs in one large clump.	IG-R
242	I would change this land use	The suggested amount of housing is way too high for this area, our schools cannot handle it. A more equitable balance between North and South Redondo needs to happen.	IG-R
250	I like this land use	I like the new suggested land use	CF-R
285	I would change this land use	I disagree; this will cause additional traffic and max out elementary schools. Put these houses at the previous plant site.	IG-R
314	I would change this land use	This zoning places entirely too much of the housing burden on North Redondo. GPAC committee should allocate more evenly across North and South Redondo (including the AES plant).	IG-R
316	I would change this land use	Do not add 1000 housing units here. North Redondo is already doing its fair share. The number of additional housing units need to be equally shared between North and South Redondo. Adding 1000 housing units here would severely impact traffic and already over-crowded schools in North Redondo. Plus adding housing units near the freeway is less than ideal and will encourage blight.	IG-R
323	I would change this land use	This industrial and retail has leases that go well into the 2030's and is unlikely to be redeveloped so it should not be counted towards the 6th RHNA cycle.	IG-R
330	I like this land use	I'm fine with high density housing here since it's near a Metro station	IG-R
332	I would change this land use	Putting homes next to the freeway is inhumane. The air pollution is so unhealthy for residents. Mobility outside of cars is so dangerous and limited due to challenges of getting around the freeway.	CF-R
337	I would change this land use	North Redondo Beach is already doing its share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site.	U
343	I would change this land use	I think it should be pointed out that the plan is to allow 1000 Housing units to be built in this area.	IG-R
		1000 Units.	
		While it's a requirement by the State to increase housing in each city, it seems like 1000 Housing Units in this area is excessive.	
345	I like this land use	Part of North Redondo's extensive and disproportionate contribution to the City's tax base. Industries + hotel complex.	IG-R
Comments placed in Artesia Blvd Focus Area			
63	I have a suggestion	This street needs to be analyzed by sections. This is not Riviera Village. The street is used to access the freeways! It is narrow! Maybe where stores were abandoned, mixed-use housing with retail is a possibility. The parking is limited, and therefore access to stores is limited. Trying to get out of a car on Artesia as cars whiz by is as dangerous as trying to cross a freeway. The stretch of Artesia needs to be thought out!	CN
105	I have a suggestion	Commercial has largely not been successful on Artesia. What will be done to draw in successful businesses? There have been some modest successes like Chick Fil A, CVS and Grocery Outlet. There are also a lot of empty storefronts right now. Building a lot behind the post office and reducing parking requirements may help bring in new businesses that will be successful.	CN
107	I have a suggestion	Artesia has historically been a commuter road, but over time the neighborhood has become more of a residential area. A low cost way to reduce traffic speeds would be to install stop signs at each intersection between Flagler and McKay. Also reducing the parking requirements for businesses could help incentive businesses to open up along Artesia.	CN
177	I have a suggestion	Diversify the retail space along Artesia and reduce the permits for dive bars and dollar stores: Dollar Tree, Goodwill and Salvation Army stores are on every block.	CN
193	I have a suggestion	They need to do something about the properties that used to house a VANS shoe store (which closed in 2009/2010) and the recently shuttered Baker's Dozen Donut Shop. Seeing the VANS property vacant for over 10 years seem like an eyesore.	CN
217	I have a suggestion	Less density and the ability to build up to 6 stories. This is already a main thoroughfare and this could allow for more density	CN
225	I have a suggestion	Artesia has turned into a dangerous road to drive. Revitalize this area to "match" the Riviera Village by reducing the speed limit, adding art installations, succulent gardens. Incentivize the landlords and businesses to put money into making the properties more inviting and new (new paint, awnings, signage requirements). More housing on the boulevard is not feasible unless the street is widened. The surrounding neighborhoods are dense!	CN
289	I would change this land use	This seems like gerrymandering. Why a single mixed in the middle of CN? Make it all consistent.	MU-1
329	I have a suggestion	Yes, we absolutely need to "incentivize identified preferred uses (restaurants with outdoor dining and offices)," and also incentivize people to improve the buildings (new paint, better signage, etc.)	CN
344	I like this land use	This sort of works but it needs to be made nicer, not denser and worse.	CN
Comments placed in Aviation Blvd Focus Area			
108	I have a suggestion	I would like to see this area developed as a gateway to North Redondo. We live near here and never visit these businesses. This would be a great area for restaurants and some green space like a park.	CN
163	I would change this land use	This corner north of Carnegie is where the condos belong.	CN
190	I like this land use	I like its current use. However, I think they need to remodel the former Denny's space so it does not stand vacant forever.	CN
216	I like this land use	Agree with this map	CN
260	I have a suggestion	Mean travel time from Redondo Beach to work is 31 minutes each way according to the US Census. Bicycles are NOT the answer.	CN
286	I would change this land use	This entire strip along from Prospect to Artesia should be rezoned to RHigh Density so that the businesses can be bought up and rebuild as condos and affordable apartments.	CN
Comments placed in Galleria Focus Area			
10	I would change this land use	No more residential beyond the 300 already approved here. We need more restaurants and office space not more housing here. Areas of South Redondo should be rezoned to take some of the burden from the North.	MU-TC
12	I would change this land use	Remove residential overlay here. Zone AES site for high density residential. The increased residential burden should be spread out over the entire city, not just North Redondo Beach	IF-R
59	I would change this land use	Reduce units and move some of them to AES site.	MU-TC



Redondo Beach Community Comments on Recommended Land Use Plan

Comments Received on Social PinPoint (April 7 - April 11, 2021)			
Comment No.	Type	Comment	Rec. Land Use Where Comment Was Placed
64	I would change this land use	Here again! Too much greed! This idea is a perfect example of an overbuilt community! With the Metro and the stores, and the traffic on Hawthorne and Artesia, how many more people do you plan to cram into this area? This may be perfect for mixed-use of residential and offices or stores. Maybe BCHD could use the area for offices, and assisted living. MAYbe put in a green area (park) for walking and sitting.	MU-TC
68	I would change this land use	I am against the preferred site at 182nd & Kingsdale Ave area. How many businesses would be displaced if building commenced there? My husband and I own La Cienega Manufacturing at 1304 Kingsdale Ave., and in our corner plaza there are at least 8 other small businesses (plus others like Ralph’s and TJ Max, etc). Surely there must be other areas that do not have active businesses that can be chosen.	IF-R
104	I have a suggestion	I would like to see the focus lean more heavily on Mixed Use hotel rooms than an abundance of residential units. Residential units will require a large increase in cost (roads, schools, etc), while hotels would bring in tax revenue without the increase in resource use. The location here would be great for both business and leisure travel.	MU-TC
106	I have a suggestion	It seems like a faulty assumption to believe public transit ridership will be a positive factor here. Public transit has seen steady decreases in ridership over time. What we are signing up for are large increases in population and traffic. There is plenty of density here, what we need are businesses that will serve the current community. We often take our business to Hermosa, MB and South Redondo.	IF-R
109	I have a suggestion	This area is close to the train and freeway, so it's an obvious spot to absorb *some* of the housing, but increased Hawthone traffic will cause other problems for a lot of the south bay that commutes. As long as this isn't the dumping ground for all our housing woes by those in the south who are unwilling to use their ENTIRELY UNDEVELOPED areas of dirt fields to share the burden I think some housing here makes sense.	IF-R
115	I like this land use	I think this area would be good for senior housing but the AES sight in South Redondo should take some of the burden.	MU-TC
120	I would change this land use	The 200 units currently planned for the Galleria site are all that should be included here. Remove the housing overlay and add it to the AES site in south Redondo.	MU-TC
121	I would change this land use	Remove the housing overlay and add it to the AES site and accompanying green space on 190th. The additional units in the draft EIR for the Galleria site are more than enough for this area.	IF-R
126	I have a suggestion	I wouldn't mind some housing in this area but still like to have some shopping. However, I will not vote for any additional housing unless it is 55+ senior housing.	MU-TC
147	I have a suggestion	Some of this new development should include a preschool area, or even a small elementary school to accommodate the new families that would live here.	IF-R
187	I would change this land use	Reduce by half	MU-TC
201	I would change this land use	Its not clear by the information presented in this online mapping project how many units are being proposed. How many units/households? Integrate and intersperse the increased housing units throughout the city without increasing housing intensity dramatically in one area. Poor planning policy.	IF-R
207	I would change this land use	This should be reduced by half and the new units should be equally distributed between North and SOUTH Redondo.	IF-R
208	I would change this land use	There are too many units assigned to this area. South Redondo needs to share the burden . The fact that there is a bus hub/Metro planned is not a reason to jam in more housing. The vast majority of people who can afford to buy in RB do not/will not take public transit.	IF-R
219	I would change this land use	Reduce by HALF	IF-R
226	I would change this land use	The way of the big mall is out! I think building a smaller scale shopping area with mixed office and residential makes sense.	U
246	I would change this land use	This area along with the Tech district (near the Green Line Station) makes the most sense for higher density zoning due to the new transit center being constructed on Kingsdale avenue, Green line station coming in 2028, it is close to the freeway and other major roads, rather than people commute through the city to and from work. I'm not a fan of density but if its forced on us these are the best locations in my opinion.	U
251	I like this land use	I would like to see this as a walkable shopping dining with restaurants and business on first floor and residential on second and third floor building.	MU-TC
254	I have a suggestion	This is a perfect place for increased density. Near shops and restaurants. Close to mass transit. We don't need to have more cut through traffic in North Redondo.	MU-TC
261	I would change this land use	enough is enough. everything is being placed on north redondo. more housing should be evenly distributed. We dont want to be overrun. stop this	MU-TC
262	I would change this land use	no more people too much in our small area	MU-TC
263	I have a suggestion	your confusing us with torrance. theres a reason we didnt buy there. we dont want multi unit housing.	MU-TC
264	I have a suggestion	just because we dont have an ocean view does not mean we want to be overrun with people.	MU-TC
265	I have a suggestion	stop saying the smaller homes are the charm for south redondo but try to make us the urban, this is our charm too and we dont want them turned into the condos and apartments. stop dumping on our side.	RH
270	I have a suggestion	update the mall and revitalize. Need more restaurants have to drive into torrance for most. Need to draw stores back not turn into housing.	MU-TC
271	I have a suggestion	south redondo can take some of the housing. stop dumping everything on the north. We got the homeless pallet homes, we have the metro hub. we already have busing. the excuse of near the metro does not fly with the residents. the riders need to go throughout the city not congest our small part.	MU-TC
272	I like this land use	this is where I do my grocery shopping, where I go to have breakfast with my kids, where I shop and spend time with my family. This is where my mom brought us when we were kids, where I took my kids and where I plan to take my grandchildren now. We do not want these changes putting thousands of more people. It will harm this area and overcrowd our small neighborhood, ruin the peacefulness of our homes. it would change the whole dynamic of our homes. choose south RB to take some of the burden.	IF-R
273	I like this land use	I like the smaller homes in this area. I have lived here 47 years and prefer the more personal neighborhoods that made Redondo what it is. This is why many of us moved here and plan to stay here. We do not want large muti- unit homes in this area. If we wanted to live in an overbuilt cement city with people living on top of each other we would have moved to another city. We don't want to live in a congested area. Don't take away the neighborly charm that is our city. south redondo better suited.	RH
282	I have a suggestion	I have mixed feelings about building housing here bc the intersection of 2 arterials is heavily polluted. However, it's a dead mall and we have to move forward.  Please keep the housing on the as far away from Hawthorne as possible, and on upper floors to minimize the health effects on residents. The developer promised public open space so let's have that on the upper decks with wide open sky (and mtn views) available to the park-poor and densely housed NRB residents.	MU-TC



Redondo Beach Community Comments on Recommended Land Use Plan

Comments Received on Social PinPoint (April 7 - April 11, 2021)			
Comment No.	Type	Comment	Rec. Land Use Where Comment Was Placed
283	I like this land use	This is the only full-service supermarket that I can bike to. This area needs a spruce up, but not a change of use.	IF-R
		Hawthorne is a dangerous, noisy and polluted corridor. Let's not build housing along it.	
308	I would change this land use	This is perfect for 6-10 story TOD if we can combine lots. My grandfather was bribed to sell his house so a developer could combine lots and build a 7-story 48-unit condo in Taipei. He was given a 4BR unit for himself, a 2 BR unit and cash to help house a growing populace in modern homes near jobs and 2 universities. He was very happy in the end. The homes in this area are not worth preserving.	RH
346	I like this land use	Another North Redondo contribution to the tax base. Leave as-is and put people in AES and along the currently skating South neighborhoods.	IF-R
Comments placed in PCH-North Focus Area			
45	I would change this land use	to commercial flex with FAR 0.6 or higher and some housing. This change in land use will be consistent with PCH blocks between Vincent and Diamond and streets next to city hall the left and Beryl and Carmelian.	PI
76	I would change this land use	This seems like a good candidate area for mix use. The post office can be redone to accommodate for more efficient use of this area.	CF
78	I would change this land use	This is a good area to start building residential housing. It is empty and can be used for this purpose. We can wait for the lease to expire as this is a long-term project.	IG
103	I would change this land use	Thinking about the residential growth in Redondo, are people going to want to buy off the 405 near Lawndale, or will the want to buy just outside of Hermosa and within walking distance of the beach? This seems like a great location for building additional housing. There's loads of housing density along Catalina, this area seems like a prime candidate for meeting a decent chunk of our housing needs.	CF
113	I would change this land use	It's a DIRT LOT for goodness sake! Put some housing on it!!!	CF
141	I would change this land use	Rezone for big residential in order to keep current neighborhoods intact. Also, the Post office and bank could move.	IG
144	I have a suggestion	Maybe a small Skate park somewhere here?	CF
150	I would change this land use	This area is perfect for multi family residential, and puts housing in a very walkable area. Why is this opportunity being simply ignored and our representatives from South Redondo just stare at the ground when it's brought up, then immediately afterward they try and jam all the increase in the Galleria and "tech" area?	CF
160	I would change this land use	Put the housing developments here	CF
162	I have a suggestion	Make a parking lot to serve Boy and The Bear and Garage 77. It should open to PCH and Carnelian with no through traffic to N Francisca and ban non residential parking on the cul-de-sac. Currently, every car that uses the cul-de-sac for coffee, coffee delivery trucks and garage 77 joy rides are generating round-trip traffic through this cul-de-sac, completely defeats the purpose of having a cul-de-sac and creating excessive noise pollution.	CN
166	I would change this land use	Business of this commercial zone should utilize its PCH driveway to access PCH and refrain from imposing their joyride traffic to a cul-de-sac residential street.	PI
167	I like this land use	The Police Department and City hall are well positioned here by the library and RUHS, giving the city a center/ focal point for civic activity.	PI
172	I like this land use	City Hall and PD are where they should be. Do not waste tax dollars changing what has served the city well.	PI
174	I would change this land use	I would put the low/low low income housing in this area because it's a very walkable area and there are already provisions for buses to access the area as well.	CF
222	I would change this land use	Isn't this a large parcel of land that is not being used for anything? This would be a good option for sharing housing requirements. BOTH zip codes need to accommodate the requirements being imposed on Redondo Beach. This and the power plant can easily fit 1200 units; and Galleria and Redondo tech areas can take another 1200 units.	CF
278	I would change this land use	Put housing here.	CF
295	I would change this land use	City Hall and the PD don't need to be 6-blocks from the ocean on an F grade arterial. Rezone to RM and sell to make affordable housing. PD and City Hall can consolidate elsewhere.	PI
342	I would change this land use	This site can easily accommodate residential. 30du/ac as opposed to industrial uses near on the waterfront.	IG
Comments placed in PCH-Central Focus Area			
37	I would change this land use	Change to mixed use, two or three story buildings with professional offices on floor 1, residential 2nd and 3rd story. This is a walkable corridor. Make it inviting.	CF
38	I would change this land use	Change to mixed use, two or three story buildings with business on floor 1, residential 2nd and 3rd story. This is a walkable corridor. Make it inviting.	Opt A: RH (0-30 du/ac)   Opt B: CN (max 0.50 FAR)
41	I would change this land use	Change to mixed use, two or three story buildings with business on floor 1, residential 2nd and 3rd story. This is a walkable corridor. Make it inviting.	CN
42	I would change this land use	to Commercial FAR 0.6 to 1 and make it RED to be consistent with the rest of Torrance Blvd. Change the RED between Pearl & Guadalupe commercial neighborhood (PINK) or (FUCHSIA).	MU-2
49	I would change this land use	Change this area between Pearl, Torrance Blvd, and west & north of PCH to Commercial (RED) and FAR 1.0 or leave this (FUCHSIA) density and FAR designation only if the area between Pearl and Ruby is changed from red to pink. That is a more appropriate transition.	MU-2
51	I have a suggestion	Keeping in mind the roads around Pearl, Ruby and PCH West and safety first, change from Commercial (red) to neighborhood commercial (pink). A better location for Commercial (Red/FAR 1.0) is the area between Pearl, Torrance Blvd, and PCH. This observation is pretty obvious even to the non-professionals...	CF
159	I like this land use	Local commercial or residential, as long as the buildings stay low. Keep the sun shining on our beautiful beach village. Tall buildings destroy calm California aesthetic. While Manhattan and Hermosa have become cities, we can still remain a village, keeping RB unique and valuable.	Opt A: RH (0-30 du/ac)   Opt B: CN (max 0.50 FAR)
247	I would change this land use	Change to mixed use, two or three story buildings with business on floor 1, residential 2nd and 3rd story. This is a walkable corridor. Make it inviting.	CN
275	I like this land use	Good spot for this zoning.	RH
315	I would change this land use	We visited Nice in 1994 and 2017. It was rebuilt taller with protected bike paths along the major boulevards and 6-10 story mixed use everywhere in the central district. It's even more lovely today than in 1994.	Opt A: RH (0-30 du/ac)   Opt B: CN (max 0.50 FAR)
		The beachy look was tired in 1960 and it looks like climate arson in 2020. Just rebuild taller and use the most efficient electric vehicles, elevators and eBikes.	
348	I would change this land use	Needs more high density housing.	CN





Redondo Beach Community Comments on Recommended Land Use Plan

Comments Received on Social PinPoint (April 7 - April 11, 2021)			
Comment No.	Type	Comment	Rec. Land Use Where Comment Was Placed
Comments placed in PCH-South Focus Area			
56	I have a suggestion	Reduce FAR, reduce height limit.	MU-1
123	I would change this land use	Great area for HD Senior housing	RMH
129	I would change this land use	Res High Density	CF
134	I like this land use	Leave as is. South Redondo does not have enough commercial. City can't afford to lose this revenue.	MU-1
135	I like this land use	Leave as is. South Redondo does not have enough commercial. City can't afford to lose this revenue.	CF
213	I like this land use	I would reduce density a bit furthur. But otherwise ok... (.25)	MU-1
266	I would change this land use	more housing here	CF
291	I would change this land use	Remove all commercial and mixed use. Move to Res High.	MU-1
293	I would change this land use	Change to Res High, remove all Comm and Mixed Use.	MU-1
294	I would change this land use	Remove all mixed use and commercial and move to Res High Density all along the turn. This can pull ocean with 4 stories.	CF
Comments placed in Torrance Focus Area			
131	I would change this land use	Continue the CF zoning or leave CN as long as medical spaces are encouraged in this area. We should not have to go to other cities to have our medical needs met.	CN
132	I like this land use	Leave as is. I like the idea of encouraging medical offices in this area. Especially with BCHD's recent attempts to get rid of them and replace them with expensive assisted living homes. They're out of touch with reality. Why should we have to go to other cities to have our medical needs tended to?	CF
212	I have a suggestion	Instead of changing the FAR, let the project apply for larger size ... Density will be too great otherwise..	CF
236	I have a suggestion	Does the city have any plans for this lot? Could it be rented or leased out?	PI
Comments placed on AES site			
1	I have a suggestion	Census data - commute time 31 minutes from Redondo on average. <a href="https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/redondobeachcitycalifornia/PST045219?_lang=en">https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/redondobeachcitycalifornia/PST045219?</a>	U
4	I would change this land use	Add some housing.	U
14	I would change this land use	Some of the Power Plant property should be rezoned for Residential. All the new housing should not be put into North Redondo. The burden should be spread out over the entire city. Preserving the quality of life for the residents of North Redondo is just as important as preserving the quality of life in South Redondo.	U
15	I have a suggestion	Please consider this land for proposed housing. It's a wasted space currently.	U
18	I would change this land use	Use this land for the housing needed. It has not served our city for decades...now is the time.	U
21	I have a suggestion	Please split the required housing units between North and South Redondo equally. Use the power plant site. Do not overload North Redondo.	U
23	I would change this land use	There's a lot of room here to add housing instead of just a park. South Redondo should do it's share	U
24	I would change this land use	Include AES site for additional housing. Why was this intentionally left off? Seems shady.	U
31	I would change this land use	The AES site would be the perfect location to add more housing. North Redondo should not bear all the new housing. Its offensive that this site was purposely left out. With this amount of space - RB could add 50% of our proposed housing (i.e. 1,000 units)	U
36	I would change this land use	Please consider the 50 acre AES power site for additional housing units. South Redondo needs to do its share in order for the city to be equitable for all residents.	U
47	I like this land use	Lots af room here for many units once the power plant is gone.	U
54	I have a suggestion	The site is zoned for Parkland. Under the obsolete power plant dwells the ancient historic salt lake where the native people gathered salt. This wetland is protected by the Coastal Commission. Starting at this site, and following the power line corridor, a linear Greenbelt Park is the perfect use for this area. It would connect with the Hermosa Greenbelt, joining our neighboring city. It would connect into Columbia Park, joining us with Torrance as well. Bike path, trails, play areas, trees	U
57	I would change this land use	This area needs to be considered for housing. Why is it still in operation? Move some of the units from Tech area and Galleria here - N Redondo should not have to absorb the majority of the housing burden as it's currently proposed.	U
70	I have a suggestion	GPAC needs to considered this area to fulfill the additional housing requirement. 50 acres is plenty of room to have a park, housing, and retail. We have to be more open minded here! I understand the need to have additional housing by the 405 and Green Line, but people want to live near the beach as well. Diversify our future residents, our diversity is what makes us great!	U
75	I would change this land use	This is a big lot, it can definitely be used for what the states mandates. Housing can be built here and share the responsibility of this State mandate with North Redondo.	U
88	I would change this land use	50 acres can be a corporate headquarters with housing for their workers. Out the housing here.	U
101	I would change this land use	Thinking about the residential growth in Redondo, are people going to want to buy off the 405 near Lawndale, or will they want to buy just outside of Hermosa and within walking distance of the beach? This seems like a great location for building additional housing. There's loads of housing density along Catalina, this area seems like a prime candidate for meeting a decent chunk of our housing needs.	U
102	I have a suggestion	Use this area to meet some of the housing targets	U
111	I would change this land use	Plenty of room here for additional housing	U



Redondo Beach Community Comments on Recommended Land Use Plan

Comments Received on Social PinPoint (April 7 - April 11, 2021)			
Comment No.	Type	Comment	Rec. Land Use Where Comment Was Placed
114	I would change this land use	This is the biggest waste of land in all of Redondo Beach, develop it and add attractive R3 housing and retail. This would bring needed development to this blight of land, help drive a revitalization of the overall pier area, and address the housing needs.	U
122	I would change this land use	This is a 50 acre site that should accommodate housing units. Replace the overlay from the Galleria area with an overlay here. More of the required housing units should be allocated to south Redondo than what is currently in the draft plan.	U
124	I would change this land use	More housing here, especially 55+ Senior homes!	U
148	I would change this land use	Place housing here instead of it being a dirt lot. Housing here will increase usage of the pier and the businesses there, which will help drive upgrades to the area.	U
149	I would change this land use	It's simply insane that this is not rezoned for housing?!!	U
151	I have a suggestion	Take away powerplant. Put in housing and greenspace. Get rid of huge blight and pollution creator and thing that destroys home values and health. Put up what is needed.... housing... 2 birds one stone. Solve a problem with your other biggest problem. Best solution that could be come up with.	U
153	I would change this land use	All of Redondo, just not North Redondo, needs to share in the additional State mandated housing requirement. More housing needs to go here. I would encourage all to contact Al Muratsuchi (assembly) and Benjamin Allen (senate) to let local communities decided their future and not Sacramento.	U
157	I would change this land use	It only makes sense to utilize this area and permit homes to help meet our RHNA targets.	U
176	I would change this land use	This area should be considered for low income housing. At the very least it should be designated as mix use (businesses on the ground floor and residence on the top floors. This would also provide parking for the residents, as current proposed locations do not have any considerations for parking. This area is very accessible to PCH, which is a main traffic artery that allows access to the 105 freeway close to the 405 entrance, which would greatly allow accessibility. Many existing bus lines	U
183	I would change this land use	No housing in the AES Power Plant site. The state of California may continue to extend its lease indefinitely.	U
185	I would change this land use	Put half of new housing allocation here.	U
186	I would change this land use	Due to the toxins in the ground, it is not a safe area to place housing. Wetlands or parks is more suitable. The law requires a safe equitable place to live. The courts could put a halt to this by law if soil contents reflects it unsafe... even if the Government requires more housing. It's not a smart move. Need another law suit? It could happen if you move in this direction.	U
194	I would change this land use	STOP protecting this huge space because it's in South Redondo and wasn't available when GPAC planning started! It should absolutely be considered for additional housing to stop the push to cram everything into NR. There's enough room to leave green space and multiple use here as well.	U
198	I would change this land use	Beating a dead horse here, put the AES land BACK in the plan, if you long for the "green park" look, put some park area where the AES power lines were once the lines are removed	U
210	I would change this land use	The AES site needs to be included in the housing allotments. There is already too much crowding /traffic in North Redondo. The # of units need to be shared between North and South RB.	U
215	I like this land use	I like the GPAC plan. We need to leave this area for Harbor related and commercial with normal density that it now has...	U
220	I would change this land use	Add Half of Required Housing to AES	U
229	I would change this land use	Adding a reasonable amount of housing with business could revitalize the area near the RB Pier. I am against adding a mall, but would support park space to include a skate park, dog park, restaurant, office and residential in this area.	U
248	I would change this land use	This property can accommodate high density housing as well as commercial.	U
274	I would change this land use	maximize this property and allow for high density housing.	U
276	I would change this land use	New housing here	U
277	I would change this land use	Put housing here	U
290	I have a suggestion	Heart of the City failed here in 2000-ish, so no reason to expect consensus in the next decade. Let's not waste our time - hope is not a plan and we've apparently crossed sword with the Ukranian owner.	U
311	I would change this land use	As soon as AES closes, this site should easily accommodate 500 homes. It's gorgeous and the higher rents would subsidize LI units. Zone for it in advance of the closure and also require lots of subsidized units here to recapture the value of zoning changes.	U
313	I would change this land use	Additional housing should be zoned equally across North and South Redondo. GPAC needs to incorporate the 50 acre Power Plant site into their allocation instead of over-loading North Redondo.	U
321	I would change this land use	Enough with the contortions involved with squeezing all of the the state's RHNA requirements on North Redondo. INCLUDE the AES site. We have enough parks.	U
322	I would change this land use	The 50 acre AES site needs to be evaluated to accommodate housing units. The required units need to be equally distributed between South and North Redondo. South Redondo can accommodate units here.	U
331	I would change this land use	This is a such an obvious location for housing units. Please get this project completed and update the harbor and pier area of the city to its full potential.	U
334	I would change this land use	Add high density housing here	U
336	I would change this land use	Please close the power plant and put more residential housing here	U
338	I would change this land use	Please change this to Housing Overlay with more units. Close the power plant and put housing here instead of some of the units allocated in North Redondo.	U
339	I would change this land use	This site can easily accommodate residential. 30du/ac as opposed to other uses near on the waterfront.	U
340	I would change this land use	North Redondo Beach is already doing its share to accommodate more housing. Please zone 1,245 units in the 90277 part of town. There is availability in areas such as the 50 acre power plant site.	U
349	I would change this land use	AES needs to be in play for housing. As does a larger chunk of South Redondo.	U



Redondo Beach Community Comments on Recommended Land Use Plan

Comments Received on Social PinPoint (April 7 - April 11, 2021)			
Comment No.	Type	Comment	Rec. Land Use Where Comment Was Placed
Comments placed in 90277 Outside of Focus areas and not within the AES site			
5	I would change this land use	Make this area R3.	RSF
6	I would change this land use	Up zone this area to R2. RHNA allocation needs to be spread out over entire city, not just North Redondo.	RSF
7	I have a suggestion	Is this area even being considered? If it's not, I'd like to know why? After all, it's RB property, not BCHD! RB is obligated to add more housing and this area would be perfect!	PI
8	I would change this land use	Change this area to R2. RHNA burden should be spread out Uber the entire city.	RSF
9	I would change this land use	Up zone this area to R3. RHNA burden needs to be spread out over the entire city.	RSF
13	I would change this land use	This area should be rezoned to R 2. The Increased housing burden should be spread out over the entire city.	RSF
29	I like this land use	The entire Catalina corridor should be down zoned or keep as is. We need mediums, more open space, decrease the speed limit, and build a bike lane. Redondo Beach already does more than its share of providing diversity housing options in the South Bay. Not so sure about the other cities.	RM
32	I would change this land use	With new construction permit requests from RMH: Residential Medium-High (0-23.3 du/ac) to: RM: Residential Medium (0-17.5 du/ac).	RMH
33	I would change this land use	I would love to see BCHD disappear and this rezoned for mixed use. It would bring more interesting shops and places to eat while adding attractive housing. I would cap this housing at 30ft though to fit in with the surrounding areas.	PI
34	I would change this land use	I would love to see BCHD disappear and this rezoned for mixed use. It would bring more interesting shops and places to eat while adding attractive housing. I would cap this housing at 30ft though to fit in with the surrounding areas.	CF
35	I would change this land use	to pen space to make it consistent with the rest of the park. Safe and wide side walks too.	CN
43	I would change this land use	to housing with decent side walks to be consistent with existing housing on the block. The density to be same or less than existing housing. It would be more appealing to the eyes. Or consider changing the entire block to pink, which I believe it would be more difficult.	CN
44	I like this land use	Bring it. Many units can be put in this area. 1/2 in the North, 1/2 in the south. The state has no right to do this to us.	CC
48	I like this land use	Plenty of room for multi-story. Find spaces for 1220 units in the south.	RSF
50	I would change this land use	Add multi story & mixed use. Find room in the south.	RSF
60	I would change this land use	This area Riveria Village is a perfect area. There are sidewalks for walking, there is parking and the stores are inviting. Two story buildings are adequate. I would do nothing to change this area.	CN
73	I would change this land use	Increase density in here.	RM
77	I would change this land use	Another good area to start building residential housing. It is empty and can be used for this purpose. We can wait for the lease to expire as this is a long-term project.	U
81	I would change this land use	This land would be better used for a few medical offices and parkland! Forget Beach Cities Health District plans for overdevelopment. Put in public jogging track, community pool, NO residential senior housing. Look at the use of Anderson Park in North Redondo as an example. It is frequently in use. The only use for Dominguez Park is the poorly maintained Dog Park.	PI
82	I have a suggestion	Where is the access to the beach? Why is the area along the beach designated as park area? A family with children and beach accessories would risk their lives crossing Esplanade. I saw a walkway; how is this public access? Parking is in a residential area.	RMH
83	I would change this land use	These buildings are not as overdeveloped as those along the shoreline. Here again, South Redondo. How many apartments are backed in here. Where is Section 8 housing in Redondo? How many units are slated for Section 8?	RMH
84	I have a suggestion	Here again, very densely populated. This is the South end of Redondo- here again how many apartments/condos are packed in here? Another example overuse of land.	RMH
85	I have a suggestion	This area is already very densely populated. The issue here is typical over-building and extreme heights. This is "South" Redondo - How many apartments/condos are in this area?	RMH
86	I would change this land use	City can put park area in a park starved location on top of an underground garage(boston commons)	PI
87	I like this land use	These neighborhoods with the wonderful trees should be kept as is. The mature trees help enhance the current wonderful community of people that live here. These quiet neighborhood and what make people want to move to RB and have families. The fact that it is zone r1 should not be changed as up zoning will not just destroy the neighborhood charm but also reduce the area in which children can play as more and more open area or backyards will be filled with concrete and housing.	RSF
93	I would change this land use	People in South Redondo chose to move into the urban core of the city. High density housing belongs here, not where people chose to live in the less dense R1 areas.	U
100	I like this land use	Appropriate here	PI
116	I have a suggestion	This area would be great for senior housing. 1 or 2 seniors per unit would be less of an impacted on schools and traffic.	RSF
125	I have a suggestion	Perfect spot for Senior housing!	PI
128	I would change this land use	Change to Res Med Density (30 foot max, multi units.	PI
130	I would change this land use	City can put housing above parking here. Go 3D and build up, add public open space on the roof. Invite neighboring private property owners to do the same and connect the buildings with elevated walkways above car traffic.	PI
133	I would change this land use	Rezone Res high density	PI
136	I like this land use	R-1 is appropriate and should be retained. We have enough Re-Condo Beach and HB-like tall and skinnies and 2/3 on a lots and 5 on 2s.	RSF
137	I would change this land use	Explicitly deny health care use on this C2 lot and preserve for neighborhood commercial use.	CF
138	I have a suggestion	BCHD is going to waste this C2 property putting up a duplicate PACE facility. PACE is basically adult daycare with medical services that costs about \$8K a month. RB MB HB Torrance, etc. are already served by PACE.	CF
139	I like this land use	Leave this as is. With the additional RHNA requirements now is not the time to consolidate schools.	PI





Redondo Beach Community Comments on Recommended Land Use Plan

Comments Received on Social PinPoint (April 7 - April 11, 2021)			
Comment No.	Type	Comment	Rec. Land Use Where Comment Was Placed
140	I have a suggestion	The post office could move to this location, freeing up residential possibilities on its current land	CF
142	I have a suggestion	Yikes! I placed that post office comment on the wrong spot, and can't delete it	RMH
143	I have a suggestion	Could the main post office move here? Seems like the post office and bank are on prime real-estate for homes.	RMH
152	I would change this land use	I would love to see BCHD disappear and this rezoned for mixed use. It would bring more interesting shops and places to eat while adding attractive housing. I would cap this housing at 30ft though to fit in with the surrounding areas.	PI
161	I like this land use	Keep the quaint neighborhoods. They are rare, and give RB its character.	RSF
164	I have a suggestion	Why not make this a housing, site which would offer continuity with surrounding areas.	RMH
165	I have a suggestion	Why not make this housing, which would continuity with Hermosa housing.	CF
168	I like this land use	This area of small, single family residences is very rare in the South Bay, and gives the neighborhood a unique charm.  We don't want the over-crowded look of Manhattan and Hemosa where lack of sunlight and airflow leads to mold problems	RSF
170	I like this land use	DO NOT TOUCH BERYL.	PI
173	I like this land use	Do not build apartments west of Catalina -- keep waterfront open for all to enjoy.	CC
179	I like this land use	Maintain the single family zoning	RSF
180	I like this land use	Preserve single family residences	RSF
181	I like this land use	Preserve single family residences	RSF
197	I would change this land use	We should be using the Seaside Lagoon (Ruby's) area and Moonstone Park area to build apartments. There is easy access to food and entertainment there.	CC
205	I would change this land use	This should be required to take half of the new housing units required and all new units should be equally distributed between North and SOUTH Redondo.	RM
206	I would change this land use	All of Redondo should be open to 2-3 on a lots if the lot is big enough. It's being done in North Redondo all the time. South Redondo should not be excepted.	RSF
211	I would change this land use	I would consider units at this location, the size of this location can accommodate the RHNA requirements and will ease some of the burden that is placed in the tech and galleria district in North Redondo	U
214	I like this land use	Agree with assessment for PCH Central. Although I would allow more density along PCH West for commuters who would live and take transportation ...	RSF
223	I have a suggestion	Isn't the Redondo Tech Center/mini storage site here? I am unaware of how many tenants occupy this area, but it seems empty. Maybe incentivize to allow mixed use residential?	MU-1
233	I have a suggestion	These areas could probably also be converted to RMH or mixed-use. There is already higher density in this section. What if there was some opportunities for commerce too?	RSF
234	I would change this land use	Allow for RM (duplexes and triplexes) instead of McMansions.	RSF
235	I have a suggestion	This section could be mixed-use or RMH. There are some convenient shops and restaurants within walking distance. Upzoning would bring more foot traffic to these places.	RSF
237	I have a suggestion	Isn't there an apartment building around here? I think these neighborhoods could fit more multi-unit housing complexes especially along the borders of larger streets like Camino Real, Prospect, and Torrance.	RSF
239	I would change this land use	Upzone to R-2 or R-3. As a longtime resident of these neighborhoods, I am constantly saddened to see small cottages and bungalows be razed to build McMansions, bringing more wealth and exclusivity to our community. I would much rather see duplexes or triplexes built in their stead, than massive homes which are a total waste of resources and land. A family of four truly does not need 4,000+ square footage to live comfortably. These lots can be quite large and can fit duplexes comfortably.	RSF
241	I would change this land use	Agreed with others to re-zone to RM or RMH in these neighborhoods. Tri- or four-plexes would be nice (there already are some just 1 block away). Add protected bike lanes going N/S to encourage bicycle commuting.	RSF
243	I would change this land use	Way too much R-1 here! R-2 zoning will not substantially change the character, especially as it is mostly built-out already.	RSF
244	I would change this land use	All this should be R-2	RSF
253	I would change this land use	This will add too much traffic in an area that has heavy congestion for the morning commute. Lets change this to commercial	RSF
257	I would change this land use	This was bought in the 50s with bonds for an EMERGENCY hospital, not \$12K a month RCFE, not BCHD office buildings. It's time to shut down BCHD and put a deed restriction that stops this parcel from being leased out.	PI
258	I would change this land use	Move this strip to Res High Density along this arterial.	RSF
259	I would change this land use	Power plant sit perfect for multifarious housing already across from apartments need more affordable housing near beaches and jobs here	CC
267	I have a suggestion	this area has too much commercial. this area better suited for multi unit housing.	RSF
268	I would change this land use	needs more low income housing and multi home units	RM
279	I would change this land use	This site can also accommodate 30 residential units and acre.	CC
287	I have a suggestion	Just to be really clear, BCHD is a public agency that we can TELL what to do. It's owned by Hermosa, Manhattan and Redondo and taxpayers bought the land and built the buildings with Tax Bond issuances. It's OUR land.	PI
292	I have a suggestion	BCHD is taking up space on the school land. Get them out into a rental building and use this space to consolidate Beryl and Parras onto a single site.	PI
296	I have a suggestion	Move Beryl onto the RUHS campus and free this land up for more RM	PI
297	I would change this land use	This area is a classic example of why we should not upzone any more land. But for bad state policy, this land should be returned to R-1 at the end of life of the 2-plexs and 4-plexes	CF
298	I would change this land use	This area is a classic example of why we should not upzone any more land. But for bad state policy, this land should be returned to R-1 at the end of life of the apartment building.	RMH



Redondo Beach Community Comments on Recommended Land Use Plan

Comments Received on Social PinPoint (April 7 - April 11, 2021)			
Comment No.	Type	Comment	Rec. Land Use Where Comment Was Placed
299	I would change this land use	This area is a classic example of why we should not upzone any more land. But for bad state policy, this land should be returned to R-1 at the end of life of the condo building	RSF
301	I would change this land use	Free this land up, rezone RM, and move Parras onto the RUHS or Continuation school campus.	PI
302	I would change this land use	This area is a classic example of why we should not upzone any more land. But for bad state policy, this land should be returned to R-1 at the end of life of the 2-plexs and 4-plexes	CF
303	I have a suggestion	All surrounding residential neighborhoods are 30-foot max height, just like this area. It needs to stay consistent with the local neighborhoods.	CF
304	I have a suggestion	BCHDs proposed \$12,500 per month rent Assisted Living doesn't have cooking facilities in the units so it's not qualified housing, nor can it count for affordable. If BCHD were to use 2% tax-free muni bond financing, and not-for-profit operations instead of a hiring a commercial developer who will get 4-5% financing costs and easily add 20% to services costs for profits we could have affordable housing for seniors. BCHD won't even consider the public option however.	PI
307	I would change this land use	Allow mixed use here. Bribe developers with taller buildings in exchange for LI and MI housing for teachers and health care workers. RUHS and nursing home workers could walk to work.	RM
309	I like this land use	Given proximity to cliffs, I wouldn't upzone here.	RM
310	I would change this land use	Beg BCHD to go back to earlier plans to have senior housing here. It would have sufficient density to satisfy LI RHNA.	PI
312	I would change this land use	The entire Catalina corridor should be upzoned. It's close enough to the beach to fetch high prices for market rate units that can subsidize LI ones.  Build protected bike lanes along Catalina or PCH so that cycling will be more attractive than driving. This area appeals to retirees and singles working at LAAFB. Extend/connect bike lanes along Aviation for younger workers. Given the opportunity, younger workers will eBike, especially the LAAFB & Aerospace workers.	RM
317	I would change this land use	Riviera Village is perfect for mixed use up to 10 floors. It's a walkable and highly desirable area. Seniors would love it. Higher density would pencil out because market rate units can most easily subsidize low income units near the beach and in RV.	CF
318	I would change this land use	Allow lot combos and upzone to mid-rise homes without internal stairs.	RSF
319	I would change this land use	This area is notorious on the red-line maps of LA County. It's an exclusionary neighborhood with covenants against Asians, Blacks and Latinos. It's also zoned R1 even though those "beachy bungalows" can be scraped off and replaced with maximum volume mansions.  At the minimum, upzone this area to R3 for reparations to those formerly excluded. Allow and incentivize lot combinations w/ denser zoning to build taller apt bldgs without internal stairs for our burgeoning elderly population.	RSF
325	I would change this land use	This site can accommodate housing at 30/du.	CC
327	I would change this land use	Allow mixed use. My friends live in a condo on top of a small shopping mall (w/ supermarket) that was redeveloped taller. Their development had open space in the middle and parking below.  This is a low-lying spot so a taller building would not be out of scale. We could require elevated public open space and an aerial walkway to BCHD and across Prospect in exchange for increasing buildable height. It would be a nice neighborhood amenity & improve pedestrian/cyclist safety.	CF
333	I would change this land use	This R1 area should be R3. It's even closer to jobs than their R3 neighbors. Extend the bike lanes on Diamond and Del Amo and tens of thousands of jobs and many schools are reachable w/o cars	RSF
341	I would change this land use	This site can easily accommodate residential. 30du/ac as opposed to industrial uses near on the waterfront.	CC
347	I would change this land use	More housing opportunities here.	RSF
Comments placed in 90278 Outside of Focus Areas			
2	I would change this land use	This is absolutely absurd. Our family, as well as our neighbors', was required to pay a premium to live here even when we can hardly afford to eat because of the cost. This neighborhood is protected and safe. Putting in housing here will ruin the neighborhood. I am in shock that this is even a consideration. Either near the Galleria, or in a neighboring city like Lawndale. Research has proven again and again and again that "affordable housing" drives down the worth of all neighboring areas.	IG
3	I would change this land use	No new housing along 182nd St/Kingsdale/Galleria area. 300 units at the Galleria is already too much for the single lane roads and full schools. The buses have run empty or few riders for many years and do not justify building more housing. There have been many accidents and near misses at the dangerous heavy traffic intersection of 182nd St/Inglewood Ave. in the R1 family neighborhoods next to Adams Middle School and Washington Elementary.	IF-R
11	I have a suggestion	South Redondo needs to share in the distribution of these low income units. North RB schools are more crowded than most South RB schools as it is. This affects our home values, our class sizes. North Redondo should not have such a disproportionate amount assigned. Make it fair to all residents and home owners.	IG
16	I like this land use	Seems like this area floods easily. (Kudos to those of you who planned the renovation that eliminated to flooding of this part of Beryl, by the way).	PI
19	I like this land use	Please keep this area R1. The streets cannot handle the traffic as it is and this would put children at greater risk.	RSF
22	I like this land use	Leave it as is. Otherwise, it will cause an overwhelming amount of traffic over narrow streets and an overcrowded school.	RSF
27	I have a suggestion	I don't support the proposed land use. We should split the housing burden equally to south and north redondo.	RSF
28	I would change this land use	Leave this zone as is. The schools are already overcrowded. There are areas in 90277 that can fit more residential homes.	IG
40	I would change this land use	I would like to see this area to used for new housing.	RMH
52	I would change this land use	1st, the housing allocation number from the state for RB is way too high. But if we are forced to accept this, then half or more must be placed in South RB. The housing that the state is demanding can be put somewhere north of Barstow..	RM
53	I like this land use	I like this land use. Leave the zoning here as-is to keep long term area residents.	RSF





Redondo Beach Community Comments on Recommended Land Use Plan

Comments Received on Social PinPoint (April 7 - April 11, 2021)			
Comment No.	Type	Comment	Rec. Land Use Where Comment Was Placed
61	I would change this land use	This area of District 3 is too dense! Homes are built to the end limits of the property line. There are no sideways with parkways. The streets are hilly which makes walking a chore. Walk in the street and hope you don't get hit. If the City of Redondo is looking at land use, review the density and "beach vibe" of this area. And parks, where can the kids play? There are no yards.	RSL
62	I would change this land use	When residents mention high density, they need to visit the area known as Golden Hills! These are not single-family homes; they are condos with a few inches of space between them! There needs to be a STOP to the zoning of 2 on a lot! There are few trees, as the driveways take up available space. The lots are too narrow for nice shade trees. Limited parking, in front of the older homes, because there are only driveways. Invite a few friends over and shuttle them to your home.	RSL
65	I have a suggestion	There are apartments across the street. Is there any area along Manhattan Beach Blvd. on the north side that could be earmarked for condo or apartments? Limited number along the street with a courtyard in the middle. Underground parking and a limit of three floors, same height as the industrial area. They would have access to buses on Manhattan and exercise at Aviation.	IG
67	I would change this land use	In this area, not sure exactly of the spot, could smaller apartment buildings be located in an area that is close to the metro, and close to stores? Mixed-use, with access to the metro for WORK! Two-three floors with underground parking. Maybe stores or offices on the first floor, and apartments on 2nd and 3rd.	IG
69	I have a suggestion	GPAC needs to consider AES to fulfill the additional housing requirement. We have to be more open minded here! I understand the need to have additional housing by the 405 and Green Line, but people want to live near the beach as well. Diversify our future residents, our diversity is what makes us great!	IG
71	I like this land use	R-2 zoning in this area is OK at best but there should be no more multi-family and/or apartment complexes built in this area. It is already too densely populated. Parking is already impossible for many and accidents on these streets are results of increased population and poor traffic control. Difficult 90 degree turns into streets.	RL
72	I have a suggestion	R-2 zoning in this area is fine however, there should be no more multi-family and/or apartment complexes built in this area since it is dense packed in it's current state. This is evident through the ever increasing traffic and non-existent street side parking.	RL
79	I would change this land use	New housing should be divided equally through entire redondo. To divide equally between north and south redondo	IG
80	I would change this land use	New housing should be divided equally through entire redondo. To divide equally between north and south redondo	RM
90	I like this land use	I do not understand the commentor who suggests all R1 should be "upzoned to R3 " on "fairness grounds" ?? We pay our "fair share of high CA taxes" for the property we own which is not a "public resource" as the commentor suggests. Please keep this area as-is, R1.	RSF
91	I would change this land use	This is a plan to destroy North Redondo to save South Redondo. High density subsidized housing exempt from parking requirements means more traffic, overly burdened schools, and cars parked on every inch of residential streets.	RSF
92	I like this land use	Please leave this area as R1. We are long-term not "privliged" residents who have worked very hard in order to save and build a decent home. Rezoning the R1 areas to R2 and higher will quickly diminish the residents' quality of life in terms of increased traffic, safety, street parking, and over-crowding of schools.	RSF
94	I would change this land use	It's unfair for North Redondo to shoulder the entire load of high density/low income housing mandated by the state while South Redondo remains unscathed.  The comments by the presenters that it's important to retain the "beach vibe" in South Redondo but not the R1 neighborhoods in the TRW and Galleria neighborhoods show that those driving this don't care if the city is divided.	IG
95	I would change this land use	Usually high density is reserved for downtown areas while suburbs are less dense. Why is the plan upside down? Reduce units by 1/4 and plan for the building of the remaining required units in South Redondo. The low/very low income residents will appreciate the proximity to the beach strand enjoy healthy living.	IG
96	I would change this land use	Was there any consideration by the GPAC to limiting high density apartment buildings in this Tech District to north of Santa Fe Avenue so as not to impact the R1 residential area south of Manhattan Beach Blvd.?	IG
97	I would change this land use	Why isn't South Redondo sharing the load of rezoning obligations imposed upon the City of Redondo by the State? Why does Wendy Nowak of PlaceWorks think the "beachy vibe" is more important to protect than the single family vibe of North Redondo Beach? I am quoting what she said during the April 7th virtual community meeting. I posed this question during the Q&A on April 7th but unfortunately the GPAC did not respond to my inquiry.	IG
98	I have a suggestion	Was there any consideration by the GPAC to limiting high density apartment buildings in this Tech District to north of Santa Fe Avenue so as not to impact the R1 residential area south of Manhattan Beach Blvd.?	IG
99	I like this land use	Please keep this little sliver of R1. We need some areas where massive houses aren't crammed together on one lot.	RSF
110	I like this land use	Keep all the housing between Aviation and Inglewood and Artesia and MBB zoned as-is. It's already a high enough density with 75% zoned R2/R3 and only a tiny sliver at R1. If we want to turn this area into an extension of Lawndale then by all means just knock it all down and make one big apartment complex.	RL
118	I like this land use	Changing this area to R2 or R3 would over crowd our local schools and cause a massive amount of traffic down very narrow streets making it dangerous for children.	RSF
119	I like this land use	The lack of comments seems to indicate a change is not imminent inzining this neighborhood. I hope that is the case, but given RB's history, I take nothing for granted!	RSF
127	I like this land use	This area is a great R1 neighborhood. The increase of AUD's is already making an impact on the density of the community. The lots are not large enough for more homes and the streets are quite narrow.	RSF
154	I like this land use	Keep R1 as it is! We have so little R1 zoned space in Redondo, and they can already accept ADUs.	RSF
169	I have a suggestion	Partition the dog park into 2 or 3 parks so owners can always have line of sight to the dogs.	OS
171	I have a suggestion	Skateboard park?	PI
178	I have a suggestion	Plant trees along the bike path. Turn in into a more attractive park and walkway.	U
182	I have a suggestion	What's happening with this parcel? I have seen it and there is nothing here but rusting vehicles.	PI
184	I would change this land use	190th needs to be explored for potential growth housing unit growth. It is unreasonable to leave this corridor out of the conversation. The demand for increased housing density must be shared amongst the entire city.	RM
188	I would change this land use	Reduce by half	IG
199	I have a suggestion	What are the occupancy rates and rental per sq. foot of the businesses and office buildings on this strip of Aviation as compared to the HD residential uses which are interspersed throughout this corridor. This would tell us how the two uses compare as effective land uses. We could make more informed comments with more detailed information.	RL



Redondo Beach Community Comments on Recommended Land Use Plan

Comments Received on Social PinPoint (April 7 - April 11, 2021)			
Comment No.	Type	Comment	Rec. Land Use Where Comment Was Placed
200	I like this land use	The high density mixed use zoning on Kingsdale makes sense for this area across from the Galleria.	RMH
224	I have a suggestion	There is an empty field area near the bike path. Why not make this into a dog park for North Redondo residents? Many people in this area live in multi-housing units and would benefit having an area for their dogs to run around.	U
228	I like this land use	We need to keep R1 areas to ensure property values remain strong and to continue to accommodate seniors. The reality is that people are living longer, and adding more multi level housing will not be feasible for the elderly to age in place due to physical limitations.	RSF
230	I have a suggestion	Is there no legal recourse against the state? Our community is already too overcrowded. Truthfully, we feel we'll have to sell our home and leave the area in the coming years if the overcrowding continues. It's getting too hard to get anywhere on the roads or find parking. We'll need new schools and infrastructure that we can't afford while Artesia and other areas still need to be revitalized. Forced growth is going to destroy our community. Can't we fight back?	RL
245	I have a suggestion	The units should absolutely be distributed equally between N+S Redondo!, but if you must find space in North Redondo, consider turning this "oddball" section of Ruhland Ave. between Rindge and blossom into R-2. You can probably get an extra 22 or so units that way.	RSF
249	I like this land use	I like the new suggested land use	IG
252	I have a suggestion	I would like to see this street mixed use with commercial on the first level and housing on second and third level. This can be a transportation corridor and an inviting residential walkable shopping corridor.	RM
255	I have a suggestion	This area should be zoned to include mixed use residential. Being that it is close to mass transit and there is enough land area for commercial and office uses as well as residential. A project could be built here that wouldn't require residents to drive to eat or do their errands.	IG
256	I would change this land use	We need to equitably share the zoning with 90277. Those of us living and owning in 90278 have always taken the brunt of the condos, apts and zoning in North Redondo. It's time to share within south Redondo as I don't want to see our property values suffer. My husband and I have owned and lived in our home since 1986. It's beyond unfair how north Redondo has suffered with single family homes being sold to developers and becoming two and three on a lot. The homeless issue needs sharing as well.	RSF
269	I have a suggestion	incentives for these store to remodel	RM
280	I have a suggestion	Tall and skinnies are junk density. How seismically safe are tall and skinny houses? You can't build any more densely without combining lots. But, you can make them more bike friendly so people living there don't need as many cars.  We need safer & more frequent crossings of Aviation & Aviation for people of all ages on foot and bike.	RSL
281	I have a suggestion	Tall and skinnies are junk density. You can't build any more densely without combining lots. But, you can make them more bike friendly so people living there don't need as many cars.	RSL
284	I like this land use	Keep this as R1 and can be utilized as ADU	RSF
288	I have a suggestion	Move City Hall and PD to this already owned and zoned land.	PI
300	I have a suggestion	Is this accurate? I was under the impression that SCE owned the R-O-W under the power lines. If so, it's zoned utility, right?	OS
305	I would change this land use	If North Redondo is to bear most of the new housing and density, plus metro, plus housing for the homeless, plus new giant mall, where are the benefits of being urbanized so aggressively... Power lines underground? Redistricting for fair and equal representation on council if we have more population? Real pedestrian/bike friendly streets? GREEN SPACE that's bigger than our yards? Either give us the benefits of being urbanized OR find ways to share the load and keep the whole city suburban.	RM
306	I would change this land use	Isn't this area dense enough with housing and traffic? I thought Artesia and Aviation were going to get more walkable for current residents? The desire to remove live-work space, seems like a veiled effort to open up this area to big box stores like on Hawthorne.	RM
320	I like this land use	Keep this as an R-1 zone. It's one of the few places in North Redondo that is zoned R-1. It can also accommodate ADU's, which would count toward our required additional housing numbers.	RSF
324	I would change this land use	This is a low-lying spot and a difficult place to cross outside of cars.  Allow taller mixed use redevelopment with retail/services below, housing above and a roof-top public open space. Find some way to provide an elevated walkway for children to cross Aviation on their way to Birney ES	RMH
326	I would change this land use	We can increase density at the Foundry and along the 190 corridor. Allow more mixed use and taller.	RM
328	I have a suggestion	Is it possible to use some of the dog park/police shooting range land to help with the housing requirements?	OS
335	I would change this land use	We should upzone all R1 to R3 throughout the city on fairness grounds. Land is both a commodity and a public resource. It should serve future residents as well as current ones. This site is walking distance to the current Green line station and many parcels have alleys. Alley homes and homes on top of alley garages could add many homes near transit and NG jobs.	RSF
Comments placed outside of City			
74	I have a suggestion	I think all required housing should be distributed equally over the entire city. This could be achieved by allowing individual property owners to decide whether they will add a second unit on their property. If course, there would have to be room on the property for that	N/A
158	I have a suggestion	FAR should be reduced 26 du/ac. No mixed use	N/A
191	I have a suggestion	I have been living near Lincoln Elementary School since 1997. Me and my siblings almost went to Lawndale High School. Have Centinela Valley Union High School District allow some North Redondo residents that live around here attend Lawndale High.	N/A
218	I have a suggestion	I would only ALLOW for residential and appropriate businesses that reflect the area. No more chemical, power or gas or electrical or recycling in this neighborhood. Especially with its proximity to Hawthorne Blvd and EXISTING homes. In other words no INDUSTRIAL uses...	N/A
231	I have a suggestion	The green and red comment use is not very clear. Does green mean "I like this land use" AS IS, or AS PLANNED? Likewise, does a red comment indicate a desired change from the current, or the proposed??	N/A
232	I have a suggestion	Why are the yellow SFR areas not zoned R2 and above like the majority of Redondo? Two-on-a-lots in these areas (whether ever built or not) would account for a huge percentage of the required RHNA numbers. There are 50 x 100 lots in some areas that are zoned R2 (mine, for instance!) -- the SFRs here are not all smaller than that, are they?? The potential for ADUs above and beyond these re-zonings could account for the affordable housing percentage required, right?	N/A

