

**From:** Mark Nelson

**Sent:** Sunday, August 8, 2021 9:41 PM

**To:** Brandy Forbes <[Brandy.Forbes@redondo.org](mailto:Brandy.Forbes@redondo.org)>

**Cc:** CityClerk <[CityClerk@redondo.org](mailto:CityClerk@redondo.org)>; CityClerk <[CityClerk@torranceca.gov](mailto:CityClerk@torranceca.gov)>; Paul Novak <[pnovak@lalafo.org](mailto:pnovak@lalafo.org)>; Judy Rae <[easyreader@easyreadernews.com](mailto:easyreader@easyreadernews.com)>; Lisa Jacobs <[lisa.jacobs@tbrnews.com](mailto:lisa.jacobs@tbrnews.com)>; Bill Brand <[Bill.Brand@redondo.org](mailto:Bill.Brand@redondo.org)>; [PFurey@torranceca.gov](mailto:PFurey@torranceca.gov)

**Subject:** Public Comment - Public Objection to BCHD Proposed Project Size and Site Location

Dear Planning Commissioners and Director:

**1,200 RESIDENTS PETITIONED BCHD TO REDUCE THE SIZE OF THE BCHD PROPOSAL TO BE CONSISTENT WITH THE SURROUNDING RESIDENTIAL 30-FOOT LAND USES**

Following BCHD's EIR Notice of Preparation, a petition exceeding 1,200 signatures of local residents was gathered and provided to BCHD objecting to the size and location of the proposed 3rd party built commercial development. This "official" plan from BCHD that was included in the NOP of the EIR was 60-feet tall, 729,000 sqft of surface buildings, and located on the perimeter of the failed South Bay Hospital site.

**BCHD NEARLY DOUBLED THE HEIGHT AND INCREASED THE SQUARE FEET OF SURFACE BUILDINGS IN THE DEIR FROM THE NOP DESPITE OBJECTIONS**

Subsequently, in response to the 1,200 local resident objection, BCHD published a draft EIR for public comment that was 103-feet tall, 793,000 sqft of surface buildings (BCHD eliminated 160,000 sqft of underground parking) and still located on the perimeter of the failed hospital site.

**BCHD CHOSE TO ENGAGE IN EJ WARFARE AGAINST THE NEIGHBORHOOD TO THE NORTH OF THE FAILED SOUTH BAY HOSPITAL PARCEL**

To make matters even worse, BCHD appears to have engaged in a deliberate act of economic and environmental injustice by concentrating the 103-foot tower damages (133-feet above surrounding homes according to BCHD DEIR) on the north campus, on the perimeter, up against the lowest income, most diverse, youngest age residents surrounding the parcel. The area between Beryl and 190th/Anita and Prospect and Flagler has an average age that is half that of the east, south and west neighborhoods. In addition, it is a more diverse area with a lower income than the surrounding areas. In short, BCHD deliberately opted to use its economic and political power against the neighborhood that could least defend itself from 5 years of construction, toxic transportation emissions and noise, aesthetic damages, and 50-100 years of continued neighborhood EJ impacts.

In short, BCHD caved to the affluent southern and eastern neighborhoods and waged an EJ war on the lower income, younger, and more diverse Redondo Beach residents to the north.

**BCHD IS PLANNING FOR 92% NON-RESIDENT TENANTS ON OUR PUBLIC LAND USE AND DISPROPORTIONATELY DAMAGING REDONDO BEACH RESIDENTS**

BCHD cannot be allowed to diminish the health and welfare of the surrounding neighborhoods for the benefit of wealthy non-residents. Redondo Beach's Public land uses are for the public benefit of Redondo Beach residents. BCHD is a public entity that has subjected the surrounding neighborhoods to 60 years of wholly disproportionate EJ damages so far, and proposes an additional 50-100 years more for the sake of housing rich, non-residents. The benefit to Redondo Beach residents is clearly NEGATIVE in this case, despite BCHD misrepresentation to the City Attorney in the February 2019 memo from counsel. This is little different than if BCHD proposed a landfill that was open to all comers. Yes it would

have small value to local residents, but the economic, environmental and health damages would swamp those benefits. BCHD is proposing a 92% non-resident benefit while Redondo Beach absorbs 100% of the damages for another 50-100 years following the 60 years of accumulated damage to date by BCHD/SBHD.

**BCHD NEVER ASSESSED THE NEED FOR RCFE IN THE 3 BEACH CITIES**

BCHDs consultant, MDS, conducted commercial analysis to determine the market for \$12,500 per month RCFE in a wide area, not for the 3 beach cities. Their analysis shows that the PV peninsula will have a larger demand by nearly 200% than the 3 beach cities for the use of our public land. Never did BCHD even analyze the needs of the 3 beach cities, because it was never planning to build a facility to serve OUR local seniors.

**BCHD NEVER ASSESSED WHETHER THERE WAS ANY MARKET SHORTFALL FOR MARKET-PRICE RCFE FOR THE 3 BEACH CITIES**

BCHD also never assessed whether there was any need for our public land to be used to create commercial, market-priced RCFE at \$12,500 per month. The market is doing a fine job of utilizing commercial land to build market priced commercial RCFE, and if BCHD is to be allowed to use our public land, then it must be for the exclusive tenancy of the 3 beach cities and provided at a cost-basis, not a severe, market price markup.

**RESIDENTS MUST BE PROTECTED FROM BCHD COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT DAMAGES ON PUBLIC LAND**

The Cities of Redondo Beach and Torrance must protect their residents from 50-100 years of additional economic and environmental injustice from BCHD. Redondo Beach must especially protect the neighborhood of approximately 1,000 residents to the north that is being taken advantage of due to its young age, lower income, increased diversity, and lesser political power than the southern and eastern neighborhoods to which BCHD clearly kowtowed. BCHD must be required to build SHORTER and SMALLER. The Redondo Beach Council determined that Kensington's 2-story design was consistent with surrounding residential land uses. BCHD must follow that same example or be denied design approval and a conditional use permit.

Mark Nelson  
Redondo Beach  
3+ Year BCHD Volunteer, Community Working Group

cc: Mayors and Councils of Redondo Beach and Torrance, Director of LALAFCO