

BLUE FOLDER ITEM

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

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING September 16, 2021

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

- Written comments on non-agenda items received after release of agenda

Planning Commission Meeting 09-16-2021

Non Agenda Item - Comment

I am opposed, in Redondo to any permanent site designated as a temporary shelter for the homeless, and less if it is selected near or around the waterfront. I some way agreed with the one, that now have the temporary Pallet Shelter that is hide among industrial or warehouse facilities. But as I stated before and I repeat again still unacceptable for Redondo to define locations without a team work with other neighbor cities. We are not an isolated city we are part of a region that is dense populated: It is a common problem and we cannot ignore that.

Last January, the governor of California issued and executive order that tasked state agencies with the evaluation of surplus land for use as potential emergency homeless shelters. The list of parcels under consideration are inland, the locations well identified, in different cities that support one more time the idea that the homeless problem is a regional job.

“Housing First...” struggles to succeed, because people with mental health need to be send to psychiatric hospitals where many cannot be released because independent living is difficult for them including with ongoing support services. Most of the others homeless are the consequence of substance abuse and dependence that made them fall in a similar situation as the one with mental illness. Consequently the better way to address homeless is to treat the root causes!

For the very few that are not included in the above group, I suggest that help them to find a job because is full of signs, all over, asking for help. If not, as I mentioned one of my senators and he agreed, send them to pick up the crop. There, they will have shelter, food and salary that will help them to be in their own.

Conclusion: Find a **regional solution to the problem**, but not selecting places in our City to dump temporary homeless shelters creating other problems in our neighborhood. There, many residents have work very hard to have their property besides a safe and decent quality of life. Then is unacceptable that under the name of homeless anyone can destroy that!

Delia A. Vechi
Redondo Beach

From: Holly Osborne

To:

Sent: Thursday, September 16, 2021, 06:03:25 PM PDT

Subject: Remarks for Planning Commission on Sept 16, 2021 Final reorganized

Good evening, planning commission and staff.

My name is Dr. Holly Osborne, i am a retired engineer.

Tonight, in the non-agenda section I want to talk about some background items, which will be helpful when I later talk about the Housing Element. This speech is *heavily* footnoted; those of you who know me know that I am obsessive about accuracy. I will send this speech out to you as soon as I am done speaking. Please just listen.

There are three items I wish to discuss:

- 1) **Heat**, the leading cause of death due to climate related activities.
- 2) An obscure, **last minute amendment to SB 9**, which really is not a change but which helped SB 9 pass.
- 3) **Senate, Lies and Videotape.**

So, here we go,

Item 1: Heat. In a recent article in the *LA Times*, (See Ref. 1a)) they describe heat as "killing more people in an average year than any other weather hazard" (tornadoes, hurricanes, etc.) I have spoken before about how shade trees or the lack thereof can cause as much as 5-20 degrees difference in a city. (Ref 1b) We have people working hard to plant more trees to make the city cooler and more walkable. The city and the planning commission should make sure that as we pursue this goal in one part of the city, we do not allow the concretization of other parts of the city, making it hotter and less walkable. Trees and grass should not be a zero-sum game.

This heat problem is only getting worse. Another article from the *LA Times* Nov. 2020 mentioned that August, September and October (of 2020) were the hottest ever. (Ref 1 c) It is even more imperative that we not allow random pavement of current green space.

Two very illuminating quotes from an aforementioned article articles (ref 1b) were:

"Heat is the nation's deadliest weather disaster, killing as many as 12,000 per year." *NY Times* August 24, 2020

"In Portland, zoning rules allowed multifamily apartment buildings to cover the entire lot and be built without any green space, a practice the city only recently changed." *NY Times* August 24, 2020

(See people? Can we put the green space requirements in? Can we not repeat mistakes?)

[I want to interject here that the planning commissioners have been saying for over two years that they are going to be dealing with the issue of open space, in multi family housing, and I hope that the chairman of the commission can deal with that tonight, and direct them to do it.]

So, what can we do about this? This brings me to item 2. A recent change to SB 9 can be useful in this problem of heat, although that was not its intention.

Item 2. Amendment to SB 9 There was talk about adding an amendment to SB 9 exclude high fire areas because people did not want to densify in fire-risk zones. When I called Sacramento, I was told that an amendment was **not necessary, because there was already a paragraph in the over-riding code that allowed a city to deny building for any reason.** so in a sense, there already was a "fire exclusion" provision.

Subsequently, the amendment was made to SB 9 by adding that paragraph. It says nothing about fires, It says:

(d) ... a local agency may deny a proposed housing development project if the building official makes a written finding, based upon a preponderance of the evidence, that the proposed housing development project would have a specific, adverse impact, as defined and determined in paragraph (2) of subdivision (d) of Section 65589.5, upon public health and safety or the physical environment and for which there is no feasible method to satisfactorily mitigate or avoid the specific, adverse impact.

This paragraph, **taken from code already existing**, was placed in SB 9, and the presenter announced that now they had taken care of the fire danger, so there was no longer a reason to oppose the bill on that grounds. (This did not really change SB 9 because this "health and safety" code was already in effect.) (See note 2d, This was not exactly what the representatives wanted.)

However, one good part about having that "health and safety" part of the code repeated in SB 9, means that more of us are aware of it. . **We need to invoke it.**

End of Part 1. To be continued later in the evening.

Item 3. This third part I call "Senate, Lies and videotape" and it is the part that infuriates me the most about SB 9.

SB 9 does not let cities enforce design guidelines, even though legislators tells you it does. : At every hearing to which I have listened, someone on the committee asks if adding houses on half- lots, or building duplexes will enable the neighborhood to have the same "look and feel" and keep their design guidelines. **The speaker dutifully says yes, every time.** However, what the speaker does **NOT** say is that a city, in fact, **cannot** keep its setback guidelines, if their the guidelines prevent building two units each of 800 sq ft, on each split. **The speaker NEVER mentions the caveat.**

And this is a problem for cities with small lots. Apparently, most members do not have any idea how small a 5000 sq ft lot is, or a 2500 sq ft lots, because they will allow both of those to be split, with a duplex on each split! Many cities have minimum lot sizes of 10,000 sq ft or more, or even on the orders of an acres. They will not have a problem. They can retain the look of their city.

Here is the statement allowing cities to set design guidelines:

b) (1) Notwithstanding any local law and except as provided in paragraph (2), a local agency may impose objective zoning standards, objective subdivision standards, and objective design review standards that do not conflict with this section.

Here is the caveat:

(2) (A) The local agency shall not impose objective zoning standards, objective subdivision standards, and objective design standards **that would have the effect of physically precluding the construction of up to two units or that would physically preclude either of the two units from being at least 800 square feet in floor area.**

I could also have called this section " Press, Lies and Videotape." I am grateful to the Daily Breeze for publishing articles on SB 9, but one of their columnists, Mr. Konstantin Hatcher, should do more diligent research on this issue, and another, Mr. Steven Greenhut, says something totally irrelevant about this matter..

Daily Breeze, August 22. Mr. Hatcher states: "The bill also ensures that a new home must fit in with the existing neighborhood: any development or modification to a property must conform with the look and feel of the current homes. Local ordinances related to setbacks, height, landscaping, design or other restrictions that apply to single family homes will still apply."

Mr. Hatcher, the bill does not apply if you have a small lot. That is a major problem with the bill.

Mr. Greenhut states: "I live in a community that allows the by-right approval of second homes (provided they conform to setbacks and size requirements.) "

My response is, that is very nice for you, but the bill would not let us in Redondo do the same. My question to you is, how big is your lot?

This Daily Breeze article was accompanied by a typical idyllic looking duplex, on a lush green lot. Here it is: What the article does **not say** is that it is on a lot greater than 11,000 sq ft. That duplex of course blends in beautifully with the neighborhood. To imply that that is typical is the ultimate falsehood.



Figure above is 11,000+ sq.ft lot on Crown Boulevard in San Jose, California. It accompanied the Daily Breeze article.

This is what 2500 sq ft lots look like in Redondo. This is our reality. One size zoning does not fit all.



Okay, commissioners, we want to see guidelines that do not let any public green space in front of houses be paved over in our residential neighborhoods (outside of our usual guidelines); nor any private front lawns reduced from their size with the current guidelines. **This is a health issue.**

Item 1 References:

1a. .LA Times, "The unjust toll of extreme heat", August 18, 2021. <https://www.latimes.com/opinion/story/2021-08-18/climate-change-extreme-heat>. [Editorial: The unjust toll of extreme heat](#) It also says that "Heat waves have been overlooked and underfunded as a climate threat in California."

1b. NY Times, August 24, 2020. <https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2020/08/24/climate/racism-redlining-cities-global-warming.html>.

(All statements below taken *verbatim* from the article. HCO)

Heat is the nation's deadliest weather disaster, killing as many as [12,000 people a year](#).

Researchers have found that excess heat and a lack of green space can [affect mental well-being](#) and increase anxiety. Without parks or shady outdoor areas to gather, people are more likely to be isolated indoors during the summer, a dynamic worsened by the coronavirus pandemic.

Green space can be transformative. Trees [can cool down neighborhoods by several degrees](#) during a heat wave, studies show, helping to lower electric bills as well as the risk of death.

In Portland, zoning rules allowed multifamily apartment buildings to cover the entire lot and [be built without any green space](#), a practice the city only recently changed.

1.c , *LA times*, Nov 7, 2020, "Three straight months of record heat in California" (Refers to August, September, ct. 2020)

1.d *NY Times*, Sept 15, 2021 <https://www.yahoo.com/news/greatest-killer-orleans-wasnt-hurricane-114215878.html>

The article was entitled:

The Greatest Killer in New Orleans Wasn't the Hurricane. It Was the Heat .

(All statements below are taken *verbatim* from the article. HCO)

This comes as heat waves are growing more frequent, longer lasting and more dangerous. The 2018 National Climate Assessment, a major scientific report by 13 federal agencies, notes that the number of hot days is increasing, **and the frequency of heat waves in the United States jumped from an average of two per year in the 1960s to six per year by the 2010s.**

"Heat is a hazard that we simply haven't given sufficient attention to," said David Hondula, a professor at Arizona State University who studies the effects of sweltering temperatures. **"All cities are in the early stages of understanding what an effective heat response looks like"**

All 10 people whose deaths have been tied to the heat were in their 60s and 70s, and they died over four broiling days, the last of which was Sept. 5, a full week after the storm. (*My note: There were 14 total deaths due to the storm. HCO*)

Please note that in the LA Time of May 3, 2020 'a planning commissioner from [Norther California, said of Covid] that; just as a forest fire clears dead brush, 'the sick, the old, the injured' should be left to meet their 'natural course in nature.' " "Older adults were a drain on society."

So maybe you don't want to worry about heat related deaths. But when heat starts affecting young people, you will. Please keep our city green, and do not let Sacramento make it into an oven.

Item 2 References:

2a) SB 9 Background. During the committee meetings in both houses of the legislature, it was brought up that several representatives did not want to densify their cities in zones that were considered high fire danger. They wanted specific fire zone exclusions [2b] Still another legislator said she would vote for SB 9 in committee (Ref 2b), but she wanted to continue to work on amendments, about fire zones. She was told there would still be amendments.

During a subsequent phone call with the person who wrote the housing analysis for the bills (Mr. Steve Wertheim) i was told there would be absolutely no amendments to SB 9. I said what about the fire danger amendments. Mr. Wertheim replied that they were not necessary, because there was already a paragraph in the over-riding code that allowed a city to deny building for any reason. so in a sense, there already was a "fire exclusion" provision.

2b). This was first mentioned in the SB 1120 hearings last year, by Assemblymember Laura Friedman. She represents a district that has a proposed development project in Tejon Ranch, consisting of thousands of houses, and she mentioned that if they were to burn, she did not want four times that number to burn, Another legislator was concerned with narrow streets in the hillsides, and few egress routes from the cities should there be a fire. (You have probably all seen the massive lines of cars trying to escape the Lake Tahoe fires.)

2c). Luz Rivas on 6/9/21 in Assembly Local Government Committee. She voted for the bill in committee; but did not support it on the full assembly floor.

2d). The three legislators who had expressed the fire related concerns at various times were not fooled, They did not vote for the bill. But other people thought something substantial had been added. (And another legislator remarked that homelessness killed people more than fires did, so she wasn't concerned about fires anyway.)