

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

J.3. A PUBLIC HEARING FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE CITY OF REDONDO BEACH 6TH CYCLE 2021-2029 DRAFT HOUSING ELEMENT OF THE GENERAL PLAN AND CERTIFICATION OF THE ASSOCIATED CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA) DOCUMENT INITIAL STUDY/NEGATIVE DECLARATION

CONTACT: SEAN SCULLY, PLANNING MANAGER

- Summary of public comments

6th Cycle 2021-2029 Draft Housing Element – Public Comments and Responses**(Does not include comments/responses concerning associated environmental documents (ISND) or from/to State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD))**

Date Comment Received	Commenter	Comment Summary	Draft Responses in progress and to be released prior to October 5, 2021 City Council Public Hearing
04.10.2021	Grace Peng, PhD, Resident	<p>Commented her concerns that HCD will reject the draft Housing Element and that the draft HE does not meet the requirements of Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) and produces disparate impacts. Offers alternatives.</p> <p>Comments and questions concerning why the City did not examine it's past history. Notes that rules have changed sing the fifth RHNA cycle and are publicly available.</p> <p>Notes multiple Federal, US Supreme Court, State, and Regional government sources of information related to provision of fair housing.</p> <p>Notes the importance of aerospace industry in North Redondo Beach and recommends not putting a housing overlay on the Industrial areas that support the aerospace industry.</p> <p>Comments that GPAC was guided by Environmental Justice. Notes data from CalEnviroScreen and cites that the proposed housing within an area bounded by Inglewood, Marine, Redondo Beach Ave, Manhattan Beach Ave and next to 405 freeway will be negatively impacted by pollution.</p> <p>Notes HCD would not support housing on the Northrop Grumman site and then assign the city a much higher</p>	

		<p>housing target to reflect an expected low yield at this location.</p> <p>Claims that Redondo Beach still bears the marks of “20th century racist zoning and lending practices”. Cites a “mapping inequality” exhibit concerning lending practices and demographic data in support.</p> <p>City should up zone all R1 zones to R2 or R3, and give incentives to combine lots for building even more densely.</p> <p>Cites a USC study that found in high rent areas a higher percentage of inclusionary (subsidized housing) can be supported.</p> <p>Notes that students living in the north tech area (Freeway) and transit center (South Galleria) housing sites will have to cross train tracks and at least one arterial roadway to get to elementary school. Claims this creates disparate pollution and traffic impacts on some residents. Comments on negative school impacts with plan.</p> <p>City should put housing above parking lot in Riviera Village and incentivize lot consolidation for mixed use in Riviera Village.</p> <p>Notes benefits of reducing segregation and includes a table with student economic and racial demographic information per school in Redondo Beach.</p> <p>Comments that AES power plant site should be developed with highest number of VLI/LI units in the</p>	
--	--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

		<p>City. Cites an environmental justice argument to support housing recommendation on AES site.</p> <p>Concludes with request that the City do better and more equitable zoning.</p> <p>Includes Appendixes with CalEnvironScreen data per City Census Tract, School Populations with Economic Data.</p>	
04.12.2021	Therese Mufic Neustaedter	<p>Comments that Redondo Beach is “gaming” the Housing Element Update. Comments that RB downzoned southern part of town and added homes to northern end of town. Commenter questions putting housing overlays on northern industrial area next to freeway and between other busy roadways. Commenter attached letter with comments on Draft Housing Element from Grace Peng, PhD dated April 10, 2021.</p>	
05.11.2021	RUTAN & TUCKER, LLP, Attorneys representing fee owners of the 50-acre site on which AES operates	<p>Comments on Planning Commission’s vote, 5 to 2, in favor of mixed use allowing 30 dwelling units per acre for up to 50% of the Power Plant site. The property owner of the site agrees with Planning Commission’s recommendation.</p> <p>Comments on current status of the AES Power Plant permits to operate per the California State Water Resources Control Board.</p> <p>Comments on property owners plans for re-use of the Power Plant site.</p> <p>Notes that owner is wants to discuss with City Council the recommended re-use of the site for mixed use</p>	

		<p>development of 30 DU/AC. Power plant site represents prototypical “underutilized” property that State Law has determined should be made available for future development.</p> <p>Comments that owner has developed a plan for closure and clearing of the site by 2027. Could have approximately half the site developed with residential by late 2025.</p> <p>Comments that North Tech area site is less suitable for redevelopment and may not qualify due to the following: Proximity to freeway and adjacent industrial uses; Opposition by Northrup Grumman; eliminating commercial and industrial areas reducing local jobs and tax base; staggered leases which may make some areas unavailable; and elimination of last mile distribution of goods movement facilities.</p> <p>Comments that Power Plan site is superior location for large commercial or mixed-use campus that held remedy City jobs/housing imbalance. Owners contemplating:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 750 residential units • 300 key hotel • 750,000 sf of office (20% studio/production space) • 150,000 sf of retail, restaurant and event space 	
05.11.2021	RUTAN & TUCKER, LLP, Attorneys representing fee owners of 1021 N. Harbor	<p>Comments that this property, 1021 N. Harbor is a suitable housing site surrounded by other high density residential developed sites.</p> <p>Property owner requests that the City Council allow for residential uses at a density of no less than 30 DU/AC.</p>	

05.20.2021	Anthony Dedousis, Director, Policy and Research, Abundant Housing LA (Letter submitted on behalf of Abundant Housing LA and YIMBY Law)	<p>Abundant Housing LA is a pro-housing, nonprofit advocacy organization. YIMBY Law’s mission to make housing in CA more accessible and affordable through enforcement of state housing law.</p> <p>Cites “major concerns about the City’s willingness and ability to meet its state-mandate RHNA target of 2,490 homes by 2029. Claim that site inventory is inconsistent with HCD instructions and affirmatively further fair housing requirements under Assembly Bill 686.</p> <p>City fails to identify enough sites where RHNA housing growth can be accommodated by 2029.</p> <p>City’s approach fails on three counts:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The City proposes new housing in locations where it is highly unlikely to be built. 2. The City does not encourage new housing in locations where it is likely to be built. Leave the City’s underutilized land as-is. 3. The City bans new mixed-use development in locations where it has successfully been built in recent years. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Unlikely that the City’s rezoning plan will encourage meaningful housing growth. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area bounded by Marine, Inglewood, Manhattan Beach, and Redondo Beach Boulevards – Not a credible site as Northrop Grumman is very unlikely to vacate Space Park over next 8 years. • Galleria District - Since the Galleria District developer is planning housing the remainder Galleria area should also be allowed to provide additional residential development. Instead City 	
------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

		<p>plans to allow additional residential development on surrounding properties, but those property owners have shown no interest in residential development.</p> <p>City failed to provide convincing evidence that redevelopment of above sites is likely to happen.</p> <p>2. The City overlooks a large number of potential housing sites, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The AES site (51 Acres). New owner proposes office, hotel, and retail and no residential. If entire site is built at 55 units per acre nearly all of RB's RHNA could be accommodated.• The former South Bay Medical Center (9.3 acres). Site should provide additional housing at 55 units per acre.• Beachside parking lots (24 acres). Should be developed with residential, similar to Marina Del Rey.• The Space Park and Aviation Park parking lots (62 acres). Northrop Grumman parking lots should be developed with residential.• The Riviera Village parking lots. Should be developed with 60 or 215 units.• The west side of the Redondo Beach Transit Center. Maximum legal density should be allowed on all parcels within a half-mile of station. <p>3. The City plans to reduce the amount of development in areas where housing "pencils out". Claims the City violates "no net loss" requirements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The South Bay Galleria should allow for more residential. The City's up zoning of surrounding	
--	--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

		<p>parcels is not feasible as those landowners have shown no interest in building housing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pacific Coast Highway. The City has banned new mixed-use development along PCH and moving housing a mile to the north. • Artesia Boulevard. The City proposes to ban new apartment buildings along Artesia. To replace this capacity, City plans to redevelop two commercial plots along 190th, at Mary Anne and Meyer. <p>The City's approach to updating the housing element does not affirmatively further fair housing and reverse existing patterns of residential segregation. The City must address the issue of residential segregation by accommodating the lower-income RHNA targets in a way that conforms with AFFH requirements.</p> <p>The City should commit to major constraint removal policies in order to encourage strong housing growth at all levels of income including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legalize apartments on all residentially zoned parcels including R-1. • Significantly up zone parcels near transit, job centers, schools, and parks. • Legalize by-right residential and mixed-use development on commercially zoned parcels. • Pre-approval of standard ADUs. • Introduce density bonus program near mass transit. • Establish small lot subdivision program similar to City of LA. • Establish a fast-ministerial review process to approve new multifamily buildings. 	
--	--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Citywide elimination of on-site minimum parking mandates. • More flexibility on height, floor-area ratio, and lot coverage. 	
06.01.2021	Jon Wizard, Policy Director, Campaign for Fair Housing Elements, YIMBY Law	Requests that the City consider Redondo Beach resident and third-party commenter Dr. Grace Peng's comments. To date the majority of the City Council has been unresponsive to Dr. Peng's input this far. Cites Dr. Pang's letter dated	
07.09.2021	Bill Maher, Realtor	The owners of the property located at 306-312 S. Catalina Avenue would like to have their property considered for multi-family or mixed-use development.	
07.09.2021	Bob Pinzler, Resident	Percentage share of Married with children in 2019 should be 23% not 29%.	
07.11.2021	Barbara Epstein, Resident	<p>Hopes planning process is protected from special commercial interests and "ill-conceived state government requirements".</p> <p>Most important thing in planning is "greening up" of Redondo.</p> <p>Claims past city governments have catered to special developer interests, resulting in inadequate yards/setbacks on residential lots and no space for beneficial trees and plants to capture carbon and water, beautify neighborhoods, provide oxygen, and cool the atmosphere.</p> <p>Require ample green space, parkland, and trees with every residential building permit.</p> <p>Supports a proposed development on Catalina Avenue between Diamond and Emerald Streets that preserves</p>	

		the café and adds a bakery. Notes that the development is also overcrowded. Suggests additional development standards including planting native plant species for this proposed development. Offered South Bay Parkland Conservancy as a resource.	
07.26.2021	Nancy Skiba, Resident	"Affordable housing for 90277 and 90278 should be equally planned."	
08.23.2021	Laura Emdee, Resident (Council Person)	"If the Housing Element has been sent to HCD, what are the purpose of the comments? Where will they go and to what purpose?"	
08.24.2021	Natalie Bennion, Resident	"North Redondo Beach is already doing it's 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."	
08.25.2021	Leonid Pustilnikov, Property Owner	<p>Claims the City of Redondo Beach has spent the last generation fighting development. Cites the Legado Project development review process in support of claim.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Originally planned for 180 units, was approved for 115 units. Still awaiting permits more than a decade later. <p>Notes surprise that Redondo completed 40% (559 of 1,397) of its required 5th Cycle.</p> <p>In order to meet 6th Cycle goal commenter recommends the City be proactive and update its zoning throughout the City. Notes that City's proposed solution puts 49% of housing at the city's edge. Claims all housing overlay sites are adjacent to other, less affluent jurisdictions. Claims probability of any units in the proposed housing overlay areas is "extremely low" and cites the following claims in support of assertion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> North Tech site. 	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A business in Redondo Beach since 1985 has no intentions of relocating or shutting down. ○ A grocery anchored shopping center with 100% occupancy (17 tenants) has no plans of selling or repositioning the property. ○ A national plumbing fixture showroom located at site for years. ○ Any residential development would pose a serious adverse health impacts on its residents. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● South Transit Center site. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Property recently purchased in 2019 and as currently planned does not include housing. ● South Bay Galleria site. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Sought entitlements for 650 units and was approved for on 300 units. ○ Claims that due to “covid pandemic” significant changes to the project are likely and will take years to resolve. <p>Claims Redondo Beach is not “serious about housing” as evidenced by residential overlays instead of rezoning sites exclusively for residential. Cites the reason for residential overlays is to avoid “vocal protest” from property owners.</p> <p>Comments that currently proposed housing sites create the illusion of housing and ignores changes to most of the city. More suitable solutions in and around affluent parts of the city were not considered.</p> <p>Cited appropriate alternative locations for exclusively residential or mixed-use development that are adjacent</p>	
--	--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

		<p>to parks, bike paths, beaches and harbors and developments ranging from 17.5 to 120 units per acre but not considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1-acre site at 1021 N. Harbor. • 50-acre power plant at 1100 N. Harbor. <p>Notes Planning Commission's recommendation for 50% of power plant site be zoned at 30 dwelling units per acre. Notes City Council chose other areas for housing and ignored power plant site that commenter claims are not suitable sites that will never be developed.</p> <p>Notes as the property owner of 1021 N. Harbor and 1100 N. Harbor that he has studies reports confirming housing could be built on the site within the 6th cycle, is eager to build housing, and is currently cleaning and remediating 1100 N. Harbor in anticipation of its closure on or before December 31, 2023. Claims that the City deemed 1021 and 1100 N. Harbor unsuitable because "the city knew it would mean real housing units".</p> <p>Strongly urges HCD to reject the housing element as drafted. Requests that the city obtain commitments from property owners of the designated housing sites demonstrating their commitment, support, and willingness to pursue residential development. Comments that city should be fairer to its electorate and spread development throughout the city and that housing is better suited nearer to parks and space rather than freeways and industrial centers.</p>	
08.26.2021	Melissa K. Dagodag, Attorney	Comments that best place to build high density housing is on the 50-acre Power Plant site. Don't put housing on	

	representing a North Redondo Beach resident (Golden Hills neighborhood)	sites that are bad for community when there are large parcels next to beach, bike path, parks.	
08.31.2021	Sheila Lamb, resident (GPAC Member)	<p>General: Requests that new additions to housing element be identified.</p> <p>Comments on the following Sections requesting clarifications, some additional information, edits in language, and challenging various conclusions and claims that the cited information is incorrect within the document:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 2.2.1 Introduction (Page 1) • Section 2.2.1C Public Participation (Page 2) • Section 2.2.2D Homeless Resources (Page 22) • Section 2.2.2E Table H22 Single family attached units (Page 24) • Section 2.2.3A Constraints on Housing Production-Government Constraints (Page 34) • Section 2.2.3A4 Tables H35-36 Provision for a Variety of Housing Types (Pages 41-42) • Section 2.2.3A4 Provision for a Variety of Housing Types-Zoning and Land Use (Pages 46-47) • Section 2.2.3A4 Provision for a Variety of Housing Types-Senior Housing (Page 48) • Section 2.2.3A4 Provision for a Variety of Housing Types-Emergency Shelters, Transitional Housing, Supportive Housing, SRO's (Page 48) • Section 2.2.3B5 Liquefaction (Page 61) • Section 2.2.3B Flooding (Page 61-64) • Fig. H2/H3 Sites Inventory (Pages 75-76) • Appendix C Public Participation (Page C-1) 	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add Appendix-List of legislation mentioned in the text • Add Appendix-List of zoning amendments in the text • Add Additional Numbers-More easily search the document 	
09.02.2021	Brian Clark, Resident (Golden Hills neighborhood)	<p>Raised four (4) main concerns with the Housing Element:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Housing Element does not mention the GLBTQIA+ community and requests that the document identify and count this community and include specialized support resources that other segments of the population have been given. 2. Commenter does not support the placement of the majority of housing in North Redondo and most specifically the housing adjacent to the 405 freeway (North Tech District). Cites health and well-being concerns for persons having to live next to the 405 freeway. 3. Commenter concerned with over-densifying the Northern-most corner of the City, citing that it will be too impactful a change in one area. Prefers that development be more evenly spread throughout the City on smaller parcels. Comments on inequity of plan to locate high density in one area and leave other others unchanged. 4. Commented that during the City Council debates concerning the land plan some viewpoints were overlooked, consensus was not gained, and minority voices were disregarded. 	
09.02.2021	Dan Elder, Resident	Commented that the overwhelming feedback from residents and the Planning Commission was ignored by City Council in identifying the Residential Overlays for	

		the required RHNA housing locations. Cites that nearly every RHNA housing site is in North Redondo Beach which will place a significant burden on infrastructure. Supports a more balanced approach for locating housing as identified by residents at multiple meetings.	
09.02.2021	Barbara Epstein, Resident	Commenter supports the preservation and creation of as much open space and parkland as possible in the City. Cites too much density existing in support of this comment. Comments desire to increase tree canopy for healthier air quality, carbon capture, shade, habitat and beauty in every neighborhood.	
09.02.2021	Gregory McGinity, Resident	<p>Strongly urges the City Council and Planning Commission to reject the 2021-2029 Housing Element. Cites severe lack of water. City should implement system similar to City of Cambria, which does not allow additional housing without additional water. Recommends “growth management” ordinance.</p> <p>Commenter does not believe the City has enough water to accommodate the City’s housing needs through 2040. Comments that water rationing now is necessary.</p> <p>Commenter cites NASA and IPCC concerning impacts of climate change in the future and it’s furtherance of water shortage for City.</p> <p>Comments on uncertainty of future supplies from State Water Project and the Colorado River Aqueduct which supply nearly 50% of water purveyors sources.</p> <p>Commenter further specific water resource details concerning State Water Project and Colorado River water supplies and cites the crises facing both these sources.</p>	

		Provides additional comments and sources concerning climate change, Sierra Nevada snowpack issues, and other water resources shortages, and concludes because of all data the commenter cites it seems unlikely that current and certainly future water needs can be met and therefor the City should reject the plan.	
09.03.2021	Chris Ahearn, Resident - Homeowner	Comments that it is very difficult to see the maps of the draft plan. City emailed copies but the quality was similarly poor. Because of the poor-quality plan commenter does not feel he has enough information to comment. Document does not specifically answer how this plan will affect current homeowners and it should.	
09.03.2021	Peter Aziz, Resident	<p>Comments that the housing needs to be equally distributed throughout all of Redondo Beach, not just one or two of the densest districts. Comments that public input was ignored. Disagrees with location of housing near the freeway, citing poor air quality and poor quality of life.</p> <p>Included multiple links to articles concerning poor air quality and negative health affects for residents of housing near freeways.</p> <p>Requests that the housing near the freeway be removed from the plan and distributed equally throughout the City.</p>	
09.03.2021	Alisa Beeli, Resident	<p>Strongly urges the City to reject the Housing Element plan and cites the following in support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nearly 94% of required units in the North/90278 zip code • Places nearly all new zones on edges of City • All overlay zones are adjacent to less affluent areas of the City 	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • North Tech district property owner have no plans to relocate existing commercial tenants and its location adjacent to 405 Freeway is a serious health risk • Alternative options for housing were not considered, 1021 and 1100 North Harbor Drive, and should be as they are next to parks, bike paths, the beach and Planning Commission recommended the 1100 North Harbor Drive location. • Based on only developing 40% of 5th Cycle RHNA housing, developing 2,490 is unlikely without updating zoning throughout the City. <p>Placing majority of new housing in North Redondo/90278 near freeways and industrial areas is not realistic or equitable. Cites concerns with traffic and overcrowding of schools in North Redondo.</p> <p>Concerned that hundreds of public comments were ignored and housing should be better distributed throughout the entire City.</p>	
09.03.2021	Mariam P. Butler, Resident	Requests that housing/low income housing be evenly distributed throughout the City to minimize impacts to one district. D4 is already very dense and cannot accept the majority of housing. Impacts on schools and resources need to be considered.	
09.03.2021	Tieira	Comments that the City must build more affordable housing in all Redondo Beach neighborhoods. All deserve safe, clean and affordable housing. Comments on Segregation and negative impacts on lower-income and black populations.	

		<p>Comments that not providing affordable housing has negative impacts. Notes that LA County residents have been requesting more affordable housing for 10 years.</p> <p>Comments that poverty is a failed policy and that we must build more housing in all communities in Redondo Beach, especially in single family zones.</p>	
09.03.2021	Marianne Teola, Resident	<p>Comments on the thoroughness and significant research went into the document. Expressed disappointment with short notice for providing comments, received email day before comments due. Suggests that a summary of the main points of the Housing Element be attached to the element. Asks the question, how will the City be impacted by the recommendations in the element.</p> <p>Comments on the difference between a single-family residence in District 1 vs. District 3. Questions the allowance of “third floors” in single family residences. Requests that a zoom meeting with the average citizen be scheduled to discuss the plan. Asks questions about the Beach Cities Health District.</p>	
09.13.2021	Mark Nelson, Resident – BCHD Volunteer	Comments on “Planning Commission Resolution No. 2021-**-PCR-**” citing an inaccuracy regarding outreach. Provides additional comments on the BCHD entity, their proposed project and their project review process to date.	
09.13.2021	Mike Martin	Comments on the Land Use Category Descriptions for Public/Institutional (PI), Public/Utility (U), and Parks and Open Space (OS) descriptions.	
09.14.2021	Our Future LA, Steering Committee Members:	To Be Summarized	

	<p>Jason Elliot, Senior Counselor to Gov Gavin Newson; Megan Kirkeby, Deputy Director, Housing Policy Director, HCD; Melinda Coy, Land Use and Planning Manager, HCD; Tyrone Buckley, Assistant Deputy Director of Fair Housing, HCD; Paul McDougall, Housing Policy Development Manager, HCD</p>		
09.15.2021	<p>Abundant Housing LA/YIMBY Law</p>	To Be Summarized	
09.15.2021	<p>Wally Marks, Property owner: 2810-2860 Artesia Boulevard</p>	<p>Commenter supports the Housing Element document identifying ways in which the housing needs of existing and future populations can be met and its focus on improving affordable housing, finding more affordable housing and removing constraints.</p> <p>Comments on need for updating zoning and adopting an inclusionary housing ordinance.</p> <p>Comments on restrictions from past and current being prohibitive of housing development and recommends</p>	

		<p>incentive based policies to create opportunities for more affordable units throughout Redondo Beach.</p> <p>Comments on future opportunities for creative policies ensuring new housing of all types for all income levels and the benefit economically and otherwise to the community.</p>	
--	--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--