

A. CALL TO ORDER

A Virtual Meeting of the City of Redondo Beach Planning Commission was called to order by Vice Chair Toporow at 7:00 p.m.

B. ROLL CALL

Commissioners Present: Berg, Hinsley, Ung, Gaddis, Boswell, Godek, Vice Chair Toporow

Commissioners Absent: None

Officials Present: Brandy Forbes, Community Development Director
Sean Scully, Planning Manager
Antonio Gardea, Senior Planner
Lina Portolese, Planning Analyst
Veronica Tam, Housing Element Consultant

C. SALUTE TO THE FLAG

Vice Chair Toporow led in the Salute to the Flag.

D. APPROVAL OF ORDER OF AGENDA

Vice Chair Toporow pulling Item No. J.4 and placing it on the Commission's agenda in October.

Motion by Commissioner Gaddis, seconded by Commissioner Ung, to approve the order of the agenda, as amended, pulling Item No. J.4 from the agenda, and placing it on the October meeting. Motion carried unanimously, by roll call vote.

E. BLUE FOLDER ITEMS – ADDITIONAL BACK UP MATERIALS

E.1 Receive and File Blue Folder Items

Motion by Commissioner Hinsley, seconded by Commissioner Godek to receive and file Blue Folder Items, as presented. Motion carried unanimously, by roll call vote.

F. CONSENT CALENDAR

F.1 Approve Affidavit of Posting of Planning Commission Regular Meeting of September 16, 2021

F.2 Approve Minutes of the Regular Planning Commission meeting of June 17, 2021 and July 15, 2021

F.3 Receive and File Planning Commission Referrals to Staff Update September 16, 2021

Commissioner Hinsley pulled Items No. F.2 and F.3 from the Consent Calendar for separate discussion and action.

Motion by Commissioner Hinsley, seconded by Commissioner Gaddis, to approve the Consent Calendar, except for Items No. F.2 and F.3. Motion carried unanimously, by roll call vote.

G. EXCLUDED CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS

G.1 (F.2) Approve Minutes of the Regular Planning Commission meeting of June 17, 2021, and July 15, 2021

In response to Commissioner Hinsley's question, Planning Analyst Lina Portolese confirmed Commissioner's Hinsley's edits were made to the minutes of June 17, 2021. Commissioner Hinsley noted he did not have an opportunity to review the minutes of July 15, 2021 and would like to continue their approval to the Commission's meeting in October.

Motion by Commissioner Hinsley, seconded by Commissioner Gaddis, to approve the minutes of the Regular Planning Commission meeting of June 17, 2021, and continue approval of the July 15, 2021, minutes to October. Motion carried unanimously, by roll call vote.

G.2 (F.3) Receive and File Planning Commission Referrals to Staff Update September 16, 2021

In reply to Commissioner Hinsley's question regarding the status of the earlier Planning Commission outdoor living space requirement and when it will be presented to City Council, Community Development Director Brandy Forbes stated that staff needed to focus on the discussions for the Land Use Plan options. She suggested that after the Planning Commission discusses the accessory structure setbacks and projections next month, they can make a motion to combine those recommendations with the open space recommendations to be discussed at the same time at City Council.

Motion by Commissioner Hinsley, seconded by Commissioner Gaddis, to approve Item No. F.3, as presented. Motion carried unanimously, by roll call vote.

H. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION NON-AGENDA ITEMS

H.1 Receive and File Written Communications for the Planning Commission on Non-Agenda Items

Planning Assistant Lina Portolese reported receiving one written comment was submitted under

Blue Folder Items and noted one speaker wishing to address the Commission.

Holly Osborne discussed heat as a leading cause of death due to climate-related activities; spoke about the importance of trees and open space in mitigating heat; talked about not allowing placement of random pavement on current green space and commented on recent changes to SB 9.

There were no other public comments on this item.

Motion by Commissioner Ung, seconded by Commissioner Gaddis, to receive and file written communications to the Planning Commission on non-agenda items. Motion carried unanimously, by roll call vote.

I. EX PARTE COMMUNICATIONS

Commissioner Hinsley reported speaking with City staff regarding Items No. J.1 and J.3.

Commissioner Gaddis reported speaking with Commissioner Boswell regarding Item No J.3, Councilmember Lowenstein, and Mayor Brand.

Commissioner Boswell reported speaking with Mayor Brand and Commissioner Gaddis regarding Item No. J.3.

Commissioner Berg reported speaking with the appellant on Item No. J.1 and J.2 and visited both sites.

J. PUBLIC HEARINGS

J.1. PUBLIC HEARING FOR CONSIDERATION OF AN EXEMPTION DECLARATION AND PLANNING COMMISSION DESIGN REVIEW TO ALLOW A STRUCTURAL ALTERATION AND ADDITION TO AN EXISTING LEGAL NON-CONFORMING PROPERTY LOCATED WITHIN A LOW-DENSITY MULTIPLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL (R-3) ZONE

APPLICANT: GABRIEL FLORES

PROPERTY OWNER: JON OLSON

PROPERTY ADDRESS: 2303 ROCKEFELLER LANE UNIT A

APPLICATION NO.: PCDR-2021-04

RECOMMENDATION:

- 1. Open public hearing and administer oath;**
- 2. Take testimony from staff, applicant, and interested parties;**
- 3. Close public hearing and deliberate; and**
- 4. Adopt a resolution by title only either approve or deny the request subject to the findings and conditions contained therein:**

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF REDONDO BEACH, CALIFORNIA, APPROVING AN EXEMPTION DECLARATION AND GRANTING THE REQUEST FOR A PLANNING COMMISSION DESIGN REVIEW TO ALLOW A STRUCTURAL ALTERATION AND ADDITION TO AN EXISTING, LEGAL NON-CONFORMING PROPERTY LOCATED WITHIN A LOW-DENSITY MULTIPLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL (R-3) ZONE AT 2303 ROCKEFELLER LANE UNIT A

OR

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF REDONDO BEACH, CALIFORNIA, DENYING A REQUEST FOR PLANNING COMMISSION DESIGN REVIEW FOR A STRUCTURAL ALTERATION AND ADDITION TO AN EXISTING, LEGAL NON-CONFORMING PROPERTY LOCATED WITHIN A LOW-DENSITY MULTIPLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL (R-3) ZONE AT 2303 ROCKEFELLER LANE UNIT A

CONTACT: ANTONIO GARDEA, SENIOR PLANNER

Motion by Commissioner Gaddis, seconded by Commissioner Ung, to open the public hearing. Motion carried unanimously, by roll call vote.

Vice Chair Toporow administered the Audience Oath to those wishing to comment on this item.

Senior Planner Antonio Gardea narrated a PowerPoint presentation with details of the Administrative Report; discussed non-conforming use and addressed location, surrounding uses, zoning, site plans, criteria, findings, and recommendations.

Discussion followed regarding the patio being considered open space for the unit, the shared wall, sound mitigation, fire rating, vetting the project through the HOA, the size of the front yard, calculating the outdoor usable open space for Unit A and the size of the second-floor balcony.

Commissioner Hinsley asked about the outdoor living space calculation of the existing space and the balcony for the unit. Senior Planner Gardea replied that typically there is a bonus for open space off of a communal area such as a living room, kitchen, or dining room if it meets a minimum size, usually 150-square feet. Since the subject area is only 80-square feet in size, it would not qualify for the outdoor living space bonuses. The balcony on the second floor is off of a bedroom and does not qualify for a bonus, and clarified that the size is 4x16.

Jon Olson, Property Owner, narrated a PowerPoint presentation; discussed the patio conversion area; the common walkway, the proposed floorplan, and conversion of the unused patio into an enclosed study.

There were no other public comments received on this item.

Motion by Commissioner Gaddis, seconded by Commissioner Berg, to close the public hearing. Motion carried unanimously, by roll call vote.

Commissioner Hinsley expressed concerns about worsening the non-conformance by enclosing the patio.

Commissioner Godek stated the non-conformance is made worse, on paper, but does not make it so, in reality as the space is currently not usable.

Vice Chair Toporow agreed with fellow Commissioners and believed the original architects abused the system.

Commissioner Ung acknowledged the project would reduce open space but noted it is presently unusable and noted he would be challenged in making the finding that the project is not making the non-conformance, worse.

Commissioner Gaddis commented on the area being closed on three sides and asked about the precedent the Commission would set in approving this application. Community Development Director Forbes clarified that this request is not for a Variance but Planning Commission Design Review under the existing non-conforming uses section of the code due to the density of the project at the time it was constructed, which narrows the area of the application. This request is not for a conforming project or a new project to reduce outdoor living space.

Senior Planner Gardea clarified that the findings for Planning Commission Design Review are easier to make than a Variance.

Commissioner Hinsley affirmed Commissioner Gaddis' comment on the area being closed on three sides asked to clarify the calculation of the existing outdoor living space. Senior Planner Gardea stated that at the time the project was developed, the walkway adjacent to the entrances of the units was allowed to be counted towards outdoor living space and that the second level balcony was not built to the size which was noted on the original Planning entitlements for the development.

Commissioner Hinsley commented on trying to tailor the findings to narrow the scope of an approval. Senior Planner Gardea suggested amending the second finding.

At the request of Vice-Chair Toporow, Senior Planner Gardea reviewed the six criteria for approval of the request.

Discussion followed regarding the original design, the criteria specific to non-conforming uses, and amending Finding B to state that the existing patio does not meet the minimum standard of having one 10-foot dimension nor the requirement to be 50% open to the sky, and the building not being built to the original plans.

Vice Chair Toporow addressed the need to modify the code to prevent similar structures from being built again and noted if this project is approved, it will cause precedence.

Planning Manager Scully noted that the existing patio does not qualify for outdoor living space due to the inadequate size and not being open to 50% open to the sky.

Senior Planner Gardea reported that the patio would not qualify as open space now, since it would not meet the minimum standard of having one 10-foot dimension nor the requirement to be 50% open to the sky.

The second part of Finding B to be revised to read "The addition does not increase the number of units on the property, nor does it increase the building height, nor remove any existing parking spaces. The existing nonconformity, in terms of density is not exacerbated. The condominium complex is built with four units and will remain as a four-unit condominium complex. The existing non-conformity in terms of outdoor living space is not exacerbated due to it not qualifying as outdoor living space because it is not open to the sky, enclosed on three sides, nor does it meet the minimum dimensions/standards for open space. Additionally, this building was not built to the original plans. "

Motion by Commissioner Hinsley, seconded by Commissioner Gaddis, to waive further reading of and adopt A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF REDONDO BEACH, CALIFORNIA, APPROVING AN EXEMPTION DECLARATION AND GRANTING THE REQUEST FOR PLANNING COMMISSION DESIGN REVIEW TO ALLOW THE STRUCTURAL ALTERATION AND ADDITION TO AN EXISTING, LEGAL NON-CONFORMING PROPERTY LOCATED WITHIN A LOW-DENSITY MULTIPLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL (R-3) ZONE AT 2303 ROCKEFELLER LANE UNIT A, as amended relative to Finding B as restated by staff. Motion carried unanimously, by roll call vote.

J.2. A PUBLIC HEARING FOR CONSIDERATION OF AN EXEMPTION DECLARATION, AMENDMENT TO A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT, OVERLAP PARKING REVIEW, AND A COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT EXEMPTION TO ALLOW THE OPERATION OF A PERSONAL IMPROVEMENT SERVICE OPERATING AS A YOGA STUDIO WITHIN AN EXISTING COMMERCIAL BUILDING ON PROPERTY LOCATED IN A COMMERCIAL (C-2) ZONE, IN THE COASTAL ZONE

APPLICANT: 423 YOGA

PROPERTY OWNER: KIRBYLANE, LLC

PROPERTY ADDRESS: 423 S. PACIFIC COAST HIGHWAY

APPLICATION NO.: PAA-2021-01; OP-2021-01

RECOMMENDATION:

- 1. Open public hearing and administer oath;**
- 2. Take testimony from staff, applicant, and interested parties;**
- 3. Close public hearing and deliberate; and**

4. Adopt a resolution by title only approving the request subject to the findings and conditions contained therein:

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF REDONDO BEACH, CALIFORNIA, APPROVING AN EXEMPTION DECLARATION AND GRANTING THE REQUESTS FOR AN AMENDMENT TO A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT, OVERLAP PARKING REVIEW, AND COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT EXEMPTION TO ALLOW THE OPERATION OF A PERSONAL IMPROVEMENT SERVICE WITHIN AN EXISTING COMMERCIAL BUILDING ON PROPERTY LOCATED IN A COMMERCIAL (C-2) ZONE IN THE COASTAL ZONE AT 423 S. PACIFIC COAST HIGHWAY

CONTACT: LINA PORTOLESE, PLANNING ANALYST

Motion by Commissioner Gaddis, seconded by Commissioner Berg, to open the public hearing.
Motion carried unanimously, by roll call vote.

Vice Chair Toporow administered the Audience Oath to those wishing to comment on this item.

Planning Analyst Portolese narrated a PowerPoint presentation of the proposed project; addressed location, surrounding uses and zoning, parking, the proposed site plan, the yoga studio, and office spaces, required findings, concerns relative to noise, conditions of approval, CEQA exemptions and listed recommendations.

Discussion followed regarding occupancy, the yoga studio, the potential boutique, ancillary uses, improvements made to date, adding bicycle racks, use of the yoga studio by employees in the building, access to parking in the building, operating hours, on-street parking, creating a greater gap between classes to avoid parking issues, efforts to follow L.A. County safety protocols relative to COVID-19, cleaning in between classes, installing appropriate air purification systems and frequency of steam cleaning floors.

There were no public comments on this item.

Motion by Commissioner Ung, seconded by Commissioner Berg, to close the public hearing.
Motion carried unanimously, by roll call vote.

Commissioner Ung suggested adding a condition relative to the installation of bicycle racks.

Discussion followed regarding the need to determine whether there is room for installing bicycle racks and the minimum time between classes.

Planning Manager Sean Scully added the following as a condition of approval: "The applicant and property owner shall work with the Community Development and Public Works Departments to provide the maximum number of bicycle racks on the subject property and adjacent right-of-way to accommodate all businesses".

Motion by Commissioner Godek, seconded by Commissioner Ung, to waive further reading of and adopt A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF REDONDO BEACH, CALIFORNIA, APPROVING AN EXEMPTION DECLARATION AND GRANTING THE REQUESTS FOR AN AMENDMENT TO A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT, OVERLAP PARKING REVIEW, AND COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT EXEMPTION TO ALLOW THE OPERATION OF A PERSONAL IMPROVEMENT SERVICE WITHIN AN EXISTING COMMERCIAL BUILDING ON PROPERTY LOCATED IN A COMMERCIAL (C-2) ZONE IN THE COASTAL ZONE AT 423 S. PACIFIC COAST HIGHWAY, as amended with the addition of Condition No 17 as stated by staff. Motion carried unanimously, by roll call vote.

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

RECOMMENDATION:

- 1. Open public hearing;**
- 2. Take testimony from staff and interested parties;**
- 3. Close public hearing and deliberate; and**
- 4. Adopt a resolution by title only subject to the findings contained therein:**

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF REDONDO BEACH, CALIFORNIA, RECOMMENDING THAT THE CITY COUNCIL ADOPT THE CITY'S 6TH CYCLE 2021-2029 DRAFT HOUSING ELEMENT OF THE GENERAL PLAN AND ASSOCIATED CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT DOCUMENTATION, INITIAL STUDY/NEGATIVE DECLARATION

CONTACT: SEAN SCULLY, PLANNING MANAGER

Motion by Commissioner Ung, seconded by Commissioner Hinsley, to open the public hearing. Motion carried unanimously, by roll call vote.

Planning Manager Sean Scully and Housing Consultant Veronica Tam narrated a PowerPoint presentation of the Administrative Report with a breakdown of the City's 6th Cycle 2021-2029 Housing Element including background, recent steps, public comments, and responses, HCD comments, next steps, environmental considerations, and recommendations.

Housing Consultant Tam explained requirements relative to AB 1597 and the need to amend Finding No. 3.

Vice Chair Toporow administered the Audience Oath to those wishing to comment on this item.

Holly Osborne referenced SB 9 in terms of allowing the City to challenge anything that would have a negative effect on public health and safety; noted the need to invoke it relative to setbacks and keeping green spaces and reported SB 9 does not let cities enforce guidelines.

Motion by Commissioner Hinsley, seconded by Commissioner Boswell, to extend the speaker's time for comment. Motion carried unanimously, without opposition.

Ms. Osborne reported forwarding her comments and additional information to Members of the Commission for review.

Gregory McGinity urged the Commission to reject the draft Housing Element; spoke about the severe lack of water to serve any new housing development in the City; referenced his written comments; noted more severe droughts in the future; asked the Commission to return the plan for reconsideration by City Council recommending the City adopt a Housing Element similar to the one adopted by the City of Cambria until new sources of water are identified.

Motion by Commissioner Gaddis, seconded by Commissioner Boswell, to extend the speaker's time for comment. Motion carried unanimously, without opposition.

Mr. McGinity referenced a presentation at a recent City Council meeting by Robert Thompson, Cal Water and comments made by Mayor Brand regarding the possibility of mandatory water rationing in the future; believed residents will be disproportionately hurt by water rationing and urged the Commission to protect residents from future injury.

Sheila Lamb spoke about the positive aspects of the proposed draft Housing Element; discussed addressing homelessness; addressed challenges within the current document relative to housing unit types; talked about governmental constraints to housing production and commented on the AES power plant and the possibility of reconsidering the site for a desalinization plant.

Motion by Commissioner Gaddis, seconded by Commissioner Boswell, to extend the speaker's time for comment. Motion carried unanimously, without opposition.

Ms. Lamb felt a desalinization plant may be the best use for the AES site; suggested creating a 2021 complete map of existing housing units in the City, by zone; asked that the information be included in any supporting documents when reviewing the Housing Element and commented on senior housing and RCFEs, asking that the City be consistent in the Municipal Code.

Planning Analyst Portolese read an eComment Alisa Beeli requesting that the Commission reject the draft Housing Element and listing specific concerns with the assigned units in North Redondo Beach.

In reply to Commissioner Hinsley's question about what the commission is being asked to do tonight, Planning Manager Scully reiterated staff's recommendations. Community Development Director Forbes added that the document is an official planning document; reported City Council already considered recommendations on land use and in terms of the Housing Element, it is up

to the Planning Commission to make its recommendation to Council on the text of the Housing Element justifying the site selection in the Housing Element.

In response to Commissioner Gaddis's request, Planning Manager Scully discussed the negative declaration. Regarding a section under Governmental Constraints, Section 2.2.3, Commissioner Gaddis requested removing the sentence, "Redondo Beach residents, however, have become increasingly concerned over the impacts of new housing on neighbor character, public services and infrastructure consequently, land use controls related to housing and residential development have been strengthened over recent years". Commissioner Gaddis felt such subjective statements do not help in getting the HCD to approve the City's Housing Element; noted examples of them throughout the document; referenced additional language including under Blue Folder Items, Page D-3 regarding race and ethnicity in relation to Measure DD and noted Measure DD has nothing to do with race and ethnicity.

Ms. Tam reported HCD asked the City to explain why there is a concentration of races and ethnicities; noted affordable housing would, most likely, be developed as high-density housing and Measure DD makes it difficult to change land use. She offered to revise the language before presenting the document to City Council.

Commissioner Ung spoke about the AFFH and the need to provide substantiation as to why it does not promote segregation; discussed high resource areas and considering low and very low in those area and asked about the criteria used to choose those areas. Community Development Director Forbes noted the entire community is considered a high resource area. Ms. Tam added the City is not building low-income house, but rather zoning in a higher density to increase the financial feasibility of low-income housing.

Recess/Reconvene

Motion by Commissioner Hinsley, seconded by Commissioner Godek, to take a recess at 10:31 p.m. Motion carried unanimously, without opposition.

The meeting reconvened at 10:36 p.m., with all Commissioners, present.

In reply to Commissioner Ung's question regarding the process if what is proposed is not approved by voters, Community Development Director Forbes explained City Council would need to consider how it expects to meet the City's RHNA obligations.

Discussion followed regarding the possibility of not approving the document and challenging the State.

Community Development Director Forbes stated as a Planner, she must recommend following the law and the City's obligation is to comply with the requirements of the Housing Element that includes demonstrating how the City will meet its RHNA obligations.

Commissioner Ung spoke about the City's responses to comments by HCD. In reply to his question regarding the timeline, Ms. Tam reported the Housing Element is an 8-year plan and

commented on committing to the plan within the time requirement.

Community Development Director Forbes reported HCD comments will be addressed in the draft Housing Element when it is returned to City Council for approval.

Commissioner Gaddis referenced liquefaction and hazards and asked about potential constraints on development. Ms. Tam noted the City is already developed and there are no new constraints.

There were no other public comments.

Motion by Commissioner Gaddis, seconded by Commissioner Boswell, to close the public hearing. Motion carried unanimously, by roll call vote.

Motion by Commissioner Gaddis, seconded by Commissioner Berg, to receive and file the documents presented. Motion carried unanimously, by roll call vote.

Commissioner Ung suggested adding language to the resolution that the City needs to adopt the Housing Element by October 15, 2021.

Motion by Commissioner Gaddis, seconded by Commissioner Boswell, to approve the negative declaration; waive further reading and adopt A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF REDONDO BEACH, CALIFORNIA, RECOMMENDING THAT THE CITY COUNCIL ADOPT THE CITY'S 6TH CYCLE 2021-2029 DRAFT HOUSING ELEMENT OF THE GENERAL PLAN AND ASSOCIATED CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT DOCUMENTATION, INITIAL STUDY/NEGATIVE DECLARATION, with the provision to include Sheila Lamb's suggestion of the H-22 schedule with a bar chart comparing the City to neighboring cities on the breakdown/detail of the types of dwellings to show HCD regionality; to remove language in Page 35, the section under Governmental Constraints, Section 2.2.3, "Redondo Beach residents, however, have become increasingly concerned over the impacts of new housing on neighbor character, public services and infrastructure consequently, land use controls related to housing and residential development have been strengthened over recent years", remove language under Blue Folder Items, Page D-3 regarding race and ethnicity in relation to Measure DD, add the finding suggested by staff and adding language as a "Whereas", that the City needs to adopt the Housing Element by October 15, 2021, HCD deadline. Motion carried 4-3, by roll call vote, with Commissioners Hinsley and Ung and Vice Chair Toporow, opposed.

Vice Chair Toporow noted that the document is flawed; felt it is detrimental to the City and that it is a loss of freedom; added there are severe issues including water shortages and other issues as addressed by the public and believed the matter should be litigated.

J.4. A PUBLIC HEARING FOR CONSIDERATION OF AMENDMENTS TO THE REDONDO BEACH MUNICIPAL CODE (RBMC) TITLE 10, CHAPTER 2 ZONING AND LAND USE AND TITLE 10, CHAPTER 5 COASTAL LAND USE PLAN IMPLEMENTING ORDINANCE PERTAINING TO SETBACKS FOR

ACCESSORY STRUCTURES IN RESIDENTIAL ZONES (RBMC 10-2.1500 AND RBMC 10-5.1500) AND STANDARDS FOR BUILDING AND OTHER PROJECTIONS IN ALL ZONES (RBMC 10-2.1522 AND RBMC 10-5.1522) AND CONSIDERATION OF A CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA) EXEMPTION FOR THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 15308 OF THE CEQA GUIDELINES

RECOMMENDATION:

- 1. Open public hearing;**
- 2. Take testimony from staff and interested parties;**
- 3. Close public hearing and deliberate; and**
- 4. Adopt a resolution by title only subject to the findings contained therein:**

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF REDONDO BEACH, CALIFORNIA, RECOMMENDING THAT THE CITY COUNCIL ADOPT ORDINANCES AMENDING TITLE 10, CHAPTER 2, ZONING AND LAND USE AND TITLE 10, CHAPTER 5 COASTAL LAND USE PLAN IMPLEMENTING ORDINANCE PERTAINING TO SETBACKS OF ACCESSORY STRUCTURES IN RESIDENTIAL ZONES AND BUILDING AND OTHER PROJECTIONS IN ALL ZONES

CONTACT: BRANDY FORBES, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

This item was pulled from the agenda.

K. DIRECTOR ITEMS CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS AGENDAS - None

L. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION PRIOR TO ACTION - None

M. ITEMS FROM STAFF

Community Development Director Forbes reported staff has begun its work regarding residential design guidelines and addressed upcoming public forums.

Planning Manager Scully wished Community Development Director Forbes a happy birthday.

N. COMMISSION ITEMS AND REFERRALS TO STAFF

Commissioner Berg thanked the City and Beach Life representatives for the success of the recent festival.

Commissioner Boswell expressed disappointment about rushing approval of the Housing Element and that State's RHNA allocation.

Commissioners Gaddis and Godek commented positively on the recent Beach Life Festival.

Commissioner Hinsley requested further consideration of accessory structures and suggested creating a subcommittee to study the issue.

Motion by Commissioner Hinsley, seconded by Commissioner Godek, to place consideration of forming a subcommittee to study accessory structures on the Commission's next meeting agenda. Motion carried unanimously, by roll call vote.

Discussion followed regarding the status of the Beach Cities Health District application and EIR.

Motion by Vice Chair Toporow, seconded by Commissioner Gaddis, to place discussion of City requirements for bicycle racks on the Commission's next meeting agenda. Motion carried unanimously, by roll call vote.

Vice Chair Toporow requested information regarding cities in California that are fighting RHNA and commented on getting a Public Health Officer for South Bay cities.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Commission, Commissioner Godek motioned, seconded by Commissioner Gaddis, to adjourn at 11:35 p.m., to the next Planning Commission meeting on Thursday, October 21, 2021, at 7:00 p.m. Motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,



Brandy Forbes
Community Development Director