

A. CALL TO ORDER

A meeting of the Planning Commission was held in the Redondo Beach Council Chamber at 415 Diamond Street, Redondo Beach, California and via teleconference and was called to order by Chair Gaddis at 6:30 p.m.

B. ROLL CALL

Commissioners Present: Hazeltine, Hinsley, Godek, Behrendt, Boswell, Lamb, Chair Gaddis

Officials Present: Brandy Forbes, Community Development Director
Sean Scully, Planning Manager
Antonio Gardea, Senior Planner
Stacey Kinsella, Associate Planner
Lina Portolese, Planning Analyst
Maria Herrera, Planning Technician

C. SALUTE TO THE FLAG

Commissioner Behrendt led the assembly in the salute to the flag.

D. APPROVE ORDER OF AGENDA

Hearing no objections, Chair Gaddis ordered approval of the agenda, as presented.

E. BLUE FOLDER ITEMS – ADDITIONAL BACK UP MATERIALS

E.1. RECEIVE AND FILE BLUE FOLDER ITEMS

Motion by Commissioner Hinsley, seconded by Commissioner Hazeltine, to receive and file Blue Folder Items. Hearing no objections, Chair Gaddis so ordered.

F. CONSENT CALENDAR

F.1. APPROVE AFFIDAVIT OF POSTING FOR THE PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING OF MAY 19, 2022

F.2. APPROVE MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION ADJOURNED REGULAR MEETING OF MARCH 3, 2022 AND REGULAR MEETING OF MARCH 17, 2022 AND APRIL 21, 2022

F.3. RECEIVE AND FILE PLANNING COMMISSION REFERRALS TO STAFF UPDATE OF MAY 19, 2022

F.4. APPROVE A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF REDONDO BEACH, CALIFORNIA, FINDING THAT THE PROPOSED 2022-2027 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (CIP) IS CONSISTENT WITH THE ADOPTED GENERAL PLAN OF THE CITY OF REDONDO BEACH, AS REQUIRED BY SECTION 65401 OF THE CALIFORNIA GOVERNMENT CODE

There were no public comments on the Consent Calendar.

Motion by Commissioner Hazeltine, seconded by Commissioner Boswell, to approve the Consent Calendar, as presented. Hearing no objections, Chair Gaddis so ordered.

G. EXCLUDED CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS - None

H. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

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

Holly Osbourne (via Zoom) referenced an article from the Wall Street Journal she forwarded to staff regarding the decreased share of newly built single-family homes that are under 1400 square feet; commented on shortages of entry-level homes; spoke about Assembly Bill 1457 focused on helping first-time buyers get into newly constructed homes and believed policies should be passed that will further that goal and urged enforcement of standards on R1-A and R1 lots.

Planning Analyst Portolese reported eComments were received from Mark Nelson and Tim Ozenne.

There were no other public comments on non-agenda items.

Motion by Commissioner Boswell, seconded by Commissioner Hazeltine, to receive and file public written comments on non-agenda items. Hearing no objections, Chair Gaddis so ordered.

I. EX PARTE COMMUNICATION

Commissioner Behrendt reported speaking with Chair Gaddis and City staff regarding Item No. J.1. and with Chair Gaddis, with the applicants, with Councilmember Todd Lowenstein and Chris Munoz, President of the HOA on North Broadway, with Regina Fletcher, Member of the HOA and with City staff regarding Item No. J.2.

Commissioner Boswell reported speaking with two business owners in the area covered by Item No. J.2., and members of the public, Jerome Chang and Holly Osbourne.

Commissioner Godek reported speaking with members of the community regarding Item No. J.2.

Commissioner Hazeltine reported speaking with Commissioners Lamb and Boswell regarding Item No. J.2., the public, residents and business owners in the area, Mayor Brand and Councilmember Nehrenheim.

Commissioner Hinsley reported speaking with staff, members of the public and watched the EIR Scoping meeting regarding Item No. J.2.

Commissioner Lamb reported speaking with Councilmember Nehrenheim, various residents, Senior Planner Gardea and Commissioner Hazeltine regarding Item No. J.2.

Chair Gaddis reported speaking with Commissioner Behrendt on Items No. J.1. and J.2.

J. PUBLIC HEARINGS

J. 1. Public Hearing for consideration of an Exemption Declaration and Planning Commission Design Review to allow the construction of a new unenclosed balcony at a legal nonconforming property that is also a locally designated landmark located within a Commercial (C-2) zone at 415 S. Guadalupe Avenue (CASE NO. PCDR-2022-01)

RECOMMENDATION:

1. Open Public Hearing and take testimony from staff, applicant, and other interested parties, and deliberate;
2. Close Public Hearing; and
3. Adopt a resolution by title only 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 PLANNING COMMISSION DESIGN REVIEW TO ALLOW THE CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW UNENCLOSED BALCONY ON A NONCONFORMING HISTORIC RESIDENCE LOCATED WITHIN A COMMERCIAL (C-2) ZONE AT 415 SOUTH GUADALUPE AVENUE

CONTACT: STACEY KINSELLA, ASSOCIATE PLANNER

Chair Gaddis administered the audience oath to members of the public intending to speak on Item No. J.1.

Motion by Commissioner Hazeltine, seconded by Commissioner Godek, to open the public hearing. Hearing no objections, Chair Gaddis so ordered.

Associate Planner Stacey Kinsella narrated a PowerPoint presentation with details of the proposed project.

Discussion followed regarding the Minor Alterations Subcommittee.

Chair Gaddis invited public comments.

It was noted that eComments were received from Barbara Zipper and Maggie Healy in support of the project.

There were no other public comments.

Motion by Commissioner Hazeltine, seconded by Commissioner Godek, to close the public hearing. Hearing no objections, Chair Gaddis so ordered.

Motion by Commissioner Hazeltine, seconded by Commissioner Boswell, to adopt a resolution by title only 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 PLANNING COMMISSION DESIGN REVIEW TO ALLOW THE CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW UNENCLOSED BALCONY ON A NONCONFORMING HISTORIC RESIDENCE LOCATED WITHIN A COMMERCIAL (C-2) ZONE AT 415 SOUTH GUADALUPE AVENUE

The Motion carried unanimously (7-0).

J.2. A PUBLIC HEARING FOR CONSIDERATION OF AN ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT (ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT - STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS AND MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM), VARIANCE, COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT, CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT (DENSITY BONUS), PLANNING COMMISSION DESIGN REVIEW, AND VESTING TENTATIVE MAP NO. 82561 TO PERMIT CONSTRUCTION OF A PROPOSED 30-UNIT RESIDENTIAL PROJECT WITH ADAPTIVE REUSE OF EXISTING NON-RESIDENTIAL BUILDINGS FOR COMMERCIAL PURPOSES ON PROPERTY LOCATED WITHIN A LOW-DENSITY, MULTIPLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL (R-3A) ZONE, IN THE COASTAL ZONE, AT 100-132 N. CATALINA AVENUE. (CASE NOS. IES-EIR-2021-01; CUP-2022-01; VAR-2022-02; CDP-2022-03; PCDR-2022-01; VTPM 82561)

RECOMMENDATION:

1. Open the continued public hearing, administer oath, take testimony from staff, the applicant and other interested parties, and deliberate;
2. Close the public hearing; and
3. Consider the applications and proposed plans, and make a determination on the project;
 - a. Should the Planning Commission support the project, adopt the attached resolution by title only, waiving further reading;

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF REDONDO BEACH, CALIFORNIA, CERTIFYING A FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT, AND ADOPTING ENVIRONMENTAL FINDINGS, STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS, AND A MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM, AND GRANTING A COASTAL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT, CONDITIONAL

USE PERMIT (DENSITY BONUS), VARIANCE, PLANNING COMMISSION DESIGN REVIEW, AND VESTING TENTATIVE MAP NO. 82561 FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A 30-UNIT RESIDENTIAL PROJECT AND ADAPTIVE REUSE OF EXISTING BUILDINGS FOR NON-RESIDENTIAL USES ON A SITE WITHIN A LOW-DENSITY, MULTIPLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL (R-3A) ZONE, IN THE COASTAL ZONE, LOCATED AT 100-132 N. CATALINA AVENUE

- b. Because this project is utilizing the Density Bonus Law, should the Planning Commission not support the project, based upon substantial evidence, findings would need to be made that demonstrate how the requested waiver and concessions:
- i. Do not result in cost reductions;
 - ii. Have a specific, significant, quantifiable, direct, and unavoidable adverse impact, upon public health and safety or the physical environment; or
 - iii. The waiver and concessions are contrary to state or federal law.

Inconsistency with the zoning ordinance or general plan land use designation does not constitute a specific, adverse impact upon the public health or safety. (California Government Code 65915).

CONTACT: ANTONIO GARDEA, SENIOR PLANNER

Chair Gaddis administered the audience oath to members of the public intending to speak on Item No. J.2.

Motion by Commissioner Godek, seconded by Commissioner Hazeltine, to reopen the public hearing. Hearing no objections, Chair Gaddis so ordered.

Senior Planner Gardea discussed staff materials; recapped prior actions and recommendations by the Preservation Commission; addressed entitlements and components to the CUP; detailed the revisions made incorporating previous comments from the Planning Commission; presented the revised site plan; commented on mitigation efforts regarding light and glare and described renderings provided by the applicant. Additionally, Senior Planner Gardea addressed the tentative map and listed recommendations.

Community Development Director Forbes reported that the City's Special Legal Counsel, Greg Kettles, is available via Zoom.

Chair Gaddis invited the applicant to make their presentation to the Planning Commission.

Jason Muller, applicant, Founder & CEO of Beach City Capital, narrated a PowerPoint presentation with a recap of the project and responses to the challenges discussed during the prior Planning Commission meeting; addressed the major pillars and goals of the project; reported they will be planting 140 trees and preserving eight trees; spoke about adding drought-tolerant plants and stormwater irrigation; noted the site is contaminated with PCEs and arsenic and talked about hiring the best architects and designers to produce the best possible project. Mr. Muller listed the Planning Commission's prior comments and responses to each; addressed reduction in the number of bedrooms, setbacks, reduction of parking requirements, consolidation

of units, breaking up the front façades and additional parking. He invited Dan Withee, Withee Malcolm Architects to continue with a report.

Mr. Withee talked about the project always being about placemaking; discussed the overriding concept and the scale and massing of the project; commented on the resulting visual rhythm and the plantation culture architecture; addressed decks, materials, window treatments, handrails and parking and felt the project will rejuvenate the block and provide high-quality housing.

Pam O'Connor, Architectural Historian, discussed the historical significance of the site and the historic eligibility of the buildings; provided a brief background of individual buildings on the property; quoted The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment and Rehabilitation of Historic Properties and noted the proposed project meets and conforms with those standards.

Mr. Muller continued with his presentation; addressed the urban context, architectural styles and by-right zoning; talked about preserving the commercial space and simple site access; highlighted the seven additional parking stalls resulting from revisions; noted 70% of the site footprint is parking and circulation and 20% is housing; reported the project is meant to be pedestrian-friendly, local and walkable and discussed property management, surrounding property privacy concerns and landscaping.

Discussion followed regarding decks/outdoor living space for 90% of the units as well as common outdoor living space for units without decks, the existing Masonic Center and its proposed future use and mitigating concerns regarding parking overflow.

Senior Planner Gardea reported the EIR does not look at parking as a potential impact, but vehicle miles traveled.

Michael Shonafelt, Land Use Counsel for the applicant, noted residential parking is off the table for consideration of overflow impacts because it is parked according to the State's Density Bonus Law, by right; reported they focused on the commercial and stated they did the best they could with existing constraints.

Discussion continued regarding quiet time enforcement, parking spaces available in the neighborhood for overflow parking, providing two parking stalls per unit, use of alternative means of transportation, community outreach meetings, placeholders for public art, tech-based leasing or roommate pairing and related impacts to the neighborhood, limiting the target market to families, setting aside 15% very-low affordable housing units, the importance of complying with housing laws and not discriminating who tenants could be, the analysis in terms of the number of people expected and the purpose of the EIR.

Discussion followed regarding average room dimensions, ground/soil contamination, and whether there was a tank for hazardous materials under the dry cleaners.

Suzanne Huerta, Rincon Consultants, addressed the hazardous materials report within the EIR; noted there is no mention of tank in the report and did not believe there is a tank.

Ensuing discussion pertained to the development being bicycle friendly, proposed bike-friendly amenities, the possibility of decreasing the number of units to comply with vehicle miles traveled, greenhouse gas emissions, the schedule of outdoor living spaces, the amount of outdoor living space per unit, whether no-net loss of parking applies, the reasons for changes from the original application, negative impacts to the surrounding properties, including the Oklahoma Apartments, from overflow parking, the possibility of providing a shared-parking analysis and benefits of public/private amenities.

Mr. Muller reported the residential part of the project has been parked to code and the parking variance is being sought for the commercial part of the project.

Mr. Shonafelt spoke about this being an R3 zone; discussed turning into an MU to keep the commercial and reiterated the parking variance is for the commercial part of the project, only; discussed the current State-wide housing emergency and reported the only thing the Planning Commission or City Council can deny or reduce density on is a specific adverse impact to the health, safety and welfare of the public which must be supported by a preponderance of the evidence. He added that parking was not identified as a significant impact in the EIR and stated the applicant needs to mitigate only those things that are significant.

Senior Planner Gardea pointed out that the EIR looked at transportation impacts; clarified that parking was not analyzed in the EIR; reported lack of parking is a social inconvenience and not an environmental impact; acknowledged the project has some legal non-conforming buildings, their uses are being intensified, parking is being generated for the more-intense uses, there is a parking shortfall of four spaces and the Planning Commission should be looking at the degree of the shortfall and separate transportation and parking impacts. He stressed the applicant complies with the required parking for the project, according to State law and reported the two uses that are generating the need for additional parking are the outdoor dining and the tasting room.

Discussion followed regarding other projects approved using State Density Bonus Law, concessions to the developer and additional ability for waivers and whether the project is within a half mile of a transit stop.

Greg Kettles, Best, Best & Krieger, Special Counsel to the City, discussed the Density Bonus Law in terms of waivers.

Community Development Director Forbes reported the State Density Bonus Law is separate from a historic parking variance and based on the types of uses the developer provides rather than the types of existing uses.

Commissioner Boswell spoke about use of restrooms by cyclists; suggested the applicant consider expanding the restrooms in the proposed coffee shop and commented on the importance of mitigating parking to minimize impacts to the neighborhood by overflow parking.

Mr. Muller reported speaking with nearby churches to negotiate a shared parking agreement and noted he was unsuccessful.

Kate Hirsch, applicant, with Beach City Capital, spoke about keeping the existing commercial uses to reduce the parking variance to four parking spaces.

Discussion followed regarding Coastal Land Use Plan (CLUP) parking regulations.

Senior Planner Gardea reported the State Density Bonus Law supersedes the CLUP and noted the project is not within the "appealable area".

Community Development Director Forbes clarified the definition of the "appealable area".

Discussion continued regarding waivers and concessions under the Density Bonus Law, the waiver of development standards, measuring building heights and whether a parking concession would have been possible.

Community Development Director Forbes reported this has been a collaborative approach and explained the Planning Commission may set conditions which will be reviewed by the Historic Preservation Commission.

Discussion followed regarding whether or not the development will be compatible with and in harmony with the historic district, necessary findings, architectural materials and design, and applicable residential design guidelines.

Chair Gaddis invited public comments on this item.

Christine Muñoz reported she manages the HOA for six townhouses on Broadway; stated residents are upset because of the building heights and lack of privacy into their properties; expressed concerns regarding the tank of hazardous chemicals from the previous dry cleaners as well as a prior railroad dump and impacts to parking and noted the Planning Commission should review a report made by the EPA regarding the site.

Motion by Commissioner Behrendt, seconded by Commissioner Hazeltine, to extend Ms. Muñoz's time for providing comments. Hearing no objections, Chair Gaddis so ordered.

Ms. Muñoz reported there was no outreach made by the applicant to the HOA regarding the project.

Suzanne Huerta, Rincon Consultants, reported reviewing environmental site assessments done for the project site; noted no underground storage tanks were found on site; discussed the issues reviewed by the consulting team; stated that the remediation plans were adequate in addressing hazardous impacts and noted mitigation measures were added to address potential impacts such as the installation of vapor barrier systems. She added that the remediation plan was reviewed and approved by L.A. County Fire Department, which has jurisdiction.

Mr. Muller explained they will excavate the dirt and install a vapor extraction system across the site; reported there was an old blacksmith shop servicing the railroad that used arsenic to kill weeds on the tracks and described steps for remediating that. He addressed the various review

processes and additional mitigation requirements. Additionally, Mr. Muller discussed the pros and cons of providing rental versus for-sale units in relation to issues and liability.

Commissioner Godek stated the property will be cleaned up to the same standards regardless of whether they will be for sale or rent.

Frank Buckley, Developer and Tenant of Mr. Muller, commended the Planning Commission for its thoughtfulness and the quality of questions asked; discussed his experience and acknowledged the challenges in in-fill development;

Motion by Commissioner Hinsley, seconded by Commissioner Lamb, to extend Mr. Buckley's time for providing comments another two minutes. Hearing no objections, Chair Gaddis so ordered.

Mr. Buckley spoke favorably about his leasing experience with Mr. Muller and in support of Mr. Muller and his project.

Robbie Kumar (via Zoom) discussed the importance of affordable housing; spoke in support of the developer, his team and the project and noted the project will revitalize local businesses that will serve the neighborhood.

Holly Osbourne (via Zoom) referenced the Coastal Commission and wondered why the units will be for rent rather than for sale and questioned that families will want to rent the units.

Amy Hudson (via Zoom) reported she lives on Broadway, directly adjacent to the project; stated she was surprised the developer chose to rent the units instead of selling them; felt the developer is pushing an unproven leasing system in the neighborhood; expressed concerns regarding negative impacts to parking; listed units on her block that rely only on public parking; urged the Planning Commission to consider the neighborhood and confirmed meeting with the developer via Zoom, to discuss their concerns.

Motion by Commissioner Lamb, seconded by Commissioner Hinsley, to extend Ms. Hudson's time for providing comments. Hearing no objections, Chair Gaddis so ordered.

Planning Analyst Portolese noted eComments were received from: Brianna Egan, David Orea, Jonathan Meister, Steve Laver, Miriam Burgos, Caesar Abed, Natalie White, Scot DeCordova, Ben O'Neal, Sep Dardashti, Mark Nelson, Kathy Rebentisch, C. Kerry Fields, Charles LeVine, Regina Fisher, Kathy Bebe, Philip Rebentisch, Kendall Johnson, Hudson MacDonell, Emmett Jones, Marie Puterbaugh, Greg Cullen, Nathan True-Daniels, Jeff Matsuno, and Raman Gulati, and reported they are included in the record and available for public review on the City website.

Mr. Muller reported many of the neighbors' concerns were addressed such as smoking, quiet hours, privacy, and parking; noted he met with many HOAs and discussed financing challenges because of the risk profile.

Discussion followed regarding setbacks and the direction of rooftop decks in mitigating privacy, screening by Cypress trees and other foliage, review of shade and shadow, consideration of 116

as a historical building, dimensions and square footage of each parcel, FAR, affordable housing generating less vehicle miles traveled, reduction in the number of units by decreasing the bedroom counts, the possibility of increasing the number of affordable units while maintaining financial feasibility, whether the project meets outdoor living space requirements, classification of the proposed office/work area and the possibility of the City advocating for or overseeing a shared parking relationship.

Members of the Commission summarized the items requested including: a context for the open space square footage (expanded information provided under the schedule of outdoor living space), reevaluation of vehicle miles traveled based on the new bedroom counts, having the resolution specify the number of bedrooms and units and that any changes to elevations and blueprints would change the project and require review, a copy of the EPA report, a parking study and any other important information, address findings regarding the historic parking variance or revise concessions and remove the common work area as open space and specify that the parking study be conducted for seven days a week at peak times and non-peak times.

Motion by Commissioner Hinsley, seconded by Chair Gaddis, to receive and file the applicant's PowerPoint presentation. Hearing no objections, Chair Gaddis so ordered.

Planning Manager Sculley explained the process involved in a shared parking study including, over a two-week period, on weekdays and weekends, during peak and non-peak times.

Discussion followed regarding having staff provide suggestions for shared parking and the need for staff to follow the policies and direction of City Council.

Mr. Shonafelt explained the shared parking study will be only for commercial uses only.

Nico Boyd with Fehr & Peers, Traffic Consultants, explained the process involved in the shared parking study.

Community Development Director Forbes added that the Planning Commission asked for a grid on what is allowed, driven by statute versus what the developer is providing, a review of the appealable area and updated floorplans.

Special Counsel Kettles described the process and options for continuing the hearing.

Mr. Muller requested continuing the item until June 23, 2022.

Community Development Director Forbes discussed challenges in scheduling the meeting to a date certain and reported the materials would need to be received by City staff by June 30, 2022 in order to hold the hearing on the Planning Commission's July meeting.

Motion by Commissioner Godek, seconded by Commissioner Hazeltine, to receive and file the eComments for Item No. J.2. Hearing no objections, Chair Gaddis so ordered.

Motion by Commissioner Hazeltine, seconded by Commissioner Godek, to close the public hearing, continue the item to a date uncertain, to be scheduled and readvertised when the

requested materials are provided to Planning staff. Hearing no objections, Chair Gaddis so ordered.

K. ITEMS CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS AGENDAS - None

L. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION PRIOR TO ACTION – None

M. ITEMS FROM STAFF

Community Development Director Forbes provided an update regarding the status of the website and the communication for the Galleria; reported the cannabis ordinance as considered by City Council and they decided to bring on a consultant to review the matter and discussed the City Manager's presentation regarding ex parte communications.

N. COMMISSION ITEMS AND REFERRALS TO STAFF - None


O. ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Commissioner Godek, seconded by Commissioner Hazeltine, to adjourn the meeting. Hearing no objections, Chair Gaddis so ordered.

At 12:00 a.m., Chair Gaddis adjourned the meeting to June 16, 2022.

All written comments submitted via eComment are included in the record and available for public review on the City website.

Respectfully submitted,



Brandy Forbes, AICP
Community Development Director