

CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION

South Coast Area Office
200 Oceangate, Suite 1000
Long Beach, CA 90802-4302
(562) 590-5071



W26a

November 22, 2005

MEMORANDUM

TO: Commissioners and Interested Persons

FROM: Deborah Lee, Senior Deputy Director
Teresa Henry, District Manager, South Coast District
Pam Emerson, Los Angeles County Area Supervisor

SUBJECT: Major Amendment Request RDB-MAJ-1-04 to the City of Redondo Beach Local Coastal Program; to amend the Land Use Plan and Implementation Plan of the certified LCP for Area One of the City's Coastal Zone. (For public hearing and Commission action at the Commission's December 14-16 meeting in San Francisco)

SUMMARY OF REQUEST

The City of Redondo Beach proposes to amend its certified Land Use Plan and Implementation Plan to allow for the development of housing for senior citizens in multi-family and commercial zones found in the certified segment (Area 1) of its Coastal Zone. The City proposes to permit senior citizen housing to vary from the development standards of the underlying zone, subject to approval of a Conditional Use Permit and Planning Commission Design Review, in areas classified as Multi-Family Residential ("R-3", "RMD", and "RH"), Commercial ("C-2", "C-3" and "C-4"), and Mixed Use ("MU") on the Coastal Land Use Plan and zoning maps.

The proposed implementation plan amendment defines senior citizen housing and allows the City, as part of approving a conditional use permit for senior citizen housing, to grant identified exceptions to the density, number of stories and maximum height (by about 5 feet) standards of the affected zones and establishes standards for reduced parking requirements for senior citizen housing. The ordinance would allow modifications to the floor area ratio and upper story setback rules in commercial districts, and to a requirement that Mixed Use development reserve the street level of a mixed-use structure for commercial use. In addition, the proposed amendment would change the use tables in the zoning ordinance to include senior citizen housing as a conditional use in the commercial, mixed use and low, medium and high density multi-family zones¹ of Area 1. The ordinance defines three kinds of senior citizen housing. The largest, "Senior Citizen Housing Developments" (35 dwelling units or more) would be required to have ten percent affordable units,² but there is no other requirement for low and moderate-income housing - most units would be market rate. The effect of the LCP amendment is to provide an incentive for residential development for senior citizens in commercial and multi-family residential zones. Before granting a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) the Planning Commission, or the City Council on appeal, would have to make three findings regarding the suitability of the site for senior citizen housing. The amendment is applicable in the

¹ The City defines R-2, and R-3A, zone classifications as low-density multi-family family classifications; it defines RMD as medium density, and R-4, RH-1, RH-2 and RH-3 as high-density multi family residential classifications. The terms R-3 and R-3A are used interchangeably in the City's submittal. See Exhibit 5 and the end note on page 35.

² "Affordable" or "Low and moderate income" are not defined in the certified LCP or in the amendment.

Area 1 segment of the City's Coastal Zone. Area 1 contains those portions of the City that are already developed and committed to residential or commercial use. Area 2, which contains the Pier and Harbor areas, is not certified, and this submittal does not apply to Area 2.

SUMMARY OF STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff is recommending that the Commission, after a public hearing, **deny** the request for an LUP amendment and **approve the City's Land Use Plan amendment with suggested modifications**. The suggested modifications would limit the application of this exception in commercially designated areas to approximately four blocks of commercially designated (C-2) lots along Pacific Coast Highway, north of Knob Hill Avenue (an area that is neither pedestrian oriented nor primarily developed with visitor serving and visitor support commercial uses.) The modifications would require additional findings that the City must make before granting a conditional use permit for senior housing. In addition to the findings submitted by the City, these "threshold findings" would require that the project a) does not impact pier or beach access parking, b) does not displace a visitor serving commercial facility, c) has no significant impact on public views to along the coastline or coastal bluffs, d) protects community character and pedestrian scale; and e) with a minor exception, is consistent with adopted LUP height limits in zones designated for low and medium density multi-family residential use. The modifications would mean that these exceptions would not apply on commercially zoned lots along Pacific Coast Highway south of Knob Hill Avenue or in the pedestrian oriented commercial area identified as Riviera Village. As recommended the program would continue to apply in all mixed use and high-density residential zones in Area 1, including one block designated mixed use located in Riviera Village. The staff is recommending that the Commission **deny** the amendment to the LUP, and **approve** the amended implementation plan **with modifications** that would 1) restrict application of the ordinance to a limited area; 2) incorporate the new LUP threshold findings, 3) limit the application of the exceptions to the height provisions of the ordinance in areas designated for "Multi-family" residential use, 4) define "visitor serving facility," 5) assure that references to low and moderate income units cross reference state standards for affordable housing and 6) add technical clarifications.

LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM HISTORY

The Commission effectively certified the City of Redondo Beach Land Use Plan for the entire Redondo Beach Coastal Zone on June 18, 1981. In 1984, the Commission approved an amendment to allow a hotel adjacent to the harbor (LUPA 1-84). After the LUP was approved, the City updated its General Plan and zoning, but did not update the LUP. In 1999, the Commission certified two project-driven amendments to the LUP. In May 1999, the Commission certified a change in land use designations from Commercial to Residential on five acres at the inner boundary of the Coastal Zone on Pacific Coast Highway (LUPA 1-99). In June 1999, the Commission approved changed land use designations on 2.3 acres at the south end of the City (Riviera Village) from Community Shopping Center to Mixed-Use Commercial/Residential (LUPA 2-99.) On January 11, 2001, the Commission certified a major LUP amendment (LUPA 1-00) that brought the

LUP into conformity with the City's General Plan (RDB-MAJ-1-00) with suggested modifications. LUPA 1-00 was effectively certified in May 2001. In 2002, the City submitted further changes to the LUP, reflecting planning efforts for recycling a steam generating plant and the area adjacent to Redondo Beach Pier and Harbor, with the zoning and Implementation Plan for the entire city. Local controversy ensued. At the City's request, the Commission agreed to delay certification of the area that contained the power plant, pier and harbor areas until local planning issues were resolved. On April 8, 2003, the Commission approved a geographic segmentation, dividing the Redondo Beach Coastal Zone into two separate areas, identified as Area 1, the residentially and commercially developed areas of the City and Area 2, which contained the harbor, the pier, the power plant and associated commercial and industrial properties. The Commission then approved the Implementation Plan for Area 1 with suggested modifications. The Commission effectively certified an Implementation Plan for Coastal Zone Area One on September 11, 2003.

Later in 2003, the Commission certified a minor amendment, RDB-MIN-2003, encompassing a number of technical changes to the Implementation Plan. In February 2004, the Commission certified an amendment, RDB-MAJ-01-03, which would transfer eleven lots in north Redondo Beach, near Catalina Avenue, from Area 2 to Area 1 and change the land use and zoning designations of these parcels from commercial to residential use. In August 2005, the Commission certified an amendment to the implementation ordinance, RDB-MAJ-01-05, that included technical clarifications to sections of the ordinance that address non-profit service providers, landscaping plans and the City's Administrative Design Review Process.

SUBMITTAL OF LCP AMENDMENT

The City submitted the present amendment request on June 23, 2004, and on October 26, 2004 completed filing all necessary documents including the Council resolution amending the LUP and Ordinance No. 2938-04 relating to housing for senior citizens and relevant parking studies. On January 13, 2005, the Commission granted a one-year extension to allow staff the time to review the request. The submittal is provided in Exhibit 2 (LUPA) and Exhibit 3 (LIPA).

On May 20, 2004, Redondo Beach Planning Commission conducted hearings on the proposed LCP amendment and adopted the General Plan and LUP amendment and the accompanying senior citizen housing ordinance. Three members of the public testified or corresponded with the Council regarding this proposal. On June 8, 2004, the City of Redondo Beach City Council adopted resolution number CC-0406-51, amending its Land Use Plan and implementation ordinances to provide for the development of senior citizen housing as a conditional Use in multi-family residential, commercial and mixed use zones of Area One of its Coastal Zone subject to the three provisions listed above. The City Council and the City Planning Commission held public hearings that were advertised in a local

newspaper, the Beach Reporter. All staff reports were made available for public review in the Redondo Beach Planning Department.

STANDARD OF REVIEW FOR AN LCP AMENDMENT

5071.

LAND USE PLAN AMENDMENT:

I. Denial as Submitted

MOTION: *I move that the Commission certify Land Use Plan Amendment RDB-MAJ-04-1 as submitted by the City of Redondo Beach.*

STAFF RECOMMENDATION TO DENY:

Staff recommends a **NO** vote. Failure of this motion will result in denial of the amendment as submitted and adoption of the following resolution and findings. The motion passes only by an affirmative vote of a majority of the appointed Commissioners.

RESOLUTION TO DENY:

The Commission hereby denies certification of the Land Use Plan Amendment ***RDB-MAJ-04-1*** as submitted by ***the City of Redondo Beach*** and adopts the findings set forth below on the grounds that the amendment does not conform with the policies of Chapter 3 of the Coastal Act. Certification of the Land Use Plan amendment would not comply with the California Environmental Quality Act because there are feasible alternatives or mitigation measures which could substantially lessen any significant adverse impact which the Land Use Plan Amendment may have on the environment.

II. Approval with Suggested Modifications

MOTION: *I move that the Commission certify Land Use Plan Amendment RDB-MAJ-04-1 for the City of Redondo Beach if it is modified as suggested in this staff report.*

STAFF RECOMMENDATION TO CERTIFY WITH SUGGESTED MODIFICATIONS:

Staff recommends a **YES** vote. Passage of the motion will result in the certification of the land use plan amendment with suggested modifications and adoption of the following resolution and findings. The motion to certify with suggested modifications passes only upon an affirmative vote of the majority of the appointed Commissioners.

RESOLUTION TO CERTIFY WITH SUGGESTED MODIFICATIONS:

The Commission hereby certifies the Land Use Plan Amendment ***RDB-MAJ-04-1*** for the ***Area One segment of City of Redondo Beach Land Use Plan*** if modified as suggested and adopts the findings set forth below on the grounds that the Land Use Plan amendment with suggested modifications will meet the requirements of and be in conformity with the policies of Chapter 3 of the Coastal Act. Certification of the land use plan amendment if modified as suggested complies with the California Environmental Quality Act because either 1) feasible mitigation measures and/or alternatives have been incorporated to substantially lessen any significant adverse effects of the plan on the environment, or 2) there are no further feasible alternatives or mitigation measures that would substantially lessen any significant adverse impacts which the Land Use Plan Amendment may have on the environment.

IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM AMENDMENT

III. Rejection as submitted.

MOTION I: *I move that the Commission reject the Amendment to the Implementation Program for the Area 1 segment of the City of Redondo Beach certified LCP as submitted.*

STAFF RECOMMENDATION OF REJECTION:

Staff recommends a **YES** vote. Passage of this motion will result in rejection of Implementation Program and the adoption of the following resolution and findings. The motion passes only by an affirmative vote of a majority of the Commissioners present.

RESOLUTION TO DENY CERTIFICATION OF THE AMENDMENT TO THE IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM AS SUBMITTED:

The Commission hereby denies certification of the Implementation Program amendment submitted for *the Area 1 segment of the City of Redondo Beach certified LCP* and adopts the findings set forth below on grounds that the Implementation Program amendment as submitted does not conform with, and is inadequate to carry out, the provisions of the certified *Land Use Plan as amended*. Certification of the Implementation Program amendment would not meet the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act as there are feasible alternatives and mitigation measures that would substantially lessen the significant adverse impacts on the environment that will result from certification of the Implementation Program amendment as submitted

IV. Approval as modified.

MOTION II: *I move that the Commission certify the Amendment to the Implementation Program for the Area 1 segment of the City of Redondo Beach certified LCP if it is modified as suggested in this staff report.*

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends a **YES** vote. Passage of this motion will result in certification of the Amendment to the Implementation Program with suggested modifications and the adoption of the following resolution and findings. The motion passes only by an affirmative vote of a majority of the Commissioners present.

RESOLUTION TO CERTIFY THE AMENDMENT TO THE IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM WITH SUGGESTED MODIFICATIONS:

The Commission hereby certifies the Amendment to the Implementation Program for *the Area 1 segment of the City of Redondo Beach certified LCP* if modified as suggested and adopts the findings set forth below on grounds that the Implementation Program amendment with the suggested modifications conforms with, and is adequate to carry out, the provisions of the certified *Land Use Plan as amended*. Certification of the Implementation Program Amendment if modified as suggested complies with the California

Environmental Quality Act, because either 1) feasible mitigation measures and/or alternatives have been incorporated to substantially lessen any significant adverse effects of the Implementation Program Amendment on the environment, or 2) there are no further feasible alternatives and mitigation measures that would substantially lessen any significant adverse impacts on the environment.

V. SUGGESTED MODIFICATIONS –LUP AMENDMENT

The Commission suggests the following modifications to the proposed amendment to the certified Land Use Plan. The deletions are marked by ~~strike-out~~ and additions are shown by **bold underlined type**. The city's submitted language, with suggested modifications, follows:

"Modify new Land Use Policy 14 of subsection 0 of Section VI of the Coastal Land Use Plan to read as follows:

14. Allow for the development of housing for senior citizens in Area 1 of the Coastal Zone by permitting such housing to vary from **the limits on height, density, floor area and number of stories, the requirements for upper level setbacks, required percentage of commercial frontage and the parking** development standards in the zone in which it is located (subject to approval of a Conditional Use Permit and Planning Commission Design Review) in areas classified as Multi-Family Residential ("R-3", "RMD", and "RH"), Commercial ("~~C-2~~", "~~C-3~~" and "~~C-4~~"), and Mixed Use ("MU") on the Coastal Land Use Plan Map, **and on lots classified Commercial ("C-2", "C-3" and "C-4") on the Coastal Land Use Plan Map, that are also located north of Knob Hill Avenue, adjacent to Pacific Coast Highway** provided that:

(a) The project does not impact pier or beach access parking;

(b) ~~a~~) It is appropriate at the proposed location;

(c) It does not displace a visitor serving commercial facility, defined as a commercial development that provides accommodations, food, and services, including hotels, motels, campgrounds, restaurants and commercial recreation developments such as shopping, eating and amusement areas for tourists;

(d) It has no significant impact on public views to or along the coastline or coastal bluffs;

(e) It protects community character and pedestrian scale;

(f) With the exception of an elevator housing to accommodate the handicapped, it is consistent with adopted LUP height limits in zones designated for low and medium density multi-family residential use;

(g) it is located within a reasonable walking distance of commercial retail, professional, and social and community services patronized by senior citizens, or has its own private shuttle bus that will provide daily access to these services, or be within a reasonable walking distance of a bus or transit stop providing access to these services; and-

(h) the project includes units affordable to lower-income or moderate-income households to the extent feasible.

VI. Suggested Modifications to the Implementation Program

SECTION 2. Subsection (144) and subsections (152) to (155) and **subsection (171)** are hereby added to subsection (a) of Section 10-5.402, Article 1, Chapter 5, Title 10 of the Redondo Beach Municipal Code to read as follows, and existing subsections (144) to (150) are hereby renumbered as subsections (145) to (151) and existing subsections (152) to (170) are hereby renumbered as subsections (156) to (180) **(170)**, and existing subsections (171) to (176) are renumbered as subsections **(172)** to **(181)**:

“10-5.402 Definitions.

(171) “Visitor serving facility” shall mean a private or public development that provides accommodations, food, and services, including hotels, motels, campgrounds, restaurants, and commercial recreation developments such as shopping, eating, and amusement areas for tourists.

“10-5.1624 Housing for Senior Citizens.

(c) Conditional Use Permit and Planning Commission Design Review required. No “senior **group** housing”, or “senior citizen **housing** development” or “residential care facility for the elderly” shall be approved pursuant to the standards and criteria of this section unless both a Conditional Use Permit is obtained pursuant to Section 10-5.2506 and an application for Planning Commission Design Review is approved pursuant to Section 10-5.2502.

(1) Zones where permitted by Conditional Use Permit. Housing for senior citizens may be considered in Area 1 of the Coastal Zone in the R-3A, RMD, and RH multiple-family residential zones, **in commercially zoned lots fronting Pacific Coast Highway that are also located north of Knob Hill Avenue and in** all commercial and mixed-use zones.

(d) Location criteria. Housing for senior citizens should be located consistent with the following guidelines:

(1) The proposed project should be located within a reasonable walking distance of a wide range of commercial retail, professional, social and community services patronized by senior citizens; or have its own private shuttle bus which will provide daily access to these services;

(2) The proposed project should be located within a reasonable walking distance of a bus or transit stop unless a common transportation service for residents is provided and maintained;

3) The proposed project does not impact beach or pier access parking.

4) The proposed project does not displace a visitor serving commercial facility as defined in subsection 171 of subsection (a) of Section 10.5.402, Article 1, Chapter 5, Title 10, of the Redondo Beach Municipal Code;

5) The proposed project has no significant impact on public views to and along the coastline or coastal bluffs

6) The proposed project protects community character and pedestrian scale,

7) In zones designated for low and medium density multi-family residential use, except for elevator housings allowed in order to accommodate access for the handicapped, the proposed project is consistent with adopted height limits, and

(8 3) Development of housing for senior citizens at the proposed location should **is** not being detrimental to public health, safety, and general welfare.

(e) Development standards and design requirements. A senior housing development shall comply with all applicable requirements of the underlying zone, except as provided in this subsection. The decision-making body shall not approve any variation from the standards of the underlying zone unless it finds that the project is consistent with the criteria and standards of this section and the criteria for approval of applications for a Conditional Use Permit and Planning Commission Design Review.

(1) The project may be permitted to exceed the density and floor area ratio standards of the underlying zone. ~~In mixed use zones where a minimum commercial floor area ratio is required, the project may be permitted to include less commercial floor area than required in the underlying zone provided the project shall include a commercial component that meets the intent of activating the street frontage.~~

(2) The project may be permitted to exceed the number of stories of the underlying zone,

(3) The project may be permitted to exceed the number of stories and maximum height of the underlying zone, provided that the height to top of cornice, parapet, or eave line of a peaked roof shall not exceed the maximum height of the underlying zone. Architectural projections including the portion of a roof above the eave line may exceed the height limit of the underlying zone by a maximum of five (5) feet.

In low and medium density residential (R-3A, RMD) zones, the project may be permitted to exceed the maximum height of the underlying zone by a maximum of five (5) feet for purposes of accommodating an elevator housing.

In Commercial (C2, C-3, and C-4), High Density Multi-family Residential R-4 and RH, and Mixed Use (MU) zones, in addition to the five feet added to

accommodate an elevator housing, the project may include architectural projections. These architectural projections, including the portion of a roof above the eave line, may exceed the height limit of the underlying zone by a maximum of five (5) feet. A peaked roof shall not be considered an architectural projection.

~~(4 3)~~ Where upper story setbacks are required, the project may be permitted to vary from the standards of the underlying zone provided the intent of softening the impacts of mass and bulk is met through solutions such as averaging .of setback requirements and significant variations in the building elevations.

~~(5 4)~~ The **project shall provide no fewer than the** minimum number of parking spaces required, ~~is listed~~ according to the type of senior housing development pursuant to **in** Section 10-5.1704 of this chapter. In addition:

a. **Parking reductions established in Section 10-5.1704 shall only be allowed in** requirements ~~may be reduced where appropriate (i.e. developments that have a minimum age requirement of 62;~~

...

(12) A housing development for senior citizens shall be required to include all of the design features and elements required in Section 51.2(d) of the California Civil Code.

(f) **Inclusionary housing requirements.** Prior to the issuance of a building permit for any portion of the project, the developer shall enter into a written agreement with the city restricting the affordability of units as required below to not less than fifty-five (55) years. The mix (**size range**) of affordable units (number of bedrooms, floor area, and amenities) shall be in similar proportion to the mix for the total number of units.

(1) **Rental housing.** Any rental housing project that is permitted to vary from the standards of the underlying zone pursuant to this section shall be required to restrict not less than ten (10%) percent of the total units for occupancy and affordability to lower-income households **as defined in Section 50079.5 of the Health and Safety Code (“H&SC”).**

(2) **For-sale housing.** Any for-sale housing project that is permitted to vary from the standards of the underlying zone pursuant to this section shall be required to restrict not less than ten (10%) percent of the total units for occupancy and affordability to low and moderate-income households as **defined in Section 50093 of the Health and Safety Code,** in approximate proportion to the construction need for low and moderate income categories as identified in the Housing Element of the General Plan pursuant to the Regional Housing Needs Assessment process.

(g) **Senior citizen use guarantees.** Prior to the issuance of an occupancy permit for any portion of the project, the applicant/developer shall record a covenant (and covenants for each unit in the case of for-sale housing) restricting the use of the project to housing for senior citizens **and including continuing responsibility for the operational features listed in subsections 7 and 11 above and approved as part of the project description** as indicated below. Such restrictions shall apply unless and until an alternative use is

approved by the city that complies fully with all standards applicable to the underlying district.

SECTION 4. Subsection 4 is hereby added to Section 10-5.1704(a), Article 5, Chapter 5, Title 10 of the Redondo Beach Municipal Code to read as follows:

“10-5.1704 Residential parking standards.

(a) Residential: automobile parking spaces required.

(4) Senior housing.

a. Senior citizen housing development. Senior citizen housing developments shall provide a minimum of one (1) covered space per one-bedroom unit and one (1) covered space plus 0.5 covered or uncovered spaces per two-bedroom unit. One (1) visitor space per every five (5) units shall be provided.

1. For two-bedroom units, two (2) parking spaces in tandem may be considered equivalent to and an alternative to the minimum requirement of 1.5 spaces per two-bedroom unit.

2. Total parking requirements for a development approved under this subsection may be reduced by a maximum of 0.2 spaces per unit restricted for low or moderate income households, provided that in no case shall there be less than one (1) covered space per unit.

b. Senior group housing. A minimum of 0.5 covered space per unit and one (1) visitor space per every five (5) units shall be provided.

c. Residential care facility for the elderly and convalescent facilities. A minimum of one (1) space per three (3) beds shall be provided.”

VII. FINDINGS FOR DENIAL OF THE LUP AMENDMENT

The Commission hereby finds and declares as follows:

A. LUP AMENDMENT DESCRIPTION AND LOCATION

Redondo Beach is an incorporated city on the Los Angeles County coast. The beach neighborhoods were subdivided in the early 20th century. Typical lots in older tracts in Redondo Beach are 5,000 square feet or less. Most lots in the coastal area of Redondo Beach are developed; development in the Redondo Beach coastal zone usually involves recycling existing uses. The Commission effectively certified the City of Redondo Beach Land Use Plan on June 18, 1981. The Commission approved three Land Use Plan amendments between 1981 and 2000. In 2001, the Commission approved a major amendment to the Land Use Plan that reflected the updated General Plan and incorporated density incentives or low and moderate-income housing as well as water quality standards. In 2003, the Commission approved segmentation into two segments, and at the same hearing approved implementation ordinances for the Area 1 segment,

with modifications, which the City accepted within a few months. A project-driven amendment that the Commission approved soon after certification allowed re-designation of certain commercially zoned lots to residential use. The lots were located on Catalina Avenue in the northern end of the City. This amendment also allowed the construction of “second units” on certain residential lots.

The present amendment to the Land Use Plan allows senior citizen housing to be approved in Multi-family (R-3A and RMD), Mixed Use (MU), and Commercially designated areas as a conditional use. As part of the conditional use process, the Planning Commission or City Council must make three threshold findings. The Planning Commission or Council may then waive height, density, and other design standards of the underlying zone and follow the standards adopted with the present amendment. Parking exceptions would be allowed, based on parking standards for senior citizen developments adopted as a subsection to the implementation ordinance as part of this amendment. The City has already implemented a parallel ordinance outside its coastal zone.

Location of areas subject to the proposed amendment. Over half of Area 1 will be affected by this amendment. The certified Land Use Plan identifies areas where multi-family residential use, commercial use, or mixed use may occur (Exhibit 4). Areas designated for low and medium density multi-family use include a two-block wide strip located on the beach fronting bluff or directly inland of the bluff front road and several blocks near Riviera Village, a commercial area at the southern end of the City. Two areas identified for R-1 single-family use and R-2 low-density multi-family use are not affected by this amendment. One block in Riviera Village and two blocks fronting Pacific Coast Highway are designated for mixed use, which allows both commercial and residential uses on the same parcel. In Area One, the mixed-use designation applies to two blocks adjacent to Pacific Coast Highway, which marks the inland boundary of the coastal zone, and, the northern side of one block of Avenue I in Riviera Village (Exhibit 4). In Area 1, the certified LUP identifies two areas for commercial development – the highway commercial strip along Pacific Coast Highway (PCH) and a compact commercial district at the south end of the city, Riviera Village. In the General Plan process, some residentially developed portions of PCH were redesignated to high-density residential use or to mixed commercial and residential use.

Development and Use Standards in the Certified Land Use Plan (LUP).

The certified Land Use Plan identifies development standards (including density and height, expressed in both stories and feet) for each land use category. In residential areas, lots smaller than 5,000 sq. ft. are limited to one unit; in the low-density multi-family areas (R-2 and R-3-A), lot combinations are not permitted. The LUP limits the floor area ratios on commercially designated lots. The LUP limits residential development on mixed use designated lots to “the second floor or higher”. In all land use categories, except for RH, C-4, and Mixed Use, heights are limited to two stories (30 feet). On lots designated C-4 commercial, High Density Residential (RH) and Mixed-Use, height is limited to three stories (45 feet).

The LUP allows additional height and density along Pacific Coast Highway for purposes of housing for low and moderate-income people. The LUP (and related zoning) does not allow pyramid zoning – residential development in commercially zoned areas is considered non-conforming.

Current patterns of development.

With the exception of City Hall and one other major public facility, most development in Area 1 of the Redondo Beach coastal zone is residential. As noted above, with the exception of a two block wide strip directly west of Pacific Coast Highway, most residentially designated land in the Redondo Beach coastal zone is designated for Multi-family use. However, because most lots are relatively small, many lots designated for low-density multi-family residential use (R3-A and RMD) can be developed with no more than single-family houses or duplexes. The LUP limits lot combinations in R3-A and RMD zones. There is a low bluff at the inner edge of the beach. The beach is publicly owned. The southern part of the top of this bluff is publicly owned and developed as a park; but from one block north of Knob Hill Avenue to the Harbor Pier complex, the bluff top is developed, much of it with six and eight unit apartments that were allowed under the zoning that applied until the mid-eighties. Rear-yard setbacks limit extensions down the face of the bluffs.

The commercially zoned and developed land in Area 1 of the Redondo Beach coastal zone includes commercial strip development along the west side Pacific Coast Highway and a commercial node at the south end of the City just west of Pacific Coast Highway, Riviera Village.

Riviera Village; a commercial area built around several crossing streets at the southern end of the City is a pedestrian oriented shopping area with offices, restaurants, and specialty shops, including a specialty grocery, small restaurants, and professional offices. A City-owned parking lot serves the Village. Riviera Village and adjacent areas of Pacific Coast Highway are popular areas for restaurants; which are heavily used on Friday nights. The area provides amenities that beach visitors can enjoy such as café's, coffee shops, and pizzerias. Pacific Coast Highway south of Knob Hill Avenue is adjacent to this area and also provides pedestrian accessible highway-oriented visitor support uses such as gas stations, grocery stores and moderate priced restaurants. The lots on this southern portion of Pacific Coast Highway are 50-75 feet deep and can accommodate only small-scale development. While most shoppers using the Riviera Village parking lot come from a five to ten mile radius³, because of the predominance of visitor serving facilities, Riviera Village and Southern Pacific Coast Highway are considered visitor-serving areas. Riviera Village is adjacent to a densely developed residential area. There is an existing mixed-use development on Avenue I at the northern periphery of the Riviera Village area, a three-story development that includes residential units above offices and show rooms.

³ Source, Randy Berler, City of Redondo Beach Planning Department, personal conversation.

North of Knob Hill Avenue on the west side of Pacific Coast Highway there are highway oriented commercial uses, including three motels and larger restaurants, as well as several clusters of apartments and single-family houses. The commercial uses, in addition to restaurants and motels include antique and home furnishing stores and neighborhood services. There are also apartments, churches, professional offices, two neighborhood shopping centers, City Hall, and the Public Library.

The City staff describes the area in this way:

Uses along PCH are primarily commercial. There are also churches, various blocks of higher density residential, and City Hall/Public Library. There is an existing senior housing development (150 units) on the east side of PCH between Emerald and Garnet, outside the Coastal Zone. We anticipate an application to be filed for a much smaller senior housing development on the west side of PCH following Coastal Commission approval of the ordinance.

North of Knob Hill Avenue, about four blocks along PCH are designated C-2; others are designated MU or RH (high density residential) or C-2A. The C-2A lots are developed with planned development: neighborhood shopping centers with a grocery store as an anchor. In previous amendments, the Commission has approved amendments allowing the redesignation of two blocks facing Pacific Coast Highway to either Mixed Use (commercial/residential) or RH high-density residential use. Presently, the LCP designates 77 percent of the parcels facing frontage along PCH as either Commercial or Mixed Use; 66 percent for commercial use only. A mixed-use parcel with both residential and commercial uses is required to provide commercial uses on the ground floor.

The proposed amendment to the LUP would allow residential development for senior citizen housing in areas designated commercial or mixed use or medium and high-density residential use as a conditional use. City staff indicates that in its view, the blocks designate C-2 would be the most likely site of senior housing development. Staff conducted a rough tally of uses found along Pacific Coast Highway, with special attention to C-2 lots, since the mixed use and RH lots can already develop residentially. The tally is available as Exhibit 5. Each block with a C-2 commercial designation supports at least one visitor serving facility, a restaurant, or motel, along with other uses such as repair shops and used furniture stores.

B. Public Access and Recreation

One of the prime Coastal Act concerns is assuring that new development does not prevent the public from reaching the beach. Cities apply sections 30210 and 30211 to preserve existing formal and informal accessways. The 1981/1984 LUP includes a public access chapter. The chapter includes policies to identify and protect existing accessways and beaches, many of which are located in Area 2, the pier/harbor area. The chapter also includes a discussion of the relationship of the provision of adequate upland parking to the ability to provide parking for the beach and pier. The LUP includes policies to protect existing public parking and to require residential and commercial uses to provide adequate

parking. It cites the “coastal guidelines” as its standard for provision of parking in residential areas. These policies were not amended when the Commission approved an updated Land Use Plan in 2001 (LUPA 1-00). This proposed amendment would provide for alternate, reduced parking standards for senior citizen projects.

The relevant access policies in the certified Land Use Plan now state:

3. The City will continue to diligently enforce existing parking standards for new development.
4. The total supply of on-street parking within the coastal zone will be retained to assure adequate parking for access to the beach and Harbor -Pier areas.

In addition to policies protecting existing public access, the Coastal Act encourages lower coast visitor serving commercial uses in the coastal zone and gives priority to upland facilities that support coastal recreational uses.

Section 30213 Lower cost visitor and recreational facilities; encouragement and provision; overnight room rentals

Lower cost visitor and recreational facilities shall be protected, encouraged, and, where feasible, provided. Developments providing public recreational opportunities are preferred.

The commission shall not: (1) require that overnight room rentals be fixed at an amount certain for any privately owned and operated hotel, motel, or other similar visitor-serving facility located on either public or private lands; or (2) establish or approve any method for the identification of low or moderate income persons for the purpose of determining eligibility for overnight room rentals in any such facilities.

Section 30223 Upland areas

Upland areas necessary to support coastal recreational uses shall be reserved for such uses, where feasible.

Beach visitors need services provided by gas stations, restaurants, motels, and convenience stores. In some cities, visitors are attracted to specialized shopping. In Redondo Beach, these uses are found along Pacific Coast Highway, in Riviera Village as well as in the Harbor-Pier area.

The certified LUP includes policies that protect public recreational uses and visitor serving facilities. While most of the policies address the beach, the pier, and the network of bike paths, the recreation policies also address visitor support uses:

Recreation policies.

1. All existing public recreational and visitor serving facilities will be maintained, enhanced and preserved and, where possible, expanded.
2. Lower cost visitor-serving and recreational facilities will be protected, encouraged, and where possible, provided.

When it developed the 1981 Land Use Plan, the City identified motels and restaurants as visitor support uses (Exhibit 6). The Land Use Plan identified seven motels in and adjacent to the City of Redondo Beach coastal zone that serve visitors to Redondo Beach. Four were located in the coastal zone: two in the Pier Harbor area (Area 2) and two in Area 1, the area subject to this amendment. Of these two, one, the Starlite Motel, was located on a residential street, Broadway, and one, the Redondo Budget Motel, was located on Pacific Coast Highway. The remaining motels were located just outside the coastal zone, one of these just outside of the city boundary. Most of the motels identified still exist, and one new motel and a long-term stay facility have been developed on the west side of Pacific Coast Highway. The motels along Pacific Coast Highway are moderately priced, requiring additional protection under Section 30213, which requires protection and encouragement of low and moderate priced visitor-serving facilities. Presently there are two motels and one long-term stay facility on the west side of Pacific Coast Highway, one at the site of the former Redondo Beach Budget Motel. As proposed, the Land Use Plan amendment does not protect these motels. As proposed, the Land Use Plan amendment is not consistent with the previously certified LUP or with the policies of the Coastal Act that protect visitor-serving facilities.

When the Commission certified the plan, it certified policies that would protect visitor-serving facilities. It also considered the densities and mixture of land uses in the LCP. When it certified the updated Land Use Plan in 2001, (LUPA 1-00,) the Commission approved changes in land use designations developed in the General Plan. The access and recreation policies were not changed.

When it approved the LUP in 1981, the Commission considered the consistency of the mix of land uses with the policies of the Coastal Act. In both the 1981 plan and in the 2001 plan the mixture of land uses included significant commercial development along Pacific Coast Highway and in Riviera Village. In reviewing the amendments, including both the general update (LUPA 1-2000), and the project-driven amendments, the Commission has considered whether changing commercial designations from commercial use to mixed use or residential use would significantly reduce the amount of visitor support uses found in Redondo Beach coastal zone including those located along Pacific Coast Highway or in Riviera Village.

The present land use designations require commercial development on about 77 percent of the parcels fronting PCH. The proposed changes could make it possible to develop any

parcel on Pacific Coast Highway as senior housing or reduce to the required commercial component in mixed-use designated areas.

The following chart shows the present breakdown of land use designations along Pacific Coast Highway, where most of the commercially zoned lots subject to this proposed amendment are located:

DISTRIBUTION OF USE DESIGNATIONS			
PACIFIC COAST HIGHWAY			
LUP	ZONE DESIGNATION	NUMBER OF BLOCKS	USES NOW ALLOWED
Multi family residential	RH	2 plus 2 half blocks	Residential
Mixed use	MU	2	Commercial only or commercial with residential above the first floor
Commercial	C-2-PD	7 blocks (single or 2 lot depth along PCH south of Knob Hill 40 or 80 foot depth)	Neighborhood commercial. Offices permitted above or behind ground level retail or service uses.
Commercial	C-2 and C-2A	4.5	Commercial
Commercial	C-3B	1	Commercial
Commercial	C-4-PD RIV OVERLAY	1	Commercial
Commercial	C-2 RIV OVERLAY	1	Commercial
Public	P	2	Public buildings/parks
TOTAL		21.5	
PERCENT COMMERCIAL DESIGNATION		77% (counting mixed use blocks) 67% (not counting mixed use blocks)	

The City states that its goal in this program is to provide smaller units for City residents who are aging and who may wish to move out of single-family residences to apartments. In support of this discussion, the City provides demographic information showing an increase in the proportion of the population who are in their fifties, and sixties (Exhibit 8). In previous planning documents, notably the 1981 LUP, the City has indicated an interest in recycling older structures. The 1981 LUP describes parcels fronting PCH as occupied by “run down” property, and states that the City’s goal is to replace them. This second goal reflects an issue shared by other cities in the region—commercial strips developed along arterial streets include more commercially designated property than can recycle with viable commercial uses. City officials state that their intent is to identify and preserve viable centers of commercial development and encourage other parts of PCH to recycle to residential uses. Previously redesignated sites along PCH have recycled to new residential development, and the proposed LCP amendment is part of this plan. However, this plan does not consider the need to preserve visitor serving accommodations, including moderate priced motels and restaurants, now found along Pacific Coast Highway.

In further discussion, City staff has agreed that the conversion of existing commercial uses in Riviera Village and PCH south of Knob Hill Avenue, which are pedestrian oriented areas, to residential use could negatively impact the commercial uses in this area, which depend on pedestrian access and clustering of similar uses. However, they point out that with the exception of two neighborhood shopping centers, PCH north of Knob Hill Avenue has 1) deeper lots, suitable for recycling, 2) several vacant parcels, 3) several clusters of existing residential use and 4) older buildings that do not provide visitor serving uses and that might qualify for recycling. .

This proposed plan provides incentives to construct housing for elderly people. The Commission has in the past approved programs that granted density incentives to developers who proposed to develop housing to serve low and moderate income families and individuals, based on a state law mandating this practice (Exhibit 7). The state law that the City proposes to implement in providing senior citizen housing allows developers of senior citizen developments to exclude families with children, as long as certain amenities to the seniors are provided. While there is evidence of a growing demand for senior housing, there is no evidence that there is a scarcity of such housing, and the state law does not require either the Commission or the local governments to provide senior housing. The development of housing under this program could have two unintended consequences: allowing the development of housing with inadequate parking that could later convert to non-senior housing, and providing an incentives to replace visitor serving uses with market rate condominiums for senior citizens.

As described by City staff and in City findings, this proposal changes some underutilized commercially zoned parcels to residential use and permits additional units to be constructed on residentially zoned parcels if they are for senior citizens. These senior citizens include those who live independently, own cars, and drive. The predicted amount of automobile use is addressed in the amendment to the implementation plan, where there is an analysis of the expected parking demand of senior citizen developments. The analysis is based on a survey of three existing senior developments located in and near Redondo Beach. In these developments, the median age of the residents is above 80. Assuming traffic impacts to be related to car ownership and parking demand, the proposed increases in density under the LUP amendment will not impact parking or the traffic capacity of the major streets in Redondo Beach. However, as proposed the LUPA allows variances on standards including parking, but not include the goals and standards to guide either the evaluation of variances or the Implementation Plan adopted to carry out the LUPA. It contains to standards to allow for additional investigations of correction of the potential impacts to beach parking. Therefore, if a project were located close to the beach, or if experience showed that the studies were overoptimistic, the City would be constrained in investigating the particular project's impacts on pier and beach parking. As proposed the LUPA does not adequately protect on-street parking, which is a component of the beach access system.

The proposed amendment to the LUP would allow development of senior citizen housing on all commercially designated parcels as a conditional use. The proposed new LUP

policy includes thresholds that must be met before senior citizen housing is permitted. These criteria include no standard for protection of visitor serving uses⁴. The Land Use Plan includes parking and density standards, which preserve parking capacity and street capacity for public access. The proposed Land Use Plan amendment allows the City to allow senior citizen developments to vary from development standards. The proposed implementation ordinance includes detailed parking standards for senior citizen units based on expected vehicle use in senior citizen housing. By allowing conversion of commercially zoned lots, this amendment provides an incentive to redevelop visitor-serving uses. In the proposed Land Use Plan amendment, the threshold findings for approval of senior housing include consideration of the “appropriateness” of the area, but do not include maintaining visitor serving uses in the area, scale, or limiting impacts on visitor serving uses. The proposed land use plan amendment as submitted could result in significant reduction in the amount of visitor support facilities by allowing unlimited residential use in the two areas now designated for commercial use and is inconsistent with Sections 30213 and 30223 of the Coastal Act.

C. Visual Resources.

Section 30251 of the Coastal Act protects views and community character. Section 30253 protects special communities and neighborhoods.

Section 30251 Scenic and visual qualities

The scenic and visual qualities of coastal areas shall be considered and protected as a resource of public importance. Permitted development shall be sited and designed to protect views to and along the ocean and scenic coastal areas, to minimize the alteration of natural land forms, to be visually compatible with the character of surrounding areas, and, where feasible, to restore and enhance visual quality in visually degraded areas. New development in highly scenic areas such as those designated in the California Coastline Preservation and Recreation Plan prepared by the Department of Parks and Recreation and by local government shall be subordinate to the character of its setting.

Section 30253 Minimization of adverse impacts

New development shall:

(5) Where appropriate, protect special communities and neighborhoods, which, because of their unique characteristics, are popular visitor destination points for recreational uses.

⁴ Allow development of housing for senior citizens in Area 1 ... provided that a) it is appropriate at the proposed location; b) it is located within a reasonable walking distance of commercial retail, professional, and social and community services patronized by senior citizens, or has its own private shuttle bus that will provide daily access to these services, or be within a reasonable walking distance of a bus or transit stop providing access to these services; and c) the project includes units affordable to lower-income or moderate-income households to the extent feasible

In the process of adopting its Land Use Plan and amended General Plan, the City adopted height limits to protect community character and the visual quality of its neighborhoods. In all areas except for some high-density zones along Pacific Coast Highway and along Avenue I in Riviera Village, the consensus was that a 30-foot height limit would conform to these policies. A thirty foot height limit would allow recycling of older structures while maintaining community character which was marked by craftsman type and twenties Spanish one and two story structures. The proposed amendment to the Land Use Plan will allow the City to approve senior citizen developments that vary from the Land Use Plan development standards in the multi-family, mixed use and commercially designated areas, including height limits and number of stories. The accompanying implementation plan amendment describes in detail the exceptions that the City intends to grant. As now submitted the Land Use Plan amendment defines the exception very broadly: the limited height exception provided in the implementation ordinance is not the only height exception that would be consistent with the proposed LUPA. Proponents argue that the change will allow elevator housings, which presently are not allowed to extend above the maximum height of the zone.

As proposed, the amended policy will apply in multi-family residential and neighborhood commercial areas where heights are limited in the certified Land Use Plan to 30 feet and two stories. Actual development in the medium density multi-family designated areas, the R-3A and RMD zones, includes duplexes and single-family houses, older smaller buildings, and several blocks of multi-family apartments along Esplanade along the coastal bluffs, which were built when zoning allowed R-5 intensity. New development in the R3-A and RMD zoned areas consists of 30-foot high duplexes and single-family units. The Commission in its permit process and the City in its revised General Plan, LCP, and zoning have consistently reduced allowable heights and densities in these residential areas to preserve community character. Under the proposed amendment, senior citizen projects in this area could receive height and density incentives. Proponents argue that the increase in height would allow installation of elevators to serve residents of senior buildings and “architectural embellishment to avoid blocky buildings as developers build extra stories/units within the height limits. While the permits would be issued as conditional use permits, there is no requirement concerning consideration of predominant heights in the area in allowing these exceptions. There are no criteria in the LUP amendment that requires the permitting body to consider the compatibility of the senior project with the scale of the area for which it is proposed, or its impacts on views to and along the coastline. As proposed, the Land Use Plan amendment is inconsistent with Sections 30251 and 30253 of the Coastal Act and must be denied.

Along Pacific Coast Highway, there are three one-block areas and one relatively small site where present land use designations permit 45 feet in height and three stories. In addition, LCP standards for density and height bonuses for low and very low income housing incentives apply along Pacific Coast Highway. Otherwise, the Land Use Plan limits new development along Pacific Coast Highway to two stories and 30 feet. Existing development varies from one story storefronts, to three -story office buildings and to two and three story motels. In the past, both the Commission and the City have found that,

with careful design, granting additional height on lots facing Pacific Coast Highway and on Avenue I, a street on the outer periphery of Riviera Village would not adversely impact the character and scale of the Redondo Beach. The proposed Land Use Plan amendment allows variances in these areas, but does not include a requirement that the approved development be compatible with the character of the area. As such, it is not consistent with Section 30551 and 30253 of the Coastal Act.

Riviera Village and Pacific Coast Highway between the City boundary and Knob Hill Avenue are small-scale neighborhoods that support small restaurants and retail shops and professional offices. Most of the older, buildings are one story, extend over only one or two lots, and open directly to the sidewalk. One of the newer structures, on Avenue I, is a three-story 45 feet high mixed-use structure. The upper stories of that structure are set back at least 40 feet from the street front. The area, including this mixed use structure, appears small scale because all the structures have ground level entrances, breaks in the building façade, and provide retail and/or plaza entries at the ground floor. There are relatively few driveway curb cuts on the street front—instead vehicular access, where possible is via alleys. Parking is shared in City lots and along the street. The area has a pedestrian scale. While there is both on- and off-street parking in the area, there is significant use of the sidewalks and a significant number of the shops are accessed from sidewalks. The proposed findings for granting a variance to the development standards of the land use plan do not require the City to find that a proposed senior citizen project is consistent with the character and scale of the area. A residential complex could be closed off from the street. Twenty-five foot wide double driveways would be a significant interruption to pedestrian use of the streets in this area, where many street frontages are only 30 feet wide. Application of the proposed LUP amendment in Riviera Village and along the southern parts of Pacific Coast Highway would have significant impacts on the character of the area by displacing these storefronts with residential structures that separate the existing commercial uses from each other. Displacing the storefronts and street level entrances, interrupting the streetscape with driveways would seriously affect the recreational experience of exploring Riviera Village and southern Redondo Beach on foot. As proposed, the amended LUP is not consistent with Sections 30251 and 30253 of the Coastal Act.

Some of the lots subject to this amendment are on the bluff over the beach. While the City staff contends that 1) conversion of the development of these lots to senior citizen housing is unlikely and 2) existing setback rules would protect the bluffs in the event of conversion or expansion of existing family structures to senior citizen use, there are no explicit findings required that the development would not impact views to and along the beach and the bluffs. As proposed, the amended LUP is not consistent with Sections 30251 and 30253 of the Coastal Act.

D. Location and Intensity of Development.

Coastal Act Sections 30250 and 30252 require communities to adopt orderly patterns of development and to locate development in areas that can accommodate it. Section 30251

requires development to protect community character and protect public views. Based on two development issues, traffic generation and community character, the City has been lowered its maximum build-out and the height, densities and intensities of new developments.

Section 30250

(a) New residential, commercial, or industrial development, except as otherwise provided in this division, shall be located within, contiguous with, or in close proximity to, existing developed areas able to accommodate it or, where such areas are not able to accommodate it, in other areas with adequate public services and where it will not have significant adverse effects, either individually or cumulatively, on coastal resources. In addition, land divisions, other than leases for agricultural uses, outside existing developed areas shall be permitted only where 50 percent of the usable parcels in the area have been developed and the created parcels would be no smaller than the average size of surrounding parcels.

The certified Land Use Plan specifically addresses the range of densities allowed in the Redondo Beach coastal zone. The land use designations adopted represent a reduction in intensity from that permitted in the City's zoning and general plan prior to adopting of the Coastal Act. Part of this reduction intensity was a result of consideration of the cumulative impact on traffic of previously permitted level of intensity. Part was the result of consideration of the appearance of the buildings allowed by the former land use designations.

The proposed Land Use Plan Amendment would allow greater intensity of development for purposes of senior citizen housing development. The criteria for allowing the exception address whether the proposed development is located in an area that is suitable for senior citizens, they do not address whether any feature of the project would be inconsistent with the protection of coastal resources.

As noted above the City analysis of traffic analysis assumes that high percentage of senior citizens will be retired, and concludes that their impact on commuting traffic would be significantly less than the impact of comparable non-senior units. However, as proposed the LUPA does not allow for additional investigations concerning potential impacts to public services.

Section 30250 also requires that new development not have impact on coastal resources, and Section 30251 protects public views and community character. The only lots subject to this amendment that are located where there are significant coastal resources are the existing high-density apartments buildings along the bluff top, between the Esplanade and the bluff face. These buildings are on lots now designated multi-family residential (RMD). The City indicates that its implementation ordinances limits variances to height and density and does not include variances on setbacks, which could result in encroachment on the bluff face. Again, these limitations are found in the ordinances and not in the LUP

amendment. There is no requirement in the LUPA that development approved under this program be consistent with the preservation of views along the beach, or with community character. While this amendment is consistent with the intention to limit development to the capacity of public services as found in Section 30250, it is not clear that the criteria for considering senior citizen development also include the protection of visual resources, such as the bluff face and neighborhood character. As proposed, the LUP amendment is not consistent with Sections 30250 and 30251.

VIII. FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL OF THE AMENDED LAND USE PLAN IF MODIFIED.

A. Access and recreation.

As noted above, the proposed amendment as proposed, could allow displacement of existing visitor serving development, and does not require consideration of the impact of a proposed senior citizen development on public access or access support. In Riviera Village, and adjacent PCH, the proposed LUP amendment allows significant reduction in retail street frontage, which affects not only the availability of services but also the recreational experience of exploring Riviera Village on foot. Moreover, the proposed amendment requires no scrutiny of the possible impacts the proposed development on the availability of coastal access and beach parking. Therefore, as proposed, the LUP amendment is inconsistent with Coastal Act Sections 30210, 30211, 30213, and 30223.

As modified to restrict application of the amendment to commercially designated lots in to lots located on Pacific Coast Highway north of Knob Hill Avenue and to eliminate commercially designated lots in Riviera Village and on Pacific Coast Highway south of Knob Hill Avenue, and to require that:

- (a) The project does not impact pier or beach access parking.
- (b) *It is appropriate at the proposed location* (City's submitted finding, see Exhibit 2);
- (c) It does not displace a visitor serving commercial facility,⁵
- (d) It has no significant impact on public views to along the coastline or coastal bluffs,
- (e) It protects community character and pedestrian scale;
- (f) It is consistent with adopted LUP height limits in zones designated for low and medium density multi-family residential use;
- (g) *It is located within a reasonable walking distance of commercial retail, professional, and social and community services patronized by senior citizens, or*

⁵ "Visitor serving facility" is defined as a commercial development that provides accommodations, food, and services, including hotels, motels, campgrounds, restaurants and commercial recreation developments such as shopping, eating and amusement areas for tourists.

has its own private shuttle bus that will provide daily access to these services, or be within a reasonable walking distance of a bus or transit stop providing access to these services (City's submitted finding, see Exhibit 2); and,
g) The project includes units affordable to lower-income or moderate-income households to the extent feasible. (City's submitted finding, see Exhibit 2)

As modified to remove a visitor serving commercial area, Riviera Village and the southern portions of PCH from the application of the revised LUPA, and to require that no commercial visitor serving facilities be displaced, the project's impact on recreation and access is reduce. As modified to require the City to consider the impact of the change on pier and beach access parking, the amended LUP will be consistent with the access and recreation policies of the Coastal Act.

B. Character and scale, views to and along the beach.

As drafted the proposed LUP amendment does not require consideration of the impact of the proposed development on the character and scale the nearby area. Secondly, the proposed amendment, if it applied to commercially designated lots in Riviera Village and southern Pacific Coast Highway would greatly affect the character and scale of the Riviera Village-- south PCH area by allowing conversion of smaller commercial spaces too much larger senior citizen developments. Third, as drafted, the LUP amendment does not allow the City to consider the effect of the development on views to and along the coastline. In addition the amendment as proposed would have the effect allowing up to five feet additional height both in the Riviera Village commercial district and in low density Multi-family R-3 and RMD neighborhoods close to the Esplanade and the beach. The Esplanade is a public street that runs along the top of the beach facing bluff south of Torrance Boulevard. South of Avenue A, in the southern part of the City there is a narrow public park seaward of the Esplanade. There is a row of developed lots seaward of the Esplanade beginning about half way between Avenue A and Knob Hill Avenue, north of Knob Hill Avenue, there is a row of several single family dwellings and then, to the immediate north, there area several blocks of four and five level apartment buildings. All of these lots are designated for low-density multi-family use, R-3A and RMD, and subject the presently proposed LUP policy. As modified to limit application of the amendment to commercial lots north of PCH and to limit exceptions to the height limit, and to require consideration of visual impacts to and along the coast line and bluffs, the amended LUP will not have significant impacts on views to and along the coast.

Pacific Coast Highway north of Knob Hill Avenue presents the visual character typical of older commercial strips, with a variety of scale, setbacks, and uses, and a proliferation of large signs. Due to its width, Pacific Coast Highway can accommodate taller and wider buildings without resulting in overwhelming a smaller street. Due to the width of the developed street frontage of many present uses, larger, 32 unit 45 foot to 50 foot high buildings will not crowd out existing structures. However, this large scale does not exist along all sections of Pacific Coast Highway. There is older, small scale, residential and commercial development along some sections of PCH, and lots fronting PCH abut residential neighborhoods. As modified, the ordnance will not apply to the southern portion

of PCH and the City will be able consider the effect of newer larger buildings, and their driveways, on the character and scale of the immediate neighborhood in granting the conditional use permits.

As modified to 1) eliminate the application of the senior housing program to commercially designated lots in Riviera Village and on PCH south of Knob Hill Avenue from the program, 2) protect views to and along the beach and 3) to require consideration of the character and scale of the immediate area, the proposed amendment will be consistent with Sections 30251 of the Coastal Act, which protects views and community character.

C. Development and traffic.

As noted above Section 30250 restricts new development to areas that can accommodate it and requires the Commission to evaluate the impacts of new development on coastal resources. As noted above, the expected difference in impacts on public services of application of the ordinance is minimal because senior housing generates less traffic than other residential development and less traffic during peak hours. As modified, the amended Land Use Plan will require that new development granted exceptions be evaluated concerning its impact of beach parking and access before an exception is granted. Therefore, as modified the proposed amendment is consistent with Sections 30250, 30251 and 30252 of the Coastal Act.

E. CONSISTENCY WITH THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA)

Section 21080.5 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) exempts local government from the requirement of preparing an environmental impact report (EIR) in connection with its local coastal program. Instead, the CEQA responsibilities are assigned to the Coastal Commission and the Commission's LCP review and approval program has been found by the Resources Agency to be functionally equivalent to the EIR process. Thus, under CEQA Section 21080.5, the Commission is relieved of the responsibility to prepare an EIR for each LCP.

Nevertheless, the Commission is required in an LCP submittal or, as in this case, an LCP amendment submittal, to find that the LCP, or LCP, as amended, does conform with CEQA provisions. The Commission has considered an alternative of limiting the application of the amendment as proposed to areas where there will be limited impacts on visitor serving facilities and to require an additional finding that the proposed development does not displace a visitor serving facility. Moreover as amended the LUP limits changes in height in certain residential zones and will require consideration of impact to public access, public parking and community character in approving senior housing projects. There are no other feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen any significant adverse impact on the environment. As modified the amended LUP will not have significant impact on resources protected under the Coastal Act. Therefore,

the Commission finds the subject Land Use Plan amendment as modified, conforms to CEQA provisions.

IX. FINDINGS FOR REJECTION OF THE AMENDED IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

A. Standard of Review of LIP Amendment.

The standard of review with regard to an amendment to the implementation ordinances of the LCP is the amendment's consistency with the certified LUP (or the amended LUP as modified) and its adequacy to carry out its provisions.

Section 30513 states, in part:

The commission may only reject zoning ordinances, zoning district maps, or other implementing actions on the grounds that they do not conform with, or are inadequate to carry out, the provisions of the certified land use plan.

B. Description of Proposed Ordinance.

The proposed ordinance permits construction of senior citizen housing in the R3, RMD and RH multi-family, commercial and mixed use zones; defines the term "senior citizen housing," establishes parking standards for senior citizen housing, and specifies exceptions to development standards that may be granted as part of a conditional use permit approving senior citizen housing. The possible exceptions include height, second story setback, the number of stories, and the percentage of first story commercial use required in a mixed use building, and parking. Moreover, the proposed ordinance allows developers of senior citizen developments to reduce the "required amount of first story commercial use" in a structure in a mixed-use designated zone. The full text of the ordinance is found in Exhibit 3. Currently the zoning ordinance reflects the development standards in the Land Use Plan: in most residentially or commercially designated districts the zoning ordinance now allows two stories and limits heights to 30 feet. In the C-4, RH, and Mixed-use districts, the ordinance allows three stories and 45 feet. Height limits are just that; the zoning ordinance does not allow stairwells, elevator housings, or roof access structures to extend above the maximum height established in the zoning.

The proposed ordinance will allow exceptions to height limits for approved senior housing developments. Proponents argue that the change will allow elevator housings, which presently are not allowed to extend above the maximum height of the zone. The proposed amendment allows the City to approve an additional story above what is permitted in the zoning as part of approving senior citizen housing. Because the ordinance also defines a "Senior citizen housing development" as a project with 35 units or more, the City staff anticipates that projects taking advantage of this exception will occur only in commercial, mixed use and high-density residential areas, which are located along Pacific Coast Highway and in Riviera Village. This is because lot combinations would be required in

order to assemble a lot capable of accommodating 35 units. Lot combinations of more than two lots are not permitted in the RMD and R-3A zones. This intended limitation is adopted into the ordinance and is not reflected in the proposed amendment to the Land Use Plan. The proposed amendment to the Land Use Plan would allow these exceptions in the low-density multi-family R-3A and RMD zones. The proposed ordinance does not include a minimum number of units for "Residential care facility for the elderly," or "senior group housing," which would also qualify for the proposed variance. The amendment of the LUP would therefore allow the exceptions described above for group home and residential care facilities for senior citizens in the low and medium density multi-family residential zones.

Senior citizen housing is defined as:

"10-5.402 Definitions.

(144) "Residential care facility for the elderly" shall mean a state-licensed housing arrangement chosen voluntarily by residents over sixty (60) years of age where varying levels and intensities of care and supervision, protective supervision, personal care or health-related services are provided, based upon residents' varying needs, as determined in order to be admitted and remain in the facility, as defined in Chapter 3.2 of the California Health and Safety Code, Section 1569 et. Seq. A residential care facility for the elderly serving six (6) or fewer persons shall be considered a "residential care facility, limited" for all zoning purposes.

(152) "Senior citizen" shall mean a person sixty-two (62) years of age or older, or a Person fifty-five (55) years of age or older living in a "senior citizen housing" development".

(153) "Senior citizen housing development" shall mean a residential development having at least thirty-five (35) dwelling units developed, substantially rehabilitated, or substantially renovated for senior citizens.

(154) "Senior group housing" shall mean a building or buildings providing residence for a group of senior citizens with a central kitchen and dining facilities and a separate bedroom or private living quarters.

(155) "Senior housing" shall mean housing:

- a. Provided under any State or Federal program that the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development determines is specifically designed and operated to assist senior citizens (as defined in the State or Federal program); or
- b. Provided in a "senior citizen housing development" as defined in this section; or
- c. Provided in "senior group housing" as defined in this section; or
- d. Provided in a "residential care facility for the elderly" as defined in this section."

Development Standard Exceptions.

The proposal allows the City as part of approving a senior citizen development as a conditional use to grant exceptions to density, number of stories and maximum height (by about 5 feet) as well as exceptions to floor area ratio and upper story setback rules. These exceptions are limited: There are no exceptions to side, front, and rear setbacks. Other requirements address enforceability, outdoor living space, and minimum floor area per residential unit.

(1) The project may be permitted to exceed the density and floor area ratio standards of the underlying zone. In mixed-use zones where a minimum commercial floor area ratio is required, the project may be permitted to include less commercial floor area than required in the underlying zone provided the project shall include a commercial component that meets the intent of activating the street frontage.

(2) The project may be permitted to exceed the number of stories and maximum height of the underlying zone, provided that the height to top of cornice, parapet, or eave line of a peaked roof shall not exceed the maximum height of the underlying zone. Architectural projections including the portion of a roof above the eave line may exceed the height limit of the underlying zone by a maximum of five (5) feet.

(3) Where upper story setbacks are required, the project may be permitted to vary from the standards of the underlying zone provided the intent of softening the impacts of mass and bulk is met through solutions such as averaging of setback requirements and significant variations in the building elevations.

In addition, the City amended the use classification table for the Multi-Family Residential (R-3", "RMD", and "RH"), Commercial ("C-2", "C-3" and "C-4"), and Mixed Use ("MU") zones to include senior citizen housing in each of these zones as a conditional use.

LUP parking and access standards: the LUP requires that parking be provided consistent with Coastal Commission guidelines. The proposed ordinance includes exceptions to the parking standard of the LCP applicable to senior citizen developments. However, the LIPA is not clear that the revised standards are the required minimum standard or whether the City may grant further exceptions:

“Parking ...

...

(4) The minimum number of parking spaces required is listed according to the type of senior housing development pursuant to Section 10-5.1704 of this chapter. In addition:

- a. Parking requirements may be reduced where appropriate (i.e. developments that have a minimum age requirement of 62);
- b. Where possible, parking layouts should avoid 90 degree angles (no less than 30 degree angles and no more than 60 degree angles are recommended)';
- c. Required parking spaces shall be available to residents of the project at no fee.

10-5.1704 Residential parking standards.

(a) Residential: automobile parking spaces required.

...

(4) Senior housing.

a. Senior citizen housing development. Senior citizen housing developments shall provide a minimum of one (1) covered space per one- bedroom unit and one (1) covered space plus 0.5 covered or uncovered spaces per two-bedroom unit. One (1) visitor space per every five (5) units shall be provided.

1. For two-bedroom units, two (2) parking spaces in tandem may be considered equivalent to and an alternative to the minimum requirement of 1.5 spaces per two-bedroom unit.

2. Total parking requirements may be reduced by a maximum of 0.2 spaces per unit restricted for low or moderate income households, provided that in no case shall there be less than one (1) covered space per unit.

b. Senior group housing. A minimum of 0.5 covered space per unit and one (1) visitor space per every five (5) units shall be provided.

c. Residential care facility for the elderly and convalescent facilities. A minimum of one (1) space per three (3) beds shall be provided."

C. Consistency with the Public Access and Recreation policies of the amended Land Use Plan

The proposed ordinance does not limit its application to areas that are not visitor serving and provides no protection of visitor serving uses. This is not consistent with either the certified Land Use Plan or the amended Land Use Plan as modified. The amended Land Use Plan as modified protects existing visitor serving uses by 1) limiting application of the revised policies to one commercially zoned area and 2) in that area requiring the protection of existing visitor serving facilities. The modified LUPA and the certified LUP provide for protection of visitor serving facilities. According to the modified LUPA, a senior citizen project approved in a commercial zone may not remove a visitor serving facility. In addition, as modified, the LUP requires that when the exception is applied to mixed use zoned districts, that commercial uses be retained in the ground floor. The proposed ordinance includes no such protections. Therefore, the amended implementation ordinance is not consistent with and is inadequate to carry out the access policies of the amended land use plan as modified.

The proposed addition of more apartments in existing multi-use zones could have impacts on public beach parking to the extent to which the neighborhoods are used for the beach parking and could be inconsistent with the policy of the LUP which states:

3. The City will continue to diligently enforce existing parking standards for new development. By requiring adequate parking for new developments within the Coastal Zone in the past, the City has assured adequate parking accessibility to the beach and the Harbor-Pier area. This policy will be continued by assuring the adoption of adequate parking standards in the implementing ordinances of the Local Coastal Program.

The amount of parking required for senior uses under this amendment are set in a sliding scale that requires more spaces for units with more bedrooms, and fewer spaces if a percentage of the units are offered as rental housing for low and moderate income tenants. The City has provided a study, Linscott, 2004⁶, showing that the ratios proposed are consistent with the present pattern found in three market rate senior development in Redondo Beach and in other Los Angeles and Orange County cities, where the average age of the occupants was over 80. If the studies shown are correct, the proposed parking ratios are adequate; allowing more units with less parking per unit will not result in more cars being stored on the street, reducing the number of parking spaces available to beach visitors. However, as noted above, it is possible that a particular project could have impacts on beach or pier parking. It is possible that project occupied by residents younger than the 80-year -olds studied by Linscott could generate more parking than is not anticipated.

The amended LUPA with modifications requires the City to examine the impacts of a proposed development on beach and pier parking. The ordinance provides no criteria for the City to consider in the event that the proposed development is near the beach and shown to impact public access to the beach or pier. While the reduced standards may be adequate in areas where there is adequate on-street parking to absorb any difference between the impact of the development and the published standards, the proposed ordinance allows the City no grounds to require additional parking in the event that a residential structure because of its location or intensity could have adverse impacts on beach or pier parking. As such the ordinance as proposed is inconsistent with inadequate to carry out the amended LUP as modified.

D. Consistency Visual Resources and Community Character Policies of the amended Land Use Plan.

As proposed the amended implementation plan allows additional height in the R3, RMD, commercial and mixed use zones up to five feet above the eave line for senior citizen housing. According to proponents, this would accommodate both elevator housings and allow decorative architectural projections to avoid a box-like structure when additional stories have been permitted. The revised LUP standard allows additional stories, which practically speaking means that it allows three stories in zones that allow two stories: R-3A, RMD, C-2, and C-3 and that it allows four stories in zone that allow three stories: RH, C4, and MU (mixed use.) The projections would soften the visual effect of extra stories. However, the effect of an architectural projection would be to add to the apparent height of the structures. Where the visual impact of height is an issue, and the development, with the extra story would be inconsistent with community character, there are alternatives, such as denying the extra story, limiting its bulk, and limiting exceptions to facilities for the handicapped such as elevator housings. The visual impact of height is an issue in the commercially zoned lots on southern PCH and in Riviera Village and on multi-family zoned

⁶ Linscott, Law and Greenspan, Memorandum to Randy Berler, Planning Director, City of Redondo Beach, "Parking Requirements for Active Senior Citizen Housing Developments, September 16, 2004.

districts. As proposed, the ordinance is inconsistent with and inadequate to carry out policies in the modified LUPA that protect these areas from visual impacts. In the Modified LUPA, the application of the extra height is limited and the visually unique Riviera Village is protected. In addition, the proposed ordinance includes no standard other than suitability of the area in which the development is proposed for evaluating the visual impacts of a proposed senior project. Accordingly, the Commission is requiring in the modified LUPA that the City consider impacts on projects community character and scale and on views to and along the bluffs and beaches, which could be adversely impacted by structures with greater bulk than considered in the certified LCP. The LIPA as submitted does not require this and is therefore inconsistent with and inadequate to carry out the visual resource and community character policies of the modified Land Use Plan.

E. Development and Traffic Capacity

The LUPA, as modified requires that the proposed development not impact parking for access to the beach or the pier. The proposed ordinance does not require analysis for the potential impacts of the project on coastal access and pier parking. Moreover, the threshold findings (section 10-5.1624(c)) as submitted do not direct the City to reject the application if there are parking impacts on beach access. As noted above the City has provided information supporting reduced parking for senior citizen developments. Such information may lead to the inference that senior citizen housing even with possible increases in density will not have impacts on beach access and parking. However, the ordinances as written does not provide for additional information provided by the applicant, staff or others that may indicate to the contrary. As submitted the proposed LIP is inconsistent with and inadequate to carry out the requirement of the modified LUPA that the proposed development will not have a negative impact on beach or pier parking.

X. FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL OF THE AMENDED IMPLEMENTATION PLAN, IF MODIFIED.

A. Description of Suggested Modifications to the Implementation Plan.

The suggested modifications to the implementation program would:

- 1) Add a definition of Commercial Visitor Serving facility; in section 10-5.402;
- 2) Change section 10-5.1624 to make the terms used for the types of senior housing in that section consistent with the list of definitions of types of senior housing found In section 10-5.402,
- 3) Limit the application of this ordinance so that it does not apply to commercially zoned lots in Riviera Village or on Pacific Coast Highway, (PCH) south of Knob Hill Avenue,
- 4) Add threshold findings to section 10-5.1624d (location criteria) reflecting the threshold findings in the LUPA as modified, regarding
 - a. Requires that the development not have an Impact on beach and pier parking,

- b. Requires an additional finding that the proposed development does not displace a commercial visitor serving facility
 - c. Requires analysis of impacts on public views to and along the coastline or of coastal bluffs and protection of those views,
 - d. Requires consideration of protection of community character and scale in granting variances to development standards, and
 - e. Limits application of exceptions to height standards in low-density residential zones.
- 5) In subsections 4 and 5, the parking standards, the Commission has added some technical clarifications to subsection 10-5.1624.d.4 to clarify the application of the revised parking standards, and
- 6) The Commission is also adding language clarifying duration and extent of the applicant's and its successor-in interest's responsibility for maintaining the use and the "operational features" required in the ordinance. (See subsection II above for the wording of the suggested modifications.) The purpose of this change is to assure that the revised LUPA standards of parking will be granted only to developments that can maintain eligibility for the exceptions.

In addition to some minor clarifications described above, the recommended changes in the implementation plan reflect the changes that the staff is recommending to reflect the suggested modifications to the amended land use plan. Without these modifications, the LIP would be inconsistent with the LUPA as modified.

B. Access and Recreation

As required in the LUPA, the revised implementation ordinance protects existing visitor serving commercial facilities in all areas, defines commercial visitor serving facility, and confines the application of the ordinance to approximately eleven blocks of Pacific Coast Highway only about four of which are presently zoned commercial, so that areas principally devoted to commercial visitor serving facilities would not be impacted by projects permitted under the ordinance. Secondly, the LIPA carries out the requirement in the modified LUPA, which requires that a senior citizen development not displace a commercial visitor serving use. Third, the LIP as modified incorporates an LUPA policy, which requires that senior citizen projects not adversely impact parking for the beach or the pier. The implementation plan as modified is consistent with and adequate to carry out the policies of the LUPA as modified.

C. Visual Character and Scale

Consistent with parallel requirements in the LUPA as modified, the modified LIP limits the application of the additional height in low density residential zones, requires a finding that new development is consistent with neighborhood character and scale, does not allow application of the ordinance in a unique visitor serving neighborhood, Riviera Village and adjoining sections of PCH, and requires protection of views of the beach and bluffs. As

such, the LIPA as modified is consistent with and adequate to carry out the visual quality provisions of the amended LUP as modified.

D. Development and Traffic Capacity

The LUPA as modified requires that the proposed development not impact parking for access to the beach or the pier. The proposed ordinance does not require analysis for the potential impacts of the project on coastal access and pier parking. Moreover, the threshold findings as submitted do not direct the City to reject the application if there are impacts on parking for beach and pier access. As noted above the City has provided information supporting reduced parking for senior citizen developments. Such information may lead to the inference that senior citizen housing even with possible increases in density will not have impacts on beach access and parking. As modified, the applicant must demonstrate to the satisfaction of the City that the proposed development will not have a negative impact on beach or pier parking and access. As modified the implementation plan is consistent with the modified LUPA

E. CONSISTENCY WITH THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA)

Section 21080.5 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) exempts local government from the requirement of preparing an environmental impact report (EIR) in connection with its local coastal program. Instead, the CEQA responsibilities are assigned to the Coastal Commission and the Commission's LCP review and approval program has been found by the Resources Agency to be functionally equivalent to the EIR process. Thus, under CEQA Section 21080.5, the Commission is relieved of the responsibility to prepare an EIR for each LCP.

Nevertheless, the Commission is required in an LCP submittal or, as in this case, an LCP amendment submittal, to find that the LCP, or LCP, as amended, does conform with CEQA provisions. The Commission has considered an alternative of limiting the application of the amendment as proposed to areas where there will be limited impacts on visitor serving facilities and to require an additional finding that the proposed development does not displace a visitor serving facility. Moreover as modified the amended the LUP limits changes in height in certain residential zones and will require consideration of impact to public access, public parking, and community character in approving senior housing projects. As proposed, the amended implementation plan does not carry out the provisions of the amended LUPA. There are feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen any significant adverse impact on the environment. As modified the amended LIP will not have significant impacts on resources protected under the Coastal Act. Therefore, the Commission finds the proposed LIP amendment as modified conforms to CEQA provisions.

i

##

ⁱ Note: Chapter 2 of the certified LCP summarizes the use and classification of the zoning districts at the beginning of each subsection.

SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL ZONES

- 10-5.500 Specific purposes, R-1 single-family residential zones.
- 10-5.501 Land use regulations: R-1 single-family residential zones.
- 10-5.503 Development standards: R-1 single-family residential zone.

MULTIPLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL ZONES

- 10-5.510 Specific purposes, R-2, R-3A, RMD, and RH multiple-family residential zones.
- 10-5.511 Land use regulations: R-2, R-3A, RMD, and RH multiple-family residential zones.
- 10-5.513 Development standards: R-2 low density multiple-family residential zone.
- 10-5.515 Development standards: R-3A low density multiple-family residential zone.
- 10-5.516 Development standards: RMD medium density multiple-family residential zone.
- 10-5.517 Development standards: RH-1 high density multiple-family residential zone.
- 10-5.518 Development standards: RH-2 high density multiple-family residential zone.
- 10-5.519 Development standards: RH-3 high density multiple-family residential zone.

C-2, C-3, and C-4 COMMERCIAL ZONES

Sections

- 10-5.600 Specific purposes, C-2, C-3, and C-4 Commercial and Pedestrian-oriented Commercial zones.
- 10-5.611 Additional land use regulations: C-1 Commercial zone.
- 10-5.612 Development standards: C-1 Commercial zone.
- 10-5.620 Land use regulations: C-2, C-2A, C-2B, and C-2-PD Commercial zones.
- 10-5.621 Additional land use regulations: C-2, C-2A, C-2B, and C-2-PD Commercial zones.
- 10-5.622 Development standards: C-2 Commercial zone.
- 10-5.623 Development standards: C-2A Commercial zone.
- 10-5.624 Development standards: C-2B Commercial zone.
- 10-5.625 Development standards: C-2-PD Pedestrian-oriented Commercial zone.
- 10-5.630 Land use regulations: C-3, C-3B, and C-3-PD Commercial zones.
- 10-5.631 Additional land use regulations: C-3, C-3B, and C-3-PD Commercial zones.
- 10-5.632 Development standards: C-3 Commercial zone.
- 10-5.634 Development standards: C-3B Pedestrian-oriented Commercial zone.
- 10-5.635 Development standards: C-3-PD Pedestrian-oriented Commercial zone.
- 10-5.640 Land use regulations: C-4 and C-4-PD Commercial zones.
- 10-5.641 Additional land use regulations: C-4 and C-4-PD Commercial zones.
- 10-5.642 Development standards: C-4 Commercial zone.
- 10-5.645 Development standards: C-4-PD Pedestrian-oriented Commercial zone.

MU MIXED-USE ZONES

Sections

- 10-5.800 W Waterfront zones.
- 10-5.802 CC Catalina Corridor zone.
- 10-5.900 Specific purposes, MU-3 Mixed-use zones.
- 10-5.910 Land use regulations: MU-3 Mixed-use zones.
- 10-5.911 Additional land use regulations: MU-3 Mixed-use zones.
- 10-5.912 Performance standards: MU-3 Mixed-use zones.
- 10-5.915 Development standards: MU-3 Mixed-use zone.
- 10-5.917 Development standards: MU-3B Mixed-use zone.
- 10-5.918 Development standards: MU-3C Mixed-use zone.