**AGENDA**
**THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 2013**
**JOINT MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION AND**
**HARBOR COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF REDONDO BEACH – 7:00 P.M.**
**CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS**
**415 DIAMOND STREET**

**CITY CLERK**
**(Packet for scanning)**

## I. OPENING SESSION

1. Call Meeting to Order
2. Roll Call – Planning Commission
3. Roll Call – Harbor Commission
4. Salute to the Flag

## II. APPROVAL OF ORDER OF AGENDA

## III. CONSENT CALENDAR

*Routine business items, except those formally noticed for public hearing (agendized as either a "Routine Public Hearing" or "Public Hearing"), or those items agendized as "Old Business" or "New Business" are assigned to the Consent Calendar. The Commission Members may request that any Consent Calendar item(s) be removed, discussed, and acted upon separately. Items removed from the Consent Calendar will be taken up immediately following approval of remaining Consent Calendar items. Remaining Consent Calendar items will be approved in one motion.*

5. Approval of Affidavit of Posting for the Joint Meeting of the Planning Commission and Harbor Commission of February 21, 2013
6. Planning Commission Approval of the following minutes: Regular Meeting of January 17, 2013.
7. Receive and file written communications

## IV. AUDIENCE OATH

## V. EX PARTE COMMUNICATIONS

*This section is intended to allow all officials the opportunity to reveal any disclosure or ex parte communication about the following public hearings.*

## VI. ROUTINE PUBLIC HEARINGS

*Routine public hearing items, except those pulled for discussion, are assigned to the Routine Public Hearings section of the agenda. Commission Members, or any member of the public, may request that any item(s) be removed, discussed, and acted upon separately. Items removed from the Routine Public Hearings section will be taken up immediately following approval of remaining Routine Public Hearing items. Those items remaining on the Routine Public Hearings section will be approved in one motion.*

## VII. PUBLIC HEARINGS

## VIII. OLD BUSINESS

*Items continued from previous agendas.*

## IX. NEW BUSINESS

*Items for discussion prior to action.*

8. Herondo Street/Harbor Drive Gateway Improvement Project

Recommendation: Review, discuss, and provide recommendations regarding the Herondo Street/Harbor Drive Gateway Improvement Project.

## X. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

*This section is intended to provide members of the public with the opportunity to comment on any subject that does not appear on this agenda for action. This section is limited to 30 minutes. Each speaker will be afforded three minutes to address the Commission. Each speaker will be permitted to speak only once. Written requests, if any, will be considered first under this section.*

## XI. COMMISSION ITEMS AND REFERRALS TO STAFF

*Referrals to staff are service requests that will be entered in the City's Customer Service Center for action.*

## XII. ITEMS FROM STAFF

## XII. ADJOURNMENT

The next meeting of the Harbor Commission of the City of Redondo Beach will be a Regular Meeting to be held at 6:30 p.m. on Monday March 11, 2013 in the Redondo Beach City Council Chambers, 415 Diamond Street, Redondo Beach, California.

The next meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Redondo Beach will be a Regular Meeting to be held at 7:00 p.m. on Thursday, March 21, 2013 in the Redondo Beach City Council Chambers, 415 Diamond Street, Redondo Beach, California.

Any writings or documents provided to a majority of the Commission regarding any item on this agenda will be made available for public inspection at the City Clerk's Counter at City Hall located at 415 Diamond Street, Door C, Redondo Beach, Ca. during normal business hours. In addition, such writings and documents will be posted, time permitting, on the City's website at www.redondo.org.

It is the intention of the City of Redondo Beach to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) in all respects. If, as an attendee or a participant at this meeting you will need special assistance beyond what is normally provided, the City will attempt to accommodate you in every reasonable manner. Please contact the City Clerk's Office at (310) 318-0656 at least forty-eight (48) hours prior to the meeting to inform us of your particular needs and to determine if accommodation is feasible. Please advise us at that time if you will need accommodations to attend or participate in meetings on a regular basis.

An agenda packet is available 24 hours at www.redondo.org under the City Clerk and during City Hall hours, agenda items are also available for review in the Planning Department.

## ROUTINE PUBLIC HEARINGS

The Commission has placed cases, which have been recommended for approval by the Community Development Department staff, and which have no anticipated opposition, on the Routine Public Hearing section of the agenda. Any member of the public or the Commission may request that any item on the Routine Public Hearing section be removed and heard, subject to a formal public hearing procedure, following the procedures adopted by the Commission.

All cases remaining on the Routine Public Hearing Section will be approved by the Commission by adopting the findings and conclusions in the staff report, adopting the Exemption Declaration or certifying

the Negative Declaration, if applicable to that case, and granting the permit or entitlement requested, subject to the conditions contained within the staff report.

Cases which have been removed from the Routine Public Hearing Section will be heard immediately following approval of the remaining Routine Public Hearing items, in the ascending order of case number.

## RULES PERTAINING TO ALL PUBLIC TESTIMONY

(Section 6.1, Article 6, Rules of Conduct)

1. No person shall address the Commission without first securing the permission of the Chairperson; provided, however, that permission shall not be refused except for a good cause.

2. Speakers may be sworn in by the Chairperson.

3. After a motion is passed or a hearing closed, no person shall address the Commission on the matter without first securing permission of the Chairperson.

4. Each person addressing the Commission shall step up to the lectern and clearly state his/her name and city for the record, the subject he/she wishes to discuss, and proceed with his/her remarks.

5. Unless otherwise designated, remarks shall be limited to three (3) minutes on any one agenda item. The time may be extended for a speaker(s) by the majority vote of the Commission.

6. In situations where an unusual number of people wish to speak on an item, the Chairperson may reasonably limit the aggregate time of hearing or discussion, and/or time for each individual speaker, and/or the number of speakers. Such time limits shall allow for full discussion of the item by interested parties or their representative(s). Groups are encouraged to designate a spokesperson who may be granted additional time to speak.

7. No person shall speak twice on the same agenda item unless permission is granted by a majority of the Commission.

8. Speakers are encouraged to present new evidence and points of view not previously considered, and avoid repetition of statements made by previous speakers.

9. All remarks shall be addressed to the Planning Commission as a whole and not to any member thereof. No questions shall be directed to a member of the Planning Commission or the City staff except through, and with the permission of, the Chairperson.

10. Speakers shall confine their remarks to those which are relevant to the subject of the hearing. Attacks against the character or motives of any person shall be out of order. The Chairperson, subject to appeal to the Commission, shall be the judge of relevancy and whether character or motives are being impugned.

11. The public participation portion of the agenda shall be reserved for the public to address the Planning Commission regarding problems, question, or complaints within the jurisdiction of the Planning Commission.

12. Any person making personal, impertinent, or slanderous remarks, or who shall become boisterous while addressing the Commission, shall be forthwith barred from future audience before the Commission, unless permission to continue be granted by the Chairperson.

13. The Chairperson, or majority of the members present, may at any time request that a police officer be present to enforce order and decorum. The Chairperson or such majority may request

that the police officer eject from the place of meeting or place under arrest, any person who violates the order and decorum of the meeting.

14. In the event that any meeting is willfully interrupted so as to render the orderly conduct of such meeting unfeasible and order cannot be restored by the removal of individuals willfully interrupting the meeting, the Commission may order the meeting room cleared and continue its session in accordance with the provisions of Government Code subsection 54957.9 and any amendments.

## APPEALS OF COMMISSION DECISIONS:

All decisions of the Planning Commission may be appealed to the City Council. Appeals must be filed, in writing, with the City Clerk's Office within ten (10) days following the date of action of the Planning Commission. The appeal period commences on the day following the Commission's action and concludes on the tenth calendar day following that date. If the closing date for appeals falls on a weekend or holiday, the closing date shall be the following business day. All appeals must be accompanied by an appeal fee of 25% of original application fee up to a maximum of $500.00 and must be received by the City Clerk's Office by 5:00 p.m. on the closing date.

Planning Commission decisions on applications which do not automatically require City Council review (e.g. Zoning Map Amendments and General Plan Amendments), become final following conclusion of the appeal period, if a written appeal has not been filed in accordance with the appeal procedure outline above.

No appeals fee shall be required for an appeal of a decision on a Coastal Development Permit application.

February 15, 2013

STATE OF CALIFORNIA )
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES ) ss
CITY OF REDONDO BEACH )

**AFFIDAVIT OF POSTING**

Pursuant to the requirements of Government Code Section 54955, agendas for a Regular Commission meeting must be posted at least seventy-two (72) hours in advance and in a location that is freely accessible to members of the public. As Planning Technician of the City of Redondo Beach, I declare, under penalty of perjury, that in compliance with the requirements of Government Code Section 54955, I caused to have posted on Friday, February 15, 2013, the agenda for the February 21, 2013 Joint Meeting of the City of Redondo Beach Planning Commission and Harbor Commission in the following locations:

City Hall, Door "A", 415 Diamond Street, Redondo Beach
City Clerk's Counter, Door "C", 415 Diamond Street, Redondo Beach

Lina Portolese
Planning Technician

# CITY OF REDONDO BEACH
## PROOF OF POSTING
## PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING AGENDA

I, Lina Portolese hereby declare, under penalty of perjury, that I am over the age of 18 years and am employed by the City of Redondo Beach, and that the following document: Planning Commission and Harbor Commission Joint Meeting Agenda of February 21, 2013
(agenda date)

was posted by me at the following location(s) on the date and hour noted below:

Posted on: 2/15/2013 (date) at 2:00 pm (time)

Posted at: City Hall, Door "A", 415 Diamond Street, Redondo Beach

City Clerk's Counter, Door "C", 415 Diamond Street, Redondo Beach

Signature

2/15/13
Date

Minutes
Regular Meeting
Planning Commission
January 17, 2013

## CALL TO ORDER

A Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission was called to order by Chair Sanchez at 7:00 p.m. in the City Hall Council Chambers, 415 Diamond Street, Redondo Beach, California.

## ROLL CALL

| | |
|---|---|
| Commissioners Present: | Benning, Biro, Mitchell, Parsons, Sanchez |
| Commissioners Absent: | Kim, Zager |
| Officials Present: | Michael W. Webb, City Attorney |
| | Aaron Jones, Community Development Director |
| | Anita Kroeger, Associate Planner |
| | Alex Plascencia, Assistant Planner |
| | Diane Cleary, Minutes Secretary |

## SALUTE TO THE FLAG

Commissioner Mitchell led the Commissioners and audience in a Salute to the Flag.

## APPROVAL OF ORDER OF AGENDA

It was the consensus of the Commission to approve the Order of Agenda as presented.

## CONSENT CALENDAR #4 THROUGH #7

Motion by Commissioner Benning, seconded by Commissioner Biro, to approve the following Consent Calendar items, and by its concurrence, the Commission:

4. **APPROVED AFFIDAVIT OF POSTING FOR THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF** January 17, 2013.

5. **APPROVED THE FOLLOWING MINUTES:** Regular Meeting of November 15, 2012.

6. **RECEIVED AND FILED THE STRATEGIC PLAN UPDATE:** December 18, 2012.

7. **RECEIVED AND FILED WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS - NONE**

Motion carried unanimously, with Commissioners Kim and Zager absent.

## AUDIENCE OATH

Chair Sanchez asked that those people in the audience who wish to address the Commission on any of the hearing issues stand and take the following oath:

> Do each of you swear or affirm that the testimony
> you shall give shall be the truth, the whole truth,
> and nothing but the truth?

People in the audience stood and answered, "I do."

**ITEM #6**

## EX PARTE COMMUNICATIONS

Commissioner Benning disclosed receiving an email regarding Item 10.

Commissioner Parsons disclosed meeting with residents, a car wash owner and the applicant on Item 10.

Commissioner Biro disclosed meeting with the applicant regarding Item 10.

Chair Sanchez disclosed meeting with the applicant regarding Item 10.

## PUBLIC HEARINGS

### 8. APPROVE CONSTRUCTION OF FIRST AND SECOND-STORY ADDITION 105 AVENUE A

Motion by Commissioner Parsons, seconded by Commissioner Benning, to open the Public Hearing at 7:05 p.m. regarding Case No. 2013-01-PC-001, the applicant being Dana Korbin, to consider an Exemption Declaration, Variance, and Coastal Development Permit to allow reduced front, rear, and side yard setbacks for a first and second-story addition to an existing single-family residence on property located in a Low-Density Multiple-Family Residential (R-3) zone within the Coastal Zone at 105 Avenue A. Hearing no objections, Chair Sanchez so ordered.

Associate Planner Anita Kroeger gave a staff report and reviewed the location and size of the property. She said a variance is being requested and the applicant is proposing to construct the same enclosed stairway as previously approved, as well as floor area additions to the first and second floor including new entries and balconies. She said the property will be a much smaller two-story single family home surrounded by much larger multifamily residences. She stated the proposal meets the findings and criteria, the site is small and unique and staff recommends approval.

Michael Harrison, designer of the project, stated he supports the staff report and said he is open for questions.

Roland DeLong, stated he owns the property adjacent behind the rear yard and requested review of the elevations and floor level compared to his building. He also stated he wasn't notified of this hearing.

Motion by Commissioner Parsons, seconded by Commissioner Biro, to close the Public Participation Section of the Public Hearing at 7:12 p.m. Hearing no objections, Chair Sanchez so ordered.

Director Aaron Jones explained that drawing A1.2 shows the elevations in relationship to the adjacent structure, and the second floor plate line will be substantially below the neighbor's elevation. He also said the owners of record within 300 feet of the proposed property would have been notified of the hearing.

In response to Commissioner Biro, Director Aaron Jones stated posting includes additional posting in front of the property and along the street frontage within 300 feet and posting at least ten days prior to the hearing.

Commissioner Parsons pointed out that the proposal will be 6 feet below the maximum height.

In response to Commissioner Benning, Director Aaron Jones stated notice is mailed to the legal owner of record, regardless of where they live.

Commissioner Parsons stated this item would be approved administratively if there wasn't a variance. He noted the property is unusual and supported the conditions in the staff report and the criteria has been established in meeting the variance.

Motion by Commissioner Parsons, seconded by Commissioner Benning, to approve an Exemption Declaration, Variance and Coastal Development Permit to allow reduced front, rear, and side yard setbacks for a first and second-story addition to an existing single-family residence on property located in a Low-Density Multiple-Family Residential (R-3) zone within the Coastal Zone, Case No. 2013-01-PC-001, Dana Korbin applicant, subject to the 4 findings and 14 conditions in the staff report. Motion carried unanimously, with Commissioners Kim and Zager absent.

## 9. APPROVE CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW GARAGE AND SECOND-STORY ADDITION 3401 DOW AVENUE

Commissioner Biro recused himself from the dais at 7:19 p.m. due to living within 500 feet of the proposal.

Motion by Commissioner Parsons, seconded by Commissioner Mitchell, to open the Public Hearing at 7:19 p.m. regarding Case No. 2013-01-PC-002, the applicant being Charles and Lisa Bree, to consider an Exemption Declaration and Variance to allow reduced rear and side yard setbacks for a construction of a new garage and second-story addition to an existing single-family residence on property located within a Single-Family Residential (R-1) Zone at 3401 Dow Avenue. Hearing no objections, Chair Sanchez so ordered.

Assistant Planner Alex Plascencia gave a staff report and reviewed the vicinity and zoning maps and said the surrounding neighborhood is zoned R1. He reviewed the request and said due to the irregular lot shape, the existing structure's front setback is measured from Burritt Avenue and not Dow Avenue. He stated the property owner is seeking a variance to allow a reduced 1 foot 9 inch side yard and 5 foot rear yard setback. He also stated there is a Chevron pipeline running behind the property and extending throughout the neighborhood creating unique lot shapes of the properties. He said the proposed addition would allow the applicant to maintain the side yard to side yard relationship with the abutting property. He said staff believes the granting of the variance would make the property more consistent with the neighborhood current development and recommends approval.

Charles and Lisa Bree stated they were unaware that the Burritt side of the property line was the frontage and stated the proposal is the best way possible to build their home for their growing family.

Motion by Commissioner Benning, seconded by Commissioner Mitchell, to close the Public Participation Section at 7:28 p.m. Hearing no objections, Chair Sanchez so ordered.

Commissioner Parsons disclosed that he lives in this neighborhood outside the 500 foot radius and stated he is familiar with the neighborhood. He supported maintaining the nature of the neighborhood and looking continuous, and believed the proposal will be a positive improvement for the neighborhood.

Commissioner Benning agreed and stated the lot shape is unusual along with the pipeline interference, and supported the variance.

Chair Sanchez noted a challenge with the unique property lines and supported the staff report and design.

Motion by Commissioner Benning, seconded by Commissioner Mitchell, to approve an Exemption Declaration and Variance to allow reduced rear and side yard setbacks for construction of a new garage and second-story addition to an existing single-family residence on property located within a Single-Family Residential (R-1) Zone, Case No. 2013-01-PC-002, Charles & Lisa Bree applicants, subject to the 4 findings and 14 conditions in the staff report. Motion carried unanimously, with Commissioner Zager absent.

Commissioner Biro returned to the dais at 7:33 p.m.

## OLD BUSINESS

### 10. CONSIDER CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION OF A CAR WASH FACILITY 617 TORRANCE BOULEVARD

Motion by Commissioner Parsons, seconded by Commissioner Mitchell, to open the Public Hearing at 7:33 p.m. regarding Case No. 2012-11-PC-016, the applicant being Chris McKenna, to consider an Exemption Declaration, Conditional Use Permit, and Planning Commission Design Review, to allow the construction and operation of a car wash facility on property located within a Commercial (C-3) zone at 617 Torrance Boulevard. Hearing no objections, Chair Sanchez so ordered.

Associate Planner Anita Kroeger gave a staff report and reviewed the vicinity map and background information. She said the site has been demolished and stated the proposal will include three options. She said the components include the car wash structure, vehicle waiting area, self-cleaning area, detailed area, outdoor patios, solid waste, employee parking and greener landscaping. She reviewed the three different site plans presented by the applicant and said the third site plan proposes most of the access from Torrance Boulevard with some traffic off of South Irena as well. She said there will be a 20-foot landscape buffer at the rear. She noted the current level of service is A and with the car wash during a.m. peak hour, there would be 2 additional southbound trips and 18 northbound trips. She reviewed the traffic counts and study and said there would not be much effect on traffic with the car wash. She also reviewed alternative land use trip generation comparisons and noted a car wash would be the least impactive at 700 daily trips, 70 a.m. peak hour and 70 p.m. peak hour. She pointed out there is no market for office space and underground parking would be required. She said the City would work with the applicant and stated noise was considered. She explained that an acoustical analysis was done by Davy & Associates, Inc., and there is also a City noise ordinance. She stated the applicant would provide equipment to meet the standard at 56.3 dBA at the north property line. She said the blower is in the tunnel while the car goes through and the motor for the vacuums is in the main building. She further said that noise from people would be supervised by management. She said employees would not be allowed to park on the residential streets and there would be four onsite employee parking spaces along with employee parking required in the south clean areas. She requested that the findings be made in the staff report, and approval of the Exemption Declaration, Conditional Use Permit, and Planning Commission Design.

Chris McKenna, applicant, supported the staff report and agreed with the conditions presented. He thanked the community, planning staff, Planning Commission and neighbors to help make a better car wash serving the needs of the local community and bringing community, business and environment together. He supported being active in the community.and participating in the future growth of the City. He said they take great pride in presenting this car wash which will be the most technologically advanced environmentally friendly state of the art car wash to ever be built in the United States. He said they are a local business and hope to be.a role model in helping the youth, the community, other local businesses and environmental awareness.

Rich Shah, Redondo Beach, supported the car wash and adopting a pro-business attitude.

Leon Feliz, Architect of the Project, reviewed the differences of the second and third site plans which include alleviating the problem of the east bound patrons making a U-turn at the intersection.

David Friedan, Redondo Beach, spoke on behalf of the car wash which he supported and will be put to productive land use and increase revenue base of the City.

Jeff Sallee, Catalina Coffee Company, supported the car wash and its amenities proposed which will be good for Redondo and is unique.

Bruce Davy, Davy & Associates, stated they did a noise study for the project which he reviewed and said a total noise level of 58.8 dBA would be experienced with the blowers, with the City's noise ordnance allowing 60 dBA. He also suggested mitigation on the back of the sign such as a material called Pyrox to absorb noise which could also be used 10 feet in the tunnel from the blowers to the exit.

Logan Crow, Redondo Beach, supported the car wash and it being eco-friendly.

Bonnie Waters, stated she works in the law office across the street from the proposed car wash and noted the area has been blighted. She welcomed the car wash, coffee shop and choices with washing the car, and also supported the operating hours. She further did not see a concern for noise in the early mornings or late evenings.

Rochelle Hernandez, stated she works in the law office across the street from the proposed car wash and noted there wasn't that much traffic with the old car wash and supported the proposal.

Brea Walrath, stated she works in the law office across the street from the proposed car wash, supported the car wash and noted the area has been a eyesore for a long time. She also supported bringing business to the City and supported the car wash's efforts with quiet equipment and not creating a lot of traffic down the street with the configuration.

Marcello Enriquez, basketball coach at Redondo Union High School, supported the car wash and thanked Mr. McKenna's group for their support of the athletic programs at the high school.

Steve Goldberg, 707 Torrance Boulevard, stated he works in the law office across the street from the proposed car wash, stated their office is tired of the vacant lot and supported the car wash. He said there has never been a traffic or noise issue at the old car wash and the traffic did not spill out onto Irena. He supported approval by the Planning Commission and then going to City Council on appeal from the neighbors.

Lisa Rodriguez, stated she attended the groundbreaking and supported the proposal which is compatible with the existing businesses. She also welcomed the new state of the art facility and beautification. She further said the traffic is on Torrance Boulevard and S. Lucia in the mornings due to the Parras Middle School drop off.

Motion by Commissioner Biro, seconded by Commissioner Parsons, to receive and file printed packets presented by the public. Hearing no objections, Vice-Chair Sanchez so ordered.

Raymur Sweeney, Redondo Beach, opposed the express car wash on Torrance Boulevard and noted the property has been empty for 12 years. She said the property was permitted for a car wash 50 years ago and a prior use is not legally grandfathered to receive a permit forever. She stated once a prior conditional use terminates, it is no longer permitted. She also said the City Municipal Code identifies over 45 other possible land uses for the property.

Delores Gilmore, Redondo Beach, said the proposed car wash is inconsistent with the conditional use requirements of the City. She said the City cannot grant a permit for conditional use that poses any adverse impact on neighboring properties. She said there are numerous adverse impacts with the proposed car wash along with other issues and are incompatible with the neighborhood. She opposed an express car wash which isn't the same as the 1965 car wash, and noted the traffic study did not compare various alternative uses to weekends.

Vic Robinet, Helberta, stated the previous car wash was very impactive with an ever present sound of machinery, motors and pumps which was fatiguing. He also said the street curves at Torrance Boulevard which is an obstructed view and said there would be added traffic with the proposal. He also questioned where the parking would take place for the coffee shop.

Jigesh Vera, South Redondo, reviewed express car washes in the City and site maps in the area, noted the distances from the residential properties, public sidewalks and stacking distance for the waiting cars, and said they are on busy streets and in commercial areas. He stated the proposed car wash does not support these features.

Mark Spidey, Redondo Beach, reviewed the traffic study and noted there is no mention to the peak volume of weekend days or a high volume express type car wash. He reviewed issues of the site design to include the bottleneck occurring with the credit card kiosks and stacking issues. He also expressed concern with public safety on Torrance Boulevard and Irena which is a double-blind corner, and expressed concern with the traffic circulation on the site.

Motion by Commissioner Biro, seconded by Commissioner Mitchell, to extend Mr. Spidey's time. Hearing no objections, Vice-Chair Sanchez so ordered.

Mr. Spidey also expressed concern with the proposed site design which he reviewed and requested denial of the project and all three site plans proposed.

Jim Hayes, Redondo Beach, reviewed issues with the comparison of other land uses and impacts that cannot be captured by a traffic study.

Mark Klyman, Redondo Beach, noted noise impacts of car washes and stated noise estimates presented are theoretical and the claims need to be documented. He also stated the applicant failed to attempt to demonstrate compliance with all six noise standards required for residential and commercial zones, and only shows compliance with the City's 15-minute limit. He questioned applying theory when actual data should be gathered.

Cathleen Bush, Redondo Beach, presented a video regarding other car washes and noise impacts they generate.

Evro Wee Sit, Sage Technologies, reviewed his report to include Sections 4.1, 4.3, and noted 86.6 claimed and the actual values are larger than 1.2 dBA. He also referred to Section 4.4 Directivity Effect, Section 4.6 Fifteen Minute Noise and interior noise.

Motion by Commissioner Parsons, seconded by Commissioner Biro, to extend Mr. Wee Sit's time. Hearing no objections, Vice-Chair Sanchez so ordered.

Mr. Wee Sit also referred to measurements taken at locations on pages 7 and 8 and Table 2 and Table 3 on page 5 which lists the more complete limits which increase as the duration gets shorter, and said the numbers failed. He stated the measured noise exceeded both the residential and commercial limits at multiple locations and multiple time intervals.

Steve Walters, Irena Avenue, opposed the project and believed the project would not warrant the CEQA exemption. He demanded that the EIR be prepared due to the new car wash having significantly greater impacts than the prior car wash, significant amounts of hazardous substances used, stored and emitted, cumulative impacts from continuing use of industrial chemicals and unusual circumstances.

Motion by Commissioner Biro, seconded by Commissioner Parsons, to extend Mr. Walters' time. Hearing no objections, Chair Sanchez so ordered.

Mr. Walters stated the CEQA exemption should not apply and expressed concern with the City being subject to lawsuits without moving forward with an EIR.

Charlie Sumanski, Redondo Beach, noted a blind access on Torrance Boulevard, pedestrian traffic and U-turns and the car wash would be located on a collector road. He also expressed concern with environmental issues, noise from equipment based on undocumented ratings, tax receipts creating degradation of the property and City funding, increase in traffic, liability issues, and stated there are over 150 people opposing the car wash.

Christy Page, Redondo Beach, expressed concern with relying on the operating conditions on the CUP and Code Enforcement and believed that could not be met all the time and can't be enforced. She also expressed concern with safety issues and litigation and asked that the application be denied.

Aaron Hokinson, Redondo Beach, stated the old car wash has been closed for many years and was told there never would be another one there. He stated the neighborhood has changed dramatically and the median income and home values have increased. He also expressed concern with a car wash lowering property values in the area which he reviewed as on Avenue G.

Scott Rosenberg, Remax Results Commercial, S. Irena, presented a handout on a car wash study and analysis on projected effect on the City property tax base and individual homeowner equity over the next 10 years.

Heather Hayes, Helberta Avenue, expressed concern with inadequate public notice and lack of public involvement in the process, and requested that the Health Care Partners letter be included in the Administrative Staff Report as part of the public record.

Will Kiow, Redondo Beach, noted dramatic changes in the area and impacts from the former car wash. He said new homes have been built, foot traffic and children have increased and he expressed concern with safety issues. He also believed entering/exiting off Irena and Torrance Boulevard won't be safe.

William Parker, expressed concern with noise, chemicals and noise, and believed the car wash would not be the proper use in the residential area. He also noted traffic increases in the summer and he expressed concern with safety.

Liz Walters opposed the car wash and reviewed the Torrance Boulevard study, and believed the car wash would not improve the corridor.

Mike Campbell, 239A Irena, opposed the car wash, expressed concern with traffic impacts, and noted the area is a gateway to the pier.

Julia Olson stated the car wash would not enhance the quality of life for the residents along the gateway to the pier. She said there are numerous children in the neighborhood and pointed out that there are four schools in the area. She also expressed concern with safety and noise issues.

Rick Sun expressed concern with safety and noise issues and noted the car wash will have an adverse effect on the neighborhood.

A member of the public expressed concern with the car wash and health issues.

Mr. McKenna stated the chemicals that will be used are the same used in the household, the clarifiers have been removed with a full sign off from the state with a no further action letter, stated they have an I-petition which has no validity, measurements taken at El Segundo and at the Shell Car Wash were taken right under the blowers which would be much louder, stated they are not using NS equipment, noted they are in a commercial zone regarding decibel levels, stated they tried to reach out to the neighborhood as much as possible, and said they would welcome any questions on sound and traffic.

In response to Commissioner Biro, Mr. McKenna stated there will be a service attendant on the island at all times with a computer iPad with instructions for override to allow a customer to be sent through in case of any payment problems to avoid holding up the line.

In response to Commissioner Parsons, Mr. McKenna stated a free wash will be provided if a customer has a problem with the billing.

In response to Commissioner Mitchell, Daniel Carpen, Belanger distributor, explained that their blowers will be much smaller in horsepower in comparison to the ones shown in the video and BFD's will control the motors which ramps the noise down. He also said the housing will be plastic and there will be sound bafflers to reduce the noise further. He said all of the chemicals are VOC compliant with everything being biodegradable, and the equipment will be state of the art and the vacuum systems are very quiet. He noted their proposal is common today with new technology which continues to change, noting the car wash will be controlled with an iPad.

In response to Commissioner Sanchez, Mr. Carpen explained that Belanger is ISO certified and the manufacturing process is governed extensively by a management facility. He also stated there is in the study a maximum dB all the way to 94 feet away.

Mr. Davy stated the noise levels were measured with A-weighting which is approximately 500 Hz due to the noise ordinance requirements. He stated it doesn't take into account low frequencies but neither does the noise ordinance or human reaction. He explained that their theoretical analysis was based on actual measurements made at the factory by Balenger and his report notes the calculations were based on three 10 horsepower motors and the blowers in the video presented were much different from those proposed at the car wash. He said documentation of where the actual measurements were being made should have been presented in the video and also explained that the monument sign outside the exit and the figure for directionality is well-documented in the acoustic engineering literature. He said he has studied three dozen car washes over the years and noted no one has proposed after the fact that his numbers were wrong. He also said acoustical material should be put on the wall to ensure there is no reflection and negate the reactivity effect he had assumed. He suggested material on the back of the monument sign wall and the entire car wash wall from the blowers out to the exit which would be a minimum for dB reduction. This would bring the dB down to the low 50 range, being 6 to 7 dB below the criteria. He also pointed out since the building has been gone, ambient noise levels have increased on the north property line. He explained that the ambient noise level will be 57 to 58 from traffic on Torrance Boulevard and the car wash noise will produce levels at least 5 to 6 dB below the ambient.

In response to Commissioner Parsons, Mr. Davy explained that the material proposed on the back of the sign will not support mold, will not rot or fall apart and is as sturdy as cement and will not change over the life of the product.

In response to Chair Sanchez, Mr. Davy stated shrubbery or bushes will not help mitigate further reflections or help provide additional defraction which has to be very thick to provide any significant benefit.

In response to Commissioner Parsons, Mr. Carpen stated the majority of the noise is from the motor and the impeller. He also explained that the vacuums start out with an 8-inch suction line and then are sized down to maintain the suction flow to keep it consistent from the first bay to the end. He also said a motor inside of a building and piping out to the tunnel to dry hasn't been done.

Commissioner Parsons said the obvious issue of the style of the car wash is the blower system drying the car off and suggested this should be investigated and mitigated. Mr. Carpen said they didn't do any further investigations due to being down to 30 horsepower, the Balenger dryers and air moved and water removed from the car.

In response to Commissioner Biro, Mr. McKenna said there would not be free vacuuming for random vehicles and is only available to the customers who paid for the initial wash process. He also said they are not coin operated with motors humming outside, and the motors would be inside the building and will not be heard outside.

In response to Commissioner Benning, Mr. McKenna stated there will be four designated employee parking spots on the facility and there would be two to four employees on a normal shift. He stated there would be up to six employees on the weekends with parking available in the two designated stalls at the self-serve vacuuming and if there happened to be more employees such as up to eight, they would not park where the vacuums are located. He said there would be a temporary spot for coffee patrons and believed that most of the coffee patrons would get their coffee while the car is being washed.

In response to Chair Sanchez, Mr. McKenna stated the self-serve vacuum bays are for the coffee patrons only.

In response to Commissioner Benning, Mr. McKenna stated they generally use the daylight savings time which would extend the car wash hour to accommodate the increasing light with a cut off of a maximum of 8 p.m. which generally never operates that late. He said in the winter months, the car wash will close no later than 5:30 p.m., and clarified that Condition No. 21 would determine the summer and winter hours.

In response to Commissioner Parsons, Mr. McKenna explained that the coffee shop is proposed to open an hour early in order to accommodate the local neighborhood starting at 7 a.m.

Commissioner Parsons noted controversy with noise studies and applying noise ordinances and asked why the study was done theoretically. Mr. Davy explained that no two car washes are the same and said their calculation was based on an actual measurement done at the factory.

Commissioner Parsons stated noise propagates differently depending on the location, weather and other items, and expressed concern with a theoretical calculation being done.

Mr. Davy stated he couldn't hear the equipment at the car wash on Roscrans which uses the same equipment as the proposed car wash.

Mr. Carpen clarified that the dB ratings provided are exact measurements taken at car washes with three 10 horsepower motors blowing, and are real readings and the data is in the report.

In response to Chair Sanchez, Mr. Davy stated the inverse square law was used to form the calculations and a point source would decrease in noise levels by a 20 dB inverse square law falling off by about 6 dB per doubling of distance. He also said the blowers would be located 10 feet inside the tunnel.

In response to Chair Sanchez, Mr. McKenna explained that the blowers are attached to a separate frame and there will be no machinery operating after hours except for the hydrogen cell which is very quiet. He also suggested the acoustical material could also be put on the outer walls as well.

In response to Commissioner Parsons, Mr. Davy stated he has data available regarding measurements for every 10 feet but is not included in the report. He also said there is something in the code relating to one unit to another as in a condo and it is the State Building Code that noise levels from traffic cannot exceed CNEL 45. He also pointed out that the additional Pyrox will be done in the 52 to 53 dB range and with windows open, the noise reduction of the building will be at least 12 dB which has been well-documented in the acoustical literature. He also said the Pyrox material in the last 10 feet in the tunnel will provide the additional dB. He said if the noise source operates for 15 minutes or less, 60 dB cannot be exceeded.

In response to Chair Sanchez, Mr. Davy stated Pyrox material on the back wall would provide approximately an additional 4 dB reductions for first floor elevations.

In response to Commissioner Parsons, Mr. Sallee stated Catalina Coffee is more of a destination location and people generally spend more time at the establishment versus the proposed coffee shop being more of a convenience with people coming and going.

In response to Commissioner Benning, Mr. Sallee stated that Wi-Fi will be provided at the coffee shop.

Sean Mohn, Gibson Transportation Consulting, stated they conducted the traffic study for the project.

In response to Commissioner Parsons, Mr. Mohn stated they did not do any line of sight studies pertaining to any turning radiuses on the street. He said they studied significant impacts and based on the size of the project, the ITE rates were estimated that the project would generate 50 trips during the peak hour. He said land use is the metric with the service rate being 40% higher than standard ITE rates, and the trip generation was the key based on understanding of the project. He said based on the trip generation rate, the internal queueing would be adequate. He explained that the ingress off of Irena would help alleviate queueing concerns, and noted the studies that took place were pivoted off the peak inbound trip generation rate of 35 cars an hour.

Commissioner Parsons expressed concern with queueing issues especially coming in from Irena, and noted people may show up all at once.

Commissioner Biro referred to the car wash on Aviation and PCH and believed people will not stop if it's backed up but if there is a second entrance, people may que up on that side. He suggested removing the Irena entrance completely which would eliminate the queuing issue at that entrance.

Mr. McKenna stated they specifically designed the car wash so that there is an exit lane on Torrance. He suggested if there is a busy day, a third car could be moved over to a self-service island to avoid queuing issues.

Commissioner Parsons noted queuing issues at the pier parking structure and noise created by people. He also pointed out that the CUP runs with the land and expressed concern with issues of a future business.

Mr. McKenna suggested moving cars over to the employee spots on busy days, noting the car wash has been designed to adjust flow between full serve and express serve, along with live feeds on the Website being provided.

In response to Chair Sanchez, Mr. Mohn explained that the worst congestion occurs during the commuter peak hours, morning and afternoon, rather than the weekends.

Mr. Wee Sit reviewed noise and measurements of the blowers and noted a discrepancy between the numbers that he measured and the numbers being reported by Davy and Associates in Table 1 of his report. He stated the limits of noise would have to be reduced by dB per the Municipal Code, and indicated three sources of noise occur from the motor, inlet noise and outlet noise. He explained the inlet and outlet noise and velocity, and pushing air fast requires high velocity and more noise, and stated the silencers proposed will not work. He explained that ISO 9000 has nothing to do with performance or acoustics. He stated the frequency content of the sound has to be known in order to know the radiation pattern but did believe sound attenuation material in the tunnel would decrease the sound measurably. He also referred to the interior noise which should be 45 dB per a document he presented in order to pass code, and the car wash is predicting 58.8 dB and with the sound attenuation material in the tunnel 54 dB. He also said commercial limits are not being addressed and sound on the sidewalk from the car wash. He referred to Tables 2 and 3 of his report with the measurements next to both residential and commercial limits.

Motion by Commissioner Biro, seconded by Commissioner Parsons, to receive and file documents presented by Mr. Wee Sit. Hearing no objections, Chair Sanchez so ordered.

In response to Commissioner Parsons, Mr. Wee Sit stated if sound is on for a long time a fatiguing effect will take place.

Commissioner Biro pointed out there is also resting and soothing sound.

Motion by Commissioner Parsons, seconded by Commissioner Benning, to close the Public Participation Section of the Public hearing at 11:29 p.m. Hearing no objections, Chair Sanchez so ordered.

In response to Commissioner Mitchell, Director Aaron Jones stated the applicant did receive full sign off from the state and there are no records of any outstanding cleanup orders, action or enforcement orders. He stated the property has received the final closure permit (notice of no further action) with no hazardous materials issues known on the property. He also explained that a Class III exemption from CEQA for new small structures would not apply if there were any known potential significant impacts that could not be mitigated. He said there is no information to conclude that preparation of an EIR is either necessary or appropriate for the project.

In response to Commissioner Biro, Director Aaron Jones stated any adverse effects or nuisance impacts are addressed in the findings.

In response to questions from Commissioner Parsons, Director Aaron Jones stated he has not experienced using an interior noise standard in the last 25 years on a reverse situation to ensure somebody's interior noise standard is met. He also said there is no letter from Health Care Partners on record in the files but staff will check. He suggested during car wash operations, any entering traffic from Irena should be held at the corner of the building and then organized in a way to flow into the queuing line, with free flow at all times, both for exiting traffic and traffic avoiding the que entering off Torrance Boulevard. He stated he would want the installation of the material in the last 10 feet of the tunnel verified and tested but there is no downside requiring this as a condition.

In response to Commissioner Parsons, City Attorney Mike Webb noted concern requiring 45 dB interior to a residential unit which doesn't fit exactly within the design guidelines but applies based on the zone of the receiving structure. He believed it fits within two criteria such as having no adverse effect on the abutting property, and general health, safety and general welfare under Section 4G.

Commissioner Parsons stated if a violation took place, there could be a prosecutorial approach or a Commission re-hearing approach. He also expressed concern with the business owner being continually shut down.

In response to Commissioner Parsons, City Attorney Mike Webb stated there are many ways to handle violations of the code such as at an administrative level, going back to the Planning Commission or sent to the City Prosecutor. He advised that a decision should not be based on future enforcement choices.

In response to Commissioner Parsons, Director Aaron Jones stated within the Municipal Code, the Commission has the right, ability and authority to suspend, revoke or modify CUP's and can be brought back for the Commission's review and ensuring compliance.

City Attorney Mike Webb reviewed the limiting grounds regarding revocation and did not advise creating another number other than what is stated in the code in terms of the interior noise levels within the abutting residential.

Motion by Commissioner Parsons, seconded by Commissioner Mitchell, to reopen the Public Participation Section of the Public Hearing at 11:55 p.m. Hearing no objections, Chair Sanchez so ordered.

In response to Commissioner Biro, Mr. McKenna stated the equipment room door will be kept locked at all times and during the hours of operation and suggested more Pyrox material could be added around the area and the sign.

Commissioner Parsons suggested adding a condition to work with staff on mitigating the sound beyond the Pyrox, to the point of removal if necessary.

Motion by Commissioner Parsons, seconded by Commissioner Biro, to close the Public Participation Section of the Public Hearing at 11:58 p.m. Hearing no objections, Chair Sanchez so ordered.

In response to Chair Sanchez, Director Aaron Jones stated that all required public notices for this project were mailed to owners of record, posted and published and mailed to property owners as of the latest tax role within 300 feet of the subject property and all proper noticing was conducted. He also said there was testimony received this evening about a neighborhood meeting conducted without any City involvement and without noticing which shouldn't be confused with the official advertised public hearing and the correct legal noticing for the proceedings.

Commissioner Parsons said he has mixed feelings on this use in the location, noting there are things that can improve impacts to the neighborhood but maybe not to a point where it should be, especially on the immediate neighbors along the property line to the north. He said he cannot support the project due to the concern of the 45 dB within the unit which is a big concern. He said he would like to support the car wash which is very nice and attractive, but believed it is in the wrong place.

Commissioner Benning agreed and expressed concern with impacts to the immediate properties abutting the back of the property, and said there are conflicting dB results without an identical project to use as an example. He also expressed concern with traffic and parking concerns from the coffee shop and how the cars will be entering and exiting and queuing issues. He said he wants to see the applicant succeed but he is not convinced it would be good for the neighbors and believed the noise will exceed the limits.

Chair Sanchez said he has been in the audio business for over 18 years and that he has greater faith in the sound mitigation efforts provided but he expressed concern with the traffic and the coffee shop and parking, the traffic flow and queuing.

Commissioner Parsons suggested no coffee shop or entry on Irena.

In response to Commissioner Biro, Director Aaron Jones stated the coffee shop allows 12 incidental seats without any requirement for parking and is an ancillary use of the property.

Associate Planner Anita Kroeger noted people will be staying in their cars while the exterior is being washed and will get out only if it is to be detailed which may be one of the times people will sit outside at the coffee shop.

Commissioner Mitchell stated there is impact on the community, especially the neighborhood, but noted the zoning has been the same for a long time and the lot has sat vacant for many years which may continue. He noted there is now an applicant trying to fit into the space and adhere to the rules. He said he also has mixed feelings and expressed concern with the flow of traffic entering and exiting and said something would need to be done to lessen the potential confusion that could take place regarding the coffee shop.

Motion by Commissioner Benning, seconded by Commissioner Parsons, to deny the Exemption Declaration, Conditional Use Permit and Planning Commission Design Review for the construction and operation of a car wash facility on property located within a Commercial (C-3) zone, Case No. 2012-11-PC-016, Chris McKenna applicant, at 617 Torrance Boulevard, based on the following findings:

- There would be an adverse impact on the abutting property
- There is not sufficient evidence to show that the use would protect the public health, safety and general welfare
- The site is not adequate in size or shape to accommodate the use

Motion carried, with Commissioner Mitchell voting no and Commissioners Kim and Zager absent.

Director Aaron Jones explained the 10-day appeal process.

## NEW BUSINESS

None.

## PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

None.

## COMMISSION ITEMS AND REFERRALS TO STAFF

None.

## ITEMS FROM STAFF

Director Aaron Jones announced a joint meeting with the Planning Commission and Harbor Commission on February 21, 2013 on the Harbor Gateway Entry and Cycle Track Improvement Project which will take place in the City Council Chambers.

## COUNCIL ACTION ON PLANNING COMMISSION MATTERS

None.

## ADJOURNMENT: 12:27 A.M. (FRIDAY, JANUARY 18, 2013)

There being no further business to come before the Commission, Commissioner Parsons moved, seconded by Commissioner Benning, to adjourn the meeting at 12:27 a.m. to a Joint Meeting with the Harbor Commission to be held at 7:00 p.m. on Thursday, February 21, 2013 in the Redondo Beach City

Council Chambers, 415 Diamond Street, Redondo Beach, California. Motion carried unanimously, with Commissions Kim and Zager absent.

Respectfully submitted,

_____

Aaron Jones
Community Development Director

# Administrative Report

**Action Date: February 21, 2013**

**To:** PLANNING AND HARBOR COMMISSIONS

**From:** PETER CARMICHAEL, WATERFRONT AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR
AARON JONES, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR
MIKE WITZANSKY, PUBLIC WORKS DIRECTOR

**Subject:** HERONDO STREET/HARBOR DRIVE GATEWAY IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

## RECOMMENDATION

Review, discuss and provide recommendations regarding the Herondo Street/Harbor Drive Gateway Improvement Project.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On November 20, 2012, the City Council approved a design and engineering services contract with Stantec Consulting Services, Inc. for the preparation of plans and specifications for the Herondo Street/Harbor Drive Gateway Improvement Project. Three stakeholder workshops were held to solicit input on design concepts for the project. Based on this input, Stantec and staff have prepared preliminary design plans, phasing options and alternatives for the Commissions' review, discussion and recommendation to City Council.

## BACKGROUND

In early September 2012, Chevron's team met with the City to discuss the Coke Drum Transport project through Mole B. Six Coke Drums each sized approximately 27 feet wide and 103 feet long will arrive via barges to Mole B and be transported on land to the Chevron El Segundo plant using Marina Way, Harbor Drive and Herondo Street to Pacific Coast Highway (PCH). In the September discussion, Chevron briefly outlined the transport route, impacts to the City's right-of-way and anticipated timing for the transport. Upon completion of the Coke Drum Transport, Chevron will perform restoration work along the transportation route as needed, such as the replacement of any broken curb or gutter and the restoration of any impacted landscape medians.

Chevron's restoration work along Herondo Street and Harbor Drive, anticipated in April 2013, presents a unique opportunity to improve a critical gateway to the City's waterfront. Marina Way is the only entry to Moonstone Park and the Harbor Patrol Building (Fire Station No. 3). Herondo Street is one of the key entries to the City and North Harbor Drive serves as an important commercial and recreational area. Along each of these streets, the existing signage, streetscape, streetlights, landscaping and pedestrian access are in need of upgrades, including resurfacing of Herondo Street from PCH to North Harbor Drive and North Harbor Drive from Herondo Street to Pacific Avenue.

**ITEM #8**

Staff took a holistic view of the improvements needed along Marina Way, Harbor Drive and Herondo Street and determined that much of the needed improvements are streetscape and transportation plan related. Similar to past streetscape projects elsewhere in the City – Torrance Boulevard, the Riviera Village, etc.– it is necessary to develop general guidelines for the Herondo Street and Harbor Drive corridors for the installation of new light poles, traffic signals, street furnishings, landscaping plant palates and wayfinding and gateway signs. These improvements are characterized as the Herondo Street/North Harbor Drive Streetscape Improvements.

Two additional City projects in the capital improvement pipeline that are impacted by the Coke Drum Transportation Project are the North Harbor Drive Cycle Track Project and North Harbor Drive Street Resurfacing Project.

The goals of the North Harbor Drive Cycle Track Project are to remove potential conflicts between bicyclists, vehicles, and pedestrians at the north and south ends of North Harbor Drive, to connect bicyclists with commercial and recreational establishments in The Pier and Harbor areas, and to improve regional bicycle facility connectivity. The project consists of the design and construction of a separated, bi-directional, on-street bike path; a replacement of the signalized, dog-legged intersection at Yacht Club Way/Herondo Street with a roundabout; the removal of the wall in Parking Lot 13 that separates Hermosa Beach and Redondo Beach; and, the elimination and replacement of some or all of theparking spaces in Lot 13 to allow for an improved bike path connection between the Hermosa Strand and the North Harbor Drive bike path. An on-street bike path, physically separated from motor traffic and distinct from the sidewalk, is also known as a cycle track. Bike lanes will be added to Herondo Street to provide east-west connectivity, and parallel parking on Herondo Street will be changed to angled, head-out parking to increase parking along Herondo Street and replace the lost spaces in Lot 13.

The North Harbor Drive Resurfacing Project consists of resurfacing North Harbor Drive between Herondo Street and Pacific Avenue to improve the streets' pavement condition according to the City's pavement management system schedule. The North Harbor Drive Resurfacing Project is an approved CIP, funded by Proposition C money in the amount of $675,000. The funding is currently available for expenditure.

Based on the related scope of work for the three projects, the coordination, design and subsequent sequence of construction were proposed in unison to maximize the availability of resources and minimize the project's disruption and impact on surrounding businesses and visitors. Staff recommended that the design of all three projects be performed by one consultant to be paid for by the administrative fees provided by Chevron for the Coke Drum Transport Project. Savings in design fees for each project will be used to supplement construction funding. In addition, savings realized from the coordination of the three projects will also be used to supplement overall construction funding.

On October 16, 2012, the City Council approved the issuance of a Request for Proposals for engineering design and construction support services for the Herondo Street/Harbor Drive Gateway Improvement Project. On October 30, 2012, the City received four (4) proposals. After extensive discussion by the evaluation team, Stantec Consulting Services, Inc. was found to be the best qualified firm per the City's evaluation criteria to provide design and construction support services for the Herondo Street/Harbor Drive Gateway Improvement Project. The main

factors in Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.'s selection was their project team's expertise and previous experience in similar bicycle facility and traffic engineering projects, their project approach, their competitive cost and ability to meet the City's schedule. The contract with Stantec was approved by Council at the November 20, 2012 City Council meeting.

Stantec utilizes living streets and complete street design principles in the preparation of plans and specifications and has agreed to evaluate and identify potential locations for public art as part of the project.

## ANALYSIS:

Three stakeholder meetings were held to solicit input on design concepts for the project. At the first meeting, held on December 19, 2012, stakeholders were presented with a project overview, and provided the opportunity to draw and annotate their visions for North Harbor Drive and Herondo Street. At the second meeting, held on January 30, 2013, Stantec presented a preliminary design concept based on the input received at the December meeting. A number of questions were raised at both of these meetings that required additional design and analysis. Answers to most of these questions were presented at a third meeting on February 13, 2013. Based on the input provided at these stakeholder meetings, three options for the first phase of the North Harbor Drive Cycle Track as well as a future phase improvement option for the installation of a North Harbor Drive/Herondo Street roundabout have been developed. A summary of these options for consideration is as follows.

### North Harbor Drive Cycle Track Options

Option 1: Construct a connection between North Harbor Drive at Yacht Club Way and The Strand through Lot 13. Implement a road diet on Herondo Street eliminating one vehicle travel lane in each direction to add bike lanes and head-out angle parking, capturing the displaced parking from Lot 13. One eastbound and one westbound vehicle travel lane in each direction would remain.

Benefits:

- Removes the wall/barrier to entry that southbound bicyclists on The Strand encounter when entering the City of Redondo Beach.
- Beautifies the entryway to the Cities of Redondo Beach and Hermosa Beach.
- Provides a smooth transition to North Harbor Drive in contrast to the right angle at the wall.
- Provides a bicycle facility on Herondo Street.
- Calms vehicle speed on Herondo Street for improved pedestrian and bicycle safety.
- Allows for a phased implementation of the cycle track along Harbor Drive and would provide more time for additional traffic analysis and coordination with surrounding development activities.

Limitations:

- Does not remove the conflict points at Yacht Club Way or at Pacific Avenue for northbound bicyclists as described in the project goals.

- Does not eliminate traffic conflict created by the close proximity of the Herondo Street and Yacht Club Way signalized intersections.

Option 2: Construct Option 1 plus a bi-directional cycle track on the west side of North Harbor Drive.

Benefits:

- Same benefits as described for Option 1.
- Achieves the project's goals of removing potential conflicts between bicyclists, vehicles, and pedestrians at the north and south ends of North Harbor Drive, connecting bicyclists with commercial and recreational establishments in The Pier and Harbor areas, and improving regional bicycle facility connectivity.

Limitations:

- Requires additional analysis and data collection to resolve concerns involving how bicyclists will interact with vehicles entering and exiting the driveways along the west side of North Harbor Drive.
- Could require cycle track modification depending on the outcome of surrounding development activities.
- Does not eliminate traffic conflict created by the close proximity of the Herondo Street and Yacht Club Way signalized intersections.

Option 3: Construct Option 1 plus a one-way cycle track on each side of North Harbor Drive, and eliminate on-street parking for the length of the cycle track.

Benefits:

- Same benefits as described in Option 1.
- Addresses concerns raised at the stakeholder meetings of potential conflict between bi-directional bicycle traffic and vehicles entering and exiting the driveways along the west side of North Harbor Drive.
- Replicates existing bike lanes and movements on North Harbor Drive.

Limitations:

- Does not remove the conflict points at Yacht Club Way or at Pacific Avenue for northbound bicyclists as described in the project goals.
- Could require cycle track modification depending on the outcome of surrounding development activities.
- Does not eliminate traffic conflict created by the close proximity of the Herondo Street and Yacht Club Way signalized intersections.
- Either eliminates parking along Harbor Drive, requiring additional replacement parking, or requires an additional eight feet (8') of right-of-way to construct the cycle tracks and maintain all existing uses on North Harbor Drive.
    - Without acquisition of additional right away from adjacent private property owners, this option would require removal of the taxi zone in front of the Crowne Plaza Hotel.

**North Harbor Drive/ Yacht Club Way Roundabout Concept**

As a possible future phase to the project, consideration is being given to a roundabout at North Harbor Drive and Herondo Street. A summary of the roundabout concept is provided below.

- Replace the signalized intersections of North Harbor Drive at Herondo Street and at Yacht Club Way with a single roundabout.
- Realign Yacht Club Way to become the west, or fourth, leg of the intersection.
- Create a new intersection between the cycle track and Yacht Club Way within the Lot 13 perimeter.

Benefits:

- Improves entry and exit to the cycle track and North Harbor Drive, Herondo Street, and Hermosa Avenue for recreational and commuter bicyclists.
- Eliminates two closely spaced substandard signalized intersections whose close proximity (approximately 200 ft) contributes to area congestion.
- Beautifies the entryway to the Harbor and Pier areas.

Limitations:

- Data for future bicycle and vehicle traffic counts for 2030 buildout is limited. As a result confirmation of operational improvements over the existing signalized intersections requires additional analysis.
- Bycicle traffic information for peak summer season use is currently unavailable. Additional traffic count information is necessary to quantify potential congestion levels at a merged Herondo St., cycle track, and Yacht Club way intersection.

The following key questions were raised at the community stakeholder meetings. Answers to these questions are provided below..

*Can the North Harbor Drive Cycle Track be located on the east side of North Harbor Drive?*

The bicycle facilities on North Harbor Drive and Herondo Street are included in the South Bay Bicycle Master Plan, adopted by City Council on October 18, 2011. The North Harbor Drive Cycle Track Project originated in the Vitality City | Blue Zones Healthways Beach Cities Livability Plan, also adopted by City Council on October 18, 2011. The input received from the Harbor and Planning Commissions at their joint meeting on September 15, 2011 in regard to these plans was provided to City Council for its plan adoption consideration. The question of a cycle track on the east side of North Harbor Drive was raised at these meetings and the Harbor and Planning Commissions requested additional review and analysis of crossing, safety and traffic issues.

While it is technically feasible to locate the cycle track on the est side of North Harbor Drive several concerns regarding the northern and southern connection points remain problematic. A cycle track on the west side of Harbor Drive would benefit recreational bicyclists and bicycle commuters by removing the conflict points at the north and south end of Harbor Drive. At the south end, bicyclists traveling north from The Pier transition onto southbound Harbor Drive and have to cross to the east side to ride in the direction of travel and would conflict with vehicles

and pedestrians. At the north end, no safe and adequate transition exists from the northbound bike lane to The Hermosa Beach Strand. Instead, bicyclists resort to crossing to the west side of Harbor Drive at Yacht Club Way, a block south of The Strand's southern terminus on the west side of Harbor Drive, and riding on the sidewalk against traffic to enter The Strand.At the sound end, a cycle track on the west side of North Harbor Drive would facilitate the transition from The Pier to the west side of North Harbor Drive where the primary employment and destination areas are located, removing the potential points of conflict.

At the north end, the proposed project will tear down the wall at the southern terminus of The Strand and construct a connection through City Parking Lot No. 13 to the cycle track on Harbor Drive. The overall operational improvements would facilitate a bicyclist's ability to access the Harbor and Pier recreational, commercial, and employment areas as well as commercial and employment areas to the north and south. A cycle track on the east side of Harbor Drive would not eliminate these conflict points.

*Are we sure a roundabout is the best solution to handle the projected traffic increases through the North Harbor Drive/Herondo Street intersection followingRevitalization of the Waterfront?*

Replacing the Harbor Drive at Herondo Street and Harbor Drive at Yacht Club Way intersections with a roundabout is one way to address potential congestion at these signalized intersections. Forecasts of future traffic counts in the area, inclusive of the build-out of the harbor, suggest that the two adjacent intersections (North Harbor/Yacht Club and North Harbor/Herdondo) would perform poorly and would likely need substantial upgrade to handle the volume. Roundabouts are shown to improve vehicle throughput and Stantec's initial analysis suggests that a roundabout at this intersection would handle the increased traffic load in the area far better than the current two intersection condition. As mentioned above, the proximity of the two intersections is substandard and creates traffic conflict.

As initially presented at the stakeholder meetings, Stantec prepared a conceptual design which realigned Yacht Club Way to become the west, or fourth, leg of the North Harbor Drive/Herondo Street intersection. An alternative vision for the connection was suggested by stakeholders at the second and third meetings where Herondo Street would be realigned through property currently owned by AES to connect to the existing Yacht Club Way. The possibility of right-of-way acquisition is not a part of the current project scope, which specified improvements within existing right-of-way only. If additional right-of-way were to become available as a result of surrounding development activities, the proposed roundabout could be modified to further improve intersection operation and roadway aligment.

**Next Steps**

The Herondo Street/Harbor Drive Gateway Improvement Project design concepts will be presented to the Public Works Commission on February 28, 2013. Input from all three commissions will then be presented to City Council for their review prior to further plan development. Visual materials for the identified design options and concepts are currently in development and will be distributed/presented at the Joint Commission Meeting.

Submitted by:

Aaron Jones
Community Development Director

Peter Carmichael
Waterfront and Economic Development Director

Mike Witzansky
Public Works Director