



RE: 2016-06-HC-001 / 2016-06-CDP-003 ⁰⁰⁴
(case number and name)

Address/Location of Subject Property Mole B, Redondo Beach
(if applicable)

Decision-making body that made the decision which is the subject of the appeal: Approval of Boat Ramp location on Mole B

- Planning Commission
- Harbor Commission
- Preservation Commission
- Planning Director
- Board of Appeals/Uniform Code

Date of decision: 8-8-16 Appealing: Approval Denial

Name of Appellant Lanakila Outrigger Canoe Club
(type or print)

Address of Appellant 2102 Speyer Lane Redondo Beach 90278

Telephone Number of Appellant 310.489.1830

Email Address of Appellant Moses@Piarpm.com

Signature Moses Ramler

For office use only:		
Appeal Fee Paid \$ _____	Date _____	Received by _____
Notice to: City Council _____ City Manager _____ City Attorney _____ Planning Department _____		
Harbor Department _____		
Other _____		

RETURN TO:
Office of the City Clerk
415 Diamond Street
Redondo Beach, CA 90277
(310) 318-0656

This appeal is made pursuant to the following Redondo Beach Municipal Code Section(s) (see page 3 for a partial listing of City's municipal code appeal provisions):

10-3.301 + 10-5.2502 + conditional use permit
10-5.1700

Ground(s) for Appeal:

Please specify the grounds for this appeal. Where an approval /denial involves multiple entitlements/actions, please specify which entitlements/actions are contested in this appeal (e.g. Conditional Use Permit) and the specific grounds for contesting each entitlement/action.

Appellant is responsible for reviewing and complying with the relevant appeal procedures contained in the City's municipal code or state law, which may contain additional substantive and/or procedural requirements depending upon the nature of the appeal. It may be necessary for appellant to supplement this form with additional pages/information to fulfill these requirements. Issues not raised here will not be considered by City Council.

10-3.301

see attached

Appeal Coastal Development Permit - location of
Boat Ramp on Mole B
Conditional Use permit

1

FINAL EIR - SCH# 2014061071 / file

2014-04-EIR-001

03

The following list provides a brief overview of some of the City's Municipal Code Appeals (to City Council) by topic area. This is not intended to be an exhaustive list. Potential appellants are advised to review the Municipal Code Sections to determine applicability of these sections and for additional appeal procedures and appeal content requirements.

For example, California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Appeal Procedures are contained within Redondo Beach Municipal Code, Title 10, Chapter 3, Section 10-3.901. CEQA Appeals (1) must be filed within ten [10] days of the decision-making body's action and contain specific information described in 10-3.901, (2) require the appellant to notify the project applicant of the appeal within ten [10] days of the City's action by certified mail (and provide the City a copy of the mail receipt), (3) require appellants to file any additional documentation (such as presentations) with the City Clerk no later than seven [7] days before the public hearing, and (4) require appellant to mail a copy of any additional documentation (such as presentations) to the applicant no later than seven [7] days before the public hearing by certified mail (and provide the City a copy of the mail receipt at the public hearing).

Redondo Beach Municipal Code Section	General Topic Area for Appeal
RBMC § 3-14.04	Encroachment permits
RBMC § 3-7.1906	Temporary Street Closure
RBMC § 4-11.146	Oil Wells-Notices to Comply
RBMC § 4-15.07	Registration of Canvassers, Solicitors, itinerant Merchants, Salesmen, and Peddlers
RBMC § 4-17.12	Amusement and Entertainment Permits
RBMC § 4-18.11	Removal of Abandoned, Wrecked, Dismantled, or Inoperative Vehicles from Private or Public Property
RBMC § 4-26.09	Bingo Games for Charitable purposes-Appeals of revocations to the Council
RBMC § 5-2.206	Weeds, Rubbish, and Stagnant Water
RBMC § 8-2.10	Uniform Transient Occupancy Tax
RBMC § 10-1.506	Subdivisions
RBMC §§ 10-1.906(a), 10-1.1011	Subdivisions
RBMC § 10-2.2500(g)	Administrative Design Review
RBMC § 10-2.2502(g)	Planning Commission Design Review
RBMC § 10-2.2504(f)	Zoning Amendments
RBMC § 10-2.2505(f)	General Plan and Specific Plan amendments
RBMC § 10-2.2506(g)	Conditional Use Permits
RBMC § 10-2.2507(f)	Administrative Use Permits
RBMC § 10-2.2508(l)	Modifications
RBMC § 10-2.2510(g)	Variances
RBMC § 10-2.2514(i)	Planned Development Review
RBMC § 10-2.2520(f)	Temporary Use Permits
RBMC § 10-3.901	California Environmental Quality Act
RBMC § 10-4.601	Certificate of Appropriateness by the Preservation Commission
RBMC § 10-5.2500(g)	Administrative Design Review [Coastal Zone]
RBMC § 10-5.2502(g)	Planning Commission Design Review [Coastal Zone]
RBMC § 10-5.2504(f)	Zoning Amendments [Coastal Zone]
RBMC § 10-5.2505(f)	General Plan and Specific Plan amendments [Coastal Zone]
RBMC § 10-5.2506(g)	Conditional Use Permits [Coastal Zone]
RBMC § 10-5.2507(f)	Administrative Use Permits [Coastal Zone]
RBMC § 10-5.2508(l)	Modifications [Coastal Zone]
RBMC § 10-5.2510(g)	Variances [Coastal Zone]
RBMC § 10-5.2514(i)	Planned Development Review [Coastal Zone]
RBMC § 10-5.2520(f)	Temporary Use Permits [Coastal Zone]
RBMC § 10-5.2222	Coastal Development Permit
RBMC § 11-2.10(d)	Public Utilities
RBMC § 11-3.608(b)	Cable TV-Liquidated damages
RBMC § 1-4.01	General Appeal Procedures* only applicable if there are no specific appeal procedures provided for the challenged action.
RBMC § 2-9.712	General Appeal Procedures [Harbor Commission]* only applicable if there are no specific appeal procedures provided for the challenged action.

ISSUE 1 Mole B is unsuitable for a boat ramp because of obstruction to emergency services Mole B was determined to be unsuitable for a boat ramp due to disruption of ingress and egress for land vehicles to get to the Harbor Patrol Headquarters, regardless of boat ramp going out of Basin 1 or 2:

Code: 10-3.301 significant effect on environment, planning and zoning – ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PURSUANT TO CEQA

Z: Interfere with emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans

And

L: Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system

FINAL EIR: Final EIR (modification of section ES.5.2.8, page ES-25): After further review, it was determined that potential environmental impacts associated with Mole B would be greater than the proposed project, so Mole B was eliminated from further consideration. Specifically, locating a small craft boat launch ramp at Mole B on land partially controlled by the City, which would include the placement and orientation of the launch ramp into Basin 2, could result in potential significant impacts on emergency services, by disruption of ingress and egress for land vehicles from Fire Station 3/Harbor Patrol Headquarters to the southern part of Mole B as shown in the Final EIR Chapter 1 Figure 1.5b.

ISSUE 2 – Loss of outrigger operating space due to boat ramp: Moonstone Park is required to be 33% of mole B. As a result of Moonstone Park being mandated at 33% of mole B, Lanakila and Nahoia Outrigger Canoe Clubs leasehold space would be reduced rendering.

Code: 10-3.301 significant effect on environment, planning and zoning – ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PURSUANT TO CEQA

W: Conflict with established recreational use of area

and

Code: 10-3.301 significant effect on environment, planning and zoning – ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PURSUANT TO CEQA

L: Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system

Per California Coastal Act of 2010.

Article 4 - Marine Environment

Section 30234 - Commercial fishing and recreational boating facilities

Facilities serving the commercial fishing and recreational boating industries shall be protected and, where feasible, upgraded. Existing commercial fishing and recreational boating harbor space shall not be reduced unless the demand for those facilities no longer exists or adequate substitute space has been provided.

(City of Redondo Beach Chapter 3 Modifications to the Draft EIR The Waterfront Final EIR July 2016 3-4 File No. 2014-04-EIR-001 SCH# 2014061071 After further review, it was determined that potential environmental impacts associated with Mole B would be greater than the proposed project, so Mole B was eliminated from further consideration. Specifically...(the boat ramp) use approximately 22 boat slips and marina parking stalls, and require removal of a portion of Moonstone Park. While a one-lane small craft boat launch ramp and parking could be accommodated by removing only a small portion of Moonstone Park, a two-lane ramp would require converting the entire Moonstone Park to a parking lot.)

There would have to be an appeal by the city to CCC to get boat trailer parking and general public parking spaces as part of the park itself. (This has not been approved by the CCC).

FYI: One boat slip on mole B gets 3/4 parking space.

ISSUE 3 - safety concerns. No Public boat ramp workshop or meeting was held by the City for Mole B Location.

The city has a responsibility to the public to hold an official meeting when determining a decision which has profound impact on the community resources, services, safety and future development. To make a decision without such due diligence is negligent and opens up precedent for future neglect into such issues.

These safety issues have been documented at the harbor commission meetings and at Bill Brand's meeting.

The issues:

Kid use area – accidents will occur (this coming from KHYC/sailing club/Lanakila/Nahoa/boat slip users/general public).

Risk assessment studies – none done, no harbor traffic SUP egress/ingress, no harbor traffic outrigger egress/ingress on weekends, no KHYC junior sailing or big sailboat racing impacts.

Safety needs to be a priority – human lives.

Blind wall – safety issue.

Afraid for the kids – safety issue.

Future litigation from incidents/accidents will cost the city based on copious documentation of safety concerns/issues before building boat ramp on mole B.

CCC 30050:

ISSUE 4 Boat ramp on mole B directly impacts multiple water oriented activities.

Code: 10-3.301 significant effect on environment, planning and zoning – ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PURSUANT TO CEQA

W: Conflict with established recreational use of area

This is being proposed to create "connectivity" for the CenterCal development (building a movie theater on the water). This movie theater would go on Mole D along with a parking structure and a "meeting hall" which has nothing to do with water-oriented activities in a harbor.

Per California Coastal Act of 2010

Article 3 - Recreation

Section 30220 Protection of certain water-oriented activities

Coastal areas suited for water-oriented activities that cannot readily be provided at inland water areas shall be protected for such uses. – Lanakila/Nahoa Outrigger Canoe Clubs cannot go inland

and

Section 30221 Oceanfront land; protection for recreational use and development "oceanfront land suitable for recreational use shall be protected for recreational use and development unless present and foreseeable future demand for public or commercial recreation activities that could be accommodated on the property is adequately provided for in the area. – This is not the case.

ISSUE 5 – no traffic impact studies have been done concerning a boat ramp on mole B.

**Code: 10-3.301 significant effect on environment, planning and zoning – ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW
PURSUANT TO CEQA**

L: Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of street system

And

Z: interfere with emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans

traffic impacts: the new projects study says traffic impacts will be made at: PCH/Torrance blvd, PCH/beryl, PCH/catalina and PCH/catalina/herondo/anita BUT it claims there will be NO impact at harbor drive/yacht club way or harbor drive/marina way - not sure how this will happen with impacts to all the arteries leading into the harbor but none along the harbor ??? **NO boat ramp on mole B traffic studies have been done let alone the implication of bicycle/pedestrian versus car accidents (as one bike accident has already occurred at Harbor Drive and Marina Way, right after the new, improved road opened)**