

MINUTES
INGLEWOOD SPECIAL PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
MONDAY, JANUARY 23, 2023

(1) PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

The City of Inglewood Planning Commission held its Special Planning Commission meeting on Monday, January 23, 2023, in the Council Chambers, on the ninth floor, in City Hall. Following the Pledge of Allegiance by Commissioner Cheryl Shaw-Williams, the meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m.

(2) ROLL CALL:

Present: Chairman Larry Springs
Commissioner Patricia Patrick
Commissioner David Rice
Commissioner Aidé Trejo
Commissioner Cheryl Shaw-Williams

Staff: Christopher E. Jackson, ECD Director
Mindy Wilcox, AICP, Planning Manager
Michael Pan, Assistant City Attorney
Bernard McCrumby, Senior Planner
Marissa Fewell, Planner
Sean May, Planning Technician
Evangeline Lane, Secretary
Via Community Phone Call Coverage:
AT&T Conference Call Operator Rep.

(3) STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:

There were none, per Ms. Wilcox.

(4) PUBLIC COMMENTS:

None (Confirmed by AT&T Operator).

(5) PUBLIC HEARING:

5A. GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 2023-001 (GPA-2023-001) INGLEWOOD HOUSING ELEMENT: A public hearing to consider General Plan Amendment 2023-001 (GPA-2023-001), the 6th Cycle Draft 2021-2029 Inglewood Housing Element.

Mr. Bernard McCrumby, Senior Planner, made the staff presentation.

Chairman Springs asked the Planning Commission if there were any questions for staff.

Commissioner Rice asked staff -

- Regarding having Builders adhering to Affordable Housing requested by the City enforced?
 - Mr. McCrumby responded to Commissioner Rice's question.
- How are Density Bonuses for projects here in Inglewood established, and is it City wide overall?
 - Mr. McCrumby responded to Commissioner Rice's question.
- How is the density bonus provided with regards to the Land, is the land given by the City?
- Will the City be obligated to provide land for a project and then have to come through this body?
 - Mr. McCrumby responded to Commissioner Rice's questions.
 - Ms. Wilcox also responded to Commissioner Rice's questions.
- Could you further explain how the process with the TOD will affect the City and Downtown, and what will be up-coming in future Development?
 - Mr. McCrumby responded to Commissioner Rice's question.

Commissioner Trejo made a statement and asked staff-

- Wanted to say how very impressed she is with the Housing Element and definitely learned a lot and very informative with regards to addressing segments of the population of our current residents. Also evident in the jump in residential units that are now being required for Inglewood, I feel is a very large requirement.
- Presently with the 1,000 plus units for the above-moderate income to a jump of 7,400 units tells me that this City has above-moderate income individuals wanting to live in Inglewood, and not necessarily the present Inglewood Resident who has moved up into that category, but I feel this is attracting other individuals who want to move to Inglewood, and I didn't realize this significant jump until just now.
- My question is why is Inglewood being asked to provide or make available 7,400 units as opposed to other Cities here in the South-Bay region that are much lower?
- In asking this question my observation is it strikes me that the requirement for 7,400 units is because of the significant population of low-income bearing all of the property and they are requiring Inglewood to come up with a significant number of units and there is no guarantee that the significant jump in the above-moderate income will be for Inglewood residents. They are requiring Inglewood to provide more affordable housing units than Manhattan Beach. When children of Manhattan Beach residents grow up and decide they are ready to have their personal dwelling, they cannot probably afford to purchase a residence in Manhattan Beach and the closest place to Manhattan Beach would be in Inglewood, because the units in Inglewood would be more affordable than the limited number of units required by more affluent neighborhoods.
- It does not sound fair to me that Inglewood would have to carry the burden of providing so many more units than any of the other cities in the South-Bay region.
 - Ms. Wilcox responded to Commissioner Trejo's questions.
- The main reason for bringing this question up is because of the recent planning commission meeting that was held last week and they gave us the numbers of the units that are being required by each City and that Inglewood's number is very high, and I feel that it is not accurate to the income level here and the sole purpose for requiring this high unit number is income, but that the income in Inglewood has lower income residents, and for the lack of a better term a lower income City and feels that Inglewood is being purposely targeted and it seems very unfair and it feels that there should be an opportunity for a different formula, because Inglewood's area is changing and feels that it's being taken advantage of.
 - Mr. Jackson responded to Commissioner Trejo's questions.
- Page 5 of 8, Goal No. 4, "...Implement the City's housing policies, 36 programs have been defined that will advance all the City's housing goals", although numerically listed there are 36, there are two missing on the programs list, no.'s 22 and 27, and also in the Resolution it mentions 34 programs, so there needs to be some consistency, because the City's Staff Report is part of the consideration taken by the planning commission and the Resolution of course is what approves it.

- Last comment regarding the Resolution, Page 2, and Section 1, No. 3, "...The Housing Element General Plan Amendment is substantially compatible with the unnamed portions..." and feels very uncomfortable with it being "unnamed", because it could be "unnamed anything". She stated that it has to be clarified that if it relates to the 7 other Elements in the General Plan, then it should specify the 7 other Elements as opposed to "Unnamed Portion".
 - Ms. Wilcox responded to Commissioner Trejo's comments and advised that language is not necessary and can be eliminated.

Commissioner Shaw-Williams stated she had one question for staff,

- Regarding the City providing potential land for housing, locations like the Imperial and Crenshaw, possibly utilizing that particular shopping center area for developing housing, and she very curious because there is a lot of land between Morningside High School and Woodworth Elementary School, has that ever been discussed or considered for potential housing?
 - Ms. Wilcox responded to Commissioner Shaw-Williams question.

Chairman Springs stated that he wanted to -

- First, thanks to Ms. Wilcox and staff for putting together this great report and getting it to the Planning Commission so quickly, and in making sure that we had plenty of time to read it, it was very enlightening and hard to put down, as some of my colleagues can readily show with all of their tabs in their books.
- Next question is in regards to Residential Sound Insulation, as that is one of the programs and as it is only allotted in one portion of the City. Will it ever be expanded to other areas of the City and if yes when; and if not, why not; and if not, how can it be changed into a yes possibility?
 - Mr. Jackson responded to Chairman Springs' question.
- Next question is in regards to the City providing Housing and/or Down-payment assistance to the moderate and low-income families here in Inglewood?
 - Mr. McCrumby responded to Chairman Springs' question.

Chairman Springs asked the Planning Commission if they might have questions for the Arroyo Group, the project consultant. There were none.

Mr. McCrumby clarified that there are a total of 36 programs currently proposed and that correction will be made throughout the documents where needed.

Chairman Springs asked the AT&T Operator to open the phone lines to anyone who may want to make a comment on this public hearing, for or against at this time, there were None as confirmed by the AT&T Operator, and he asked the Planning Commission if there were any further questions for staff, there were none, and then called for a motion.

MOTION:

Commissioner Trejo motioned to affirm categorical exemption EA-CE-2023-002 and adopt the resolution recommending City Council adoption of GPA-2023-001 with the slight modification and wording in the Staff Report and the Resolution to provide consistency in the number of programs under Goal No. 4 in the Staff Report and clarifying the wording to delete "unnamed portions" under Section

1, No. 3 in the Resolution and was seconded by Commissioner Patrick, Resolution No. 1947

A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF INGLEWOOD, CALIFORNIA, RECOMMENDING CITY COUNCIL APPROVAL OF GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT 2023-001 (GPA-2023-001) THE UPDATE OF THE HOUSING ELEMENT OF THE INGLEWOOD GENERAL PLAN FOR THE 6TH HOUSING ELEMENT CYCLE.

Be approved.

The motion was carried by the following roll call vote:

Ayes: Commissioners Patrick, Rice, Trejo, Shaw-Williams and Chairman Springs.

Ms. Wilcox explained that this item will go directly to the City Council.

(7) PUBLIC COMMENTS:

None, (Confirmed by the AT&T Operator).

(8) COMMISSION INITIATIVES:

Commissioner Patrick -

- Wishing everyone to have a safe week and let's get ready for the Super Bowl.

Commissioner Rice -

- No initiatives.

Commissioner Trejo -

- No initiatives.

Commissioner Shaw-Williams -

- No initiatives.

Chairman Springs -

- No initiatives.

(9) ADJOURNMENT:

Chairman Springs adjourned the Meeting at 7:47p.m.

Evangeline Lane, Secretary
City Planning Commission
Inglewood, California

Approved this 1st Day
of March 2023.

Chairman Larry Springs
City Planning Commission