CITY OF CARSON

PLANNING COMMISSION STAFF REPORT

PUBLIC HEARING: July 29, 2020

SUBJECT: Continued Public Hearing for:
Site Plan and Design Review (DOR) 1745-18
Conditional Use Permit (CUP) 1074-18
Specific Plan (SP) 18-18
General Plan Amendment (GPA) 108-18,
Entitlement Agreement (DA) 24-18.

APPLICANT: KL Fenix Corporation
19401 S. Main Street
Gardena, CA 90248
Attn: Segovia Felipe

PROPERTY OWNER: Young Kim
KL Fenix Corporation
19401 S. Main Street
Gardena, CA 90248

REQUEST: Consideration of applicant's proposal for construction of 53,550-square-foot structure with 39,500 square feet of warehouse space, 14,050 square feet of office space, 6 loading docks, 115 passenger vehicle parking spaces, 475 cargo container/truck spaces

PROPERTY INVOLVED: 20601 S. Main Street

COMMISSION ACTION

AYE	NO		AYE	NO	
		Chairperson Pimentel			**Palmer**
		Vice-Chair Madrigal			**Rahman**
		Cainglet			**Rashad**
		Fe'esago			**Valdez**
		Mitoma			**Alt. Diaz** **Alt. Hellerud** **Alt. Zuniga**

Item No. 7A

EXHIBIT NO. 7

I. Introduction

Applicant
KL Fenix Corporation
19401 S. Main Street
Gardena, CA 90248
Attn: Segovia Felipe

Property Owner
Young Kim
KL Fenix Corporation
19401 S. Main Street
Gardena, CA 90248

II. Background

The applicant requests the Planning Commission's consideration for a General Plan Amendment (GPA) to change the designation from MU-BP to Heavy Industrial, a Zone Change via the Specific Plan (SP), an Entitlement Agreement (EA) to regulate the temporary use, a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for development of the proposed use and development on an Organic Refuse Landfill site and a Site Plan and Design Review per CMC 9172.23.

At the regularly scheduled meeting of May 27, 2020, the Planning Commission voted 7-2 to continue this item to the July 28, 2020 meeting. Of paramount concern to the Planning Commission were the deficiencies and discrepancies in the plans submitted by the applicant resulting in numerous conditions of approval including those requiring submittal of revised plans prior to scheduling the item for City Council. In addition, the applicant submitted a letter disagreeing with many of the conditions of approval and the Entitlement Agreement (EA) provisions making it difficult for the Planning Commission to analyze and make a decision on the project. The Commission discussed the project and directed the applicant to revise their plans and continued the item to this meeting Staff has held several meetings with the applicant's representatives to resolve many of the matters. On July 9, 2020, the applicant submitted the revised plans for staff's review. Therefore, staff has had just enough time to review the plans and revise the conditions of approval and the EA; however, we have not had time to discuss our comments and corrections with the applicant. This has resulted in retaining most of the conditions of approval from the previous Planning Commission meeting including the one requiring the applicant to revise the plans prior to scheduling for City Council's consideration. In addition, there are still disagreements with staff on many of the major deal points of the EA.

The Planning Commission also directed the applicant to host a Community Meeting or other type of feasible community outreach during the COVID-19 health crisis; to date staff is not aware that the applicant has complied with this request.

Site & Project History

The May 27, 2020 staff report provides a detailed Site and Project history, including the exception granted to the applicant by City Council to the logistics moratorium in place at that time for making this application. (Exhibit 5)

II. Project Description

The May 27, 2020 staff report discussed in detail the project use, structures, vehicle parking, access, setbacks, fencing and landscaping. This staff report highlights Planning Commission direction from the last meeting and applicant's response to said direction.

Use

The applicant is proposing a “cargo container parking” facility on the project site. On-site operational activities would include the mobilization of either imported goods that have just arrived from the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach or exported goods that are in transit to the Ports. The project also includes a warehouse component within the proposed building. Hours of operation have not changed from the May 27, 2020 Staff Report and are implemented through COA # 59.

Structures and Vehicle Parking and Storage Spaces

The proposal originally included a 53,550-square-foot structure on the eastern portion of the 14.33 acre property with 39,500 square feet of warehouse space, 14,050 square feet of office space and 6 loading docks within a two-story building. The site plan includes 115 passenger vehicle parking spaces, 400 cargo container parking spaces and 75 truck parking spaces for a total of 475 cargo container/truck spaces (Truck Spaces). However, the applicant has revised and removed a proposed open-air loading dock facility with 9 loading docks from the site plan which is acceptable to staff.

Access

The applicant has revised the access points to the site as suggested by staff. The project now proposes one driveway along Main Street for cars and one along Figueroa Street for trucks as requested by CalTrans. However, the new Figueroa Street driveway creates additional issues which are discussed later in this report.

Setbacks

The proposed facility has a 25-foot setback along Main Street, a 20-foot setback along Figueroa Street and 5 foot of landscaped setbacks along Northern and Southern property lines. The building is setback 50 feet from the Southern property line and the loading docks are setback 150 feet from the same.

The proposed Specific Plan proposes a 25-foot setback on Figueroa Street Figueroa street setback which is inconsistent with 20-foot setback on the site plan. Condition No. 61 (g) has been added to reduce the Specific Plan setback to 20 feet resolve this discrepancy.

III. Analysis

The May 27, 2020 staff report provided a detailed analysis for the proposed project. Below are a summary of unresolved issues between city staff conditions of approval/recommendations and the proposed application.

Submittal of Revised Documents

The materials presented to the Commission in the May hearing were not drawn or written by professional firms. Applicant was directed by the Planning Commission to follow Staff’s recommendation on hiring professional architect to draw up the architectural drawing set and hire a professional planning firm to draft the Specific Plan. In addition, Staff also recommended that the elevations be revised to incorporate comments of City’s Design consultant.

The applicant hired a professional planning firm to draft the Specific Plan. The revised specific plan addresses major concerns, however, the applicant and planning firm did not address all issues in detail. This is discussed later in the report.

Staff had numerous concerns with the applicant's previously submitted Site Plan and Elevations which were not created by a professional design firm. It appears that most of the same issues remain with the resubmitted Site Plan as it includes minimalistic edits and the Elevations have not been modified at all. Therefore, Conditions of Approval Nos. 15,16,17,18,19, 20, 21 and 61 include provisions to address staff's concerns and requires the applicant to submit the revisions to the site plan, elevations, and the specific plan prior to scheduling the item for City Council.

Land Use Compatibility

Design Aspects

The May 27, 2020 staff report presented Land-use compatibility issues (Exhibit 5). This report provided a creative approach to addressing site compatibility with the surrounding areas.

This approach involved a significant reduction of Truck Spaces to make the proposed use more compatible with the areas to the south and reduce the traffic, noise, and air quality impacts associated with the proposed use. Eliminating two rows of Truck Spaces together with the most southerly drive aisle would provide an approximately 155' foot buffer between the truck operations and the uses to the south. This would reduce the number of Truck and Container Spaces by 177 from 475 to 298, refer to COA #15. Additional safe guards were also presented to ensure these conditions are met and to allow even more separation between incompatible uses. Depending on how surrounding parcels develop, the proposed truck operations may cease permanently or could expand to 475 spaces as currently proposed by the applicant and be vested permanently. The applicant has not agreed to this reduction to protect the surrounding land uses and create compatibility with them and is asking the Planning Commission to consider their original proposal with 475 spaces with no buffer from the properties to the south. One such property is currently being proposed with a Specific Plan to cause the development of the site as high density residential.

Figure (a) Surrounding parcels and area

Entitlement Agreement (EA)

The May 27, 2020 staff report required additional safeguards to ensure long term compatibility of the proposed use with the surrounding areas. The following provides a summary of the provisions included in the EA for the Cargo Container Parking facility:

- Initial Term is 7 years meaning the proposed use will continue as approved for a 7 year period regardless of the developments of the surrounding areas.
- 5 Surrounding Parcels have been identified to define compatibility of the project with surrounding areas (Figure (a)):
  - 3 Adjacent Surrounding Parcels; and
  - 2 Other Surrounding Parcels.
- 3-year automatic extension will be granted at the end of 7 years:
  - If within the 7 year period no new development occurs on the Adjacent Surrounding Parcels; or
  - No new development or only one new development occurs in Other Surrounding Parcels.
- Automatic 3-year extensions will be granted until one of the following occurs:
  - One new development occurs in Adjacent Surrounding Parcels:
    - If the new development is heavy industrial, the proposed use will be vested and continues for perpetuity; or

        - If the new development is non-heavy industrial, the proposed use will cease operation for perpetuity.
    - There are two new developments (cumulative) on Other Surrounding Parcels
        - If both new developments (cumulative) are heavy industrial, the use will be vested and continues for perpetuity; or
        - If both new developments (cumulative) are non-heavy industrial, the use will cease operation for perpetuity.
        - If both the parcels develop, one as heavy industrial and the other as non-heavy industrial, the permanency or the cessation of the use will be determined by the development of the adjacent surrounding parcels
- In the event that during a review period, two of the adjacent surrounding parcels develop, the development of the first parcel shall govern the permanency or cessation of the use, except if the second parcel developed has a residential use, in which case the residential use would take precedence and the Cargo Container parking use will have to cease permanently.

In addition, in the event at least 50% of the area of the Surrounding Parcels gets developed as Light Industrial, then at least (60) calendar days prior to expiration of the Initial Term or any Extended Term, Developer may petition City to have the Planning Commission review the Project in the context of such development, and the Planning Commission will determine whether Developer will be granted permanent use of the Cargo Container Parking facility or will cease operations permanently.

As long as Cargo Container use is operational, the warehouse use shall be allowed to continue. If the Cargo Container Parking Facility use has to cease operations, the warehouse use can be allowed to continue. The following provides a summary of the provisions included in the EA for the Warehouse Use:

- 3-year automatic extension will be granted from the date of cessation of Cargo Container Parking use if both the other surrounding parcels have been developed, one as a light industrial and other one is developed as something other than Light Industrial.
- If only one of the adjacent surrounding parcels develop as Light Industrial, the warehouse use shall be permanently vested.
- In the event that during a review period, two of the adjacent surrounding parcels develop, the development of the first parcel shall govern the permanency or cessation of the use, except if the second parcel developed has a residential use, in which case the residential use would take precedence and the warehouse use shall cease operations.

The above provisions will ensure the proposed project will be predominantly compatible with the surrounding uses both now and in the future. The applicant has not agreed to the above and is proposing the following for the Planning Commission to consider:

- At the end of the initial term the cargo container parking use will terminate if two of the Surrounding Parcels are developed with non-heavy industrial uses, otherwise the use becomes permanent.
- However, if two of the Surrounding Parcels are developed with non-heavy industrial uses, the warehousing use will still remain permanent as it is an automatically permitted use under the existing land use and zoning designations.

The applicant also contends that regardless of how the surrounding areas develop, the warehousing use should continue permanently as it is an automatically permitted use under the existing land use and zoning designations. Staff disagrees with the applicant's determination as the existing Mixed-Use Business Park (MU-BP) Designation of the General Plan does not allow large warehousing uses. Such uses are only permitted in Heavy Industrial (HI) and Light Industrial (LI) designations.
General Plan's MU-BP states that this land-use would allow for commercial and business park/limited industrial uses but not residential. The definition of limited industrial uses is further clarified in the Business Park section of the General Plan, which clearly states that "warehousing of a small scale (for example, no more than one ground level loading door per x square feet of building) in conjunction with a permitted primary use will be allowed". The General Plan does not contemplate large, independent warehouses in this area.

Stormwater Management
The subject property adjoins the Torrance lateral of the LA County Flood Control District along its northerly property line.

Area of Concern:
The applicant has indicated their intent to drain run-off water into the flood control channel and claim to have District approval but has yet to provide written confirmation from the District. Without formal confirmation of District approval, the applicant must redesign the proposed stormwater management system to the satisfaction of the Department of Public Works Engineering Division and the LA County Flood Control District prior to issuance of any permits; refer to COA# 31, 77.

Access
The applicant proposes one point of vehicular access from Main Street. In addition, the proposal has been modified to a single driveway on Figueroa Street as per the written comments received from Caltrans. Staff still has concerns regarding the Figueroa Street access point which are discussed later in this report.

Area of Concern:
Staff still has concerns about the viability of the proposed driveway which is not aligned with the on and off-ramp of the I-110. COA # 18 (b) addresses this concern and advises the applicant to redesign the entrance with a median to separate the incoming and outgoing traffic flow and also consult with Caltrans to align the ingress-egress with the on and off ramps of I-110. The applicant will also have to work with Caltrans to get an approval for the precise location of the driveway (COA# 19). In addition, the proposed new driveway location would require a left-turn pocket to be created on Figueroa Street for access to the Site from southbound trucks (refer COA# 88(l)).

Parking & Traffic

The proposed development exceeds the minimum parking requirement for the Site, as presented in May 27, 2020 Staff Report. The applicant has attempted to address Staff's concerns about maneuverability of trucks on site by removing the outdoor docking area.

Area of Concern:

The revised Site Plan rectifies the maneuverability issue for dock numbers 1 through 4. However, the distance between the docking area of docks 5 & 6 and the first container parking bay directly across from these bays is still insufficient for a 65-foot truck to back up and dock.

In addition, Staff had proposed a Condition of Approval requiring the Figueroa Street gates to be open at all times during the operational hours. This was intended to prevent any backing up of traffic on Figueroa Street as trucks await opening of the gate. Applicant team does not agree to this condition and for security reasons would like to be able to close the gate at dusk. Thus, COA # 18 (e) has been drafted to modify the Site Plan to allow at least one full truck length of stacking outside the gates of the property. Alternately, the applicants still retain the possibility of accepting Staff's condition.

The revised Site Plan does not show any truck turning radii and flow of movement within the site.

Building and Architecture

The proposed building lacks the design quality and thoughtfulness expected from a project of this nature. The City's Design Consultant team (RRM) reviewed and provided detailed comments and suggestions for improvements that the applicant has not incorporated into the proposed development.

Area of Concern:

The proposed elevations are conflicting in different directions. Moreover, the renderings that have been recently submitted also fail to create interest or provide clarity to the project.

- The applicant was directed to work with a licensed architect specializing in tilt-up construction in order to address all comments provided by RRM. To Staff's knowledge, this process has not been initiated. COA # 5, 20 & 21 address these issues by requiring the applicant to submit revised elevations, revised materials board, and revised color renderings prior to scheduling for City Council.
- In addition, COA # 43 requires additional on-site landscaping to adequately screen the Cargo Container parking areas from I-110 off-ramp and North and Southbound Figueroa Street. Applicant objects to this condition and staff is concerned that without the additional landscaping, the visual impact of one of the primary entrances into the City will be blighted by the view of trucks and containers on this project site.

Signage

Due to the unique nature of the project, the project shall be required to submit for a Sign Program for all signs to be permitted on the property. The standards incorporated in the Specific Plan are not comprehensive and thus COA # 53 and 62 require the applicant to

edit the Specific Plan to remove all sign standards from the Specific Plan and file for a Sign Program instead. COA # 54 clarifies that no proposed signages shall be approved as part of this approval including the “City of Carson” monument sign proposed along Figueroa Street.

Fencing

The entire perimeter of the subject property includes 8-foot high walls and fencing. The developer is proposing a combination of wrought-iron fencing and pre-cast concrete panel walls as fencing material. The building entrance on Main Street will include wrought-iron fencing. Pre-cast concrete panels will be installed along the Northern and Southern property lines and a combination of both materials is proposed along Figueroa Boulevard.

Area of Concern:

The proposed wall on the North side is offset 10 feet to the south of the property line. Staff presented their concerns about the maintenance of the area between the wall and the North property line in the May Planning Commission hearing. The applicant has not provided an explanation to address this concern other than placement of the water filtration system on the north side of the wall and draining run-off water into the flood control channel, which staff believes is not permissible. The applicant has not revised the Site Plan to place the wall on the property line as directed earlier. Thus, COA # 31 is still relevant and valid.

The applicant has been requested to match the colors of the concrete panels to the colors of the building and provide a paint and material board for the fencing and walls for Staff’s review. Since this information has not been provided, COA# 28 & 29 still remains valid.

In addition, the applicant will be required to build an 8-foot high fence along the last truck/container parking spaces securing the buffer area created by eliminating two rows of container parking spaces and the associated drive aisle. This fence is at least 150 feet from the Southern property line to fence off the unused portion of the Site due to reduced truck/container parking spaces. Refer to COA# 18(d) & 34.

Specific Plan

Specific plans are planning tools included in state law that allow cities to adopt different development standards than those in specific zones included in the City’s zoning code. The implementation of the proposed project requires different development standards and uses than those included in the Carson Municipal Code Chapter 1, Part 4, Heavy Industrial Zone; therefore, the applicant proposes the KL Fenix Cargo Container Parking Specific Plan (Exhibit 3).

After the May 27, 2020 Planning Commission meeting, the applicant hired a professional firm to redraft the said Specific Plan.

Areas of Concern:

The revised Specific Plan is a marked improvement over the first draft. However, it is clearly evident that the applicant and the Specific Plan team did not have sufficient time to address all of the conditions presented by Staff. For example, on Page 16 of the

revised Specific Plan, Cargo Container facilities are prohibited within 1,000 feet of residentially zoned properties. However, since residential uses do currently exist within 1,000 feet of the site, the applicant's proposed use would not be permitted by the Specific Plan. The same applies for institutional uses as well.
There are several other minor issues such as discrepancy of setbacks and missed details that have been addressed by COA # 62.

Furthermore, the Permitted Uses Section of the proposed Specific Plan would need to be modified to exclude "Cold Storage" warehousing. Cold Storage use generates a different trip generation rate that other warehousing uses and the inclusion of this use could result in the substantial modification of the Mitigated Negative Declaration. Therefore, staff has included COA# 62 (e) to address this issue prior to scheduling the Specific Plan for City Council.

It should be noted that the CMC includes a definition for a cargo container parking facility; however, it is not included as a permitted use or a use requiring a Conditional Use Permit. Since the zoning code is a permissive code meaning that if a use is not specifically mentioned as permitted or conditionally permitted then it is not permitted by the zoning code, a Specific Plan is the proper tool to allow the proposed cargo container facility.

Entitlement Agreement Terms and Conditions

In addition to the provisions stated above to ensure compatibility of the proposed use with the surrounding areas, the following provides a summary of the major Terms and Conditions included in the Entitlement Agreement:

Compliance with EA, Fines

Prior to issuance of building permits, the developer is required to deposit with the City $100,000. This deposit will be used by the City, if necessary, to ensure compliance with the provisions of the EA. A fine of either $1,000 per incidence or $500 per day until compliance has been reached will be levied for violation of the following terms and conditions of the EA:

- Only a total of 298 spaces (220 container parking spaces and 75 truck parking spaces) spaces shall be allowed on the site. ($1,000).
- Use of the Property must be in strict compliance with the Permissible Usage. ($1,000).
- All truck ingress and egress to and from the Property shall be via Figueroa Street. ($1,000)
- No trucks shall be permitted to traverse on Torrance Boulevard or Main Street. ($1,000).
- Developer is required to install Video Surveillance Cameras ("**VSCs**") that record 24-7. ($1,000)
- Developer's trucks do not travel into or from the Property using Torrance Boulevard and Main Street. ($1,000).

- Developer must cease operations when such cessation is required, and retrofit warehouse when required. ($500 per day as a penalty until compliance has been reached)
- Trucks without the KL Fenix logos shall not be authorized to use the site. ($1,000)
- Developer must comply with the prescribed hours of operation.($1,000)
- All VSCs shall be installed and operational at all times. ($1,000)
- The Property, including the Buffer Area, must at all times be maintained and generally kept in a clean condition. ($1,000)

Area of Concern:
Since May 27, 2020 Planning Commission meeting, Staff has revised the fines from $5,000 per incident down to $1,000 in an attempt to be accommodating to the applicant, reach a consensus and allow this project to move forward.
However, due to the fairly nominal value of fines per violation, Staff has a concern that there could be an issue of repeated and persistent violations. The Commission may consider the following options to remedy the situation and provide direction to Staff:

1. Increase the per violation amount and direct staff to incorporate the fine amount in the Entitlement Agreement.
2. Institute an incremental increase in fines per violation via the Entitlement Agreement. As an example, fine for the first violation is at $1,000, second violation at $1,500, third at $3,000 and so on.
3. Condition the project for reconsideration by Planning Commission after a certain number of violations within a given time. As an example, Commission may decide to reconsider the project's entitlements if 10 violations occur within any given 6-month period.

Staff requests the Commission to consider these options and provide further direction.

IV. CFD/DIF Discussion

Interim Development Impact Fee: On July 1, 2020, the citywide DIF fees were adjusted in accordance with Article XI of the Carson Municipal Code (Interim Development Impact Fee Program) which requires the applicant to pay an estimated one-time development impact fee of 217,396.96 (currently $729.52 per truck/container space based on 298 Truck Spaces) to fund the development's proportional share of city-wide capital infrastructure improvements. The fee paid will be proportional to the number of truck Spaces ultimately approved for the project and the fee in effect when building permits are issued, refer to COA #1.

Funding Mechanism for Ongoing Services / Community Facilities District: The applicant, property owner, and/or successor to whom these project entitlements are assigned ("Developer") is responsible to establish a funding mechanism to provide an ongoing source of funds for city services including the maintenance of parks, roadways, and sidewalks. A uniformed-standardized rate for ongoing city services was adopted by the City pursuant to Resolution No. 19-009 and accompanying Fiscal Impact Analysis ("FIA") report. Under the adopted Resolution and FIA report, the subject property falls under "Other Industrial Zones" with a current rate of $480.75 per acre per year. Based on a 14.33-acre site, the current estimated annual

amount is $6,889.15 ***which reflect the adjusted rates as of July 1, 2020***. The actual amount of the CFD will be based on the fee in effect at the time the building permits are issued. Developer is required to mitigate its impacts on city services either through: 1) Annexing into a City established Community Facilities District (CFD) or 2) Establishing a funding mechanism to provide an ongoing source of funds for ongoing services, acceptable to the City, refer to COA#2.

Additionally, at the time of application for a business license, if there are two different users between the Cargo Container Parking Facility and warehouse, then an additional DIF payment will be made for the warehouse in the amount of One Hundred Thirty Thousand Six Hundred Sixty Two Dollars ($130,662.00), calculated at $2.56 per square foot of building area (calculated at $2.56 x 53,550 = $137,008). Such DIF payment will be made at the time applications for the business licenses are submitted to City.

V. Zoning and General Plan Consistency

The proposed Cargo Container Parking use is not allowed within the Mixed-Use Business Park General Plan Land Use designation. Therefore, to implement the proposed project, a General Plan Amendment is required to change the General Plan Land Use Designation to Heavy Industrial. This change would make this parcel the only parcel in the vicinity of the site with a HI designation.

Since the current zoning of the site is not compatible with the HI land use designation, a zone change is required. Typically, the implementing zone for the HI designation is Manufacturing Heavy (MH) zone. However, since the MH zone allows a variety of uses not desired in this area, Staff requested the applicant to file for a specific plan which provides more control over the possible uses of the site.

VI. Environmental Review

Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), a Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration was prepared and made available for public review from April 14, 2020 through May 13, 2020. A Notice of Intent to Adopt a Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration was posted with the City Clerk, LA County Clerk, Carson Library, on-site, and sent to responsible agencies. An electronic copy of the document was also posted on the Planning Division website (http://ci.carson.ca.us/CommunityDevelopment/KLFenix.aspx). No comments were received recommending that an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) should be prepared.

Detailed discussion of the impacts and mitigation measures has been presented in the May 27, 2020 Staff Report.

The applicant recently submitted a design approval letter from DTSC (Exhibit 7) that approves the Construction Quality Assurance Plan (CQAP). CQAP summarizes the activities associated with the installation of the pavement system and cover system at the project site. Additionally comments were received from Armbruster Goldsmith & Delvac LLP, legal counsel of Carson El Camino LLC on the inadequacies of the CEQA document, which have been addressed in a letter by City's Environmental

Consultant (Exhibit 10). Based on the comments and their responses, Staff believes that revising or recirculating the MND is not warranted.

VII. Public Notice & Community Meeting

Notice of public hearing was published in the newspaper on April 30, 2020. Notices were mailed to property owners and occupants within a 750' radius and posted to the project site by April 30, 2020. No re-noticing was required as the Planning Commission continued the item to the July 28, 2020 regularly scheduled public hearing. The agenda was posted at City Hall no less than 72 hours prior to the Planning

At the regularly scheduled meeting of May 27, 2020, the Planning Commission directed the applicant to host a Community Meeting or other type of feasible community outreach during the COVID-19 health crisis; to date the applicant has not complied with this request.

VIII. Recommendation

That the Planning Commission:

- **ADOPT** Resolution No. 20-2696, entitled, "A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF CARSON APPROVING SITE PLAN AND DESIGN OVERLAY REVIEW NO. 1745-18, CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT NO. 1074-18 AND RECOMMENDING APPROVAL TO CITY COUNCIL FOR GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 108-18, SPECIFIC PLAN NO. 18-18, ENTITLEMENT AGREEMENT NO. 24-18, MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (MMRP) FOR A PROPOSED CARGO CONTAINER PARKING FACILITY AT 20601 S. MAIN STREET"

IX. Exhibits

1. Draft Resolution
   A. Legal Description
   B. Conditions of Approval
2. Development Plans
3. Revised Container Parking Specific Plan
4. Entitlement Agreement
5. Planning Commission Staff Report dated May 27, 2020
6. Planning Commission Disposition Excerpt dated May 27, 2020
7. DTSC Design approval letter
8. Applicants comment letter to May 27, 2020 Staff Report
9. Public Comments letters received post- publication of May 27 agenda packet.
10. Response to AGD LLP Comment Letter

Prepared by: Manraj G. Bhatia, Assistant Planner