



CITY OF CARSON

Legislation Text

File #: 2020-817, Version: 1

Report to Mayor and City Council

Tuesday, December 01, 2020

Discussion

SUBJECT:

GENERAL PLAN UPDATE AND PRESENTATION OF THE PREFERRED PLAN (CITY COUNCIL)

I. SUMMARY

The effort to update the 2004 General Plan began in the Fall of 2017. This update, Carson 2040, includes six phases. The Carson 2040 General Plan (General Plan) covers the Sphere of Influence of the City, which includes the City limits and some unincorporated areas to the northwest (north of Alondra) and east of the City (north of Del Amo and east of Wilmington). Three phases have been completed and the fourth phase will be completed with City Council's consideration of this item. In the first phase, the consultant team produced an Existing Conditions Report that offered a detailed assessment of existing conditions, trends, and opportunities in the City. The report was developed using inputs from stakeholder interviews including City Council members, the community, and City Staff. On February 13, 2018 the consultant team shared the Existing Conditions Report at a joint City Council and Planning Commission meeting.

In the second phase of the update process the consultant team assisted in developing the City's Vision Statement and Guiding Principles (Exhibit No.1). This effort was completed through extensive community outreach. Input was collected through an online survey, community workshops, stakeholder interviews, and General Plan Advisory Committee (GPAC) meetings. Decision-makers also provided input during a joint City Council and Planning Commission study session.

During the third phase, the consultant team produced three land-use alternatives and an Alternatives Report (Exhibit No. 2) based on the previously established Vision Statement and Guiding Principles. To develop the three alternatives, potential "opportunity sites"-sites with greatest potential for land use change or intensification over the next 20 years-were identified within the Planning Area. This was accomplished by mapping vacant and underutilized parcels using Los Angeles County Assessor's data, local knowledge, input from City staff and the community, and focused windshield surveys. The three land-use alternatives were then developed using the mapped opportunity sites along with input from stakeholders, decision makers and the GPAC. The three alternatives were also shared with

the stakeholders who provided further input on them. Staff and the City's General Plan consultant, Dyett & Bhatia, have incorporated the comments received from the community, stakeholders and decision makers and combined the three alternatives into one Preferred Plan.

During the public participation process for the Preferred Plan, the City of Carson's Planning Division provided a comment period to the community from September 2, 2020 to October 25, 2020. Outreach included direct mail postcards to each Carson commercial and residential address, weekly email blasts to over 3,000 Carson stakeholders, a hotline available in English, Spanish and Tagalog languages, a dedicated email inbox and website, and social media posts to encourage stakeholders to share their comments. Stakeholders were also permitted to write hard copy letters and place telephone calls to the Planning Division to share their comments.

This report summarizes the key findings and community input on the Preferred Plan and seeks City Council consensus on same. Once the City Council approves the Preferred Plan, the writing of the General Plan will begin.

II. **RECOMMENDATION**

TAKE the following actions:

1. **DISCUSS** and **PROVIDE** input on the Preferred Plan; AND
2. **PROVIDE** direction to staff to continue the General Plan process including writing the General Plan document and the Environmental Impact Report based on the Preferred Plan.

III. **ALTERNATIVES**

TAKE another action the City Council deems appropriate, consistent with the requirements of the law.

IV. **BACKGROUND**

Community Outreach Summary

The Preferred Plan was circulated for public review from September 2, 2020 to October 25, 2020. Outreach included direct mail postcards to each Carson commercial and residential address, weekly email blasts to over 3,000 Carson stakeholders, a hotline available in English, Spanish and Tagalog languages, a dedicated email inbox and website, and social media posts to encourage stakeholders to share their comments. Stakeholders were also permitted to write hard copy letters and place telephone calls to the Planning Division Counter to share their comments.

Public Comments

Environment

A number of commenters linked the desire to have more parks and open space or high density development with improvements to air quality. They have concerns about industrial uses and heavy-duty truck traffic, and their effect on air pollution as well as noise.

Land Use

Regarding increasing density and residential areas, in general, there was recognition of using existing commercial areas like the areas around the South Bay Pavilion to create and concentrate mixed-use housing opportunities for the City. There were several comments regarding existing industrial areas. Several commenters were concerned about how much land was being designated for industrial uses, some feeling that it was too much, while others felt it should be maximized. Residents around existing industrial uses were concerned about it being incompatible with residential use. Some expressed a desire for the trucking businesses to be eliminated.

Economic Development

Several commenters were concerned about the amount and impact of industrial land and the trucking industry. One would like to see the trucking businesses eliminated. Several commenters were concerned that logistics-related businesses in industrial areas may be required to go through a discretionary approval process or need a Conditional Use Permit.

Several commenters recommend attracting sales tax generating stores such as Trader Joe's, Lowes, Costco, and Marshalls. One commenter would like to see more community-serving retail. One person would like the City to provide space at Boulevards of South Bay for a solar farm. Another person thinks there is too much retail and doesn't want to see more. Several commenters expressed interest in more healthy food retailer options including a grocery store.

Circulation

There were several comments about specific improvements to streets that people would like to see. They include:

- Beautification improvements along Del Amo, Wilmington, Avalon, and the freeway;
- Add a turning lane eastbound at Victoria and Carson Harbor Village;
- Desire to see General Plan align with 2016 Vision Plan for streetscape improvements like street trees and landscaping;
- One person wants to avoid throughways for Martin and Vera to Del Amo from 213th, and speed bumps near Del Amo Elementary and Dolphin Park;
- Improvements to Martin Luther King Street to make it smoother;

- Repairing of block walls along Avalon Blvd. and University Drive so they look more pleasing; and
- Better maintenance of the median along 223rd Street and for holiday decorations on Avalon Blvd to come further south.

Housing

Focusing particularly on density, stakeholders thought that the City should increase residential zoning. There was a comment about adding high density housing to South Bay Pavilion and for other parcels on that side of Avalon Blvd. More than one person would like more single family homes rather than apartments.

With regards to affordable housing, MHP areas should be zoned to preserve affordable housing. Another commenter would like SFD affordable housing greater than 1,500 sq. ft. on 7,000 square foot lots. And another thought that there is not enough affordable senior housing.

Several comments were also shared where stakeholders believe that adding density will contribute to poor air quality.

Open Space and Parks

Several comments asked for more open space and trees to improve air quality.

More specifically, commenters want Carson to have a dog park, walking tracks, tennis courts, and parking.

V. FISCAL IMPACT

None.VI. EXHIBITS

1. City's Vision Statement and Guiding Principles (pgs. 5-12)
2. Alternatives Report (pgs. 13-86)
3. Preferred Plan Map (pg. 87)

| | | | |
|----------------------------------|-----------|------|------|
| 4. | Preferred | Plan | Land |
| Use Classifications (pgs. 88-95) | | | |

Prepared by: Saied Naaseh, Director of Community Development, Alvie Betancourt, Planning Manager