

CARSON REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY
RESPONSES TO WRITTEN OBJECTIONS

FRANK J. RHODES

Frank J. Rhodes
4822 Hampton Lake Drive
Marietta, GA 30068
Tel: 770-579-8555

August 16, 2010

CITY CLERK/AGENCY SECRETARY
701 East Carson Street
Carson, CA 90745

Re. Proposed Amendment to Redevelopment Plans
Carson Consolidated Project Area

Dear City Clerk, Agency Secretary, Boris Sztorch:

I am the property owner at 400 West Walnut Street, Carson. I have been a property owner since about 1994.

I oppose the proposed amendments.

Regarding merging Project Areas, I feel each existing project area should continue to be considered in its own right, and I oppose the proposal to borrow from Peter to pay Paul. If there are not enough funds in a particular area, stop spending. I also oppose exempting trailer parks or any other special interest uses.

I oppose expanding eminent domain authority in either time or scope. I am against Re-establishment as well. I do not feel non-residential property should be singled out. I also oppose giving government more leverage and authority.

My overall feeling is that Carson has very extensive zoning rules, which are out of balance with the city. I have owned property here since about 1994 and have not seen significant improvement in the city, quality of life, ability of Carson to attract/retain strong businesses, etc. I believe the city would be much better off without the onerous restrictions and the heavy hand of government.

My recommendation is for the city to lower zoning restrictions, spend less, and allow the private sector to do more with fewer restrictions. I believe the city government should downsize and reduce its scope and reach. Not the opposite.

This will save money, reduce opportunities for corruption, and empower the private citizens to seek their destinies in Carson with fewer fetters.

Thank you for your consideration.

Regards,



- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 3.
- 3.

Response

1. Section 33485 of the CRL states that merging project areas is desirable if it results in substantial public benefit. The Agency's Report to Council, dated July 20, 2010, outlines the various public benefits that will be achieved as a result of the 2010 Amendment, as well as the cost savings and administrative simplification that will result from merging the Existing Project Areas. Mr. Rhodes states he is opposed to exempting trailer parks or any other special interest group from the 2010 Amendment. The eminent domain language contained in the 2010 Amendment prohibits the Agency from using eminent domain authority to acquire property where person or persons reside, including trailer/mobile home parks. In this stipulation, trailer/mobile home parks are not receiving any special benefit. Rather, the Agency is concerned that people feel safe that their homes will be protected, whether the home is a single family home, apartment or mobile home.
2. Section 33333.2(a)(4) of the CRL expressly grants the Agency the legal authority to extend or reestablish its eminent domain authority for a period of twelve additional years if significant blight remains and this blight cannot be eliminated without the use of eminent domain. The Agency's Report to Council, dated July 20, 2010, documents that significant blight does remain in the Existing Project Areas, and eminent domain may be necessary in the future to help acquire and consolidate parcels to eliminate these blighting conditions.
3. Comments under item 3 deal with the City's zoning regulations. The 2010 Amendment has no authority to change zoning regulations and Mr. Rhodes' comments about cost savings of changing zoning regulations are purely speculative.

Finding

Based on the information contained in the above response, the testimony received at the public hearing, and other evidence contained in the record before the City Council, the City Council hereby finds that the objection is without merit and overruled.

