



TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 2025
701 East Carson Street, Carson, CA 90745
Juanita Millender-McDonald Community Center
Carson Dominguez Hall
6:30 p.m.

MINUTES
MEETING OF THE
PLANNING COMMISSION

Members:	Dianne Thomas Chair	Louie Diaz Vice Chair	Frederick Docdocil
	Carlos Guerra	Del Huff	Richard Hernandez
	DeQuita Mfume	Clarence Johnson	Leticia Wilson
Alternates:	Jaime Monteclaro		
Staff:	Christopher Palmer, AICP Planning Manager	Benjamin Jones Assistant City Attorney	Laura Gonzalez Planning Secretary

“In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, if you require a disability related modification or accommodation to attend or participate in this meeting, including auxiliary aids or services, please call the Planning Department at 310-952-1761 at least 48 hours prior to the meeting.” (Government Code Section 54954.2)

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Thomas Called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Commissioner Guerra led the Salute to the Flag.

3. ROLL CALL

Planning Commissioners Present: Thomas, Diaz, Guerra, Huff, Docdocil, Wilson, Mfume, Johnson

Planning Commissioners Absent: Monteclaro

Planning Staff Present: Community Development Director Naaseh, Planning Manager Palmer, Senior Planner Alexander, Contract Planner Carver, Assistant City Attorney Jones, Traffic Engineer Merrill, Planning Secretary Gonzalez

4. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS FOR MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA

None

5. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS FOR NON-PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS LISTED ON THE AGENDA (MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC)

None

6. CONSENT CALENDAR

A) Approval of Minutes – November 12, 2024

Planning Commission Decision:

Vice Chair Diaz moved, seconded by Commissioner Docdocil, to approve the minutes as presented. Motion carried, 8-0.

7. PUBLIC HEARING

A) General Plan Amendment (GPA) No. 2-24, Specific Plan Amendment (SPA) No. 2-24, Site Plan and Design Review (DOR) No. 20-24, Tentative Tract Map (TTM) No. 3-24 for VTTM 84598, Amended and Restated Development Agreement No. 2-24, Addendum to Carson 2040 General Plan Update EIR

Request:

A request for approval of a 62-unit residential townhome condominium development.

Staff Recommendation:

Planning Consultant Leila Carver presented the staff report and the recommendation to ADOPT Resolution No. 25-2881, entitled, "A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF CARSON: (1) CONDITIONALLY APPROVING AN ADDENDUM TO THE CARSON 2040 GENERAL PLAN UPDATE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT, SITE PLAN AND DESIGN REVIEW NO. 20-24, AND VESTING TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 3-24, ALL CONTINGENT UPON CITY COUNCIL APPROVAL OF GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 2-24, SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 2-24, AND DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT NO. 2-24 (AMENDED AND RESTATED DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT NO. 27-21), AND SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL; AND (2) RECOMMENDING THAT THE CITY COUNCIL APPROVE GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 2-24, SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 2-24, AND DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT NO. 2-24 (AMENDED AND RESTATED DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT NO. 27-21), SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL AS APPLICABLE, FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF A 62-UNIT RESIDENTIAL TOWNHOME CONDOMINIUM DEVELOPMENT AT 21611 PERRY STREET, APNS 7327-010-014 & 015."

Commissioner Guerra – Was the soil removal specifically for the storage unit?

Planner Carver – The soil cleanup occurred in 2014. That was before the entitlement for the self-storage facility.

Commissioner Guerra – Has there been additional remediation to the site other than the soil removal?

Planner Carver – My understanding from the history and the geotechnical investigation report is that there has been no further remediation of the site.

Director Naaseh – There are conditions of approval in the project that require clearance from the regulatory agencies that are in charge of the cleanup of the site. Conditions 17 and 18 deal with those issues. Prior to issuance of any permits, the applicant has to demonstrate to the city that the Water Board and DTSC have cleared the project for construction. After the construction is completed then they may further test to the satisfaction of DTSC and the Water Board to release the occupancy of the homes.

Commissioner Guerra – Why was there a lapse testing the water wells?

Assistant City Attorney Jones – I'm not aware of any lapse. There are groundwater monitoring wells on the property which is pursuant to regulatory agency requirements. Those will be relocated to avoid conflicting with the buildings as part of condition #19. Conditions 17 through 19 address all the compliance with the regulatory agency requirements.

Chair Thomas – This land was cleaned long before the project for the storage units came about. It wasn't cleaned up for the storage units. It was cleaned prior to that because that was a requirement, and I think that is what was being conveyed by the Assistant City Attorney.

Assistant City Attorney Jones – It was cleaned up in 2014 to a level that is sufficient for commercial or industrial uses. That's why you see the existing Water Board Covenant on the property that restricts the property from residential uses. We are aware that the applicant has been in discussions with the Water Board to amend that covenant to defer to DTSC approval. Basically, no residential uses on the property unless approved by DTSC. They've received a tentative approval via email from the Water Board to enter into an amendment to the Water Board Covenant and then concurrent with that they have been in discussions with DTSC regarding approval of a CLRRRA Agreement. That would provide a path that's approved by DTSC for development of residential uses on the property. Condition #17 provides that proof of compliance with regulatory agency requirements related to the project site, including but not limited to the Regional Water Board and DTSC shall be submitted to the Community Development Director or Division prior to the issuance of any certificates of occupancy. The city would not issue any certificate of occupancy, temporary or permanent for this project without proof that DTSC has approved this. We already know that the amendment to the Water Board Covenant would be needed to where they would basically defer to DTSC. If DTSC gives their approval, then they would be in the clear. The Water Board approval by the first amendment to the covenant and then the DTSC approval of the CLRRRA Agreement and all the signed offs needed under the CLRRRA Agreement. All of that needs to occur prior to and full approvals from those regulatory agencies prior to issuance of any certificate of occupancy. Condition #18 talks about how prior to issuance of any permits the applicant will need to submit those fully executed agreements. The full signed amendment to the Water Board Covenant as well as the DTSC CLRRRA Agreement will need to be submitted to the city indicating that they have approval from those agencies to enter into those agreements. They have to submit those

signed agreements before any permits, and they have to comply with those agreements and get full approvals before the certificate of occupancy.

Chair Thomas – There's a process that has to take place.

Developer Brandon Cutler – The environment history is broken up into two components. There is what is called underground storage tanks (UST) and it's typically what you see in almost any industrial facility going back 60 or 70 years. It's also common to see in former gas station sites. Most industrial sites have underground or buried storage tanks. Sometimes those storage tanks leak. When you're trying to get approval from either local or state regulators to remove a storage tank you have to test the ground around it to make sure that it hasn't leaked. In this case there were some leaks from those underground storage tanks. The soil contamination that was referenced and that was completed in 2014 is because of those underground storage tanks. They removed the tanks and all the soil around the tanks. They tested around the entire site to make sure that they didn't miss any spots. That was just so the then owner and responsible party could get clearance from a liability perspective going forward. Since that time the project has changed ownership a couple of times. Shell is the ultimate responsible party for both the soil and the underlying groundwater. There isn't any soil responsibility anymore. The site has groundwater monitoring wells, and they are very common throughout the South Bay and certainly within the City of Carson. The monitoring wells are tied to underground pipelines. Those are different from groundwater testing or treatment wells. In this case it's focused on monitoring. There were issues years ago as to whether there might be chemicals of concern in the groundwater. The groundwater is not in any way tied to the Municipal Water System. Contaminated water can in some cases vaporize and then go up through the soil to create a soil vapor issue. There have been no suggestions of that being an issue in this area. The monitoring wells are tied to the regional issue having nothing to do with this site itself. Typically, groundwater monitoring is supposed to be reported quarterly, biannual, semiannual, or on an annual schedule but sometimes that gets missed. It gets run through the LA County Regional Water Quality Control Board. DTSC only gets involved when there are residential projects on former sites that might have groundwater issues specifically to address any risk to vapor intrusion. DTSC is the next governmental oversight that becomes required when we're talking about making sure places are safe for people to live in. The added work that needs to be done between now and when someone would be able to occupy these units safely is all of the work that we would have to go through DTSC and that would extensive testing any sort of additional remedial work, vapor barriers, both active and passive systems built into the facilities, and then eventually indoor air monitoring before the sites are deemed occupiable. There's quite a bit of extra work that needs to be done that takes it from where it would be today for self-storage into where it would be for housing.

Chair Thomas opened the public hearing.

Calvin Pratt (Resident) – I live down the street from that vacant lot. I oppose this project for residential use because we have enough congestion as it is.

Chair Thomas closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Johnson – I'm excited to see more housing being brought to the city.

Commissioner Wilson – Staff has done a great job by providing us with all this information in detail particularly addressing the issue of contamination and the history. I have a lot of confidence in our government entities and the process that we have in place over the years. It's a requirement by the state to add additional housing. We are doing our part to meet our requirement by the state but also to protect the quality of life in our community.

Commissioner Guerra – Do we have traffic statistics as it relates to how many cars per unit?

Planning Manager Palmer – They have more than what is required for the lot. They are required 137 and they are proposing 150. We don't have a per bedroom count, but we do have a per unit count. I believe it's in line with the current zoning. We expressed that when we had the General Plan meetings. The General Plan designation was designated as Commercial Mix which allows for residential, and it anticipated that in the EIR, and it anticipates this solid 100 percent residential use in the addendum to the EIR. I believe those are not in conflict and it's something that is supportable.

Chair Thomas - It should be noted that the presentation and the material covered the number of trips that would be expected during the peak hours. Statically speaking it would be even less traffic with the residential project than if you went with the storage. We are just going to have more traffic as we continue to improve this city. We have the expectation of bringing more housing because of the requirements by the state. If a residential project takes place at this site this would help us towards that goal. Back in 2022 we approved the storage facility and that is still an option. The developer asked to have residential as a second option which is what would be preferred by the city. If for some reason they are unsuccessful because of any issues that DTSC deemed unacceptable then they would still have the availability for the storage.

Planning Commission Decision:

Vice Chair Diaz moved, seconded by Commissioner Huff, to approve staff's recommendation with revisions to the Development Agreement, thus adopting Resolution 25-2881. Motion carried, 8-0.

8. MANAGER'S REPORT

Planning Manager Palmer – We're about to dig into the code and we're going to have some workshops for Phase 2 of the Municipal Code Update. We're going to do some cleaning up of the Phase 1. Now that it's established, we see how it works and doesn't work. We're coming back with proposals that hopefully rounds it out.

9. COMMISSIONERS' ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

Commissioner Wilson – Thank you everyone.

Commissioner Docdocil – It's always a point of pride when you work with such competent and skillful people. Not just my fellow commissioners but certainly city staff for doing all the heavy lifting. It's also a huge boost when you have applicants that know what they are doing and have done the research that is necessary for continued growth for our city.

Commissioner Huff – It is an honor and a pleasure to be back. Thank you staff for doing a wonderful job. It was a pleasure having the developer here to answer and give a complete explanation.

Commissioner Guerra – I'm glad staff was able to calm my concerns.

Commissioner Johnson – I thank everyone involved for addressing the public concerns. Hopefully at one point create walking or bike paths to mitigate traffic concerns.

Chair Thomas – The city has had meetings about bike paths, where they can potentially go, and making them safe. One portion of that bike path is going to go along the canal to the west of the property.

Commissioner Mfume – It's great to see all the commissioners this year. Thank you staff for all the hard work. I had a lot of questions, but the applicant explained everything and made me feel confident about this project. The apartment complex across the street from this new development is dangerous. The balcony on the 3rd floor does not have rails. I was wondering if anything can be done.

Planning Manager Palmer – We'll investigate to see what options are available.

Vice Chair Diaz – Some of the residents on the east side of town at the Dominguez Lincoln Village had some concerns and requests to be directed to 2025 schedule for street repairs and continuance of the slurry. The Dominguez Park continues to have the gopher problems, and we need an update on that. Can staff guide me so that I can convey that back to them?

Commissioner Guerra – Do we have a façade improvement progress status available to us?

Community Development Director Naaseh – We continue to work with applicants that have filed applications. It's a long process and it's not the type of program that you see the results immediately but over time you will see results. We continue to meet with new applicants as well as work with the existing applicants that we have.

Chair Thomas – Thank you everyone. Staff from City of Carson has been working on the Black History Program. Save the date for Friday, February 21st at 6:00 p.m. at the Community Center, Halls A, B, and C.

10. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:38 p.m.

Dianne Thomas
Chairperson

Attest By:

Laura Gonzalez
Planning Secretary