

# Attachment H

**From:** [Victoria Steinhorst](#)  
**To:** [Scott Kinsey](#)  
**Cc:** [Maryanne Cronin](#)  
**Subject:** GlobeMaster Corridor Plan  
**Date:** Wednesday, December 02, 2020 3:09:24 PM  
**Importance:** High

---

**-EXTERNAL-**

Request for clarification and response

My name is David Herley and I represent The Blanche T. Herley Trust and the James E. Herley Bypass Trust. I am writing this email in response to the NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING I recently received in the mail regarding the Globemaster Corridor Plan, and wish to express my concerns regarding the affected income property we own within the designated 'Corridor'.

Our affected property is a critical part of our operation and is currently leased to two tenants: Maxim Crane Company and Discount Camper Shells. It is located at the North-West corner of Orange and Spring. The two addresses identifying the property are 3001 Orange Ave and 1175 East Spring Street.

I am requesting a timely clarification and response from you regarding the following:

1. Will the Globemaster Corridor Plan affect the operation and/or ownership of our property in any way, either now or in the future?
2. What changes to the 'Plan' are anticipated in the future, that will or may affect the operation and/or ownership of our property?
3. As stated in the PUBLIC NOTICE, **'I may be limited to raising only those issues that are raised at the public hearing (12-17-20), or in written correspondence on these matters delivered to the agency at or prior to the public hearing.'** I am therefore requesting your timely clarification and response to my questions and concerns, so that I may address them within the constraints you are imposing upon me.

Sincerely,

David M. Herley  
Herley Offices

[HerleyOffices@herley-kelleyco.com](mailto:HerleyOffices@herley-kelleyco.com)

(562) 424-2523

**From:** [Scott Kinsey](#)  
**To:** [Victoria Steinhorst](#)  
**Cc:** [Maryanne Cronin](#)  
**Subject:** RE: GlobeMaster Corridor Plan  
**Date:** Wednesday, December 02, 2020 3:28:00 PM  
**Attachments:** [image007.png](#)  
[image008.png](#)  
[image009.png](#)

---

Hello,

Your current businesses at the properties, as long as you maintain a valid City of Long Beach business license for each, will not be affected now or going forward.

In general, within the proposed specific plan (the Globemaster Corridor Specific Plan), the properties you listed will actually move to a more permissive zoning district. They will go from the current IM (Medium Industrial) zoning district, to the specific plan's version of the IG (General Industrial) zoning district. This will not affect the allowed land uses on these two properties in a more restrictive manner.

The plan must be adopted by the City Council before it is effective, and this is anticipated in the first quarter of 2021. The plan has an anticipated lifespan of 25 years. No changes to the plan are anticipated once it is adopted.

You can view the plan draft at this web address: <http://www.longbeach.gov/lbds/planning/globemaster-corridor-specific-plan/>

Please let me know if you have any other questions.

Regards,

**Scott Kinsey, AICP**  
*Planner V*

**Department of Development Services | Planning Bureau**  
[411 W. Ocean Blvd., 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor | Long Beach, CA 90802](#)  
Office: (562) 570-6461



To help balance the City's budget during this economic downturn, some services are closed on alternating Fridays for staff furloughs (unpaid time off). These furloughs affect many operations in all City Departments and help prevent significant service reductions to the community. To see a schedule of impacted service days, visit [www.longbeach.gov/furlough](http://www.longbeach.gov/furlough). We appreciate your patience and understanding.

---

**From:** Victoria Steinhorst <HerleyOffices@herley-kelleyco.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 02, 2020 3:09 PM  
**To:** Scott Kinsey <Scott.Kinsey@longbeach.gov>  
**Cc:** Maryanne Cronin <Maryanne.Cronin@longbeach.gov>

**Subject:** GlobeMaster Corridor Plan

**Importance:** High

-EXTERNAL-

Request for clarification and response

My name is David Herley and I represent The Blanche T. Herley Trust and the James E. Herley Bypass Trust. I am writing this email in response to the NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING I recently received in the mail regarding the Globemaster Corridor Plan, and wish to express my concerns regarding the affected income property we own within the designated 'Corridor'.

Our affected property is a critical part of our operation and is currently leased to two tenants: Maxim Crane Company and Discount Camper Shells. It is located at the North-West corner of Orange and Spring. The two addresses identifying the property are 3001 Orange Ave and 1175 East Spring Street.

I am requesting a timely clarification and response from you regarding the following:

1. Will the Globemaster Corridor Plan affect the operation and/or ownership of our property in any way, either now or in the future?
2. What changes to the 'Plan' are anticipated in the future, that will or may affect the operation and/or ownership of our property?
3. As stated in the PUBLIC NOTICE, '**I may be limited to raising only those issues that are raised at the public hearing (12-17-20), or in written correspondence on these matters delivered to the agency at or prior to the public hearing.**' I am therefore requesting your timely clarification and response to my questions and concerns, so that I may address them within the constraints you are imposing upon me.

Sincerely,

David M. Herley  
Herley Offices

[HerleyOffices@herley-kelleyco.com](mailto:HerleyOffices@herley-kelleyco.com)

(562) 424-2523

**From:** [PlanningCommissioners](#)  
**To:** [Scott Kinsey](#); [Alexis Oropeza](#); [Patricia Diefenderfer](#); [Maryanne Cronin](#); [Heather Flores](#); [Christopher Koontz](#); [Alyssa Brown](#); [Karen Moffitt](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Dec.17 meeting  
**Date:** Tuesday, December 15, 2020 2:53:29 PM

---

**From:** Glennis Dolce <glennisd@me.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 15, 2020 2:36 PM  
**To:** PlanningCommissioners <PlanningCommissioners@longbeach.gov>  
**Subject:** Dec.17 meeting

**-EXTERNAL-**

Regarding item 2 and the Globemaster Corridor Specific Plan-

From the June 2018 public meeting on this project a list of resident concerns was developed and requested to be addressed by the city regarding this plan. They were as follows:

*Participants expressed that the City could do a better job directly contacting businesses and property owners in the affected corridor plan zone. Currently, notices are in the form of press releases, social media postings and email newsletters. Clarify that this is a concept plan and not a development plan.*

*Increased traffic and parking issues in the area of future development need to result in improvements to public transportation, parking options, as well as protections for the adjoining nearby neighborhoods, notably the Cal Heights Historic neighborhood.*

*Any bicycle mobility plans should include consistency of surfaces and be safety driven.*

*New buildings should have a net zero goal- providing all the energy they use as well as installing purple and grey water systems for all landscaping needs.*

*Indicated also that the city should work with existing businesses to help them transition to new and changing economy rather than see them replaced with new businesses.*

*Adding design requirements that better integrate the new development into the existing character of the area rather than let developers decide completely on their own.*

*Add more greenscape along Cherry Avenue. Develop it so it is inviting to area residents and not just the businesses and employees that will occupy the buildings. Work with the City of Lakewood to keep visual consistency since the auto dealers there along Cherry are surrounded by this plan and are part of Lakewood, not Long Beach.*

*The plan needs a parking study especially in light of the stated desire of the plan to narrow traffic lanes and remove parallel parking options along Cherry Avenue.*

*The plan needs to have an additional overlay map that indicates the existing airport runway safety zones to better understand what can and can't be done in those areas affected.*

Please address each of the items and show where in the updated and Final GCSP 1891 page document it has been specifically addressed.

Thank you.

Glennis Dolce

**From:** [Scott Kinsey](#)  
**To:** [glennisd@me.com](mailto:glennisd@me.com)  
**Bcc:** [Christopher Koontz](#); [Patricia Diefenderfer](#); [Alexis Oropeza](#); [Maryanne Cronin](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Dec.17 meeting  
**Date:** Thursday, December 17, 2020 1:51:00 PM  
**Attachments:** [image007.png](#)  
[image008.png](#)  
[image009.png](#)

---

Hello,

Thank you for your comments. Please see the responses to your comments below *in blue*.

Sincerely,

**Scott Kinsey, AICP**  
Planner V

Department of Development Services | Planning Bureau  
411 W. Ocean Blvd., 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor | Long Beach, CA 90802  
Office: (562) 570-6461



To help balance the City's budget during this economic downturn, some services are closed on alternating Fridays for staff furloughs (unpaid time off). These furloughs affect many operations in all City Departments and help prevent significant service reductions to the community. To see a schedule of impacted service days, visit [www.longbeach.gov/furlough](http://www.longbeach.gov/furlough). We appreciate your patience and understanding.

---

**From:** Glennis Dolce <[glennisd@me.com](mailto:glennisd@me.com)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 15, 2020 2:36 PM  
**To:** PlanningCommissioners <[PlanningCommissioners@longbeach.gov](mailto:PlanningCommissioners@longbeach.gov)>  
**Subject:** Dec.17 meeting

**-EXTERNAL-**

Regarding item 2 and the Globemaster Corridor Specific Plan-

From the June 2018 public meeting on this project a list of resident concerns was developed and requested to be addressed by the city regarding this plan. They were as follows:

*Participants expressed that the City could do a better job directly contacting businesses and property owners in the affected corridor plan zone. Currently,*

notices are in the form of press releases, social media postings and email newsletters. Clarify that this is a concept plan and not a development plan. *The City will engage in additional outreach efforts during Phase 3 (Economic Development phase) of the C-17 Transition Master Plan process. The current proposal is a Specific Plan that regulates land uses; it does not contain a development proposal.*

*Increased traffic and parking issues in the area of future development need to result in improvements to public transportation, parking options, as well as protections for the adjoining nearby neighborhoods, notably the Cal Heights Historic neighborhood. The Specific Plan emphasizes TDM, park-once strategies, multi-modal/active transportation, complete streets, and overall vehicular trip reduction. This will also help reduce traffic effects on nearby neighborhoods such as Cal Heights.*

*Any bicycle mobility plans should include consistency of surfaces and be safety driven. Bicycle infrastructure will ultimately comply with the City's Bicycle Master Plan.*

*New buildings should have a net zero goal- providing all the energy they use as well as installing purple and grey water systems for all landscaping needs. Most of these items are regulated through the Building Code and apply to all new major developments regardless.*

*Indicated also that the city should work with existing businesses to help them transition to new and changing economy rather than see them replaced with new businesses. This will be included in the Phase 3 Economic Development outreach.*

*Adding design requirements that better integrate the new development into the existing character of the area rather than let developers decide completely on their own. This is one of the core purposes of the Specific Plan, which requires high-quality design standards for both private development and public spaces and thoroughfares.*

*Add more greenscape along Cherry Avenue. Develop it so it is inviting to area residents and not just the businesses and employees that will occupy the buildings. Work with the City of Lakewood to keep visual consistency since the auto dealers there along Cherry are surrounded by this plan and are part of Lakewood, not Long Beach. Like the above, this is a major component of the Specific Plan. The City is working with Lakewood as well.*

*The plan needs a parking study especially in light of the stated desire of the plan to narrow traffic lanes and remove parallel parking options along Cherry Avenue. The Specific Plan addresses parking to make sure new development will provide sufficient parking, while encouraging non-automobile modes of transportation to reduce vehicular traffic and parking demands.*

*The plan needs to have an additional overlay map that indicates the existing airport runway safety zones to better understand what can and can't be done in those areas affected. The Specific Plan contains this information and enhances the*

*clarity on these regulations above and beyond the City's current regulations.*

Please address each of the items and show where in the updated and Final GCSP 1891 page document it has been specifically addressed. *The latest version of the Specific Plan can be found at the following link, most of the above items are addressed in Chapters 3 and 4: <http://www.longbeach.gov/lbds/planning/globemaster-corridor-specific-plan/>*

Thank you.

Glennis Dolce

**From:** [Colleen Doan](#)  
**To:** [PlanningComission@longbeeach.gov](mailto:PlanningComission@longbeeach.gov); [Scott Kinsey](#)  
**Subject:** Signal Hill EIR Comments and Concerns  
**Date:** Thursday, December 17, 2020 5:10:03 PM  
**Importance:** High

---

**-EXTERNAL-**

Dear Long Beach PlanningComission and Planer Scott Kinsey,

Please read into the record the following statement from the City of SignalHill regarding the Globemaster SP.

We are dissatisfied with the responses to our City's comments. Our traffic engineer has reviewed the responses and disagrees with the many regardingour traffic concerns. We don't agree the response regarding the intersection LOS and are especially concerned with the response to comment 6-10, which states that the City of Signal Hill will need to undertake targeted physical improvements to maintain desired LOS.

We will be forwarding a formal response to the LB responses to our comments in the following days.

Regards,

Colleen T. Doan  
Community Development Director, City of Signal Hill  
562-989-7344  
[cdoan@cityofsignalhill.org](mailto:cdoan@cityofsignalhill.org)

**\*\*Please note, City Hall will be closed beginning Dec. 25, 2020 thru Jan. 1, 2021**

**\*\* Also please note City Hall will be closed on Fridays from September 4, 2020 through January 1, 2021.\*\***





California Heights Neighborhood Association  
3553 Atlantic Avenue, #350  
Long Beach, CA 90807

City of Long Beach  
Planning Commission  
411 W. Ocean Boulevard, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
Long Beach, California 90802

December 17, 2020

Dear Chair Lewis, Vice Chair Christoffels, and Commissioners Cruz, LaFarga, Ricks-Oddie, Templin, Verduzco-Vega:

Our organization, the California Heights Neighborhood Association (CHNA), is a non-profit organization working to promote public knowledge and preservation of historic and architectural resources within the largest historic district in Long Beach. Our historic district borders the proposed Specific Plan boundary at the northwest corner of Wardlow Road and Cherry Avenue. Due to this adjacency, we are very interested in potential impacts to our historic district.

First and foremost, we would like to thank City staff for reaching out to our organization and the broader community throughout this multi-year process. It has been a very collaborative effort and we are very appreciative of the City in addressing our earlier comments related to land uses and mitigation for potential historic resources within the Globemaster Corridor Specific Plan ("Specific Plan") area. Generally, we are pleased with the vision and framework of the Specific Plan. We are excited to see the former Boeing property transformed and bring additional jobs into the area. We are also excited about the idea of Cherry Avenue being transformed as indicated in the vision. Although we are supportive of this document, we believe that some modifications are needed to the Specific Plan and corresponding Environmental Impact Report (EIR) to ensure these benefits are not implemented at the cost of our neighborhood.

#### Comment No. 1 – Wardlow Design

The Specific Plan in Exhibit 4-3 identifies the existing condition of Wardlow Road does not reflect the existing condition to the west of Cherry, which only has two lanes of travel and on-street parking on both sides. Planned improvements to Wardlow Road identified in the Specific Plan includes adding a bike lane and removes on-street parking on both sides of the street. West of Cherry, on-street parking is heavily used by apartments and residents that do not have adequate on-site guest parking. Either a new cross section should be created for Wardlow Road to maintain the on-street spaces on the north side of the street, or the existing section should be annotated to identify the portion of Wardlow Road east of Cherry. We are agreeable to this design shown as long as it is limited to the portion of Wardlow Road east of Cherry Avenue.



California Heights Neighborhood Association  
3553 Atlantic Avenue, #350  
Long Beach, CA 90807

#### Comment No. 2 – Parking Requirement for Offices

Parking requirements for office uses identified in Section 5.5.6 of the Specific Plan (Page 85) have been reduced from the City's Code of roughly 4 spaces per 1,000 square feet (sf) for the first 20,000 sf of office buildings and 2 spaces per 1,000 sf thereafter to just 2 spaces per 1,000 sf. The Specific Plan also includes a reduction in the parking requirement for uses providing extensive open space (albeit, subject to a traffic study).

The east side of our neighborhood has issues where employees of commercial uses in Lakewood park in the neighborhood. We would not want development within this Specific Plan to amplify this impact. Furthermore, there does not seem to be any justification for this reduction, other than to appease developers of smaller office buildings. These future developments should comply with the Code just like every other office development outside of downtown (including those within the recently adopted Douglas Park Planned Development Code). Should these future developers need a parking reduction, they should request the reduction, provide adequate justification, and follow the procedures identified in the Specific Plan or other allowed parking reduction mechanisms found within the City's Code. We are not agreeable to a blanket reduction in parking requirements when developments here are required to meet the same Transportation Demand Management (TDM) requirements as elsewhere in the City.

#### Comment No. 3 – Cherry Avenue Design

We are concerned about the design of Cherry Avenue. We believe that this design will worsen circulation issues, as the portion between Spring and Wardlow (and further north to Carson) is commonly congested – even with minimal traffic being generated by the Boeing property being out of operation for about five (5) years).

A few facts about the existing Cherry Avenue design and the proposed design identified in the Specific Plan:

- The existing condition of Cherry Avenue includes two travel lanes in each direction, a center turn lane, and on-street parking. The proposed condition includes a landscape median and converting the on-street parking to a Class IV protected bike lane.
- Wardlow Road is not designated as a truck route and the Specific Plan identifies Wardlow Road as having "local deliveries."
- According to the General Plan, the intersection of Cherry and Wardlow already functions at Level of Service (LOS) E without any planned improvements. Cherry Avenue is also identified as a "congested northbound/southbound corridor" and is also identified as a Major Avenue.
- Table 5 of the City's Mobility Plan identifies that the maximum acceptable LOS for a Major Avenue is LOS D.
- Pre-COVID, northbound Cherry Avenue traffic frequently backed up from Wardlow Road to the 405 freeway, including back-up on the off-ramp. This northbound 405 off-ramp does not help, by requiring vehicles to yield to vehicles onto Cherry (which is impossible when it is backed up). This condition was amplified when the City recently allowed the Port of long Beach to temporarily store containers within the Specific Plan area. Traffic was backed up to the freeway during non-peak hours during the pandemic.



California Heights Neighborhood Association  
3553 Atlantic Avenue, #350  
Long Beach, CA 90807

- Cherry Avenue north of Wardlow Road generally consists of two travel lanes in each direction and includes a jogging jurisdictional boundary between Lakewood and Long Beach. North of Carson, where Cherry Avenue is fully within Long Beach, Cherry Avenue consists of three travel lanes in each direction.
- Historically, traffic from the Boeing property used our neighborhood for cut-through traffic. This is evident by the existing signage at the intersection of 36<sup>th</sup> Street and Cherry Avenue, prohibiting westbound traffic past Cherry Avenue on 36<sup>th</sup> Street during the PM Peak hour.
- The City of Signal Hill, on Comment No. 6-9 of the FEIR, has expressed that "Cherry Avenue from Spring to 19th will not include bike facilities."

We anticipate that this project will include different specialties and will become a regional hub of employment in the South Bay, attracting employees from beyond Long Beach. Implementing a Class IV bike lane in Cherry Avenue that will not continue south of Spring in the foreseeable future and could potentially not travel north of Wardlow since portions of that right-of-way are located in the City of Lakewood could impede implementation of the Class IV Bike Lane that would help alleviate traffic. The Specific Plan should not just require a utopian dream, but it needs to look at and anticipate what can be implemented.

Furthermore, the Specific Plan has the opportunity to enhance travel for all modes and to make Cherry Avenue more resilient and accommodating for future transportation needs. Due to Cherry's proximity to the 405 freeway and existing non-compliance with the General Plan, we recommend that Cherry Avenue cross section should be modified between the 405 on/off ramps and Wardlow Road to include a transitional lanes or right-turn turn lane in lieu of the Class IV bike lane in the interim condition. This way, traffic can flow directly from the freeway to these new uses as well as to the freeway (the 405 southbound on-ramp from Cherry Avenue southbound already has this lane). Once agreements can be secured with the cities of Lakewood and Signal Hill, implementing the Class IV Bike Lane from Carson Street to Wardlow Avenue, then the third lane could be converted into the Class IV bike lane to help alleviate the increased traffic.

If congestion worsens on Cherry Avenue, trucks and employees will travel the path of least resistance and use Wardlow Road or other roads through our neighborhood to avoid congestion. Using Douglas Park as an example, Carson Avenue has six lanes of travel and a Class I bike route on the south side of the ROW. Carson also has the same designation as Cherry Avenue (Major Avenue). The other major street, Lakewood Boulevard, has 7 lanes of travel, though it is designated as a Regional Connector. The Douglas Park development added the 7<sup>th</sup> lane, which is a right turn lane between Carson and Cover. We are requesting the same treatment on Cherry Avenue between Wardlow Road and the 405 on/off ramps for both northbound and southbound travel.

We enjoy bike lanes and we want the project to be successful, but it should not be at the expense to our neighborhood by increasing cut-through traffic to the benefit of non-local developers and property owners.

Thank for your consideration,

California Heights Neighborhood Association