

#	Comment	Element	Page	Response
1	Replace General Plan Cover photo to a non-aerial view of Culver City	Cover	0	Replace cover photo.
2	<p>The GPU mentions the people who were on the Advisory Committee, TACs, etc. but does not reference anywhere any of the commissioners who also participated. As commissioners are also volunteers, I believe that it is important to name them. The current commissioners can be found online in the city's website.</p> <p>https://www.culvercity.org/City-Hall/Boards-Commissions</p> <p>As I'm on Cultural Affairs, I'll list the current Cultural Affairs Commissioners:</p> <p>Tania Fleischer Ehsaan Mesghali Leora O'Carroll Brenda G Williams Jeannine Wisnosky Stehlin</p>	Introduction	4	<p>The City appreciates the participation of boards and commissions in the development of the General Plan Update. A new section will be added listing the Commissions, Boards, & Committees who participated in the development of the General Plan. Add:</p> <p>"Commissions, Boards & Committees Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee Advisory Committee on Housing and Homelessness Cultural Affairs Commission Disability Advisory Committee Parks, Recreation and Community Services Commission"</p>
3	<p>Finally, the GPU mentions the people who were on the TACs, etc. but does not reference anywhere any of the commissioners. I believe that it is important to name the Cultural Affairs Commissioners who gave feedback on this document. The current Cultural Affairs commissioners can be found online in the city's website.</p> <p>Current Cultural Affairs Commissioners who gave official feedback are:</p> <p>Jeannine Wisnosky Stehlin Leora O'Carroll Brenda G Williams Ehsaan Mesghali Tania Fleischer</p> <p>To that end, other commissioners should also be referenced and credited.</p>	Introduction	4	<p>The City appreciates the participation of boards and commissions in the development of the General Plan Update. A new section will be added listing the Commissions, Boards, & Committees who participated in the development of the General Plan. Add:</p> <p>"Commissions, Boards & Committees Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee Advisory Committee on Housing and Homelessness Cultural Affairs Commission Disability Advisory Committee Parks, Recreation and Community Services Commission"</p>
4	Include the Reimagining Public Safety element	User Guide	12	The Reimagining Public Safety Element is not being included in the General Plan Update per the decision at the 11/13/2023 City Council meeting. No change recommended.
5	Where is the policing element?	User Guide	12	The Reimagining Public Safety Element is not being included in the General Plan Update per the decision at the 11/13/2023 City Council meeting. No change recommended.
6	<p>THE Culver City General Plan should include the Reimagining Public Safety Element.</p> <p>On November 13, 2023, the City Council voted 3:2 to exclude the Reimagining Public Safety Element from the General Plan Update. This Element does NOT call for "defunding the police."</p> <p>It incorporated extensive public input, including a survey with more than 2,500 respondents, far more than other Culver City surveys used to determine public policy.</p> <p>People have claimed the General Plan is "just a land-use document." If that were the case, it wouldn't require an Environmental Justice section. "A general plan is each local government's blueprint for meeting the community's long-term vision for the future." In discussing General Plan guidelines, the state describes Health in All Policies (HiAP), "a collaborative, cross-sectoral approach... to address the social and environmental factors that drive health outcomes and health inequities."</p> <p>The Culver City Reimagining Public Safety Element complements the other elements of the General Plan with a forward-thinking concept of community safety and well-being.</p> <p>The Reimagining Public Safety Element:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Acknowledges the role of police in enforcing a racial caste system and the costs of mass incarceration to communities. - Reviews other Culver City and regional agencies that can address social problems in place of police. - Establishes a regular process to audit police activities so they can be assigned elsewhere. - Recognizes that many crimes are driven by desperation, and it is more humane and effective to provide for basic human needs than to punish those who find no legal means to meet them. - Recognizes that victims of crime are poorly served by the current system, rarely receiving restorative services. - Recommends civilian oversight of CCPD, rewriting police policies to prioritize protection of human lives, and increasing transparency and accountability at every level. - Sets a target budget level of no more than half of what the city spends on all other public safety programs combined. - The Reimagining Public Safety Element charts a municipal roadmap to addressing social problems such as homelessness, traffic safety, substance abuse, domestic violence, school discipline, shoplifting, and mental illness without primary reliance on law enforcement. 	User Guide	12	The Reimagining Public Safety Element is not being included in the General Plan Update per the decision at the 11/13/2023 City Council meeting. No change recommended.

#	Comment	Element	Page	Response
7	<p>The Culver City General Plan should include the Reimagining Public Safety Element.</p> <p>On November 13, 2023, the City Council voted 3:2 to exclude the Reimagining Public Safety Element from the General Plan Update.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This Element does NOT call for “defunding the police.” • The Reimagining Public Safety element incorporated extensive public input, including a survey with more than 2,500 respondents, far more than other Culver City surveys used to determine public policy. Individual police officers and police leadership were invited to participate in the process and chose not to participate. • People have claimed the General Plan is “just a land-use document.” If that were the case, it wouldn’t require an Environmental Justice section. “A general plan is each local government’s blueprint for meeting the community’s long-term vision for the future.” In discussing General Plan guidelines, the state describes Health in All Policies (HiAP), “a collaborative, cross-sectoral approach... to address the social and environmental factors that drive health outcomes and health inequities.” <p>The Culver City Reimagining Public Safety Element complements the other elements of the General Plan with a forward-thinking concept of community safety and well-being.</p> <p>The Reimagining Public Safety Element:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acknowledges the role of police in enforcing a racial caste system and the costs of mass incarceration to communities. • Reviews other Culver City and regional agencies that can address social problems in place of police. • Establishes a regular process to audit police activities so they can be assigned elsewhere. • Recognizes that many crimes are driven by desperation, and that it is more humane and effective to provide for basic human needs than to punish those who find no legal means to meet them. • Recognizes that victims of crime are poorly served by the current system, rarely receiving restorative services. • Recommends civilian oversight of CCPD, rewriting police policies to prioritize protection of human lives, and increasing transparency and accountability at every level. • Sets a target budget level of no more than half of what the city spends on all other public safety programs combined. <p>The Reimagining Public Safety Element charts a municipal roadmap to addressing social problems such as homelessness, traffic safety, substance abuse, domestic violence, school discipline, shoplifting, and mental illness without primary reliance on law enforcement. These are key elements of public safety without which a safety element is not complete.</p>	User Guide	12	<p>The Reimagining Public Safety Element is not being included in the General Plan Update per the decision at the 11/13/2023 City Council meeting. No change recommended.</p>
8	<p>As a member of the General Plan Update Advisory Committee and the Rethinking Public Safety Technical Advisory Committee, I know what data was collected, what arguments were heard, and what policies were supported by evidence and fit the guiding principles of the General Plan. I ask that you restore the draft to accurately reflect our work. I ask also that you restore the Reimagining Public Safety element. My colleagues and I worked very hard on this, as did Raimi and Associates, and it is unacceptable for the City Council to delete it without a single substantive argument. This is a visionary text, if I may say so myself, and is already being embraced by activists in other cities who have the honesty and courage to follow through on the challenges of the abolitionist movement.</p>	User Guide	12	<p>The Reimagining Public Safety Element is not being included in the General Plan Update per the decision at the 11/13/2023 City Council meeting. No change recommended.</p>
9	<p>Met all the 3rd party associates, were very idealistic, wants a plan that is implementable, how do we get to a doable not aspirational plan... maybe having a shorter-term plan that is doable would be beneficial.</p>	User Guide	16	<p>The General Plan is designed to be aspirational to achieve the Community Vision for the Future. Other plans like the Short-Range Transit Plan focus on near-term action. However, it does contain short-term implementation actions (actions designed to be implemented within 1-5 years of adopting the Plan) to achieve progress. Goal GL-7 includes related policies and actions to implement the Plan. Per policy GL-7.1, the City will require integration of General Plan implementation actions into departmental workplans. The City will also, per GL-7.2, update the City's website with implementation status via the General Plan Annual Progress Report. No change recommended.</p>
10	<p>Guiding principles: under diversity and housing I am missing a reference to the regional shortage of housing and the guiding principle to grow the housing supply given the high demand and high job density.</p>	User Guide	17	<p>The "Leader/Model City" guiding principal aspires for the City to be a proactive leader in solving regional, state, and national challenges surrounding issues like housing, climate change, or mobility. The Guiding Principles are benchmarks that guided policy development and generally do not identify the exact reasons why they are in place. No change recommended.</p>
11	<p>What is also glaringly absent from the Plan are analytics, metrics, and quantitative support for the proposals. May I suggest adding a section that calls for this for future planning and evaluation of individual projects. Also, there is no discussion of what the City experience will be if all the building proposed went through - no discussion of real impact.</p> <p>Actual numbers included in the Plan leap out: there has been a 4% increasing in housing units over 20 years, while traffic, crowding, and associated problems have increased substantially, and now the proposed Plan wants to add 67% more housing units (11,500 units) in 20 years, with zero discussion of how the City will manage this stunning increase and what the City will look like. It will not look good. This is a giant point that is totally unaddressed in the Plan or Element.</p>	User Guide	17	<p>The General Plan Update was informed by technical analysis, including existing conditions reports and technical analysis of the preferred land use alternative. Plan impacts are being evaluated and will be disclosed in the General Plan's Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR). The housing growth projections that are studied in the EIR are based three anticipated RHNA cycles through the Genreal Plan horizon year of 2045. No change recommended.</p>

#	Comment	Element	Page	Response
12	<p>I believe the Plan Guiding Principles and the Framework could use some additions. As it reads, it seems the current proposed Plan follows the philosophies of the previous Council (2 years ago). It seems a few things are missing, and one could argue that the proposals in the Plan could be analyzed through the lens of these points, and it would benefit CC's residents:</p> <p>Guiding Principles and Areas of Examination:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Maintain and Enhance the Quality of Life of Current Residents - Security and Privacy of Residents - Freedom of Choice for Residents - Close Overseeing of City Spending, Looking for Value and Economies <p>Back to the thought of what Principles and Policy Framework points that might be added: Quality of Life would include exposure to pollution, parking issues, free-flowing traffic, reduction of idling cars. Security would be safety, as in dedicated and ongoing analyses of how controlled growth will impact crime, traffic, etc. Privacy would have us take a keen look at proposals like cameras installed to monitor traffic violations - that would be a serious privacy issue and had a Big Brother Feel. Rather than throwaway excuses for bringing such a system in (that it would supposedly be more egalitarian), an analysis needs to be done on what is sacrifice if we consider going to cameras, and this would include a report from the police.</p> <p>Freedom of Choice might include removing mandates for electric energy, electric automobiles, and all-electric buildings. Why shouldn't residents have a choice? Also, mandating anything like that will most likely could very negatively impact lower income residents: most electric-energy-only choices are more expensive. The plan may be well behind the curve in the area of building charging stations, for example, as 3,800+ auto dealers recently wrote the President to inform him of lukewarm demand for electric vehicles:</p> <p>https://evvoiceofthecustomer.com/</p> <p>Again, the reexamination of the Plan is for professionals, these points are just quick ideas. Thank you.</p>	User Guide	17	The Vision and Guiding Principles represent input received on the General Plan from the community, General Plan Advisory Community, City Council, and other City commissions, boards, and committees during the vision phase of the project. No change recommended.
13	Remove or revise Reimagining Public Safety Guiding Principle because the Reimagining Public Safety Element will no longer be included in the General Plan.	User Guide	18	Reimagining Public Safety Element removed from the General Plan. Remove " PUBLIC SAFETY Reimagine public safety to invest in living wage jobs, health care services, stable housing, and educational opportunities. Ensure public safety addresses the root causes and symptoms of crime and violence. Improve law enforcement practices like carrying out safe interactions, ensuring independent oversight, and building community trust."
14	Diversified and circular economy – what is that goal/strategy and what actions relate the achieving this?	User Guide	18	The Economic Development Element contains goals related to the economy. The GHG Reduction Element and Infrastructure Element contains policies related to the circular economy. No change recommended.
15	<p>Not all of the restrictions were based on race. There were several periods where different immigrant groups were discriminated against including: Italians, Irish, Latinos and Hispanics, Catholics, Jews, Native Americans, Asian and more. Not all of these people are "other people of color" or "non-Christian faiths," yet all faced barriers to housing and land ownership</p> <p>This language is not inclusive enough. Why are all Black people referred to as African American? Many Black people trace their routes to the Caribbean, not Africa.</p> <p>Does it make sense to designate "other people of color" as a category? The experience of the Japanese and Japanese Americans is different from that of the southern Europeans who were routinely discriminated against as "undesirable." The early Mexican landowners were also considered as more of a loan risk.</p> <p>The large pool of people who were discriminated against is not adequately covered with this language.</p>	User Guide	19	<p>The General Plan expands further on restrictions placed on housing and landownership on page 28. The various groups discriminated against are detailed on page 28, and it also expands to include both "Black and African American" communities as a historically discriminated group, not just "Black" communities.</p> <p>No change recommended.</p>
16	I would like to have a discussion regarding the introduction... Although it is partially accurate, it feels very one sided. As an introduction to our city.	General Plan Background	21	The General Plan Background and Introduction have been reviewed with the Historical Context Study released by the City and has been found to be accurate. No change recommended.
17	Add Culver City Neighborhoods Figure.	General Plan Background	22	Remove photo from page 22 of the Plan. Add "Local Context" text from page 24 to page 22. After the sentence, "Culver City distinguished by its unique natural resources, landmarks, and places, shown in Figure 3," add the following sentence: " Culver City's distinct neighborhoods are depicted in Figure 4. " Move Figure 3 to page 24 and the Neighborhoods Figure as Figure 4 on page 25.

#	Comment	Element	Page	Response
18	Current Cultural corridor (from east to west): Ivy substation – Historic Architecture/ theatre for the Actor’s Gang Culver Studios – Historic Mansion/ Amazon Studios – Entertainment The Culver Steps – Summer Music Festival & other performances Public Art – throughout Downtown including Town Plaza+ City Hall Kirk Douglas Theatre – Historic Building, Theatre for Center Theatre Group Village Well – Bookstore Sony Pictures Studios – Historic Architecture / Entertainment/ Public Art Veterans Memorial Building – Historic Architecture / Auditorium Culver City Historical Society’s Archives Resource Center within VMB Wende Museum – Museum Glorya Kaufman Creative Community Center (opening soon)	General Plan Background	24	Add text to bullet three: -Culver City is home to multiple arts districts (Culver City Arts District, Cultural Corridor, Hayden Tract, and Helms Bakery) that are thriving hubs of creative activity. The Cultural Corridor has a cluster of creative sector businesses, cultural institutions, and historic architecture. The Cultural Corridor includes landmarks such as the Ivy Substation at its northern terminus, the Culver Steps, Kirk Douglas Theatre, Sony Pictures Studio, and the Wende Museum at its southern end.
19	Please consider elaborating on the Cultural Corridor. The information below could impact Elements 4, 5, and 6 as well. Culver City’s Cultural Corridor continues to enliven Culver Boulevard as a vibrant thoroughfare with cultural institutions, public art, historic architecture and prominent studios. From Downtown to Veterans Memorial Complex: The Ivy Substation - The Actors’ Gang Theater / Historic Architecture The Culver Studios Mansion - Amazon Studios/ Historic Architecture The Culver Steps - Community Gathering Place presenting performances, screenings, and the Summer Sunset Concert Series The Culver Theater - Cinema Kirk Douglas Theatre - Center Theatre Group / Historic Architecture Village Well - Books, Cafe and Events Sony Pictures Studio - Sony Pictures Entertainment / Historic Architecture / Public Art Veterans Memorial Building - Performance and Event Space / Historic Designation for Veterans Memorial Complex Culver City Historical Society Archives Resource Center - within Veterans Memorial Building Wende Museum - Art Museum, Cultural Center, and Archive of the Cold War Gloryia Kaufman Creative Community Center - Wende Museum’s Cultural and Educational Facility Also, over 10 pieces of Public Art dot the Cultural Corridor with clusters of art at The Culver Steps/Town Plaza, and City Hall.	General Plan Background	24	Per a response to another comment, more detail about the Cultural Corridor will be added to page 24.
20	The Arts, Culture, and Creative Economy element has some things missing. For instance, there is reference to the Cultural Corridor, but it does not define what this is. The Cultural Corridor is basically from the Ivy Substation (Actors Gang) all the way to the Wende and soon to be Glorya Kaufman Center. It includes the Kirk Douglass Theatre, etc. There are a lot of cultural points along the way, like the Lion Fountain in Town Plaza, Amazon and the Culver Studios, and the Rainbow at Sony, Sony itself, the Historical Society museum at the Veterans Memorial Building, etc. Please find a place to define it.	General Plan Background	24	Per a response to another comment, more detail about the Cultural Corridor will be added to the Introduction of the Plan on page 24.
21	The "red" least desirable section that crosses Venice Blvd. north of Washington has the following population description: The area is definitely blighted and is therefore accorded a "high red" grade. Population e. Shifting or Infiltration: Slight infiltration c. Foreign Families: 5%. Nationalities: Mexicans and Italians d. Negro: 0% b. Class and Occupation: Airplane factory workers, motion picture common labor, artisans, etc. Income \$1000 to \$1500	General Plan Background	28	Noted. This is the population description from the HOLC map. No change recommended.
22	It was very nice to meet you at the last GPU community meeting. I have given page 28 of the GPU a great deal of thought. Personally, I believe that this page should be rewritten and not part of this weeks closing discussions. As the city has invested quite a bit of money to have a Racial study done about the history of our city, I would recommend that we hold off on any finalization of this page until we are able to read and review the study. This page is our introduction to our city and will be around for many years to come. So, to me accuracy is of the utmost importance. I spoke with Andrew Goodrich last week and he said that the city will have something to review very soon, and it will be available to the community within the next few months. Hoping by February or so. I want to express my feelings of the importance to get it right. I hope that you will agree with this thought. I do look forward to hearing from you.	General Plan Background	28	Page 28 has been reviewed with the Historical Context Study released by the City and has been found to be accurate. No change recommended.
23	The deed restrictions were put into place not by the City in an official legal capacity, instead they were "required" by the banks and mortgage lenders. I question the use of the phrase "These exclusions were legalized..."	General Plan Background	28	Page 28 has been reviewed with the Historical Context Study released by the City and has been found to be accurate. No change recommended.
24	Does Mr. Kent have the education and training, and research abilities to be cited as a major source for the history of Culver City?	General Plan Background	28	Page 28 has been reviewed with the Historical Context Study released by the City and has been found to be accurate. The Historical Context Study released by the City was done in conjunction with various Architectural Historians and experts that have provided insight into the history of Culver City, including the historical discriminatory practices. No change recommended.
25	Will the language about the "racist past" be put into proper context? John Kent is not a reliable source for the full context.	General Plan Background	28	The City released a Historical Context Study that included various architectural historians and experts that have found Culver City's past discriminatory practices and reaffirmed what Mr. Kent had previously stated. No change recommended.

#	Comment	Element	Page	Response
26	Consider the source of this quote. The language of "formal City entities" including police, attorneys and Informal city actors is unclear. Were there racists and segregationists in the city, police, etc, undoubtedly this is true. The question is, was this a city policy and what are the historical citations to establish this.	General Plan Background	28	The Historical Context Study found that the KKK was associated with "formal City entities." No change recommended.
27	Perhaps the report should be fact checked to support the claim that there was active KKK enforced racial exclusion. Googling KKK and Culver City comes up with one instance where a Culver City resident was identified as a KKK member. KKK seems to be used as a shorthand for saying racially and ethnically motivated "racial exclusion" which seems to be a much more accurate descriptor for the blatant demeaning and disenfranchisement of peoples other than people of White English speaking European origin.	General Plan Background	28	The Historical Context Study released by the City states that the KKK was active in the early years of Culver City. There is evidence provided in the study that the KKK had some association with Culver City. No change recommended.
28	A lot of the language in the redlining is discriminatory and racially and ethnically charged. Those were not the only reasons neighborhoods were deemed declining or hazardous. There are several reference to lack of drainage, proximity of oil wells, substandard housing etc. This is for the area adjacent to downtown Culver City: Location is unattractive detrimentally affected by proximity to industry and business districts (Which contain a number of Mexican families) and oil wells one half mile southeast.	General Plan Background	28	The HOLC appraisers rated neighborhoods based on various factors other than race, but the worksheets the appraisers used reveal racial biases which negatively impacted a neighborhood's rating. No change recommended.
29	p. 28 History of Exclusionary Policies and Practices Redlining, study the actual map, there are no locations or areas within Culver City that were designated "A" for investments. The only two small areas one off Culver, and the other near Lindburgh Park were marked "low B" It was difficult for everyone who wanted to live in Culver City to get the loans and investments. Most of the city was marked C or D. Basically, all of Culver City was deemed a questionable investment. This was a working-class town. The studio workers, steamfitters, and plumbers could actually afford to live in the city. This broader context should be mentioned. Redlining was not only based on Black or Mexican American designations. Discrimination in the mid-30s included any newer group of immigrants including Jews, Japanese, Italians, and Irish who were considered "hazardous" and "subversive" too. Discrimination was also against lower-income people and "foreign families." Much of the low grading was influenced by poor drainage and poor construction of buildings. Redlining was created by the federal government and perpetuated by the banks. Developers included exclusionary language in the deeds against Blacks, Hispanics, Latinos, Japanese, Jews and other immigrants. Also note: From the GP: "Newspapers advertisements of the time show the roots of racially exclusionary development policies in Culver City." "formal City entities such as informal city actors, such as the Ku Klux Klan, enforced racial exclusion. The historical source is John Kent. Has anyone looked into his academic qualifications? The area was laced with discrimination against anyone not "white." But is there evidence of the Klan in Culver City? What advertisements are being referred to?	General Plan Background	28	The redlining of the city was influenced by race, and the "blue/desirable" designation was given only to the districts that were described as being occupied by white collar businessmen, who were all White. This area also had deed restrictions which protected against "racial hazards". The HOLC appraisers rated neighborhoods based on various factors other than race, but the worksheets the appraisers used reveal racial biases which negatively impacted a neighborhood's rating. Various advertisements referred to the "restricted" nature of properties in the City, which was understood at the time to include restrictions on the basis of race. Some newspapers include the Los Angeles Times and The Los Angeles Herald. Other advertisements from this time were more subtle in their messaging, but nonetheless promoted an image of "whiteness" as something optimal, paralleling broader societal attitudes towards race and ethnicity. No change recommended.
30	How many newspaper advertisements and where were they published? There is an advertisement created by an early developer which refers to Culver City as an idea "white city." Can you cite where Henry Culver or the city itself created racially exclusionary advertisements? The redlining was federal and basically declared the vast majority of existing neighborhoods and areas of Culver City as undesirable for loan purposes. Redlining identified areas where the federal government and its evaluators determined were very poor, poor, or hazardous area to sustain loans and mortgages. No part of Culver City was deemed to have minimal risk for banks and other mortgage lenders. The banks and developers maintained the limited availability of financing. The entire city at the time (1936) was deemed Red: highly undesirable with substandard building, substandard land and too many Blacks, Mexicans, Asians (particularly Japanese) Jews, and southern and eastern Europeans including: Polish, Hungarian, Czech, Greek, Mexican, Russian, Slavic and Syrian. Red = Hazardous Yellow = Declining Blue = Desirable Green = Best There were two very small "low blue" areas in Culver City. The conclusion is that redlining disadvantaged all peoples living in Culver City at the time especially: Blacks, Mexicans, Japanese, Jews, Italians, and Slavs. Red was hazardous, Yellow	General Plan Background	28	Various advertisements referred to the "restricted" nature of properties in the City, which was understood at the time to include restrictions on the basis of race. Some newspapers include the Los Angeles Times and The Los Angeles Herald. Other advertisements from this time were more subtle in their messaging, but nonetheless promoted an image of "whiteness" as something optimal, paralleling broader societal attitudes towards race and ethnicity. The redlining of the City was influenced by race, and the "blue/desirable" designation was given to the districts that were described as being occupied by white collar businessmen, who were all White. This area also had deed restrictions which protected against "racial hazards". No change recommended.
31	Eliminate rent control and tenant protections. These policies exacerbate the issue of building more housing.	General Plan Background	32	The City adopted a rent control ordinance and a tenant protections ordinance in 2020. It is not the intent of the City at this time to revise these ordinances. No change recommended.
32	Update General Plan Update Process section to more accurately reflect project dates.	General Plan Background	33	Revise the following text: The General Plan process was comprised of five stages that began in 2019 and ended in 2023 2024.
33	If we have comments for the text, are we limited to the comment form or are there other ways to provide public comment?	General Plan Background	33	Members of the community were able to provide comments via the online comment form, attending a community workshop (in person or hybrid), or by calling or emailing the City between September 30 and November 30, 2023. No change recommended.
34	Need more environmental studies	General Plan Background	34	An EIR evaluating the impacts of the Culver City General Plan was released in spring 2024. No change recommended.

#	Comment	Element	Page	Response
35	A lot of third party at the events, is the General Plan signed off by city council or third party (consultants)?	General Plan Background	34	City Council will take action on the General Plan in Fall 2024. No change recommended.
36	Ownership of the General Plan document- Who is the owner of the document?	General Plan Background	34	Per California State law, all cities and counties are required to adopt General Plans. The City is responsible for adopting and implementing the General Plan. No change recommended.
37	Who wrote the General Plan?	General Plan Background	34	The General Plan was written by City staff and the consultant team, informed by technical analysis and findings from community engagement. The Plan underwent multiple rounds of review by City staff before the Public Review Draft was released to the public. No change recommended.
38	Winter/spring EIR: what is that?	General Plan Background	34	The Public Draft General Plan Environmental Impact Report was released to the public in spring 2024. No change recommended.
39	Update "Review and Adoption" timeframe.	General Plan Background	34	Revise adoption timeline to read " Winter Summer 2024"
40	Add additional pop-up engagement events to page held during the General Plan review period.	General Plan Background	36	Add the following events in the bulleted list under Pop-Up Workshops and Community Events: Summer Sunset Concert Series, Juneteenth Celebration and Resource Fair, Culver City Pride Rally
41	Update community engagement section to reflect activities held during the "Review and Adoption" stage	General Plan Background	36	Change text in the Community Workshops and Festivals section to read: "The City hosted nine 14 community meetings and festivals that included interactive components such as mapping exercises, real-time balloting, and arts-based engagement to gather input from participants. These events were planned around key phases of the General Plan Update process, primarily the visioning, alternatives, and policy frameworks, and General Plan review phases. "
42	Update community engagement section to reflect activities held during the "Review and Adoption" stage	General Plan Background	37	Change colon after "Online Storybank" to a period for formatting consistency. "Online Storybank:."
43	Update community engagement section to reflect activities held during the "Review and Adoption" stage	General Plan Background	37	Add the following text as a new bullet after the Online Storybank section: "Public Draft General Plan Online Comment Form. Following the release of the Public Draft General Plan, the City posted a feedback form on General Plan project website to obtain comments from members from the community on the Public Draft General Plan. The feedback form was open from September through November 2023."
44	The section attributes inequities to racial injustice, when both subjective and objective evidence points to economic factors. It is wrong to assume that all people of color are poor. That assumption should not be baked into the General Plan.	Community Health and Environmental Justice	41	The Community Health and Environmental Justice Element does not attribute health inequities solely to race. Per page 42 of the General Plan, "According to California Health and Safety Code Section 39711, a disadvantaged community is defined as "a low-income area that is disproportionately affected by environmental pollution and other hazards that can lead to negative health effects, exposure, or environmental degradation." For the purposes of the Culver City General Plan, "disadvantaged communities" are referred to as "SB 1000 Priority Neighborhoods." The California Communities Environmental Health Screening Tool (CalEnviroScreen) is a screening methodology that can be used to identify SB 1000 Priority Neighborhoods burdened by multiple sources of pollution. These neighborhoods are defined as: (1) census tracts that score in the top quartile of the CalEnviroScreen 4.0 tool; or, (2) census tracts or block groups that are low-income and disproportionately affected by environmental pollution and other hazards that can lead to negative health effects, exposure, or environmental degradation." Race is not a criteria in the State's analysis. No change recommended.
45	Our household is glad to see that the plan pays close attention to affordable housing and health/environmental equity. These are key to Culver City's next few decades, we believe. The community has sometimes been divided on the single family home/density issues, but we think the plan may help keep very rapidly rising unaffordability for middle class families at bay. Essential to increasing density will be the ability to get around without a car -- so the integration of transportation innovation is equally important.	Community Health and Environmental Justice	49	Noted. No change recommended.
46	IA. CHEJ-3: I support the accessible health and social services programming. If I were to ask the Director of Parks and Director of Housing about the progrma would they know what I was talking about?	Community Health and Environmental Justice	50	Implementation actions were developed in collaboration with the specified departments. No change recommended.
47	IA. CHEJ-20: I support the ongoing partnership and program for the Safe Routes to School.	Community Health and Environmental Justice	53	Noted. No change recommended.

#	Comment	Element	Page	Response
48	IA. CHEJ-28: I support the ongoing program of evaluation of pilot projects. It is very much in line with Mayor Vera's State of the City address focused on innovation, compassion and hope.	Community Health and Environmental Justice	54	Noted. No change recommended.
49	City Council recently disbanded the Fiesta La Ballona Committee. Revise list of committees in the Governance and Leadership Element	Governance and Leadership	61	City Council recently disbanded the Fiesta La Ballona Committee. Revise list of committees in the Governance and Leadership Element to strike out " Fiesta La Ballona Committee ".
50	Tax and revenue generation to provide resources and fund community priorities	Governance and Leadership	66	Policy GL-1.7 aims to design and implement City budgets that reflect the community's values. It also aims to actively engage community members, particularly groups that are traditionally underrepresented in public spending decisions. No change recommended.
51	Participatory budgeting	Governance and Leadership	66	Policy GL-1.7 aims to design and implement City budgets that reflect the community's values. It also aims to actively engage community members, particularly groups that are traditionally underrepresented in public spending decisions. No change recommended.
52	Please stop with the racial, equity, and diversity initiatives and leave them out of the governance decisions. These programs are, by definition, racist. The civil rights movement allowed everyone to be treated equally under the law. The residents of Culver City are now policymakers of the past. They are people and families of different backgrounds who moved to Culver City to work, raise their families, or do both. They are not perpetuating any past wrongs and have no obligation to make reparations for any of those bad policies that don't exist today. They do not owe one race more than any other race. IA GL-12 Your REAP, IA GL-13, and GL 3.3 are racist policies that force the City to elevate only people of color and exclude people of another color. Some mental gymnastics need to be made to believe that your race or the color of your skin is why you would get a job over someone who is white or Asian. You do not even make clear if the resulting staff is supposed to represent in proportion to the race distribution of the entire United States or just a requirement that everyone be a different color. People work hard to get jobs, and you don't know their background. Still, you are going to disqualify one applicant who is, in your view, from a more privileged background, whether or not it's true, and give that opportunity to a person who appears to be from a disadvantaged background, again without knowing that they may have come from a privileged background. Not only is this unfair, it's fundamentally racist. Two wrongs do not make a right, and it is as insulting to the person who was not given the job because of the color of their skin as the person who got the staff job because they happened to be born a particular skin color or sex or some other characteristic that is out of their control. In summary, please refrain from making policies that are racist, that create division, that incentivize based on color. If you want to create a just city and community, start by rewarding those based on their achievement and not some physical characteristic. It's insulting and demeaning to the residents of Culver City. The City leaders need to strive to be better and work with those to provide a hand up, not give a handout. It will help the disadvantaged build their self-worth and self-esteem to take agency in their future and move forward with pride.	Governance and Leadership	67	One of the Core Values of the General Plan is equity and inclusion, and the Core Values were used to guide policy development. Goal GL-3 advances equity in daily operations through program evaluation, assessment, and training. No change recommended.
53	Is there a regular schedule of updates that happens, e.g., progress updates of GP?	Governance and Leadership	69	Goal GL-7 includes related policies and actions to implement the Plan. Per policy GL-7.1, the City will require integration of General Plan implementation actions into departmental workplans. The City will also, per GL-7.2, update the City's website with implementation status via the General Plan Annual Progress Report. No change recommended.
54	Does the track record of what we implemented in the GP relevant to getting grants?	Governance and Leadership	69	Yes, the City can be eligible for grants based on progress on implementing the General Plan. No change recommended.
55	IA GL-8: I encourage, support, recommend continued support.	Governance and Leadership	71	Noted. No change recommended.
56	IA GL-9: I believe it's possible to assess appointment procedures and member representation on CBC's every year. It could be rolled into the existing application, interview, and nomination process.	Governance and Leadership	71	Reagrding IA-GL.9, the City prefers to review CBC procedures every 2-4 years rather than annually. No change recommended.
57	IA. GL-5-7: The type of action for these 3 goals vary from community survey, website update, and program evaluation. I would recommend considering a participatory budgeting program to tie them together..	Governance and Leadership	71	While budget hearings are open to the public, the City does not intend to initiate a participatory budgeting process. No change recommended.
58	IA. GL-18: Interactive mapping should be associated with GL-7. It would be an appropriately user friendly geographic display of public spending.	Governance and Leadership	73	Revise Associated Goals to: "GL-5, GL-7 "
59	In this analysis, although the scope is fantastic, have we made an analysis about implementation and budget? Are we making these considerations?	Governance and Leadership	76	An analysis of General Plan implementation cost has not be completed. IA-GL.36 is an ongoing implementation action to link the General Plan's goals, policies, and actions with the City Council's budget process. No change recommended.
60	Curious about how the plan is aspirational, are there periodic assessments of the plan to track the progress, calls for an assessment of the plan to identify where we are in accomplishing the plan (post the annual report to website)	Governance and Leadership	76	Implementation action IA-GL.35 requires reporting on progress of implementation actions, General Plan amendments, and relevant projects. It also includes a provision to study establishing and tracking performance indicators or metrics. IA-GL.37 requires the continual update of the General Plan based on changing conditions. No change recommended.
61	IA. GL-36: I think linking the General Plan goals and policies with the City Council's budget process would be a bit too unwieldy. It seems most appropriate and focused to simply link implementation actions with the City Council's budget process.	Governance and Leadership	76	Individual implementation actions included within the General Plan may require staff and resource allocations to complete. Integrating with the budget process is necessarily for successful implementation. No change recommended.
62	IA. GL-35: This is absolutely necessary. There are a significant number of actions, general plan amendments, ordinances, projects, programs and studies. An annual progress report would demonstrate staff performance or underperformance.	Governance and Leadership	76	Noted. No change recommended.

#	Comment	Element	Page	Response
63	IA. GL-34: I would eliminate this implementation action. I don't think this is necessary. It also seems odd that Planning and Development have primary responsibility and the City Manager's Office has secondary responsibility. That should be reversed. The City Manager's Office should have primary responsibility over goal setting sessions with the City Council. I do not know if the City Manager would use the General Plan or prefer another document to guide goal-setting.	Governance and Leadership	76	Planning and Development Department are responsible for reviewing and reporting on the General Plan implementation. No change recommended.
64	Page 78: The current title for "creative workers" is also "arts workers." Can you add that? I'd love if the city put up signs and banners regarding the Cultural Corridor Cultural Corridor needs to be defined	Arts, Culture, and the Creative Economy	78	"Artist" and "creative worker" are defined on pp. 81-82. "Creative worker" is a current term that includes arts and other creative fields. No change recommended.
65	As a member of the General Plan Update Advisory Committee and the Rethinking Public Safety Technical Advisory Committee, I know what data was collected, what arguments were heard, and what policies were supported by evidence and fit the guiding principles of the General Plan. I ask that you restore the draft to accurately reflect our work. In the Arts, Culture, and Creative Economy, I ask, as I have numerous times during the process, that you create separate Arts & Culture and Creative Economy Elements. As Richard Florida, Scott Timberg, Rebecca Solnit, Sarah Schulman, and numerous other writers on urban development have observed, business growth (the so-called "creative economy") has a complex relationship to arts & culture. Often it fuels gentrification which displaces artists and their infrastructure, as former residents of San Francisco, Oakland, Austin, New York, and Seattle can tell you.	Arts, Culture, and the Creative Economy	79	The Arts, Culture, and Creative Economy Element will continue to include the creative economy. Policies in the Economic Development Element also speak to the creative economy. No change recommended.
66	Separate discussions of the arts from "the creative economy." Tech fueled gentrification ("the creative economy") displaces the artists and their support systems	Arts, Culture, and the Creative Economy	81	This is already expressed in p 83-84, specifically the section titled, "Importance of Fine Arts and Artists". No change recommended.
67	Specify that the top ten lists refer to jobs in the creative sector	Arts, Culture, and the Creative Economy	83	Replace list header with "Top Ten Creative Economy Occupations in Culver City". Same with "Top Ten Creative Industries in Culver City."
68	Supplement Richard Florida with Scott Timberg "culture crash" (LA Times, LA Weekly)	Arts, Culture, and the Creative Economy	83	Richard Florida is not referred to in the element. No change recommended.
69	Cultural Planning Group has done an excellent job in its effort to encapsulate the arts, culture and creative economy in Culver City. Here are just a few recommendations for clarification and adjustments: Importance of Fine Arts and Artists Page 84 - Adjustment - Please reconsider the term "Art for Arts Sake". Perhaps there is another way to describe the value of non-commercial art. Please consider language similar to what Arts for LA uses as part of its advocacy work - "The Arts strengthen communities by increasing cultural empathy and fostering civic and public engagement."	Arts, Culture, and the Creative Economy	84	Page 84, replace "art for art's sake" with " the arts ".
70	As the Culver City Historical Society has been the caretaker for Culver City's, history and city documents for the past 45 years we would like to be acknowledged in this section of the General Plan Update. The opening paragraph reads " The City's role in arts and culture has proliferated and evolved in recent decades to encompass Art in Public Places, cultural facilities, historic preservation, programs, events and grant funding. The Historical Society has been a resident of the Veteran's Memorial Building for the past 18 years. We are a growing museum collecting and preserving Culver City's local culture, Motion Picture Industry and the DNA of our city's past. As a resident of the Veteran's Memorial Complex, the 4th facility, and the Cultural Corridor, we feel that the Culver City Historical Society should be acknowledged on page 85 in paragraph #1. You site the Wende, Gloria Kaufman, Actor's Gang and the Kirk Douglas. Our suggestion would be to add us to this part of the paragraph- The City ** Operates the fourth facility, the VMB and Auditorium, which holds a longtime lease (MOU) with the Culver City Historical Society, which is operated by the Culver City Historical Society. As a note for the past 16 years the Society has presented local history programs to our community and the public at no cost, historic marking of buildings and historic places with markers that are a partnership with the city, but the bronze plaques are paid for by the Culver City Historical Society, and Walking tours of our historic downtown area. We also have a successful internship program with Culver City High School (CCUSD), giving our students an opportunity to dig deeper into our past and present projects to the public that they consider important. If you are interested to know more about us I would suggest that you visit our website at culvercityhistoricalsociety.org. In there you will find many years of collected history and articles along with our YouTube channel that currently has over 90 videos and over 1000+ subscribers. We hope that you will agree with our remarks and make this addition to the plan. If you should have any questions regarding our comments, please feel free to contact me- Hope Parrish at (310) 880-6335 at anytime. ** Site a correct: It is my understanding that the City of Culver City does own and operate the VMB.	Arts, Culture, and the Creative Economy	85	Page 85, add after "the Veteran's Memorial Building and Auditorium," " which is also home to the Culver City Historical Society and museum. "
71	City's Role in Arts, Culture and Creative Economy Page 85 - Clarification - The City does have a Cultural Plan but it needs to be updated. It is correct that the City needs a Public Art Master Plan.	Arts, Culture, and the Creative Economy	85	Page 85, change "developing a citywide cultural plan" to "developing a new citywide cultural plan."
72	Page 85 -it says "Developing Cultural Master Plan," but we already have one. Please change "developing" to "updating" Historical Society Museum should be in the in this section and also in the Parks section Page 85 - Vets facilities is not clear. There is a theatre there.	Arts, Culture, and the Creative Economy	85	Page 85, change "developing a citywide cultural plan" to "developing a new citywide cultural plan." Per another comment, a mention of the Historical Society. Page 85, will be added after "the Veteran's Memorial Building and Auditorium," " which is also home to the Culver City Historical Society and museum. "

#	Comment	Element	Page	Response
73	Historical Society Museum should be in the in this section and also in the Parks section	Arts, Culture, and the Creative Economy	85	Per a response to another comment, a mention of the Historical Society. Page 85, will be added after "the Veteran's Memorial Building and Auditorium," "which is also home to the Culver City Historical Society and museum."
74	Furthermore, the Culver City Historical Society is not mentioned anywhere in the whole GPU, even though many many photos used in the GPU give them credit. Please refer the the Culver City Historical Society and their museum. I have heard a person complain about the title of Arts, Culture, and the Creative Economy. I think that the title is fine.	Arts, Culture, and the Creative Economy	85	Per a response to another comment, the Culver City Historical Society and museum will be mentioned on page 85.
75	Page 85 -it says "Developing Cultural Master Plan," but we already have one. Please change "developing" to "updating" Historical Society Museum should be in the in this section and also in the Parks section	Arts, Culture, and the Creative Economy	85	Page 85, change "developing a citywide cultural plan" to "developing a new citywide cultural plan."
76	Page 85 - Vets facilities is not clear. There is a theatre there.	Arts, Culture, and the Creative Economy	85	The auditorium is mentioned on page 85. No change.
77	Cultural corridor is mentioned on page 85 – but should be defined	Arts, Culture, and the Creative Economy	85	The Cultural Corridor is defined to in the General Background section (pp. 24-25) and illustrated on Figure 3. No change recommended.
78	Cultural corridor related to several sections of element 3 as well as element 4+5	Arts, Culture, and the Creative Economy	85	The Cultural Corridor is defined to in the General Background section (pp. 24-25) and illustrated on Figure 3. No change recommended.
79	Culver City's arts and culture are very good	Arts, Culture, and the Creative Economy	85	The General Plan seeks to preserve and enhance the city's existing arts, cultural, and creative economy infrastructure and programming. No change recommended.
80	There are over 100 pieces of public art in Culver City. It would be nice to directly reference them all, or link to them on the website.	Arts, Culture, and the Creative Economy	86	Figure 8 maps nearly Art in Public Places Artworks in Culver City. They are named in the Appendix.
81	Facilities and Spaces for Arts and Culture Page 88 - Culver City Arts District Background - The first galleries started proliferating in the early 2000s when Blum & Poe gallery moved from Santa Monica to a site near the intersection of Washington Boulevard (Culver City) and La Cienega Boulevard (City of Los Angeles). Everyone wanted to be near Blum & Poe, so smaller galleries started taking over spaces nearby - some in Culver City and some in LA. Culver City called the area the Culver City Art District and that name was generally use by all the galleries in the area. The area was renamed The Culver City Arts District when most of the galleries moved out of Culver City starting in the 2010s.	Arts, Culture, and the Creative Economy	88	Page 88, this is too detailed for the element. The Element does not provide detailed overviews of the four arts districts in Culver City (though they are described on page 24), but a new policy will be added. "AC-3.3: Promote and facilitate the sustainability of Culver City arts districts (Arts District, Hayden Tract, Helms Bakery and Cultural Corridor)."
82	Land use Issues related to artists studios in former industrial zones. Art Studios as an establishment for artists such as dancers, sculptures, painters, etc and Art Studios :Industrial for metalwork, glassblowing, etc. which are more intensive uses.Other ways to identify these differences in land use include "Artist Studio- General" which would be the less intensive artists use (painting, sculpting, etc.) "Artists Studio- Artisan Industrial" would be the more intensvie uses. "Arts Studio- Commerical" commercial establishment with art classes, performances, etc. Artist and artisans are not included in the live-work development standards and it is designed for "clean" occupations that exclude some artists' uses. To maintain its status as a center for innovation and creativity, Culver City must craft ways for artists, creatives, and creative enterprises to remain in the city." I hope the new Mixed Use-Industrial zones can be more diverse than just additional housing for workers in the "Silicon Beach" economy. As your work moves forward, please consider whether some further modifications of the zoning framework and Culver City's live/work development standards can accommodate a range of artist and artisan uses.	Arts, Culture, and the Creative Economy	89	Hand Craft Industries - establishments manufactruing and/or assembling small products primarily by hand, including jewelry, pottery and other ceramics, as well as small glass and metal art and craft products, is allowed in MU-1, MU-2, AND MU Industrial zones. Although providing affordable spaces for artists may be a challenge, The General Plan has proposed policies to foster public private partnerships for affordable studio space to include live/work units as affordable housing. No change recommended.
83	We're thrilled to see the attention paid in the plan to leveraging increased City and private resources for the arts. A growing arts scene will pay big dividends to Culver City residents, now and in the future. We hope the City won't wait too long to begin implementing some of these goals. Greater resourced grant programs; mechanisms to develop a culture of private philanthropic support; continued leveraging of City property to every extent possible -- we think these are the most important focuses and we applaud the plan's goals in these areas.	Arts, Culture, and the Creative Economy	91	Noted. No change recommended.
84	Cultural corridor already exists – just needs street signage & publicity to blossom, cultural tourism gem	Arts, Culture, and the Creative Economy	92	Add policy "AC-3.3: Promote and facilitate the sustainability of Culver City arts districts (Arts District, Hayden Tract, Helms Bakery and Cultural Corridor)."
85	Page 92 - there is reference to Culver Arts but it does not say what Culver Arts is. Please define Culver Arts. Here is their website: https://culverarts.org/ . The city partners with Culver Arts, which is a foundation that supports arts and artists in Culver City. Culver Arts supports the Performing Arts Grant as well as our Artist Laureate.	Arts, Culture, and the Creative Economy	92	Culver Arts is referenced as a fundraising partner on page 88. No change recommended.
86	Yes	Arts, Culture, and the Creative Economy	92	Noted. No change recommended.

#	Comment	Element	Page	Response
87	Page 92 - there is reference to Culver Arts but it does not say what Culver Arts is. Please define Culver Arts. Here is their website: https://culverarts.org/ . The city partners with Culver Arts, which is a foundation that supports arts and artists in Culver City. Culver Arts supports the Performing Arts Grant as well as our Artist Laureate.	Arts, Culture, and the Creative Economy	92	The General Plan does not define all organizations mentioned. No change recommended.
88	Arts and Culture portion: AC1-AC3 should be implemented in 1-5 years, not the proposed 5-10 years. These goals, along with other goals in this section, won't be realized with the current time frame of 5-10 years.	Arts, Culture, and the Creative Economy	92	The implementation timelines in the General Plan were confirmed by directors of each City department. No change recommended.
89	In the section titled: Implementation Actions I have comments on several of the Action Items time frame. AC-1 to AC-3 should change to short term 1-5 years, NOT 5-10 years.	Arts, Culture, and the Creative Economy	92	The implementation timelines in the General Plan were confirmed by directors of each City department. No change recommended.
90	AC-8 should also be shortened to 1-5 years, NOT 5-10 years.	Arts, Culture, and the Creative Economy	93	The implementation timelines in the General Plan were confirmed by directors of each City department. No change recommended.
91	AC-12 should also be shortened to 1-5 years, NOT 5-10 years.	Arts, Culture, and the Creative Economy	94	The implementation timelines in the General Plan were confirmed by directors of each City department. No change recommended.
92	Also, AC-15, the suggested name for the new department should be adopted. The name that was chosen by Jesse Mays doesn't make sense and is taken from language he taught was interesting about the arts in Australia.	Arts, Culture, and the Creative Economy	96	No change to IA.AC-15.
93	I write in strong support of the following goals included in the land use: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A walkable, pedestrian-oriented urban environment that supports a vibrant mix of well-designed transit-oriented development, public spaces, neighborhood-serving businesses, community services, and mobility options. • Healthy, safe, and complete residential neighborhoods where all residents can thrive and meet their basic needs. • A diverse, expanded range of housing types that are affordable for different income levels and meet the needs of various household compositions and stages of life. • A sustainable and resilient built environment that preserves urban land resources, enhances habitat quality, and improves community health outcomes. The acute shortage of housing in Culver City means that we need to provide developers with multiple options to propose new construction or reuse of buildings. Just because an area is designated for a high density of housing doesn't mean it will be developed that way, and current lower density uses will not change overnight.	Land Use and Community Design	98	Noted. No change recommended.
94	We support goals in this element that relate to everyone who lives, works, and plays in Culver City: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A walkable, pedestrian-oriented urban environment that supports a vibrant mix of well-designed transit-oriented development, public spaces, neighborhood-serving businesses, community services, and mobility options. Healthy, safe, and complete residential neighborhoods where all residents can thrive and meet their basic needs. - A diverse, expanded range of housing types that are affordable for different income levels and meet the needs of various household compositions and stages of life. - A sustainable and resilient built environment that preserves urban land resources, enhances habitat quality, and improves community health outcomes. The acute shortage of housing in Culver City means that we need to provide developers with multiple options to propose new construction or reuse of buildings. Just because an area is designated for a high density of housing doesn't mean it will be developed that way, and current lower density uses will not change overnight.	Land Use and Community Design	98	Noted. No change recommended.
95	Element 4: Land use and community design (1) p.48 Under "trying to achieve", I am missing a reference to 'housing' in the pedestrian oriented urban environment. It reads as if there is residence- no residence is a distinction between residential neighborhoods and the walkable urban environment.	Land Use and Community Design	98	Revise intent to: A walkable, pedestrian-oriented urban environment that supports a vibrant mix of well-designed transit-oriented development, public spaces, housing , neighborhood-serving businesses, community services, and mobility options.
96	Include a data source for figure 10 on page 99.	Land Use and Community Design	99	Add: "Source: City of Culver City, 2023"
97	Additionally, with the current proposed plan, an unsustainable increase in housing units is proposed, far above the 3,341 per mandate. As you are aware, the Housing Element calls for 11,500 new housing (+67%) units by 2045. It also calls for at least 20,000 new residents (a 50% increase). The current proposal will have an extraordinary impact on pollution, access, noise, and traffic in our neighborhoods. We do not have the necessary infrastructure and moreover, Culver City already is becoming less and less accessible to people with disabilities and the elderly who have a difficult time getting around. The addition of thousands of apartment units will only make access that much worse. Thank you for your consideration.	Land Use and Community Design	102	The Mobility Element was developed in tandem with the Land Use Element and plans for a mobility network through the year 2045 to support these land use changes, and the Infrastructure Element provides strategies for the provisionment of infrastructure. The General Plan horizon year is 2045, so the General Plan projects housing unit needs for three RHNA cycles. No change recommended.

#	Comment	Element	Page	Response
98	<p>The stretch of Culver Blvd. between Elenda and Sepulveda is lined with single family homes, duplexes, and low-rise apartment buildings. On page 105, identifies it as a mixed use corridor which by the paragraph's definition "the parcels that line these corridors vary in size and use, almost all commercial buildings front one of these six corridors. The only commercial structures on the part of the corridor are at the Sepulveda end. Instead it should be labeled multi-family residential.</p> <p>The land use map on p. 115 only shows "mixed-use corridor" on the south side of Culver the Vets Park area. Can you explain the discrepancy between p. 105 and p. 115 showing different representations of whether the "mixed-use" applies to both sides of Culver?</p>	Land Use and Community Design	103	<p>The General Plan Land Use map (Figure 15, p. 115) is the regulatory map and correctly illustrates the designations. Illustrative maps on pages 103 and 105 will be updated consistent with Figure 15.</p> <p>Revise text on page 103 to more clearly explain that the city structure maps are intended for illustrative purposes: "Culver City's corridors, activity centers, districts, and neighborhoods, shown in the illustrative city structure diagrams on the following pages, shape the city's urban form and how people experience the public realm. Collectively, these components of the built environment reflect the city's history and evolving priorities, needs, and development models. For a map of exact General Plan Land Use designations, see Figure 15."</p>
99	<p>We have the following specific comments about the Land Use Element. (Current and proposed land use maps and the associated table of housing densities are included on the following pages for your reference.)</p> <p>- Page 110: Jefferson Boulevard between Overland and Sepulveda is not included in the list of TOCs, despite the Mobility Element's vision of the Jefferson-Overland intersection as a major transit stop. A more consistent forward-looking approach would be to align the map of TOCs with the Mobility Element's proposed transit improvements and allow higher density accordingly, including designating the east side of this portion of Jefferson for higher housing density.</p>	Land Use and Community Design	110	The transit-oriented communities (TOC) map in the Land Use and Community Design Element is consistent with Metro's current TOC program. If the TOC map changes in the future due to increases in transit service, the map and incentive program would be updated. No change recommended.
100	<p>The acute shortage of housing in Culver City means that we need to provide developers with multiple options to propose new construction or reuse of buildings. Just because an area is designated for a high density of housing doesn't mean it will be developed that way, and current lower density uses will not change overnight.</p> <p>I have the following specific comments about the Land Use Element.</p> <p>- Page 110: Jefferson Boulevard between Overland and Sepulveda is not included in the list of TOCs, despite the Mobility Element's vision of the Jefferson-Overland intersection as a major transit stop. A more consistent forward-looking approach would be to align the map of TOCs with the Mobility Element's proposed transit improvements and allow higher density accordingly, including designating the east side of this portion of Jefferson for higher housing density.</p>	Land Use and Community Design	110	The transit-oriented communities (TOC) map in the Land Use and Community Design Element is consistent with Metro's current TOC program. If the TOC map changes in the future due to increases in transit service, the map and incentive program would be updated. No change recommended.
101	<p>I have the following specific comments about the Land Use Element. (Current and proposed land use maps and the associated table of housing densities are included on the following pages for your reference.)</p> <p>- Page 110: Jefferson Boulevard between Overland and Sepulveda is not included in the list of TOCs, despite the Mobility Element's vision of the Jefferson-Overland intersection as a major transit stop. A more consistent forward-looking approach would be to align the map of TOCs with the Mobility Element's proposed transit improvements and allow higher density accordingly, including designating the east side of this portion of Jefferson for higher housing density.</p>	Land Use and Community Design	110	The transit-oriented communities (TOC) map in the Land Use and Community Design Element is consistent with Metro's current TOC program. If the TOC map changes in the future due to increases in transit service, the map and incentive program would be updated. No change recommended.
102	-- Jefferson Boulevard between Overland and Sepulveda is not included in the list of TOCs on page 110, despite the Mobility Element's vision of the Jefferson-Overland intersection as a major transit stop. A more consistent forward-looking approach would be to align the map of TOCs with the Mobility Element's proposed transit improvements. This would allow higher density.	Land Use and Community Design	110	The transit-oriented communities (TOC) map in the Land Use and Community Design Element is consistent with Metro's current TOC program. If the TOC map changes in the future due to increases in transit service, the map and incentive program would be updated. No change recommended.
103	The City Council voted to remove the incremental infill language from the housing element and provide all of the SB9 protections. When will this language be modified? It is essential that the language change in the HE because it basically governs zoning.	Land Use and Community Design	111	City Council voted to eliminate the incremental infill designation at the August 14, 2023 City Council meeting to be consistent with State law (SB 9). The Housing Element will be reviewed for consistency with the General Plan. No change recommended.
104	<p>We should build a diverse range of housing options for people of all incomes to live in all areas of the city. We should focus on pedestrian oriented design, building many transit options and de-prioritizing car infrastructure. We need public and community-focused spaces where people can be engaged, comfortable and safe.</p> <p>On page 111 the Housing Element states "Lower-density, more incremental growth is allowed within the existing residential neighborhoods consistent with State laws." This means that the General Plan won't allow anything beyond the ADUs required by state law but as I've said in my other comments we need to allow equal sized housing in these neighborhoods to provide more options over the long-term. Even with the zoning changes it will still be years before existing lots will be sold and redeveloped at any meaningful pace. We don't have any time to lose. This is an emergency.</p>	Land Use and Community Design	111	City Council voted to eliminate the incremental infill designation at the August 14, 2023 City Council meeting. However, consistent with State law, low-density single-family areas will continue to change over time. As required by State law, single-family parcels in the city may add up to two ADUs and one junior accessory dwelling unit (JADU). Senate Bill 9 also allows homeowners to divide their property into two lots and allows two homes to be built on each of those lots. No change recommended.
105	<p>We have the following specific comments about the Land Use Element. (Current and proposed land use maps and the associated table of housing densities are included on the following pages for your reference.)</p> <p>- Page 111: the Housing Element states "Lower-density, more incremental growth is allowed within the existing residential neighborhoods consistent with State laws." This means that the General Plan won't allow anything beyond the ADUs required by state law. Not even when the square footage and height of new "McMansions" on large corner lots could easily accommodate four condominiums or apartments. The "Low Density Residential" illustration in Figure 13 is misleading and doesn't resemble any current Culver City neighborhood.</p>	Land Use and Community Design	111	City Council voted to eliminate the incremental infill designation at the August 14, 2023 City Council meeting. However, consistent with State law, low-density single-family areas will continue to change over time. As required by State law, single-family parcels in the city may add up to two ADUs and one junior accessory dwelling unit (JADU). Senate Bill 9 also allows homeowners to divide their property into two lots and allows two homes to be built on each of those lots. No change recommended.

#	Comment	Element	Page	Response
106	<p>The acute shortage of housing in Culver City means that we need to provide developers with multiple options to propose new construction or reuse of buildings. Just because an area is designated for a high density of housing doesn't mean it will be developed that way, and current lower density uses will not change overnight.</p> <p>I have the following specific comments about the Land Use Element.</p> <p>- Page 111: the Housing Element states "Lower-density, more incremental growth is allowed within the existing residential neighborhoods consistent with State laws." This means that the General Plan won't allow anything beyond the ADUs required by state law. Not even when the square footage and height of new "McMansions" on large corner lots could easily accommodate four condominiums or apartments. The "Low Density Residential" illustration in Figure 13 is misleading and doesn't resemble any current Culver City neighborhood.</p>	Land Use and Community Design	111	<p>City Council voted to eliminate the incremental infill designation at the August 14, 2023 City Council meeting. However, consistent with State law, low-density single-family areas will continue to change over time. As required by State law, single-family parcels in the city may add up to two ADUs and one junior accessory dwelling unit (JADU). Senate Bill 9 also allows homeowners to divide their property into two lots and allows two homes to be built on each of those lots. No change recommended.</p>
107	<p>I have the following specific comments about the Land Use Element. (Current and proposed land use maps and the associated table of housing densities are included on the following pages for your reference.)</p> <p>- Page 111: the Housing Element states "Lower-density, more incremental growth is allowed within the existing residential neighborhoods consistent with State laws." This means that the General Plan won't allow anything beyond the ADUs required by state law. Not even when the square footage and height of new "McMansions" on large corner lots could easily accommodate four condominiums or apartments. The "Low Density Residential" illustration in Figure 13 is misleading and doesn't resemble any current Culver City neighborhood.</p>	Land Use and Community Design	111	<p>City Council voted to eliminate the incremental infill designation at the August 14, 2023 City Council meeting. However, consistent with State law, low-density single-family areas will continue to change over time. As required by State law, single-family parcels in the city may add up to two ADUs and one junior accessory dwelling unit (JADU). Senate Bill 9 also allows homeowners to divide their property into two lots and allows two homes to be built on each of those lots. No change recommended.</p>
108	<p>Amazing how much this plan veers away from what the old plan was and should be. Seems not to care about quality of life for residents one bit! Having lived here for decades, as have most of my neighbors we have seen a rapid decline in CC and adjacent areas. That you allow removal of single and affordable tri and quadplexes to be replaced with oversized multimillion dollar condos, just feet away from single family homes is despicable and was NOT allowed in any prior gen. plan! No regard for what effect it has on adjacent property, the lack of warming sun and light and privacy and property value! Nor the effect it has on street parking as all added units means more cars and more pollution for all of us. Add to that the removal of the most important items, 1. green space and trees 2. truly affordable apts. and starter homes, and 3. more use of limited resources like water! If you cared at ALL about climate change, this would NOT be allowed in small low height dwellings!!! There is a picture among many in prior general plans that showed what was NOT permitted, whereas you provided NO such examples! There is a fallacy that people will take to the buses or bikes more, but the way in which people live and work here it is NEVER a true possibility! Many people cannot get to work or go grocery shopping without a car, especially elders and infirmed., forgetting about rainy season that seems to be worse every year, or did you discount that. With more people comes MORE cars and most all streets are parking lots already on any given day for many hours! That you do not change the setbacks farther and space between buildings, and require trees to be planted is just plain wrong, and proves you do NOT care about the quality of life for residents. And BTW, this form of 1 line only is a pain and more proof you don't care what we say!!!</p>	Land Use and Community Design	111	<p>The Mobility Element contains strategies to ensure everyone can navigate around Culver City without a car. The General Plan establishes regulations for use and building density; the Zoning Code Update regulates development standards (e.g., building setbacks).</p> <p>Policy LU-14.4 requires new development to add street trees along streets and public spaces. Policy LU-14.8 aspires to increase the size and extent of the tree canopy.</p> <p>The City is currently updating its affordable housing density bonus program. The Housing Element also includes strategies to boost affordable housing production.</p> <p>The Infrastructure Element contains policies and actions related to water conservation and security strategies. No change recommended.</p>
109	<p>As a member of the General Plan Update Advisory Committee and the Rethinking Public Safety Technical Advisory Committee, I know what data was collected, what arguments were heard, and what policies were supported by evidence and fit the guiding principles of the General Plan. I ask that you restore the draft to accurately reflect our work. In the Housing Element, you must restore the Incremental Infill designation for R1 and R2 areas, establish a citywide affordable housing overlay, and use the state of emergency declared for homelessness to expedite the construction of housing at all price points in all neighborhoods.</p>	Land Use and Community Design	112	<p>City Council voted to eliminate the incremental infill designation at the August 14, 2023 City Council meeting. However, consistent with State law, low-density single-family areas will continue to change over time. As required by State law, single-family parcels in the city may add up to two ADUs and one junior accessory dwelling unit (JADU). Senate Bill 9 also allows homeowners to divide their property into two lots and allows two homes to be built on each of those lots. No change recommended.</p>
110	<p>Consider and designate SB 10 areas, opt in to AB 1033 allowing sale of ADUs</p>	Land Use and Community Design	112	<p>The General Plan has not designated SB 10 areas. The City may consider opting in to AB 1033 at a future date. No change recommended.</p>
111	<p>Bottom line is the city should prioritize building as much new housing as quickly as possible, especially in our low-density neighborhoods which have the most room to grow and benefit the most economically from living in high demand areas, but prevent access through restrictive zoning, instead of trying to force all new development into the already higher density surrounding neighborhoods.</p>	Land Use and Community Design	112	<p>The Land Use and Community Design Element advances the idea of infill development in residential neighborhoods (see "Supporting Neighborhood Infill" section). No change recommended.</p>
112	<p>Update "Residential Density" and "Nonresidential Intensity" sections to be consistent with the Zoning Code.</p>	Land Use and Community Design	113	<p>Revise text to the following:</p> <p>Dwelling units per acre (du/ac) shall be used to calculate the maximum number of primary dwelling units. ADUs are not counted toward calculating density. Residential unit density shall be calculated using the net area of the project site. The net area excludes dedicated streets and private easements (e.g., access) where the owner of the underlying parcel does not have the right to use the entire surface. Refer to the zoning code for instructions on calculating residential density.</p> <p>Nonresidential Intensity. General Plans are meant to specify the intensity of development. Floor Area Ratio (FAR) is the industry standard for defining nonresidential development intensity. Therefore, this General Plan establishes FAR to calculate the maximum nonresidential intensity. FAR will be calculated using the total above-ground nonresidential floor area, including nonresidential parking structures, divided by the net area of the project site. FAR is generally calculated using the total above-ground nonresidential floor area, divided by the net area of the project site. Refer to the zoning code for instructions on calculating nonresidential FAR.</p>

#	Comment	Element	Page	Response
113	Culver Blvd. Sepulveda to Harter residential only (parking, traffic)	Land Use and Community Design	114	Culver Boulevard. The densities and uses incorporated into the General Plan relate back to land use options provided in community meetings that displayed various development intensities and land use approaches discussed conducted with City Council, Planning Commission, and the General Plan Advisory Committee. These designations were dispersed throughout the city, including in the Hayden Tract and along Jefferson and Washington. No change recommended.
114	Concerned about high density multifamily built on major street corners and how that affects traffic	Land Use and Community Design	114	High Density Multifamily. The densities incorporated into the General Plan relate back to land use intensity options provided in community meetings that displayed various development intensities and land use approaches discussed conducted with City Council, Planning Commission, and the General Plan Advisory Committee. These designations were dispersed throughout the city, including in the Hayden Tract and along Jefferson and Washington. The Mobility Element plans for a multi-modal transportation network that supports the land use plan outlined in the Land Use Element. No change recommended.
115	(2) Under "land use designation" please elevate the allowable du/acre in the mixed use corridor 1. 35 du/acre is too low of a density to add different sizes of apartments along the boulevards. Maybe du/acre is not even necessary to mention if there are no parking minimums, only a total FAR (commercial and housing together)? Studies by LCI, the Livable Communities Initiative, have shown that if you want to stimulate local owners to develop on their site, that a higher amount of units will make all the difference in making the development viable. (See your Goal on page 167 element 6 ED.7.3 "evaluate CC commercial corridors and enable transformation in Mixed use environments".) I would let go of the distinction between corridor 1 and 2.	Land Use and Community Design	114	Mixed Use Corridor 1 parcels are generally smaller with shallower lots, and smaller sites may be more challenging to reach higher densities. It also reflects the desire for height transitions to the adjacent neighborhoods. Though some cities regulate by total FAR, Culver City does not currently regulate residential and non-residential development by FAR (only non-residential development is regulated by FAR). No change recommended.
116	Density/FAR for MU Corridor 1 and MU Medium are too low based on existing builds	Land Use and Community Design	114	Mixed Use Corridor 1 parcels are generally smaller with shallower lots, and smaller sites may be more challenging to reach higher densities. It also reflects the desire for height transitions to the adjacent neighborhoods. No change recommended.
117	It strikes me that MU1 at 35 du/ac is lower density than existing small apt buildings on small lots that are in the proposed MU1 designation. For example, 11529 W Washington Blvd and similar buildings in this neighborhood are closer to 45 du/ac and don't feel very dense at all in this neighborhood, especially given that they sit on Washington Blvd. It would make a lot more sense for this designation to be set at least at 50 du/ac to allow for new housing to be built.	Land Use and Community Design	114	Mixed Use Corridor 1 parcels are generally smaller with shallower lots, and smaller sites may be more challenging to reach higher densities. It also reflects the desire for height transitions to the adjacent neighborhoods. No change recommended.
118	We have the following specific comments about the Land Use Element. (Current and proposed land use maps and the associated table of housing densities are included on the following pages for your reference.) - There should be a single Mixed Use Corridor designation, with 50 dwelling units per acre (du/ac).	Land Use and Community Design	114	Mixed Use Corridor 1 parcels are generally smaller with shallower lots, and smaller sites may be more challenging to reach higher densities. It also reflects the desire for height transitions to the adjacent neighborhoods. No change recommended.
119	The acute shortage of housing in Culver City means that we need to provide developers with multiple options to propose new construction or reuse of buildings. Just because an area is designated for a high density of housing doesn't mean it will be developed that way, and current lower density uses will not change overnight. I have the following specific comments about the Land Use Element. - There should be a single Mixed Use Corridor designation, with 50 dwelling units per acre (du/ac).	Land Use and Community Design	114	Mixed Use Corridor 1 parcels are generally smaller with shallower lots, and smaller sites may be more challenging to reach higher densities. It also reflects the desire for height transitions to the adjacent neighborhoods. No change recommended.
120	I have the following specific comments about the Land Use Element. (Current and proposed land use maps and the associated table of housing densities are included on the following pages for your reference.) - There should be a single Mixed Use Corridor designation, with 50 dwelling units per acre (du/ac).	Land Use and Community Design	114	Mixed Use Corridor 1 parcels are generally smaller with shallower lots, and smaller sites may be more challenging to reach higher densities. It also reflects the desire for height transitions to the adjacent neighborhoods. No change recommended.

#	Comment	Element	Page	Response
121	<p>During the prior Housing Element planning period, Culver City added thousands of new jobs, and virtually no additional housing. The resulting scarcity of housing combined with the high incomes of many of the new tech jobs has led to uncomfortably rapid gentrification of our community. It also means that our efforts to create affordable housing at various levels will be even more costly than it would have been a decade ago. Many of us who live in Culver City now could not afford to move here today, especially if we are retired.</p> <p>We value the neighborhood character of our current single family neighborhoods, but we can't roll back the clock 15 years. Individually, we may not want or be comfortable with increased housing density, but it's not what we want individually that matters. What matters is what the community, the region, and yes, the planet needs.</p> <p>The housing crisis has reached a point where we need to use every available opportunity to create both market incentives and subsidies to enable developers to propose new construction or reuse of existing buildings. We know that just because an area is zoned for a high density of housing doesn't mean it will all be developed to that level; witness the number of single family homes built on R2 lots and small apartment buildings that are not at the current maximum allowed. Furthermore, higher density zoning doesn't mean that lower density buildings will be razed and replaced overnight. The evidence from other cities shows that this is a very slow process.</p> <p>One of the goals of the Land Use and Community Design Element is "A diverse, expanded range of housing types that are affordable for different income levels and meet the needs of various household compositions and stages of life."</p> <p>In order to accomplish this, the proposed Land Use Plan should increase the allowable density in several areas. Specifically: -- There should be a singled Mixed Use Corridor designation, with 50 dwelling units/acre. It makes no sense to have one side of Sepulveda zoned for 35 du/ac and the other size 50 du/ac. Unless existing owners of the current commercial properties sell, we are not going to see big apartment buildings spring up overnight. The same applies to portions of Culver and Washington Blvds that are within Transit-Oriented Community (TOC) areas.</p>	Land Use and Community Design	114	<p>Mixed Use Corridor 1 parcels are generally smaller with shallower lots, and smaller sites may be more challenging to reach higher densities. It also reflects the desire for height transitions to the adjacent neighborhoods. No change recommended.</p>
122	<p>This would be an absolute nightmare for those of us who live in the neighborhood. I cannot believe you are EVEN considering it. Please just stop building!!! The traffic is horrendous here and haven't we suffered enough? It took years of hellish traffic and construction disruptions for the bike path or walk path between Culver and Little Culver. Enough! There is absolutely no parking here -- I don't live on Culver ... I live a few blocks north of Culver but have friends who do live there and they do NOT have driveways so there is already almost no parking ... nor do the people on Elenda have driveways...so putting additional commercial and residential would be disastrous for all of us who live in the neighborhood. Building underground lots, etc. would be a terrible way to go causing years of construction and disruption for those of us who bought houses here thinking this was a lovely residential neighborhood...Sepulveda, Washington and Overland all have HUGE amounts of retail space that isn't even that popular so why would we need more????</p>	Land Use and Community Design	114	<p>Mixed Use Corridor 1. The densities and uses incorporated into the General Plan relate back to land use options provided in community meetings that displayed various development intensities and land use approaches discussed conducted with City Council, Planning Commission, and the General Plan Advisory Committee. These designations were dispersed throughout the city, including in the Hayden Tract and along Jefferson and Washington. No change recommended.</p>
123	<p>I feel that high density mixed use zones replacing current commercial and industrial zones is a great step forward. I look forward to seeing these now empty corporate parks (for example fox hills area) turn in to lively corridors of shopping, food, and young residents. My sister is a recent graduate who hoped to live in downtown culver. From searching with her in May 2023, I saw how limited inventory there was in "desirable areas". It is important to create high density zones, as they often foster characteristics that young women need when searching for an apartment: well-lit, higher foot traffic at day and night (joggers, people going out to eat, walking their dogs and strollers), daily services (cafes, nail salon, dry cleaning, convenience store, grocery store, hardware store, ice cream parlors, etc) within walking distance, gated parking lots, secure building with lobby, businesses and residences with security cameras/doormen/parking attendants, green space, affordable rents, and proximity to other desirable parts of town. Southern culver city has the potential to be a new extension of playa vista. It is geographically very central in the fabric of los angeles, close to beach, airport, sofi stadium, and major freeways. It already has a large park, westfield mall, and high tech offices such as tik tok - just missing apartments and small businesses! I hope that your new zoning plan will help young professionals and families find desirable housing there.</p>	Land Use and Community Design	114	<p>Mixed Use High. No change recommended.</p>
124	<p>Dear Culver City Representatives: In regards to our 2045 General Plan, I would like to see the dwelling units per acre to be reduced, especially on the 65 dwelling unit per acre zones. 35% reduction in the base density overall makes sense, but especially in the areas zoned for 65du/acre. It is my belief that 30 dwelling units per acre is sufficient for dense urban and transit supportive residential uses. How can this alteration become part of the general plan update? Thank you so much for your assistance.</p>	Land Use and Community Design	114	<p>Mixed Use Industrial/Mixed Use Medium: The densities incorporated into the General Plan relate back to land use intensity options provided in community meetings that displayed various development intensities and land use approaches discussed conducted with City Council, Planning Commission, and the General Plan Advisory Committee. These designations were dispersed throughout the city, including in the Hayden Tract and along Jefferson and Washington. No change recommended.</p>
125	<p>I would like the dwelling units per acre to be reduced, especially on the 65 dwelling unit per acre zones. I believe that a 35% reduction in the base density overall makes sense, but especially in the areas zoned for 65du/acre. Based on what I have read, I believe that 30 dwelling units per acre is sufficient for dense urban and transit supportive residential uses.</p>	Land Use and Community Design	114	<p>Mixed Use Industrial/Mixed Use Medium: The densities incorporated into the General Plan relate back to land use intensity options provided in community meetings that displayed various development intensities and land use approaches discussed conducted with City Council, Planning Commission, and the General Plan Advisory Committee. These designations were dispersed throughout the city, including in the Hayden Tract and along Jefferson and Washington. No change recommended.</p>
126	<p>Increase FAR in Mixed Use Industrial to 3.0 to be consistent with the Zoning Code Update</p>	Land Use and Community Design	114	<p>Mixed Use Industrial: Change Maximum Nonresidential FAR: "3.0 2.0"</p>

#	Comment	Element	Page	Response
127	<p>I respectfully request that the proposed areas of Mixed Use 2 (sometimes described as “Mixed Use Medium” and “Mixed Use High”) be removed from the proposed General Plan and Housing Element for the area West of Overland Ave. Especially for the area north of Jefferson. I request that the actual current land use and zoning remain as it is in all areas proposed for Mixed Use. I refer to the map on Page 115 of the proposed General Plan.</p> <p>We believe that development under Mixed Use 2 (or Mixed Use Medium or High) will cause irreversible harm to the neighborhood and residents, as it could add thousands of housing units to a neighborhood that is already crowded, has gridlock, has minimal parking, and has substantial noise and air pollution from significantly increasing traffic. Per Page 115, allowing Mixed Use appears to allow the neighborhoods bordered by Overland, Washington, Sepulveda, and Jefferson to be surrounded by a nearly continuous wall of towering apartment buildings. This would mean being encircled by many thousands of apartments and would be devastating to our neighborhoods.</p> <p>It is important to note that “Mixed Use,” to our understanding, does not guarantee that retail will be developed. This means that CC residents who live close to Sepulveda Blvd. could not only be impacted by massive building and traffic, but also lose both the convenience and necessity of retail locations near their homes, including an animal hospital, restaurants, a landmark music lessons business, massage locations, etc.</p> <p>CC residents who live near Sepulveda, Culver Blvd., Washington, and Venice Blvds. have absorbed enough negative impact of huge traffic increases. There is more to come when hundreds of units are added at Sepulveda and Jefferson. CC’s commitment to 3,341 additional housing units is sufficient, and itself will bring impact and challenges to our neighborhood.</p> <p>For perspective, per the Plan, over the last 20 years, housing units are up 4% and CC’s population is up around 5% over 30 years. During this time, traffic and all of its associated negatives have vastly increased, likely attributable - at least in part - to the growth of jobs in CC.</p> <p>Now, with the current proposed plan, a huge increase in housing units is proposed, way above the 3,341 per mandate. In fact, the Housing Element calls for 11,500 new housing (+67%) units by 2045. It also calls for at least 20,000 new residents (a +50% increase). And that is stacked on top of many thousands of new jobs projected. Job growth alone, as it has shown during the last 20 years, will have an extraordinary impact on traffic, noise, and pollution in our neighborhood.</p> <p>The City estimates, with a 67% increase in housing units by 2045, at least a 50% in population gain (20,000+ new residents). This is over 10 times the increase of the previous 20 years, and all would agree that we are already jam-packed now with the previous increases noted. Many folks would say it is preposterous to expect our neighborhood to absorb this. The City, its consultants, and the Council should quantify the effect of all potential increases in housing units above the state mandate - its effect on traffic, noise, pollution, parking, and overall quality of life. Removing Mixed Use 2 (Medium and High) would not solve the increase in impact coming, but it certainly would help significantly.</p>	Land Use and Community Design	114	<p>Mixed Use Medium/Mixed Use High. The densities incorporated into the General Plan relate back to land use intensity options provided in community meetings that displayed various development intensities and land use approaches discussed conducted with City Council, Planning Commission, and the General Plan Advisory Committee. These designations were dispersed throughout the city, including in the Hayden Tract and along Jefferson and Washington. The Mobility Element, developed in tandem with the General Plan Land Use Map, identifies strategies to reduce traffic impacts from new development, such as promoting alternative modes of transportation. Policy LU 11.7 aspires for development to be compatible with existing neighborhoods and for there to be smooth transitions in height, form, and character. No change recommended.</p>
128	<p>The argument that affordable housing is needed is highly unlikely to be addressed by Mixed Use. Even if a small percentage of apartments are priced below market, they likely will be expensive. Mixed Use is unlikely to result in truly affordable housing.</p> <p>Our neighborhood (Culver Park West near Culver Blvd.) has been junked up for years by an unapologetic previous city Council majority. The Culver median project brought many years of disruption, and it accomplished very little in positives. Residents on Culver Blvd. South were denied the long-planned frontage road, which was crucial for resident safety. The dedicated Bike Lane on Elenda (east side) between Culver and Washington is seldom used, has removed at least 40 parking spaces, and resulted in nightmare traffic back-ups at the intersection at Culver Blvd. The 405 offramp moved to Culver Blvd. brought a huge increase in traffic. ADUs have brought more traffic and minimized street parking. The previous Council also pushed hard for homeless housing at the VFW building site (in a zone where many children walk to school), which fortunately did not happen; and on and on.</p> <p>Removing Mixed Use 2 (Mixed Use Medium and/or High), at all sites west of Overland on the proposed General Plan Map (page 115), along with removing Mixed Use 1 on Culver Blvd., will allow our neighborhood to contend with natural growth, which by itself is already substantial, and likely to increase as jobs increase. Allowing it will result in towers of expensive apartments, likely a reduction in retail, and it will significantly harm current residents. Thank you.</p>	Land Use and Community Design	114	<p>Mixed Use Medium/Mixed Use High. The densities incorporated into the General Plan relate back to land use intensity options provided in community meetings that displayed various development intensities and land use approaches discussed conducted with City Council, Planning Commission, and the General Plan Advisory Committee. These designations were dispersed throughout the city, including in the Hayden Tract and along Jefferson and Washington. The Mobility Element, developed in tandem with the General Plan Land Use Map, identifies strategies to reduce traffic impacts from new development, such as promoting alternative modes of transportation. No change recommended.</p>
129	Need to prioritize dense, mixed-use development that can offer more housing & walkable, pedestrian-friendly neighborhoods	Land Use and Community Design	114	<p>Mixed Use Medium/Mixed Use High. The General Plan proposes mixed use land use designations and policies to support pedestrian-friendly neighborhoods. No change recommended.</p>
130	The recommendations on density in the General Plan can be enhanced by focusing density on certain corridors that can handle the height. Endorsement to look at height constraint and scale up in the appropriate corridors that can handle more height.	Land Use and Community Design	114	<p>Mixed Use Medium/Mixed Use High/Mixed Use Industrial. Major corridors such as Jefferson, Washington, and Sepulveda are given designations that density. The Zoning Code Update is underway and will review height regulations. No change recommended.</p>
131	As part of the rezoning process, all areas should have some zoning code changes in addition to density. Commercial corridors should have setbacks reduced or removed. Many of Culver City’s best areas are those with small lot sizes and buildings built right next to the side walk. Areas that will be redeveloped should be allowed to not have setbacks. Remove setbacks for commercial corridors.	Land Use and Community Design	114	Noted. No change recommended.
132	Hello, I am a developer and I wish to provide suggestions. If it is the City’s intent to promote new housing developments on commercial corridors (specifically on Washington, Sepulveda, and Culver), I would suggest allowing for higher density in these areas. Developers will often determine the value of land by each developable unit. Given higher interest rates, increasing cap rates, and the overall current economic situation, there are very few sites where the best-use of the land (from a financial perspective) is to redevelop into housing. Sites with high allowable density are more feasible for housing development. I would suggest comparing the proposed allowed density in these areas to the permitted density on commercial corridors in Los Angeles and by the new zoning ordinance in Santa Monica. After the utilization of density bonuses for projects on commercial corridors in LA and Santa Monica, developers are able to achieve densities of around 150-200 units per acre within 6 or 7 stories. Beverly Hills allows for one unit per 550SF in most commercial corridors (approx. 80 units per acre base density and 120 with a density bonus). I suggest designating more areas to the “Mixed-Use High” land use designation. Higher density projects also lead to smaller unit sizes, which in turn are more affordable. Since Santa Monica implemented their new zoning ordinance for commercial corridors this past summer, there has been a large influx in proposed projects, despite the worsening economic situation.	Land Use and Community Design	114	Noted. No change recommended.

#	Comment	Element	Page	Response
133	A number of years ago, there was a push to build a large hotel in the strip mall on the northeast corner of Sepulveda and Slauson that would loom over the residential neighborhood on the north side. The neighbors fought this as they were concerned with their privacy. Now, this general plan wants to do the same thing along Jefferson, Overland, Sepulveda, and Washington with mixed use medium and high density. The city has a 3 story height limit for buildings, which is waived if the building plan includes a percentage of the units (usually only a few) made available as affordable housing. This allows for giant apartment buildings to be built and would destroy our city and the surrounding neighborhoods. It will increase traffic, impact our already embattled schools, and put even more pressure on the city's infrastructure. This needs to be removed from the general plan. The vast majority of Culver City residents when it is discussed would oppose this.	Land Use and Community Design	114	Overland/Washington/Sepulveda/Jefferson. The densities incorporated into the General Plan relate back to land use intensity options provided in community meetings that displayed various development intensities and land use approaches discussed conducted with City Council, Planning Commission, and the General Plan Advisory Committee. These designations were dispersed throughout the city. Policy LU 11.7 aspires for development to be compatible with existing neighborhoods and for there to be smooth transitions in height, form, and character. In addition, the Mobility Element plans for a multi-modal transportation network that supports the land use plan outlined in the Land Use Element. No change recommended.
134	Preserve single family homes	Land Use and Community Design	114	Single Family. Residential is allowed under the Single Family, Two Family, and Low Density Multifamily designations. No change recommended.
135	Due to state ADU laws, all neighborhoods must allow 4 housing units. Maintaining the R1 designation is a fiction and political convenience. Unfortunately, it also means the zoning code will not permit the construction of 4 condos or apartments within the same two-story building envelope currently used to build single family homes of 4,000 sf. I live in Carlson Park. I would much rather have 4 neighbors who can afford \$1.5 million condos (or apartments with corresponding rent) of 1,000 sf than one neighbor who can afford a \$4.5 million single family home. Culver City will drive out all but the very wealthiest young families with children if we do not create less costly housing. The R1 and R2 zones should be returned to the Incremental Infill designation.	Land Use and Community Design	114	Single Family. City Council voted to eliminate the incremental infill designation at the August 14, 2023 City Council meeting to be consistent with State law (SB 9). No change recommended.
136	Culver City must restore the "Incremental Infill" designation for R1 and R2 residential neighborhoods so as to be able to apply for federal and state affordable housing grants. Failing to eliminate exclusionary R1 zoning costs the city money by leaving the city ineligible for these grants.	Land Use and Community Design	114	Single Family. City Council voted to eliminate the incremental infill designation at the August 14, 2023 City Council meeting to be consistent with State law (SB 9). No change recommended.
137	There's no section for the Housing Element so I'm putting this comment here: Restore the "Incremental Infill" designation for R1 and R2 residential neighborhoods. SB9 and ADU laws require cities to allow up to 4 housing units on any residential lot. By failing to eliminate exclusionary R1 zoning, Culver City forgoes the opportunity to qualify for federal and state affordable housing funding grants. Preserving the R1 designation in name only serves no purpose other than allowing certain irritating politicians to claim they "saved single family zoning."	Land Use and Community Design	114	Single Family. City Council voted to eliminate the incremental infill designation at the August 14, 2023 City Council meeting to be consistent with State law (SB 9). No change recommended.
138	I found the general plan to be skewed towards one particular group and not inclusive to the city as a diverse community. I would like the land use to be sensitive to those who bought their homes based on certain zoning rules. In my neighborhood the lots are small and I feel as though we live on top of each other. Having a 4-plex next door to me would be against why I bought my house. If I wanted to live in a densely populated neighborhood I would have spent the small amount of money I had in a different part of LA. I CHOSE CULVER CITY AND MY NEIGHBORHOOD BASED ON LOWER DENSITY LIVING. Higher density building should be kept to already densely build corridors and areas near public transit. I approve of equity for all and to protect the fabric of our neighborhoods. We should ALL have what we want not just a few.	Land Use and Community Design	114	Single Family. City Council voted to eliminate the incremental infill designation at the August 14, 2023 City Council meeting to be consistent with State law (SB 9). No change recommended. Single family housing is allowed in Single Family, Two Family, and Low Density Multifamily areas. No change recommended.
139	Approve the single family zoning in the areas mentioned on the map!	Land Use and Community Design	114	Single Family. City Council voted to eliminate the incremental infill designation at the August 14, 2023 City Council meeting to be consistent with State law (SB 9). No change recommended. Single family housing is allowed in Single Family, Two Family, and Low Density Multifamily areas. No change recommended.
140	I have the following suggestions: 1) Restore the "Incremental Infill" designation for R1 and R2 residential neighborhoods. SB9 and ADU laws require cities to allow up to 4 housing units on any residential lot. By failing to eliminate exclusionary R1 zoning, Culver City forgoes the opportunity to qualify for federal and state affordable housing funding grants. Preserving the R1 designation in name only serves no purpose other than allowing certain politicians to claim they "saved single family zoning."	Land Use and Community Design	114	Single Family. City Council voted to eliminate the incremental infill designation at the August 14, 2023 City Council meeting to be consistent with State law (SB 9). No change recommended.
141	(3) Tabel 2: single family maximum density 8,7 du/acre: To me this is misleading because the density is higher with the ADU/AJ and SB 9. I would love to see that the city takes her own responsibility and show in those schedules what real max. allowed density (or the conditioned max density) is.	Land Use and Community Design	114	Single Family: Because ADU/JADUs are accessory units, they do not count towards the allowable densities (units) on a lot. No change recommended.
142	Does this mean that there is no FAR for single family to high density multifamily properties?	Land Use and Community Design	114	Single family: The City's General Plan regulates housing development by dwelling units per acre and does not regulate standalone residential designations by FAR. The City's Zoning Code, however, includes FAR for single family homes. No change recommended.
143	Show existing LU for comparison, expand on single-family definition to explain ADU units	Land Use and Community Design	114	Single family: The existing land use map is shown in Figure 11. The "Supporting Neighborhood Residential Infill" of the Land Use and Community Design Element details the types of ADUs/JADUs allowed in single family areas. No change recommended.
144	The argument, occasionally made, that CC's anticipated job growth means CC must produce housing inventory to accommodate new workers is not supported by no data in the Plan or Element that shows what percentage of new CC residents would also work in CC. In fact, statistically, most new residents will not be working in CC. That means we would have new resident traffic on top of new worker traffic. Also, there is no mandate for CC to absorb or solve the County or State's lack in community planning.	Land Use and Community Design	114	The General Plan land use designations and map are designed to support housing growth mandated through three Regional Housing Need Allocation (RHNA) cycles. No change recommended.
145	Suggestion for form-based code and local-serving retail in R1	Land Use and Community Design	114	The Zoning Code is being updated concurrently with the General Plan and may consider changes to uses. No change recommended to the General Plan.

#	Comment	Element	Page	Response
146	This is for the housing element, but since that isn't an option, here's my comments. In the housing element, although incremental infill was removed, there should still be some type of up-zoning for existing two family areas. When incremental infill was removed from the element, it got rid of the proposed up-zoning for single and two family areas, and while up zoning single family neighborhoods is out of the question, up zoning multifamily neighborhoods would still result in a lot of good.	Land Use and Community Design	114	Two family: The General Plan alternatives process explored redesignating Two Family areas as other designations allowing more density. City Council voted to eliminate the incremental infill designation at the August 14, 2023 City Council meeting. The General Plan Update retains the existing General Plan's maximum density for two family: 17.4 du/ac. However, two family parcels in the city may add up to two ADUs and one junior accessory dwelling unit (JADU). No change recommended.
147	Hello, I noticed that under Incremental Infill, as well as upzoning R1 areas, R2 areas were also upzoned. When the Council Voted to get rid of Incremental Infill, it got rid of the upzoning in both R1 and R2 areas. My comment is, since the council got rid of Incremental Infill to help protect R1 areas, can we upzone the R2 areas back to 35du/ac, since it probably wouldn't be that controversial, and those areas are 2plexes already?	Land Use and Community Design	114	Two family: The General Plan alternatives process explored redesignating Two Family areas as other designations allowing more density. City Council voted to eliminate the incremental infill designation at the August 14, 2023 City Council meeting. The General Plan Update retains the existing General Plan's maximum density for two family: 17.4 du/ac. However, two family parcels in the city may add up to two ADUs and one junior accessory dwelling unit (JADU). No change recommended.
148	(1) The General Plan is an unconstitutional regulatory taking because it terminates oil uses; (2) The Proposed "General Plan" Land Use Map Figure XX Misrepresents the Legal Status of IOF Land Not Within Culver City's Boundaries; (3) The General Plan is not exempt from CEQA; (4) Federal Pre-emption Bars The Proposed "General Plan" IOF "Goals and Actions"; (5) Ending Energy Production In Culver City Serves No Legitimate Public Interest; (6) The Proposed "General Plan" Violates Municipality Authority; (7) Culver City Misrepresents Its "Sphere Of Influence" Requiring the Proposed "General Plan" To Be Redrafted; (8) General comments on General Plan	Land Use and Community Design	115	<p>(1); (4); (5); (8) The City Council previously terminated new and expanded oil uses within the Culver City portion of the Inglewood Oil Field via the Oil Termination Ordinance. The General Plan does not amend or revise the Oil Termination Ordinance, which is implemented through the December 7, 2023 Settlement Agreement between the City and Sentinel Peak Resources California LLC. The requirement for termination of oil and gas activities within the Culver City portion of the Inglewood Oil Field is an existing condition and a premise for the General Plan. Goals within the General Plan that reference oil operations within the Inglewood Oil Field outside of the current city limit are consistent with adopted Los Angeles County policies and regulations applicable to the Baldwin Hills Community Standards District.</p> <p>(3) The City is preparing an EIR, not a categorical exemption, for the General Plan.</p> <p>(2 & 7) The Culver City Sphere of Influence was established in 1991 and last reconfirmed in 2012 by the Los Angeles Local Agency Formation Commission (LA LAFCO). Land use designations for the Sphere of Influence area were established consistent with local agency reorganization regulations in place at that time, and which are carried forward and reflected in the General Plan Land Use Map. The land use designations shown for the Sphere of Influence are an existing condition and a premise for the General Plan. Change to the adopted Sphere of Influence boundary can be initiated by the legal property owners by application to LA LAFCO in accordance with the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000.</p> <p>(6) The General Plan has been prepared in accordance with the statutory requirements and authority under the Planning and Zoning Law, Government Code Sections 65000-66301. Appropriate findings to support this fact will be considered at the time the General Plan is considered for adoption.</p>
149	It would help if you provided the present land use map along with the proposed plan. That way people could see what you want to change.	Land Use and Community Design	115	Both the existing land use map and proposed General Plan Land Use Designations map are included in the General Plan. No change recommended.
150	Culver Blvd between Elenda & Sepulveda - request is to return it to residential	Land Use and Community Design	115	Culver Boulevard. The densities and uses incorporated into the General Plan relate back to land use options provided in community meetings that displayed various development intensities and land use approaches discussed conducted with City Council, Planning Commission, and the General Plan Advisory Committee. These designations were dispersed throughout the city, including in the Hayden Tract and along Jefferson and Washington. No change recommended.
151	Don't want mixed use on Culver Blvd between Elenda and Sepulveda	Land Use and Community Design	115	Culver Boulevard. The densities and uses incorporated into the General Plan relate back to land use options provided in community meetings that displayed various development intensities and land use approaches discussed conducted with City Council, Planning Commission, and the General Plan Advisory Committee. These designations were dispersed throughout the city, including in the Hayden Tract and along Jefferson and Washington. No change recommended.
152	Culver Blvd. South – kindly return that to residential – we do not want mixed use	Land Use and Community Design	115	Culver Boulevard. The densities and uses incorporated into the General Plan relate back to land use options provided in community meetings that displayed various development intensities and land use approaches discussed conducted with City Council, Planning Commission, and the General Plan Advisory Committee. These designations were dispersed throughout the city, including in the Hayden Tract and along Jefferson and Washington. No change recommended.

#	Comment	Element	Page	Response
153	I do NOT want the zoning changed to Mixed Use. I own two properties on Culver and both are residential.	Land Use and Community Design	115	Culver Boulevard. The densities and uses incorporated into the General Plan relate back to land use options provided in community meetings that displayed various development intensities and land use approaches discussed conducted with City Council, Planning Commission, and the General Plan Advisory Committee. These designations were dispersed throughout the city, including in the Hayden Tract and along Jefferson and Washington. No change recommended.
154	The multiuse designation on Culver between the park and Sepulveda does not make sense. That stretch is completely residential. There are no businesses	Land Use and Community Design	115	Culver Boulevard. The densities and uses incorporated into the General Plan relate back to land use options provided in community meetings that displayed various development intensities and land use approaches discussed conducted with City Council, Planning Commission, and the General Plan Advisory Committee. These designations were dispersed throughout the city, including in the Hayden Tract and along Jefferson and Washington. No change recommended.
155	<p>The purpose of this letter is to request that the Proposed General Plan's Land Use designation for South Culver Boulevard between Sepulveda and Elenda be changed from the currently proposed Mixed Use 1 (light purple on the Plan map) to its current actual land use designation and zoning designation, as that applies. This request has universal support among residents surveyed (by other residents) that live on or near Culver Blvd. on this stretch. Residents of this stretch would be irreversibly harmed by any "Mixed Use" proposal, as there already is minimal parking (with elderly residents forced to park and walk distances), gridlock during rush hour, and high levels of air pollution and noise, along with speeding cars as traffic has increased. Adding huge numbers of new living units and potential retail stores would drastically increase the problems in each of these areas. Thank you in advance for making this change. We appreciate the large amount of work that has gone into the Plan and we appreciate you considering the importance and value we place on maintaining the character and quality of life reflected in our neighborhood.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This is a family-friendly neighborhood; a totally residential zone (aside from the motel at the corner of Sepulveda). We are not Washington Blvd. or Venice Blvd. We insist on remaining a residential zone with our current density. - There already is traffic gridlock going in both directions which means delays, idling cars that pollute, and noise. This occurs at Sepulveda, Elenda, and Overland. The concept of adding a large number of residential units and businesses along this stretch is inconceivable relative to the issues stated - things would only get far worse. - There already is a lack of parking. The addition of several ADUs on this stretch has maxed out street parking. It used to be relatively easy to find a spot. Now it is difficult, and residents often have to park down the block or on other streets. Changing the density would obviously make parking extremely difficult. There are elderly people in this area - making them walk further is trying. The ADU issue is substantial - it adds significantly more crowding, traffic, and lack of parking. - It has been mentioned by consultants to the City and others that residents south of Culver Blvd. suggested an "interest" in retail establishments on Culver Blvd. were they to be located there. There are 2 issues with this: first, all such residents already have easy walking access to retail: on Sepulveda, Overland, Washington, and downtown Culver City. Second, the city has stated that "Mixed Use" does not mean retail or commercial is mandatory, therefore there may not be retail anyway located in what would be "Mixed Use." - Our neighborhood has been the subject of extreme disruption (many years of median work, the 405 offramp relocated to Culver Blvd., the Elenda/Culver delays and parking reduction created by the Elenda bike lanes, etc.) and we don't want the extreme neighborhood change that Mixed Use would bring. - As mentioned, local residents have spoken to more 26 residents in the past, and more currently, who live on Culver Blvd. South - none want the Land Use or Zoning to change from its current, and they also do not want Mixed Use. If the City and its consultants had the opportunity to speak directly to a larger number of residents who are most affected by the proposal - those who live on Culver Blvd. - perhaps there would have been no proposal for Mixed Use in this area, as believe the City should respond to what the vast majority of the most-affected residents desire. - While we are in this process, please consider adding speed bumps for those non-rush hour times when cars are driving substantially above the speed limit. -We kindly ask that the proposed Plan creators to immediately change the designations as requested. If that is not done, we ask that the Council make the change as soon as possible. Thank you. 	Land Use and Community Design	115	Culver Boulevard. The densities and uses incorporated into the General Plan relate back to land use options provided in community meetings that displayed various development intensities and land use approaches discussed conducted with City Council, Planning Commission, and the General Plan Advisory Committee. These designations were dispersed throughout the city, including in the Hayden Tract and along Jefferson and Washington. No change recommended.
156	<p>The purpose of this letter is to request that the Proposed General Plan's Land Use designation for South Culver Boulevard between Sepulveda and Elenda be changed from the currently proposed Mixed Use 1 (light purple on the Plan map) to its current actual land use designation and zoning designation, as that applies.</p> <p>This request has universal support among residents surveyed (by other residents) that live on or near Culver Blvd. on this stretch. Residents of this stretch would be irreversibly harmed by any "Mixed Use" proposal, as there already is minimal parking (with elderly residents forced to park and walk distances), gridlock during rush hour, and high levels of air pollution and noise, along with speeding cars as traffic has increased - Adding huge numbers of new living units and potential retail stores would drastically increase the problems in each of these areas.</p> <p>Thank you in advance for making this change. We appreciate the large amount of work that has gone into the Plan and we appreciate you considering the importance and value we place on maintaining the character and quality of life reflected in our neighborhood.</p>	Land Use and Community Design	115	Culver Boulevard. The densities and uses incorporated into the General Plan relate back to land use options provided in community meetings that displayed various development intensities and land use approaches discussed conducted with City Council, Planning Commission, and the General Plan Advisory Committee. These designations were dispersed throughout the city, including in the Hayden Tract and along Jefferson and Washington. No change recommended.

#	Comment	Element	Page	Response
157	<p>The purpose of this letter is to request that the Proposed General Plan's Land Use designation for South Culver Boulevard between Sepulveda and Elenda be changed from the currently proposed Mixed Use 1 (light purple on the Plan map) to its current actual land use designation and zoning designation, as that applies. This request has universal support among residents surveyed (by other residents) that live on or near Culver Blvd. on this stretch. Residents of this stretch would be irreversibly harmed by any "Mixed Use" proposal, as there already is minimal parking (with elderly residents forced to park and walk distances), gridlock during rush hour, and high levels of air pollution and noise, along with speeding cars as traffic has increased - Adding huge numbers of new living units and potential retail stores would drastically increase the problems in each of these areas. Thank you in advance for making this change. We appreciate the large amount of work that has gone into the Plan and we appreciate you considering the importance and value we place on maintaining the character and quality of life reflected in our neighborhood.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This is a family-friendly neighborhood; a totally residential zone (aside from the motel at the corner of Sepulveda). We are not Washington Blvd. or Venice Blvd. We insist on remaining a residential zone with our current density. - There already is traffic gridlock going in both directions - which means delays, idling cars that pollute, and noise. This occurs at Sepulveda, Elenda, and Overland. The concept of adding a large number of residential units and businesses along this stretch is inconceivable relative to the issues stated - things would only get far worse. - There already is a lack of parking. The addition of several ADUs on this stretch has maxed out street parking. It used to be relatively easy to find a spot. Now it is difficult, and residents often have to park down the block or on other streets. Changing the density would obviously make parking extremely difficult. There are elderly people in this area - making them walk further is trying. The ADU issue is substantial - it adds significantly more crowding, traffic, and lack of parking. - It has been mentioned by consultants to the City and others that residents south of Culver Blvd. suggested an "interest" in retail establishments on Culver Blvd. were they to be located there. There are 2 issues with this: first, all such residents already have easy walking access to retail: on Sepulveda, Overland, Washington, and downtown Culver City. Second, the city has stated that "Mixed Use" does not mean retail or commercial is mandatory, therefore there may not be retail anyway located in what would be "Mixed Use." - Our neighborhood has been the subject of extreme disruption (many years of median work, the 405 offramp relocated to Culver Blvd., the Elenda/Culver delays and parking reduction created by the Elenda bike lanes, etc.) and we don't want the extreme neighborhood change that Mixed Use would bring. - As mentioned, local residents have spoken to more 26 residents in the past, and more currently, who live on Culver Blvd. South - none want the Land Use or Zoning to change from its current, and they also do not want Mixed Use. If the City and its consultants had the opportunity to speak directly to a larger number of residents who are most affected by the proposal - those who live on Culver Blvd. - perhaps there would have been no proposal for Mixed Use in this area, as we believe the City should respond to what the vast majority of the most-affected residents desire. - While we are in this process, please consider adding speed bumps for those non-rush hour times when cars are driving substantially above the speed limit. - We kindly ask that the proposed Plan creators to immediately change the designations as requested. If that is not done, we ask that the Council make the change as soon as possible. Thank you. 	Land Use and Community Design	115	<p>Culver Boulevard. The densities and uses incorporated into the General Plan relate back to land use options provided in community meetings that displayed various development intensities and land use approaches discussed conducted with City Council, Planning Commission, and the General Plan Advisory Committee. These designations were dispersed throughout the city, including in the Hayden Tract and along Jefferson and Washington. No change recommended.</p>
158	<p>The purpose of this letter is to request that the Proposed General Plan's Land Use designation for South Culver Boulevard between Sepulveda and Elenda be changed from the currently proposed Mixed Use 1 (light purple on the Plan map) to its current actual land use designation and zoning designation, as that applies.</p> <p>This request has universal support among residents surveyed (by other residents) that live on or near Culver Blvd. on this stretch. Residents of this stretch would be irreversibly harmed by any "Mixed Use" proposal, as there already is minimal parking (with elderly residents forced to park and walk distances), gridlock during rush hour, and high levels of air pollution and noise, along with speeding cars as traffic has increased - Adding huge numbers of new living units and potential retail stores would drastically increase the problems in each of these areas.</p> <p>Thank you in advance for making this change. We appreciate the large amount of work that has gone into the Plan and we appreciate you considering the importance and value we place on maintaining the character and quality of life reflected in our neighborhood.</p>	Land Use and Community Design	115	<p>Culver Boulevard. The densities and uses incorporated into the General Plan relate back to land use options provided in community meetings that displayed various development intensities and land use approaches discussed conducted with City Council, Planning Commission, and the General Plan Advisory Committee. These designations were dispersed throughout the city, including in the Hayden Tract and along Jefferson and Washington. No change recommended.</p>
159	<p>The purpose of this letter is to request that the Proposed General Plan's Land Use designation for South Culver Boulevard between Sepulveda and Elenda be changed from the currently proposed Mixed Use 1 (light purple on the Plan map) to its current actual land use designation and zoning designation, as that applies.</p> <p>This request has universal support among residents surveyed (by other residents) that live on or near Culver Blvd. on this stretch. Residents of this stretch would be irreversibly harmed by any "Mixed Use" proposal, as there already is minimal parking (with elderly residents forced to park and walk distances), gridlock during rush hour, and high levels of air pollution and noise, along with speeding cars as traffic has increased - Adding huge numbers of new living units and potential retail stores would drastically increase the problems in each of these areas.</p> <p>Thank you in advance for making this change. We appreciate the large amount of work that has gone into the Plan and we appreciate you considering the importance and value we place on maintaining the character and quality of life reflected in our neighborhood.</p>	Land Use and Community Design	115	<p>Culver Boulevard. The densities and uses incorporated into the General Plan relate back to land use options provided in community meetings that displayed various development intensities and land use approaches discussed conducted with City Council, Planning Commission, and the General Plan Advisory Committee. These designations were dispersed throughout the city, including in the Hayden Tract and along Jefferson and Washington. No change recommended.</p>
160	<p>The purpose of this letter is to request that the Proposed General Plan's Land Use designation for South Culver Boulevard between Sepulveda and Elenda be changed from the currently proposed Mixed Use 1 (light purple on the Plan map) to its current actual land use designation and zoning designation, as that applies.</p> <p>This request has universal support among residents surveyed (by other residents) that live on or near Culver Blvd. on this stretch. Residents of this stretch would be irreversibly harmed by any "Mixed Use" proposal, as there already is minimal parking (with elderly residents forced to park and walk distances), gridlock during rush hour, and high levels of air pollution and noise, along with speeding cars as traffic has increased - Adding huge numbers of new living units and potential retail stores would drastically increase the problems in each of these areas.</p> <p>Thank you in advance for making this change. We appreciate the large amount of work that has gone into the Plan and we appreciate you considering the importance and value we place on maintaining the character and quality of life reflected in our neighborhood.</p>	Land Use and Community Design	115	<p>Culver Boulevard. The densities and uses incorporated into the General Plan relate back to land use options provided in community meetings that displayed various development intensities and land use approaches discussed conducted with City Council, Planning Commission, and the General Plan Advisory Committee. These designations were dispersed throughout the city, including in the Hayden Tract and along Jefferson and Washington. No change recommended.</p>

#	Comment	Element	Page	Response
161	The purpose of this letter is to request that the Proposed General Plan's Land Use designation for South Culver Boulevard between Sepulveda and Elenda be changed from the currently proposed Mixed Use 1 (light purple on the Plan map) to its current actual land use designation and zoning designation, as that applies.	Land Use and Community Design	115	Culver Boulevard. The densities and uses incorporated into the General Plan relate back to land use options provided in community meetings that displayed various development intensities and land use approaches discussed conducted with City Council, Planning Commission, and the General Plan Advisory Committee. These designations were dispersed throughout the city, including in the Hayden Tract and along Jefferson and Washington. No change recommended.
162	The purpose of this letter is to request that the Proposed General Plan's Land Use designation for South Culver Boulevard between Sepulveda and Elenda be changed from the currently proposed Mixed Use 1 (light purple on the Plan map) to its current actual land use designation and zoning designation, as that applies. This request has universal support among residents surveyed (by other residents) that live on or near Culver Blvd. on this stretch. Residents of this stretch would be irreversibly harmed by any "Mixed Use" proposal, as there already is minimal parking (with elderly residents forced to park and walk distances), gridlock during rush hour, and high levels of air pollution and noise, along with speeding cars as traffic has increased - Adding huge numbers of new living units and potential retail stores would drastically increase the problems in each of these areas. Thank you in advance for making this change. We appreciate the large amount of work that has gone into the Plan and we appreciate you considering the importance and value we place on maintaining the character and quality of life reflected in our neighborhood.	Land Use and Community Design	115	Culver Boulevard. The densities and uses incorporated into the General Plan relate back to land use options provided in community meetings that displayed various development intensities and land use approaches discussed conducted with City Council, Planning Commission, and the General Plan Advisory Committee. These designations were dispersed throughout the city, including in the Hayden Tract and along Jefferson and Washington. No change recommended.
163	As long term residents who live on Culver Blvd between Sepulveda Blvd and Elenda St, we are against any zoning of mixed use of any kind in this particular area for the following reasons: In our opinion we feel that we already have enough density on Culver Blvd between Sepulveda Blvd and Elenda St. There are not enough parking spaces now for tenants to park on Culver Blvd and they have to park elsewhere. There is already traffic gridlock going in both directions and traffic would only get far worse. We have also witnessed the problem of emergency vehicles unable to get to their destination sooner due to the traffic congestion. In our opinion the city's outreach process could have been better. Most residents I spoke to knew nothing about the mixed use change or the meeting for the mixed use zoning plan on Culver Blvd. I myself was told about the situation of mixed use zoning on Culver Blvd and an upcoming meeting at Vets Park by another resident. I then attended that meeting at Vets Park and asked some questions and voiced concerns on the General Plan 2045. If we had any more questions we were then directed to speak to the many consultants who were at the meeting. I voiced my opinion to all these consultants which were the same concerns I have stated above. Is it possible for a city to have too much density citywide or too much density in a specific area of the city, or does the city just build as much as they want with developers?	Land Use and Community Design	115	Culver Boulevard. The densities and uses incorporated into the General Plan relate back to land use options provided in community meetings that displayed various development intensities and land use approaches discussed conducted with City Council, Planning Commission, and the General Plan Advisory Committee. These designations were dispersed throughout the city, including in the Hayden Tract and along Jefferson and Washington. No change recommended.
164	The purpose of this letter is to request that the Proposed General Plan's Land Use designation for South Culver Boulevard between Sepulveda and Elenda be changed from the currently proposed Mixed Use 1 (light purple on the Plan map) to its current actual land use designation and zoning designation, as that applies. This request has universal support among residents surveyed (by other residents) that live on or near Culver Blvd. on this stretch. Residents of this stretch would be irreversibly harmed by any "Mixed Use" proposal, as there already is minimal parking (with elderly residents forced to park and walk distances), gridlock during rush hour, and high levels of air pollution and noise, along with speeding cars as traffic has increased - Adding huge numbers of new living units and potential retail stores would drastically increase the problems in each of these areas. Thank you in advance for making this change. We appreciate the large amount of work that has gone into the Plan and we appreciate you considering the importance and value we place on maintaining the character and quality of life reflected in our neighborhood.	Land Use and Community Design	115	Culver Boulevard. The densities and uses incorporated into the General Plan relate back to land use options provided in community meetings that displayed various development intensities and land use approaches discussed conducted with City Council, Planning Commission, and the General Plan Advisory Committee. These designations were dispersed throughout the city, including in the Hayden Tract and along Jefferson and Washington. No change recommended.
165	I think the stretch of Culver Boulevard between Elenda and Sepulveda should remain as multi-family but not be changed to Mixed Use 1. This area is 100% made up of single-family homes and small apartment buildings and changing it to a commercial, mixed-use zone would not be compatible with the way the street has developed.	Land Use and Community Design	115	Culver Boulevard. The densities and uses incorporated into the General Plan relate back to land use options provided in community meetings that displayed various development intensities and land use approaches discussed conducted with City Council, Planning Commission, and the General Plan Advisory Committee. These designations were dispersed throughout the city, including in the Hayden Tract and along Jefferson and Washington. No change recommended.
166	This request has universal support among residents surveyed (by other residents) that live on or near Culver Blvd. on this stretch. Residents of this stretch would be irreversibly harmed by any "Mixed Use" proposal, as there already is minimal parking (with elderly residents forced to park and walk distances), gridlock during rush hour, and high levels of air pollution and noise, along with speeding cars as traffic has increased - Adding huge numbers of new living units and potential retail stores would drastically increase the problems in each of these areas. Thank you in advance for making this change. We appreciate the large amount of work that has gone into the Plan and we appreciate you considering the importance and value we place on maintaining the character and quality of life reflected in our neighborhood.	Land Use and Community Design	115	Culver Boulevard. The densities and uses incorporated into the General Plan relate back to land use options provided in community meetings that displayed various development intensities and land use approaches discussed conducted with City Council, Planning Commission, and the General Plan Advisory Committee. These designations were dispersed throughout the city, including in the Hayden Tract and along Jefferson and Washington. No change recommended.

#	Comment	Element	Page	Response
167	<p>My concern is always for the</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) over urbanization of Culver City; 2) over density (cramming too many people in space not originally designed for their habitation) 3) "liquefaction" having NOT been tested in a big earthquake. Liquefaction is only "predicted" and we can't be sure what will actually occur. So although it is thought high rises will survive intact, we don't really know until the event occurs. I have lived through many earthquakes - so I am against vertical building in our area. 4) increase in "dehumanizing" our community as it would incur more inhabitants than is optimal and tolerable. The result will be crime, insecurity, and lack of resources appropriated as people are squeezed together. 5) schools more crowded, resources less available 6) more concrete, more heat, less green space 7) A dystopian future for everyone <p>I agree with the statements below.</p> <p>The purpose of this letter is to request that the Proposed General Plan's Land Use designation for South Culver Boulevard between Sepulveda and Elenda be changed from the currently proposed Mixed Use 1 (light purple on the Plan map) to its current actual land use designation and zoning designation, as that applies.</p> <p>This request has universal support among residents surveyed (by other residents) that live on or near Culver Blvd. on this stretch. Residents of this stretch would be irreversibly harmed by any "Mixed Use" proposal, as there already is minimal parking (with elderly residents forced to park and walk distances), gridlock during rush hour, and high levels of air pollution and noise, along with speeding cars as traffic has increased - Adding huge numbers of new living units and potential retail stores would drastically increase the problems in each of these areas.</p>	Land Use and Community Design	115	<p>Culver Boulevard.The densities and uses incorporated into the General Plan relate back to land use options provided in community meetings that displayed various development intensities and land use approaches discussed conducted with City Council, Planning Commission, and the General Plan Advisory Committee. These designations were dispersed throughout the city, including in the Hayden Tract and along Jefferson and Washington. No change recommended.</p>
168	<p>The purpose of this letter is to request that the Proposed General Plan's Land Use designation for South Culver Boulevard between Sepulveda and Elenda be changed from the currently proposed Mixed Use 1 (light purple on the Plan map) to its current actual land use designation and zoning designation, as that applies.</p> <p>This request has universal support among residents surveyed (by other residents) that live on or near Culver Blvd. on this stretch. Residents of this stretch would be irreversibly harmed by any "Mixed Use" proposal, as there already is minimal parking (with elderly residents forced to park and walk distances), gridlock during rush hour, and high levels of air pollution and noise, along with speeding cars as traffic has increased - Adding huge numbers of new living units and potential retail stores would drastically increase the problems in each of these areas.</p> <p>Thank you in advance for making this change. We appreciate the large amount of work that has gone into the Plan and we appreciate you considering the importance and value we place on maintaining the character and quality of life reflected in our neighborhood.</p>	Land Use and Community Design	115	<p>Culver Boulevard.The densities and uses incorporated into the General Plan relate back to land use options provided in community meetings that displayed various development intensities and land use approaches discussed conducted with City Council, Planning Commission, and the General Plan Advisory Committee. These designations were dispersed throughout the city, including in the Hayden Tract and along Jefferson and Washington. No change recommended.</p>
169	<p>The purpose of this letter is to request that the Proposed General Plan's Land Use designation for South Culver Boulevard between Sepulveda and Elenda be changed from the currently proposed Mixed Use 1 (light purple on the Plan map) to its current actual land use designation and zoning designation, as that applies.</p> <p>This request has universal support among residents surveyed (by other residents) that live on or near Culver Blvd. on this stretch. Residents of this stretch would be irreversibly harmed by any "Mixed Use" proposal, as there already is minimal parking (with elderly residents forced to park and walk distances), gridlock during rush hour, and high levels of air pollution and noise, along with speeding cars as traffic has increased - Adding huge numbers of new living units and potential retail stores would drastically increase the problems in each of these areas.</p> <p>Thank you in advance for making this change. We appreciate the large amount of work that has gone into the Plan and we appreciate you considering the importance and value we place on maintaining the character and quality of life reflected in our neighborhood.</p>	Land Use and Community Design	115	<p>Culver Boulevard.The densities and uses incorporated into the General Plan relate back to land use options provided in community meetings that displayed various development intensities and land use approaches discussed conducted with City Council, Planning Commission, and the General Plan Advisory Committee. These designations were dispersed throughout the city, including in the Hayden Tract and along Jefferson and Washington. No change recommended.</p>
170	<p>My family and I are supportive of the General Plan Land Use Map as shown on this page. We are especially supportive of the Mixed Use High Designation in Fox Hill which has very low density, a beautiful park, convenient shopping, an excellent public transit system that is in a Transit Priority Area. None of the Mixed High Use designation in Fox Hills displaces any residential and is well separated from the existing residential. This coupled with the need to produce housing makes Fox Hills well situated for the Mixed Use High designation.</p>	Land Use and Community Design	115	<p>Fox Hills. No change recommended.</p>
171	<p>My family and I are supportive of the General Plan Land Use Map as shown on this page. We are especially supportive of the Mixed Use High designation for Fox Hills which has very low density, a beautiful park, convenient shopping, and an excellent public transit system that is in a designated Transit Priority Area. Most importantly is that none of the Mixed Use High designation in Fox Hills displaces any residents and is well separated from the existing residential. All this coupled with the need for housing makes Fox Hills well situated for the Mixed Use High designation. Thank you.</p>	Land Use and Community Design	115	<p>Fox Hills. No change recommended.</p>
172	<p>I, along with other members of the community, are in support of the current proposed use map, especially as it relates to the currently underserved Fox Hills area, which is littered with outdated and high-vacancy commercial buildings. The land use map, as it stands, would provide much needed housing and help reinvigorate the community without negatively affecting current residents that border the area to the east. Culver City, as a whole, has a clear need for housing, and the updated land use map and related designations will greatly help the city reach its goal of providing quality housing for its residents.</p>	Land Use and Community Design	115	<p>Fox Hills. No change recommended.</p>
173	<p>I support the current proposed use map especially in the Fox Hills area where redevelopment is needed. It would serve to provide housing where the city has an extreme housing shortage which continues to worsen. Further, it would remove some of the eyesores in the community by building new affordable residential developments, which would further serve the people within their community. This is a long time coming and needs to happen before the crisis worsens!</p>	Land Use and Community Design	115	<p>Fox Hills. No change recommended.</p>
174	<p>I am in full support of the General Plan Update as it currently is and especially supportive of the Mixed Use High designation as it is shown on the General Plan Land Use Map, especially in Fox Hills. Please approved the plan as it currently is.</p>	Land Use and Community Design	115	<p>Fox Hills. No change recommended.</p>

#	Comment	Element	Page	Response
175	I support the General Plan Update with no changes. I support the Mixed-Use High designation as it is shown on the General Plan including the Fox hills area.	Land Use and Community Design	115	Fox Hills. No change recommended.
176	Fox Hills is a very densely populated neighborhood in Culver City, and it will only become more dense as new development takes place. We see there are city plans for quite a lot more development in Fox Hills, especially given the housing mandate, and we are excited about that.	Land Use and Community Design	115	Fox Hills. No change recommended.
177	Express support for general plan and zoning code Property owner in fox hills Good area for high density, very convenient location, when development comes in it would not displace or move residents out Fox hills is the right area to put high density	Land Use and Community Design	115	Fox Hills. Noted. No change recommended
178	<p>There needs to be a very specific revision to the Land Use Element in the General Plan that involves decreasing the Density Designation on the south side of Slauson in Fox Hills from 100 units per acre to below 65 units per acre. This high density designation, if it remains, will result in having an extremely high likelihood of creating negative impacts on the Fox Hills community for many years to come. The south side of Slauson in Fox Hills is the densest part of Fox Hills, as it has presently 2600 residential units, many offices, businesses, the Westfield Shopping mall and extensive cut through traffic and parking problems. For many years, the city, at every level of governance, has been well aware of the issues related to density in Fox Hills.</p> <p>If this density designation is not lowered to at least below 65 units per acre, this side of Slauson has a very high probability of seeing closely a 50% increase in the number of housing units if not more. There is already 2 developers who have held community meetings and if approved, that would add 599 units, as well as the Fox Hills Plaza owner, who will most likely propose at least 500 units plus an office building. There are several potential office sites, which could be sold to developers, making the figure increase even further.</p> <p>This high density designation was described at the October 19th, 2023 Draft GP meeting as 42% in Fox Hills, which really may not seem like a lot, but in reality we are looking at a high likelihood of having around 1100 units if not more on the south side of Slauson. So just looking at the 42 % figure tends to minimize the reality of the numbers. At the Oct 19 Draft GP meeting, we were also told that there will be a "special study" for this high density designated area costing 1.3 million dollars. Why would studying a problem which would be deliberately created instead of preventing the problem to begin with by lowering the density designation, is beyond me and others in the community.</p> <p>I am aware of the push to create traffic patterns to get people out of their cars; however that goal can be reached by a combination of approaches without stressing the infrastructure and people of Fox Hills in the process. The city needs to be much less rigid in how to approach attaining this goal, with equitable distribution of the state required 3341 housing units that Culver City must plan for. Putting this high density designation in Fox Hills appears to have been made as an expedient solution for meeting the state's requirement, as a large bulk of this requirement has a high probability of landing in Fox Hills because developers, as you must know, love high density to maximize their profits.</p> <p>Lastly, 3 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fox Hills is considered under SB 1000 to be a Threshold Priority Neighborhood, which makes it more at risk for having a disproportionate pollution burden that leads to impacting health negatively. This fact only gives even more reason for lowering the density designation. • The natural ocean breeze that the south side of Slauson now has helps to cool this area and high density housing would block this breeze, as the ones being proposed, thus far at 5700 Hannum Ave. and 5730 Uplander. If the breeze is blocked by high density housing and since the Fox Hills complexes were built around 50 years ago, many do not have the capacity for central or even unit based air conditioning. Banking on state/federal help with this issue as well as mitigating increased pollution may sound good, but not convincing, as predicting how the government will respond often changes and is not reassuring at all. • Place the high density designation on the north side of Slauson, where there is presently only businesses, NO housing now and much less traffic. <p>I have also attached the link to a community petition: www.showupforyourfoxhills.com. Thank you.</p>	Land Use and Community Design	115	Fox Hills. The densities incorporated into the General Plan relate back to land use intensity options provided in community meetings that displayed various development intensities and land use approaches discussed conducted with City Council, Planning Commission, and the General Plan Advisory Committee. These designations were dispersed throughout the city, including in the Hayden Tract and along Jefferson and Washington. The study referred to is a Specific Plan, which would plan for Fox Hills in a detail greater than can be planned under the General Plan. The study referred to is a Specific Plan, which would plan for Fox Hills in a detail greater than can be planned under the General Plan. No change recommended.

#	Comment	Element	Page	Response
179	<p>There needs to be a very specific revision to the Land Use Element in the General Plan that involves decreasing the Density Designation on the south side of Slauson in Fox Hills from 100 units per acre to below 65 units per acre. This high density designation, if it remains, will result in having an extremely high likelihood of creating negative impacts on the Fox Hills community for many years to come. The south side of Slauson in Fox Hills is the densest part of Fox Hills, as it has presently 2600 residential units, many offices, businesses, the Westfield Shopping mall and extensive cut through traffic and parking problems. For many years, the city, at every level of governance, has been well aware of the issues related to density in Fox Hills.</p> <p>If this density designation is not lowered to at least below 65 units per acre, this side of Slauson has a very high probability of seeing closely a 50% increase in the number of housing units if not more. There is already 2 developers who have held community meetings and if approved, that would add 599 units, as well as the Fox Hills Plaza owner, who will most likely propose at least 500 units plus an office building. There are several potential office sites, which could be sold to developers, making the figure increase even further.</p> <p>This high density designation was described at the October 19th, 2023 Draft GP meeting as 42% in Fox Hills, which really may not seem like a lot, but in reality we are looking at a high likelihood of having around 1100 units if not more on the south side of Slauson. So just looking at the 42 % figure tends to minimize the reality of the numbers. At the Oct 19 Draft GP meeting, we were also told that there will be a "special study" for this high density designated area costing 1.3 million dollars. Why would studying a problem which would be deliberately created instead of preventing the problem to begin with by lowering the density designation, is beyond me and others in the community.</p> <p>I am aware of the push to create traffic patterns to get people out of their cars; however that goal can be reached by a combination of approaches without stressing the infrastructure and people of Fox Hills in the process. The city needs to be much less rigid in how to approach attaining this goal, with equitable distribution of the state required 3341 housing units that Culver City must plan for. Putting this high density designation in Fox Hills appears to have been made as an expedient solution for meeting the state's requirement, as a large bulk of this requirement has a high probability of landing in Fox Hills because developers, as you must know, love high density to maximize their profits.</p> <p>Lastly, 3 points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fox Hills is considered under SB 1000 to be a Threshold Priority Neighborhood, which makes it more at risk for having a disproportionate pollution burden that leads to impacting health negatively. This fact only gives even more reason for lowering the density designation. • The natural ocean breeze that the south side of Slauson now has helps to cool this area and high density housing would block this breeze, as the ones being proposed, thus far at 5700 Hannum Ave. and 5730 Uplander. If the breeze is blocked by high density housing and since the Fox Hills complexes were built around 50 years ago, many do not have the capacity for central or even unit based air conditioning. Banking on state/federal help with this issue as well as mitigating increased pollution may sound good, but not convincing, as predicting how the government will respond often changes and is not reassuring at all. • Place the high density designation on the north side of Slauson, where there is presently only businesses, NO housing now and much less traffic. <p>I have also attached the link to a community petition: www.showupforyourfoxhills.com. Thank you.</p>	Land Use and Community Design	115	<p>Fox Hills. The densities incorporated into the General Plan relate back to land use intensity options provided in community meetings that displayed various development intensities and land use approaches discussed conducted with City Council, Planning Commission, and the General Plan Advisory Committee. These designations were dispersed throughout the city, including in the Hayden Tract and along Jefferson and Washington. The study referred to is a Specific Plan, which would plan for Fox Hills in a detail greater than can be planned under the General Plan. No change recommended.</p>
180	<p>Why is the density so high in Fox Hills?</p>	Land Use and Community Design	115	<p>Fox Hills. The densities incorporated into the General Plan relate back to land use intensity options provided in community meetings that displayed various development intensities and land use approaches discussed conducted with City Council, Planning Commission, and the General Plan Advisory Committee. These designations were dispersed throughout the city, including in the Hayden Tract and along Jefferson and Washington. No change recommended.</p>
181	<p>Why is Fox Hills receiving density when it is an SB 1000 Threshold neighborhood and there are air quality concerns?</p>	Land Use and Community Design	115	<p>Fox Hills. The densities incorporated into the General Plan relate back to land use intensity options provided in community meetings that displayed various development intensities and land use approaches discussed conducted with City Council, Planning Commission, and the General Plan Advisory Committee. These designations were dispersed throughout the city, including in the Hayden Tract and along Jefferson and Washington. No change recommended.</p>
182	<p>Want Mixed Use High on Buckingham north of Slauson</p>	Land Use and Community Design	115	<p>Fox Hills. The densities incorporated into the General Plan relate back to land use intensity options provided in community meetings that displayed various development intensities and land use approaches discussed conducted with City Council, Planning Commission, and the General Plan Advisory Committee. These designations were dispersed throughout the city, including in the Hayden Tract and along Jefferson and Washington. No change recommended.</p>
183	<p>Change Fox Hills to 65 du/ac</p>	Land Use and Community Design	115	<p>Fox Hills. The densities incorporated into the General Plan relate back to land use intensity options provided in community meetings that displayed various development intensities and land use approaches discussed conducted with City Council, Planning Commission, and the General Plan Advisory Committee. These designations were dispersed throughout the city, including in the Hayden Tract and along Jefferson and Washington. No change recommended.</p>
184	<p>I am concerned about the proposed "Mixed Use High" zoning in the block enclosed by Bristol Parkway, Sepulveda, and Green Valley Circle. I live nearby on Doverwood, and have noticed that Doverwood Dr. is a much-used parking area for Culver City residents who are visiting Fox Hills Park. Without ample empty space on Doverwood Dr, people's ability to access the park would be severely curtailed. I agree that the block in question does need re-zoning and revival; however, any development there must come with plenty of parking for those who live and/or visit there. Without adequate parking, I fear that Doverwood Dr. will fill up with cars, and fewer City residents will be able to access Fox Hills Park.</p>	Land Use and Community Design	115	<p>Fox Hills. The densities incorporated into the General Plan relate back to land use intensity options provided in community meetings that displayed various development intensities and land use approaches discussed conducted with City Council, Planning Commission, and the General Plan Advisory Committee. These designations were dispersed throughout the city, including in the Hayden Tract and along Jefferson and Washington. No change recommended.</p>

#	Comment	Element	Page	Response
185	<p>There was a community comment in this summary to make all of Fox Hills high density. I know that I had included in my comments to lower the density, but it was omitted in this Engagement Summary. In addition, no mention was made of the petition from over 100 Fox Hills community members to decrease the high density designation as well.(the petition was included in my comments submitted) I fear that these omissions will create bias when the Planning Commission makes their recommendations to the City Council.</p> <p>Please amend the comment summary under the Land Use Element to include the input I have just mentioned. I will also be addressing the Planning Commission and City Council again with my concerns as stated above.</p> <p>_____</p> <p>Thank you for getting back to me. So I take it other comments will be included that reflect the other issues regarding the opposition to the high density designation in Fox Hills: such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -This high density designation of 100 units/acre is in the highest density area in Fox Hills (on the south side of Slauson) -This decision appears to be expedient -That the large bulk of the state required housing has a high probability of being in Fox Hills. (I mentioned the above items in my comments that I submitted) <p>I hope I am correct, because just the comment that was included re: the air quality gives only a partial picture of the issue.</p>	Land Use and Community Design	115	<p>Fox Hills. The densities incorporated into the General Plan relate back to land use intensity options provided in community meetings that displayed various development intensities and land use approaches discussed conducted with City Council, Planning Commission, and the General Plan Advisory Committee. These designations were dispersed throughout the city, including in the Hayden Tract and along Jefferson and Washington. No change recommended.</p> <p>The Engagement Summary doesn't reflect the total number of comments received, but rather the scope of all comments. The response matrix will reflect all comments received.</p>
186	<p>Not enough community feedback is being discussed by the planning commission</p> <p>Not much positive feedback from community</p> <p>Fox hills community opposed to the plan, concerned that it will interfere with breezes from ocean</p> <p>TikTok building is atrocious, horrendous</p> <p>Build on north side of Slauson, keep things uniform in Fox Hills with 3 stories</p> <p>Enjoy walking in office park, like that there is not too much traffic, driving kids to school in the morning will be more difficult</p> <p>Very car reliant, basing development on biking is not practical or real</p>	Land Use and Community Design	115	<p>Fox Hills. The densities incorporated into the General Plan relate back to land use intensity options provided in community meetings that displayed various development intensities and land use approaches discussed conducted with City Council, Planning Commission, and the General Plan Advisory Committee. These designations were dispersed throughout the city, including in the Hayden Tract and along Jefferson and Washington. No change recommended.</p>
187	<p>I wanted to make sure we assess the ramifications of these advancements on climate regulation in Fox Hills, considering their potential obstruction of the ocean breeze, as well as the nearby urban expansion in Los Angeles, juxtaposed with the skepticism regarding the community's preference for an additional 2,000 housing units in their vicinity.</p> <p>I just wanted to bring to your attention that several of us from Fox Hills are concern about the issue state above</p>	Land Use and Community Design	115	<p>Fox Hills. The densities incorporated into the General Plan relate back to land use intensity options provided in community meetings that displayed various development intensities and land use approaches discussed conducted with City Council, Planning Commission, and the General Plan Advisory Committee. These designations were dispersed throughout the city, including in the Hayden Tract and along Jefferson and Washington. No change recommended.</p>
188	<p>Be aware that there are already 1709 proposed units to be built on the south side of Slauson which is the densest area of Fox Hills with presently 2800 units, the mall, offices and businesses, with more development proposals coming. In addition: the surrounding LA area, right across on Sepulveda and Centinela is an area where many developments have already been built and continue to be built, making Fox Hills even more closed in and subject to even more traffic. Culver City, as you probably know has no control over LA development.</p> <p>As we were told, usually these studies do not include assessing the effect that developments have on climate control in an existing community. Specifically, this "wall of housing" proposed would block the natural ocean breeze to our units in Fox Hills and these 50 year old buildings do not have central air and some are not set up to even have wall air conditioners. This natural breeze helps tremendously in keeping our community cooler during the warmer months. Please include a very detailed study of this potential problem, perhaps hire a specialist in weather and also throw in a little common sense.</p> <p>We are a threshold Priority Neighborhood which means we are more vulnerable to suffer health impacts due to environmental pollutants. Clearly, the high density designation for this area would add to that problem greatly.</p> <p>You probably know that a special study is proposed for this area d/t the density designation of 100 units/acre which could be prevented by decreasing the density designation, freeing up the funding for things that are really needed in FH, such as traffic calming measures. If the study was meant to reassure the community it does not.</p> <p>In conclusion, Indeed there has been community outreach and the main themes of inquiry have revolved around asking people what they like, do not like and what they would like to see happen in CC.</p> <p>I sincerely doubt that the main feedback from FH had to do with building another 2000 units adjacent to the already 2800 units here already.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	Land Use and Community Design	115	<p>Fox Hills. The densities incorporated into the General Plan relate back to land use intensity options provided in community meetings that displayed various development intensities and land use approaches discussed conducted with City Council, Planning Commission, and the General Plan Advisory Committee. These designations were dispersed throughout the city, including in the Hayden Tract and along Jefferson and Washington. No change recommended.</p>

#	Comment	Element	Page	Response
189	<p>● Be aware that there are already 1709 proposed units to be built on the south side of Slauson which is the densest area of Fox Hills with presently 2800 units, the mall, offices and businesses, with more development proposals coming. In addition: the surrounding LA area, right across on Sepulveda and Centinela is an area where many developments have already been built and continue to be built, making Fox Hills even more closed in and subject to even more traffic. Culver City, as you probably know has no control over LA development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● As we were told, usually these studies do not include assessing the effect that developments have on climate control in an existing community. Specifically, this “wall of housing” proposed would block the natural ocean breeze to our units in Fox Hills and these 50 year old buildings do not have central air and some are not set up to even have wall air conditioners. This natural breeze helps tremendously in keeping our community cooler during the warmer months. Please include a very detailed study of this potential problem, perhaps hire a specialist in weather and also throw in a little common sense. ● We are a threshold Priority Neighborhood which means we are more vulnerable to suffer health impacts due to environmental pollutants. Clearly, the high density designation for this area would add to that problem greatly. ● You probably know that a special study is proposed for this area d/t the density designation of 100 units/acre which could be prevented by decreasing the density designation , freeing up the funding for things that are really needed in FH, such as traffic calming measures. If the study was meant to reassure the community it does not. <p>In conclusion, Indeed there has been community outreach and the main themes of inquiry have revolved around asking people what they like, do not like and what they would like to see happen in CC. I sincerely doubt that the main feedback from FH had to do with building another 2000 units adjacent to the already 2800 units here already.</p>	Land Use and Community Design	115	<p>Fox Hills. The densities incorporated into the General Plan relate back to land use intensity options provided in community meetings that displayed various development intensities and land use approaches discussed conducted with City Council, Planning Commission, and the General Plan Advisory Committee. These designations were dispersed throughout the city, including in the Hayden Tract and along Jefferson and Washington. No change recommended.</p>
190	<p>What I see lacking is people who live in fox hills making these decisions, very little diversity in people speaking, how much time did you spend in fox hills, maybe if you set up an informational session in fox hills and get residents involved, having a meeting at night on valentines will not get engagement, start planning things and plan the dates and hours, density is way too much for fox hills and will negatively impact the people in fox hills, there are other areas you can focus on, shouldn't be burdened by the proposed density</p>	Land Use and Community Design	115	<p>Fox Hills. The densities incorporated into the General Plan relate back to land use intensity options provided in community meetings that displayed various development intensities and land use approaches discussed conducted with City Council, Planning Commission, and the General Plan Advisory Committee. These designations were dispersed throughout the city, including in the Hayden Tract and along Jefferson and Washington. No change recommended.</p>
191	<p>Fox Hills alliance, black community, discriminatory practice, paragon of white suburban idealism, fox hills neglected step sister. Fox hills most densely populated area in Culver City. Burden of providing affordable housing falls on Fox Hills. Bursting to the seems with housing. Time for equitable distribution of resources, fox hills should not face blunt of meeting housing requirements.</p>	Land Use and Community Design	115	<p>Fox Hills. The densities incorporated into the General Plan relate back to land use intensity options provided in community meetings that displayed various development intensities and land use approaches discussed conducted with City Council, Planning Commission, and the General Plan Advisory Committee. These designations were dispersed throughout the city, including in the Hayden Tract and along Jefferson and Washington. No change recommended.</p>
192	<p>I live on Buckingham Pkway in the Fox Hills neighborhood, and I am quite concerned about the proposal to build additional housing units on the south side of Slauson Blvd. Ours is a very densely populated area of the city. In fact, I believe that it is the densest area in Culver City. We already have serious issues regarding traffic and parking here. I do understand that additional housing is needed in the city. Please reconsider and modify your plans to build those units on the north side of Slauson. At present, there are only a few office buildings there, so housing could expand as needed.</p>	Land Use and Community Design	115	<p>Fox Hills. The densities incorporated into the General Plan relate back to land use intensity options provided in community meetings that displayed various development intensities and land use approaches discussed conducted with City Council, Planning Commission, and the General Plan Advisory Committee. These designations were dispersed throughout the city, including in the Hayden Tract and along Jefferson and Washington. No change recommended.</p>
193	<p>Targeting fox hills community south side of Slauson is the most dense, north side a Slauson should have the density, housing is needed, but it needs to be equitably distributed, comments to lower the density were not included in the summary, lower density designation in fox hills, a lower density needs to be penciled out with density bonuses and incentives. Community concerns about overloading fox hills is seen as a discriminatory practice. 125 signatures and many comments that deal with all these issues of inequitable distribution</p>	Land Use and Community Design	115	<p>Fox Hills. The densities incorporated into the General Plan relate back to land use intensity options provided in community meetings that displayed various development intensities and land use approaches discussed conducted with City Council, Planning Commission, and the General Plan Advisory Committee. These designations were dispersed throughout the city, including in the Hayden Tract and along Jefferson and Washington. No change recommended.</p>
194	<p>Fox hill areas surrounded by hills and cemetery, lower density in the house, way to bring down rent is to create competition by adding units to the inventory, only way that developers will bring in affordable is with market rate housing, developers must make a profit and buildings must do well, more housing inventory will stabilize rents, strongly support fox hills prime to become a small city of housing and mixed use housing</p>	Land Use and Community Design	115	<p>Fox Hills: Noted. No change recommended.</p>
195	<p>Dear Advance planning project team. I strongly support the Updated General Plan as it is currently written. I especially support the Mix-Use High Designation throughout the City and especially in Fox Hills. The Fox Hills area has extremely low density and is without a doubt the best area to add dense multifamily housing. Thank you.</p>	Land Use and Community Design	115	<p>Fox Hills: Noted. No change recommended.</p>

#	Comment	Element	Page	Response
196	This feature doesn't allow me to comment on more than one element. For Element #4: Helms Avenue from 3317 to 3425 should be upzoned. On at least the west side of the street, if not also the east side as well, it does not make sense to continue with "low density multifamily" zoning. Due to the street's close proximity to the Culver City station for Metro's E-Line (within 1/2 mile) and Culver City bus lines on Washington Boulevard (two blocks) and Metro's bus lines (and bike lanes) on Venice Boulevards (four blocks), this street should be zoned for considerably higher density. The multifamily housing stock that currently exists is all two story and very delapidated with a huge portion of the lots given over to surface parking and space-wasting easements between small buildings. Built to today's standards, the lots could easily provide housing for at least three times more households, and do so without impacting lower density neighborhoods to the east. As I understand the FAR suggested in the draft EIR, the inefficient buildings already standing on these sites could not be replicated. The FAR under the proposed plan appears to represent a defacto downzone. Moving forward, zoning incentives need to be in place so these plots are consolidated and redeveloped dramatically higher (at least four stories with a much denser FAR than proposed). Such an improvement would provide considerable help toward meeting the city's RHNA while putting housing where it can best be absorbed and needed (near the city's best public transit, shopping and strong employment). Note: some parking still would have to be provided in future developments. Such a zoning change would also increase the odds that new construction would be rental not owner-occupied housing, which is the progressive option.	Land Use and Community Design	115	Helms Avenue. These sites are designated as Medium Density Multifamily in the existing General Plan, Zoning Code and the General Plan Update. The allowed density of the Medium Density Multifamily designation in the existing General Plan is 29 du/ac and 50 du/ac in the General Plan Update. The General Plan Update increases the maximum density allowed under this designation, so it is not a downzone. Implementation action IA.LU-9 calls for developing a density bonus for assembled or master planned nonresidential parcels transitioning to residential use. No change recommended.
197	Helms Avenue from 3317 to 3425 should be upzoned. On at least the west side of the street, if not also the east side as well, it does not make sense to continue with "low density multifamily" zoning. Due to the street's proximity to the Culver City station for Metro's E-Line (within 1/2 mile) and Culver City bus lines on Washington Boulevard (two blocks) and Metro's bus lines on Venice Boulevards (four blocks), this street should be zoned for considerably higher density. The multifamily housing stock that currently exists is aging two story buildings with a huge portion of the lots given over to surface parking and space-wasting easements between small buildings. Built to today's standards and making better use of existing surface parking, the lots could easily house at least three times more households and do so without impacting lower density neighborhoods to the east. As I understand the FAR suggested in the draft General Plan, the inefficient buildings already standing on these sites could not be replicated. The FAR under the proposed plan appears to represent a de facto downzone. Moving forward, zoning incentives need to be in place, so these plots are consolidated and redeveloped dramatically higher (at least four stories with a much denser FAR than proposed). Such an improvement would provide considerable help toward meeting the city's RHNA while putting housing where it can best be absorbed and needed (near the city's best public transit, excellent shopping and strong employment). Note: some parking still would have to be provided but likely would either be redeveloped as an underground or on the first level amenity.	Land Use and Community Design	115	Helms Avenue. These sites are designated as Medium Density Multifamily in the existing General Plan, Zoning Code and the General Plan Update. The allowed density of the Medium Density Multifamily designation in the existing General Plan is 29 du/ac and 50 du/ac in the General Plan Update. The General Plan Update increases the maximum density allowed under this designation, so it is not a downzone. Implementation action IA.LU-9 calls for developing a density bonus for assembled or master planned nonresidential parcels transitioning to residential use. No change recommended.
198	Property Owners of land currently oil field operations in IOF want to address proposed amendments to the General Plan given the settlement agreement reached with Sentinel Peak, the operator of the oil field. The property would be available for higher and better uses than the proposed Open Space designation. Open space designation is inconsistent with the General Plan's goals. The draft fails to address the continuation of the two overlays concerning the IOF area, including the Special Study Area and the U (utility) designation referenced in the existing General Plan. We would further note that the Owners object to the inclusion in the draft of a portion of their property within the County of Los Angeles.	Land Use and Community Design	115	Inglewood Oil Field: The City Council previously terminated new and expanded oil uses within the Culver City portion of the Inglewood Oil Field via the Oil Termination Ordinance. The General Plan does not amend or revise the Oil Termination Ordinance, which is implemented through the December 7, 2023 Settlement Agreement between the City and Sentinel Peak Resources California LLC. The requirement for termination of oil and gas activities within the Culver City portion of the Inglewood Oil Field is an existing condition and a premise for the General Plan. Goals within the General Plan that reference oil operations within the Inglewood Oil Field outside of the current city limit are consistent with adopted Los Angeles County policies and regulations applicable to the Baldwin Hills Community Standards District. The Culver City Sphere of Influence was established in 1991 and last reconfirmed in 2012 by the Los Angeles Local Agency Formation Commission (LA LAFCO). Land use designations for the Sphere of Influence area were established consistent with local agency reorganization regulations in place at that time, and which are carried forward and reflected in the General Plan Land Use Map. The land use designations shown for the Sphere of Influence are an existing condition and a premise for the General Plan. Change to the adopted Sphere of Influence boundary can be initiated by the legal property owners by application to LA LAFCO in accordance with the Cortese-Knox-Hertzberg Local Government Reorganization Act of 2000. No change recommended.
199	Hiking + open space (natural space) is the best use for oil field	Land Use and Community Design	115	Inglewood Oil Field: The General Plan Land Use Designation is Open Space. No change recommended.
200	Kinston Ave. south of Jefferson Blvd should be upzoned to allow for higher density. Currently there are only about fifty 4 unit buildings on the street which is around 200 units total. The entire street backs up to commercial property on both sides so the impact to surrounding residential property would be very minimal. This street could house many more people than it does currently, and it is easily the most walkable area of Culver City in terms of essentials (two grocery stores, community college, target, pet store, dry cleaners, the list goes on). Creating new housing is the only way to address our city's housing issue and this is probably our city's least controversial, most carbon neutral place to do it. Please consider this as you draft our plan, thank you.	Land Use and Community Design	115	Kinston Avenue. The densities incorporated into the General Plan relate back to land use intensity options provided in community meetings that displayed various development intensities and land use approaches discussed conducted with City Council, Planning Commission, and the General Plan Advisory Committee. These designations were dispersed throughout the city, including in the Hayden Tract and along Jefferson and Washington. No change recommended.
201	Change City Hall parcel (APN 4207-008-917) to from Mixed Use Medium to Institutional to match the rest of City Hall property.	Land Use and Community Design	115	Make change for consistency with the Zoning Code.
202	Change properties on east side of Sepulveda at Venice (APNs 4213-019-010, 4213-019-011, 4213-019-012, 4213-019-031, 4213-019-034, 4213-019-035, 4213-019-911) from Mixed Use Medium to Mixed Use Corridor 2 to accommodate existing auto uses.	Land Use and Community Design	115	Make change for consistency with the Zoning Code.

#	Comment	Element	Page	Response
203	Change Costco properties (APNs 4236-029-003, 4236-029-004, 4236-029-006, 4236-029-007, 4236-029-008, 4236-029-009) from Mixed Use Medium to Mixed Use Corridor 2 to accommodate existing auto uses.	Land Use and Community Design	115	Make change for consistency with the Zoning Code.
204	Change Fox Hills properties south of Centinela Ace (APNs 4134-016-904, 4134-016-017, 4134-016-014, 4134-016-015, 4134-016-016) from Mixed Use Medium to Mixed Use Corridor 2 to accommodate existing auto uses.	Land Use and Community Design	115	Make change for consistency with the Zoning Code.
205	Change APN 4207-032-013 (Ballona Creek and Duquesne Ave) from Medium Density Multi Family to Open Space for consistency.	Land Use and Community Design	115	Make change for consistency with the Zoning Code.
206	Change APNs 4216-026-002, 4216-026-008, 4216-026-057, 4216-026-001, 4134-001-003, 4134-001-901, 4134-001-014, 4216-026-007, 4216-026-031, 4216-026-019, 4134-001-016, 4134-001-017, 4134-001-006, 4134-001-002, 4216-026-032, 4134-001-013, 4134-001-015, 4134-001-012, 4134-001-007, 4134-001-902, 4134-001-008, 4134-001-900, 4216-026-030, 4134-001-005, 4216-026-027, 4216-026-018, 4216-026-033, 4216-026-044, 4216-026-028, 4134-001-001, 4134-001-018, 4134-001-004 (405/90 Industrial Area) to Mixed Use Industrial to allow existing uses to remain conforming.	Land Use and Community Design	115	Make change for consistency with the Zoning Code.
207	The purpose of this letter is to request that the Proposed General Plan's Land Use designation for South Culver Boulevard between Sepulveda and Elenda be changed from the currently proposed Mixed Use 1 (light purple on the Plan map) to its current actual land use designation and zoning designation, as that applies. This request has universal support among residents surveyed (by other residents) that live on or near Culver Blvd. on this stretch. Residents of this stretch would be irreversibly harmed by any "Mixed Use" proposal, as there already is minimal parking (with elderly residents forced to park and walk distances), gridlock during rush hour, and high levels of air pollution and noise, along with speeding cars as traffic has increased - Adding huge numbers of new living units and potential retail stores would drastically increase the problems in each of these areas. Thank you in advance for making this change. We appreciate the large amount of work that has gone into the Plan and we appreciate you considering the importance and value we place on maintaining the character and quality of life reflected in	Land Use and Community Design	115	Mixed Use Corridor 1. The densities and uses incorporated into the General Plan relate back to land use options provided in community meetings that displayed various development intensities and land use approaches discussed conducted with City Council, Planning Commission, and the General Plan Advisory Committee. These designations were dispersed throughout the city, including in the Hayden Tract and along Jefferson and Washington. No change recommended.
208	(Part 1) California is BIG COUNTRY. Plenty of room to live and build. Over 60 years ago when my family moved here, California was the State of Opportunity in the Land of Opportunity. It has devolved over the last several years into a land of opportunists. Driven by greed, arrogance, lust for power and faux religions, most prominently environmentalism, people at the at the highest levels of government who have been elected to oversee the quality of life for the rest of us have twisted the vision of what California could be into a contorted mass of their own design. Who thinks that we should live this way? The politicians, bureaucrats and true believers. But do we want to? No. Sacramento operates under a "Rules for thee, but not for me mentality". Does Culver City seek a higher moral plain? Gavin Newsom lives in a 12,000 square foot house on an 8.2 acre estate along the American River in Northern California. 6 bedrooms, 10 baths, pool, tennis court, jacuzzi, and wine cave. And that's not including his winery which remained open while he shut others down. How many occupants is that per acre? The State bureaucrats under this Governor have determined that there is a housing shortage in California, even as almost a million Californians have left the state for green pastures. It would be greener pastures, but for the mismanagement of water at the highest levels of government, here, layers of colored rock have, for all too many, replaced the green, green grass of home. With perfect consistency, land use has been flushed away along with the rivers to the north. Decades of environmental impact reports which have deterred building throughout the state have left State politicians and bureaucrats in the position of trying to increase density in already overly impacted areas. The goal is apparently to cram as many people into as little space as possible. Build up not out. Deter home ownership. Reward high density projects, which can increase the tax base and the income of certain builders, while forcing people into undersized domiciles, decreasing the quality of life for both the current residents of the impacted neighborhoods and the new renters who will end up paying what the market will bear. Don't kid yourself about the planners using terms like "affordable". If the current trends of outmigration continue our least concern will be affordability. With increasing outmigration rising crime, violent and property, increasing affordability and density will not be our friend. Of course, all of this is built on a number of false assumptions and "dreams" of what some "intellectuals" believe about how communities should look and about the way the physical world works. The Agenda The extremists believe that man is the sole blight on The Planet. And that it is The Planet that must be saved. Then, of course, there is a spectrum of belief. The more common strategies are to reduce the impact of man on The Planet. Get people out of their cars. Build up not out. Everything that you need accessible within a 15-minute ride on your bike. Tell that to a plumber. Or to a mother who has to go to the Valley to take care of her grandchildren. "From the desert to the sea to all of Southern California"? Forget about it. No more fossil fuel. Electric vehicles only. Even though there is no place on The Planet where this is possible. Except, perhaps France, that gets 70% of its power from nuclear sources. But no nuclear here. It's toxic. It's dangerous. So, in the meantime California buys electricity produced by "renewable" sources and passes it off on consumers as Green. All this while over 90% of electricity is produced using fossil fuel. The problem is that there are not enough windmills or solar power plants to meet the California's need. There won't be in the foreseeable future. And based on current technology it is physically impossible and environmentally more destructive than modern use of fossil fuel. So, the Governor of California has to ask people not to charge their electric cars, at the same time he tells people to buy one.	Land Use and Community Design	115	Noted. No change recommended.

#	Comment	Element	Page	Response
209	<p>(Part 2) And he is forced to extend the use of a nuclear power plant for 10 years, despite his environmental confreres cries to shut it down. The big lie undergirding all of this is that 1) the Earth is warming 2) The warming is caused by man AND, 3) the most essential component, the warming is catastrophic. (As an aside, more deaths occur as a result of cold than heat.) We have been told this for at least 30 years, and the fearmongering continues despite no solid scientific basis for the claim. We were supposed to be underwater by now. Do a retrospective on any given year and see how often the weatherman was right. Then ask yourself how reliable a forecast could be for 100 years from now. Weather is a very complex system. Michael Crichton recognized, long ago, how difficult it is to predict in complex systems, using animal control in Yellowstone as a case study.</p> <p>So, we are all asked to chase our tails until we are too dizzy to stand, as the people in power, often unelected, tell us how to live, where we can and cannot go, and how we are to get there. So, who is served by the mandates from Sacramento? That is the proper role of government, to serve, no? And who are the city fathers of Culver City choosing to serve if they opt to drop thousands of units of new rental housing into the already most densely populated area in the city. Many of the current residents of Fox Hills have sunk their life savings into the homes and neighborhood that they have, over decades, made their own. We had the freedom to choose this neighborhood. With open air, a park and a quiet business park that served as a buffer between ourselves and the hustle and bustle and traffic at the mall. We supposedly live under a document that declares that we are endowed by our Creator with unalienable Rights, among them Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness. So, Liberty be damned. Life? What life without the freedom to make your own choices? Happiness? You can pursue it, but Big Brother is going to tell you how and where and why. If this all sounds hyperbolic, look around. There is no socialist/fascist one-party country or State that has not devolved into a nightmare. And it all starts with top down social planning. "...if an intellectual, who's brilliant, has an idea for rearranging society and it ends in disaster, he pays no price at all." Thomas Sowell</p> <p>Problems NOT by priority:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Pollution increase -Increased density -Parking loss -Loss of green space -Traffic volume increase -Reduced road access -Reduced air circulation -Reduced privacy -Reduced property values -Crime -Increased load on power grid 	Land Use and Community Design	115	Noted. No change recommended.
210	<p>The 5700 Hannum Project is the foot in the door. The City, as dictated by the State, has to make way for 2-3,000 units. They have suggested dropping them all in the space between the mall and Fox Hills. State-Mandated Housing Coming to Your Town Christine Epperly - YouTube. This story is all about us.</p> <p>New State Laws Rezoning Distortions Manipulation High Density Costs Costs Costs DON'T go down Affordable? Housing Building new units increasing the rents Despite massive number of existing unrented units Rents don't go down "Form based code" "Objective design standards" Ideologues' make policy based on FANTASY that is 1) out of touch with REALITY 2) under which they will not have to live "Brutalism" California used to be the HOPE Invented need Parking 15-minute city Give up your car Discourage home ownership Encourage dependency Rental society versus owner society Who has a stake? How to STOP it What can be done Think it through</p>	Land Use and Community Design	115	No change recommended.
211	MU colors blend, hard to read	Land Use and Community Design	115	Noted. No change recommended

#	Comment	Element	Page	Response
212	Good morning, I support the Culver City General Plan and Zoning Code update in its current form. Thank you.	Land Use and Community Design	115	Noted. No change recommended
213	Need for housing, R1 designation of IOF, county property is A2 zoning. Privately owned, making it open space is a legal issue	Land Use and Community Design	115	Noted. No change recommended.
214	IOF: concern over amortization, 45 acres as R1 Should be rezoned to Multifamily	Land Use and Community Design	115	Noted. No change recommended.
215	Potential for missing middle, making it ministerial and over the counter Suggestions APA equity and planning guide, documents that can be centered in community outreach and development of future plans Public comprehension: alternative to choose from, lowering of du/a in fox hills. Up to voices in community to voice their support/opinion	Land Use and Community Design	115	Noted. No change recommended.
216	I am concerned about safety and the increased transportation problems for Overland Avenue because of the city's new plan for increased high density multi-family units being added to the next streets where I live in a single-family home. There is also El Rincon elementary which already brings in tremendous traffic. Multi family units would only increase traffic along Overland, Sawtelle, and Sepulveda.	Land Use and Community Design	115	Overland Avenue. The densities incorporated into the General Plan relate back to land use intensity options provided in community meetings that displayed various development intensities and land use approaches discussed conducted with City Council, Planning Commission, and the General Plan Advisory Committee. These designations were dispersed throughout the city, including in the Hayden Tract and along Jefferson and Washington. The Mobility Element, developed in tandem with the General Plan Land Use Map, identifies strategies to reduce traffic impacts from new development, such as promoting alternative modes of transportation. Policy LU 11.7 aspires for development to be compatible with existing neighborhoods and for there to be smooth transitions in height, form, and character. No change recommended.
217	I am concerned about my family's safety and the increased transportation problems for Overland Avenue because of the city's new plan for increased high density multi-family units being added to the next streets where I live in a single family home.	Land Use and Community Design	115	Overland Avenue. The densities incorporated into the General Plan relate back to land use intensity options provided in community meetings that displayed various development intensities and land use approaches discussed conducted with City Council, Planning Commission, and the General Plan Advisory Committee. These designations were dispersed throughout the city, including in the Hayden Tract and along Jefferson and Washington. The Mobility Element, developed in tandem with the General Plan Land Use Map, identifies strategies to reduce traffic impacts from new development, such as promoting alternative modes of transportation. Policy LU 11.7 aspires for development to be compatible with existing neighborhoods and for there to be smooth transitions in height, form, and character. No change recommended.
218	I respectfully submit that Mixed Use 2 (Medium and High) should be removed from the proposed General Plan, especially for the area bordered by Overland, Washington, Sepulveda, and Jefferson. Surrounding our neighborhoods with thousands of apartment units is not an answer to any problem facing our city or neighbors. There is no mechanism that will offset set the high demand and market for apartment units on the west side of Los Angeles County. Mixed Use 2 will not result in affordable housing unless one considers "affordable housing" to be those units affordable to people making well into the 6-figures annually.	Land Use and Community Design	115	Overland/Washington/Sepulveda/Jefferson. The densities incorporated into the General Plan relate back to land use intensity options provided in community meetings that displayed various development intensities and land use approaches discussed conducted with City Council, Planning Commission, and the General Plan Advisory Committee. These designations were dispersed throughout the city, including in the Hayden Tract and along Jefferson and Washington. No change recommended.

#	Comment	Element	Page	Response
219	<p>Re Mixed Use 2 (Medium and High) on proposed General Plan. Part 1 (Note: Part 2 was also submitted through the Picture CC website)</p> <p>I respectfully request that the proposed areas of Mixed Use 2 (sometimes described as “Mixed Use Medium” and “Mixed Use High”) be removed from the proposed General Plan and Housing Element for the area West of Overland Ave. Especially for the area north of Jefferson. I request that the actual current land use and zoning remain as it is in all areas proposed for Mixed Use.</p> <p>I refer to the map on Page 115 of the proposed General Plan. Previously, I requested the removal of Mixed Use 1 on Culver Blvd.</p> <p>We also believe that development under Mixed Use 2 (or Mixed Use Medium or High) will cause irreversible harm to the neighborhood and residents, as it could add thousands of housing units to a neighborhood that is already crowded, has gridlock, has minimal parking, and has substantial noise and air pollution from significantly increasing traffic. Per Page 115, allowing Mixed Use appears to allow the neighborhoods bordered by Overland, Washington, Sepulveda, and Jefferson to be surrounded by a nearly continuous wall of towering apartment buildings. This would mean being encircled by many thousands of apartments and would be devastating to our neighborhoods.</p> <p>It is important to note that “Mixed Use,” to our understanding, does not guarantee that retail will be developed. This means that CC residents who live close to Sepulveda Blvd. could not only be impacted by massive building and traffic, but also lose both the convenience and necessity of retail locations near their homes, including an animal hospital, restaurants, a landmark music lessons business, massage locations, etc.</p> <p>CC residents who live near Sepulveda, Culver Blvd., Washington, and Venice Blvds. have absorbed enough negative impact of huge traffic increases. There is more to come when hundreds of units are added at Sepulveda and Jefferson. CC’s commitment to 3,341 additional housing units is sufficient, and itself will bring impact and challenges to our neighborhood.</p> <p>For perspective, per the Plan, over the last 20 years, housing units are up 4% and CC’s population is up around 5% over 30 years. During this time, traffic and all of its associated negatives have vastly increased, likely attributable - at least in part - to the growth of jobs in CC.</p> <p>Now, with the current proposed plan, a huge increase in housing units is proposed, way above the 3,341 per mandate. In fact, the Housing Element calls for 11,500 new housing (+67%) units by 2045. It also calls for at least 20,000 new residents (a +50% increase). And that is stacked on top of many thousands of new jobs projected. Job growth alone, as it has shown during the last 20 years, will have an extraordinary impact on traffic, noise, and pollution in our neighborhood.</p> <p>The City estimates, with a 67% increase in housing units by 2045, at least a 50% in population gain (20,000+ new residents). This is over 10 times the increase of the previous 20 years, and all would agree that we are already jam-packed now with the previous increases noted. Many folks would say it is preposterous to expect our neighborhood to absorb this. The City, its consultants, and the Council should quantify the effect of all potential increases in housing units above the state mandate - its effect on traffic, noise, pollution, parking, and overall quality of life. Removing Mixed Use 2 (Medium and High) would not solve the increase in impact coming, but it certainly would help significantly.</p> <p>(Part 2 is submitted separately)</p>	Land Use and Community Design	115	<p>Overland/Washington/Sepulveda/Jefferson. The densities incorporated into the General Plan relate back to land use intensity options provided in community meetings that displayed various development intensities and land use approaches discussed conducted with City Council, Planning Commission, and the General Plan Advisory Committee. These designations were dispersed throughout the city, including in the Hayden Tract and along Jefferson and Washington. The Mobility Element, developed in tandem with the General Plan Land Use Map, identifies strategies to reduce traffic impacts from new development, such as promoting alternative modes of transportation. Policy LU 11.7 aspires for development to be compatible with existing neighborhoods and for there to be smooth transitions in height, form, and character. No change recommended.</p>
220	<p>Part 2:</p> <p>Re: Removing Mixed Use 2 (Medium and High) from the proposed General Plan, especially in the neighborhoods bordered by Overland, Washington, Sepulveda, and Jefferson, and returning these areas to their current, actual land use designations. Part 1 was submitted through the Picture CC website.</p> <p>The argument, occasionally made, that CC’s anticipated job growth means CC must produce housing inventory to accommodate new workers is not supported by no data in the Plan or Element that shows what percentage of new CC residents would also work in CC. In fact, statistically, most new residents will not be working in CC. That means we would have new resident traffic on top of new worker traffic. Also, there is no mandate for CC to absorb or solve the County or State’s lack in community planning.</p> <p>The argument that affordable housing is needed is highly unlikely to be addressed by Mixed Use. Even if a small percentage of apartments are priced below market, they likely will be expensive. Mixed Use is unlikely to result in truly affordable housing.</p> <p>Our neighborhood (Culver Park West near Culver Blvd.) has been junked up for years by an unapologetic previous city Council majority. The Culver median project brought many years of disruption, and it accomplished very little in positives. Residents on Culver Blvd. South were denied the long-planned frontage road, which was crucial for resident safety. The dedicated Bike Lane on Elenda (east side) between Culver and Washington is seldom used, has removed at least 40 parking spaces, and resulted in nightmare traffic back-ups at the intersection at Culver Blvd..</p> <p>The 405 offramp moved to Culver Blvd. brought a huge increase in traffic. ADUs have brought more traffic and minimized street parking. The previous Council also pushed hard for homeless housing at the VFW building site (in a zone where many children walk to school), which fortunately did not happen; and on and on.</p> <p>Removing Mixed Use 2 (Mixed Use Medium and/or High), at all sites west of Overland on the proposed General Plan Map (page 115), along with removing Mixed Use 1 on Culver Blvd., will allow our neighborhood to contend with natural growth, which by itself is already substantial, and likely to increase as jobs increase. Allowing it will result in towers of expensive apartments, likely a reduction in retail, and it will significantly harm current residents. Thank you.</p>	Land Use and Community Design	115	<p>Overland/Washington/Sepulveda/Jefferson. The densities incorporated into the General Plan relate back to land use intensity options provided in community meetings that displayed various development intensities and land use approaches discussed conducted with City Council, Planning Commission, and the General Plan Advisory Committee. These designations were dispersed throughout the city, including in the Hayden Tract and along Jefferson and Washington. The Mobility Element, developed in tandem with the General Plan Land Use Map, identifies strategies to reduce traffic impacts from new development, such as promoting alternative modes of transportation. Policy LU 11.7 aspires for development to be compatible with existing neighborhoods and for there to be smooth transitions in height, form, and character. No change recommended.</p>

#	Comment	Element	Page	Response
221	<p>Re Mixed Use 2 (Medium and High) on proposed General Plan. Part 1 (Note: Part 2 was also submitted through the Picture CC website)</p> <p>I respectfully request that the proposed areas of Mixed Use 2 (sometimes described as “Mixed Use Medium” and “Mixed Use High”) be removed from the proposed General Plan and Housing Element for the area West of Overland Ave. Especially for the area north of Jefferson. I request that the actual current land use and zoning remain as it is in all areas proposed for Mixed Use. I refer to the map on Page 115 of the proposed General Plan.</p> <p>We believe that development under Mixed Use 2 (or Mixed Use Medium or High) will cause irreversible harm to the neighborhood and residents, as it could add thousands of housing units to a neighborhood that is already crowded, has gridlock, has minimal parking, and has substantial noise and air pollution from significantly increasing traffic. Per Page 115, allowing Mixed Use appears to allow the neighborhoods bordered by Overland, Washington, Sepulveda, and Jefferson to be surrounded by a nearly continuous wall of towering apartment buildings. This would mean being encircled by many thousands of apartments and would be devastating to our neighborhoods.</p> <p>It is important to note that “Mixed Use,” to our understanding, does not guarantee that retail will be developed. This means that CC residents who live close to Sepulveda Blvd. could not only be impacted by massive building and traffic, but also lose both the convenience and necessity of retail locations near their homes, including an animal hospital, restaurants, a landmark music lessons business, massage locations, etc. CC residents who live near Sepulveda, Culver Blvd., Washington, and Venice Blvds. have absorbed enough negative impact of huge traffic increases. There is more to come when hundreds of units are added at Sepulveda and Jefferson. CC’s commitment to 3,341 additional housing units is sufficient, and itself will bring impact and challenges to our neighborhood.</p> <p>For perspective, per the Plan, over the last 20 years, housing units are up 4% and CC’s population is up around 5% over 30 years. During this time, traffic and all of its associated negatives have vastly increased, likely attributable - at least in part - to the growth of jobs in CC.</p> <p>Now, with the current proposed plan, a huge increase in housing units is proposed, way above the 3,341 per mandate. In fact, the Housing Element calls for 11,500 new housing (+67%) units by 2045. It also calls for at least 20,000 new residents (a +50% increase). And that is stacked on top of many thousands of new jobs projected. Job growth alone, as it has shown during the last 20 years, will have an extraordinary impact on traffic, noise, and pollution in our neighborhood.</p> <p>The City estimates, with a 67% increase in housing units by 2045, at least a 50% in population gain (20,000+ new residents). This is over 10 times the increase of the previous 20 years, and all would agree that we are already jam-packed now with the previous increases noted. Many folks would say it is preposterous to expect our neighborhood to absorb this. The City, its consultants, and the Council should quantify the effect of all potential increases in housing units above the state mandate - its effect on traffic, noise, pollution, parking, and overall quality of life. Removing Mixed Use 2 (Medium and High) would not solve the increase in impact coming, but it certainly would help significantly.</p> <p>Part 2: Re: Removing Mixed Use 2 (Medium and High) from the proposed General Plan, especially in the neighborhoods bordered by Overland, Washington, Sepulveda, and Jefferson, and returning these areas to their current, actual land use designations. Part 1 was submitted through the Picture CC website. The argument, occasionally made, that CC’s anticipated job growth means CC must produce housing inventory to accommodate new workers is not supported by no data in the Plan or Element</p>	Land Use and Community Design	115	<p>Overland/Washington/Sepulveda/Jefferson. The densities incorporated into the General Plan relate back to land use intensity options provided in community meetings that displayed various development intensities and land use approaches discussed conducted with City Council, Planning Commission, and the General Plan Advisory Committee. These designations were dispersed throughout the city, including in the Hayden Tract and along Jefferson and Washington. The Mobility Element, developed in tandem with the General Plan Land Use Map, identifies strategies to reduce traffic impacts from new development, such as promoting alternative modes of transportation. Policy LU 11.7 aspires for development to be compatible with existing neighborhoods and for there to be smooth transitions in height, form, and character. No change recommended.</p>
222	<p>I object to the blanket designation of the Rancho Higuera neighborhood and those surrounding Linwood Howe as Two Family residential. These single family home lots are part of what makes CC so nice. Allowing for them all to be replaced by duplexes over time and up to 4 units is in direct conflict with what the residents largely want.</p>	Land Use and Community Design	115	<p>Rancho Higuera. The densities and uses incorporated into the General Plan relate back to land use options provided in community meetings that displayed various development intensities and land use approaches discussed conducted with City Council, Planning Commission, and the General Plan Advisory Committee. No change recommended.</p>
223	<p>Sepulveda Ave from Sawtelle to Slauson is currently zoned as “General Commercial” on both sides of the street. It was changed to “Mixed Use Corridor 2 (50 du/ac) on the west side of Sepulveda, but to “Mixed Use Corridor 1” (35 du/ac) on the east side. The east side should have the same allowable density. The same is true of other portions of Sepulveda as well as Culver and Washington Boulevards that are within Transit-Oriented Community (TOC) areas.</p>	Land Use and Community Design	115	<p>Sepulveda Avenue. The parcels on the east side of Slauson are generally smaller with shallower lots, and smaller sites may be more challenging to reach higher densities. It also reflects the desire for height transitions to the adjacent neighborhoods. No change recommended.</p>
224	<p>Sepulveda Ave from Sawtelle to Slauson is currently zoned as “General Commercial” on both sides of the street. It was changed to “Mixed Use Corridor 2 (50 du/ac) on the west side of Sepulveda, but to “Mixed Use Corridor 1” (35 du/ac) on the east side. The east side should have the same allowable density. The same is true of other portions of Sepulveda as well as Culver and Washington Boulevards that are within Transit-Oriented Community (TOC) areas.</p>	Land Use and Community Design	115	<p>Sepulveda Avenue. The parcels on the east side of Slauson are generally smaller with shallower lots, and smaller sites may be more challenging to reach higher densities. It also reflects the desire for height transitions to the adjacent neighborhoods. No change recommended.</p>
225	<p>Sepulveda Ave from Sawtelle to Slauson is currently zoned as “General Commercial” on both sides of the street. It was changed to “Mixed Use Corridor 2 (50 du/ac) on the west side of Sepulveda, but to “Mixed Use Corridor 1” (35 du/ac) on the east side. The east side should have the same allowable density. The same is true of other portions of Sepulveda as well as Culver and Washington Boulevards that are within Transit-Oriented Community (TOC) areas.</p>	Land Use and Community Design	115	<p>Sepulveda Avenue. The parcels on the east side of Slauson are generally smaller with shallower lots, and smaller sites may be more challenging to reach higher densities. It also reflects the desire for height transitions to the adjacent neighborhoods. No change recommended.</p>
226	<p>Hello I live right behind Bed Bath & Beyond which looks like it’s slated for High Density mixed use. This looks right into my yard...and I’d like to know does that mean 5 stories of stores or condos??</p> <p>I would like to know what your intentions are. Why did I just find out about this? Can’t you even publicize in the local paper? You couldn’t email your plan to the residents in this city? Or were u hoping to sneak it by. Sign me...irritated.</p>	Land Use and Community Design	115	<p>Target/Bed, Bath & Beyond site on Jefferson. The densities incorporated into the General Plan relate back to land use intensity options provided in community meetings that displayed various development intensities and land use approaches discussed conducted with City Council, Planning Commission, and the General Plan Advisory Committee. These designations were dispersed throughout the city, including in the Hayden Tract and along Jefferson and Washington. The Mobility Element, developed in tandem with the General Plan Land Use Map, identifies strategies to reduce traffic impacts from new development, such as promoting alternative modes of transportation. No change recommended.</p>

#	Comment	Element	Page	Response
227	I am very concerned with high rise being so close to single family homes and also right near the elementary school. I am referring to the area where target and bed bath and beyond was . There is a safety concern and traffic congestion is already bad. Please do not build high rise living here	Land Use and Community Design	115	Target/Bed, Bath & Beyond site on Jefferson. The densities incorporated into the General Plan relate back to land use intensity options provided in community meetings that displayed various development intensities and land use approaches discussed conducted with City Council, Planning Commission, and the General Plan Advisory Committee. These designations were dispersed throughout the city, including in the Hayden Tract and along Jefferson and Washington. The Mobility Element, developed in tandem with the General Plan Land Use Map, identifies strategies to reduce traffic impacts from new development, such as promoting alternative modes of transportation. No change recommended.
228	I am concerned with the addition of high density multi-family units being added to the Target/Bed Bath and Beyond lot. That area of Culver City on both Jefferson and Overland is already very congested with cars and adding more homes to the area would increase already large amounts of traffic to the area.	Land Use and Community Design	115	Target/Bed, Bath & Beyond site on Jefferson. The densities incorporated into the General Plan relate back to land use intensity options provided in community meetings that displayed various development intensities and land use approaches discussed conducted with City Council, Planning Commission, and the General Plan Advisory Committee. These designations were dispersed throughout the city, including in the Hayden Tract and along Jefferson and Washington. The Mobility Element, developed in tandem with the General Plan Land Use Map, identifies strategies to reduce traffic impacts from new development, such as promoting alternative modes of transportation. No change recommended.
229	I live in Europe and own a rental property on Wasatch. I heard to my dismay that there is a homeless shelter in planning close to my house. On Sepuveder are mostly commercial buildings and you plan this so close to quiet residential streets	Land Use and Community Design	115	The City is doing its part to help the unhoused neighbors of Culver City, which includes providing services to the unhoused. No change recommended.
230	Revise Figure 16 to remove public open space, for consistency with the Zoning Code.	Land Use and Community Design	117	Revise Figure 16 to remove public open space from the Baldwin Hills study area.
231	More housing and affordable housing needed	Land Use and Community Design	118	Goal LU-2 aspires for a community with a range of housing options affordable to a diversity of people. Associated policies LU-2.1, LU-2.3, and LU-2.4 identify opportunities to expand inclusionary housing programs, develop workforce housing, and explore equity homeownership models. No change recommended.
232	Low income housing needed in Culver City	Land Use and Community Design	118	Goal LU-2 aspires for a community with a range of housing options affordable to a diversity of people. Associated policies LU-2.1, LU-2.3, and LU-2.4 identify opportunities to expand inclusionary housing programs, develop workforce housing, and explore equity homeownership models. No change recommended.
233	More permissive land use wanted	Land Use and Community Design	118	Noted. No change recommended.
234	Im interested in Housing and development	Land Use and Community Design	118	Noted. No change recommended.
235	Culver City does not need more expensive rental housing. We need more home ownership by building row houses or town houses with yards for families and adaptive reuse of other commercial building that are under utilized.	Land Use and Community Design	118	Policy LU-2.4 seeks to explore expanded use of equity homeownership models to increase homeownership.The Housing Element expands further on strategies to increase housing available for ownership. No change recommended.
236	Hello Culver City! I believe my comments would fall into the "Element 4" category. It could possible relate to "Element 8" as well. I have lived in Culver City for over 20 years and 2 blocks outside the City boundary for an additional 10 years. My concern is the rapid expansion of large business/condo buildings going up in our city. It's not that I don't expect growth, but it is getting really crowded; too tight. Traffic is SO BAD right now. If people don't get onto public transportation, what is your vision? Perhaps hour-long commutes to drive 10 miles?	Land Use and Community Design	118	The Mobility Element plans for a city where people can navigate via a variety of options, including autos, public transportation, walking, and biking. Goal 1 of the Land Use Element relates to focusing development in transit-oriented communities, where there are robust transit options to reduce dependence on cars. No change recommended.
237	Can we comment on the assumptions on affordable housing production based upon the increased Real Estate Transfer Tax and if that tax is hindering investment housing being built?	Land Use and Community Design	118	This was not identified as a constraint in the Housing Element. No further discussion or analysis of this topic is needed in the General Plan. No change recommended.
238	Revise policy 7.2 to strengthen requirements from new development.	Land Use and Community Design	121	LU-7.2: Walkable streets in Fox Hills. Prioritize walking and biking by breaking Require new development to break up large blocks and prioritize pedestrian, bicycle, and emergency vehicle access with into a finer grained network and through complete streets improvements.
239	Revise policy 7.4 to strengthen requirements from new development.	Land Use and Community Design	121	LU-7.4: Park and open space. Require new publicly accessible parks and open spaces, and complete streets connections to these spaces, to support business and residential communities.

#	Comment	Element	Page	Response
240	Establish transfer of development rights to facilitate public benefit and housing density particularly over fault lines in Hayden tract	Land Use and Community Design	122	The City is not considering a transfer of development rights program at this time. No change recommended.
241	The city should initiate a robust incentive program to enable homeowners to rent ADUs at affordable prices. ADU Construction is undeniably expensive, especially as a one-off process leaving homeowners looking for more lucrative ways to recover costs such as renting them through platforms like AirBnB. The city should provide pre-approved plans and explore incentives that provide low interest loans or grants in exchange for commitments to rent to lower income households.	Land Use and Community Design	123	ADUs: Measure 4 of the Housing Element includes an "Affordable ADU Incentive Program," which describes a program to developed pre-approved plans and incentives for developing affordable ADUs, including for the homeless. LU-11.1 aspires to actively facilitate development of affordable housing. No change recommended.
242	We should also allow for the separate purchasing of ADUs which is now legal under AB 1033 but requires opt-in from the city, to provide more options for tenants and other lower income individuals to own. On that note the city should create a program to prioritize ADU housing for long-term residents who actually want to live in Culver City, and disincentivize short term AirBnB-type markets, as well as vanity builds for home theaters or offices as long as we're experiencing such a dire housing shortage.	Land Use and Community Design	123	ADUs: Measure 4 of the Housing Element includes an "Affordable ADU Incentive Program," which describes a program to developed pre-approved plans and incentives for developing affordable ADUs, including for the homeless. LU-11.1 aspires to actively facilitate development of affordable housing. No change recommended.
243	2) Develop a robust incentive program to enable homeowners to rent ADUs at affordable prices. ADUs are undeniably expensive to build, especially when constructed as a one-off process. Currently, many Culver City homeowners building ADUs are renting them through platforms like AirBnB or using them for purposes other than long term rentals to people who want to live in Culver City. The city should provide pre-approved plans and explore incentives that provide low interest loans or grants in exchange for commitments to rent to lower income households.	Land Use and Community Design	123	ADUs: Measure 4 of the Housing Element includes an "Affordable ADU Incentive Program," which describes a program to developed pre-approved plans and incentives for developing affordable ADUs, including for the homeless. LU-11.1 aspires to actively facilitate development of affordable housing. No change recommended.
244	Culver City should develop a robust incentive program to enable homeowners to rent ADUs at affordable prices. ADUs are undeniably expensive to build, especially when constructed as a one-off process. Currently, many Culver City homeowners building ADUs are renting them through platforms like AirBnB or using them for purposes other than long term rentals to people who want to live in Culver City. The city should provide pre-approved plans and explore incentives that provide low interest loans or grants in exchange for commitments to rent to lower income households.	Land Use and Community Design	123	ADUs: Measure 4 of the Housing Element includes an "Affordable ADU Incentive Program," which describes a program to developed pre-approved plans and incentives for developing affordable ADUs, including for the homeless. LU-11.1 aspires to actively facilitate development of affordable housing. No change recommended.
245	Culver City should develop a robust incentive program to enable homeowners to rent ADUs at affordable prices. ADUs are undeniably expensive to build, especially when constructed as a one-off process. Currently, many Culver City homeowners building ADUs are renting them through platforms like AirBnB or using them for purposes other than long term rentals to people who want to live in Culver City. The city should provide pre-approved plans and explore incentives that provide low interest loans or grants in exchange for commitments to rent to lower income households.	Land Use and Community Design	123	ADUs: Measure 4 of the Housing Element includes an "Affordable ADU Incentive Program," which describes a program to developed pre-approved plans and incentives for developing affordable ADUs, including for the homeless. LU-11.1 aspires to actively facilitate development of affordable housing. No change recommended.
246	Fully two-thirds of the housing state law requires Culver City to build must be affordable to very low to moderate income households. An affordable housing overlay to facilitate citywide development of 100% affordable housing sites is key to helping us meet these requirements.	Land Use and Community Design	123	Affordable Housing Overlay: The City is not considering an affordable housing overlay at this time. No change recommended.
247	3) Adopt an affordable housing overlay to facilitate citywide development of 100% affordable housing sites. As much as a revamped zoning plan is necessary, the incentives for 100% affordable housing need to be even stronger to build badly needed affordable units. Units affordable to households with very low to moderate incomes make up 2,272, or 66% of the 3,341 state-mandated housing units Culver City has to build.	Land Use and Community Design	123	Affordable Housing Overlay: The City is not considering an affordable housing overlay at this time. No change recommended.
248	4) Immediately fund a study to develop the density bonuses and other incentives that will maximize production of affordable housing in Culver City. The draft General Plan refers to density bonuses for affordable housing as a possible deviation to the Land Use Designation Map, rather than a strategy to accomplish the goal of increasing the supply of affordable housing. The affordable overlay will produce zero affordable units unless we can first understand what height limits, floor area ratios, bonus units, etc. will actually make it cost effective to build affordable units in our city's particular development environment.	Land Use and Community Design	123	Density Bonus Ordinance: The City is developing a Density Bonus Ordinance Update, which will evaluate new incentives for developing affordable housing. The Housing Element also includes strategies to boost affordable housing production and ADU development. LU-11.1 aspires to actively facilitate development of affordable housing. No change recommended.
249	The city needs to immediately fund a study to develop the density bonuses and other incentives that will maximize production of affordable housing in Culver City. The affordable overlay will produce zero affordable units unless we can first understand what height limits, floor area ratios, bonus units, etc. actually make it cost effective to build affordable units in our city's particular development environment.	Land Use and Community Design	123	Density Bonus Ordinance: The City is developing a Density Bonus Ordinance Update, which will evaluate new incentives for developing affordable housing. The Housing Element also includes strategies to boost affordable housing production and ADU development. LU-11.1 aspires to actively facilitate development of affordable housing. No change recommended.
250	-- We need an affordable housing overlay to facilitate citywide development of 100% affordable housing sites. As much as a revamped zoning plan is necessary, the incentives for 100% affordable housing need to be even stronger to build badly needed affordable units. Units affordable to households with very low to moderate incomes make up 2,272, or 66% of the 3,341 state-mandated housing units Culver City has to build.	Land Use and Community Design	123	Density Bonus Ordinance: The City is not considering an affordable housing overlay at this time. The City is developing a Density Bonus Ordinance Update, which will evaluate new incentives for developing affordable housing. The Housing Element also includes strategies to boost affordable housing production and ADU development. LU-11.1 aspires to actively facilitate development of affordable housing. No change recommended.
251	Implementation is everything. A sense of urgency about housing production is essential. It is not enough to sit back and say "There's nothing we can do if the project doesn't pencil out for developers." We need to create incentives for developers, but we also must recognize the market alone will not create the affordable housing we need to meet the RHNA goals.	Land Use and Community Design	123	The Housing Element sets forth a series of policies and programs that affordable housing development. No change recommended.
252	Allow childcare as a standalone use	Land Use and Community Design	123	The Zoning Code is being updated concurrently with the General Plan and may consider changes to uses. No change recommended.
253	Plant more trees, don't remove trees as part of development	Land Use and Community Design	125	Policy LU-14.4 requires new development to add street trees along streets and public spaces. Policy LU-14.8 aspires to increase the size and extent of the tree canopy. No change recommended.

#	Comment	Element	Page	Response
254	-- We need to include developers in the planning process to learn what incentives will increase production of affordable housing. The affordable overlay will produce zero affordable units unless we can first understand what height limits, floor area ratios, bonus units, etc. will actually make it cost effective to build affordable units in our city's particular development environment.	Land Use and Community Design	128	The City is currently updating its Density Bonus Ordinance, which will put in place incentives for developing affordable housing. No change recommended.
255	Don't require stormwater dedications/fees for new development as part of approvals process	Land Use and Community Design	128	The City requires development impact fees to fund impacts associated with new development. Policy LU-18.2 requires development to pay its fair share of the cost of capital improvements needed to serve that development. It also calls for regularly reevaluating the City's impact fees. No change recommended.
256	What will the zoning look like in regards to the changes?	Land Use and Community Design	129	The City is currently updating its Zoning Code for General Plan consistency. No change recommended.
257	Grass or white roofs on commercial and apartment buildings, are you all bought & paid for by developers? The units required by developers to set aside for affordable housing is a joke. 10% is not even close to filling needs now & more so in the future. Medium income levels are not near what most people get, especially seniors.	Land Use and Community Design	129	The City's Density Bonus Update is underway and aims to expand affordable housing production. The General Plan (including the Housing Element) include policies to advance affordable housing production. No change recommended.
258	Zoning didn't allow for daycare without CUP. Takes too long to get a permit	Land Use and Community Design	129	The Zoning Code is being updated concurrently with the General Plan and may consider changes to uses. No change recommended.
259	Too many districts require CUPs. This takes too much time	Land Use and Community Design	129	The Zoning Code is being updated concurrently with the General Plan and may consider changes to uses. No change recommended.
260	Want to be able to build higher, 85 ft, 65ft doesn't pencil	Land Use and Community Design	130	Policy LU-4.1 and associated implementation action IA.LU-10 identify a study to evaluate whether the City should change its height limits in targeted locations. No change recommended.
261	Reducing restrictions for height etc. Is going totally wrong direction and works against any climate change mediations. You cannot expand road infrastructure one bit, not acceptable now	Land Use and Community Design	130	The Zoning Code update is underway and will consider changes to heights. No change recommended.
262	The fact that it took me a year and a half to get city permits for an ADU project that took only 7 months to build is unacceptable. If the city is serious about building housing the permit process must be streamlined.	Land Use and Community Design	131	Goal ED-6 aims to streamline the City's development process to increase potential for housing and mixed use development. Associated implementation action IA.ED-11 identifies an ordinance/code amendment update to reduce the need for discretionary approvals. The Housing Element has a number of similar actions. No change recommended.
263	Parks should be more versatile and multi-purpose, innovative (see LA County)	Parks, Recreation, and Public Facilities	135	Goal PR-2 speaks to providing quality park facilities that meet the community's needs. Associated policies PR-2.1 and PR-2.2 seek to allowing flexible uses in parks and providing multi-purpose uses. No change recommended.
264	Please review the Funding section on Page 132. It states "PRCS currently does not have adequate funding to support capital improvements or maintenance and operations. Consequently, the City's parks and recreation facilities are undermaintained, and will continue to be undermaintained throughout the General Plan horizon."	Parks, Recreation, and Public Facilities	142	Maintenance is a major challenge for PRCS and will continue to be as the need for parks grows. Implementation action IA.PR-12 seeks to identify strategies to support maintenance funding over the General Plan horizon. No change recommended.
265	One pool is not enough – what is tax money going towards?	Parks, Recreation, and Public Facilities	142	The City plans to build a new lesson pool and update the Municipal Plunge as a warm pool. This project is included in the Element in the list of planned and proposed parks and recreation facilities and shown in Figure 20 as a planned project. No change recommended.
266	Please consider adding more language regarding the importance of renovating Veterans Memorial Auditorium so that it can be a state-of-the-art event and performance venue. The Auditorium is one of the focal points for the current PRCS feasibility study on Bill Botts Field and Veterans Memorial Park. There have been many voices supporting this renovation at the public workshops. Please consider contacting the feasibility study contractor for more information.	Parks, Recreation, and Public Facilities	142	The General Plan describes the need to update the Veterans Memorial Complex and plans in progress for community meeting rooms and a bridge from the aquatics to the teen center. Details about proposed changes will come from the park visioning process. No change recommended.
267	Do not remove 90 freeway, "we have enough parks in Culver City"	Parks, Recreation, and Public Facilities	147	LA Mayor Karen Bass has come out against utilizing the 90 freeway for a park. Currently, there are no plans to remove the 90 freeway. The application for federal funding to study the freeway's ability to be converted into affordable housing, park space, and multimodal transportation is being pursued by other organizations and state officials. No change recommended.
268	Look into future of the 90 – can be future park space	Parks, Recreation, and Public Facilities	147	LA Mayor Karen Bass has come out against utilizing the 90 freeway for a park. Currently, there are no plans to remove the 90 freeway. The application for federal funding to study the freeway's ability to be converted into affordable housing, park space, and multimodal transportation is being pursued by other organizations and state officials. No change recommended.

#	Comment	Element	Page	Response
269	Where are new parks going to go?	Parks, Recreation, and Public Facilities	147	Per Goal PR-1, new parks will be developed as opportunities arise to ensure equitable park access. Opportunities include mini parks along Ballona Creek, new linear parks, and on privately-owned spaces. No change recommended.
270	Like idea of 10-minute walk to parks	Parks, Recreation, and Public Facilities	147	Policy PR-1.1 aspires for a community where everyone is within a ten minute walk to a park, open space, and joint use facilities. No change recommended.
271	Consider capping Ballona Creek	Parks, Recreation, and Public Facilities	147	The City has limited authority over the Ballona Creek. A cap would be under the jurisdiction of the Army Corps of Engineers and LA County Flood Control. No change recommended.
272	Ballona Creek – make park of it a floodable pool	Parks, Recreation, and Public Facilities	147	The City has limited authority over the Ballona Creek. A floodable pool would be under the jurisdiction of the Army Corps of Engineers and LA County Flood Control. No change recommended.
273	I am all for people getting exercise in fact I encourage it. The pickleball craze has got a lot of people off their sofas and that's good. But there are 2 problems 1) the take over tennis courts 2) it's VERY loud. I hope the city will help these people find places to play (indoors?) that will not encroach on our tennis courts or bother nearby residents.	Parks, Recreation, and Public Facilities	148	Goal PR-2 speaks to providing quality park facilities that meet the community's needs, including indoor recreation facilities. No change recommended.
274	Parks and Recreation are essential to every community. With the inclusion of after school programs, transported youth activities and resources for families provides a circle of support.	Parks, Recreation, and Public Facilities	148	Goal PR-2 speaks to providing quality park facilities that meet the community's needs. No change recommended.
275	Fox Hills Park needs to be better maintained	Parks, Recreation, and Public Facilities	148	Goal PR-3 aspires for well-maintained and upgraded parks, recreational facilities, and public facilities. Associated policies and implementation actions seek to secure more funding for maintenance and establish strategies for evaluating park maintenance. No change recommended.
276	Likes community events in parks (movies in the park, should continue to do this)	Parks, Recreation, and Public Facilities	148	Goal PR-4 aims to provide programming that meet's the community's health, educational, social, and safety needs. Associated policies aim to provide varied programming for people of all ages, arts and cultural programming, and community events and festivals, which may include movies in the park. No change recommended.
277	Concern about open space under Metro stop (Platform Park) – would like to see it controlled by the City, address safety.	Parks, Recreation, and Public Facilities	148	Noted. No change recommended.
278	More arts programs in parks	Parks, Recreation, and Public Facilities	148	Policy PR-4.2 aspires to incorporate arts and cultural programming in City parks and public facilities. No change recommended.
279	Do not want large construction in Bill Botts or Vets	Parks, Recreation, and Public Facilities	148	The City is undertaking a visioning study for the future of Veterans Memorial Park and Bill Botts Field. This study is happening concurrently with the General Plan Update in a separate process. No change recommended.
280	How does the parks and recreation situation regarding the Veterans Memorial Park update tie into the General Plan Update, if at all?	Parks, Recreation, and Public Facilities	148	The City is undertaking a visioning study for the future of Veterans Memorial Park and Bill Botts Field. This study is happening concurrently with the General Plan Update in a separate process. The visioning study is anticipated to conclude in Spring 2024, around the same time the General Plan is anticipated to be finalized for adoption. The visioning studies will provide a greater-level of detail than in the General Plan. Additionally, per implementation action IA-PR.1, the City will create a Parks and Master Plan following adoption of the General Plan Update that should incorporate findings from the visioning study. No change recommended.
281	Lots of land dedicated to sports – should be more diversity of park types	Parks, Recreation, and Public Facilities	148	The Element seeks to develop a diversity of park types, facilities, and amenities to meet the needs of the population, as well as natural habitat. No change recommended.
282	Make Blanco Park/El Rincon Elem. grounds open on weekends	Parks, Recreation, and Public Facilities	152	IA-PR-3 seeks to develop and maintain joint use agreements with the Culver City Unified School District to increase access to sports fields, open spaces, and recreational facilities when school is not in session. No change recommended.
283	West LA College – great opportunity for joint use within easy walking distance of a lot of people	Parks, Recreation, and Public Facilities	152	IA-PR-3 seeks to develop and maintain joint use agreements with West LA College to increase access to sports fields, open spaces, and facilities. No change recommended.

#	Comment	Element	Page	Response
284	Make sure new development provides park space	Parks, Recreation, and Public Facilities	154	IA.PR-10 initiates a study to establish requirements for non-residential development to dedicate parkland, per community benefits agreements, or linkage fees, per the Fee Mitigation Act. This study may or may not result in updates to the City's parkland dedication requirements. No change recommended.
285	The development fees the City requires for parks and schools are too high, don't increase fees to create more park space	Parks, Recreation, and Public Facilities	154	IA.PR-10 initiates a study to establish requirements for non-residential development to dedicate parkland, per community benefits agreements, or linkage fees, per the Fee Mitigation Act. This study may or may not result in updates to the City's parkland dedication requirements. School fees are not established by the City. No change recommended.
286	IA. PR-9: I support this action. I recommend it be associated with PR-2: Temporary parks. I would also recommend partnering with the numerous local organizations like the Culver/Palms Y which are very successful at engaging young people.	Parks, Recreation, and Public Facilities	154	IA-PR.9 is associated with Goal 4 because Goal 4 seeks to ensure parks and recreational facilities and programming serves all members of the community, including youth. PR-4.5 seeks to establish partnerships with community organizations for recreational programming. No change recommended.
287	For Element #t: With less than 4% of its space devoted to park land, the city needs to take advantage of existing Metro property within its boundaries for park usages. An ideal example is the use that the Platform development has made of area under Metro's E-Line tracks when they elevate above grade. The city needs to embrace similar opportunities, particularly parallel to the E-Line.	Parks, Recreation, and Public Facilities	154	Implementation action IA.PR-3 seeks to develop and maintain joint use agreements with Los Angeles Metro, among other agencies, to allow public use of facilities. No change recommended.
288	With less than 4% of its space devoted to park land, the city needs to take advantage of existing Metro property within its boundaries for park usages. An ideal example is the use that the Platform development has made of area under Metro's E-Line tracks when they elevate above grade. The city needs to embrace similar opportunities, particularly parallel to the E-Line. Make this and other property within city limits but controlled by another entity available for park purposes: sports activities, community gardens, planted areas, etc.	Parks, Recreation, and Public Facilities	154	Implementation action IA.PR-3 seeks to develop and maintain joint use agreements with Los Angeles Metro, among other agencies, to allow public use of facilities. No change recommended.
289	With less than 4% of its space devoted to park land, the city needs to take advantage of existing Metro property within its boundaries for park usages. An ideal example is the use that the Platform development has made of area under Metro's E-Line tracks when they elevate above grade. The city needs to embrace similar opportunities, particularly parallel to the E-Line. Make this and other property within city limits but controlled by another entity available for park purposes: sports activities, community gardens, planted areas, etc.	Parks, Recreation, and Public Facilities	154	Implementation action IA.PR-3 seeks to develop and maintain joint use agreements with Los Angeles Metro, among other agencies, to allow public use of facilities. No change recommended.
290	I'm a tennis player and the CC courts really need some attention particularly the court at Kronenthal park.	Parks, Recreation, and Public Facilities	155	Goal PR-2 speaks to providing quality park facilities that meet the community's needs. Goal PR-3 seeks to ensure parks and recreation facilities are maintained and upgraded. No change recommended.
291	I would like to see a permanent outdoor Gazebo type stage and sound system installed in Vets Park for use at city events and park rentals. Specifically, the Fiesta La Ballona would greatly benefit by saving money on renting a stage and sound system each year.	Parks, Recreation, and Public Facilities	155	Goal PR-2 speaks to providing quality park facilities that meet the community's needs. The City is undertaking a visioning study for the future of Veterans Memorial Park and Bill Botts Field. This study is happening concurrently with the General Plan Update in a separate process. No change recommended.
292	Update key/icons in Figure 22.	Economic Development	161	Reassign numbers in the figure, with #1 representing the largest industry sector and #15 representing the smallest sector.
293	Economic Development One of the pages mentions Beats Electronics. Since this is a 20-year plan, I wonder if calling out specific businesses is the right way to go. Also, it is like advertising for a business while leaving out others... I don't know if that's an issue but I thought I'd bring it up.	Economic Development	163	Revise text to "The Hayden Tract, a former industrial area of the city, is now a converted office district home to Creative Tech employers like Beats Electronics, with overall rents for converted industrial space in the Hayden Tract reaching rates comparable to higher-end office rents across Culver City, and substantially more than what those spaces could command if they remained as industrial space."
294	shorter process needed for approval	Economic Development	167	Goal ED-6 aims to streamline the City's development process to increase potential for housing and mixed use development. Associated implementation action IA.ED-11 identifies an ordinance/code amendment update to reduce the need for discretionary approvals. No change recommended.
295	I want to turn the affordable housing question on its head for a moment. We need a living wage such that employees can afford market rate housing within walking distance of their workplace. The benefits are in multiple categories : traffic, pollution, housing affordability, equity, safety and quality of life.	Economic Development	167	The General Plan encourages housing options (market rate and affordable) within walking distance of workplaces. Policy LU-1.2 encourages more mixed use and affordable housing to promote, among other things, walk-to-work options. No change recommended. No change recommended.
296	Element 6: Economic development: (1) ED 7.3: it would be good to translate this goal about developing mixed use boulevards in a policy (encourage an experiment for example, or pre-approved plans, or collaborate with Livable Communities Initiative)	Economic Development	167	The Land Use Element changes the land use designation of many parcels along corridors from standalone commercial to mixed use. The City will revise its mixed use ordinance to be consistent with the Land Use Element and State law and consider other incentives, per Implementation IA-LU-4 . No change recommended.
297	Expedite permitting	Economic Development	169	Implementation action IA.ED-1 will involve a study to identify opportunities to reduce the cost of small businesses to locate and remain in the city, which may include reducing permitting timelines. No change recommended.
298	Help small businesses get their permits faster	Economic Development	169	Implementation action IA.ED-1 will involve a study to identify opportunities to reduce the cost of small businesses to locate and remain in the city, which may include reducing permitting timelines. No change recommended.

#	Comment	Element	Page	Response
299	The city needs dedicated staff in economic development to handhold businesses and attract developers to ensure that businesses in the city is doing well, sad to see vacant businesses... the city needs to be proactive.	Economic Development	169	The Economic Development Department does promote Culver City to recruit businesses and provides assistance establishing new businesses. No change recommended.
300	IA ED-11: I would eliminate this implementation action. Reducing the need for discretionary approvals dangerously eliminates community engagement, public discourse, as well as negotiated and conditioned community benefits.	Economic Development	170	Noted. No change recommended.
301	IA ED-10: I would also recommend studying the best practices from other Westside Cities Council of Governments.	Economic Development	170	The removal of the word "past" from the policy will allow the study of current best practices from other communities. Change IA.ED-10 to: "Assess past community benefit programs to identify best practices for meeting both the needs of developers and the community."
302	I would like to know what the planning is for the additional stress on the infrastructure that would occur with increasing housing density? There is already a lot of traffic congestion, as mentioned by the other questioner, so I think this is an area of concern.	Infrastructure	174	The Environmental Impact Report will include an assessment of the General Plan buildout on existing infrastructure. There are measures to reduce traffic congestion across many of the elements, including the Mobility element which makes recommendations to increase transit and active mobility. Much of the new density is concentrated on the corridors where there is existing transit access. No change recommended.
303	Greenspace, and overflow of water during storms... want the city to be aware that storms are going to get worse and how we can mitigate the impacts of large storms.	Infrastructure	177	The Infrastructure chapter includes goals, policies, and implementation actions associated with the potential impacts of climate change on infrastructure systems. See INF-1 and INF-5. No change recommended.
304	Address runoff at Fox Hills Park (east side)	Infrastructure	179	INF-5 provides a policy framework associated with stormwater management in the City. Specific infrastructure projects would be part of the City's Capital Improvement Program and/or stormwater master planning. Additionally, Conservation Policy C-6.14 seeks to incorporate projects that are funded by Measure CW to address urban and stormwater runoff. No change recommended.
305	Add new policies consistent with AB 1176	Infrastructure	181	Add new policy: INF-7.5. Grid upgrades. In coordination with relevant utilities, support identification of opportunities to advance grid infrastructure upgrades where they are needed to support building and vehicle electrification.
306	How to reach zero emissions beyond tail pipe emissions, for example particulates from tire wear	Mobility	188	The Mobility Element contains strategies to eliminate GHG emissions in the transportation network by reducing vehicle miles traveled (VMT) from passenger vehicles and using clean transportation. Strategies include transit electrification (IA-M-7), increasing opportunities to use forms of active transportation (Goal M-8), and developing a sustainable and accessible transportation system and transit-oriented communities (Goal M-5). These local measures are complimented by regional and State measures to reduce emissions. No change recommended.
307	According to the paragraph on "Safe and Comfortable Walking and Biking," which appears in your chapter on Mobility, "Unsafe speed was the most common factor for vehicle-involved collisions, accounting for nearly a third of all collisions in Culver City between 2014 and 2018. All collisions involving unsafe speed occurred on roadways with speed limits ranging from 30-40 miles per hour." This being the case, it does not appear to be advisable to be carving out bike lanes on the side of primary arterial roadways such as Sepulveda and Overland Avenue. To quote your information on page 194, they are corridors with the highest traffic volume and longest trip demands! One of the motivations for riding a bicycle include being healthy, however, exposing a bicyclist to air pollution from cars will not help achieve that goal. We also understand that the City has begun working on bike paths from Fox Hills that will connect to Overland Avenue via Hannum. Since traffic on Overland has gone from bad to worse, it would be better for the bicyclists to take a left on Sawtelle which already has a bike path that connects it to the Ballona Creek bike path that will eventually lead to Culver City Middle and High Schools. This is a safer route for the bicyclists from Fox Hills and for the students as part of their safer roads to school project. Last, but not least, the labor cost will be lower, since Sawtelle already has paved bike paths. A win-win-win proposition!	Mobility	190	Additional bike lanes provide more options for everyone and provide a more direct path of travel for trips originating east of Sepulveda without backtracking. No change recommended.
308	Hi, All — for a photo in the general plan that highlights a protected bike lane, you don't have anyone actually using the bike lane. In fact, they're riding across the street in the not-bike lane, on the west side of Elenda heading south. Worth considering changing this photo, unless it is just not possible to find any photos of people using the protected bike lane. (Page 196, Element 8: Elenda Street Bike Path	Mobility	196	Replace with photo of biker using protected bike lane.
309	Clarify meaning of "threshold" in priority corridors table – what is triggered by being threshold?	Mobility	197	This refers to the most likely indicators and conditions supporting implementation of specific special designations that would be most appropriate. Replace " thresholds based on " or " thresholds to implement " or " thresholds for " to " indicators and conditions supporting implementation of "
310	Element 8 Mobility (2) In the Figure 26 with Road Network: why are there 3 parallel 1st arterials (Venice, Washington, Culver). You could choose to indicate wished degradation on the map. Why are Slauson and Hannum both 1st arterials, while we are looking for more green, walkable streets. Why is mentioned how many bike roads/lanes/routes we have and not mentioned how many arterial roads we have. It worries me because we are intending to build more along the boulevards and in the mixed use neighborhoods and the abundance and speed of cars will keep on ruining the urban environment. If we are transitioning away from more single occupied cars into other modes of transportation, should translate in the road designs. The Boulevards that will change from arterial into transportation priority corridors will also become more residential and should become active transportation corridors as well.	Mobility	198	Classification designation is primarily determined by typical right-of-way width, the GPU provides guidance for balancing modal priorities based on context and complementary facilities through the use of special designations like Active Transportation Corridors and Transit Priority Corridors. No change recommended.

#	Comment	Element	Page	Response
311	Request consideration of adding more street names to figure and maps, a lot of places infrastructure is shown on the map, but only shows major arterials. You have to be familiar with the city to understand the pedestrian and bike maps.	Mobility	198	Noted. No change recommended.
312	Do not forget about Seniors. We will not be cycling. We need transportation that is available now, which is our CARS. Please restore 2 lanes for cars through downtown Culver City. "emerging transportation" in the plan has no meaning!	Mobility	198	The GPU provides policies and actions to support mobility for all ages and abilities including M-1.3 (Improve transportation network safety), M-3.3 (Mobility options), M-4.2 (First/last-mile barriers), M-4.6 (Accessible pedestrian facilities), M-4.7 (Mobility service geographic prioritization), and IA.M-2 (Safe Routes for Seniors Program). No change recommended.
313	Lastly, taking away a traffic lane on Venice Blvd. was nonsense. I believe Culver City worked with the city of Los Angeles to make this change. We're not getting onto public transportation. Why? Because it's dangerous. Please give us our lane back.	Mobility	199	The General Plan does not recommend changing the configuration of Venice Boulevard. The "Roadway Reclassification Process" section of the Mobility Element describes the process that would happen if a change were made. No change recommended.
314	Safe routes to school for Fox Hills, more consideration of student transport – school buses and electrified buses	Mobility	201	Per Figure 27, the Fox Hills area is identified as a Safe Routes to School (SRTS) Improvement Zone. SRTS Improvement Zones have intersection and corridor safety projects consist of new or improved crosswalks, traffic signal improvements, and traffic calming elements. The Culver City Unified School District manages school buses. Because it is a separate agency, the General Plan does not have authority on the operation of school buses. No change recommended.
315	Please also stop expanding the bike lanes; they are hardly used and only benefit people who are of a condition that can bike. Older people, children, and people with health conditions, amongst other things, can't use these lanes. These lanes prolong their commute. People on bikes have limited ability to carry groceries, do errands that require transport, take more than a child on a trip, use bikes if they need to go to the doctor if they are sick, enjoy limited destination activities, i.e., they might arrive at a social setting or work sweating. Biking is overwhelming for recreation, and those routes are along scenic places, not the inner city. The policy won't encourage more residents to bike or give up their cars.	Mobility	203	The Mobility Element seeks to create a multi-modal transportation network where people can easily and safely use different means of transportation (cars, public transit, bikes, pedestrians) to reach their destinations. No change recommended.
316	Attended the draft GP, there will be a bike lane on overland and Sepulveda, from a biker's perspective coming from Fox Hills... it seems you would have a shorter commute if you went from Hannum and went to Sawtelle, the Ballona creek to come to city hall, rather than commuting on Sepulveda and Overland. Concern about health riding on overland between 4-7 pm (polluted air from Vehicle traffic). Recommend using preexisting bike lanes on Sawtelle for bikers coming from Fox Hills.	Mobility	204	Additional bike lanes provide more options for everyone and provide a more direct path of travel for trips originating east of Sepulveda without backtracking. No change recommended.
317	Why isn't more of the bike path planning directed at quieter & safer, smaller streets instead of focusing mostly on high traffic corridors	Mobility	204	Bike lanes on high traffic corridors provide more options for everyone and provide a more direct path of travel to their destination. The GPU contains multiple policies and actions which can improve safety through design including M-1.1 (Safe systems approach) and M-1.3 (Improve transportation network safety), especially for the high traffic corridors. M-1.4 aims to implement programs that increase awareness of safe travel programs. No change recommended.
318	Westley is a very small lane, not necessary to have a sharrow there	Mobility	204	Class III on Wesley St provides a connection to/from the Expo Bike Path. No change recommended.
319	Elenda residents do not want dedicated bike lane on Elenda – people want parking retained, rarely used	Mobility	204	Elenda is shown as proposed Class III bike facility (not dedicated). The designation as an AT Corridor would prioritize deployment additional (location specific) investments to improve pedestrian and active transportation safety / accessibility. PWD would conduct outreach and local engagement prior to advancing design and development of treatments. No change recommended.
320	As an avid bike rider for most of my 72 years I've enjoyed the growth in bike ridership in our city over the past 10 years and I hope the city will provide more dedicated bike lanes throughout our entire community.	Mobility	204	Future proposed bike lanes are indicated in Figure 28 Bicycle Network. No change recommended.
321	Ordinance proposal: to have every lane be a protected bike lane (West Hollywood example)	Mobility	204	IA.M-4 is an action that calls for completion and adoption of currently underway complete streets guidelines that will provide the City with context appropriate guidance for the implementation of bicycle facilities. No change recommended.
322	Class II bike lanes should be protected, Overland should be class IV, avoid Class III – don't include on bike maps, parking should not be a reason to not provide bike lanes	Mobility	204	The Bicycle Network figure is consistent with the Bicycle and Pedestrian Action Plan (BPAP). The City does not plan to update the BPAP at this time. The City is undertaking development of a Complete Streets Design Guidelines (CSDG) that will provide framework for decision tradeoffs and decision making to make streets more multimodal. No change recommended.
323	Suggestion for City control of E line bike path to Syd Kronenthal park	Mobility	204	The Expo Line Bike Path is in right-of-way maintained by Metro. There are no plans to transfer ownership at this time. No change recommended.
324	Excitement about transit corridors and increased frequency, consideration of previous comments and inclusion in the network	Mobility	205	Noted. No change recommended.
325	Wanted to know ridership of current circulator	Mobility	205	The Transportation Department is preparing a Comprehensive Mobility Service Analysis (CMSA) which will include detailed analysis of existing transit service as well as additional analyses and surveys to evaluate market demand and identify enhancements to transit and mobility services. No change recommended.

#	Comment	Element	Page	Response
326	Dedicated bus lanes on Culver Blvd., just after Culver steps, seems to hold up traffic. Could potentially be lessened by optimizing red light timing	Mobility	205	The Transportation Department is preparing a Comprehensive Mobility Service Analysis (CMSA) which will include detailed analysis of existing transit service as well as additional analyses and surveys to evaluate market demand and identify enhancements to transit and mobility services. No change recommended.
327	Element 8 Mobility (4) Fig 9: add a key for the T (Transit Hub) and also: isn't Fairfax/Washington a Transit Hub too?.	Mobility	205	Transit Hub on this map is just a reference to the Culver City Transit Center owned by City. No change recommended.
328	Fox Hills is a very densely populated neighborhood in Culver City, and it will only become more dense as new development takes place. We see there are city plans for quite a lot more development in Fox Hills, especially given the housing mandate, and we are excited about that. However, there is not currently a bus that directly connects Fox Hills with downtown Culver City & the Culver City Expo Line stop without transfers. It's quite a short distance, and a very short drive. A bus transfer makes getting to the Expo Line too cumbersome, taking up to 45-60 minutes. As we hope to use transit to get around Los Angeles more and more, Fox Hills should not be so disconnected from downtown Culver. Parking/driving will also become more difficult as more housing units are built here, so it's a serious need to use transit reliably. Given the number of people living in Fox Hills, there should be a circulator bus to the Culver City train station (or at least an update to one of the bus lines to be a direct route).	Mobility	206	The Transportation Department is preparing a Comprehensive Mobility Service Analysis (CMSA) which will include detailed analysis of existing transit service as well as additional analyses and surveys to evaluate market demand and identify enhancements to transit and mobility services. The City is also considering an additional potential microtransit service area that includes the Westfield-Culver City, the Culver Pointe Business District, the Fox Hills neighborhood, and neighboring Playa Vista. Other opportunities to integrate microtransit service as part of the Culver CityBus system involve upgrading the Dial-a-Ride service and replacing late night, less productive fixed-route service with microtransit service. In addition the GPU provides multiple policies and actions to enhance access and mobility for Fox Hills including LU-7.2 (Walkable streets in Fox Hills) and LU-7.3 (Fox Hills main streets). No change recommended.
329	Regular Mobility Training: The General Plan should include clear action items for regular mobility training for our staff, in line with global best practices. Adopting proven strategies from models like those in the Netherlands will save time and resources, avoiding the need to reinvent the wheel, and will enable effective design, implementation, and maintenance of advanced cycling infrastructure, positioning Culver City as a leader in urban mobility. Thank you very much for considering these important enhancements. I am confident that these initiatives will significantly improve our transportation infrastructure for the betterment of the entire community.	Mobility	211	Add new policy: "M2-.7: Staff mobility training. Provide regular mobility training to equip City staff with best practices to design, implement, and maintain the City's complete streets network and educate the community on safety."
330	Better access to quick bus to airport, Fox Hills focus, Bus line #6 not fast	Mobility	211	As referenced in Aviation (Pg. 209) Culver CityBus is evaluating future mobility service enhancements at LAX as part of the agency's CMSA. Projects near completion include the Crenshaw/LAX Transit Project, which extends transit service from the existing Metro E Line at Crenshaw/Exposition south through Inglewood to merge with the Metro K Line at the Aviation/LAX Station in El Segundo and the new Airport Metro Connector (AMC) transit station that is currently under construction. As travel patterns adjust, Culver City-Bus can also adjust Line 6 and Rapid 6 accordingly to ensure riders have better airport access. No change recommended.
331	Traffic safety – educate cyclists to not run red lights & stop signs – I see it all the time	Mobility	211	IA.M-3 (Safe Streets traffic safety education) is an action to maintain and enhance the Safe Streets traffic safety education program covering school students, working adults, seniors, and unhoused community members, in addition to continuing to apply for Office of Traffic Safety (OTS) and other grant sources to help fund these Public Works to educate travelers of all modes. No change recommended.
332	Concerned about cut through traffic	Mobility	211	M-6.4 aims to address cut-through traffic by discouraging the use of local streets for non-local travel. IA.M-11 will develop a plan to improve overall performance of the transportation while prioritizing efficiency and public safety. No change recommended.
333	Provide more places to drop off in DTCC – almost none now	Mobility	211	The City is currently undertaking development of Complete Streets Design Guidelines which will provide direction for context appropriate use of the curb zone. GPU policy M-7.5 (Parking and curb management) calls for continued evaluation and implementation of monitoring and evaluation systems, such as digitizing curbside assets, to dynamically accommodate evolving curbside demands (such as drop-offs) with a focus on the Downtown area. No change recommended.
334	The "Culver Gap" needs to be addressed to create an inclusive route that is accessible, can really connect culver city to the westside, can be improved, currently not comfortable. It doesn't seem to be a network of protected lanes. A lot of points where it ends on class II bike lane. This is a huge problem if you want commuters engaging with different transportation modes.	Mobility	211	The City of Los Angeles is responsible for the connection across Venice. Culver City would be open to coordinate with Los Angeles for any proposed bike improvements across Venice. No change recommended.
335	Stop the Road Diets. Stop making traffic worse for drivers.	Mobility	211	The document does not include a reference to "road diets". No change recommended.
336	Bike lanes – encampments under bridges at Higuera St and National Blvd, graffiti at Syd Kronenthal Park	Mobility	211	The Expo Line Bike Path is in right-of-way maintained by Metro. Metro would need to address the encampments impacting the right-of-way. Goal PR-3 aspires for well-maintained and upgraded parks, recreational facilities, and public facilities. Associated policies and implementation actions seek to secure more funding for maintenance and establish strategies for evaluating park maintenance. No change recommended.

#	Comment	Element	Page	Response
337	Lower speed limits by design, not posting signs	Mobility	211	The GPU provides no direct recommendations on changing posted speeds but contains multiple policies and actions which can improve safety through design including M-1.1 (Safe systems approach) and M-1.3 (Improve transportation network safety). No change recommended.
338	No more "Move" in Culver City. Bicycles are not the future for seniors and those of us partially, or totally restricted by health.	Mobility	211	The GPU provides policies and actions to support mobility for all ages and abilities including M-1.3 (Improve transportation network safety), M-3.3 (Mobility options), M-4.2 (First/last-mile barriers), M-4.6 (Accessible pedestrian facilities), M-4.7 (Mobility service geographic prioritization), and IA.M-2 (Safe Routes for Seniors Program). No change recommended.
339	Already overwhelmed traffic	Mobility	211	The Mobility Element plans for a multi-modal transportation network that supports the land use plan outlined in the Land Use Element. No change recommended.
340	Element 8 Mobility (1) I do like the policies and the goals, but I would like to point out that the approach of the chapter in imagery and classifications is car centric and not human centric. I appreciate the intension to move away from the road classification but the figures tell another story than the words.	Mobility	211	The multimodal classification system was informed by community engagement, considering all road users, not just automobiles. While maintaining consistency with the FHWA and CRS classification structure and hierarchy, Culver City is adapting multimodal street classification principles to transition from a highway-centric functional classification system to better integrate land use context and non-motorized transportation components in the transportation network. The GPU includes modal priority and special roadway designation typologies that enable the reallocation of public right-of-way to promote and encourage safe use of alternative transportation modes. No change recommended.
341	Great accessibility to LAX but not to downtown Culver City – that's a problem	Mobility	211	The Transportation Department is preparing a Comprehensive Mobility Service Analysis (CMSA) which will include detailed analysis of existing transit service as well as additional analyses and surveys to evaluate market demand and identify enhancements to transit and mobility services. The City is also considering an additional potential microtransit service area that includes the Westfield-Culver City, the Culver Pointe Business District, the Fox Hills neighborhood, and neighboring Playa Vista. Other opportunities to integrate microtransit service as part of the Culver CityBus system involve upgrading the Dial-a-Ride service and replacing late night, less productive fixed-route service with microtransit service. In addition the GPU provides multiple policies and actions to enhance access and mobility for Fox Hills including LU-7.2 (Walkable streets in Fox Hills) and LU-7.3 (Fox Hills main streets). No change recommended.
342	Culver City should be affordable, and people should be able to live in an area where you don't need a car and can get around on other modes/ by walking.	Mobility	212	Goal M-4 calls for a "transportation system that provides affordable or free, equitable, and efficient access to employment centers, residential communities, schools, and other essential services." Affordability related to housing and transportation is directly addressed in the Land Use and Community Design Element under Goal LU-1 (Transit-oriented communities). No change recommended.
343	Funding priorities in mobility element – would like to know more about it and more detail.	Mobility	212	Mobility project prioritization and funding is outlined in Chapter 3 of the Short Range Mobility Plan FY22-26 starting on Pg. 26. No change recommended.
344	Metro mobility from Culver and Overland is poor to downtown Culver City. Discouragement going into downtown	Mobility	212	Provision of LA Metro services are outside the purview of the City, M-3.1 (Regional mobility coordination) calls for continued coordination with Metro and other municipal mobility service providers to ensure Culver City community members are connected to regional mobility options and resources. Part of the ongoing MCC project is to evaluate and improve mobility conditions and options along this segment. No change recommended.
345	Is there a dedicated person who is disabled that is informing the accessibility portion of the document?	Mobility	212	The public draft has not been reviewed by a specific City staff member dedicated to accessibility, though the consultants, and the mobility and planning departments reviewed with these considerations in mind. Per the Vision, Core Values (equity and inclusion) and Guiding Principles ("MOBILITY: Build more active and shared modes of getting to, from, and through Culver City by providing more reliable, safe, affordable, clean, and connected carbon-free transportation and mobility options for people of all ages and abilities.) the Plan was guided by the intent to make CulverCity more accessible for all. No change recommended.

#	Comment	Element	Page	Response
346	Support for circulator route from Fox Hills to Culver City or La Cienega/Jefferson Metro stations	Mobility	212	The Transportation Department is preparing a Comprehensive Mobility Service Analysis (CMSA) which will include detailed analysis of existing transit service as well as additional analyses and surveys to evaluate market demand and identify enhancements to transit and mobility services. The City is also considering an additional potential microtransit service area that includes the Westfield-Culver City, the Culver Pointe Business District, the Fox Hills neighborhood, and neighboring Playa Vista. Other opportunities to integrate microtransit service as part of the Culver CityBus system involve upgrading the Dial-a-Ride service and replacing late night, less productive fixed-route service with microtransit service. No change recommended.
347	Fox Hills should have better connection to buses and trains, right now more isolated	Mobility	212	The Transportation Department is preparing a Comprehensive Mobility Service Analysis (CMSA) which will include detailed analysis of existing transit service as well as additional analyses and surveys to evaluate market demand and identify enhancements to transit and mobility services. The City is also considering an additional potential microtransit service area that includes the Westfield-Culver City, the Culver Pointe Business District, the Fox Hills neighborhood, and neighboring Playa Vista. Other opportunities to integrate microtransit service as part of the Culver CityBus system involve upgrading the Dial-a-Ride service and replacing late night, less productive fixed-route service with microtransit service. No change recommended.
348	Expansion of services of circulator to subway	Mobility	212	The Transportation Department is preparing a Comprehensive Mobility Service Analysis (CMSA) which will include detailed analysis of existing transit service as well as additional analyses and surveys to evaluate market demand and identify enhancements to transit and mobility services. The City is also considering an additional potential microtransit service area that includes the Westfield-Culver City, the Culver Pointe Business District, the Fox Hills neighborhood, and neighboring Playa Vista. Other opportunities to integrate microtransit service as part of the Culver CityBus system involve upgrading the Dial-a-Ride service and replacing late night, less productive fixed-route service with microtransit service. No change recommended.
349	More frequent & reliable bus service	Mobility	212	The Transportation Department is preparing a Comprehensive Mobility Service Analysis (CMSA) which will include detailed analysis of existing transit service as well as additional analyses and surveys to evaluate market demand and identify enhancements to transit and mobility services. No change recommended.
350	Currently there is a lot of traffic – how can the city support growth?	Mobility	213	Goal M-3 aims to secure high-quality public transit and mobility services that will accommodate the city's growth in population, jobs, and economy. M-3.1 (Regional mobility coordination) calls for continued coordination with Metro and other municipal mobility service providers to ensure all Culver City community members are connected to regional mobility options and resources, as the city grows. Part of the ongoing MCC project is to evaluate and improve mobility conditions and options along this segment. No change recommended.
351	Concerned about the traffic on Sepulveda and Culver. Bad for emergency vehicles to get through.	Mobility	213	Goal M-3 aims to secure high-quality public transit and mobility services that will accommodate the city's growth in population, jobs, and economy. No change recommended.
352	I live near the intersection of Sawtelle and Sepulveda. As the number of businesses increase on our neighborhood, it is getting harder and harder to find parking. For example, Mayumi Hotel is on my block — a popular hotel with zero parking of its own. I would like the city to consider permitting the residential streets that are adjacent to businesses so we are able to park on our own blocks instead of competing for parking with people who are shopping, going to the gym, staying at the hotel, etc, which is the situation we are currently facing. Thank you.	Mobility	213	The City is not currently considering permitted parking near Sawtelle/Sepulveda. No change recommended.
353	Buz zone waiting areas limited to low use streets, Not S. Robertson	Mobility	214	Bus zone waiting areas are directly not addressed in the GPU, this issue will be covered by the City's new Mobility Stop Guidelines. No change recommended.
354	you cannot fix that part, or expand it as needed, but would help if the city would pave some main N/S arteries NOW! You also need to put up street banners before next meeting so more people can know & attend. This form sucks! One line a bad joke! Sure looks like you want to limit public input!	Mobility	214	Goal M-6 aspires to proactively manage streets, for safety and consider re-designs. No change recommended.
355	Loading zone hours for parking on Bike & Bus Lanes	Mobility	214	Loading zone/parking hours are not recommended for bike or bus lanes. No change recommended.
356	Do not consider congestion pricing for DTCC	Mobility	214	The General Plan provides no direct recommendations on congestion pricing, M-6.3 (Regional congestion pricing) calls for the continued monitoring and engagement of regional planning studies around congestion pricing and high occupancy toll lanes. No change recommended.

#	Comment	Element	Page	Response
357	What is the situation for sidewalks, widening of sidewalks, and making sidewalks more friendly for pedestrians? Many areas don't have sidewalks. This presents an opportunity to make some adjustments.	Mobility	214	The GPU provides policies and actions to support the enhancement of pedestrian facilities including addressing gaps in the sidewalk network including M-2.1 (Prioritize multimodal projects), M-4.6 (Accessible pedestrian facilities), LU-14.3 (Pedestrian connections and sidewalks), and LU-15.1 (Walkable and inviting buildings and spaces). No change recommended.
358	Element 8 Mobility (5) Goal M6-4: Is this referring to local roads only? I hope not.	Mobility	214	Yes, local streets are context appropriate for neighborhood traffic calming implementation that may discourage passthrough travel. Local Streets provide direct access to adjacent land and are found mostly in residential neighborhoods, and local streets are not intended for use in long distance travel, except at the origin or destination end of the trip. No change recommended.
359	I heard that the City Council voted to eliminate some or all of the relatively newly designated bike lanes on Culver and Washington Boulevards in the downtown CC area. Is this true? I have seen a huge increase in traffic congestion in our downtown area which makes it very difficult as a downtown CC resident to get in and out of my neighborhood. What is the plan update on the future of the bike lanes? I personally would like to see them changed back to the way they used to be to allow a smoother flow of traffic.	Mobility	215	On April 24, 2023, the City Council directed staff to prepare a modified design for the MCC Project for a maximum evaluation period of two years. This modified design will create shared bus and bike lanes throughout the project corridor and add a second general-purpose lane where it is feasible and needed to enhance capacity for vehicular traffic. The Project's boundary was also extended eastward by 0.6 miles along Washington Blvd. from La Cienega Ave. to Fairfax Ave. The Council also directed staff to design a protected bike lane on Adams Blvd. between Washington Blvd. and Fairfax Ave. to close the gap between existing bike lanes on Adams Blvd. in the City of Los Angeles and the Project. No change recommended.
360	Implementation of BPAP	Mobility	215	Policy M-2.1 seeks to address priorities identified in the BPAP. Policy M-8.5 seeks to align with the BPAP and expand the network recommendations as needed to facilitate a complete and interconnected active transportation network. No change recommended.
361	I am requesting additional funding for the Expo line bike path in the Arts District area of Culver City. The Expoline bike path creates the potential for a wonderful extension of the park areas in Culver City. It was designed with wonderful intent but sadly, the area needs new trash cans, regular tree trimming, repair to the safety flood lights, sprinkler maintenance, regular clean up and a focus on the landscaping. There is so much focus on making our city biker-friendly. Shouldn't we pay attention to the path where the families and bikers ride everyday and make it safe and beautiful? Please dedicate funds to this project and ensure there is a plan for implementation.	Mobility	215	The E Line bike path is in right-of-way maintained by Metro, so the City has limited jurisdiction over maintenance of this area. Revise: " Policy M-8.4: Streetscaping. Provide and maintain shade trees, street furniture, bike racks, and other streetscaping features to enhance the street environment and encourage active modes of travel."
362	Element 8 Mobility (6) Goal M9 Ballona Creek: I don't see the goal to have an active transportation route on both sides of the Ballona creek translated in a policy.	Mobility	216	IA.M-17: Ballona Creek calls for creating new paths and connections along the south side of the creek, which currently lacks active transportation facilities. Update policy: " M-9.1: Ballona Creek multi-use path. Enhance the experience along the regionally significant Ballona Creek multi-use path for walking, biking, and rolling so that the path is an active transportation spine for those of all ages and abilities, along both sides of the Creek. Continue to implement recommendations from the Bicycle and Pedestrian Action Plan and Ballona Creek Greenway Plan (2010) and Projects (2011)."
363	City must address the "Culver Gap" – the intersection between Venice and National. It is an important section that can provide connectivity to Ballona creek and beach path but is currently inadequate and unsafe for certain users (e.g., older people, disabled people).	Mobility	216	The City of Los Angeles is responsible for the connection across Venice. Culver City would be open to coordinate with Los Angeles for any proposed bike improvements across Venice. No change recommended.
364	There needs to be a better focus on making the commute to and from school more safe, with less cars and more traffic officers present in the morning and evening. The area around the middle and high school is not well policed in the afternoon and it is not safe for those kids who bike.	Mobility	217	IA.M-1 (Safe Routes to School) is an action that calls for implementation of developed citywide Safe Routes to School projects and monitors conditions for future upgrades to facilitate safe access to schools. Safe Routes to School projects also support bicycle riding, transit riding, and safety training courses. No change recommended.
365	Hello, I am writing to propose key enhancements to the mobility section of our general plan, focusing on the various mobility plans and the need for ongoing professional development within the Transportation and Public Works departments. Comprehensive Plan Updates: It's crucial to mandate regular updates, at least every eight years, not only for the BPAP but for all mobility and traffic safety plans. This will address the inefficiencies and dangers of our existing Class II and III bike infrastructures and ensure alignment with evolving best practices and urban needs, leading to a safer and more sustainable transportation network.	Mobility	217	M-1.2 (Priority Safety Corridors) calls for the City to maintain regular updates every three to five years to the Local Road Safety Plan (LRSP) that identifies a High Injury Network and location specific safety improvements. M-2.6 (Update and maintain street classifications) calls for the City to update the roadway classification table every three to five years based on modal priorities and corresponding land uses to achieve more equitable use of roadway space. No change recommended.
366	Scoring process for SRMB (short range mobility plan)	Mobility	219	Mobility project prioritization and funding is outlined in Chapter 3 of the Short Range Mobility Plan FY22-26 starting on Pg. 26. No change recommended.

#	Comment	Element	Page	Response
367	Get rid of beg buttons, add scramble phases for bike/ped, Idaho stop laws	Mobility	220	M-7.4 (Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)) calls for the continued deployment of existing and new technologies to streamline operations at intersections and crossings including transit signal priority, lead pedestrian intervals, and pedestrian and bicycle detection at signals. The City looks into implementing scramble crosswalks on a case by case basis. No change recommended.
368	I am an avid bike rider (I'm 72) and have been clamoring for 20 years for the Ballona bike path between National and Duquesne to be fixed. It is in miserable shape. We want to encourage particularly our youth to use the bike path to get to the CC school complex and as it is they're being punished by that stretch with all the bumps and humps.	Mobility	220	The GPU provides multiple policies and actions for improving access to and mobility along Ballona Creek including IA.M-17 which calls for the upgrade of existing multi-use path segments. No change recommended.
369	Focus on GHG reduction is unnecessary, it presumes catastrophic global warming	Greenhouse Gas Reduction	224	Here is a list of organizations that accept global warming is real and supported by observation: NASA's Goddard Institute of Space Studies, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, National Academy of Sciences, Environmental Protection Agency, National Center for Atmospheric Research, the State of California, and many more. The State's strategy to reduced greenhouse gas emissions, which is supported by local action, is the 2022 Scoping Plan. No change recommended.
370	Does GHG element cite LA County sustainability plan?	Greenhouse Gas Reduction	224	No, the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Element does not cite the Los Angeles County Sustainability Plan. There is, however, ongoing regional coordination related to climate action taking place in LA County. No change recommended.
371	Avoid greenwashing, and indicate clearly in this Element what is mandated by the state for GHG reduction	Greenhouse Gas Reduction	224	The State has numerous climate policies and goals that require actions to reduce GHGs across many sectors. The State's strategy is contained in the 2022 Climate Change Scoping Plan: https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/our-work/programs/ab-32-climate-change-scoping-plan/2022-scoping-plan-documents . No change recommended.
372	Has the General Plan been informed by the L.A. Regional Planning Climate Action Plan? Has the city synergized with the plan?	Greenhouse Gas Reduction	224	While not directly informed by the Climate Action Plan, the strategies to reduced greenhouse gas emissions are similar. There is ongoing regional coordination related to climate action taking place in LA County. No change recommended.
373	The source information in Figure 33 is in the incorrect location	Greenhouse Gas Reduction	226	Move the source information in Figure 33 to the same location as shown in Figure 32
374	How much land, wind, solar is available for fossil fuels transition?	Greenhouse Gas Reduction	228	The Clean Power Alliance currently provides an opportunity for Culver City businesses and residents to purchase 100% renewable energy. By 2045, per Senate Bill 100, all electricity provided by Southern California Edison will be 100% renewable. No change recommended.
375	What does the "evaluate new technology" and "productive rooftops" sections entail – I thought the section was interesting and wanted more details, but felt that it was vague.	Greenhouse Gas Reduction	229	The climate policy landscape is constantly changing as technologies related to clean energy development and distribution, energy demand management, clean vehicles, electric building systems and appliances, sustainable building materials, and carbon sequestration, for example, evolve. New technologies may want to be incorporated into the City's climate planning as appropriate. "Productive roofs" is a concept that encourages rooftops to be utilized to generate energy through solar installations and/or reduce the urban heat-island effect through green roofs and the installation of reflective materials. No change recommended.
376	Are school buses something that the city is looking into to make carbon-free?	Greenhouse Gas Reduction	230	The City does not have agency over school buses because they are owned and operated by the Culver City Unified School District. No change recommended.
377	Reduce single-use plastics	Greenhouse Gas Reduction	231	Reduction of single use plastics would be part of the Zero Waste Plan (IA.GHG-18) and reduction in consumption-based emissions (IA.GHG-17). No change recommended.
378	GHG-5 Zero Waste residents + restaurants, e.g. Switzerland waste policies, also Japan	Greenhouse Gas Reduction	231	Reduction of single use plastics would be part of the Zero Waste Plan (IA.GHG-18) and reduction in consumption-based emissions (IA.GHG-17). No change recommended.
379	What is the energy demand on the grid from new housing? Is that reviewed in EIR?	Greenhouse Gas Reduction	232	The Environmental Impact Report (EIR) will consider the impact of General Plan buildout on energy systems. CEQA Guidelines, however, do not establish specific significance criteria for energy demand/conservation. No change recommended.
380	Add GHG monitoring	Greenhouse Gas Reduction	232	The Greenhouse Gas Reduction Element contains implementation actions intended to monitor and reduce GHG emissions. IA.GHG-1 requires the City to determine GHG emission reduction targets and requires the City to develop strategies to reach this goal. IA.GHG-2 is a study to establish GHG emission thresholds for projections. IA.GHG-3 involves updating the community and municipal GHG inventories. No change recommended.

#	Comment	Element	Page	Response
381	In 2024, the Ninth Circuit reversed a lower district court decision allowing local jurisdictions to enact building codes that prohibit natural gas piping in buildings (California Restaurant Association v. City of Berkeley). The Clean Power Alliance, Southern California Air Quality Management District, and other local jurisdictions, however, continue to explore policy options to improve indoor/outdoor air quality, improve efficiency, and support climate goals. This revision acknowledges the City of Berkeley court decision, while continuing to work with regional partners to support multi-benefit solutions.	Greenhouse Gas Reduction	233	Revise Implementation Action IA.GHG-6: All-electric Decarbonized new buildings. Study creating an ordinance for all new buildings to be all-electric and prohibit new natural gas infrastructure for new buildings, with minimal exceptions. new building decarbonization options, such as building performance standards, source energy thresholds, or indoor air quality standards in collaboration with the CPA, SCAQMD, and other regional partners.
382	In 2024, the Ninth Circuit reversed a lower district court decision allowing local jurisdictions to enact building codes that prohibit natural gas piping in buildings (California Restaurant Association v. City of Berkeley). The Clean Power Alliance, Southern California Air Quality Management District, and other local jurisdictions, however, continue to explore policy options to improve indoor/outdoor air quality, improve efficiency, and support climate goals. This revision acknowledges the City of Berkeley court decision, while continuing to work with regional partners to support multi-benefit solutions.	Greenhouse Gas Reduction	233	Revise Implementation Action IA.GHG-7: All-electric Existing building decarbonization phasing. Study creating a phase-in plan to convert existing natural gas systems to all-electric. existing building decarbonization and electric-ready policy options, such as building performance standards and indoor air quality standards to support building decarbonization.
383	Be more aspirational in policies and move beyond what is required in Title 24	Greenhouse Gas Reduction	233	Policies encourage new construction to go beyond CALGreen standards and guide the City to foster electrification; however, reach code is not mandated specifically for energy or water efficiency. Implemetation actions include promoting incentives and providing educational resources as well as conducting studies for future legislation (IA.GHG-5-11). Recent court cases, e.g., California Restaurant Association v. City of Berkeley have invalidated local reach codes for electrification. No change recommended.
384	Is there a reason why some goals don't have actions?	Greenhouse Gas Reduction	234	Some goals do not require actions but may guide future decision making and/or review of development applications. In addition, some actions may relate to multiple goals. No change recommended.
385	Who will pay for installation of EV chargers at current housing?	Greenhouse Gas Reduction	234	Typically, property owners are responsible for charger installation. Many utility and State provided incentives and/or rebates exist to reduce the cost burden of charger installation. See this list: https://www.evconnect.com/southern-california and search here: https://driveclean.ca.gov/search-incentives . No change recommended.
386	Recognition and consideration of indigenous cultural resources	Conservation	239	The Conservation Element seeks to preserve cultural resources, including Native American cultural resources. IA.AC-11 involves developing a strategy to include arts and cultural signage, including signage the celebrates and educates the community about local Native American History. It also seeks to develop strategies to create gathering spaces informed by Native American traditions. Policy GL-4.7 advances forming and strengthening partnerships with the Gabrielino-Tongva Indian Tribal Council and California Native American Heritage Commission to identify and implement best practices for engaging and consulting with stakeholders on decision-making processes and City projects. No change recommended.
387	Create wildlife habitat along the creek, including butterflies	Conservation	249	Goal C-2 aims to protect and enhance habitats for sensitive, threatened, or endangered wildlife species and support healthy, diverse ecosystems. Goal C-6 is dedicated improvements to Ballona Creek, including Policy C-6.8, which calls for expanding tree planting and landscaping along the creek to provide habitat for wildlife. No change recommended.
388	Plant more trees and don't remove existing trees!	Conservation	249	Policy C-2.4 Tree Planting recommends planting and maintaining trees, related policies are also included in other elements. No change recommended.
389	Typo for C-2.9; should say "Native species"	Conservation	249	Revise " Native Spaces " to " Native species "
390	Goal C-4 should read "Air quality" rather than "Air Quality"	Conservation	250	Revise " Air Quality " to " Air quality "
391	Ensuring Ballona Creek is safe and clean (not inviting for recreation)	Conservation	251	Policy C-6 aspires for a transformed Ballona Creek that mitigates flooding, restores native ecologies, and becomes a multi-use recreation corridor. Policies C-6.4 and C-6.5 identifies strategies to increase safety along the Creek, including incorporating lighting along the Creek. No change recommended.
392	Light pollution is a big problem and even though we are surrounded by a huge city, we could be the vanguard in a Dark Skies initiative. Too much light, while a demand on our energy, is also disruptive to wildlife and PEOPLE.	Conservation	255	Add new action: " IA.C-14: Dark Skies Ordinance. Develop a Dark Skies Ordinance that sets maximum standards for outdoor lighting to prevent excessive up-light, glare, and light pollution while allowing adequate illumination for safety, security, utility, and the enjoyment of outdoor areas. " Associated goal: C-2; Timeline: Medium ; Type: " Ordinance / Code Amendment "; Primary Responsibility: " Planning and Development. " Renummer the rest of the implementation actions following this new action.
393	Provide link to the most current, approved Local Hazard Mitigation Plan per AB 2140.	Safety	259	Add new sentence after the following sentence: "The implementation of these mitigation actions, which include both short-term and long-term strategies, involve planning, policy changes, programs, projects, and other activities. To review the most current MJHMP, please visit https://www.culvercity.org/hazardmitigationplan. "

#	Comment	Element	Page	Response
394	Is there a map or description of existing emergency service facilities and areas lacking service, specifically noting any areas in SRAs or VHFHSZs?	Safety	259	The city infrastructure is identified on Table 9. See also MJHMP Page 3-20: Exhibit 3-5. No change recommended.
395	Is historical data on wildfires or a reference to where the data can be found, and information about wildfire hazard areas that may be available from the United States Geological Survey, included?	Safety	265	Yes. Elaborate more on the history of wildfire that have impacted the city and add new table. Add "Table 9 below includes a full list of notable significant fires which occurred from 1878 to 2020. Smaller incidents with limited impacts to the planning area are more common historical occurrences than major wildfire incidents. Nevertheless, while major wildfires have occurred in other parts of Los Angeles County, the city experiences secondary effects such as smoke and poor air quality." Add new Table 9.
396	Have local, state, and federal agencies with responsibility for fire protection, including special districts and local offices of emergency services, been identified?	Safety	265	Yes. Add "In California, wildfire protection is a shared responsibility among local, state, tribal, and federal organizations, each with legal and financial obligations. In Culver City, this collaborative effort involves several agencies at different levels of government. The Culver City Fire Department and the Los Angeles County Fire Department oversee fire protection and emergency services within the City and its surrounding areas."
397	CAL FIRE does the mapping and recommends them to the local areas. It is the responsibility of the jurisdiction to adopt them by ordinance. CAL FIRE encourages this language in the safety element.	Safety	265	Revise text: California Government Code Section 51178 requires the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) CAL FIRE to identify and map "severity zones" in the state based on severity of fire hazards that are expected to occur there. While CAL FIRE does the mapping and recommends them se maps to local areas, but it is the responsibility of the local jurisdiction to adopt them by ordinance. While CAL FIRE does the mapping and recommends them to local areas, it is the responsibility of the local jurisdiction to adopt them by ordinance.
398	Are other fire protection plans, such as Community Wildfire Protection Plans, Local Hazard Mitigation Plans, CAL FIRE Unit or Contract County Fire Plans, referenced or incorporated into the Safety Element?	Safety	265	Yes. Add "The Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan (MJHMP) for the City of Culver City planning area was developed in accordance with the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000 (DMA 2000) and followed FEMA's most recent Local Hazard Mitigation Plan guidance. The MJHMP incorporates a process where hazards are identified and profiled, the people and facilities at risk are analyzed, and mitigation actions are developed to reduce or eliminate hazard risk. The implementation of these mitigation actions, which include both short-term and long-term strategies, involve planning, policy changes, programs, projects, and other activities. To review the most current MJHMP, please visit https://www.culvercity.org/hazardmitigationplan ."
				Also add: In California, wildfire protection is a shared responsibility among local, state, tribal, and federal organizations, each with legal and financial obligations. In Culver City, this collaborative effort involves several agencies at different levels of government. The Culver City Fire Department and the Los Angeles County Fire Department oversee fire protection and emergency services within the City and its surrounding areas.
				The CCFD provides local fire protection services and has developed an Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) tailored to the unique needs of the community. This plan outlines the City's response to various emergencies, including wildfires. Additionally, the CCFD offers the Community Emergency Response Team (CERT) program, which trains residents to assist in emergency response efforts, enhancing community resilience. The CCFD also provides multiple resources on its website, including disaster preparedness guides, to prepare and safeguard the community (see https://www.culvercityfd.org/Emergency-Preparedness).

#	Comment	Element	Page	Response
399	Are other fire protection plans, such as Community Wildfire Protection Plans, Local Hazard Mitigation Plans, CAL FIRE Unit or Contract County Fire Plans, referenced or incorporated into the Safety Element? (continued)	Safety	265	Yes, add: The LACoFD implements several programs to mitigate fire risks and enhance community preparedness, such as the Ready! Set! Go! Program, which helps residents understand how to prepare their properties for wildfire, create evacuation plans, and stay informed during a fire event. The department's comprehensive Strategic Fire Plan provides a framework for fire prevention, suppression strategies, and emergency response protocols. Federal entities like the United States Forest Service (USFS), Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), and National Park Service (NPS) contribute resources and support to combat wildfires and manage fire-prone areas. Further, Southern California Edison (SCE), a special district responsible for electricity distribution, aids in wildfire prevention through measures such as Public Safety Power Shutoffs. Through the integration of local, state, and federal efforts, Culver City benefits from a comprehensive and coordinated approach to fire protection and suppression, ensuring the safety and resilience of the community.
400	Are Fire Hazard Severity Zones Identified? CAL FIRE or Locally Adopted Maps Ensure the colors related to the VHFHSZ match what is used by CAL FIRE.	Safety	266	Yes. See the Fire Severity Zones Figure. In addition, update Figure 41 Fire Severity Zones to ensure the colors related to the VHFHSZ match what is used by CAL FIRE.
401	Has the general location and distribution of existing and planned uses of land in very high fire hazard severity zones (VHFHSZs) and in state responsibility areas (SRAs), including structures, roads, utilities, and essential public facilities, been identified?	Safety	266	Include new figure to show the general location and distribution of existing and planned uses of land in very high fire hazard severity zones (VHFHSZs) and in state responsibility areas (SRAs), including structures, roads, utilities, and essential public facilities. Add "Figure 43 identifies the VHFHSZ together with the distribution of existing and planned land uses, including structures, roads, utilities and essential public facilities, including fire stations. There are three fire stations in Culver City and a fire training building near the VHFHSZ."
402	Revise language in Safety Element to be more specific to SB 99.	Safety	267	Revise text, "In addition, California Government Code Section 65302(g)(5), adopted through Senate Bill (SB) 99, requires identification of residential developments in Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones hazard areas that do not have at least two emergency evacuation routes."
403	Update table numbering.	Safety	268	Revise text: Table 910 identifies these critical facilities. Revise Table title. Update all following table numbers in the Plan.
404	Does the plan include policies to evaluate re-development after a large fire?	Safety	269	Yes, see Policy S-1.4. No change recommended.
405	Are new essential public facilities located outside high fire risk areas, such as VHFHSZs, when feasible?	Safety	269	Yes, see Policy S-2.1. Revise Policy S-2.1 to read: S-2.1: Critical facility location. Avoid locating any new critical facilities including but not limited to, hospitals and health care facilities, emergency shelters, emergency command centers, emergency communication facilities, and utilities within or immediately adjacent to hazard areas (hazard areas are shown in Figure 37 through Figure 41). If no reasonable alternative is available, implement features to reduce their impact, including construction methods or other methods to minimize damage if these facilities must be located in a hazard area.
406	Are there policies or programs promoting public outreach about defensible space or evacuation routes? Are there specific plans to reach at-risk populations?	Safety	270	Yes, see Policy S-3.1. No change recommended.
407	Are goals or standards for emergency services training described?	Safety	270	Yes, see Policy S-3.3. No change recommended.
408	How do fault lines effect development in the Hayden tract? Including housing	Safety	270	The General Plan Safety Element identifies policies related to building safety in seismic events. Furthermore, development must adhere to seismic safety requirements in the City's building code. No change recommended.
409	Has fire safe design been incorporated into future development requirements?	Safety	273	Yes, see Policy S-7.5. Revise Policy S-7.5 to read: Comply with minimum standards for fire safetyprotection . Require new development to meet the State's minimum standards for fire safetyprotection unless the City's Municipal Code defines more conservativestringent standards. Require that ingress and egress routes be constructed using the most current State Fire Safe Regulations, Fire Code, and/or Municipal Code that meets these minimum requirements.
410	Does local ordinance require development standards that meet or exceed title 14, CCR, division 1.5, chapter 7, subchapter 2, articles 1-5 (commencing with section 1270) (SRA Fire Safe Regulations) and title 14, CCR, division 1.5, chapter 7, subchapter 3, article 3 (commencing with section 1299.01) (Fire Hazard Reduction Around Buildings and Structures Regulations) for SRAs and/or VHFHSZs?	Safety	273	Yes, see Policy S-7.1. No change recommended.

#	Comment	Element	Page	Response
411	Is fuel modification around homes and subdivisions required for new development in SRAs or VHFHSZs	Safety	273	Yes, see Policy S-7.5. Revise Policy S-7.5 to read: Comply with minimum standards for fire safety protection . Require new development to meet the State's minimum standards for fire safety protection unless the City's Municipal Code defines more stringent standards. Require that ingress and egress routes be constructed using the most current State Fire Safe Regulations, Fire Code, and/or Municipal Code that meets these minimum requirements. These standards include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fire protection plans for new development in VHFHSZ; • Ability for a safe and efficient fire department response; • Adequacy of water supply for new development (i.e., maintenance and long-term integrity); and • Adequacy of fire flow (gallons per minute) to extinguish a fire at the proposed development.
412	Are fire protection plans required for new development in VHFHSZs?	Safety	273	Yes, see Policy S-7.5. No change recommended.
413	Is there adequate access (ingress, egress) to new development in VHFHSZs?	Safety	273	Yes, see Policy S-7.5. No change recommended.
414	Water supply and fire flow?	Safety	273	Yes, see Policy S-7.5. No change recommended.
415	Maintenance and long-term integrity of water supplies?	Safety	273	Yes, see Policy S-7.5. No change recommended.
416	Evacuation and emergency vehicle access?	Safety	273	Yes, see Policy S-7.5. No change recommended.
417	Does new development have adequate fire protection?	Safety	273	Yes, see Policy S-7.8. Revise Policy 7.8 to read: S-7.8: Long-range fire safety planning. Continue to conduct and implement long-range fire safety planning and protection, including projections for emergency services for the City if needed , to cope with increasing urban density caused by new development, redevelopment, and property infilling. Consider more stringent Building or Fire Municipal Code standards, improved infrastructure, and improved mutual aid agreements with the public sector.
418	Does the plan include an assessment and projection of future emergency service needs?	Safety	273	Yes, see Policy S-7.8. Revise Policy S-7.8 to read: S-7.8: Long-range fire safety planning. Continue to conduct and implement long-range fire safety planning and protection, including projections for emergency services for the City if needed , to cope with increasing urban density caused by new development, redevelopment, and property infilling. Consider more stringent Building or Fire Municipal Code standards, improved infrastructure, and improved mutual aid agreements with the public sector.
419	Are there goals and policies to avoid or minimize new residential development in VHFHSZs?	Safety	273	Yes, see Policy 7.9. Revise policy 7.9 to read: Wildfire risk hazard . If warranted, avoid approving new development in areas subject to wildfire risk hazard . Enforce the standards and guidelines of the City's Building Code and Fire Code fire safety provisions to reduce wildfire risk hazard . For areas within fire hazard severity zones, the California Fire Code requires construction methods intended to mitigate wildfire exposure, hazardous vegetation and fuel management, create defensible space around all buildings and structures, and maintain community fire breaks.
420	Does the plan address long term maintenance of fire hazard reduction projects, including community fire breaks and private road and public road clearance?	Safety	273	Yes, see Policy 7.9. Revise policy 7.9 to read: Wildfire risk hazard . If warranted, avoid approving new development in areas subject to wildfire risk hazard . Enforce the standards and guidelines of the City's Building Code and Fire Code fire safety provisions to reduce wildfire risk hazard . For areas within fire hazard severity zones, the California Fire Code requires construction methods intended to mitigate wildfire exposure, hazardous vegetation and fuel management, create defensible space around all buildings and structures, and maintain community fire breaks.
421	Fuel modification and defensible space?	Safety	273	Yes, see Policy S-7.9. Change "risk" to hazard
422	Community fire breaks? Is there a discussion of how those fire breaks will be maintained?	Safety	273	Yes, see Policy 7.9 and 7.18. Added Policy S-7.18: Long-term fire-reduction maintenance. Ensure long-term maintenance of all fire hazard reduction projects, including community fire breaks and private road and public road clearance.
423	Revise language to be more specific to SB 99.	Safety	274	Revise policy S-7.13: Fire code enforcement. Continue to enforce the California Fire Code and Municipal Fire Code Amendments for new construction in Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones fire hazard areas , like using sprinklers in residential structures.

#	Comment	Element	Page	Response
424	If areas exist with inadequate access/evacuation routes, are they identified? Are mitigation measures or improvement plans identified?	Safety	274	Yes, see Policy S-7.14. Revise to read: S-7.14: Evacuation routes. Require all development proposals to identify evacuation routes or establish new evacuation routes as needed. Consider including the following actions, or similar actions that achieve the same outcomes, in conjunction with established fire standards when formalizing plans for potential or imminent evacuation routes, particularly in the VHFHSZ: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase capacity through use of contraflow lanes; • Manage traffic control, including through turn restrictions and route or ramp closures, to minimize outflows from evacuation areas; • Manage street parking on high hazard days; • Continually improve communication systems and implement strategies that improve disaster alerts; • Instigate dynamic route guidance and monitoring; • Implement phased evacuations; • Promote reductions in vehicle volumes during evacuations, such as by encouraging households to use only one vehicle to evacuate; and • Closely monitor power issues that could affect traffic signals and slow down evacuations.
425	Are minimum standards for evacuation of residential areas in VHFHSZs defined?	Safety	274	Yes, see Policy S-7.14. No change recommended.
426	Are there plans or actions identified to mitigate existing non-conforming development to contemporary fire safe standards, in terms of road standards and vegetative hazard?	Safety	274	Yes, add new policy S-7.15: Identify or develop programs to provide financial incentives or assistance to existing non-compliant development for defensible space maintenance, home gardening, low-cost retrofits, and other measures to reduce fire hazard.
427	Visible home and street addressing and signage?	Safety	274	Yes, see new Policy S-7.16. S-7.16: Proper addressing and signage. Implement proper addressing and signage for all streets and homes in compliance with Culver City Fire Department standards to assist in fire emergencies.
428	Does the plan identify future water supply for fire suppression needs?	Safety	274	Yes, see new Policy S-7.17. S-7.17: Fire prevention and suppression needs. Coordinate with Los Angeles Department of Water & Power (LADWP) and Golden State Water Company, as well as other water service providers within the city and neighboring cities and fire agencies in neighboring cities, to plan for future fire prevention and suppression needs including identifying future water supply for fire suppression needs.
429	Location of anticipated water supply?	Safety	274	Yes, see Policy S-7.17. No change recommended.
430	IA S-1&2: I recommend changing the time frame to on going and making it a priority because of the wildfire danger to residents. Figure 41 - Fire Severity Zones on page 266 caught my attention. The Wildfire section on page 265 states: The 2011 Cal Fire Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones includes eastern portion of Culver Crest neighborhood, Blair Hills neighborhood, and areas within the Inglewood Oil Field and development within these areas must follow certain Municipal Code restrictions for development types, landscaping requirements, fuel management, and brush clearance requirements to reduce the risks associated with wildfires.	Safety	276	Both actions are ongoing. Change Timelines for IA.S-1 and IA.S-2: "Ongoing Short-term"
431	IA S-9 is associated with goal "GL-6", inconsistent with the rest of the goals in the Safety IA table (labeled S-1, S-2, etc.)	Safety	277	Change associated goal for IA.S-9 from GL-6 to S-10.
432	Noises affect our health	Noise	288	Noted. No change recommended.
433	N-3.9, 3.10, 3.11, 3.12 LAX Sunday AM (5:30-7:30) cargo flights	Noise	289	The listed policies address this concern. No change recommended.
434	N 3.5 10 Hwy Traff Noise Abatement	Noise	289	The listed policy addresses this concern. No change recommended.
435	Helicopters can be replaced by drones in most cases. Drones are fast, cheap, and QUIET. I would encourage CC to deny LAPD the airspace over our city.	Noise	291	Noted. No change recommended.
436	6) Start the research now about funding sources for affordable housing development. Even with all of the above, we will fall short of our affordable housing targets unless we prioritize financing for affordable development in Culver City. The city's acquisition of the Retting gun store property presents an unprecedented opportunity, but the city must start exploring funding sources. We cannot rely on the market to build this housing over the next 8 years.	Implementation	304	Implementation action IA.CHEJ-23 would develop a new low-income housing grant program to address deferred property maintenance, which may help preserve existing affordable housing. Page 40 of the Housing Element lists grant resources to support implementation of the Housing Element and the City will continue to be proactive in pursuing grant. No change recommended.
437	Start the research now about funding sources for affordable housing development. Even with all of the above, we will fall short of our affordable housing targets unless we prioritize financing for affordable development in Culver City. The city's acquisition of the Retting gun store property presents an unprecedented opportunity, but the city must start exploring funding sources. We cannot rely on the market to build this housing over the next 8 years.	Implementation	304	Implementation action IA.CHEJ-23 would develop a new low-income housing grant program to address deferred property maintenance, which may help preserve existing affordable housing. Page 40 of the Housing Element lists grant resources to support implementation of the Housing Element and the City will continue to be proactive in pursuing grant. No change recommended.
438	There are multiple grants at the federal, state, and county level to support affordable housing and reduce homelessness. If Culver City were to hire a housing grants specialist, the first grant obtained would cover that person's compensation many times over. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.	Implementation	304	Implementation action IA.CHEJ-23 would develop a new low-income housing grant program to address deferred property maintenance, which may help preserve existing affordable housing. Page 40 of the Housing Element lists grant resources to support implementation of the Housing Element and the City will continue to be proactive in pursuing grant. City staffing is determined by departemnts. No change recommended.

#	Comment	Element	Page	Response
439	Use the Culver City Proclamation of the Local Emergency regarding Homelessness to jumpstart streamlining the approval process for affordable housing. City leaders have said we are "locking arms" with Karen Bass and the City of Los Angeles. One of Mayor Bass's first acts was to issue an Executive Directive that fast tracks approval of 100% affordable housing projects. Based on the predictability and greatly shortened timeframe provided by this directive, developers have proposed 100% affordable projects in place of market rate units, which is expected to result in more than 7,000 additional units in the city of Los Angeles. We encourage the City to look at City of Los Angeles's Mayor Karen Bass's Executive Directive No. 1 for some possible approaches to encourage affordable development.	Implementation	304	Implementation IA.ED-11 aims to streamline the residential entitlement process. This would involve processes to decrease uncertainty. However, it is the City's goal to reduce the development approval timeline for housing and can use Directive 1 as a potential model. No change recommended.
440	5) Use the Culver City Proclamation of the Local Emergency regarding Homelessness to jumpstart streamlining the approval process for affordable housing. City leaders have said we are "locking arms" with Karen Bass and the City of Los Angeles. One of Mayor Bass's first acts was to issue an Executive Directive that fast tracks approval of 100% affordable housing projects. Based on the predictability and greatly shortened timeframe provided by this directive, developers have proposed 100% affordable projects in place of market rate units, which is expected to result in more than 7,000 additional units in the city of Los Angeles. We encourage the City to look at City of Los Angeles's Mayor Karen Bass's Executive Directive No. 1 for some possible approaches to encourage affordable development.	Implementation	304	Implementation IA.ED-11 aims to streamline the residential entitlement process. This would involve processes to decrease uncertainty. However, it is the City's goal to reduce the development approval timeline for housing and can use Directive 1 as a potential model. No change recommended.
441	Culver City's Homeless Emergency is also a Housing Shortage Emergency. The City of LA has found that decreasing uncertainty and shortening the review process through Mayor Bass's Executive Directive 1 has led some developers to propose affordable housing where previously they were planning only market rate. Culver City should consider a similar approach.	Implementation	304	Implementation IA.ED-11 aims to streamline the residential entitlement process. This would involve processes to decrease uncertainty. However, it is the City's goal to reduce the development approval timeline for housing and can use Directive 1 as a potential model. No change recommended.
442	IA S-9 is associated with goal "GL-6", inconsistent with the rest of the goals in the Safety IA table (labeled S-1, S-2, etc.)	Implementation	323	Change associated goal for IA.S-9 from GL-6 to S-10 .
443	Consider housing as infrastructure, electricity microgrids	Implementation	323	Implementation Action IA-S-5 calls for the City to consider using microgrids to support energy resiliency at key facilities. Implementation of solar rays on housing will be supported by property and building owners. No change recommended.
444	Remove CPTED from Glossary because it is only used in the Reimagining Public Safety, which will not be included in the General Plan Update.	Glossary	342	Revise: Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED): A multi-disciplinary approach to deterring criminal behavior through environmental design.
445	Are residential developments in hazard areas that do not have at least two emergency evacuation routes identified?	Appendix		Yes, see Culver City Evacuation Route Capacity and Viability Study" in Appendix C of the General Plan.
446	Have evacuation routes and their capacity, safety, and viability under a range of emergency scenarios been identified?	Appendix		Yes, see Culver City Evacuation Route Capacity and Viability Study" in Appendix C of the General Plan.