

Lighthouse Specific Plan Comments
Chapter 5: Circulation, Parking & Streetscape
Sharon Dwight

RECEIVED

MAY 20 2015

City of Monterey
PEEC DIVISION

Circulation, Parking and Streetscape, Page 71

- 1st paragraph: *"Tree-planted or pedestrian mid-block mini-plazas will enhance the overall pedestrian experience."*
- Tree-planted what?
- 2nd paragraph: *"Lighthouse Avenue primarily provides....and is an important tourist destination due to its proximity..."*
- Do we know that tourists are a significant part of Lighthouse business?
- 2nd paragraph, 2nd sentence:
"Foam Street, which parallels Lighthouse Avenue, is another primary route through New Monterey, serving one-way travel towards Pacific Grove. These two transportation corridors, Lighthouse Avenue and Foam Street, connect Downtown, to Pacific Grove and points beyond."
- Instead of 'through,' perhaps 'across lower New Monterey' is more accurate.
 - This fails to mention that Foam serves neighborhood residents who use Foam as access from points south, visitors and businesses on Wave & Cannery Row, as well as people who are coming to businesses on Foam & Lighthouse.
- 3rd paragraph, 1st sentence:
"Lighthouse Avenue is a four-lane street with a narrow parallel parking lane and prohibited left turns, which does not optimize multi-modal travel along the corridor."
- There are narrow parking lanes (one on each side of the street.)
 - If this does not optimize, what would?
- 3rd paragraph, 2nd sentence:
"The narrow travel and parking lanes increase conflicts along the corridor and make travel conditions difficult for bicyclists."
- Bicyclists should not be there. It's beyond 'difficult' conditions.
 - We could say that it is difficult for 'vehicles', too.
- 3rd paragraph, 3rd sentence: *"...make walking along the corridor difficult."*
- Long light cycles make it "frustrating"," uninviting". It requires patience, standing in the cold wind. Is there a different word?
- 4th paragraph: One-way couplet. The first two sentences are fine. The rest of the paragraph needs a rewrite.
- Clockwise couplet creates a huge conflict where outbound Lighthouse Curve crosses inbound Foam traffic.
 - Counterclockwise couplet has no such conflict.
 - Traffic entering the Presidio has a right hand exit
 - Lighthouse traffic wanting to return on Foam makes a left turn through the park triangle and merges with Foam traffic
 - Blocks between Foam and Lighthouse function as they currently do.
 - Lighthouse to Lighthouse Curve works as it currently does.
 - Lighthouse Curve to Foam works as it currently does.
- 5th paragraph:
"However, business owners expressed concern that a one-way couplet would negatively impact the businesses."
- New Monterey Business Association and New Monterey Neighborhood Association supported one way counterclockwise couplet, submitting letters after discussions and formal votes of their respective boards.
 - Cannery Row Company and others publicly opposed one way.
- "Because the community could not reach consensus on a solution, no changes to the traffic patterns are proposed at this time."*
- More to the point *"The City Council directed that there be no changes..."*
 - The document should include language to *"Revisit the issue after improvements have been made to Washington/Del Monte intersection and Holman Highway roundabout."*

Lighthouse Specific Plan Comments
Chapter 5: Circulation, Parking & Streetscape
Sharon Dwight

- Add some language about removing pedestrian crossings at Del Monte/Washington to reduce signal time and improve traffic flow along Lighthouse.
- Add some language about increasing frequency of bus service to residential neighborhoods of New Monterey and Pacific Grove to feed into BRT and MST.
- Encourage MST to
 - do another resident survey to find out where large numbers of people are travelling and when
 - provide responsive bus service at those times.
 - People will not get out of their cars until they can get to their destination in a timely manner.

Objectives, Page 72

- Reduce auto trips.
 - How realistic is this expectation? PG adds units, more housing units in CR & Lighthouse mixed use districts, affordable units in Pebble Beach just inside the Country Club Gate. An objective should be attainable.
 - “Work with MST to improve bus service to Pacific Grove and New Monterey neighborhoods to reduce auto trips”
- Create a pedestrian-friendly, neighborhood-serving destination.
 - Instead of ‘destination,’ could it say ‘district’ or some other term? If the people who live there want to shop or do laundry or have something to eat, it isn’t a ‘destination.’
- Improve parking policies and design.
 - Improve the policies how? What needs to be fixed? I think this needs to be more specific.
- Define parking policies appropriate for mixed use development.
 - Refine existing policies to accomplish what? What is broken that needs to be fixed?
 - Do not allow exceptions to adopted standards.
- Minimize land dedicated to parking.
 - Optimize land dedicated to parking. Provide enough parking for the proposed uses; it takes the space that it takes.

Add an objective: *Protect the residential neighborhood from commercial parking.*

Parking, page 72

2nd paragraph: Real-time availability signs for Cannery Row garage

- Cannery Row garage is not in the Lighthouse Specific Plan area.
- If Lighthouse area wants to use Cannery Row garage, then this section needs to
 - spell out the steps to make that possible, and
 - make the ‘real-time availability’ language relevant to this planning area.
- Because of the pedestrian egress design of the Cannery Row garage, I don’t believe people will find it convenient for access to Lighthouse businesses. Stairs open onto Wave Street.

3rd paragraph:

“...larger, more visible signs placed on Lighthouse Avenue prior to the merge onto Foam Street would direct motorists to the Cannery Row garage or other large private facilities.”

- What “other large private facilities” are there in Lighthouse/Foam area?
- The universal ‘P’ sign with an arrow is smaller (less sign clutter).
- Is the driver looking for directions to parking at that location? It seems premature.

Lighthouse Specific Plan Comments
Chapter 5: Circulation, Parking & Streetscape
Sharon Dwight

Create a Residential Parking Benefit District, Page 73

- Add policy language:
Create and enforce programs designed to protect residential neighborhoods from employee and mixed use neighborhood parking.
- Commercial and mixed use parking needs to be contained within the commercial district's boundaries.

- *"...allow a limited number of commuters to pay to use surplus on-street parking spaces in residential areas..."*
- Delete this whole section. There is no 'surplus on-street parking' in lower New Monterey.
- Because residents cannot find enough parking in their own block, there is a Residential Permit program that they have to pay for each year which includes enforced time restrictions. That program has been enabled along the full length of Hawthorne and a distance up David Avenue.
- The City has widened most of the streets below Pine to provide more parking for residences.
- Apartments built prior to the 1980s provided significantly less parking than the current standards. Most of those apartments are in lower New Monterey.

Develop Transportation Demand Management (TDM) policies and programs, Page 73

"Such programs could include a parking cash-out program, universal transit passes, and mandating that employees receive benefits in exchange for giving up their parking space."

- What is a 'parking cash-out program?' Is that feasible in the Lighthouse district?
- How would 'Universal transit passes' work? Cost?
- Would Universal transit passes be a citywide program? Would it include major regional employers such as CHOMP, CSUMB, DLI, and MIIS?
- A primary reason residents don't use transit is the infrequency of buses into the neighborhood. Universal transit passes would, therefore, most likely be used by residents of the mixed use neighborhood, yes?
- Businesses and building owners are required to provide parking for employees. Why would employees be paid anything if they don't use a parking space?

- Add language that supports *"affordable employee permit parking on side streets."*
- Some businesses were required to provide employee parking by participating in an employee-parking-on-side-streets program. The cost of those permits has gone up from the \$30. NIP paid to widen two streets. The city makes enough money from tickets to pay for the enforcement. This should be an incentive, not a punishment.

Streetscape Plan, Page 74

- We discussed narrowing the sidewalks 2' on both sides between trees. There is no mention of that in this section.
Do we need to discuss the implications further?
How many existing trees would be lost?

- Curb extensions for BRT are not popular.
Will there be a point where the traffic flow impacts are examined to determine their effectiveness?

Bicycle Improvements, Page 75

- Bottom of 1st paragraph: *"...Wave Street as a class III route, and a new connection to the bike boulevard from Coastal Trail via Hoffman Avenue."*
- Hoffman is the most congested intersection already. (Is it due to pedestrian crossings on the S leg of the intersection?) The queue backs up onto Foam Street, blocking the left lane of travel.
- Choose a different street for bicycles. McClellan? (Signage from the Rec Trail) Drake?

Lighthouse Specific Plan Comments
Chapter 5: Circulation, Parking & Streetscape
Sharon Dwight

Bicycle Improvements, Page 75 (cont'd)

- Correction: Private Bolio ~~Street~~ Road

Acceptable Materials List, Page 77

The 'appropriate planters' do not seem to fit with the Lighthouse Avenue Character. Are there other options?

Lights, Page 78

Could some appropriate pedestrian-scale lights be shown in the document?

- Would they be wall-mounted? Pole-mounted? Bollards?

Sidewalks, Page 78 "...The color of the paver will be complementary to the color of the sidewalk."

- Is the intent that all blocks have the same color of paver?
- What color is the sidewalk if not gray? Is that the same for all blocks of Lighthouse & Foam?
- Would it be acceptable if different blocks had different colors of paver as long as it is 'complementary to the color of the sidewalk'?
- Are developers expected to provide these improvements as new projects are built?

Planting, Page 78

"Some of the trees used on the plant list have not been used as street trees in Monterey, and therefore should be tested on a trial basis prior to extensive use.

- What is the source of these plants? Why have they been included and others not?
- Why are the recommended trees from our Urban Forester *not* on this list? They are tested and found successful in this microclimate.
- Last paragraph: Use of acronyms is confusing for nonprofessionals. ROW, BMPs, LID
- Where and when are storm water BMPs required?
- Are run-off collection basins required on a single lot?

Planting, Page 79

- LID Technical Guidance for Central California
- Is this guidance going to be tailored for coastal areas vs. inland locales? Salinas and Monterey Bay have very different characteristics and needs.

Gateways and Signage

- "Major gateway features will be designed for both ends of Lighthouse Avenue and the east end of Foam Street to reinforce the overall identity of the Planning Area."
 - What would a 'major gateway feature' look like?
 - Where is there room for that at the Carl's Jr/Coco's end of Lighthouse? Is it needed?
 - Where is the 'east end' of Foam? At David Avenue? Is it needed? It's the end of a one-way street coming from the other direction.
- Signage complementary to the gateway concept
 - Doesn't Lighthouse BID already have a sign concept and lighthouse logo? Why not use that?
 - Do you want a different logo for Foam?
- Street Name Signs
 - Size? The signs at Pacific/Del Monte are too large. Would those on Lighthouse be the same size?

Lighthouse Specific Plan Comments
Chapter 5: Circulation, Parking & Streetscape
Sharon Dwight

- Street Name Signs (cont'd), Page 79
 - What color are the signs? Green? Black?
- *"...special posts or frames could be used that are consistent with the sign family concept."*
 - Is there a desire in the district to introduce special posts? Options? Costs?
 - If there is no stated desire for them, then I think this option should be deleted.

Implementation, Page 79

- 1st paragraph: *"... guidelines will support successful implementation of the Streetscape Plan."*
 - Do we need the word 'successful' in the sentence? How do you measure success before it's built?
- *"...coordinate implementation of the plan with other projects, including private development, undergrounding of utilities, and roadway improvements."*
 - Where would undergrounding be expected? On Foam Street?
- 1st bullet:
Menu *"...of design solutions for the existing parking lane area of the street (parkway with street trees, expanded sidewalk "mini-plaza", or on-street parking)."*
 - We have street trees along Lighthouse – and Foam? Is that the parkway?
 - We have on-street parking.
 - Is it proposed that it would be okay to cut down the trees? Eliminate the parking?
 - Isn't the 'expanded sidewalk mini-plaza' what they've been doing downtown and we said we would *not* do on Lighthouse?
 - Why is this bullet included in this document?
- 2nd bullet:
"In order to maximize the functional width of the streetscape area, where feasible, relocate all posts for signs, lights, etc. out of the sidewalk and into the proposed parkway or mini-plaza areas."
 - Why do we want to move signs and lights into the trees?
 - Here's the expanded sidewalk mini-plaza again.
- *"Plant all street trees in the proposed parkway strip and mini-plaza areas. Relocate all site furnishings (benches, pots, bicycle racks) to mini-plaza areas."*
 - Do we anticipate any publicly-owned mini-plazas as shown on Page 77?
 - We have sidewalks and trees.
 - We need to decide where we want benches – if we want benches.
 - Pots have been to back of sidewalk. Do we want to encourage plantings? (I think it is positive.)
 - Should hanging pots be allowed? Encouraged?
 - Is there room for bicycle racks? Where?