

Comments on Lighthouse Area Specific Plan
Chapter 5: Circulation, Parking & Streetscape

Page 71, **Circulation, Parking and Streetscape**, 1st paragraph: "...*Tree-planted or pedestrian* mid-block mini-plazas will enhance..."

- What is '*tree-planted*' referring to? Why "...or *pedestrian*..."?
- How many mini-plazas do we expect will be built?

"*Gateway features and guide signs*...will further define the character of the mixed-use neighborhood."

- What is intended by 'gateway features'?
- Where would *Gateway features* be placed at the PG end of Foam and Lighthouse?

Page 71, 2nd paragraph:

"Lighthouse Avenue primarily provides commercial uses for the nearby residential community and is an *important tourist destination* due to"

- Do we know that tourists are a significant part of Lighthouse business?

"Foam Street, which parallels Lighthouse Avenue, is another primary route through *New Monterey*, serving one-way travel towards Pacific Grove."

- Foam is a route ***across lower New Monterey***.

" *These two transportation corridors, Lighthouse Avenue and Foam Street, connect Downtown to Pacific Grove and points beyond.*"

- This paragraph 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.

Page 71, 3rd paragraph:

"Lighthouse Avenue is a four-lane street with **a** narrow parallel parking lanes**s** and prohibited left turns..."

"...which does not optimize multi-modal travel along the corridor."

- 'Multi-modal' has been used to refer to bus transit, bicycle, pedestrian. Safety of travel for all vehicles is the objective. Can this sentence be revised?

"The narrow travel and parking lanes increase conflicts...conditions difficult for *bicyclists*."

- Since bicyclists avoid Lighthouse and Foam, why mention them here?
- Conditions are difficult for all vehicles.

"Additionally, long vehicle signal cycle lengths make walking along the corridor *difficult*."

- Perhaps 'frustrating' or 'uninviting' or some other word. 'Difficult' doesn't quite capture it.

Page 71, 4th paragraph, 3rd sentence:

"A clockwise couplet allows ..."

- This paragraph needs to be rewritten. The clockwise couplet fails when inbound Foam traffic has to cross over outbound traffic coming from the Tunnel.
- "A **counterclockwise** couplet **would allow** ..."
 - 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.

Comments on Lighthouse Area Specific Plan
Chapter 5: Circulation, Parking & Streetscape

Page 71, 5th paragraph:

"However, business owners expressed concern...

- Both New Monterey Business Assn and New Monterey Neighborhood Assn supported counterclockwise one-way couplet, submitting letters after discussions and formal votes of their respective boards.
- Some property owners "expressed concern."

~~"Because the community could not reach consensus on a solution,~~ no changes to the"

- **"The City Council directed that there be** no changes to the...."
- Add a sentence "Revisit the issue after Hwy 68 roundabout is completed and after Washington/Del Monte pedestrian crossing has been relocated."

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.

Page 72, **Objectives**

"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.

Perhaps revise to say, *"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 a *destination*, aren't we talking about a 'business district'? ? 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? Can this be more specific?

"Define parking policies appropriate for mixed use development."

- Refine existing policies to what end? Most people seem satisfied with the existing standards.
- Is it clear in the document that there are to be no exceptions to adopted standards?

"Minimize land dedicated to parking."

- Why is this objective here? We are not proposing to build parking structures.
- **Optimize** land dedicated to parking. Provide enough parking for the proposed uses. Parking requires space.
- Where are bicycles supposed to be parked? Motorcycles?
- Is provision for electric vehicle recharging stations desirable?

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.

Comments on Lighthouse Area Specific Plan
Chapter 5: Circulation, Parking & Streetscape

Page 72, **Parking**, 2nd paragraph:

"Install real-time availability signs in the Cannery Row garage and provide real-time availability information online."

- Cannery Row Garage is outside of the Lighthouse Area. Why is it in this Specific Plan?
- 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.
- Improve signage for Lighthouse pedestrian ingress/egress to the Cannery Row garage.

Page 72, **Parking**, 3rd paragraph:

"Although there are small signs currently in place on Foam Street, *larger*, more visible signs placed on Lighthouse Avenue prior to the merge on Foam Street would direct motorists to the Cannery Row garage or other large private facilities."

- Is the driver looking for directions to parking at that location? It seems premature.
- The universal 'P' sign with an arrow is smaller (less sign clutter). We don't need *larger* signs on Lighthouse Curve.
- What *other large private facilities* are there in the planning area?
- Is this a Lighthouse Plan issue? This is a Cannery Row issue.

If **parking meters were removed from Foam Street**, there would be fewer underutilized on-street parking spaces.

Page 73, **Create a Residential Parking Benefit District**

"...allow a limited number of commuters to pay to use surplus on-street parking spaces in residential areas and return the resulting revenues to the neighborhood to fund public improvements such as streetscape amenities and revitalization."

- **Delete this whole section.** New Monterey has no 'surplus on-street parking spaces.'
- 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. [Does the current price of the program encourage resident participation in the program?]
- 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.
- The City Council adopted the policy, but foresaw no time that they would ever implement it.

Page 73, **Develop Transportation Demand Management policies and programs**

"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."

- Do any of those options have practical applications in this district?
 - 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 participate in an employee permit parking program on side streets. How many businesses currently use it? What is the current cost? This should be encouraged.

Page 74, **Streetscape Plan**

The alternative of narrowing sidewalks 2' on both sides of Lighthouse is not mentioned.

Curb extensions for BRT are not popular.

Will there be a point where the traffic flow impacts are examined to determine their effectiveness?

In addition to bulbs:

- Eliminate southern crosswalks at Prescott (between On the Beach and CVS) and Hoffman
- Encourage removal of pedestrian crossing at Washington/Del Monte intersection
- Reconsider counterclockwise 1-way couplet after Hwy 68 Roundabout and after Washington/Del Monte changes.
- Include in 1-way couplet a transition lane through the triangle park for Lighthouse traffic to return on Foam St.
- Encourage MST to provide small bus connections from the neighborhood to BRT service.
- If existing trees are removed for narrowing of sidewalks, be certain the plan directs that they are replaced with new trees.

Page 75, **Bicycle Improvements**

- Legend can delete those references not included in the New Monterey portion of the map.
 - Existing Class 1-3, Class 2, and Class 3
 - North Fremont Bicycle Blvd
 - East Downtown Bicycle Blvd
 - Changing Facilities – Existing
 - Changing Facilities – Proposed
 - TM Existing
 - TM Proposed
 - Airport
 - Hospital

“...and a new connection to the bike boulevard from Coastal Trail via *Hoffman Avenue*.”

- Hoffman is the most congested intersection. The queue backs up onto Foam, blocking the left lane of travel.
- Direct bicycles to a different intersection. McClellan with signage from the Rec Trail? Drake?

“Additionally, a new bicycle connection is planned... Private Bolio **Street Road** and Corporal...”

- This plan should include the connection in the list of projects to be financed/designed/built.

“...to access downtown that will avoid the changes in *elevation* associated with using the Coastal Trail.”

- **Avoiding traffic congestion** could also be mentioned in this sentence.

Page 77, Example of appropriate planters

- Are there any other planter styles that would enhance the 1920's Spanish Colonial Revival buildings?

Page 78, **Lights**

“Pedestrian scale lights to light the sidewalk area ...” “Selecting a light fixture already in use in Monterey...”

- Examples? Where mounted? Bollards?
- The Specific Plan needs to state which lights are to be used.

Page 78, **Sidewalks**

Driveways – natural gray concrete

“Concrete pavers will be used for sidewalks at intersection corners and at mini-plazas.”

“The concrete paver selected for the intersection corners will extend across the street in the crosswalk.”

“The concrete paver for mini-plazas could be a different, but complementary, paver. The color of the paver will be complementary to the color of the sidewalk.”

- Who decides if the sidewalk is not gray? Who decides the color(s) of concrete pavers?
- Is it okay to have different sidewalk colors for different blocks? Different sidewalk colors within the same block?
- Is it okay to have different colored concrete pavers in different blocks? Different paver colors within the same block?
- Are these variations acceptable on Lighthouse and Foam alike?
- Are developers required to provide these improvements as new projects/remodels are built?

Page 78, **Planting**

“Mass planting using a few plant species is recommended over detailed planting with multiple plant types.”

- Do we really care? Variety of shape, color, texture adds interest.

“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.”

- There is a Tree Master Plan in the City. Why deviate from those species that have proven successful in this micro-climate?
- What is the source of these plants? Why were these included and others not?

Page 78, last paragraph

“When constructing landscape areas in the **ROW** (Right-of-Way) that will also function as storm water **BMPs**, care should be taken to identify the most suitable plant mix for the anticipated soil, runoff, and anticipated nutrient uptake needs.”

“Several California-specific **LID** guidance documents ...”

“...program to foster LID awareness and implementation in the Central California.”

- Spell out the abbreviations so readers know what is being said.
- Where and when are storm water BMPs required?
- Are run-off collection basins required on a single lot?
- Are there *coastal* LID guidance documents? What works in Salinas will not work here.

Page 79, **Gateways and Signage** “Major gateway features”

- Examples?
- Where might these features be installed? Where is there room for major features at the PG end of Foam & Lighthouse?
- Is there a need for Gateway signage at the end of Foam at David Avenue?

“Other signage...complementary to the gateway concept...”

- Lighthouse BID developed a sign concept and lighthouse logo. Why not use those?
- Is there a desire for a different logo for Foam?

“Street name signs, incorporating a logo...”

- What size? Pacific St/Del Monte size? (too big!)
- Color?

“Regulatory signs...although special posts or frames could be used...”

- Does the district want special posts? Frames? What are the options? Costs?
- What does the adopted Streetscape Plan specify?

Page 79, **Implementation**

“...guidelines will support *successful* implementation of the Streetscape Plan.”

- Is the word ‘successful’ necessary in this sentence?

“...coordinate implementation of the plan with other projects, including... *undergrounding of utilities* and roadway improvements.”

- Since Lighthouse already had utilities placed underground, should the document state where? Foam Street?

First 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).

- There are street trees along Lighthouse – and Foam? Is that the parkway?
No one has suggested replacing parking spaces with additional trees.
- What is ‘expanded sidewalk mini-plaza’? Is that removal of parking for outdoor seating?
We all agreed that would not be done in the plan area.
- There is on-street parking.
- On-street parking is what we want. There is no menu of options. The first bullet should be rewritten, stating that on-street parking is to be retained.

Second bullet:

“...relocate all posts for signs, lights, etc out of the sidewalk and **into the proposed parkway or mini-plaza areas.**”

“Plant all street trees **in the proposed parkway strip and mini-plaza areas.**”

“Relocate all site furnishings... **to mini-plaza areas.**”

- Does this policy language apply to Lighthouse and Foam?
- Are publicly-owned mini-plazas as shown on Page 77 likely?
Are there standards for privately-owned mini-plazas?
- Why move signs and lights into the trees?
- Sidewalks and trees: policy language to retain trees? Replace?
Can developer remove and not replace trees?
- Benches where?
Where MST has a stop and no bench, can the plan area provide a bench?
- Planters where? Are they encouraged?
- Hanging pots allowed? Encouraged?
- Bicycle racks Where?
- Private seating areas at back of sidewalk – are there any guidelines?
- Umbrellas? Awnings?

Who provides the funding for the features chosen?

Chapter 6: Public Utilities

Page 83, **Storm Drainage and Low Impact Design**, 1st paragraph:

“Building coverage and paved surfaces must be minimized and incorporated within a system of porous pavements, ponding areas, and siltation basins.”

- Is the lot coverage still 50% in Lighthouse Area?
- How much paving is allowed? How much land is left uncovered?
- Are porous pavements, ponding and siltation basins required for all projects?

Page 83, 2nd paragraph:

- Can abbreviations **ROW** and **LID** be spelled out so the reader knows what is being said?

Page 83, 3rd paragraph, 2nd sentence:

“These requirements will be changing **in 2012** when the Regional Board is anticipated to revise existing storm water design requirements for development.”

- Update this sentence to reflect what happened in 2012.

Page 83, 4th paragraph:

“Preliminary GIS soil investigations...existing soil substrate is not well suited for LID design strategies...”

“Site-specific analyses will be necessary and required to confirm **this** potential for drainage design purposes.”

- Change ‘*this*’ to ‘**whether there is.**’
- Has any additional testing been done to determine whether LID MBPs will work here? It seems a lot of reading to get to the site-specific analysis requirement.

Thinking about public utilities, I wonder whether the document should say something about:

- Underground utilities – where they might be undergrounded and how soon
- Integration of Sewer and Storm Drain Systems as has been done in Pacific Grove
- High Speed Internet capabilities
- Cell phone towers

Chapter 7: Financing and Implementation

Page 87, **Purpose of the Strategy**, 2nd paragraph:

“This implementation strategy assesses the types of development opportunities that will be allowed..., including *catalyst* projects.”

- There is no explanation of the term ‘catalyst project.’ What is it?

Page 87, **Development Opportunities**, 2nd paragraph:

“The relatively modest amount of new development means that redevelopment and re-tenanting of existing properties will be **as** significant **a** factor in the future evolution of the Lighthouse area.”

- As significant *as what*? Rewrite to say that it “will be **a** significant factor in the...”?

“Re-tenanting presents an opportunity to replace underperforming retailers as leases expire with new retailers that can enhance retail offerings.”

- This sounds like a truism. Is there a strategy in this? It seems to be advocating for change.

Page 87, **Opportunity Sites**:

The 1st paragraph seems to be saying, “We really want to load up these two sites.”

- Do we want very dense development there? Massive, traffic-generating projects that add to already-congested intersections?
- The purpose of this exercise was to develop design guidelines for mixed use development in this business district, not to try to encourage any particular developments. Why the change in emphasis?

Comments on Lighthouse Area Specific Plan
Chapters 6-9

Page 88, first paragraph:

"The total cost of the streetscape and infrastructure improvements is approximately \$23.4 million."

- What does that total include? Sidewalks? Pavers? New signs, new streetlights, planters and benches? Narrowing sidewalks?
- What does it not include?

Page 88, **Land Assembly**, 1st paragraph:

"Sites in the Lighthouse Area are split into many parcels, and assembly of these parcels into larger sites can be important both for allowing larger development that is more viable, as well as for transferring available water allocations between adjacent properties."

- Why is staff suggesting 'larger developments'? The first words of the sentence summarize the character of Lighthouse and Foam "*split into many parcels*". I've heard no groundswell from the public to change the character and create larger projects.
- Transferring of water credits was done when the Greene Mansion was purchased. The parcel was subdivided, the restaurant's water given to the Senior Housing project, leaving the mansion with water enough for a bathroom. Parking for the Mansion was reduced to 2 spaces, the rest given to the Seniors project; and the historic grove of trees for which Harry Greene was known around the world left to die from lack of water. This is not a success story, certainly not one we'd want to repeat.

Page 88, **Funding Public Improvements**, 2nd paragraph:

Add a capital 't': "There are also a variety of"

Page 88, 1st paragraph, 2nd sentence:

"Besides the types of public improvements identified for the specific plan,..."

- "...identified in the specific plan..."

Page 88, 3rd paragraph, 2nd sentence:

"As part of this process, a financing plan will be developed for Lighthouse Specific Plan improvements..."

- When?

"The range of funding sources for the Specific Plan funding strategy would be expected to choose from the following as well as other sources:"

- Will the City be applying for grant funds as was done on North Fremont?
- How does the City expect the costs will be distributed? The most likely sources of funding?
 - Infrastructure Finance District
 - Community Facilities District assessment through BID
 - Development Impact Fee
 - Developer Exactions
 - Public-Private Partnerships
 - Revenue bonds
 - The public, businesses & employees do not support increased parking fees.
 - General Fund Debt Obligations
 - Federal, State & Regional Grant Programs
 - Where does the City expect to get the 20% local match funding?

Page 91, **Capital Improvement Program**, 1st paragraph, 3rd sentence:

"Several opportunity sites have been identified..."

- There are two.

"...have the potential to increase retail, hospitality, and residential choices...."

- Planning to add motels? Would this require a vote to allow additional VAF use?

Comments on Lighthouse Area Specific Plan

Chapters 6-9

Page 91, **Capital Improvement Program**, 1st paragraph, last sentence:

“Besides development, there is also the potential for re-tenanting of existing buildings to expand retail and service offerings.”

- Is there a process to ‘re-tenant’? Or is this an observation?

Page 95, **Administration**, 1st paragraph, 3rd sentence:

“Deviation from the Design Guidelines outlined in Chapter [redacted] may be proposed....”

Purpose and Intent, 2nd sentence:

“Projects that are consistent with the development standards and design guidelines of this plan will be *reviewed at a staff level*....”

- Is it standard to review all commercial projects administratively? One & 2-story?
- Are story-poles sometimes required for some 2-story?

“Projects that are required to obtain a use permit or are inconsistent with the development standards and/or design guidelines will be referred....”

- All 3-story?
- The uses on the spreadsheet not principally permitted.

Administrative Amendments and Other Amendments

- Can language that specifically states that NMBA and NMNA will be notified of proposed amendments two weeks to a month prior to hearings be included? Both groups have participated in this process and should have an opportunity to meet and discuss proposed amendments. Three days notice is insufficient.

Page 96

- Note that the footnote says, “***waterfront master plan.***”

Page 101, **Definitions**

- The definitions section does not explain abbreviations, such as ROW, MBP, LID.
- Were the definitions added that were requested throughout the draft process?