



Half Moon Bay General Plan and LCP Update
General Plan Advisory Committee Meeting #15
Emergency Operations Center, 537 Kelly Avenue, Half Moon Bay, CA 94019
January 11, 2017 | 6:30pm

Meeting Notes

Materials for this meeting can be found at www.planhmb.org/general-plan-library.html.

Project Overview: Project Status and Schedule

- Reviewed notification and agenda availability and format:
 - Notification for this session was similar to previous sessions and included: Half Moon Bay ENews (multiple notifications), Plan Half Moon Bay email (multiple notifications), Next Door website posting, press notification, and www.planHMB.org project web page.
 - Agenda Availability: Posted electronically on City of Half Moon Bay web page calendar and www.planHMB.org; and hard copy December 20, 2016 at City Hall.

- Reviewed schedule and project status.

- Summary Notes – GPAC acknowledgment of summary notes from December 15, 2016 – no requests for changes made.

- Levels of Agreement: Reviewed the “Levels of Agreement” concept proposed for GPAC’s use in working toward consensus decisions.

Draft General Plan Elements:

The presentation included an overview of the Healthy Community Element and focus on the topic of alternate routes in the Circulation Element. The presentation suggested key policy questions for the GPAC and community members to consider as they review the documents. The topics were presented one at a time with GPAC discussion and community comment conducted before moving on to the next item. Due to lack of time, the Noise Element, which was on the agenda, was continued to the next session. Because many community members in attendance were prepared to speak regarding alternate routes as relevant to the Circulation Element, the GPAC agreed to begin the session with that item and then move back to the other elements.

Alternate Routes and the Circulation Element: At the GPAC’s December 15, 2016 session the committee agreed to continue the discussion of alternate routes to a future session when more GPAC members could be present to discuss and staff could provide materials that would be helpful to the discussion. To begin the discussion, it was confirmed that the 1992 Foothill Boulevard alignment is no longer feasible and not directly a subject of this discussion. Instead,

Plan Half Moon Bay
GPAC Meeting #15 Summary

the concept of an alternate parallel route to Highway 1, especially north of SR 92 was the topic continued for more discussion. Two lists of options (“Key Policy Choices,” below) as suggested by GPAC and community members at the December session were presented for discussion, including those options for new roadways and other choices involving alternate transportation modes (bikes and pedestrians) or reconfiguration of existing roads as follows:

- Key Policy Choices – New Roadway Concepts:
 - Frenchmans Creek Road Terminus
 - SR 92 Intersection Relocation and/or Eastern Alignment in Unincorporated San Mateo County
 - Lewis Foster Drive and/or Half Moon Bay High School Roadway
 - Neighborhood Connection Only
 - Golden Gate Drive
 - Concept Only

- Key Policy Choices – Alternate Modes and Approaches:
 - Pedestrian and Bicycle Parallel Route
 - Bicycle Circulation
 - Silver Avenue Connection

Each of the above suggestions were referenced on a map and known considerations of each were identified including ESHA, community input, and other matters. Staff presented that the City received of a letter of concern from community members in Highland Park about any changes to the configuration of Silver Avenue. Staff confirmed that the communication had been provided to the GPAC on January 6, 2017 by email. Staff also confirmed that the first public draft Circulation Element as prepared by the City’s consultants and staff does not include any changes to the configuration of Silver Avenue for vehicular access.

Healthy Community Element: A detailed overview of the Healthy Community Element was provided at the October 13, 2016 GPAC session. The January 11, 2017 presentation summarized that the Healthy Community Element is an optional element, incorporates and updates the 1995 Parks and Recreation Element, and features the topic of wellness. Healthy Community has been identified as a City Council priority for this planning update (a building block topic) and is also a City Council strategic initiative. Input provided by the community directed the scope of the Healthy Community Element. The San Mateo County Health System, specifically its policy division (Get Healthy San Mateo County), were credited for their support in providing health relevant data sources and other guidance for preparation of community health policies appropriate for general plans.

- Highlights of Topics Covered:
 - Wellness:
 - Healthy Environment
 - Healthy Food
 - Active Living
 - Healthcare
 - Community Vitality

Plan Half Moon Bay
GPAC Meeting #15 Summary

- Parks and Recreation:
 - Parks and Recreation Facilities
 - Recreation Programming
 - Parkland Standard
- Key Policy Choices
 - Walkability: Walkshed, Walking Distance, Indices
 - Land Use Relevance:
 - Neighborhood Serving Markets
 - Parks and Community Gardens
 - Healthcare
 - Childcare
 - Vision Zero
 - Parkland Standard – 5 Acres/1,000 residents
 - Parkland Acquisition Priority – Land or Money?

GPAC Clarifying Questions, Public Comment and GPAC Discussion:

To support the GPAC's discussion, the following handout materials were provided to GPAC and community members: Levels of Agreement; Noise Contour Map and draft Noise Element policies relevant to sound walls; an 11x17 color map highlighting the northeast portion of the City including approximate layout from the 1992 Circulation Element's concept for Foothill Boulevard (superseded by the 2013 Circulation Element) and the street plan for Pacific Ridge.

The GPAC discussion incorporated public comment. The following questions, comments and discussion points were made throughout the remainder of the GPAC session following each staff presentation – first on the Circulation Element Alternate Routes and next on the Healthy Community Element:

Circulation Element – Alternate Routes:

- A GPAC member suggested connecting short streets between neighborhoods on the east side of Highway 1 north of SR 92. These connections could provide for bikes, pedestrians, with or without cars. *Staff Response: This is similar to the Golden Gate Drive concept and involves both private property as well as ESHA.*
- GPAC members stated that their impression is that alternate routes for vehicles have been dismissed by the community through broad consensus; and that furthermore, to move the route further east would cut through agriculture and habitat. A GPAC member asked if this impression of consensus against such vehicle routes was documented. *Staff Response: Staff confirmed that feedback from residents in the City's northeast neighborhoods was firmly and substantially against a parallel route for vehicles like Foothill Boulevard or any of other concept that would potentially introduce cut through neighborhood traffic.*
- A GPAC member cited the benefit of a parallel route for bikes and pedestrians adjacent to Highway 1 to serve farm workers who would benefit from commute access along the corridor. The member noted that even if a second route for bikes and pedestrians could be provided further east, it would not serve this population as well and it would be better to focus on one option instead of two.

Plan Half Moon Bay
GPAC Meeting #15 Summary

- A GPAC member noted that there have been significant challenges with trail users' dogs accessing farmland and habitat areas and that this is a topic for community information and education.
- A GPAC member expressed that a bike and pedestrian route adjacent to Highway 1 is a major safety concern and would not feel personally safe using it. The member suggested that instead of a new route, focus should be on improving linkages and use of existing facilities. Another GPAC member noted that the California Coastal Trail does not serve the eastern neighborhoods. In continuation of this discussion, another GPAC member noted that with respect to an eastside route, each facility might not be ideal for all users, but it could be designed for use to serve many people. A Cabrillo Unified School District (CUSD) representative agreed and described how grade school children are accompanied by parents for walking and biking to school and that middle and high schoolers would be able to utilize an east side bike and pedestrian route on their own. Two GPAC members cited that this is a design matter and not a concern inherent to the proposed location. It was further noted that the draft plan indicates this will be a separated Class I facility, as defined in the draft document. It was also noted that the California Coastal Trail and Naomi Patridge Trail are both examples of Class I facilities. *Staff Response: Staff confirms that Class 1 facilities are described in the draft document and that careful attention to details is essential to successful implementation. It was also noted that the draft plan includes policy suggesting improvements to existing Class 1 facilities with respect to visibility and other matters.*
- A GPAC member noted that mitigating traffic congestion is a consideration related to these routes and that providing pocket parks in each eastside neighborhood – especially if they are linked by trails – would reduce trips to recreation facilities elsewhere in town.
- A community member described the trail that will be part of the Pacific Ridge open space conservation easement and that this trail is worthwhile on its own even if it cannot be connected to other trails or open spaces in the future. Another community member commented on the Pacific Ridge open space as having not been accepted by the City and will need to be managed by the home owners association.
- A community member expressed concern that if Highway 1 is widened there will not be enough room for a separated bike and pedestrian route adjacent to the roadway within existing right-of-way. Another community member suggested that it is possible to shift Highway 1 west to accommodate the parallel trail on the east side of the roadway. It was also noted that this trail should extend from the north to south city limits.
- A representative from CUSD expressed that the District would welcome any and all safe walking and biking trails on the eastside of Highway 1; especially if they are separated and safe. There is also a need for more safe street crossings.
- A community member described that the issue with the eastside neighborhoods, with specific reference to Highland Park, is that they are landlocked. The only path out of the neighborhood is along Highway 1 in a breakdown lane (shoulder). The 0.2 miles between Highland Park and North Main Street is logistically challenging. The community member also stated that the neighborhood is adamant that they do not want their neighborhoods to be connected together by other routes. They want a dedicated bike and pedestrian route adjacent to the eastside of Highway 1. Another community member from Highland Park agreed with the location of the route to be

Plan Half Moon Bay
GPAC Meeting #15 Summary

- adjacent to Highway 1 and not further east into the neighborhoods, citing past issues with an old trail where drug use and sales and student drop off and pick up were taking place. It was further noted that design issues are critical and that there are safety and crime concerns about tunnels and other concealed areas.
- A community member presented detailed comments about specific objections to any potential change to Silver Avenue with regards to vehicular access. The comments had been fully detailed in writing and presented to the GPAC the Friday before the session as previously noted. In summary, the community member stated that opening Silver Avenue will not improve Highway 1 traffic in any meaningful way, residents are fully against it, and it has already been studied and ruled out. Another community member stated that Silver Avenue could be made to work; however, the speaker was not suggesting this option.
 - A community member expressed support for bike and pedestrian facilities wherever they can be implemented.
 - A community member encouraged consideration of Lewis Foster Drive and the roadway behind the Half Moon Bay High School as an alternate vehicular route to Pacific Ridge, or for emergency access.
 - A GPAC member noted that the discussion had focused on a parallel trail on the eastside and wondered about the west side and also stated that the Circulation Element should include bike and pedestrian connections to the California Coastal Trail. Another GPAC member noted that there already is a trail to Sweetwood. Other GPAC members and staff described the California Coastal Trail and Naomi Patridge Trail's existing and planned extents and connections and that they are addressed in the Circulation Element.
 - A GPAC member noted that these plans are 25 year documents and should maintain choices, including a reference to the north-south concept for parallel vehicular routes even if an alternate route cannot be identified at this time. Another GPAC member expressed concern that keeping policy for a route defined conceptually will distract from the specific route identified for bikes and pedestrians on the east side of Highway 1. The conceptual route would need to be studied and could slow down implementation of the defined and most feasible route.
 - A GPAC member reiterated a comment from the previous session about formalizing a connection from Wave Avenue to the California Coastal Trail. *Staff Response: Staff confirmed that the comment had been picked up.*
 - ***The GPAC worked to a consensus statement regarding the Class 1 bike and pedestrian facility proposed for the east side of Highway 1. The consensus includes the following key details: The route shall be planned to extend between the northern and southern city limits; the route is a priority over other conceptual options; the route shall be "dedicated" to bike and pedestrian use; the route shall be a Class 1 facility with special attention to design details to optimize safety.***
 - ***The GPAC worked to a majority statement with dissenting opinion regarding a conceptual bike and pedestrian facility farther east of Highway 1; feasibility and alignment to be determined in the future; with the concept documented in narrative and policy, but not mapped. The dissenting opinion of a few GPAC members was to not include this narrative or related policy and one member further noted that this could be added in a future revision to the Circulation Element; the dissenting members also expressed concern that inclusion of this concept could confuse community members***

Plan Half Moon Bay
GPAC Meeting #15 Summary

and could also leave open the possibility of a roadway for vehicles. Staff Response: Staff stated that the majority's intent is clearly not for a vehicular roadway and the language will be very clear about that. Staff further noted that this is an appropriate topic to bring forward to the Planning Commission for their consideration of both the majority and dissenting opinion.

Healthy Community Element:

- A GPAC member suggested that the Healthy Community Element would be the best place for the General Plan to address the City's position on marijuana which has community health implications.
- A GPAC member encouraged parkland acquisition as a priority over in lieu fees.
- A GPAC member expressed support for the Green Infrastructure discussion and noted that grant funding is available for projects that implement those types of measures.
- A GPAC member was concerned about the name of the element and specifically wanted to emphasize the Parks and Recreation aspect of this work. *Staff Response: Staff is open to other options; Healthy Community was selected because of Council's use of this language and because of the breadth of the topic.*
- A GPAC member asked if public art was addressed; and if not, that it be added. Another GPAC member cited agreement. *Staff Response: It appears that public art was not fully considered and the revision will better describe the intent in the narrative and include policy.*
- A GPAC member expressed that they would like to see more pocket parks for the east side neighborhoods.
- A GPAC member asked about point to point transit as relevant to active transportation.
- A GPAC member is supportive of the community garden components.
- A GPAC member requested more development of the commercial recreation narrative and policy; specifically with respect to the unique opportunity for wildlife viewing (especially birding) available in Half Moon Bay. This section could be expanded to emphasize coastal commercial recreation.
- A GPAC member expressed liking the element and that there are no panaceas for health; fostering exercise (such as via active transportation and the provision of parks and recreation facilities) needs to be a priority.
- A GPAC member asked about the build out numbers for which the parkland calculations were based. *Staff Response: Staff described the modeling method performed by the economic consultant that went into the numbers and also noted that more work would be done later on the build out analysis and its assumptions.*
- A community member stated that they would like the GPAC to reconsider the proposed parkland standard and that maintaining the existing higher standard of 8 acres/1,000 residents is appropriate. The comment further included reference to Half Moon Bay's role in providing recreation opportunities to unincorporated communities outside the City limits. Another community member suggested that because 20% of the land area in PUDs must be for open space, and that should any of these PUDs be developed, it is feasible that enough land would be available to meet an 8 acre/1,000 resident standard. *Staff Response: Staff described how the 5 acres/1,000 residents standard has been incorporated into the City's code (up from 4 acres/1,000) and that this is a State imposed limit for this type of standard. Staff*

Plan Half Moon Bay

GPAC Meeting #15 Summary

also noted that higher standards can be part of policy but that the GAPC should know that there may be a funding or land acquisition gap.

- Staff from the San Mateo County Health System spoke on behalf of their advocacy for community health policy and their work to provide data and other support to Half Moon Bay to prepare and eventually implement the Healthy Community Element. They also noted that Half Moon Bay is one of few cities in the County to bring forth such an element. They further offered to provide a presentation on Vision Zero if the City is interested. *Staff Response: Staff reiterated their appreciation for San Mateo County Health System staff guidance in preparing this document.*
- A community member requested that an aquatic center be added to the element. *Staff Response: This item is referenced in the narrative but not directly in the policies. The document revisions will include it.*
- Community and GPAC members expressed that the City needs more dog parks.
- A representative from the CUSD suggested that the element include a new type of park – a bike park – where children and others can learn how to ride more safely in a practice area.
- Two GPAC members expressed concern that the element is primarily focused on new infrastructure and facilities. They would like to see more attention paid to maintenance of existing facilities, programs (e.g. Farmers Market), etc. *Staff Response: Staff agreed and noted that the text would be revised; staff also noted that for some facilitates, maintenance is addressed in other parts of the plan, such as the Circulation Element for trails and similar facilities.*
- A GPAC member noted that “Adopt a Park” already exists. *Staff Response: Staff agreed and noted that the text would be revised.*
- A GPAC member asked what “periodically” means in policy 5-I.67 which addresses evaluation of parks and recreation facilities and services needs over time. *Staff Response: Staff noted that the reference to frequency for this type of evaluation is meant to be general and that the forthcoming Parks Master Plan will be a more specific and strategic consideration and will provide timelines and other milestones and priorities for parks and recreation opportunities.*

Next Steps in the Process:

The next GPAC session will be as follows:

- January 26, 2017, Thursday: Noise Element and other matters selected because more input is needed.

City Council will receive an update on Plan Half Moon Bay at their January 17, 2017 session to provide direction on topics previously presented at Council’s November 15, 2016 session.

Attendance

GPAC Members

James Benjamin

Jo Chamberlain

Les Deman, Planning Commission Alternate Member

Plan Half Moon Bay
GPAC Meeting #15 Summary

Hugh Doherty
Jan Gray
Brian Holt
Greg Jamison
Diane Johnson
Steve Kikuchi (Alternate at Large)
Ed Love (Alternate at Large)
Dan McMillan
Shahrzad Pantera, Parks and Recreation Committee Member
Sara Polgar

City Staff

John Doughty, Community Development Director
Jill Ekas, Planning Manager
Bridget Jett, Planning Analyst