



**Half Moon Bay General Plan and LCP Update  
General Plan Advisory Committee Meeting #12**

New Temporary Venue: Train Depot, 110 Higgins Canyon Road, Half Moon Bay, CA 94019  
October 13, 2016 | 6:30pm

## **Meeting Notes**

Materials for this meeting can be found at [www.planhmb.org/general-plan-library.html](http://www.planhmb.org/general-plan-library.html).

### **Project Overview: Project Status and Schedule**

- Reviewed schedule and project status. Highlights include the following:
  - City in receipt of Coastal Commission LCP Assistance Grant, Round 3
  - First Public Draft General Plan Elements anticipated early November 2016
- Reviewed Updates regarding previous session and First Public Draft Local Coastal Land Use Plan (LUP):
  - Comment summary will follow release of the draft elements.
  - Pursuant to community input from previous sessions, this GPAC meeting was professionally recorded.
  - No comments have come in about the First Draft LUP policy concordance table. Staff assumes that it is acceptable and serving its purpose to support review.
- 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 notifications, [www.planHMB.org](http://www.planHMB.org) project web page, and multiple announcements at City Council and Planning Commission sessions.
  - Agenda Availability: Posted September 27, 2016 – electronically on City of Half Moon Bay web page calendar and [www.planHMB.org](http://www.planHMB.org), and hard copy at City Hall.

### **Draft General Plan Elements – Overview:**

The presentation included a brief overview of the five forthcoming General Plan Elements including key policy questions for the GPAC and community members to consider as they review the documents:

**Plan Half Moon Bay**  
GPAC Meeting #12 Summary

*Circulation Element:*

- Relevance to Guiding Principles: #4. Promote pedestrian, bicycle and transit mobility; increased connectivity between the City's neighborhoods; and enhanced coastal and open space access.
- Relationship to LUP: Section 2.3 Coastal Access and Recreation
- One of seven required General Plan Elements.
- Content Highlights:
  - 2013 Circulation Element three themes incorporated into text: safety, connectivity and multimodal circulation
  - Complete Streets is existing 2013 Circulation Element policy and assumed to be an existing condition from the policy perspective for the updated element.
  - Roadway Functional Classification System is updated – all are encouraged to review this change
  - Transportation Demand Management and Parking are both addressed as well as listing of the City's bridges.
  - Improvements are listed as short or long term. Some are well defined, others conceptually defined. All are encouraged to review and provided input with respect to details and prioritization.
- Key Policy Choices:
  - Alternate Routes: Draft language regarding alternate routes was presented as follows: *Development has occurred in Half Moon Bay on a project-by-project basis over the years and has resulted in no functional parallel alternative routes to Highway 1 or SR 92. As a result, trips by automobile or truck into, out of, within or through Half Moon Bay must use Highway 1, SR 92, or both regardless of the length of the trip. This funneling of almost all vehicular traffic onto these two roads results in congestion on both facilities and many of the streets that cross them. Community members have expressed interest in alternative routes for bicycles and pedestrians, especially on the east side of HWY 1 and SR 92. Generally, community members are not supportive of any new parallel routes for vehicles and cite a number of concerns including growth inducement, environmental impacts, neighborhood cut-through traffic, and overall diminishment of community character. Alternate routes for vehicles are not proposed in the Circulation Element update.*
  - The Character of Highway 1: The challenge - Highway 1 was designed to be a two lane highway, but the community needs to use it as an arterial street. Staff noted that a specific vision for HWY 1 has not come forth. They reviewed the diversity of input received: Do not add anymore signalized intersections; signalized all of the intersections; the highway should be two-lanes through town; the highway should be four lanes end to end.
  - Draft maps indicating roadway improvements for vehicle, pedestrian, bicycle, and transit modes were presented. The vision presented in these draft maps includes the following: Highway 1 two-lanes at the north and south ends of town and four-lanes consistently mid-town where that conditional already exists or is planned. New crossings for pedestrians identified in three areas for additional study: Roosevelt area; Spindrift-Grandview area, and Redondo Beach Road area. Bike improvements also described. Roundabouts were

discussed and a concept for a two-lane roundabout was presented noting the challenges associated with this type of facility. One lane roundabouts were described as potentially appropriate as well as other highway crossing options including under and over passes.

The relationship to complete streets and active transportation was incorporated into the presentation of improvements that will be considered in the first public draft Circulation Element. Mode share was also discussed, and specifically noted for journey to school and work.

- Performance Standards: The City's LOS standard was presented and discussed (LOS C for off-peak; LOS E for peak periods including two-hour commute and 10-day average peak recreation hour). Options to LOS were discussed including reference to options developed for the Connect the Coastside effort including pedestrian, bicycle and transit environmental quality indexes. Delay and VMT were also addressed.

*Conservation and Open Space Element:*

- Relevance to Guiding Principles: #2. Enhance the city's scenic visual quality and coastal landscape setting, and ensure protection of environmental and surrounding agricultural resources through conservation and sustainable development.
- Relationship to LUP: Section 2.2 Land Use; 2.3 Coastal Access and Recreation; and 2.4 Coastal Resources
- Both the Conservation and Open Space Elements are required; they are combined which conforms to General Plan allowances.
- Content Highlights:
  - Conservation is focused on all resources not covered in the LUP.
  - Water and energy conservation
  - Air quality protection
  - GHG emission reductions
  - Waste – management and reduction
  - Open space land use designations
  - Acquisition Strategy
- Key Policy Choices:
  - Potential New Open Space Land Use Designations:
    - Open Space for Conservation – A designation of this type could be prepared and utilized at a future time when appropriate land is acquired for conservation purposes other than for regional public recreation.
    - City Parks – The city's parks are not designated as parks or public facilities. A "City Park" or "Public Facilities – Park" designation could be prepared and applied to all of the City's parks for this update. This would result in revisions to the Land Use map in the LUP.

*Healthy Community Element:*

- Relevance to Guiding Principles: #1. Maintain Half Moon Bay's small-town character and quality of life, and strengthen community connections through activities and improved public gathering places.
- Relationship to LUP: Broadly applicable; "health in all policies"

**Plan Half Moon Bay**  
GPAC Meeting #12 Summary

- Notes about the Healthy Community Element:
  - Optional Element, similar to the 1995 Parks and Recreation Element.
  - A City Council building block topic for the Local Coastal Program and General Plan Update and a City Council strategic initiative
  - Significant community input received on this topic – too much to be worked into other required elements; works well on its own
- Content Highlights:
  - Wellness:
    - Healthy Environment
    - Healthy Food – community gardens, kitchen gardens, edible landscapes, food sharing
    - Active Living – transit, bike, ped, scooters, etc. Includes snapshots of citywide VMT, journey to work and school
    - Healthcare
    - Community Vitality
    - Health Indicators and Outcomes: Life expectancy, rates of obesity, diabetes and healthy eating habits (e.g. 5-A-Day fruit/vegetable consumption)
  - Parks and Recreation:
    - Parks and Recreation Facilities
    - Recreation Programming
    - Parkland Standard – draft includes 5 AC per 1,000 residents
- Key Policy Choices:
  - Walkability: Walkshed, walking distance, and walkability indexes highlight parts of town with limited walkability.
  - Land Use Relevance:
    - Neighborhood Serving Markets – less access in north and south ends of town
    - Parks and Community Gardens – several neighborhoods do not have walking access to a city park
    - Healthcare – some residentially oriented healthcare services could be considered for residential zoning districts
    - Childcare – noted shortage on Midcoast
  - Vision Zero: “No loss of life is acceptable.” Discussed the concept generally and encouraged GPAC and community members to check what other communities have been doing with Vision Zero Policies.
  - Parkland Standard: City ordinance now can maintain 5 AC per 1,000 residents when new development is proposed. Existing standard is 8 AC per 1,000 in policy and had been 4 AC per 1,000 in ordinance resulting in a significant gap between policy and implementation. GPAC and community members encouraged to consider 5 AC per 1,000 which would require an additional 10 AC of parkland if the 2040 growth projections are met.
  - Parkland Acquisition: Priority – Land or money? Consideration of criteria for open space acquisition were discussed. The basis of the discussion was whether land or money would be the priority when future development triggers the City’s parkland fee ordinance requirements. The GPAC and

**Plan Half Moon Bay**  
GPAC Meeting #12 Summary

community members were encouraged to consider the conditions for which either option might be favored. The draft Conservation and

*Safety Element:*

- Relationship to LUP: Section 2.5 Coastal Hazards. Many of the City's hazards are related to its coastal setting and therefore they are coastal hazards, applicable and addressed in the LUP Section 2.5 Coastal Hazards.
- One of the seven mandatory General Plan Elements
- Content Highlights:
  - Integrates the Hazard Mitigation Plan – San Mateo County Hazard Mitigation Plan and Half Moon Bay's "annex" have been updated and are in approval process now. This is required every five years and must be consistent with and integrated into the Safety Element.
  - Community Resiliency – recognizes the community's role in emergency response
  - Hazardous Materials focus – noted the old Half Moon Bay Oil Field

*Noise Element:*

- Relationship to LUP: 2.2 Land Use; 2.4 Coastal Resources
- Content Highlights:
  - Noise Standards – interior and exterior
  - Noise Evaluations for New Land Uses – receptors and generators
  - CNEL and other standards – consider nighttime sensitivity of the community
  - Thresholds of significance for CEQA purposes
- Key Policy Choices:
  - Sensitive Receptors – Includes standard examples (residential, senior and childcare facilities, etc.) as well as noise sensitive ESHA
  - Sensitive Uses near High Volume Roadways: Interiors space can almost always be insulated to conform to standards; what about exterior areas? Does the entire site need to meet the standards; or would it be ok for portions of a site to conform (e.g. noise protected courtyard)? There are implications with respect to mitigation measures; e.g. sound walls.

***GPAC Clarifying Questions, Public Comment and GPAC Discussion:***

NOTE: The meeting progressed with less formality than the order specified in the agenda. Throughout the staff presentation, the GPAC asked clarifying questions which were intermingled with public comment. The GPAC discussion was also inclusive with public comments in sync with the presentation topics. The following questions, comments and discussion points were made throughout the presentation.

- A GPAC member requested that in advance of preparing the comment summary and response table, the comments as submitted be posted so that GPAC and community members can see what others are thinking. *Staff Response: This can be done within the next few weeks.*
- A GPAC member expressed the requirement for consistency between the LUP and General Plan Elements and also noted that the 2013 Circulation Element had not been

**Plan Half Moon Bay**  
GPAC Meeting #12 Summary

- made completely consistent with the 1993 LUP. *Staff Response: The requirement for consistency supports updating both the LCP and general plan elements concurrently making it easier to align them.*
- A GPAC member asked about the forthcoming trails plan and how it will be included in the LCP and General Plan updates. *Staff Response: Trails will be included in the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan which is currently being initiated. This Master Plan will focus on implementation more so than vision. Significant input has been received through the LCP and General Plan update process to support the master plan and it is unlikely that the master plan will bring forth concepts significantly divergent from the LCP and General Plan. If that occurs, the LCP and/or General Plan can be revised appropriately – either as drafts or after adoption through an amendment.*
  - With respect to the potential new 4-lane HWY 1 segment (between Central and Seymour and shown on the draft circulation improvements map) a GPAC member expressed concern about the potential conflict between having a wider roadway with higher traffic speeds. This could affect the safety and function of the signalized intersection and crossing at Poplar. *Staff Response: This stretch of HWY 1 is located in between two segments that are already four lanes. The width of the pavement area is already four lanes wide. Any changes to lane configuration would result in upgrades to the pedestrian and bicycle facilities at the associated signalized intersection. The comment is appreciated and in fact pertains to a key policy choice with respect to the character of HWY 1.*
  - A community member asked if the City is coordinated with Connect the Coastside, the County's transportation planning effort for the unincorporated Midcoast. *Staff Response: Staff noted that the City has tracked the Connect the Coastside project and is in contact with the County colleagues working on that project. Staff further noted later in the session that a number of concepts coming out of Connect the Coastside appear to be well developed and worthy of the City's consideration.*
  - A GPAC member asked about the potential to use vehicle miles traveled (VMT) as a performance measure instead of level of service (LOS). Later in the discussion this topic came up again and a community member suggested that VMT would help address congestion citywide over time. *Staff Response: Staff noted that the State has been considering requiring VMT as a performance standard, but that it has not been concluded. Staff explained that VMT is referenced in the Healthy Community Element and as a performance measure it is a good way to assess the City's trip making behavior as a whole, but that it does not provide any assessment of specific portions of the transportation network that may be affected by new development or a change in configuration.*
  - A GPAC member noted the importance of evaluating the cumulative condition of transportation system performance in traffic impact analysis. *Staff Response: Staff confirmed the comment.*
  - A community member noted that they would like to see more graphics in the Circulation Element. Santa Cruz's Circulation Element was cited as a good example; as were the Midcoast Safety Mobility studies from a few years back as noted by another community member. *Staff Response: Staff requested examples and will check out options.*
  - A GPAC member brought up Sand Hill Road in Palo Alto as an example of a high volume four-lane roadway that also has bike lanes and pedestrian crossings.

**Plan Half Moon Bay**  
GPAC Meeting #12 Summary

- Community members and GPAC discussed the quality and function of this roadway and cited positive aspects (e.g. good example of complete streets) as well as observations that it is currently causing backups onto HWY 280.
- A community member expressed concern about the characterization of the Urban Reserve land use designation. The designation is not open space, but applicable to active agriculture businesses. More should be done to support agriculture businesses through land use allowances to support viability of those uses. *Staff Response: Staff (and a GPAC member) noted that they would welcome a meeting with Urban Reserve property owners to learn more about their concerns and interests.*
  - A GPAC member asked if new open space land use designations could be applied to areas that may be hazardous in addition to areas specifically for conservation of the land in open space. *Staff Response: Staff confirmed the comment.*
  - A GPAC member noted that open space could benefit the City through by carbon storage; e.g. carbon farming. *Staff Response: Staff confirmed the comment.*
  - A community member described that an Open Space Reserve designation is in place for some properties east of Main Street near Downtown and that it is not consistent with the existing lot sizes and other factors of land use. *Staff Response: Staff will look into this comment and present a map with these properties highlighted for the GPAC.*
  - A GPAC member asked if Magnolia Park was included in the parkland inventory. *Staff Response: Yes, it is included.* Another GPAC member asked if the new open space area to be established from the Pacific Ridge development was included. *Staff Response: No, but staff will look into it.* Another GPAC member asked if the beaches are included in the inventory. *Staff Response: No, the inventory included only City owned and managed parklands which are subject to parkland standards, Quimby Act, etc. A GPAC member also noted that the Coastal Act does not allow beach lands to be counted as city parkland.*
  - A GPAC member expressed that they would like to see recreation activities related to the beach setting – e.g. kayaking, surfing, beach enjoyment, etc. – emphasized. These uses were not presented. *Staff Response: The presentation was focused only on a few highlights of each element. The GPAC and community members are encouraged to provide feedback about this topic after they review the forthcoming Healthy Community Element as well as the go back and look at the related portions of the LUP Section 2.3 Coastal Access and Recreation.*
  - A GPAC member asked about the potential for more hiking and biking trails. Another GPAC member asked about how the Parks master Plan will be addressed in the element. *Staff Response: Staff noted that both the forthcoming Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan and the Parks Master Plan will address these topics from an implementation perspective.*
  - A GPAC member asked about potential for a roundabout at HWY 1 and SR 92 even if multi-lane. Pedestrian crossings could be grade separated. *Staff Response: The Circulation Element intends to provide flexibility and staff encourages a range of solutions to be studied going forward.*
  - A community member brought up a past method for calculating park in lieu fees that was based on bedroom count for each housing unit. *Staff Response: Staff noted that the City's park fee ordinance was updated in late 2015 and that it is important to keep such fees current in that they are based on the value of land. Staff said that they will report out on the details of the updated fee at a future session.*

**Plan Half Moon Bay**  
GPAC Meeting #12 Summary

- A community member asked if there is another coastal city that has a shuttle such as what has been described for weekday service for residents to run errands and weekend service for visitors. Members of the public noted that marine, Capitola and Santa Barbara have shuttles. A GPAC member noted that this pertains to the Coastal Access section of the LUP and that this needs to be better developed. *Staff Response: Staff confirmed the comments.*
- A GPAC member asked where the Half Moon Bay Landfill is addressed Another GPAC member expressed that this landfill is the second largest hazardous materials site in the county and as such should be included in the Safety Element. A number of concerns were mentioned including methane, the challenge of maintaining the property, the past breach of the bluff side of the fill that was repaired, etc. *Staff Response: Staff agreed that follow up is important. The facility is owned and maintained by San Mateo County who previously provided status when the Existing Conditions, Trends, and Opportunities Assessment was prepared. Staff will check back for a new update.*
- A GPAC member recounted that he has provided input to staff about hazards and hazardous waste sites. *Staff Response: Staff confirmed the comment.*
- A GPAC member described recent occurrences on the east coast with Hurricane Mathew that are relevant to Half Moon Bay. Of specific note is the size and intensity of the wave surge. This can affect the scope of needed evacuation areas and planning for emergency response with regards to routes, equipment and number of responders. Suggests considering a more graduated approach with respect to the tsunami zone in Half Moon Bay. *Staff Response: The comment is noted, but requires more research with respect to options for tsunami response.*
- A GPAC member asked about lighting for pedestrian safety in consideration of the intent for residents to walk Downtown and to other destinations. *Staff Response: Staff described their impression of the community's interest for lighting in Half Moon Bay – specifically that dark skies are valued and that the community does not want the City to be over-lit in order to conserve night skies and not waste energy. Staff described where lighting policy is included in the LUP and the General Plan Elements (predominately LUP Section 2.4 Coastal Resources and the Healthy Community Element). Staff suggested that pedestrian scale lighting could be added to the policies with the condition that it must be directed downward and only light what needs to be lit for pedestrian safety.*
- A community member expressed concern about use of a noise standard that averages low nighttime levels with high daytime levels. This can result in a determination of no impact for land uses that are extremely loud during daytime hours. *Staff Response: Staff noted that an LEQ for operational hours can be included in the Noise Element and that staff appreciates the comment and will make sure it is addressed to provide appropriate flexibility in how noise is assessed.*
- With respect to residential uses near high volume roadways where outside noise environments exceed the approved level, two GPAC members commented. One expressed that they would like to be able to make findings of denial for proposed sensitive uses in such locations based on not being able to fully comply with noise standards on the entire property. Another described the potential for attractive sound walls to protect sensitive uses. *Staff Response: Staff expressed that they have been under the impression that the community is not strongly supportive of sound*



**Plan Half Moon Bay**  
GPAC Meeting #12 Summary

*walls along HWY 1, but that the GPAC's input and discussion is very helpful in considering how to address this topic.*

- A community member described experiencing increased roadway noise (duration and intensity) over the past 8 years from a home about 200 yards away from HWY 1. There are detrimental health effects of noise exposure. The assumed growth for this planning process – 1,000 more residents and 300,000 square feet of additional commercial development at 2040 – needs to be reconsidered in that with existing population and commercial development adverse impacts are already evident. The community member further expressed that sound walls are not the only response to deal with increased traffic, and that growth should be addressed. *Staff Response: Staff acknowledged the comment.*
- A community member expressed concern about potential conflict of interest for a GPAC member. The GPAC member responded and reminded attendees that the City Council appointed the GPAC members; that every member has a potential conflict because of their residence alone; and furthermore that in the event of Council concern or actual finding of potential conflict per the regulations in place that he would step down or refrain from specific discussions. He also noted that other members have recused themselves from portions of discussions in the past due to potential conflict and that this is how it is handled. *Staff Response: Staff notes that all of the GPAC members have been informed about conflict and have been encouraged to contact the California Fair Political Practices Commission (FPPC) for consultant and guidance.*
- A community member returned the discussion to roadway noise and noted that sound walls are not the only option for addressing this issue. There are CalTrans approved alternatives. *Staff Response: Staff agreed with the comment and noted that quieter pavement is an engineered option that the General Plan will acknowledge as one example.*
- A community member described the use of aviation easements for ensuring that new residents and homeowners are aware of the noise environment of a particular property. Another community member clarified that those easements are applicable to airport noise. *Staff Response: Staff acknowledged the input.*
- A GPAC member reiterated that they would like to have hard copies of the forthcoming elements in advance of the next discussion. *Staff Response: Staff confirmed that this would be the case.*

The presentation concluded at this point in the meeting. It was acknowledged that ample time for public comment had been provided during the presentation; but community members were offered an opportunity to provide final comments for the evening. The following additional comments were made before the conclusion of the session:

- A community member expressed concern that a solution for HWY 1 and SR 92 is conspicuously absent from the Circulation Element. The specific issue is that backups from the intersection of these roadways during peak periods will discourage visitors from coming back to Half Moon Bay because getting out of Downtown can be so difficult due to severe congestions. *Staff Response: Staff encourages GPAC and community members to consider the improvements proposed in the forthcoming Circulation Element and to continue to provide suggestions and feedback and proposed solutions.*

## **Plan Half Moon Bay**

### GPAC Meeting #12 Summary

- A GPAC member expressed that because circulation challenges are significant, traffic impact analyses should be prepared for each development proposal and that there should be a comprehensive solution. *Staff Response: Traffic impact analyses are prepared for projects that are not exempt from environmental review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).*
- A community member stated that the planned new traffic signal at HWY 1 and Terrace Avenue is not a done deal and that there are alternatives to it. Because the signal is to serve new development at Pacific Ridge, there are other options that should be considered such as using Lewis Foster Drive or Silver Avenue with right turns in and out with a place to make U-turns farther north or south on HWY 1. *Staff Response: This City is working on engineering design for the signalization of HWY 1 at Terrace Avenue and expects future approval of the design by Caltrans. This new intersection will also incorporate an extension of Frontage Road on the west side of HWY 1, provide new pedestrian crossings and bicycle facilities. Lewis Foster Drive is a private street; not City right-of-way.*

### **Next Steps in the Process:**

GPAC sessions are planned as follows:

- November 17, 2016: Focus on circulation and land use
- December 15, 2016: Working draft of comment summary and responses should be available for this discussion
- January – Two sessions to wrap up comments for Planning Commission. Staff will email the GPAC to check availability for the January dates.

Document availability was reviewed again. Staff also noted that they will update City Council at an upcoming meeting.

## **Attendance**

---

### **GPAC Members**

James Benjamin  
Jo Chamberlain  
Les Deman (Planning Commission Alternate)  
Jan Gray  
Brian Holt  
Greg Jamison  
Diane Johnson  
Ed Love (Alternate at Large)  
Dan McMillan  
Shahrazad Pantera  
Sara Polgar

### **City Staff**

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