



Half Moon Bay General Plan and LCP Update

General Plan Advisory Committee Meeting #9

537 Kelly Avenue, Half Moon Bay, CA 94019

April 28, 2016 | 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 schedule and project status. The first Draft Local Coastal Land Use Plan (LUP) was made available in conjunction with this meeting. Draft General Plan Elements are expected this summer.

Connect the Coastsides:

- Presentation by San Mateo County Planning and Building Department staff regarding the County's assessment and recommendations for Midcoast transportation improvements. County and City staff noted the relationship of Connect the Coastsides to Half Moon Bay (as advisory and a reference). GPAC members were encouraged to consider Connect the Coastsides' suggested improvements as examples of policy implementation. This may be helpful context for the GPAC in their review of transportation and access policies.
- GPAC Members and Public had many comments, questions, and discussion topics regarding Connect the Coastsides including the following:
 - Will the Connect the Coastsides presentation be made available to the public?
 - Response: County staff explained that the presentation at this GPAC meeting is an excerpt of their larger presentation which can be found on the Connect the Coastsides webpage (www.connectthecoastsides.com). The GPAC presentation focused on Half Moon Bay and does not include the unincorporated Midcoast portion of the study. (Note: the Half Moon Bay oriented Connect the Coastsides presentation is provided on www.PlanHMB.org.)
 - What is the Parallel Trail?
 - Response: The Parallel Trail is a planned separated bike/ped route running from Devil's slide to the southern Half Moon Bay city limits.

Plan Half Moon Bay
GPAC Meeting #9 Summary

Half Moon Bay's segment of the Parallel Trail is the Naomi Patridge Trail, which is almost complete. Future trail extensions are expected in the unincorporated Midcoast.

- Do the Connect the Coastside staff/consultants know if Coastside residents have commute modes choices? Many Coastside residents work over-the-hill and driving is their only option.
 - Response: County staff explained that they do not have this specific detailed data but that they are aware of this important consideration.
- Signal timing questions and discussion.
 - Response: City staff described current efforts to coordinate signal timing at Highway 1 and SR 92, SR 92 and Main Street, and Highway 1 and Main Street (north).
- What is the effect of more lanes (widening from 2 to 4-lanes in some segments) on Highway 1 on pedestrian crossings?
 - Response: Best practices with respect to crosswalk green time accommodate slower walking speeds and also include the provision of refuge areas midway. The County's "PEQI" (pedestrian environmental quality index) performance standard was also explained with respect to pedestrian comfort and safety.
- How can we get benches at transit stops?
 - Response: Samtrans criteria for providing benches and shelters was presented (based on daily boardings). It was noted that the City or other organizations could provide benches in cases where the criteria are not met.
- Questions about parking and where to add parking.
 - Response: Some initial locations have been noted, however, this requires future study.
- Comment about providing for visitor access – from the Bay side; e.g. providing weekend transit service from under-utilized parking lots near Highway 280 such as those at the community colleges (Skyline, San Mateo and Canada).
 - Response: The suggestion was noted as relevant to the Connect the Coastside intention for providing coastal access.
- How was full build-out calculated?
 - Response: County staff described how both full and constrained build-out were determined and noted some of the assumptions made for each case. It was also noted that constrained build-out is considered more realistic and relates to the planning horizon. A

Plan Half Moon Bay
GPAC Meeting #9 Summary

detailed report about the build-out calculations is available on the Connect the Coastsides website (www.connectthecoastside.com).

- Does Connect the Coastsides include an assessment of the California Coastal Trail bridges; e.g. Seymour?
 - Response: This level of detail will come at a future implementation stage. The Connect the Coastsides study includes very general financial feasibility assessment, which will be further developed as the planning process progresses.
- A comment was made about making sure that the Coastal Trail is included in the Connect the Coastsides assessment of transportation routes even if it is not a commuter route.
 - Response: The California Coastal Trail is eligible for grant funding support from a variety of sources. For example, the trail is a designated Priority Conservation Area through the ABAG/MTC designation and that status is significant for funding available to those areas. The City also has a complete streets policy in the 2013 Circulation Element, which recognizes alternate transportation modes consistently with Caltrans. The Coastal Trail is part of the City's transportation network serving alternate modes.
- A comment was made about the need for traffic control personnel during peak weekend times as a means to improve safety and service levels at busy intersections, especially Highway 1 at SR 92.
 - Response: Such personnel are in place during key peak times such as pumpkin season. County staff further noted that they accept the comment for their record and will consider this type of approach.
- There was a request for clarification about the future signal at Terrace Avenue on Highway 1 and the number of Highway 1 lanes for the new configuration.
 - Response: City staff described the basic components of the planned improvements including the provisions for room to merge when the configuration transitions from a 4 to a 2-lane Highway 1 segment. Community members were invited to view the plans under development at City Hall.
- A concern was expressed about the provision of bike lanes on Highway 1 and the potential for conflicts with emergency response vehicles which utilize the roadway shoulder to travel through congestion. Utilizing Naomi Patridge trail in Half Moon Bay, instead of adding bike lanes to Highway 1 was encouraged.
 - Response: County staff explained that in the concept plan for bike lanes on Highway 1, the lanes would not be located in the shoulder and that an adequate shoulder would also be maintained. They also noted that they are considering the feedback about Naomi Patridge

trail, especially as accommodating the bicycle mode on the west side of the Highway.

Draft Local Coastal Land Use Plan:

- Two Coastal Commission staff members were in attendance for the conveyance of the first draft Local Coastal Land Use Plan (LUP).
- Staff presented an overview of the first draft LUP including the following:
 - Scope: The California Coastal Act defines the realm of the LUP. Policy matters outside the Coastal Act will be included in the forthcoming draft General Plan Elements.
 - Document Organization and Format:
 - LUP is the General Plan Land Use Element.
 - LUP is a stand-alone document.
 - LUP is also incorporated into General Plan in order to further improve usability, reduce redundancy, and provide consistency.
 - Policies have headings and start with an action word to improve consistency and ease of use.
 - Policy sources are noted if they were brought forward from 1993 LUP or came from Synthesis process.
 - Notes to Reader indicate topic areas where the consultants and staff believe GPAC discussion and community input is needed. These notes will not be included in future drafts.
 - Sources for the draft LUP policies: All of the draft policies come from relevant sources including the following:
 - California Coastal Act
 - California Coastal Commission Guidance
 - Half Moon Bay's 1993 LUP
 - Plan Half Moon Bay policy synthesis process
 - Technical background references; e.g. Sea Level Rise Vulnerability Assessment
 - Best practices such as those found in other communities' LUPs.
 - LUP Chapters – some highlights of note:
 - Land Use – If already developed, the existing condition of PUDs is described to better document their status.
 - Coastal Access and Recreation – The California Coastal Trail is highlighted.
 - Coastal Resources – A wide ranging chapter including Biological, Hydrology, Natural Shorelines, Agriculture, Scenic and Visual Resources, and Cultural Resources.
 - Coastal Hazards – Includes key new narrative and policy addressing sea level rise hazards, adaptation and mitigation.

Plan Half Moon Bay
GPAC Meeting #9 Summary

- Appendix - Full presentation of California Coastal Act policies.
- Glossary - To support consistency, the Glossary will eventually serve both the LUP and General Plan Elements.

A GPAC member asked why Council directed focus away from the PUDs and if community members understand what PUDs are. Some members noted that Ocean Colony is a successful PUD. Brief discussion about Council direction to focus on the Core Area followed.

Next Steps in the Process:

Work Sessions on the Draft LUP

The GPAC discussed dates in June for their review sessions. June 9th was ruled out because it is the last day of school. The members will be polled about their preferences through email.

GPAC Summary Notes

Summary notes from the September 3, 2015 and April 14, 2016 GPAC sessions are posted on www.PlanHMB.org.

Document Availability

The first draft LUP is available for free on the www.PlanHMB.org webpage. Reference hard copies are also provided at City Hall and the Library. Staff is working on a cost-effective way to produce additional hard copies for the GPAC members and interested members of the community. Approximately ten community members indicated that they would like a hard copy of the document.

Additional discussion about the intention to reduce paper waste through the review process brought forth a number of suggestions for document production and binding going forward.

Public Comment:

Community members expressed their thoughts and asked questions throughout the session. The discussion topics are indicated in the summary notes for each section, above.

Attendance

GPAC Members

Jo Chamberlain
Thomas Conroy, Planning Commission representative
Hugh Doherty
Jan Gray
Brian Holt
Greg Jamison
Cameron Jeffs
Diane Johnson
Steve Kikuchi, alternate for absent member
Edward Love, alternate for absent member
Dan McMillon
Shahrzad Pantera, Parks and Recreation Committee representative
Sara Polgar

Note: Two GPAC Members were absent and their places were filled by both Alternate Members.

City Staff

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