ALLIED
Neighborhoods Association

BOARD OF OFFICERS

Mary Turley
President

Bonnie Donovan
1st Vice President

Jean Holmes
2nd Vice President

Chris Barros
Secretary

Judy Orias
Treasurer

John DeVore
Webmaster

MEMBER ASSOCIATIONS .

Citizens for Livable Neighborhoods

Citizens Planning Association

Flamingo Neighborhood Association

Grove Lane Area Neighborhood Assoc.

Hidden Valley Residents Assoc.

La Mesa Neighborhood Association

Mesa Protection Alliance

Samarkand Neighborhood Assoc.

West Beach Neighborhood

September 14, 2020

To: Historic Landmarks Commission

Re: Downtown and Waterfront City Right-Of-Way/Bike Share Program, First Phase (September 16, 2020 Agenda, Item 7)

Allied Neighborhoods Association appreciates the opportunity to provide additional comment on the electric bike share program, proposed first phase. Attached please find our letter of August 31, 2020 submitted to your previous review of this agenda item; we would appreciate your review of our earlier letter, as it contains some more in-depth comments germane to our comments today.

The Plans. They do not appear to have changed, except for the front page date. The plans do not reflect any response to HLC comments or motion, or comments from the public.

There are no dimensions shown for the tall kiosks; what is their total height? (plans show the 3.0 station kiosk and the 1.0 station kiosk – the 1.0 kiosks could still be 6 or 7 feet in height…?)

The Draft Service Map (pg. 20/39) is so small that the location dots most often become a series of overlapping dots. To understand the proposed locations (especially downtown) the map needs to be enlarged, and the dots keyed to the listed locations. To be able to fully understand the map we suggest the map include the EPV boundary area, so it's obvious which locations are in EPV and which locations are outside EPV.

The Waterfront Area. As we mentioned in our previous letter, the plans do not reflect what's going on with businesses currently open outside on sidewalks and in the street (this comment applies to both the waterfront area and downtown State Street).

Pg. 33/39. The pictures outlining the location of the 1.0 kiosk and 7 docks appear to be a location currently used for sidewalk restaurant dining.

There could be as many as four locations with docks and each with a tall kiosk on the ocean side of Cabrillo Blvd. As we mentioned in our previous letter, we are concerned about the visual impact of this equipment on the ocean side of the boulevard, to its character, and scenic view of the beach and ocean.

Downtown State Street. There's still the open question of whether this area is a pedestrian plaza, or not, and whether promoting more bike use on this stretch of State is appropriate. Additionally, currently there's the safety issue with bikes and pedestrians, as we discussed in our previous letter.

Also, there's not one example that shows any business uses on the sidewalks, thus the plans do not reflect the situation on the ground today. We suggest the plans be updated to show how the docks would work in conjunction with the new sidewalk business uses, if docks would still be proposed in those areas or blocks.

Pedestrian Master Plan. The PMP diagram on pg. 3/39 shows a 4 ft. furnishings zone next to the curb. There's a problem because the bike plans show 6 ft. needed for the docks (not including the 5 ft. backup area); thus it appears the 8 ft. PMP "through pedestrian zone" cannot be maintained/achieved.

Please review the plans (both downtown and waterfront) for consistency with the Pedestrian Master Plan.

Compatibility Analysis Criteria. As stated in the agenda, the project requires consistency with Project Compatibility Analysis. There's much to consider here, including the following categories:

1. Compliance with City Charter and Municipal Code; Consistency with Design Guidelines. EPV Guidelines, Pedestrian Master Plan, etc.

2. Compatible with Architectural Character of City and Neighborhood.

4. Sensitivity to Adjacent Landmarks and Historic Resources. A map of designated historic resources in the project area has not been provided in the online plan set, with which to evaluate the project.

5. Public View of the Ocean and Mountains. "Does the design of the project respond appropriately to established scenic public views?" (SBMC 22.22.145.B.5)

We suggest the HLC motion include a continuance. This will provide time for the applicant to provide additional materials for your review. This would also provide time for Council (now back from a summer break) to consider the appropriateness of mixing bikes with pedestrians in the area of downtown State currently closed to vehicular traffic – as well as, closely studying <u>resulting reductions of sidewalk widths</u> throughout the project area.

We appreciate your consideration of our comments.

Sincerely,
Allied Neighborhoods Association

Cc: City Council
Ariel Calonne
Paul Casey