

**MATRIX SUMMARIZING COMMISSIONS' COMMENTS & RECOMMENDATIONS:
DRAFT GENERAL PLAN (based on December 2010 Public Draft)**

| ELEMENT | COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS / STAFF COMMENTS | COMMENTS |
|------------------------|---|-----------------|
| | PLANNING COMMISSION | |
| GLOBAL COMMENTS | Update data throughout to reflect 2010 Census | Support |
| | Prepare an Executive Summary | Support |
| | Provide a page that names the GPAC members, staff, City Council, Planning Commission and others | Support |
| | Revise footer | Support |
| 1) INTRODUCTION | Proposed Revisions/Clarifications to Text, Figures, Tables, and Data: | |
| | Section 1.3, Page 1-4: Expand this section to include the public hearings for consideration and adoption, including the Planning Commission, other commissions, and the City Council. | Support |
| | Section 1.4, Page 1-6, 4 th paragraph: Revise reference to the Downtown Specific Plan. Add clarifying language regarding how the General Plan incorporates other plans by reference (such as the Trails Master Plan) as implementing documents and what happens to the General Plan if/when those plans change—when the GP would have to be amended and when it would not. | Support |
| 2) LAND USE | Proposed Revisions/Clarifications to Text, Figures, Tables, and Data: | |
| | Section 2.2, Page 2-2, 1 st full paragraph—Revise 3 rd full sentence as follows: “By the time the Foothill Municipal Water District was annexed to the Los Angeles Municipal <u>Metropolitan Water District of Southern California...</u> ” | Support |
| | Section 2.2, Page 2-2, 2 nd full paragraph—Add more discussion regarding community characteristics, such as trees, landscaping, diversity, and age. Note that the term “semi-rural” includes preserving the current “dark sky” conditions to the extent practical. Also, add a definition for and discussion regarding the A/B development line. | Support |
| | Section 2.3.3.4: Add childcare facilities to list of allowable uses. | Support |
| | Revise Figures LUE-1 and LUE-3 to add the properties to be redesignated HDR per the revised Housing Element. | Support |
| | Revise Figures LUE-1 and LUE-3 to redesignate Robert Ford’s property to commercial and change the LCF Country Club golf course from Open Space to Parks & Recreation. | Support |
| | Revise Figure LUE-3 to add Districts to the legend and depict them more clearly. | Support |
| | Section 2.4.1, Page 2-14, 3 rd bullet under “Action” — Revise first sentence as follows: “Since the redesignation of all Medium-High Density Residential | Support |

| | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|
| | property to Open Space (<u>City-owned Rockridge conservation area</u>) and Very Low Density Residential (<u>see Table LUE-3 below</u>) reduces the potential...” | |
| | Section 2.4.1, Page 2-17, Opportunity/Issue 7, 1 st bullet under “Action”—reword as follows: “The City of La Cañada Flintridge Trails Master Plan (<u>as may be amended from time to time</u>)...” | Support |
| | Revise Table LUE-1, Table LUE-2, and Table LUE-3, and text as appropriate, to reflect the change in acreage of land use designations and number of dwelling units as a result of redesignating properties to HDR for the Housing Element. | Support |
| | The City is about to pass a historic preservation ordinance; therefore, add a discussion to the LUE. | Support |
| | Proposed Revisions to Goals/Objectives/Policies: | |
| | Add new LUE Policy 1.2.6 (per comment letter from Allen Hubsch), as follows—“Encourage the development of childcare facilities, including infant and toddler care and pre- and after-school care, in the Commercial, Public and Institutional land use categories to serve the needs of La Cañada Flintridge families and workers. In accordance with the strategic plan adopted by the Los Angeles County Childcare Planning Committee, reduce barriers to childcare service due to zoning regulations and expensive permit requirements.” | Support |
| | Add a new Policy 1.6.3 that allows clustering and flexibility in site design and/or encourages use of the PD process to preserve desirable site characteristics (such as open space, views, etc.) and mitigate site challenges (such as steep slopes). | Support |
| | LUE Policy 2.3.2, Page 2-25—caution expressed about encouraging too much consolidation, as the small shops and individual owners are positive features in certain areas. | Support; staff recommends modifying this policy to pertain to larger properties that could benefit from such consolidation. |
| | LUE Policy 3.1.4, Page 2-27—reword as follows: “ Revise the Zoning Code to a Allow...” | Support |
| | LUE Policy 3.1.8, Page 2-27—delete references to specific programs. | Support |
| | LUE Policy 3.1.9, Page 2-27—delete “b” and delete space before “trees” in c. | Support |
| | LUE Policy 5.2.5, Page 2-30—Revise in accordance with Edison’s letter | Support |
| | LUE Policy 6.1.4: Consider adding other options to this policy to implement Housing Element policy, such as allowing smaller minimum unit size for HDR and MU, etc. | Support |
| | Add a new policy that addresses the proposed historic preservation ordinance. | Support |
| 3) OPEN SPACE & RECREATION | Proposed Revisions/Clarifications to Text, Figures, Tables, and Data: | |
| | Section 3.1, Page 3-1, 1 st paragraph—delete the word | Support |

| | | |
|------------------------|--|---|
| | "the" before the word "residents" in the 2 nd line. | |
| | Section 3.3.1, 1 st bullet—add "...and Flint Canyon" to the end of the sentence. | Support |
| | Section 3.3.3, 2 nd paragraph—reword 1 st sentence as follows: " According to the Trails Master Plan's trails inventory, there are approximately 24 miles of existing hiking and riding trails <u>of a variety of levels of difficulty</u> ." | Support |
| | Figure OSRE-1—revise map to add missing sections of trails, add missing labels, and add labels to areas the trails pass through, including Hall-Beckley Canyon Recreation Area and Cherry Canyon Open Space Area/Park. | Support |
| | Table OSRE-1, Page 3-6—update population to 2010 Census. | Support |
| | Section 3.4.4, Page 3-8, 1 st paragraph—reword as follows: "The Trails Master Plan <u>will continue to</u> provides direction for development... When completed, the The core circular trails system will allow trail users to... It also will <u>provides</u> citizens..." | Support |
| | Proposed Revisions to Goals/Objectives/Policies: | |
| | OSRE Policy 2.1.3—reword as follows: "The <u>semi-rural, hillside</u> ..." | Support |
| | OSRE Policy 2.1.5—amend to enhance direction regarding what uses La Cañada Flintridge would like to see there, such as expanding joint use, and commenting /providing input on the Angeles Forest Plan. (May want to consider breaking this policy into 2 separate policies—one specifically regarding the Angeles National Forest and one that addresses the remaining portion of the existing policy.) | Support. Recommend breaking this policy into at least two, possibly three policies to be more specific. |
| | OSRE Policy 3.1.3—add "...and maintain the ones we have" to the end of this policy. | Support |
| | Add OSRE Policy 3.1.8—"Encourage the maintenance, expansion, and development of new privately owned recreation facilities." | Support |
| | OSRE Policy 4.2.8—reword as follows: " Complete and <u>Preserve the core</u> ..." | Support |
| 4) CONSERVATION | Proposed Revisions/Clarifications to Text, Figures, Tables, and Data: | |
| | CNE Policy 1.1.2—add "...where feasible" to the end of d. | Support |
| | CNE Policy 1.1.7—reword as follows: "Require new development and rehabilitation projects to make maximum use of water conservation techniques, including retrofitting of existing buildings, pursuant to..." | Support |
| | CNE Policy 1.2.10—reword as follows: "Prior to the issuance of permits on existing vacant lands designated for residential and mixed-use <u>land</u> uses, require confirmation that <u>an on- or off-site</u> wastewater treatment facility..." | Support |

| | | |
|------------------|--|---|
| | CNE Policy 1.3.7—revise this policy to differentiate between commercial and residential lighting standards and to reflect the desire to maintain “dark sky” for residential areas. | Support |
| | CNE Policy 1.3.10—replace the word “feasible” with “appropriate.” | Support |
| | CNE Policy 1.3.11—reword as follows: “Encourage that residential projects of 6 units or more <u>and commercial projects</u> participate in the California Energy Commission’s New Solar Homes Partnership, which provides rebates to developers who offer solar power in at least 50 percent of new units, or a program with similar provisions <u>available rebate programs.</u> ” | Support; recommend adding mixed use projects. |
| | Add CNE Policy 1.3.14—add a new policy to address the inefficient use of resources caused by too many trash truck/hauler companies currently operating in the City. | Support |
| | CNE Policy 1.5.6—replace the word “Encourage” with “Consider.” | Support |
| | Add a new policy after CNE Policy 3.1.1 to encourage implementation of the Mills Act. | Support |
| 5) SAFETY | Proposed Revisions/Clarifications to Text, Figures, Tables, and Data: | |
| | Replace “La Crescenta Valley Station” with Crescenta Valley Station.” | Support |
| | Correct typo in 3 rd line at the top of Page 5-8—should be “contributes.” | Support |
| | Proposed Revisions to Goals/Objectives/Policies: | |
| | SE Policy 1.3.2—add “...where appropriate” to the end of this policy. | Support |
| | SE Policy 1.4.5—Since defensible space is different in the core than in it is in areas of the City that have large lots and/or are located in the wildland-urban interface, revise this policy for applicability to all areas. | Support |
| | SE Policy 1.4.8—Planning Commission requested that this policy be revised to make language stronger, more proactive, and provided possible revised wording: “ Encourage <u>Require</u> water companies to meet required fire flows, <u>evaluate water infrastructure needs, disclose deficiencies, and bring infrastructure up to standards to the extent provided by law.</u> ” | Support. Staff’s Suggested Wording for SE Policy 1.4.8: <u>“Require water providers to conduct an evaluation of the water infrastructure based on current code standards (note: see comment below) with special emphasis on the upslope urban wildland interface areas. Results of the evaluation should disclose deficiencies (differences between current code and existing conditions). During this planning period, a method should be developed and initiated to correct identified deficiencies.”</u> Comment: The City adopted the |

| | | |
|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | Los Angeles County Fire Code as the fire code of the City. The LA County Fire Code adopted and incorporated the 2010 Edition of the California Fire Code. Appendix B of the CA Fire Code addresses required fire flow, while Appendix C addresses required hydrant spacing. Note: Safety Commission also requested stronger language. |
| | Possible new policy to look into consolidation of water companies. | Support. (Note: This was also suggested by the Public Works and Traffic Commission [PWTC].) |
| 6) CIRCULATION | Proposed Revisions/Clarifications to Text, Figures, Tables, and Data: | |
| | Update list of existing bicycle facilities, Page 6-8. | Staff supports all proposed revisions and clarifications. Please note that the PWTC also made similar comments. |
| | Update Figure CE-5 “Existing & Planned Bikeway System” to reflect facilities that have been implemented. | |
| | Page 6-8: Replace the photograph with a new one of the improved Chevy Chase crosswalk. | |
| | Update CE-4 “ Trails Map” to include La Cañada Flintridge Loop Trail southeast of the City in Pasadena. | |
| | Correct Section 6.5.4 “Truck Access” to delete reference to Foothill Boulevard truck route. | |
| | Revise Section 6.7.1 “Capital Improvement Program” to reflect completed projects and new additions to the list. | |
| | Delete Section 6.7.3.1 “Red Route Bikeway” as it is completed and will be shown as such on Figure CE-5. | |
| | Proposed Revisions to Goals/Objectives/Policies: | |
| | Add a new policy to Goal 1 regarding opposition to 710 Tunnel and increased traffic on I-210 consistent with the policy in the Noise Element. | Support; also a request by the PWTC. |
| | CE Policy 1.2.3—modify to reference City’s desire to maintain residential character of streets. Right of way dedication does not mean the entire width of right of way will be “paved.” | Support. Please also see PWTC’s comments re: this policy. Staff recommends adding a policy to address both the PC’s and PWTC’s comments. |
| | CE Policy 1.3.2—modify to emphasize that the criteria established to assess street lights on residential streets should give priority to locations where they are warranted for safety reasons. Elsewhere, the “Dark Sky” policy should prevail to maintain the rural character of La Cañada Flintridge. | Support. PWTC also made proposed changes to this policy. Staff recommends the PWTC’s proposed rewording with the addition of the PC’s request to address the safety and dark sky issue. |
| | CE Policy 5.1.2—modify to reflect the Metro Call For Project funding of The Link. | Support |
| | Consider modifying CE Policies 5.2.2 and 5.2.3 to emphasize the need for balance between progressive | Support. Note: The PWTC also recommended rewording of CE |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | traffic movements on Foothill Boulevard, at reasonable speeds, with the need for safe and convenient pedestrian crossings. Add language emphasizing the need to consider alternatives to additional traffic signals. | Policy 5.2.3. Staff recommends accepting the PWTC's proposed rewording plus making the clarifications recommended by the PC. |
| 7) NOISE | Proposed Revisions/Clarifications to Text, Figures, Tables, and Data: | |
| | Section 7.3, Page 7-4—delete "Existing Noise Conditions" heading in body font. | Support |
| | Section 7.3.2.1, Page 7-7, 3 rd full paragraph—add "(in 2007 dollars)" to the end of the first sentence. | Support |
| | Section 7.4.3, Page 7-16, 1 st paragraph—update the 1 st sentence to reflect the final land use map. | Support |
| 8) AIR QUALITY | Proposed Revisions/Clarifications to Text, Figures, Tables, and Data: | |
| | Correct the first sentence in Section 8.2, page 8-1, to read: " <u>La Cañada Flintridge occupies is located within the South Air Coast Basin (Basin), an approximately 6,745 square miles of the Basin area. It that is bounded by the Pacific Ocean...</u> " | Support |
| 9) HOUSING | Proposed Revisions/Clarifications to Text, Figures, Tables, & Data and Goals/Objectives/Policies: | |
| | Page 9-6, second paragraph under Population Growth Trends, of December 2010 version—Foothill Municipal Water District was annexed to Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, not Los Angeles Metropolitan Water District. | Support Please see the version of the Housing Element that has been revised to address HCD requirements for other changes since the December 2010 version. |
| PARKS & RECREATION COMMISSION | | |
| 3) OPEN SPACE AND RECREATION | Proposed Revisions to Goals/Objectives/Policies: | |
| | OSRE Policy 1.1.3—reword as follows: "Continue to work with citizens, organizations, volunteer groups, and community partners to identify, <u>acquire land</u> and provide needed <u>active and passive parks, recreation and open space amenities</u> land." | Support |
| SAFETY COMMISSION | | |
| 5) SAFETY | Proposed Revisions/Clarifications to Text: | |
| | Fix typos—it's Big Briar Way, not Big Brian Way; it's Georgian Road, not Georgia Road. | Support |
| | Proposed Revisions to Goals/Objectives/Policies: | |
| | SE Policy 1.3.2—reword as follows: "Require approval of preliminary hydrology reports <u>where necessary</u> prior to approval of hillside development proposal in order to ensure safe development." | Support |
| | SE Policy 1.4.5—reword as follows: "Require property owners to create and maintain defensible space around their buildings and structures <u>in those portions of the City that are adjacent to the wildland/urban interface as mapped.</u> " | Support |
| | SE Policy 1.4.8—reword as follows: "Encourage water companies to meet required fire flows <u>to the extent provided by law.</u> " | Support. Staff proposed to revise the wording as proposed in response to the PC's comments. |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | | <p>Staff's suggested rewording for SE Policy 1.4.8: <u>"Require water providers to conduct an evaluation of the water infrastructure based on current code standards (note: see comment below) with special emphasis on the upslope urban wildland interface areas. Results of the evaluation should disclose deficiencies (differences between current code and existing conditions). During this planning period, a method should be developed and initiated to correct identified deficiencies."</u></p> <p>Comment: The City adopted the Los Angeles County Fire Code as the fire code of the City. The LA County Fire Code adopted and incorporated the 2010 Edition of the California Fire Code. Appendix B of the CA Fire Code addresses required fire flow, while Appendix C addresses required hydrant spacing.</p> |
| | <p>Add a new policy for the City to work with the water companies to consolidate them into one entity and better regulate the pipes in the streets. This is intended to address existing problems in some areas meeting fire flow requirements for various reasons.</p> | <p>Staff recommends exploring the proposed policy to consolidate the water companies with the City Attorney to determine if it's possible.</p> <p>Staff recommends adding a policy to better regulate the pipes in the street.</p> |

| | | |
|------------------------------|---|---|
| | <p>PUBLIC WORKS & TRAFFIC COMMISSION (PWTC)</p> | |
| <p>6) CIRCULATION</p> | <p>NOTE: This section provides a summary of key comments and recommendations provided by the Public Works and Traffic Commission. Details can be found in Attachment X, which provides all the recommended changes to the draft Circulation Element in strike-out/underline format as well as comments.</p> | <p>NOTE: Many of the recommendations by the PC were also recommended by the PWTC.</p> |
| | <p>Proposed Revisions/Clarifications to Text:</p> | |
| | <p>Revise first sentence in Section 6.1.1.1, Page 6-1, as follows: <u>"...the last RTP was adopted in May 2008 and is currently being updated in 2012."</u></p> | <p>Support. Staff notes that the 2012 RTP will not be adopted in time to incorporate it into LCF's General Plan update (GPU).</p> |
| | <p>Add to end of Section 6.1.1.1, Page 6-2: <u>"The draft 2012 RTP includes the I-710 Gap Closure Project in its regional plan. It is important that the City remain actively involved in the development and</u></p> | <p>Support</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p><u>implementation of the 2012 RTP to protect against potential adverse impacts to La Cañada Flintridge.</u></p> | |
| <p>Section 6.3, Page 6-3: Revise heading as follows: Existing <u>Baseline Circulation System (2012)</u> Reword 1st sentence to add: "...and parking availability <u>as it exists in 2012.</u></p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Section 6.3.2.5, Page 6-6: The PWTC had questions regarding Figure CE-2. It appears there is an error regarding the Local Residential street sections—both the "ideal" and minimum" are depicted the same width (52 feet), while the text in Section 6.3.2.5 states that the minimum is 44 feet. Guidance should be provided on where the minimum and ideal cross sections would be applied, and if it is even feasible to achieve the "ideal" in a built-out city.</p> | <p>Support. Figure CE-2 will be revised and clarification suggested by the PWTC will be added to the text.</p> |
| <p>Section 6.3.5, Page 6-8: Add a discussion about bikeway connections to other cities and bikeways.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Update Figure CE-5 and bulleted text to show existing routes.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Section 6.3.6, Page 6-8: The trail photo is outdated; please update.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Figure CE-4 is inaccurate. Trails need to be aligned with the actual crossing locations. There appears to be errors in map alignment.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Section 6.3.7, Page 6-9: Add to end of paragraph—<u>Due to the absence of designated truck routes, the legal truck route is the shortest distance to the origin/destination from the I-210 or SR-2 Freeways, both regionally designated truck routes.</u> Add discussion about current truck restrictions on Angeles Crest Highway north of the I-210 Freeway.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Section 6.3.8.1, Page 6-9: Verify title of study - it is <i>Comprehensive Parking Strategy!</i></p> | <p>Support</p> |
| <p>Section 6.3.8.1, Page 6-9 – 6-10: State why the Parking Study was conducted and provide list of study findings. Convert the last 3 paragraphs of this section to a table similar to the table in the study with a reason why each is recommended.</p> | <p>Staff supports adding language to the 2nd paragraph in Section 6.3.8.1 as to why the parking study was conducted. However, as the General Plan is a policy document, staff does not recommend restating the parking study findings or providing the degree of detail re: the strategies and findings as recommended by the PWTC.</p> |
| <p>Section 6.3.9.2: The ADT volumes used in the draft Circulation Element are from 2008 and are already 4 years old. Should they be updated?</p> | <p>The 2008 ADT volumes were used because the GPU was initiated in 2007. Updating them now would require additional time and an increased scope and budget. Therefore, staff recommends that the baseline ADT volumes be</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| | updated in the future either as a part of General Plan implementation through the City's CIP process, after SCAG's 2012 RTP is approved, or as an interim update of the Circulation Element. |
| Section 6.4.3: Add discussion about the relationship of the City's bicycle network to the Regional Bicycle Transportation Plan. | Support |
| Section 6.5: Add major discussion about Complete Streets for all street users and how the plan conforms to State law. | The Complete streets legislation was adopted in 2010 and is required for all GPUs started in 2011; LCF's GPU was underway in 2007 and therefore is not required to be addressed to the degree recommended by the PWTC. To do so would require additional time and a revised scope and increased budget. Instead, staff recommends adding a short discussion about Complete Streets and accepting the PWTC's revised CE Policy 1.1.3 (see below), that the City will explore Complete Streets as a part of implementation of the General Plan. |
| Section 6.5.1: Should the existing roadway standards for ROW widths be changed? | After Figure CE-2 and Section 6.3.2.5 are revised per the PWTC's comments above, Staff does not consider it necessary to change the existing roadway standards for ROW widths. |
| Section 6.5.1: Question as to if/how a minimum standard (threshold of significance) might potentially discourage development. Question if the standard being proposed is for roadway segments or intersections or both. | Since the City does not currently have an adopted threshold of significance, Section 6.5.1 notes that the CMP was used to evaluate the General Plan build-out. Refer to Section 6.4.1 and draft CE Policy 1.2.1, which note the importance of the City adopting an LOS impact standard, but only after evaluation regarding its appropriateness to LCF. (See Staff Comments re: CE Policy 1.2.1, below.) Staff recommends that Section 6.4.1 be expanded to include a recommendation that the study address the potential impact on development, as well as an evaluation of whether the standard should be for roadway segments or intersections or both. |
| Section 6.5.2: First paragraph—add a discussion about the need for more connections to the regional | Support |

| | |
|--|---|
| transit system as a way to encourage alternate transportation modes. | |
| Add section regarding public facilities to support Goal 3, objectives, and policies. | Support |
| Add new section regarding storm drain facilities and planned improvements to handle storm water runoff, including debris management and flood events. | Support |
| Section 6.5.3: Add new section about pedestrian facilities, including where sidewalks are and are not to be completed. Add map of pedestrian sidewalks. | This request was not a part of the scope of work for the GPU. To do so now would require additional time and budget. Instead, staff recommends adding a policy to undertake an evaluation of existing and proposed pedestrian facilities as a part of implementation. |
| Section 6.5.4: Revise the 2 nd and 3 rd sentences as follows: “The City’s only Regional truck routes are provided on the I-210 and Foothill Boulevard—SR-2 Freeways. All other City streets are to remain prohibited to through truck traffic.” | Support |
| Section 6.6: Concern expressed that SCAG’s RTP (2004) Regional Model is now 8 years old and that a new regional model was developed for the 2012 RTP. | When the GPU was initiated in 2007, SCAG’s 2004 RTP model was the appropriate model to use. The 2012 RTP model is in draft form and will not be approved prior to adoption of the City’s GP. While it is possible to wait to approve the City’s GP until after the 2012 RTP model is approved, it would require additional time and a revised scope and budget, as both the Circulation Element and the EIR would have to be revised. Instead, Staff recommends that a policy be added to the CE to conduct an interim update of the Circulation Element after the 2012 RTP has been adopted. |
| Section 6.7.1: Update the text and bulleted list regarding the CIP to 2011-2015. Bulleted list needs to be expanded to the 20-year forecast. | Staff supports updating the list to reflect the improvements in current 5 year CIP. The City does not have a 20 year CIP. |
| Add a <i>new</i> section (in place of existing Section 6.7.2) titled “Foothill Boulevard Districts.” Describe the Foothill Master Plan, distinctive districts, development of districts, and support for CE Goal 5. Provide map of Foothill Boulevard districts with proposed policies in support of CE Objective 5.2. | Support. The proposed policies would be reflected in the text. |
| Former Section 6.7.2/New Section 6.7.3—DVSP: Update the list of proposed improvements and explain the change in previous policy direction regarding the DVSP. | Support |

| | |
|--|---|
| Former Section 6.7.2.1/New Section 6.7.3.1—Town Center Drive: Update this section and add discussion about future extension to Rinetti Lane. Confirm this is still the City’s policy. | Support |
| Former Section 6.7.2.2/New Section 6.7.3.2—Angeles Crest Highway/Chevy Chase Drive at Foothill Boulevard: Revise this paragraph as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Revise wording starting with 2nd sentence, as follows: “While the DVSP contemplated the realignment of these two intersections to eliminate the offset, the City has recently completed a project in <u>2008</u> that signalized the Chevy Chase intersection and operates the two signals as one intersection with full coordination between the two. The City recognizes that the closely spaced traffic signals have resulted in less-than-satisfactory operation and is currently evaluating <u>will continue to pursue optimal more efficient</u> signal timing <u>and configuration</u> to reduce driver delay. o Discussion regarding potential intersection and traffic signal improvements is too weak. Suggest examining/identifying specific improvements. Add discussion that alternatives should be pursued. | See below Support The PWTC’s request for examination / identification of specific improvements is beyond the scope of the GPU. Staff recommends adding a policy to pursue this as a part of implementation. |
| Former Section 6.7.3/New Section 6.7.4—Bikeways: Delete Section 6.7.3.1, as Red Route Bikeway is completed and described in current conditions. Add discussion about completion of the Planned Bikeways and other bicycle facilities as part of a Bicycle Transportation Plan to be approved by Metro. Modify former Section 6.7.3.2 to describe Foothill Boulevard Link Bikeway Project, funded with Call For Projects and awarded in 2011. | Support |
| Former Section 6.7.4/New Section 6.7.5—Long Beach Freeway (I-710) Gap Closure Project: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Revise the 3rd sentence in the 1st paragraph as follows: “The latest <u>One</u> proposal is to link...” o Discuss City’s official objection to I-710 tunnel as stated in prior letters to Caltrans/Metro. | Support all recommendations |
| Other minor changes, such as additional clarifying words, changes to the wording in headings, etc. These can be seen in Attachment 1. | Support |
| Proposed Revisions to Goals/Objectives/Policies: | |
| Add parking strategies identified in Section 6.3.8.1 to the Goals/Objectives/Policies Section. | Support |
| Add objective/policy regarding evaluating/monitoring LOS thresholds. | Support. Staff recommends rewording CE Objective 1.2 to add that the LOS threshold should be monitored and reevaluated periodically. |
| Add new policy regarding 3 or more axle or 9,000 lb. trucks on Angeles Crest Highway (SR-2) and the City’s support of Caltrans truck ban on the State highway. | Support |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | <p>CE Policy 1.1.3—Revise language as follows: “Promote the concept of <u>Develop a</u> “Complete Streets” Plan in the City, which are<u>is</u> designed and operated to enable safe and convenient access for all users of all ages and abilities, including pedestrians, bicyclists, motorists, transit riders, and equestrians.”</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| | <p>Add a new policy to CE Goal 1 objecting to the I-710 freeway/tunnel for circulation and air quality reasons.</p> | <p>Support; also recommend adding noise as a reason.</p> |
| | <p>CE Policy 1.2.1—Need to make a stronger statement whether or not to develop the local threshold.</p> | <p>This issue was discussed extensively by the GPAC to address a policy in the existing (1995) Circulation Element that calls for the City to adopt an LOS standard; note that a standard has not been adopted. The GPAC determined that at this point the City does not have enough information to make a stronger statement and/or make a recommendation for a specific LOS standard. The text (Section 6.4.1) and this policy are intended to acknowledge that adopting an LOS standard is important but that other factors, such as the impact of incremental changes on traffic operations, need to be evaluated and that a simple LOS standard might not be sufficient and/or appropriate. Therefore, Staff recommends leaving the policy as written.</p> |
| | <p>CE Policy 1.2.3: Revise wording as follows: CE Policy 1.2.3: “To the extent constitutionally permitted, Pursue right-of-way acquisition to meet the City’s adopted standards. Dedication of right-of-way is anticipated to be the primary means to upgrade right-of-way widths. In non-residential areas, density bonuses increased building densities may be considered in conjunction with right-of-way dedication. Right-of-way upgrades will serve to benefit not only vehicles, but all forms of transportation.” PWTC Comment: Are there other ways to deal with ROW issues that should/could be considered in addition to this policy, such as easements, alternate routes, designated access roads, etc.?</p> | <p>Support. Staff recommends adding another policy to address the PWTC’s comment.</p> |
| | <p>CE Policy 1.3.1—Revise wording as follows: “Encourage the development of aesthetic streetscapes that are consistent with the low-density, residential character of the community to promote a positive City image and provide visual</p> | <p>The wording is from the from existing 1995 Circulation Element. The GPAC reviewed it and recommended leaving the language as-is.</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | relief. | |
| | CE Policy 1.3.2—Revise wording as follows: “Installation of street lights in previously unlit areas <u>may be initiated</u> at the request of homeowners shall be initiated by a petition to the City, with approvals to be determined by staff based on criteria to be established in advance by the City Council, and with proper public notice to directly affected properties as well as those properties nearby that may be indirectly affected. Appeals of staff determinations shall be referred to the appropriate Commission for consideration. The City’s determination shall provide for the mitigation of lighting impacts, and shall be appealable at a public hearing if necessary. ” | Support |
| | CE Policy 1.3.3—Comment: this policy does not really apply to LCF, as land uses are already established, so there is no possibility for encouragement. | Staff notes that the GPU allows certain property to be recycled into higher density mixed-use development; therefore CE Policy 1.3.3 is appropriate as written. |
| | CE Policy 1.4.2—Revise wording as follows: “Consider assessing transit and multi-modal impact fees on new <u>non-residential</u> developments to fund public transportation, bicycle, pedestrian, and trails infrastructures, and other multi-modal or low-/zero-emissions infrastructure or accommodations.” | Staff notes that the policy as originally written would apply to multi-family development and mixed-use development that includes residential uses. If the intent of the proposed revision is not to assess single-family development, that can be clarified, similar to Staff’s proposed revision to CE Policy 2.1.1 below. |
| | CE Goal 2—Revise this goal as follows: “Facilitate alternatives to automobile travel, including public transportation, bicycling, ridesharing, <u>and walking</u> , and equestrians , that support land use plans, meet transportation needs, and reduce vehicle-related and GHG emissions.” | The GPAC specifically included equestrians; Staff does not recommend the proposed rewording. |
| | CE Policy 2.1.1—Revise wording as follows: “Ensure that new <u>commercial and multiple-family residential</u> developments incorporate project design features that promote the use of alternative modes of transportation, such as proximity to transit, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, preferential parking for low-/no-emission vehicles, etc.” | See Staff’s comment re: CE Policy 1.4.2 above. Staff recommends adding mixed-use development to the beginning of this policy. |
| | CE Policy 2.1.3—Revise wording as follows: “ Carry out a comprehensive public involvement and input process that Contine to provides <u>provide</u> information...” | Support |
| | CE Policy 2.2.1—Revise wording as follows: “Encourage the use of transit along Foothill Boulevard and specifically to and from the DVSP by enhancing the LCF shuttle service, (work-Work to increase shuttle frequency and service hours.” | Support |
| | CE Policy 2.2.4—Revise Wording as follows: “Work | Support |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>with regional and local transit providers to enhance customer service and system ease-of-use as feasible, including by supporting development of features such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> . Developing a Regional Pass system to reduce the number of different passes and tickets required of system users; . Implement “Smart Bus” technology, using global positioning satellite (GPS) and electronic displays at transit stops to provide customers with “real-time” arrival and departure time information (and to allow the system operator to respond more quickly and effectively to disruptions in service); and . Investigating the feasibility of an a regional on-line trip planning program.” | |
|--|--|--|

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | <p>CE Policy 3.1.1—Reword as follows: “Continue to promote the opportunity for the pursue construction of public sewers, where determined feasible.</p> | <p>The GPAC crafted this language specifically; Staff does not recommend the proposed revision.</p> |
| | <p>Add new policy to consolidate residential waste service contracts into one unified service to reduce air pollution, noise, road wear, and vehicle trips. Explore methods to reduce impacts to streets by waste collection trucks.</p> | <p>Staff recommends a new policy to address the PWTC’s and other Commissions’ concerns.</p> |
| | <p>CE Policy 3.1.4—Reword as follows: “Improve the existing storm drainage system by correcting identified deficiencies, where feasible and appropriate. Require new developments to upgrade storm drains to handle the increased runoffs generated from a development site.”</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| | <p>CE Policy 3.1.5—Weak policy statement. Need more reliable electrical service. Need more energy efficient energy generation.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| | <p>Add new policy to develop a more energy efficient infrastructure, including solar power, LED lighting, time-of-day usage, equipment replacement and other energy-reducing programs.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| | <p>CE Policy 3.2.1—Reword as follows: “Require that providers of cable television, broadband Internet, and other communication services consult with the City and with affected property owners before placing physical equipment, except cables, on telephone <u>telecommunication</u> company infrastructure within the City.”</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| | <p>CE Policy 3.2.2—Reword as follows: “Establish a chain of command so that City officials and staff are apprised of all requests by telecommunication companies for the location of communication towers and monopolies on public or <u>and</u> private properties.”</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| | <p>Add new policy to expand public media services with all telecommunication franchises in the City.</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| | <p>CE GOAL 4—Revise wording as follows: “Maintain and</p> | <p>Support</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>enhance public systems, services, and utilities to provide safe access throughout the community accessibility for a wide range of needs to public facilities and services, including motorized vehicular access, emergency services, pedestrian and bicycle travel, <u>for persons with special mobility needs, emergency services, commercial deliveries, and other users, and public services and utilities.</u>"</p> | |
| | <p>CE Objective 4.1—Reword as follows: "Pursue the development of sidewalks and/or ADA-compliant "walkable paths" in the vicinity of schools to provide adequate pedestrian access. The location of the sidewalks and/or ADA-compliant "walkable paths" will include consideration of the Suggested Routes to School Plans and connection to present or future bus or shuttle service in the area. <u>Identify where sidewalks are and are not to be pursued (show on map.)</u>"</p> | <p>This issue of where, and if, to install sidewalks in the City and what types of walkable pedestrian paths will require its own study and was not a part of the scope of the GPU. See staff's response to Section 6.5.3 above.</p> |
| | <p>CE Policy 4.1.3—Revise wording as follows: "Recommend sidewalk and/or ADA-compliant "walkable paths" development in new development areas where public safety objectives will be served, at the discretion of the Planning Commission. Similar recommendations for public safety within existing developments should continue to be reviewed by the Public Works <u>and Traffic Commission.</u>"</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| | <p>CE Policy 4.2.4—Revise wording as follows: "<u>Continue to work</u> Work with Caltrans and State officials to limit <u>restrict</u> the size and number of trucks using Angeles Crest Highway through the City <u>and to pursue runaway vehicle preventative measures.</u>"</p> | <p>Support</p> |
| | <p>CE Policy 4.2.7—Revise wording as follows: "Study and consider implementing overnight <u>Investigate and adopt</u> parking prohibitions to enhance the safety if neighborhoods within the City." (PWTC comment: overnight restrictions are not desired by many residents.)</p> | <p>Staff notes that the GPAC did not want to assume that such prohibitions would be adopted. Therefore, Staff recommends leaving the originally policy as written.</p> |
| | <p>CE Objective 4.3—Revise wording as follows: "Require new development to install curbs and gutters, including all land divisions and substantial redevelopment of properties other than single-family residences <u>where feasible. Investigate and adopt zones where curb and gutters are consistent with the neighborhood's character and shall be required for private developments.</u> The Planning Commission may exclude single family residential additions and remodels and residential land divisions from this policy where it is determined safe from an engineering perspective and when such improvements are substantially inconsistent with the neighborhood's character. Where feasible, pursue the installation of curbs and gutters at existing developments based on recommendations from the</p> | <p>Support</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | City Engineer and approval through a public hearing process. | |
| | CE Policy 5.1.1—PWTC Comment: Suggest identifying and describing what improvements are proposed in the last sentence. | Staff recommends leaving the policy as written, as any potential traffic calming measures would be developed as a part of an implementing plan. |
| | CE Policy 5.1.3: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Turn first sentence into a separate policy under a new objective—see below. o Revise wording as follows: <u>“Pursue the recommendations of the downtown parking study. When feasible and not in conflict with other public utilities scheduled for this area, implement parkway landscaping improvements that encourage pedestrian use and reduced traffic speeds that while maintaining adequate emergency vehicle access while encouraging pedestrian uses and reduced traffic speeds.”</u> | Support |
| | CE Policy 5.2.3—Reword as follows: <u>“Evaluate the need for additional signals or consolidation at of cross streets to along Foothill Boulevard that can as a way to facilitate pedestrian access to the Boulevard, and enhance the levels of service at these intersections. Any new signals shall be incorporated into the integrated signal synchronization program so as not to conflict with the objectives of congestion management and speed control.”</u> | Support, with the rewording to include the PC’s recommendation for language emphasizing the need to consider alternatives to additional traffic signals. |
| | Existing CE Policy 5.2.4—Move to new Policy 6.2.7 under CE Goal 6. | Staff notes that the reason this policy is under CE Goal 5, Objective 5.2 (traffic flow on Foothill Blvd.) instead of Goal 6, Objective 6.2 (trails) is because the GPAC specifically wanted to acknowledge the fact that trails cross Foothill Boulevard and the objective’s focus on traffic flow should include accommodating trails. Staff recommends leaving CE Policy 5.2.4 in its current location. |
| | Replace existing CE Policy 5.2.4 as follows: <u>Wherever possible, avoid creation of new intersections along Foothill Boulevard and pursue consolidation of closely intersecting streets.</u> | Staff supports adding this as new CE Policy 5.2.7. |
| | CE Policy 5.2.5—PWTC Comment: Regarding improvements to key intersections on Foothill Boulevard at Ocean View, what improvements? Show concept or plan. | Staff notes that the GPU did not include an intersection analysis or recommended improvements. This policy was referring to making any potential improvements that may be identified, such as the DVSP or is traffic studies required of new development recommend them. |
| | Add new <u>CE Objective 5.3: Enhance parking efficiency and utilization along Foothill Boulevard to promote our</u> | Support |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <u>City's commercial vitality.</u> | |
| | Add new CE Policy 5.3.1: Pursue the recommendations of the 2008 Comprehensive Parking Study. (Formerly first sentence of CE Policy 5.1.3.) | Support |
| | Add new CE Policy 5.3.2: Investigate and adopt curb parking time limits along Foothill Boulevard during peak usage periods in areas with insufficient parking supply when feasible and appropriate for the adjacent land uses. | Staff suggests replacing "...and adopt..." to "...consider adopting..." |
| | Add new CE policy after existing CE Policy 6.1.4 to require bike racks for new commercial developments. | Support, although staff suggests including multi-family and mixed-use development. |
| | CE Policy 6.1.6—reword as follows: "Improve bicycle access to schools within the City <u>by pursuing Safe Routes to School</u> funding for <u>planned bikeways and other bike facilities near schools.</u> " | Support |

Draft Environmental Impact Report (December 2010 Public Draft)

| PLANNING COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS / COMMENTS | STAFF COMMENTS |
|---|--|
| <p>Page 3-18, 2nd paragraph under the heading <i>Existing Residential Development Potential</i>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▫ Replace the 2nd sentence in its entirety as follows: "The Estate Residential density designation allows a maximum of 1 du/ac." ▫ Revise the remainder of the paragraph, including the assumption of potential build-out by 2030, to acknowledge the fact that the City's existing Hillside Development Ordinance would modify the actual density allowed. | Support all |
| Table 3-3 on Page 3-19—revise the table to reflect the changes noted above. | |
| Revise data/tables to reflect changes to the land use policy maps per the revised Housing Element and any other changes that occur through the public hearing process. | |
| Update data throughout to reflect 2010 Census | |
| Page 3-7 of the Findings of Fact (Proposed Mitigation) MM AQ-2 Building Design Measures: "A site-specific health risk assessment will be required as part of the development review for proposed development projects within proximity (i.e., within 500 feet) of busy roadways..." | The Planning Commission has recommended that this measure be eliminated altogether or altered to be affective only upon finding through an Initial Study that such an assessment is warranted. Staff would point out that "busy streets" are not defined and that a study could be done to determine which streets are busy enough to warrant the health assessment. Alternatively a systematic city-wide pre-assessment could be completed to pre-establish locations that would be affected and establish standard mitigation. |