

**Judith Mayer priority recommendations for the Gateway Area Plan draft “Mobility” Chapter, for consideration by the Planning Commission at its April 11, 2023 meeting, and beyond**

---

The Gateway’s general mobility principles and design recommendations and aspirations are thoughtful and well explained to support the possibility of development that provides multiple housing possibilities, affordability, mixed-use potential, and the possibility of car-free living. However, please consider the following recommendations:

1. **Develop the Gateway to reduce car-use needs, but do not assume all Gateway residents, workers, or business patrons will opt for a “car-free” lifestyle.**

The Mobility chapter’s Overview explain’s the Plan’s aspirational “Options for a Car-free Lifestyle” (10/22 GAP draft, p. 69). Gateway planning aspires to create neighborhoods to provide residents with the “... option to live car-free without sacrificing safety or convenience.” It is important to write plan policies that prioritize a car-free lifestyle option, while acknowledging that achieving a neighborhood with affordable housing for a mixed-age, mixed-tenancy, mixed-livelihood, mixed-income population, and attracting investment in businesses and services that may depend on clients from beyond the neighborhood, requires reasonable provision for driving and parking in and near new planned development. Eliminating on-site parking requirements for new development makes sense, as long as development provides good access for people with diverse abilities and mobility. However, setting maximum allowable parking limits too low will frustrate City attempts to develop housing or mixed uses through private investment.

**DL - Policy Pitch**

2. **Develop fully-envisioned alternatives to eliminating the L-Street bikeway / pedestrian path:**

(Modify and reconsider the single-alternative “Mobility Strategy,” (Draft p. 70+). *It is not acceptable to just depend on the EIR Alternatives analysis to do this.* The Draft’s “Mobility Concepts” section (Draft p. 79+) does this well for the proposed K/L Couplet. Alternatives that will retain the L Street bikeway / Pedestrian way / Linear park vision should also be fully envisioned before the City commits to the K/L one-way couplet concept proposed in this draft concept.

**The City must seriously investigate and realistically propose circulation design(s) that will retain and improve the L Street bikeway / Pedestrian way / Linear park, as it has done for the proposed K/L Street couplet.** This could involve retaining K Street as a 2-way road, but adding safety features that will also improve traffic flow with greater use, adding possible features such as safer pedestrian crossings with improved markings and signals, including left-turn lanes, City-operated traffic signals at key intersections, and no parking near “choke-point” intersections. Primary access to new development on former Industrial land to the west of K and L Streets could be from East-West streets, including extensions into large former Industrial sites. If the City is determined to provide access to the Gateway through a one-way couplet, completing M or N Street, of a one-way J / K Street couplet may also provide north-south access. Each design should clearly consider connections to existing streets at north and south ends (Alliance and Samoa).

**DL - Policy Pitch**

3. **Barrel District Master Plan – Policy GA-7f** (draft p. 75):

The City should work closely with Barrel District owners to develop site plans, and provide means for multiple owners or developers of large sites to work together. The form-based Gateway Code should explicitly address the “campus” design criteria for Barrel areas. (I still hope that draft plan’s Barrel District will be divided so that it does not straddle the Coastal Zone boundary.) If the University or other governmental body acquires or develops these sites, the City should work closely with them and strongly advocate designs which do meet City form-based requirements.

**DL – Other Items, No specific recommendation**

4. **No Net Loss of Class I Trail System** Policy GA-7i (P. 76 in Draft):

ADD: If major bike trails are eliminated, realigned, or portions are to be taken out of use for an extended period, the City itself shall provide alternative and equivalent or improved bike trail connectivity if the Developer is not in a position to do so.

**DL - Policy Pitch**

5. **Incentivize Active and Alternative Transportation as a Community Amenity** Policy GA-7j (Draft p. 76): Modify specifics of this policy according to the Gateway (form based) Code, as it is developed. We should acknowledge that state-mandated density bonus policies may significantly limit the incentive-power of the City’s Gateway “Community Benefit” amenity program.

**DL - Policy Pitch**

6. **Frontage dedication as a community amenity** (Policy GA-7k): The Gateway Code should specifically identify locations or types of development where developers will be required to dedicate street frontage to the City for public use, even if the City may accept dedications above and beyond those requirements as community “amenities” linked to density or height.

**DL - Policy Pitch – Also note, this may be housed better in the zoning ordinance**

7. **Streetscape policies** (draft p. 102+):

- a. Sidewalk Dining (Policy GA-8d) – In new development require developers who envision sidewalk dining to provide frontages where seating and serving will not encroach on sidewalk travel in ways that reduce accessibility.
- b. Landscaping, Street Trees, and Street Furniture (Policies GA-8e, GA-8f, GA-8g): Street landscaping including trees and planters should be located to provide buffers between sidewalk travelers and road traffic first, and with sufficiently wide space to separate building ground floor construction from public sidewalks. Landscaping and street furniture must be prohibited from obstructing public sidewalk travel and accessibility.

**[DL – this is a zoning issue and is already envisioned in the streetscape design]**

## Comments on Circulation Element

Peter Lehman, 4/11/23

[DL – all of these could be adopted on consent]

- **Policy T-4:** “Sensitive” is spelled wrong.
- **Policy T-5e:** The policy states that, “The required number of bicycle parking spaces shall be calculated as a proportion of the number of vehicle parking spaces.” I suggest that bicycle parking should depend on the number of people (or units) within a development, not the number of parking spaces, as follows, “The required number of bicycle parking spaces shall be calculated as a proportion of **the number of people or the number of living units within a development.**”

[DL – we could base this on number of units]

- **T-5g, #1: Easement or right of way dedication.** This states that, “Dedication of easements or rights of way for pathways through new private developments may be required.” Suggest changing “may be required.” as follows: “Dedication of easements or rights of way for pathways through new private developments **should be required whenever possible.**”

[DL – will need to modify slightly to where possible, planned, and desirable.]

- **T-5h, #2:** Suggest adding to #2: “**Wider sidewalks are encouraged for all new developments.**”
- **T-5h, #4: Sidewalk Maintenance.** Sidewalk facilities shall be systematically inspected and maintained to clean and repair damaged surfaces, **smooth out any irregularities that form**, and remove impediments such as poles, newspaper racks, and other obstructions that interfere with pedestrian flow. Suggest adding the words (as shown above): “**...smooth out any irregularities that form,**”
- **POLICY T-6 PARKING SUPPLY AND PARKING MANAGEMENT: Objective.** The objective reads, “Provide an adequate supply of parking. Minimize the impacts of Cal Poly Humboldt parking into adjacent neighborhoods. Ensure that new development provides an adequate but not excessive supply of parking.” Suggest replacing “...an adequate but not excessive supply of parking.” with, “...the minimally necessary supply of parking.” as follows, “Provide an adequate supply of parking. Minimize the impacts of Cal Poly Humboldt parking into adjacent neighborhoods. Ensure that new development provides **the minimally necessary supply of parking.**”
- **T-6a, #1:** This reads, “Assess and plan for future parking needs. Municipal parking lots shall be provided in the perimeter of downtown to create an adequate parking supply to serve existing businesses, future development, and to replace on-street parking removed for pedestrian, bicycle, and landscaping improvements. Assess the need for additional parking lots if additional demand or opportunities arise.” Suggest striking the last sentence and replace it with, “**If additional demand for parking arises, assess the possibility of using existing private lots (e.g., the Cal Poly Humboldt Store lot) for additional public parking.**”
- Appendix A, pg 4: Extra phrase inserted: “**...is on Samoa Boulevard west of “K” Street...**” Strike.

Comments on the Gateway Mobility Chapter

**GA-7c: Balanced Transportation System.** Suggest adding the bold text to the existing: “Create and maintain a balanced transportation system with choice of bus transit, bicycle, and pedestrian as well as **car sharing and private automobile modes.**”