
**CITY OF DANA POINT
TOWN CENTER SUBCOMMITTEE
AGENDA**

November 10, 2005
6:00 p.m.

City Hall Offices
Council Chamber (#210)
33282 Golden Lantern
Dana Point, CA 92629

1. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE
2. SUBCOMMITTEE ROLL CALL
3. PUBLIC COMMENTS
4. PUBLIC OUTREACH UPDATE
5. SUMMARY OF BUSINESS ASSISTANCE/INCENTIVE PROGRAM ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSION *Attachment A*
6. TRAFFIC ALTERNATIVES *Attachment B*
7. ART IN PUBLIC PLACES (CONTINUED FROM 7/19) *Attachment C*
8. SIGN CODE & GUIDELINES (CONTINUED FROM 10/11) *Attachment D*
9. FOLLOW-UP FROM OCTOBER 24TH SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING *Attachment E*
 - a. *October 24, 2005 Meeting Minutes*
 - b. *Subcommittee Recommendations To Date* *Attachment F*
10. ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSION
11. NEXT MEETING/ADJOURNMENT

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
COUNTY OF ORANGE)
CITY OF DANA POINT)

AFFIDAVIT OF POSTING

I, Kyle Butterwick, Community Development Director of the City of Dana Point, do hereby certify that on or before Friday, November 4, 2005, I caused the above notice to be posted in four (4) places in the City of Dana Point, to wit: City Hall, Capistrano Beach Post Office, Dana Point Post Office and the Dana Point Library.

Kyle Butterwick, Director
Community Development Department

Agendas are available on the City's website at www.danapoint.org
IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT, IF YOU NEED SPECIAL ASSISTANCE TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS MEETING, YOU SHOULD CONTACT THE OFFICE OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION AT (949) 248-3564. NOTIFICATION 48 HOURS PRIOR TO THE MEETING WILL ENABLE THE CITY TO MAKE REASONABLE ARRANGEMENTS TO ASSURE ACCESSIBILITY TO THIS MEETING.

Summary of Business Assistance/Incentive Program Roundtable Discussion

Based on the desire to foster a vibrant business environment, incentives and/or assistance may be necessary to support existing businesses and to encourage the establishment of new businesses. To understand business needs, a roundtable discussion is scheduled for November 10, 2005 at 9:30am, following the Focus Group Meeting. The meeting will be conducted by City staff, which includes the new interim Economic Development Manager. While the meeting is open to the public, a select number of business/property owners were notified of the meeting. The outcome of the meeting will assist staff in developing program(s) appropriate for Town Center businesses.

Subcommittee members are welcome to attend. For those unable to attend the Roundtable discussion, a summary will be provided at the 6pm Subcommittee meeting.

Recommendation Summary

No action necessary.

Comparison of Traffic Alternatives

The original traffic plan recommended modifying the circulation system to a two-way pattern. This alternative was presented at multiple workshops and supported by the Town center Subcommittee with specific conditions. After further consideration of the traffic plan for the Town Center, a second alternative has been evaluated which maintains the one-way configuration and reduces the number of lanes to two in each direction.

Traffic Alternatives

A brief description of each alternative is provided below:

Two-Way Circulation – PCH – two lanes each direction; landscaped median, parking cut-outs; public parking facility; signalized intersections. Del Prado – one lane each direction; stop signs.

One-Circulation – PCH & Del Prado – Maintain one-way; reduce each roadway to two lanes; signalized intersections.

Summary

Based on the traffic assessment, both alternatives are acceptable from a circulation perspective. Therefore, to develop a preferred alternative, other issue areas have been evaluated. There are pros and cons of each alternative which are summarized in the attached matrix. The selection of either alternative, however, should consider the inclusion of certain amenities to address the issues related to each alternative. For instance, because a one-way circulation system is less ideal for a pedestrian environment, certain streetscape improvements are required to prioritize the pedestrian.

A detailed discussion of the traffic analysis and alternatives will be provided at the meeting.

Recommendation Summary

Two circulation alternatives and conditions are presented for consideration.

One-Way Circulation

1. Maintain one-way circulation pattern with the following improvements:
 - a. Reduce to two lanes on PCH and Del Prado
 - b. Include pedestrian amenities and traffic calming measures, such as intersection bulb-outs and textured paving, narrowed roadway, and signal priorities for pedestrians.
 - c. Include roadway beautification measures at a pedestrian scale, such as landscaping, seating and lighting.
 - d. Establish specific entry features at the north and south end of the couplet.

Two-Way Circulation

1. Continue with the proposed preferred concept, as detailed in the May 2005 Plan, which includes four lanes on PCH and two lanes on Del Prado, as well as the following components:
 - a. Create additional public parking which would include one and preferably two facilities prior to Phase I and ensure adequate parking signage is provided.
 - b. Reestablish on-street cut-out parking on PCH in moderate to heavily utilized areas in which it is physically possible to create 3 or more spaces and at the

request of the property owner(s) who may be required to dedicate property for right-of-way purposes.

- c. Construct the landscaped median on PCH during Phase I.
- d. Consider modifying the intersection of Blue Lantern and PCH, as well as other intersections, to narrow the entrance to the side streets and making it appear as a less desirable alternative route.
- e. Evaluate an alternative intersection at Copper Lantern.
- f. Meet with the business community to review parking issues.
- g. Establish specific entry features at the north and south end of the couplet.
- h. Establish 4-way stop signs on Del Prado, where justified.
- i. Establish appropriate parking time limits for public parking in the Town Center as an action of the Implementation Plan.

Comparison of Traffic Alternatives

ISSUE	TWO-WAY CIRCULATION <i>PCH – Two lanes each direction; landscaped median, parking cut-outs; public parking facility; signalized intersections. Del Prado – One lane each direction; stop signs.</i>	ONE-WAY CIRCULATION <i>PCH & Del Prado – Maintain one-way; reduce each roadway to two lanes; signalized intersections.</i>	PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
Environment	Ability to significantly alter environment on Del Prado to create small town atmosphere with narrow roadway, slower traffic and stop signs. Del Prado to become a destination and not a roadway to carry traffic. PCH to return to be arterial highway to carry through traffic. Landscaped median to beautify.	PCH and Del Prado become equal. Pedestrian features, such as intersection bulb-outs and wide sidewalks, will be created. Wider sidewalks on PCH.	Two-Way
Parking	Need to create parking cut-outs and public parking facility to off-set loss of on-street parking on PCH. Increases cost significantly and feasibility of parking cut-outs may be limited.	On-street parking maintained which will provide a buffer between pedestrian traffic. On-street parking slows traffic. Parking more convenient.	One-Way
Cost	Significant up front costs related to parking cut-outs, establishing a public parking facility and landscaped median. Other significant costs related to the need to rebuild Del Prado.	Costs associated with rebuilding both roadways. Costs related to parking cut-outs, public parking facility and landscaped median eliminated.	Approximately Equal (detailed cost estimates needed)
Traffic Speeds	Del Prado speeds significantly reduced. PCH speeds slower than today, but faster than Del Prado.	Roadway traffic speeds will be similar. Faster than two-way alternative on Del Prado.	Two-Way
Land Use Distribution	Focus on making Del Prado as a pedestrian-scaled destination area and PCH a roadway to carry traffic would allow for a distinction of land uses on each street. Land uses on Del Prado would focus on specialty retail uses which would encourage patrons to spend time in the area. PCH would include residential serving uses and offices.	Development focus on both streets. No distinction of land uses between Del Prado and PCH.	Equal
Business Visibility from Vehicles	Slowing of traffic on Del Prado allows the motorist to view businesses more easily. Pass through traffic utilizing PCH places more vehicles on the roadway which theoretically increases visibility.	Roadways share through traffic and visibility. Equal distribution of vehicles. However, increased speeds on Del Prado would decrease ability of motorists to view businesses.	Equal
Gateways	Alteration of gateway intersections needed to create two-way. Potential issue of creating intersection at Copper Lantern.	Gateway intersections already lend themselves to one-way circulation. Little alteration required.	One-Way
Access	Eliminates need to circle the Town Center to locate a business. Creates better exposure and visibility to businesses.	Difficulty in locating businesses.	Two-Way
Special Events	Separate roadways easily enable Del Prado to be closed for special events, such as a parade or street festival.	Street closures require significant traffic control measures to distribute traffic to surrounding streets.	Two-Way
Circulation	PCH median increases U-turns. Less conflict with pedestrian and vehicles. Less confusing, more direct routes. Better for transit operators.	Better access to driveways and on-street parking on both sides of street. Better signal coordination.	Equal

Public Art in the Town Center

The Subcommittee reviewed the City's existing Art-in-Public-Places Program (AIPP) on July 19th. The topic is being brought back to the Subcommittee to recommend that the current AIPP program be evaluated as an implementation measure of the Town Center Plan. This action would allow for the program to be fully analyzed and the appropriate modifications made to ensure the full benefits of public art are realized in the Town Center.

The use of public art in the Town Center is consistent with the Guiding Principle to encourage culture, arts and socializing – day and night. Cultural activities that reflect the identity and heritage of the City can strengthen the appeal of the Town Center. One mechanism for creating this identity is the use of public art.

The Subcommittee's recommended Town Center policies included the following in regards to public art in the Town Center. This policy provides a basis for evaluating and making modifications to the existing AIPP program.

Policy 2.6: Incorporate art features, including any required public art as an element of development and enhancements.

Art in Public Places

The City's current Art-in-Public Places program (AIPP) requires all new development exceeding \$1,000,000 in construction costs to comply with the requirements of the program. Applicants have the option of including a public art component within the project, off-site or contributing to an in-lieu fund equal to the required value of public art. The required value of the art is one-half percent of the total development construction costs. For example, a project which costs \$2,000,000 to construct has an obligation of \$100,000 towards public art. Today, approximately \$92,500 has accumulated in the AIPP in-lieu fund account.

The City's Planning Commission is responsible for approving AIPP art and/or contributions to the in-lieu fund. A specific process of utilizing the in-lieu funds is not defined in the program. Use of the In-lieu fees have supported only one public art piece which will be located in front of the new Fire Station in Doheny Village. In this case, the Council approved allocation of the funds and artists were requested to submit proposals. The selection of the art piece will be made by the Planning Commission, with recommendations and support from an art consultant.

Recommendation Summary

Modification of the City's existing AIPP program may be required to create a presence of art work in the Town Center. To facilitate this, it is recommended that the program be fully evaluated as an implementation measure of the Town Center Plan. Specifically, the recommendation is:

1. As an implementation measure of the Town Center Plan, evaluate the current AIPP program and make revisions as necessary to ensure that the Town Center benefits from the establishment of public art.

Sign Code & Guidelines

The Subcommittee reviewed the City's Sign Code and Sign Guidelines at its October 11, 2005 meeting. The purpose was to provide the members an understanding of the regulations to determine if modifications were needed to tailor the regulations for Town Center. Despite aggressive outreach efforts, which included hand delivery of notices, one business member provided testimony at the meeting.

An update to the Sign Code and/or Guidelines is an extensive process which would require additional analysis. If the Subcommittee sees the need to revise these documents, it is recommended that it be identified as an implementation measure.

The City's Sign Code and Sign Guidelines govern temporary and permanent signage in the City in residential and non-residential areas. Since its adoption in 1991, the Sign Code has undergone several amendments to tailor the regulations to meet the needs of businesses and to encourage well designed, consistent signage. The Sign Design Guidelines, which were adopted in February 2004, assist in implementing the Sign Code and communicate the City's vision for well designed signs.

The following goal and policies have been considered by the Subcommittee for inclusion in the Plan to provide the framework for reviewing signage in the Town Center. Policy 6.1 will be addressed as part of the streetscape plan and would not be a component of the Sign Code. The Sign Code already allows for projecting signs, as mentioned in Policy 6.2.

GOAL: Require signs to contribute to the atmosphere and to serve as symbols of quality for commercial establishments.

New Policies

Policy 6.1: Create a public signage program which creates a unified design which reflects the character of the Town Center for street signage, and direction signs to public parking locations and community serving uses (i.e., public buildings, parks, scenic attractions, coastal access points, bike and pedestrian paths, cultural/historic structures)

Policy 6.2: Encourage pedestrian signage, such as projecting signs.

Recommendation

If the Subcommittee wishes to conduct a more extensive review of the Code & Guidelines be conducted to address the special needs of the Town Center, it is recommended that this become an implementation measure which would state the following:

1. Evaluate and update as needed the Sign Code & Guidelines to ensure regulations encourage signage which is consistent with the goals of the Town Center Plan.

**CITY OF DANA POINT
TOWN CENTER SUBCOMMITTEE
OCTOBER 24, 2005 MEETING MINUTES**

The Subcommittee convened the meeting at approximately 6:10pm.

1. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

2. SUBCOMMITTEE ROLL CALL

All members were present with the exception of Alice Anderson, Bob Mardian and Steven Weinberg.

3. PUBLIC COMMENTS

The following members of the public spoke.

1. Tom Blake – Owner of Tutor & Spunkys. Increased building height has generated significant developer interest.
2. Jerry Grunor – Stated his reasons for resigning from the Subcommittee.

5. PUBLIC OUTREACH UPDATED

Kathy Barnum provided an overview of outreach efforts.

6. BUILDING HEIGHT

Kyle Butterwick, Brenda Chase and Patrick Munoz presented the staff report related to conditionally allowing buildings heights up to 50-feet. The criteria was expanded as requested by the Subcommittee at the September 27th meeting. Jim Miller asked about the ability to require a super-majority vote for approving variances. Patrick Munoz indicated that additional research would be needed. Boris Dramov provided a PowerPoint presentation which depicted optional building heights and development standards. Subcommittee discussed the criteria for increased building height. Public comments included:

1. Jerry Grunor – Questioned benefit of higher buildings, what large retailers is the City seeking and what is mean by an “inventory”.
2. Herb Hueg – Concerned of potential view loss from his residence on Blue Lantern.
3. Harold Kaufman – Concerned with allowing buildings up to 50-foot. Requested clarification on potential for takings, CUP findings, and the definition of cultural benefit. Should only allow for 5’ for architectural projections. Consider credit for on-street parking, zero front yard setback and encroachments for sidewalk cafes.
4. Darrin Duhamel – Imperative to have 18’ high street level retail. Retaining existing retailers need to be addressed. Consider criteria which would allow for additional height if developer offered space to existing tenants.

Mayor Rayfield suggested conducting a brainstorming session with interested businesses to discuss retention programs.

Staff addressed the questions raised by the public. Boris stated that the success of the town will be based on the quality of place, goods/services and population density.

Members discussed that increased building height should only be considered in truly exceptional cases, questioned if the height would be consistent with the coastal

community, explored if 40-feet was enough to generate change in the Town Center and considered requiring a CUP for increased heights.

The members concluded that a maximum of 40-feet was appropriate, but would like to consider projections beyond 40-feet for architectural elements, roof decks and other roof top accessories. Staff will return with a recommendation for these items.

7. DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS

Staff presentation related to development standards was provided with Item #5. Clarification was provided that parking structures would be included in calculated Floor Area Ratio.

Public comment included:

1. Bob Theel – Suggested that need for additional height for roof top decks. It was clarified that subterranean parking would be permitted to the property line. Questioned if tuck-under parking would be included in calculating the FAR. Not allowing for 50-feet is a disincentive. Needed appropriate in-lieu fees to ensure also not a disincentive.

Terry Walsh proposed a motion and Jim Howard seconded to approve the development standards with the following modifications:

- Remove reference to height up to 50-feet
- Max 2.5 FAR, eliminate up to 3.0
- Text related to roof decks to state that roof decks shall be permitted with no limitations on square footage.

8. FOLLOW-UP FROM OCTOBER 11TH SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING

The October 11th meeting minutes were approved. No discussion related to the Subcommittee Recommendations.

9. MEETING SCHEDULE

The meeting schedule provided in the agenda packet would be modified to include one meeting in November and one in December to account for the holidays. Following discussion, the date of November 10th was scheduled for a Focus Meeting at 8am and Subcommittee at 6pm to discuss alternative circulation plans. A Subcommittee meeting on December 7th at 1pm was also scheduled.

10. ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSION

Jim Howard provided clarification to the quotes he provided to the newspaper. Clarification was provided to Terry Walsh that the traffic analysis would include the animated traffic analysis. Yvonne English indicated she was unable to attend the November 10th meeting and asked if she could mail a letter to the business community provided that it stated that she was not representing the Subcommittee. She would provide the letter prior to mailing.

11. NEXT MEETING/ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned 10:05p.m.

Next meetings – November 10, 2005 at 6pm.
December 7, 2005 at 1pm

TOWN CENTER SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS (as of 10/24/05)

APPROVED RECOMMENDATIONS – the following recommendations were approved by the Subcommittee.

PCH/DEL PRADO STREET IMPROVEMENTS AND PHASING PLAN (8/9/05 Meeting)

1. Continue with the proposed preferred concept, as detailed in the May 2005 Plan, which includes four lanes on PCH and two lanes on Del Prado, as well as the following components:
 - a. Create additional public parking which would include one and preferably two facilities prior to Phase I and ensure adequate parking signage is provided.
 - b. Reestablish on-street cut-out parking on PCH in moderate to heavily utilized areas in which it is physically possible to create 3 or more spaces and at the request of the property owner(s) who may be required to dedicate property for right-of-way purposes.
 - c. Construct the landscaped median on PCH during Phase I.
 - d. Consider modifying the intersection of Blue Lantern and PCH, as well as other intersections, to narrow the entrance to the side streets and making it appear as a less desirable alternative route.
 - e. Evaluate an alternative intersection at Copper Lantern.
 - f. Meet with the business community to review parking issues.
 - g. Establish specific entry features at the north and south end of the couplet.
 - h. Establish 4-way stop signs on Del Prado, where justified.
 - i. Establish appropriate parking time limits for public parking in the Town Center as an action of the Implementation Plan.

IN-LIEU PARKING PROGRAM (8/9/05 Meeting)

1. Continue with the recommended concept, as detailed in the May 2005 Plan which includes the establishment of an in-lieu parking program, as well as the following components:
 - a. Require that residential and guest parking be provided on-site.
 - b. Conduct study to determine appropriate in-lieu fee.
 - c. Implement parking program in areas between Golden Lantern and Blue Lantern.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION (8/23/05 Meeting)

- 1) Require that the nine structures and gazebo located in the Town Center which were identified in the 1997 survey be placed on the Dana Point Historic Register and be subject to Section 9.07.250(g)(1)(C) for removal. Similar to the two structures which were required to be designated, removal of these structures in the Town Center would require review by the Planning Commission.
- 2) With the assistance of the Historic Society, identify other structures in the Town Center which satisfy the eligibility criteria and include these structures on the Register. These structures would also be subject to Section 9.07.250(g)(1)(C) for removal.
- 3) Update the Dana Point Historic Resources Inventory every five years.
- 4) Preserve portions of concrete sidewalks which have historical stamp from original development of the City, where feasible.
- 5) Notify property owners of the benefits of registering their structures on the National Register of Historic Places.
- 6) Create incentives for structures which have been modified to reestablish historical characteristics.

DESIGN GUIDELINES (8/23/05 Meeting)

1. Supplement and/or replace the existing design guidelines for private property in the Town Center with new design guidelines, focusing on humanizing the pedestrian environment within the Town Center, with consideration for courtyards, passages, and other provisions that help to link and extend the quality of public space into quasi-public and private areas. Guidelines are to address:
 - a. roof top gardens,
 - b. clarify encroachment for outdoor seating,
 - c. ensure guidelines are flexible,
 - d. architecture should be regionally significant, and
 - e. evening character and lighting.

MARKETING COUNCIL TASK FORCE (9/15/05 Meeting) *ACTED ON BY COUNCIL 9/28/005*

1. Retain economic development director and develop a formal Economic Development Program for the City of Dana Point that would involve the formulation of a formal economic development strategy to market the City as well as to assist with business development in Dana Point;
2. While staff is developing an Economic Development Program for the City, staff should be exploring opportunities to partner with the Harbor Association to market Dana Point as an upscale visitor destination that can be implemented immediately; and
3. In addition, direct staff to pursue, as a part of the Economic Development Program, a more regional approach with the Tri-City area Cities towards marketing South County as a visitor destination.

BUILDING HEIGHT (9/15/05, 9/27/05 and 10/24/05 Meetings)

1. Increase the overall Town Center building height standard for 3 stories to 40-feet (additional 5-feet).

DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS (9/15/05 and 10/24/05 Meetings)

1. Replace the existing development standards for the Town Center with new standards which would encourage design that would support the objectives of greater residential development, retail concentration and continuity, and economic feasibility (see matrices reviewed at 10/24/05 meeting).

ISSUES TO BE FINALIZED – the following issues have been discussed, but the Subcommittee has not approved final recommendations.

PCH/DEL PRADO STREET IMPROVEMENTS – Review additional traffic analysis for one-way circulation and two lanes.

LAND USE (7/19/05 and 8/9/05 Meetings)

1. Create land use districts to focus specialty commercial along Del Prado, community commercial along PCH, and Commercial/Office in the area of La Plaza. Generate a land use matrix which would identify uses which would be permitted, conditionally permitted and prohibited in these districts.
2. Implement discretionary review process which would provide the tools needed for ensuring uses on Del Prado will generate activity and help achieve the vibrant pedestrian environment sought for the Town Center.

ART IN PUBLIC PLACES (7/19/05 Meeting)

1. Update the AIPP program creating a process of allocating in-lieu fees and guidelines for reviewing proposed art works.

2. Create a Cultural Arts Commission which would:
 - a. become the body which reviews the City's AIPP applications and allocate funding for art pieces, and
 - b. define the Town Center Art Program and address the issues identified above.

BUILDING HEIGHT (9/15/05, 9/27/05 and 10/24/05 Meetings)

1. Consider items such as architectural elements, roof decks and other appurtenances to exceed the maximum building height.

SIGN CODE & GUIDELINES (10/11/05 Meeting) – Continue review of Sign Code and Guidelines. Encourage business owners to provide comments.

TOWN CENTER POLICIES (10/11/05 Meeting) – Continue to review and update draft policies.

ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED

1. Develop incentives such as improvements to historic structures, façade improvements and relocation assistance.
2. Explore program for business retention and modify guiding principle to reflect desire to retain business. *(The issue of business retention has been included as a policy of the Plan).*
3. Town Center and Street Names
4. Streetscape (lighting, seating, trash receptacles, restrooms, landscaping). *(Addressed through Plan policies. Detailed selection of lighting, seating, etc., will occur during streetscape design and will not be addressed in the development of the Plan. General guidance for these issues have been provided through Plan policies, as discussed at the 10/11/05 meeting.)*