

City of Lafayette Staff Report

To: Planning Commission
By: Niroop K. Srivatsa
Ann Merideth
Meeting Date: January 30, 2012
Subject: **GP01-11/ SPA01-11:** Amendments to the Lafayette General Plan to ensure consistency with the Downtown Specific Plan, adoption of the Downtown Lafayette Specific Plan and certification of the final Environmental Impact Report

At the January 17th meeting, the Commission reviewed five chapters of the revised draft Downtown Specific Plan (Introduction, Vision Statement, Overview, Context and Sustainability) and made several revisions. The attached table lists those revisions and will be updated after each meeting. Also attached is a revised schedule.

Please bring the following documents from the previous packet to your next meetings to assist in the discussions:

1. Suggested revisions to 2011 draft Downtown Specific Plan, November 2011
2. Table of responses to the Planning Commission's November 30, 2011 comments with the following attachments:
 - a. Comparison of the DSP and existing Specific Plans
 - b. Minutes of March 30, 2011 Planning Commission meeting
 - c. Staff memorandum on the Downtown Design Guidelines and design review findings
3. Staff memorandum on height limits
4. Comments on the DSP

Recommendation

1. Conduct the public hearing with a focus on the draft Downtown Specific Plan document.
2. Continue the hearing to February 6, 2012.

Attachments

1. List of DSP revisions made by the Planning Commission
2. Schedule
3. Comments from the Circulation Commission dated January 25, 2012

DSP Page	Chapter	Item
2	Introduction	<p>Rewrite first sentence as follows: <i>This Downtown Specific Plan (DSP) was prepared to continue this planning, nurturing, and sustaining of Lafayette’s downtown. It accomplishes the following:</i></p> <p>Delete the following two bullets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Explain why the DSP was prepared and what are its objectives. It describes the comprehensive public process that was undertaken for its preparation.</i> ▪ <i>Provides the context. This includes the history of the downtown and the community. The relationship is described between the DSP and other City policies.</i> <p>Add the following bullet points from the 2009 draft Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Seeks to improve downtown circulation. This is accomplished through management of traffic congestion rather than roadway improvement, including facilitating alternative modes of transportation – walking, pedestrians, and transit. Improvements to circulation are also accomplished through a smarter parking strategy with facilities that can meet the needs of both customers and employees.</i> ▪ <i>Preserves the downtown’s natural features – its creeks and trees – so they continue to contribute the downtown character and the community’s quality of life.</i> ▪ <i>Preserves downtown character through a District-based strategy. This specific Plan builds on the distinctive character of the different parts of the downtown. It envisions the downtown as a series of interconnected districts whose different physical characteristics and land uses complement each other.</i> ▪ <i>Establishes priorities for downtown public improvements while identifying funding sources that could be used for these improvements and their ongoing maintenance.</i>
3	Vision Statement	<p>In the first sentence, delete comma after “downtown”.</p> <p>In the last sentence of the first paragraph, replace “a” with “this”.</p>
5	Overview	Delete the paragraph on redevelopment.
7	Overview	Box containing downtown survey results: Add to potential improvements: <i>...improved street furnishings (74%); and more parks / plazas (70%).</i>
9	Overview	Amend Vision Statement as follows: <i>Vision Statement</i> articulates what <i>is the vision for Lafayette’s downtown over the next 20 years.</i>
11 and 93	Context and Public Realm	Figure 1: Context Map & Figure 19: Creek Corridors: show Happy Valley Creek in the Bart Block
14	Context	Figure 3: Downtown Projections for Additional Development: Add 2030 numbers.

DSP Page	Chapter	Item
		Note: numbers will be added once a preferred alternative is chosen.
15	Context	In the first paragraph under General Plan, delete the following sentence: <i>To ensure consistency between the DSP and the General Plan, the latter document will be amended concurrently with the adoption of the DSP.</i> Delete repetitive paragraphs.
16	Context	Delete the following bullet point if the DSP proposes no circulation changes to accommodate traffic on Mt. Diablo Blvd. and Moraga Road: <i>Implement limited circulation changes to accommodate traffic on Mt. Diablo Boulevard and Moraga Road.</i>
17	Context	Amend the last sentence under BART Block as follows: <i>The Plan <u>established a limit of three stories but allowed additional height above 35 feet in areas where additional height could be mitigated. in certain cases.</u></i>
20	Context	Redevelopment Plan: Condense section on redevelopment to a brief paragraph explaining the history and activities of RDA. Consider relocating Redevelopment to the History of the Downtown section.
21	Context	Bikeways Master Plan: Revise first sentence as follows: <i>The Bikeways Master Plan was adopted in 1973 and updated in 2006.</i>
22	Context	Parks and Recreation Facilities Master Plan: Add the following description: <i>The Parks and Recreation Facilities Master Plan was approved in 2009. The purpose of this Plan is to create a road map for providing the parkland and park facilities needed to serve the citizens of Lafayette according to the goals and policies established in the General Plan and other approved City plans. This Specific Plan identifies particular opportunities for three downtown parks that are consistent with the Parks and Recreational Facilities Master Plan. See Section 5.3 Parks and Other Community Spaces.</i>
23	Sustainability	Amend seventh bullet as follows: <i>Safe pedestrian and bicycle facilities.</i>
24	Sustainability	Revise sentence in second paragraph under Transportation and Circulation as follows: These factors contributed to some of <u>downtown</u> Lafayette's biggest concerns – traffic congestion and <i>the lack of parking</i> <i>failed</i> roads.
27	Sustainability	Keep the table in the DSP.

**Tentative Schedule for Downtown Specific Plan, DSP EIR, and General Plan Amendment:
January – March 2012**

January 20, 2012

Date	Who	What
November 30	Planning Commission	Present and begin initial discussions on DSP, EIR and GP amendment
January 17	Planning Commission	Begin review of DSP chapters and GP amendment
January 30	Planning Commission	Continue review of DSP chapters and GP amendment
February 6	Planning Commission	Continue review of DSP chapters and GP amendment
February 13	City Council	Planning Commission Chair provides update to the City Council
March 5	Planning Commission	Review EIR with focus on mitigation measures
March 19	Planning Commission	Adopt recommendations to the City Council on the DSP, EIR and GP amendment

City Council meeting dates have not yet been scheduled.

City of Lafayette Memorandum

To: Planning Commission Chair Jeanne Ateljevich
Lafayette Planning Commission

CC: Ann Merideth
Niroop Srivatsa
Lafayette Circulation Commission

From: Leah Greenblat, Transportation Planner

Date: January 25, 2012

Subject: Additional Circulation Commission Comments on DSP, Final EIR and
Proposed General Plan Amendments

This memo serves to provide additional comments to the January 4, 2012 memo to the Planning Commission containing the Circulation Commission's comments on the *September 2011 Revised Draft Downtown Lafayette Specific Plan (DSP)*. The Circulation Commission met on January 17, 2012 to consider its comments on the various transportation-related materials provided to the Planning Commission on November 30, 2011 regarding the DSP's Final EIR and the associated proposed General Plan Amendments. Also, the Circulation Commission developed a few additional comments on the DSP. The Commission agreed to forward the Planning Commission the attached table of comments for your consideration.

Item	Page	Issue	Recommendation/Comment
1.	Thru-out	Traffic Signals and EBMUD Pathway Study	The FEIR notes the need to mitigate vehicle traffic impacts by installing traffic signals at Oak Hill Road and the SR24 EB Off-Ramp and at First Street and the SR24 EB On-Ramp. Although the signals would be needed to address development impacts, the signals would provide an additional benefit towards improving pedestrian and bicycle circulation in the downtown particularly if the City proceeds with implementing the EBMUD Pathway project. Traffic signals at these two locations are critical to the pathways function and facilitating the

Item	Page	Issue	Recommendation/Comment
			crossing of Oak Hill Road and First Street. They should remain as mitigation measures for the DSP.
2.	Table B-1 Comparative Summary of Environmental Impacts, Pg. B-15, e)	Vehicular Traffic: Exceeding the Delay Index specified in the Pleasant Hill Action Plan	To be eligible for Contra Costa Transportation Authority funding, a jurisdiction must demonstrate that a General Plan Amendment is consistent with the Lamorinda Action Plan and not adversely affect the Action Plan's objectives and actions. It appears that the DSP would adversely affect the Action Plan so the City and the Lamorinda Program Management Committee should begin discussion and analysis to determine whether the GPA or Action Plan should be modified and reconciled. Lafayette should not adopt the DSP until this matter is resolved so that it remains in compliance with Measure J.
3.	Table C-1 Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Program, Pg. C-15 & C-16	Thresholds for installing traffic signals.	<p>In TRAF-5 "a traffic signal should be installed ...at such time as the signal warrants are met."</p> <p>In TRAF-6 the threshold for installing a signal is "when determined necessary by the City, but no later than when either mid-day or PM peak hour operations deteriorate to LOS E."</p> <p>In TRAF-8 a signal is to be installed "when PM peak hour operations deteriorate to LOS F for the left turn movement."</p> <p>Why are the thresholds (LOS and warrants) different when determining when to install a signal? Please provide an explanation of the varying circumstances and conditions at each location that lead to the differing thresholds.</p>
4.	Table C-1 Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Program, Pg.	Table C-1 TRAF-11	The City of Lafayette generally develops at a slow rate. It seems overly burdensome and excessive to report on development when almost none is occurring.

Item	Page	Issue	Recommendation/Comment
	C-17		<p>Modify the second sentence of the Mitigation Measures to read, “The City of Lafayette will collaborate with BART on monitoring fare gate waiting times by providing periodic <u>regular</u> reports to BART when significant <u>on new</u> development projects in the Plan Area <u>occur</u>.”</p> <p>Modify the Party Responsible for Implementation to include City of Lafayette Planning who currently tracks development proposals and BART who would need to authorize improvements at its station.</p>
5.	Thru-out	Evaluation prior to signal installation	Prior to when future traffic signals are considered, current traffic data should be used to model up, down and side stream effects and impacts.
6.	DSP: pg. 39	Policy 3.2: Fueling stations	Clarify if auto-servicing includes fueling stations, if not, please include as a use with a land use permit.
7.	DSP: pg. 49	Circulation and Streetscape, What the Plan Proposes	Add a bullet which states, “Emphasize peak traffic management strategies.”
8.	TJKM Tech Memo 10/6/11	Trip generation reductions and the 2002 General Plan	DSP EIR includes trip reduction credits for proximity to BART, etc. Clarify if the 2002 General Plan EIR utilized any trip reductions. If not, similar credits should be applied to trips in the General Plan in order to provide a fair comparison.