DOWNTOWN SPECIFIC PLAN (DSP)

INFORMATION ITEM
TOPICS

- Background - DSP History
- Tinting or Reflective Glass on Storefront Windows
- Signs for Non-Street Front Uses
- Building height and setback along street-side property lines
- Design review process
- Parking requirements for Non-profit Museum uses
- Parking standards and the Parking In-Lieu Fee program
BACKGROUND

- DSP established on August 1, 2000
- Multi-year visioning process (Downtown Task Force)
- Purpose/vision:
  1) Revitalize the Downtown,
  2) Improve its physical appearance, and
  3) Maintain its existing “village” and pedestrian-friendly character
- Development Standards
- Design Standards
- Implementation Plan/Incentives
TINTING OR REFLECTIVE GLASS ON STOREFRONT WINDOWS

Storefront windows shall be clear glass, neither tinted nor reflective. Windows may be shaded by street trees, awnings and arbors.

Intent: To allow transparency and promote a pedestrian friendly Downtown.

Alternative provisions: 1) Allow subject to Planning and Building Safety (PBS) Director review or 2) Eliminate the restriction entirely.

Planning Commission Recommendation:
- Relax or eliminate the window tinting restrictions
- Maintain the restriction on reflective glass
SIGNS FOR NON-STREET FRONT USES

Current language:
"Perpendicular/Pedestrian signage may be used for non-street fronting businesses and shall be no more than nine square feet."
"A maximum of two square feet of lettered/logo and/or icon painted directly onto the entrance (without a background)."

Intent: to allow for attractive signs in scale with existing buildings

Alternative provisions: 1) Allow additional sign types and area for non-street fronting businesses

Planning Commission Recommendation:
-In favor of additional signage, but limited in area
-In favor of giving the Commission to review and approve signage that exceeds the limits
BUILDING HEIGHT AND SETBACK ALONG STREET-SIDE PROPERTY LINES

Current language:

"To the extent a building exceeds 30 feet in height, the front portion of the building that exceeds 30 feet in height must be setback 25 feet from the front property line."

Intent: to allow reduce the height and mass of buildings along street frontages ("canyonization effect")
BUILDING HEIGHT AND SETBACK ALONG STREET-SIDE PROPERTY LINES

Current language:
“...the front portion of the building that exceeds 30 feet in height must be setback 25 feet from the front property line.”

Intent: to allow reduce the height and mass of buildings along street frontages (“canyonization effect”)

Alternative provisions: For corner lot street-side setbacks, require a similar or reduced setback for buildings exceeding 30 feet in height.

Planning Commission Recommendation
- Not in favor of establishing an additional setback along street-facing side property lines
- Requested more information regarding this issue and lot sizes

Main Street and Holly Avenue
Alternative provisions: For corner lot street-side setbacks, require a similar or reduced setback for buildings exceeding 30 feet in height.

Planning Commission Recommendation
- Not in favor of establishing an additional setback along street-facing side property lines
- Requested more information regarding this issue and lot sizes
45'-0" Height

- P.L: 26'-0"
- Existing Grade: 80'
- Face of Conc. Curb: 12'
- 3 Stories = 45'-0" Max.
- 26'-0"

Main Street

Existing Grade
Alternative Language
(Minimum setback along side street)

Current Language
(Zero setback along side street)
DESIGN REVIEW PROCESS IN THE DSP

- DSP Section VIII - Design Standards
- Current language: Design standards regarding the development of public and private property (site planning and architectural treatment).
- Current process: 1) plan check or 2) administrative approval by the PBS Director or designee
- Current fee: $275 (for all projects)
- Intent: to maintain the existing community context and character
DESIGN REVIEW PROCESS IN THE DSP

- Alternative provisions: 1) Establish different levels of review (ministerial, administrative, and/or Planning Commission), and 2) determine the types of projects that require either level of review

- Planning Commission Recommendation:
  - In favor of a more defined design review process
  - Clearly defining which project types require each type of review
PARKING REQUIREMENTS FOR NON-PROFIT MUSEUM USES - EL SEGUNDO MUSEUM OF ART (ESMOA)

Required Parking: Nine (9) parking spaces are required for ESMOA based on the size of the museum.

Provided Parking: No on-site parking spaces are provided. ESMOA has made arrangements to use parking on nearby parking lots owned by Chevron on weekends and for special events.

The museum has a small staff and is typically closed on weekdays.

Planning Commission Recommendation:
- Not in favor of waiving or discounting parking in-lieu fees or eliminating the parking requirements for museums
- In favor of a parking demand study to evaluate and manage the parking for the museum’s regular operations
- In favor of valet parking and use of off-site parking (without a covenant) for large events
Parking Incentives:

1) Restaurants and Outdoor dining (1st 200 s.f. excluded)

2) Change and intensification in use (e.g. general office to medical office, retail to restaurant, office to restaurant, etc.)

3) Parking Demand Studies for shared uses and Parking Reductions (up to 20%)

4) Historic Buildings (50% addition, up to 500 s.f.)

5) Parking In-Lieu Fee
PARKING IN-LIEU FEE PROGRAM

- Adopted in 2003
- Purpose - additional development incentive
- Current fee per space: $17,500
- Modified in 2009 to allow payment over a 20-year period and to allow in-lieu payments for temporary uses

- Six properties have made use of the program to-date
  - Four restaurants: Rock and Brews, The Farmstand, Second City Bistro, and Deluca’s)
  - Two medical offices: (319 Main Street - Wedgewood Properties and 422 and 426 Main Street - Mixed Use retail/office/residential use building)
CONCERNS REGARDING PARKING IN THE DOWNTOWN

- The demand for parking has increased, because new businesses (restaurants primarily) moved to the area and existing businesses have expanded.

- The parking supply has not increased at the same rate, because businesses have made use of Downtown parking incentives.

- This has resulted in a shortage of parking on some blocks of the Downtown.
## PARKING MANAGEMENT PLAN

- The DSP anticipated increased demand for parking as development occurred in the area.
- The DSP included the outline of a parking management plan with:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short-term options</th>
<th>Mid-term options</th>
<th>Long-term options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Create Visitor Parking Map</td>
<td>a) Implement Trial Period Shared Valet Parking Program During Peak Season</td>
<td>a) Install Parking Meters on Selected Streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Implement a Shared Use Parking Program</td>
<td>b) Add On-Street Angle Parking</td>
<td>b) Continue to Investigate Costs and Feasibility of Added Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Establish Baseline Parking Ratios for the Downtown as a whole and Monitor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Enhance Directional Signage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Provide staff direction on each of the items discussed

1. Tinting or Reflective Glass on Storefront Windows
2. Signs for Non-Street Front Uses
3. Building height and setback along street-side property lines
4. Design review process
5. Parking requirements for Non-profit Museum uses
6. Parking standards and the Parking In-Lieu Fee program
THE END
PARTICIPATION IN THE PARKING IN-LIEU FEE PROGRAM

- Six businesses (4 restaurants and 2 commercial office uses) have participated in the parking in-lieu fee program to date.

- 139, 319, 422 and 426 Main Street (Rock and Brews, Wedgewood Properties, Mixed Use retail/office/residential use building, The Farmstand).

- 223 and 225 Richmond Street (Second City Bistro, Deluca’s).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPTIONS</th>
<th>DESIRED EFFECTS/ISSUES</th>
<th>Relative Cost to Implement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H, M, L (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Short-Term Parking Management Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Desired Effects/Issues</th>
<th>Relative Cost to Implement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create Visitor Parking Information Guide/Map</td>
<td>• increase awareness of parking opportunities&lt;br&gt;• more effective use of available parking&lt;br&gt;• need support of business community to circulate guide/map</td>
<td>Low (approximately $5,000 to $10,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement a Shared Use Parking Program</td>
<td>• better utilize available private spaces&lt;br&gt;• would require additional detailed analysis and coordination with private property owners</td>
<td>Low (staff/administration costs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish Baseline Parking Ratios for the Downtown as a Whole and Monitor Over Time</td>
<td>• identify current parking surplus&lt;br&gt;• monitor development as it occurs and its impact on overall parking operations&lt;br&gt;• add new parking or take other actions when supply reaches approximately 85% of demand, prior to reaching a critical point</td>
<td>Moderate (staff/administration costs equivalent to several hours per week, after initial labor intensive inventory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance Directional Signage</td>
<td>• provide more clear and consistent signage&lt;br&gt;• better utilize alley-access parking&lt;br&gt;• enhance aesthetics</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Mid-Term Parking Management Options

| Implement Trial Period Shared Valet Parking Program During Peak Season | • provide convenient customer parking  
• assist parking impacted business  
• need to analyze potential sites and select Contractor | Low to Moderate  
($5,000 to $15,000 per season for City support) |
|---|---|---|
| Add On-street Angle Parking | • provide more spaced via use of angle rather than parallel curb parking  
• slows traffic, promotes pedestrian use | Moderate  
(costs for signing and striping) |

(1) Cost:  
- **H** - High Cost associated with major capital expenditure,  
- **M** - Moderate Cost for physical improvements and/or staff administrative costs,  
- **L** - Low Cost reflecting limited staff time allocation or minor supplies/equipment cost.
### Longer Term Parking Management Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Install Parking Meters on Selected Streets</th>
<th>Moderate to High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• manage the parking supply, enhance turnover for businesses</td>
<td>(Initial cost, ultimately self supporting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• prevent all-day parking by employees in prime spaces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• raise revenues needed for parking expansions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**While Implementing Parking Management Strategies, Continue to Investigate Costs and Feasibility of Added Parking**

| • provide added patron and employee parking | High to Very High |
| • remove employee parking from adjacent residential streets | |
| • requires additional detailed analysis of economic factors | |

(1) **Cost:**
- **H** - High Cost associated with major capital expenditure,
- **M** - Moderate Cost for physical improvements and/or staff administrative costs,
- **L** - Low Cost reflecting limited staff time allocation or minor supplies/equipment cost.
PARKING REQUIREMENTS FOR NON-PROFIT MUSEUM USES - EL SEGUNDO MUSEUM OF ART (ESMOA)

Options:

1. Amend the DSP to reduce or eliminate the parking requirement for non-profit museums
2. Parking Demand Study
3. Allow more special events per year (currently only four are allowed), where parking can be approved on a case-by-case basis.