

# PLEASURE POINT COMMUNITY PLANNING PROCESS

COUNTY OF SANTA CRUZ  
COMMUNITY WORKSHOP #3  
September 15, 2007

## *WORKSHOP SUMMARY*



## INTRODUCTION

The Pleasure Point Community Planning Process (“the project”), initiated by the County of Santa Cruz in the fall of 2006, is intended to guide future development in the Pleasure Point area. The project is based on an analysis of Pleasure Point’s natural systems, social and cultural resources, land use and development, building character, transportation and circulation, and findings from three community workshops. In order to solicit recommendations from a broad base of stakeholders, extensive public outreach was conducted with notices sent to all homeowners and community members in the Pleasure Point study area.

At the first workshop participants identified area challenges and opportunities, and defined an overarching vision for the neighborhood. The second workshop focused on confirming the community vision and discussing potential improvements, preliminary community design principles and strategies. The purpose and outcomes of the third workshop are described in the following summary.

## WORKSHOP FORMAT AND CONTENT

On September 15th, 2007, approximately 55 community members and 10 County staff members convened for a workshop to reconfirm the community’s vision for Pleasure Point and discuss preliminary community design principles and strategies. This was the third in a series of three community planning workshops held to identify community planning issues and create guidelines for future development in the Pleasure Point area. This third workshop was held from 9:00 a.m. to noon at Simpkins Swim Center.

Tom Burns, Director of County Planning, welcomed community members and introduced Jan Beutz of the County Board of Supervisors (representing District 1, including the Pleasure Point area). Daniel Iacofano of Moore Iacofano Goltsman (MIG), Inc. provided an overview of the agenda, project and planning process, and community vision based on the previous workshops held in January and July 2007.

Mukul Malhotra (MIG, Inc.) presented a brief overview of the type of residential buildings that characterize the area, and the existing standards that regulate residential development in the Pleasure Point neighborhood, including floor area ratio (FAR), setbacks, lot coverage, garage location and size. Based on the participant response from the previous two community workshops, Anchi Mei (MIG, Inc.) and Mukul Malhotra presented proposed guidelines and standards for maintaining the unique character of the Pleasure Point neighborhood. These included standards and guidelines for private development (building mass/height and public-private interface), recommendations for public development, and implementation proposals to incorporate the proposed new standards, guidelines and recommendations into the governing process.

As a basis for discussion, score cards were provided to each participant, detailing proposed standards, guidelines, implementation proposals and discussion items. The difference between standards, guidelines and implementation proposals is as follows:

- Standards: Standards are measurable regulations required for all residential developments in Pleasure Point
- Guidelines: Strong suggestions for the residential developments requiring a Discretionary Permit in Pleasure Point (i.e. in the “Coastal Appeal” area within 300 feet of the coast or where a variance is needed)
- Recommendations: Requests for other County departments to act upon to maintain the unique character of Pleasure Point.
- Discussion Items: Items that could become proposed standards and guidelines based on community feedback.

The score card solicited participants to indicate a level of preference in relation to each proposal, with check boxes representing agreement, agreement with modifications, or disagreement. Daniel Iacofano facilitated a large group discussion in which workshop participants provided feedback to the various proposed standards, guidelines, recommendations and implementation proposals. Anchi Mei and Mukul Malhotra graphically recorded the comments expressed during the meeting. These comments, as well as preferences submitted on score cards are summarized in this summary memo. A sample score card is included as Appendix I of this document.

## **WORKSHOP SUMMARY**

Proposals were discussed in relation to four major categories: building mass and height, public-private interface, public realm, and implementation. Comments, preferences and rankings indicated on the score cards and during the workshop discussion are reviewed below. All proposed Standards, Guidelines, Recommendations, and Discussions Item are graphically displayed on the Workshop #3 PowerPoint slide presentation that can be found on the County Planning Department's Pleasure Point Community Planning Project webpage (under "what's new").

The summary is organized into the following headings:

- A. Building Mass & Height**
- B. Public-Private Interface**
- C. Public Realm**
- D. Implementation**
- E. Next Steps**
- F. Appendix:**
  - I. Sample Score Card**

## A. BUILDING MASS AND HEIGHT

There was broad support for all the standards, guidelines and discussion items relating to building mass and height except in relation to minimizing the use of stucco (Discussion item A7), where the reaction was mixed. Some community members indicated that stucco is a climatically suitable material in coastal areas and if used creatively (i.e., mixed with other building materials, etc.), could help to maintain the character of Pleasure Point. There were counter balancing opinions about proposed new setbacks (see figures, diagrams and photos on the slides of the Workshop #3 Powerpoint presentation found on the Planning Department's website). However, there was strong support for allowing porches with some modification to the proposed standard (A3) regarding porches. Participants also suggested that Guidelines A5 (encourage façade articulation) and A6 (encourage roof angles that minimize shadow impacts) be considered as standards.

The following table shows the results of the score card rankings. Descriptions of the coded standards, guidelines and discussion items are included on the following pages and in the diagrams and figures on the Pleasure Point Workshop #3 Powerpoint slideshow found on the County Planning Department's website.

	Agree	Agree with Modifications	Disagree	No Comment
<b>Proposed Standard A1</b>	29	8	6	3
<b>Proposed Standard A2</b>	30	7	7	2
<b>Proposed Standard A3</b>	31	12	2	1
Proposed Standard A3a	22	19	4	1
Proposed Standard A3b	39	3	3	1
Proposed Standard A3c	30	11	4	1
Proposed Standard A3d	35	8	2	1
Proposed Standard A3e	40	3	2	1
<b>Proposed Guideline A4</b>	29	4	10	3
<b>Proposed Guideline A5</b>	27	7	7	5
Proposed Guideline A5a	27	7	7	5
Proposed Guideline A5b	27	6	8	5
Proposed Guideline A5c	28	3	10	5
<b>Proposed Guideline A6</b>	32	5	6	3
<b>Discussion Item A7</b>	17	8	18	3
<b>Discussion Item A8</b>	29	6	5	6

Participants offered the following comments and/or specific modifications to the proposed standards, guidelines and discussion items relating to building mass and height:

### **General Comments**

- Ensure that new standards and guidelines only apply to new construction and remodeled structures.
- Clarify the definition of the “Coastal Appeal Area” (i.e. area within 300’ of coast where discretionary permit approval is required) versus the “building permit-only” area (i.e, the remainder of the neighborhood where only ministerial/over the counter permit approval is needed).
- Strengthen guidelines to limit the “mansionization” of small lots. The existing floor area ratio (FAR) standard may still be too large.
- Standards and guidelines should take into account the changes needed for 2 story buildings that are torn down and rebuilt.
- “Impact” standards should be created to mitigate the negative consequences of tear-downs, such as air and noise pollution.
- All building standards should take into account the livability needs of new residents and existing neighbors.

### **STANDARDS: Proposed measurable regulations for all residential development in Pleasure Point**

**Proposed Standard A1: Ensure that the height and setback requirements of a residential building fit within the dimensions of the designated building volume limit (see slides 32-40 of the Powerpoint presentation). Existing 0.5 Floor Area Ratio (FAR) limits will continue to govern the maximum size of residential development (i.e., building square-footage cannot exceed one-half of lot square-footage).**

This proposed standard aims to create a design framework that encourages appropriately scaled homes to maintain the “small town”/beach community character of Pleasure Point. By setting back the second stories of houses from the first story outline/footprint, light, air and solar access to neighboring houses is maximized, reducing the effect of large houses “looming over” their neighbors (which has been identified as increasing trend in Pleasure Point). While all the existing first floor setback standards are maintained, a new second floor side setback 10’ wide from the sideyard parcel line is proposed. This will help break down the overall apparent mass and bulk of two-story buildings and help minimize shade impacts on adjoining existing buildings.

### **Workshop Participant Comments:**

- Support the consideration of solar access in the creation of new setback standards.
- Explore reducing 10’ side setback of second floors.
- Consider allowing “bump-outs” on 2<sup>nd</sup> floors to allow for elements such as dormer windows. Examine an option where “bump-outs” are allowed to be a third of the length of the side building façade. Balance allowing “bump- outs” with the privacy and view needs of neighbors.
- Explore reducing lot coverage standards to 75% of existing standards.
- Explore reducing first floor height limit to 15’.
- Examine the impacts of new standards on the interior of homes.
- Favor façade articulation as opposed to increased setbacks.

**Proposed Standard A2: Allow maximum lot coverage of 45% for small lots of less than 3,500 square feet in size (see slide 41 of the Powerpoint presentation).**

The rationale for this proposed standard is to allow small lots to accommodate a desirable building size on the first floor. The existing allowable maximum lot coverage for small lots is 40%. Increasing the lot coverage could encourage greater flexibility to build more on the ground floor, and less (or not at all) on the second

floor. Similarly, this proposed standard minimizes the significant constraints that could be imposed on small lots by proposed standard A1.

**Workshop Participant Comments:**

- Encourage larger lot coverage for one-story buildings, but reduce to 40% for two-story buildings (on all lots).

**Proposed Standard A3: Encourage more front porches to be built on the ground floor (see slides 42-45 of Powerpoint presentation), based on the following criteria:**

**A3a: Porch can extend up to 6' deep into the required front yard setback (eases current restriction);**

**A3b: Porch area is not included in lot coverage or FAR calculations (eases current restriction);**

**A3c: Porch area not to exceed 140 square feet (i.e., any additional porch area gets counted in lot coverage and FAR calculations);**

**A3d: Porch must remain unenclosed (including glass); and**

**A3e: Height of porch roof not to exceed 10'.**

Encouraging well-designed porches in residential buildings, by creating incentives and removing disincentives, achieves key components of the Pleasure Point community vision. Front porches can help break down the front façade to a more human scale in tune with the character of the Pleasure Point neighborhood. Many of the existing houses in Pleasure Point have functional and aesthetically appealing front porches. Encouraging front porches by allowing them to not be counted as part of the maximum buildable FAR, but within certain limits of size, height and area will encourage more porches to be built, helping to strengthen the overall distinctive character of the neighborhood. More front porches will also encourage more opportunities for community interaction.

**Workshop Participant Comments:**

- Porches will help enhance the unique community and building character of the Pleasure Point neighborhood.
- Allow porches to continue to the side setbacks of the buildings and wrap around at building corners.
- Explore limiting porch sizes so as not to exceed more than half the length of façade.
- Explore extending the allowable width of a porch from proposed 6' to 8' to allow for bigger outdoor furniture. Additional porch space (above the 6' limit) would be included in FAR calculations.
- Allow sides of the porches to be glassed or have 'wind screens'.
- Increase the height limit of porch roofs to be 15'.

**GUIDELINES: To be "strongly encouraged" in discretionary area (within 300' of coast), but only "recommended" elsewhere**

**Proposed Guideline A4: Where possible, encourage greater setbacks between adjacent one-story buildings than between adjacent two-story buildings (see slides 47-49 of Powerpoint presentation).**

This proposed guideline stems from community concerns of the impacts of new large two-story buildings built next to existing single story buildings. It also aims to minimize the impact of the bulk and mass of larger two story buildings next to one-story buildings. This guideline also serves to respect the scale of adjoining buildings.

### **Workshop Participant Comments:**

- Provide better clarity to graphics explaining this section.
- Make this stronger than a guideline.
- Support asymmetry in side setbacks as a result of this guideline.
- Examine structural and internal physical design implications for existing one-story buildings that add an additional floor.

### **Proposed Guideline A5: Encourage façade articulation (see slides 50-54 of Powerpoint presentation) through the following techniques:**

**A5a: Create “vertical” (i.e., variable frontyard) setbacks of minimum 4’ depth (from rest of facade), for front facade segments equal to or longer than 20’ wide;**

**A5b: Break up uninterrupted front facades wider than 10’ with architectural elements such as balconies, bay windows, and sun shade devices; and**

**A5c: Use a variety of building materials, textures and colors.**

The rationale of this proposed guideline is to encourage architectural practices that will help break down the vertical and horizontal mass of large front facades to a more human scale. These guidelines also encourage the diversity of facades that is so intrinsic to Pleasure Point.

### **Workshop Participant Comments:**

- Divide this guideline into separate individual guidelines, for clarity.
- Consider making the first two sub-bulleted guidelines into standards. Retain the third sub-bullet as a guideline.
- Explore allowing bay windows to project into front yard setbacks by up to 3’.
- Explore increasing setback depth.
- Study financial impacts of using different materials.

### **Proposed Guideline A6: Encourage roof angles that minimize shadow impact (see slide 55 of Powerpoint presentation).**

The shape and profile of certain roofs can increase the shadows cast by the building. This proposed guideline encourages roof angles of new developments to be in tune with the angles of the sun to maximize the direct sunlight exposure to residents of existing residential buildings.

### **Workshop Participant Comments:**

- Consider making this guideline into a standard.

### **DISCUSSION ITEMS: Proposals that could become standards or guidelines after additional community feedback**

#### **Discussion Item A7: Minimize use of stucco to maintain the overall character of Pleasure Point (see slide 57 of Powerpoint presentation).**

A number of the older Pleasure Point homes do not have stucco as their primary façade treatment. The rationale of this discussion item was to explore community feedback to ascertain if the use (or “overuse”) of

stucco is detracting from the overall character of the neighborhood and establish an overarching framework of how stucco use in new developments.

**Workshop Participant Comments:**

- Stucco is appropriate for the coastal climate as well being termite and fire-resistant.
- Allow stucco as a material, but encourage it to be used wisely and tastefully (textured to look more like wood or contrasted with appropriate materials like wood, metal, etc) to respect the neighborhood character and avoid large wall/facade expanses of plain uninterrupted stucco.

**Discussion Item A8: Encourage the creation of a Pleasure Point Residential Design Award program (see slide 56 of Powerpoint presentation).**

This discussion item intends to explore ways of encouraging residential development that would respect the distinctive context of the neighborhood. A Pleasure Point Residential Design Award program could help create a higher standard of residential design and architecture that would then raise the overall standard of residential development in the neighborhood.

**Workshop Participant Comments:**

- Provide clear direction as to who/what entity would determine award winners.
- Ensure that the jury reflects the community and not just design experts. Include neighborhood residents as voters.

## B. PUBLIC-PRIVATE INTERFACE

There was strong support for all the standards and guidelines in the public-private interface category except in designating garage locations as either flush or behind building facades (Standard B4). Participants noted that an appropriate, well-designed façade articulation could overcome the negative visual impacts of facade-dominating garage doors. There were varying opinions about proposed Standard B5 (articulate two-car garage openings with vertical elements so as to minimize appearance). There was also concern about larger garages being used as storage areas, potentially resulting in increased parking on the street.

The table below shows the results of the score card rankings. Descriptions of the coded standards and guidelines are provided in the summary of comments following the table.

	Agree	Agree with Modifications	Disagree	No Comment
<b>Proposed Standard B1</b>	33	5	4	4
<b>Proposed Standard B2</b>	26	6	8	6
<b>Proposed Standard B3</b>	32	2	7	5
<b>Proposed Standard B4</b>	19	7	17	3
<b>Proposed Standard B5</b>	27	4	11	4
<b>Proposed Guideline B6</b>	36	3	3	4
<b>Proposed Guideline B7</b>	32	3	7	4
<b>Proposed Guideline B8</b>	30	5	8	3

The following comments and/or modifications were proposed for the public-private interface standards and guidelines:

### General Comments

- Standards and guidelines should balance neighborhood character and encourage getting parked cars off the streets. Existing street parking issues should not be magnified.

### **STANDARDS: Proposed measurable regulations for all residential development in Pleasure Point**

**Proposed Standard B1: On lots less than 30' wide, limit residential buildings to having a one car-width garage door. On lots that are 30' or wider, limit the combined width of garage doors to no more than 50% of the street-facing building façade. (See slides 60-61 of Powerpoint presentation)**

Building elements on the front facade such as windows, porches and balconies, provides opportunities for people inside to connect to the adjacent street life. Similarly, street users feel safer when their street experience is animated with these 'active' building elements. Garage doors are more passive building elements that typically discourage positive community interaction. Also, when they dominate the front facade, some of the semi-public building uses such as living rooms are relegated to the interior or rear of the house. This proposed standard aims to encourage building elements and uses that encourage community life and minimize the potential negative impacts of garages on wider lots.

### **Workshop Participant Comments:**

- Consider lowering the standard from 50% to 40%.
- Explore maximum garage door width to be 40% of the front façade.
- Examine creating a standard for a garage door to be at least 12' wide.

**Proposed Standard B2: Allow 3-car tandem parking (i.e., with one car behind the other). (See slide 62 of Powerpoint presentation).**

This standard aims to allow more tandem parking than allowed by existing standards. At the same time, 3-car tandem parking allows great opportunities for the building façade to be dominated by active building uses and not by garage doors, thereby encouraging greater opportunities for community interaction.

**Workshop Participant Comments:**

- Minimize potential negative impacts of cars parking in the side setbacks and streets.
- Allow longer and wider driveways, not larger garages.
- Determine if this standard would likely be abused by creating garages that are used for storage and not for parking cars.

**Proposed Standard B3: On lots that are 30' or wider, a maximum of a two-car garage is allowed on a building façade (see slide 63 of Powerpoint presentation).**

Three-car garage doors in the front facades take away from the traditional beach town, community friendly character of the Pleasure Point neighborhood as they create significant sections of passive building edges. This proposed standard would restrict the number of garage doors to two per unit for 30' or wider lots to minimize the negative impacts of large garages. Residential units can still fulfill their parking requirements through tandem parking.

**Workshop Participant Comments:**

- Investigate the possible implications (i.e., people not using the garage space for parking) of tandem parking, which could encourage residents to park on the street.

**Proposed Standard B4: Garages must be either flush with, or preferably, set back behind, the building façade (i.e., no more "snout houses"). (See slide 64 of Powerpoint presentation)**

The placement of garages and garage doors in front of other active building uses such as living rooms causes the garage to become a dominant feature of the house when viewed from the street, and thus takes away from the community interaction that is characteristic of Pleasure Point. Setting back the garage, or at a minimum, keeping garages flush with the front building façade, will reduce the effect of the garage dominating the facade (especially on narrow lots), and will thus enhance the interaction between private buildings and the public realm.

**Workshop Participant Comments:**

- Consider shifting this standard to a guideline, as a good design may minimize the negative impacts of the garage.
- Discourage garages that are flush with the building façade as this minimizes façade variation.

**Proposed Standard B5: Two-car garage openings must have vertical elements so as to minimize appearance/dominance (i.e., make them appear as 2 separate doors instead of one large one). (See slide 65 of Powerpoint presentation)**

Two car garage doors are typically 16' to 20' wide. Some of the garage doors in recent residential developments are essentially made of a single unarticulated material. These large monolithic elements detract from the fine grained and intimate scale of the characteristic Pleasure Point homes. This proposed standard aims to vertically break up large garage doors into two or more separate doors, or at least the appearance of such. This in turn can also assist in breaking up the overall apparent mass of the home. These elements could include vertical trims, groves and panels and the use of different materials like wood, metal and clear and obscured glass.

**Workshop Participant Comments:**

- This is a good recommendation that need not be too expensive to implement.
- Consider it as a guideline.

**GUIDELINES: To be “strongly encouraged” in discretionary area (within 300’ of coast), but only “recommended” elsewhere**

**Proposed Guideline B6: Encourage garages to be located in the rear of lots, and encourage alley access (especially for small lots), where possible (see slide 67 of Powerpoint presentation).**

Active building uses such as living rooms and building elements such as windows, entry doors and porches in the front of the parcel facing the street can enhance the opportunities for community interaction with neighbors and street users, which is a defining characteristic of the Pleasure Point neighborhood. Garages located in the rear of the lot can help to maximize these conditions. This guideline works better on wider lots and lots that have alley access, as they can better accommodate this situation.

**Workshop Participant Comments:**

- Support the guideline.
- Explore applying the guideline to lots fronting an existing alley.

**Proposed Guideline B7: Locate onsite surface parking in a compact manner that encourages larger, community-friendly, functional yard space (see slide 68 of Powerpoint presentation).**

Front yards provide great opportunities for green yard spaces and interaction between neighbors, residents and passerby. Locating the driveways and onsite parking to one side of the lot can maximize opportunities for the front yard to be used for landscaping, porches, outdoor seating, and other settings that encourage community life and interaction.

**Workshop Participant Comments:**

- Support the guideline.

**Proposed Guideline B8: Maximize plant materials in the front yard (see slide 69 of Powerpoint presentation).**

Many of the new and old residential lots have landscaped front yards with wide a variety of plant materials, including trees, shrubs and grasses. These landscaped yards contribute to the unique character of the neighborhood. When next to roads with constrained public right-of-way (ROW), front yard trees can provide protection from the elements for the pedestrians and other street users. They also help minimize the harsher impervious driveway surfaces and provide a softer greener foreground to the some of the larger building facades. The guideline encourages maximum use of plant materials in the front yard to maintain the small town/beach community open space character of the Pleasure Point neighborhood.

**Workshop Participant Comments:**

- Encourage larger plants with maximum height of 3'6" and bigger canopy trees.
- Soften fencing with plant materials.
- Consider fire safety while creating a plant palette. Encourage fire resistant plants. Encourage the use of native, drought tolerant plants (not lawns).
- Encourage the use of permeable driveway materials.

### C. PUBLIC REALM

All recommendations related to the public realm received strong support. Community members widely welcomed the proposed classification and suggested improvements of existing Pleasure Point streets to enhance pedestrian and bike safety and comfort, while maintaining the existing unique character of Pleasure Point. The table below shows the results of the score card rankings. Descriptions of the coded recommendations are provided in the summary of comments following the table.

	Agree	Agree with Modifications	Disagree	No Comment
<b>Recommendation C1</b>	28	9	3	6
Recommendation C1a	27	10	3	6
Recommendation C1b	28	9	3	6
Recommendation C1c	30	8	3	5
<b>Recommendation C2</b>	35	6	2	3
<b>Recommendation C3</b>	40	2	1	3
<b>Recommendation C4</b>	39	3	2	2

The following comments and/or modifications were proposed for recommendations relating to the public realm:

#### General Comments

- Encourage “green infrastructure” where possible.
- Encourage informal country streets with soft natural edges and curves that are comfortable for walkers and bikers.

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS: Suggested actions for other County departments to take maintain the unique character of Pleasure Point.**

**Recommendation C1: County to recognize existing conditions on local neighborhood streets as “Pleasure Point Street Standards”, which may be different than County road standards elsewhere, and complete conceptual street improvement plans via the County’s “Plan Line” Process for all major through streets (see slides 72-76 of Powerpoint presentation). Recommend the following characteristics for different street types:**

#### **Major Streets**

- 40’ to 60’ right-of-way
- Includes 26th, 30th, 38th and 41st Avenues, East Cliff Drive, & Portola Drive
- Street Plans (i.e. “Plan Lines”) to be prepared for 26th & 38th Avenues, & East Cliff Drive from Corcoran Lagoon to 32nd Avenue
- Two travel lanes with 20 to 22’ width
- Minimum 4’ wide bike lanes where possible
- Minimum 4’ wide dedicated pedestrian pathway/sidewalk on at least one side, separated by landscape where possible
- Drainage by curbs and gutters, where necessary
- Parking on one side or both sides, if possible

#### **Local Pleasure Point Neighborhood Streets**

- 40’ to 50’ right-of-way
- Includes all other non-alley streets
- Travel lanes with 18 to 20 feet width
- Shoulder stripe, centerline stripe only as necessary for safety and to prevent passing
- Shared right-of-way
- Drainage swales on shoulders (instead of curbs and gutters)

- **Parking on shoulders wherever sufficient width available**

#### ***Alley and Private Streets***

- **Right-of-way width varies**
- **Includes Manzanita and Madrone Avenues and others**
- **Allow alleys to provide primary (or secondary) residential auto access to the rear of abutting parcels**
- **No on-street parking for right-of-way less than 25 to 30'**
- **Shared right-of-way**
- **May require signage for fire and emergency access**

The public realm contributes to Pleasure Point neighborhood's unique character, particularly with respect to streetscapes. The streets within the neighborhood boundary are categorized based on the following criteria: existing ROW; configuration, length, and location; type and amount of automobile use; bicycle and pedestrian use ; and improvement opportunities. The proposed recommendation calls for future improvements to some of these streets, while taking into account their unique features, as defined by the characteristics mentioned in the recommendation.

#### **Workshop Participant Comments:**

- Consider traffic calming on major streets by allowing street calming elements such as chokers, speed bumps, bulb-outs, traffic circles, etc.
- Enforce speed limits. Lower speed limits on local streets to 15 miles per hour.
- Ensure proper height of speed signs.
- Encourage bike lanes up to 5' wide if possible.
- Study and mitigate possibilities of "funneling" increased traffic to some streets.
- Study old Plan Line for 38<sup>th</sup> Avenue and ensure that it aligns with the community's needs.
- Encourage Portola, 41<sup>st</sup> and East Cliff as major streets but create a different category with refined recommendations for 26<sup>th</sup>, 30<sup>th</sup> and 38<sup>th</sup> to serve as local connectors.
- Explore the use of French drains.
- Encourage better maintenance of private roads by requiring them to be paved. Keep in mind the road association agreements regarding pavement.
- Explore permeable materials and decomposed granite for pathways.

#### **Recommendation C2: Improve safety of crosswalks across Portola Drive, particularly at 36th and 26th Avenues, by adding overhead lights where needed and crosswalk safety warning lights (push-button activated). (See slide 77 Powerpoint presentation)**

Portola Drive is wide with busy, fast-paced traffic. It can be unsafe for pedestrians and bicyclists to cross at the key intersections of 36th and 26th Avenues. The proposed recommendation is to install overhead streetlights where needed for night-time visibility, and push-button activated warning lights at these intersections to improve the overall safety of crossing pedestrians and bicyclists.

#### **Workshop Participant Comments:**

- Explore making 26<sup>th</sup> Avenue one-way with bike paths and sidewalks.
- Examine the potential of installing a stop sign at 36<sup>th</sup> Avenue & Portola Drive.

#### **Recommendation C3: Maintain and enhance coastal access points in keeping with neighborhood character (see slide 78 of Powerpoint presentation).**

Proximity to various natural resources/elements such as Monterey Bay, Moran Lake, Moran Creek and Corcoran Lagoon assist in providing the Pleasure Point neighborhood with its unique character. Various existing pedestrian pathways connect streets to the coast and other natural resources. Coastal connections include stepped pedestrian paths from Rockview and East Cliff Drive at 30th Avenue. Similarly, pedestrian pathways exist along Moran Lake and Creek. The recommendation aims to maintain and strengthen these connections to maintain the neighborhood's unique character and integrity. Potential new pedestrian connections to Moran Creek could include paths through the Sanitation Facility from the southeast end of Quartz and Lode Streets.

**Workshop Participant Comments:**

- Balance need to access public coastline with neighborhood responsibility.

**Recommendation C4: Encourage undergrounding of utility infrastructure along the scenic corridor portion of East Cliff Drive, where feasible (see slide 79 of Powerpoint presentation).**

The existing overhead utilities along East Cliff Drive between 32<sup>nd</sup> and 41<sup>st</sup> Avenues detract from the positive experience of the various street users (pedestrians, bicyclists and drivers). This recommendation proposes to underground the physically and visually obtrusive utilities so that scenic quality of East Cliff can be fully realized and appreciated.

**Workshop Participant Comments:**

- Explore increasing the area for undergrounding to other parts of Pleasure Point.

## D. IMPLEMENTATION

A majority of workshop participants either agreed with implementation proposals or agreed with minor modifications (specifically for D1, D2 and D3). While there was strong support for D7 (evaluate the potential for acquisition of properties with a park site designation, and the Roadhouse property on East Cliff Drive), there was greater interest in spending money on existing and new parks and open spaces.

The table below shows the results of the score card rankings. Descriptions of the coded implementation proposals are provided in the summary of comments following the table.

	Agree	Agree with Modifications	Disagree	No Comment
<b>Implementation Proposal D1</b>	26	10	5	5
<b>Implementation Proposal D2</b>	25	10	4	7
<b>Implementation Proposal D3</b>	25	7	9	5
<b>Implementation Proposal D4</b>	34	2	3	7
<b>Implementation Proposal D5</b>	35	2	3	6
<b>Implementation Proposal D6</b>	39	2	0	5
<b>Implementation Proposal D7</b>	35	3	5	3

The following comments and/or modifications were proposed for the implementation proposals:

### General Comments

- None

### IMPLEMENTATION PROPOSALS:

**Implementation Proposal D1: Add proposed new standards that will apply to all residential development in the Pleasure Point neighborhood. Add the proposed guidelines (i.e., as “guidelines”, not “standards”) to the County code that applies to discretionary projects only (i.e., projects that require a public hearing, located within 300’ of the coast or that need a variance).**

The proposed new standards aim to strengthen the character of the entire Pleasure Point neighborhood. In order to maintain consistency throughout the neighborhood and streamline the permitting process, the proposed new standards will need to be uniformly applied to both the discretionary and non-discretionary areas of the neighborhood. However, the guidelines will apply to only the discretionary areas as defined in the implementation proposal.

### Workshop Participant Comments:

- Consider applying guidelines to nondiscretionary projects and, perhaps, all residential development in Pleasure Point.
- Study whether the proposed standards are more attuned to the needs of the Pleasure Point area as opposed to the 26<sup>th</sup> Avenue community (which has more large lots).
- Consider removing guidelines from this proposal and making them all standards.

**Implementation Proposal D2: For the non-discretionary areas that only require a ministerial building permit (i.e. greater than 300’ from the coast), add a new discretionary exception process for applicants that cannot or will not comply with new ministerial standards (allowing for some flexibility from the standards in unusual circumstances).**

To the largest extent possible, this process has attempted to propose standards and guidelines based on the different typologies of parcels and streets fronting them. However, there may be unusual circumstances which have not been analyzed, such as irregular configuration of a parcel or natural special elements within a parcel, which may require some flexibility from the existing and proposed standards. As a result, a new discretionary exception process in non-discretionary areas is proposed to accommodate these and other special circumstances.

**Workshop Participant Comments:**

- Support the fact that the proposal keeps the door open for exceptions.

**Implementation Proposal D3: Require use of visual simulations and/or story poles to indicate mass and height of two-story houses larger than 2,500 square feet for discretionary projects (i.e. within 300' feet from the coast or for variances/exceptions).**

Various methods can give an approximate idea of the overall size, mass and height of proposed development with respect to the adjoining buildings. Scaled models, hand drawn perspectives and computer generated simulations are good examples of these methods. Similarly, 1:1 scaled story poles on the site can give a fair idea of the potential impacts of overall mass and height of large two-story buildings. This proposal aims to better communicate the scale of the new residential development in the Pleasure Point neighborhood to both County staff and residents.

**Workshop Participant Comments:**

- Ensure "safety legs" for the story poles.
- Explore applying this proposal to all residential development in Pleasure Point.

**Implementation Proposal D4: Recommend that the Department of Public Works incorporate the street guidelines (Recommendation C1) into the County Design Criteria as an exception (i.e., for the Pleasure Point area only).**

Most of the proposed street guidelines are responses to the physical and social context of Pleasure Point. They reflect the constraints, opportunities and overarching community vision of the community members. However, they may not be aligned with the needs and physical context of the other County neighborhoods. Thus this proposal aims to incorporate the special street guidelines into the County Design Criteria as an exception applicable to the special needs of the Pleasure Point neighborhood only.

**Workshop Participant Comments:**

- None

**Implementation Proposal D5: Encourage the Department of Public Works to allow the use of various materials in the parking lane outside of private property. Provide a menu of materials and techniques acceptable to the Department of Public Works for residents to improve the parking lane outside of their property.**

In order to implement the intimate scale and 'green' character of the streets, various solutions can be explored in the parking lane of the streets. These solutions could include special types of paving and planting

that would reduce the overall amount and imperviousness of asphalt, thereby calming the streets and reducing runoff. However, these solutions require materials and techniques that may not be in the County's existing menu of acceptable practices. In consultation with the Department of Public Works, a new menu of materials and techniques could be developed for residents to improve the parking lane outside their property.

**Workshop Participant Comments:**

- None

**Implementation Proposal D6: Encourage the development of environmentally sensitive drainage and infrastructure solutions.**

The issues relating to drainage and infrastructure, such as flooding are important to maintaining a safe and accessible public realm. However, to the largest extent possible, the solutions to these issues should also address the desire of the community vision for an environmentally sensitive neighborhood. These solutions could include integrated storm water drains, bioswales and special planting. However, the solutions should respond to the physical context of the Pleasure Point streets, including annual precipitation, slope of the road and high water table.

**Workshop Participant Comments:**

- Explore French drains and other environmentally sensitive solutions.

**Implementation Proposal D7: Evaluate the potential for acquisition of properties with a park site designation, and the Roadhouse property on East Cliff Drive.**

There are some sites in the neighborhood, such as the Roadhouse property, that people associate with the unique history and culture of the neighborhood. If possible, the County should explore the acquisition of these symbolic sites, which could then become key community amenities such as gathering places. Detailed studies would need to be done to establish their historic and cultural importance.

**Workshop Participant Comments:**

- Encourage acquisition of roadhouse as community space/heritage historic structures.
- Push for more money for more open space and enhancing existing parks and open spaces such as Moran Lake and the Hook.

## **E. NEXT STEPS**

---

Based on the feedback received from the community workshop, staff and consultants will revise and refine the various standards, guidelines, recommendations and implementation proposals. These will be incorporated in the Draft Pleasure Point Neighborhood Community Report, which will be made public by County Staff for public input and review. It will thereafter be presented to the County Board of Supervisors, for final comments and community feedback.

***APPENDIX I***  
***Community Workshop #3 Sample Score Card***

## D. IMPLEMENTATION

Agree      Agree with  
                 Modifications      Disagree

### IMPLEMENTATION PROPOSAL D1 \_\_\_\_\_

Add new standards to the county code that apply only to Pleasure Point neighborhood.

          

### IMPLEMENTATION PROPOSAL D2 \_\_\_\_\_

Add new standards (including second floor setbacks) to existing permit checklist and "site and structural dimensions chart".

          

For the Residential Exclusion Jurisdiction, add a new discretionary exception process for applicants that cannot or will not comply with new ministerial standards and thus, allowing for some flexibility from the standards in unusual circumstances (i.e. structural problems with proposed additions.)

### IMPLEMENTATION PROPOSAL D3 \_\_\_\_\_

Require use of visual simulations and/or 'story poles' to indicate mass and height of two-story houses larger than 2,500 square feet for the Coastal Appeal Jurisdiction Area and/or other discretionary review permits.

          

### IMPLEMENTATION PROPOSAL D4 \_\_\_\_\_

Recommend that the street guidelines be incorporated into the County Design Criteria as an exception.

          

### IMPLEMENTATION PROPOSAL D5 \_\_\_\_\_

Encourage the Department of Public Works to allow the use of various materials in the parking lane outside of private property. Provide a menu of materials and techniques acceptable to the Department of Public Works for residents to improve the parking lane outside of their property.

          

### IMPLEMENTATION PROPOSAL D6 \_\_\_\_\_

Encourage the development of environmentally sensitive drainage and infrastructure solutions

          

### IMPLEMENTATION PROPOSAL D7 \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluate the potential for acquisition of properties with a park site designation, and the Roadhouse property on East Cliff Drive

          

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Address \_\_\_\_\_

If you are unable to return this at the end of the meeting, please mail or fax to:  
Pleasure Point Community Planning Process c/o Frank Barron, Project Manager  
County of Santa Cruz, Planning Department  
701 Ocean Street, Santa Cruz, CA 95060  
Fax: (831) 454-2131

# Pleasure Point Community Planning Process

COMMUNITY WORKSHOP #3: PROPOSED STANDARDS, GUIDELINES & RECOMMENDATIONS

September 15, 2007 • 9 a.m.-11:30 p.m.

Simpkins Family Swim Center • 979 17th Avenue, Santa Cruz

## SCORE CARD

This Score Card is provided for your convenience. Please provide written comments below and return the comment card to the facilitators at the end of the workshop. Please note that **Standards** are measurable regulations required for all residential developments in Pleasure Point, and **Guidelines** are strong suggestions for the residential developments requiring a Discretionary Permit. **Recommendations** are requests for other departments to act upon to maintain the unique character of Pleasure Point. **Implementation Proposals** are suggestions for incorporating the proposed new standards, guidelines and recommendations within the government process.

**Thank You!**

## A. BUILDING MASS AND HEIGHT

Agree      Agree with  
                 Modifications      Disagree

### PROPOSED STANDARD A1 \_\_\_\_\_

Ensure that the height and setback requirements of a residential building fit within the dimensions of the designated building volume. F.A.R. will continue to govern the maximum size of residential development

          

### PROPOSED STANDARD A2 \_\_\_\_\_

Allow maximum lot coverage of 45% for lots less than 3,500 sq. ft.

          

### PROPOSED STANDARD A3 \_\_\_\_\_

Allow front porches on the ground floor based on the following criterion:

- Extend up to 6' deep into the required front yard setback
- Area not to exceed 140 square feet
- Remain Unenclosed (including glass)
- Height of roof not to exceed 10'
- Porch area is not included in lot coverage or FAR.

          

             
              
              
              
           

### PROPOSED GUIDELINE A4 \_\_\_\_\_

Where possible, encourage greater setbacks from an adjacent one-story building than from an adjacent two-story building.

          

### PROPOSED GUIDELINE A5 \_\_\_\_\_

Encourage façade articulation through the following techniques:

- Create vertical setbacks of about 4' wide, for front facade segments equal to or longer than 20' wide.
- Break up uninterrupted front facades wider than 10' with architectural elements such as balconies, bay windows, and sun shade devices.
- Use a variety of building materials, textures and colors.

          

             
              
           

### PROPOSED GUIDELINE A6 \_\_\_\_\_

Encourage roof angles that minimize shadow impact.

          

### PROPOSED GUIDELINE A7 \_\_\_\_\_

Encourage the creation of a Pleasure Point Residential Design Award program.

          

### DISCUSSION ITEM A8 \_\_\_\_\_

Minimize use of stucco to maintain the overall character of Pleasure Point

## B. PUBLIC PRIVATE INTERFACE

Agree    Agree with  
Modifications    Disagree

### PROPOSED STANDARD B1

On lots less than 30' wide, limit residential buildings to one car garage door. On lots that are 30' or wider, limit width of garage doors to 50% of the street facing building façade.

      

### PROPOSED STANDARD B2

Allow 3-car tandem parking.

      

### PROPOSED STANDARD B3

On lots that are 30' or wider, a maximum of a two-car garage is allowed on a building façade.

      

### PROPOSED STANDARD B4

Garages must be either flush or behind the building façade.

      

### PROPOSED STANDARD B5

Articulate two-car garage openings with vertical elements so as to minimize appearance.

      

### PROPOSED GUIDELINE B6

Encourage garages in the rear of lots and encourage alley access where possible.

      

### PROPOSED GUIDELINE B7

Locate onsite surface parking in a compact manner that encourages larger, community-friendly, functional yard space.

      

### PROPOSED GUIDELINE B8

Maximize plant materials in the front yard.

      

## C. PUBLIC REALM

Agree    Agree with  
Modifications    Disagree

### RECOMMENDATION C1

Recognize existing conditions on local neighborhood streets as Pleasure Point street standards and complete conceptual street improvement plans, via the County's Plan Line Process, for all Major Through Streets. Recommend following characteristics for different street types:

#### • MAJOR STREET

- 40' to 60' Right of Way
- Includes 26th, 30th, 38th and 41st Ave, East Cliff Dr, & Portola Dr
- Plan Lines to be prepared for 26th & 38th Ave, & East Cliff Dr from Corcoran Lagoon to 32 Ave
- 2 travel lanes with 20' to 22' width
- Minimum 4' bike lanes where possible
- Minimum 4' dedicated pedestrian pathway on one side, separated by a landscape strip where possible
- Drainage by curbs and gutter, where necessary
- Parking on one side or both, if possible

      

      

#### • LOCAL PLEASURE POIN NEIGHBORHOOD STREET

- 40' to 50' Right of Way
- Includes all other non-alley streets
- Travel lanes with 18 to 20' width
- Shoulder stripe, center line stripe only as necessary for safety and to prevent passing
- Shared Right of Way
- Drainage swales on shoulders
- Parking on shoulders wherever sufficient width

      

#### • ALLEY & PRIVATE STREETS

- ROW Varies
- Includes Manzanita and Madrone Avenues and others
- Allow alleys minimum standards to provide residential auto access
- NO parking for right of way less than 25 to 30 feet
- Shared Right of Way
- May require signage for fire and emergency access

      

### RECOMMENDATION C2

Improve safety of crosswalks across Portola Drive, particularly at 36th and 26th Avenue by adding crosswalk safety warning lights (push-button activated).

      

### RECOMMENDATION C3

Maintain and enhance coastal access points in keeping with neighborhood character.

      

### RECOMMENDATION C4

Encourage undergrounding utility infrastructure along the scenic corridor portion of East Cliff Drive, where feasible.