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RESOLUTION NO. 91-185

RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE NEW MONTEREY AREA PLAN AS AN ELEMENT OF THE CITY OF MONTEREY GENERAL PLAN

WHEREAS, the City Code and the Monterey General Plan encourage the development of area plans to translate city-wide goals, policies, programs, and land use recommendations from its General Plan into more specific neighborhood recommendations; and

WHEREAS, this Area Plan is an element of the City General Plan and should be used by City Staff, the Planning Commission, and City Council in determining zoning and subdivision consistency with the General Plan when considering all proposed public and private development projects; and

WHEREAS, adoption of the Area Plan will result in minor changes to the Land Use Element of the General Plan relating to Open Space and Commercial designations; and

WHEREAS, the City Council has adopted criteria for adopting Area Plans and staff has reviewed the plan to assure that the plan complies with those criteria; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission held three public hearings on this Area Plan; and

WHEREAS, the City Council held five public hearings on this Area Plan;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE MONTEREY CITY COUNCIL that the New Monterey Area Plan is hereby adopted as an element of the City General Plan, and the Land Use Element of the General Plan is amended to be consistent with the New Monterey Area Plan.

PASSED AND ADOPTED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MONTEREY this 24th day of October, 1991, by the following vote:

AYES: 3 COUNCILMEMBERS: CANEPA, VREELAND, ALBERT

NOES: 0 COUNCILMEMBERS: NONE

DISQUALIFIED: 2 COUNCILMEMBERS: EDGREN, OUTZEN
Because of conflict of interest:

ATTEST:               APPROVED:

/s/CYNTHIA PARHAM  /s/DANIEL ALBERT
City Clerk thereof    Mayor of said City
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1.0 PREFACE

The New Monterey Area Plan was originally adopted in 1980. It had a target life of 15 years; however, development has occurred at a faster rate than anticipated, and the number of units constructed between 1980 and 1990 exceeds the build-out capacity of the plan. This plan is an update of the 1980 plan and will guide development of the neighborhood for the next 10 years.

The general direction of this plan is:

- The existing residential General Plan and zoning designations will remain unchanged.
- The attributes which make the neighborhood a desirable place to live will be enhanced.
- The conditions which detract from the neighborhood will be diminished.

In summer, 1989, a door-to-door neighborhood survey was conducted in New Monterey. Surveys were also mailed to absentee land owners. A total of 2,314 surveys were distributed, and 1,137 were returned, for a 49% response rate. In the R-1 areas, 643 of 1,025 surveys were returned, for a 62% response. In R-3 areas, 445 of 1,289 surveys were returned, for a 35% response. Surveys included both residents and absentee landowners. The survey questionnaire covered a wide variety of subjects including what residents like and don't like about the neighborhood and the adequacy of City policies and services within the neighborhood.

In late 1989 and early 1990, City staff held several meetings with the New Monterey Area Plan Committee to review changes which have occurred since adoption of the 1980 plan and to review issues raised in the survey process. Policies for New Monterey were adopted, based on the survey and neighborhood meeting input.
2.0 INTRODUCTION

2.1 WHAT IS AN AREA PLAN?

Under State planning law, each city is required to adopt a General Plan to guide the long-range development of the city. Each General Plan must contain seven elements which, together, compose an integrated set of goals, policies and action programs. In addition to the seven required elements, a city can adopt additional discretionary elements or address any other subjects which, in the judgement of the City Council, relate to the physical development of the city. The Monterey City Code and the General Plan both provide for adoption of area plans. The General Plan provides that "area plans should be adopted as part of the General Plan in the same manner as elements. They translate the general, citywide goals, policies, programs and land use recommendations into more specific recommendations for particular areas of the city." The City Code provides, in part, that area plans should "relate the city-wide policies and programs of the General Plan to particular neighborhoods or other areas of the city" and that "policies and implementation programs...should be more specific and for a shorter time period than the General Plan."

This Area Plan identifies policies and programs that require City Council appropriation or result in an increased or new level of city services. Such items will be referred to the appropriate budget review process. They are identified in the text with an asterisk (*). They are also listed in Chapter 6.0 for easy referral. This list will be reviewed annually for items to be considered for funding in the annual City budget.

2.2 WHAT DOES AN AREA PLAN DO?

The Area Plan gives direction to both the City and the neighborhood on the growth and development of the neighborhood over the next ten years. The plan should be reviewed annually and updated as needed to reflect the current desires of the neighborhood and to assure that the plan is consistent with ongoing city-wide policies.
3.0 THE PLANNING AREA

New Monterey is the largest neighborhood in the city. It consists of 295 acres of hillside overlooking Cannery Row and Monterey Bay. Area boundaries are Pacific Grove to the northwest and southwest, the Presidio of Monterey to the southeast, and Cannery Row to the northeast. The primary features of New Monterey are its residential nature, grid street pattern, hillside slopes, ocean views, sea breezes, fog, and its complex physical and social mixture.

In contrast to its name, New Monterey is one of the oldest neighborhoods on the Monterey Peninsula. The first subdivision in the neighborhood was recorded by W.C. Little in 1886. Since that time, it has been substantially built out. There is very little vacant land in New Monterey, and most new development in the past twenty years has taken place by removal of a house in order to build apartments or larger houses.

New Monterey is a residential neighborhood. The General Plan (Figure 1) and zoning (Figure 2) are exclusively residential, except three commercial lots which are developed with commercial use (two lots on the Corner of David and Hawthorne and one lot on Hawthorne between Drake and Dickman). There is a small commercial area at Taylor and Prescott, and there are scattered commercial uses on the Bay side of Hawthorne Street.
Figure 1
NEW MONTEREY NEIGHBORHOOD
Existing General Plan

- Parks, Recreation, Open Space
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Figure 2
NEW MONTEREY NEIGHBORHOOD
Existing Zoning

R-1-5   Single Family Residential
R-3-5   Multiple Family Residential
C-2    Community Commercial
O      Open Space
4.0 NEIGHBORHOOD ISSUES

The 1989 New Monterey Neighborhood Survey gives a picture of what residents like and don't like about the neighborhood and what changes they would support in the neighborhood. The following are the major issues identified by the survey. These issues are the primary focus of the area plan. The following is a summary of the strongest survey responses, with the highest responses listed first.

**Tree Preservation.** 88% of the responses favored tree preservation. Of the "yes" responses, 65% favor requiring permits for tree removal, and 56% favor city street tree planting programs.

**Historic Preservation.** 74% of the responses favored preserving older or historic buildings.

**Bus Ridership.** 71% never ride the bus. 69% would not use the bus even if more convenient.

**Security.** 67% feel there is no security problem in the neighborhood. 64% would favor a neighborhood watch program.

**Street Widening.** 66% do not favor widening of streets in their immediate area.

**Apartments.** 61% oppose more apartments. There were several questions about apartment preferences if apartments are allowed. On substandard lots (lots with less than 5,000 square feet) 51% prefer 1 unit, 27% prefer 2-3 units and 10% don't know. On 5,000 square foot lots, 38% prefer 1 unit, 23% favor single-family plus secondary unit, 12% favor 2 units, 15% favor 3 units, and 11% don't know. 65% favor a minimum lot size for apartments. 10% favor less than 5,000 square feet, 31% favor 5,000 square feet, 59% favor more than 5,000 square feet.

**Traffic.** 54% feel speeding is a problem. 48% feel traffic is a problem.

**Underground Utilities.** 51% of property owners do not want to pay an average $1,000 for undergrounding.

**Parking.** 46% feel parking is a problem. 55% in R-3 zones feel parking is a problem.

**Parks.** 44% feel there are not enough parks. 37% feel there are enough. In listing preference for additional parks, 54% want more greenbelts/open space, 46% want more picnicking/barbecue areas, 31% want children's play areas, and 30% want more tennis courts.

**Street Repairs.** 37% feel street repairs are needed. Of "yes" responses, 60% feel resurfacing is needed. Of "yes" responses, 51% are concerned about open drains at corners. If there is no curb & gutter in front of the house, 44% don't want installation. 39% want installation.

**Walkways.** 37% feel lack of walkways is a problem. 43% in R-1 feel this is a problem. If there is no walkway in front of the house, 50% want a walkway installed. 40% do not want a walkway.
5.0 GOALS, POLICIES AND PROGRAMS

5.1 DEFINITIONS

GOALS - Goals are broad statements of purpose which provide direction for more specific policies and programs.

POLICIES - Policies are the main emphasis of the Area Plan. They are specific statements indicating the kinds of actions which should be taken by the City, neighborhood, and other agencies to address issues and meet goals. During the preparation of this plan, many different policies were considered and evaluated.

PROGRAMS - Programs are the specific actions the City, neighborhood, or others intend to use to carry out the policies of the Area Plan. These programs establish a commitment to action and are not just a list of possible measures. Programs should be reviewed every year and relate directly to the City's annual Neighborhood Improvement Program and Capital Improvement Program.

NEW MONTEREY AREA PLAN - The Area Plan Map (Figure 3) is a composite of the land use recommendations of the plan. It is, in effect, a General Plan for the neighborhood.

REQUIRED GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENTS - The required General Plan Amendments map (Figure 4) shows General Plan amendments which would be necessary to bring the General Plan into conformity with the Area Plan.

REQUIRED ZONING CHANGES - The Required Zoning Changes map (Figure 5) shows the zoning changes necessary to bring the zoning into conformity with the Area Plan.
Figure 3
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Figure 4
NEW MONTEREY NEIGHBORHOOD
Required General Plan Amendments

1. From Residential to Commercial
2. From Residential to Parks/Open Space
3. From Residential to Parks/Open Space
4. From Residential to Parks/Open Space
5. From Residential to Parks/Open Space
6. From Special Study to Parks/Open Space
Figure 5
NEW MONTEREY NEIGHBORHOOD
Required Zoning Changes

1. Rezone from R-3 to C-2
2. Rezone to "O" Open Space
3. Rezone to "O" Open Space
4. Rezone to "O" Open Space
5. Rezone to "O" Open Space
5.2 HOUSING

5.2.1 EXISTING CONDITIONS

In January 1990, the New Monterey neighborhood contained an estimated 2,620 dwelling units, with 1,250 single-family units and 1,370 multiple-family units. This represents 20% of the total units, 20% of the single-family units, and 20% of the multiple-family units in Monterey.

In 1989, the housing mix was 48% single-family and 52% multiple-family units (1,250 single-family/1,370 multiple-family). Build-out to zoning would result in a mix of 32% single-family and 68% multiple-family units (1,115 single-family/2,355 multiple-family). The number of single-family houses decreases because of demolition to allow apartment development.

5.2.2 HOUSING ISSUES

The New Monterey neighborhood originated as a single-family neighborhood. The present apartment zoning has resulted in a change of neighborhood character to a mix of apartments and single-family houses. In the neighborhood survey, 61% of respondents opposed more apartment units in the neighborhood. On July 16, 1991, the City Council held a public hearing on the draft New Monterey Area Plan, heard public testimony on the issue of changing the apartment areas to single-family zoning, and voted to retain the apartment zoning.

The New Monterey Area Plan proposes no change to existing residential General Plan and zoning. Zoning allows construction of 850 net new units in the R-1 and R-3 zoned areas.

One issue of concern to the neighborhood is construction of Planned Unit Developments on R-1 lots. New Monterey has smaller lots which do not support the construction of Planned Unit Developments.

Topography and soils constraints in the upper R-3 area (Parcel, Lyndon, Alice, Taylor area) are a concern. Streets cannot be widened without large cuts, on-street parking for guests and visitors is often not available, driveway access is hazardous, and street widths do not support traffic from further development.

The lower R-3 area (Spencer to Hawthorne Street) has (1) narrow streets which have been intermittently widened, (2) parking problems resulting from narrow streets which limit traffic capacity and parking, (3) inadequate parking from older apartment complexes, and (4) parking problems created by new apartments which often generate on-street parking, even with the more strict apartment parking standards (see Traffic and Parking Section).

5.2.3 HOUSING PROGRAM SUMMARY

No change is proposed in the New Monterey residential General Plan or zoning provisions, except for commercial and open space changes on Figures 4 and 5. The plan proposes several steps to retain a single-family character within the apartment zoned areas, including encouragement of single-family houses, single-family houses with secondary units, and apartments which retain the single-family design features (see the Urban Design section). The Area Plan eliminates Planned Unit Developments.
5.2.4 HOUSING GOALS, POLICIES, AND PROGRAMS

GOAL A: Retain the present residential General Plan and zoning. Preserve, maintain, and perpetuate the single-family character of New Monterey.

POLICY 1: Retain the present residential General Plan and zoning. Preserve, maintain, and perpetuate the single-family character of New Monterey. Prohibit Planned Unit Developments.

PROGRAM 1A: Retain the present residential General Plan and zoning.

PROGRAM 1B: Encourage maintenance and new construction of single-family houses in R-3 areas as stand alone single-family houses or single-family houses with secondary units.

PROGRAM 1C: Provide City assistance through the City Housing Rehabilitation Program for rehabilitation of single-family houses for home owners who qualify for the program.

PROGRAM 1D: No new Planned Unit Developments will be allowed in New Monterey.

PROGRAM 1E: Minimum lot size for subdivisions shall be 5,000 square feet. Lots less than 5,000 square feet may be approved for re-combination of substandard lots in accord with the City's substandard lot policy.

PROGRAM 1F: The neighborhood supports consistent enforcement of zoning regulations and City ordinances.
5.3 URBAN DESIGN

5.3.1 EXISTING CONDITIONS

New Monterey is a unique neighborhood in setting and urban design. The natural setting includes areas of urban forest, exceptional views and diverse topography. The built environment includes historic houses, eccentric hand-made structures, and conventional single-family and apartment buildings built over the last 90 years. This eclectic mix is one of the distinguishing features of the New Monterey area.

Urban design review is accomplished by the City's Architectural Review Committee. The City has two sets of design guidelines. The first (and least restrictive) requires staff review of new single-family houses and referral to the Architectural Review Committee if certain conditions are present. The second is application of a design overlay district, which requires Architectural Review Committee review for all proposed residential development.

5.3.2 URBAN DESIGN ISSUES

Urban design guidelines are difficult to establish because they tend to standardize design, instead of encouraging the variety now present in the neighborhood. However, urban design guidelines can also focus attention on the unique attributes of the neighborhood to assure that new development complements the distinctive and unique neighborhood assets. The distinctive neighborhood features which deserve design consideration over and above the typical City residential requirements are views and view corridors, trees and urban forest areas, topography, and coordination with the built environment.

Building height is currently measured based on the average ground level (measured at the midpoint of each side of the house). Because of this, buildings on sloped sites may have elements considerably higher than the 25-foot building height. All of New Monterey is a hillside area, and use of the average ground level can result in buildings which are not complementary to the neighborhood.

Several areas of New Monterey have panoramic views of Monterey Bay, particularly in middle and lower areas of the neighborhood. Since New Monterey is primarily built out, many houses now enjoy views. Additions or new construction on adjoining property can obliterate those views, particularly in the desire to capture the view in the new construction. The goal of this section is to find a balance, so that both properties can enjoy a view. If modifications to the development plan can leave a view corridor for existing houses while also providing usable space and views for the new construction, the Architectural Review Committee should attempt to provide that balance.

The Architectural Review Committee Guidelines for Single-family Dwellings in Design Review areas and the additional policies relating to vegetation would generally address trees, topography, and coordination with the built environment.

5.3.3 URBAN DESIGN PROGRAM SUMMARY

This plan proposes adoption of the D-1 design overlay district in the R-1 single-family areas in order to assure that development is harmonious with this unique neighborhood. This assures that all new single-family houses, as well as accessory buildings and landscaping, will have
Architectural Review Committee review associated with new construction. The plan proposes that apartment development have single-family design elements facing the street.

In the design review process, building height should be minimized by stepping up or down the hillsides, rather than using the average ground level as the only criteria for evaluating height. This would lower the profile of buildings on sloped sites. The measurement of heights to the midpoint of a pitched roof as currently defined in the Zoning Ordinance would continue to be acceptable.

5.3.4 URBAN DESIGN GOALS, POLICIES, AND PROGRAMS

GOAL B: Provide development sensitive to the existing built environment in the R-1 areas. Provide development compatible with single-family design standards in the R-3 areas. Provide development sensitive to topography, soils, and urban forest in the upper R-3 area.

POLICY 2. Design review should be required in both the single-family and multiple-family areas of New Monterey and should be sensitive to the unique topography and built environment of the neighborhood. Design guidelines for the R-3 area should be prepared so that apartments have single-family design elements facing the street. Provide development sensitive to topography, soils, and urban forest in the upper R-3 area.

*PROGRAM 2A: The D-1 Design Review Overlay zone shall be placed on the single-family zoned areas of New Monterey.

PROGRAM 2B: Architectural Review Committee Guidelines for Single Family Dwellings in Design Review Areas shall apply to developments in R-1 areas and for R-3 developments with a single-family house and secondary unit.

PROGRAM 2C: Design guidelines shall be prepared for apartment areas. New and remodeled apartments should have single-family design elements facing the street.

PROGRAM 2D: On lots greater than 5,000 square feet which have an existing single-family house, secondary unit additions and apartment development should be incorporated within the existing structure as much as feasible.

PROGRAM 2E: In addition to existing Guidelines related to height on hillside lots, buildings on slopes greater than 15% should step up or down the hill to minimize apparent building height in R-1 and R-3 areas. Building under-story and wall heights should be kept to a minimum.

PROGRAM 2F: City-wide height standards for hillside areas in R-1 and R-3 areas should be reviewed to consider potential amendment to specify that building height should be measured from the building element to the existing grade or final grade, whichever is lower, directly below that element. Height may be measured to the midpoint of a pitched roof element.

PROGRAM 2G: Projects shall be designed to save existing healthy trees in R-1 and R-3 areas.
PROGRAM 2H: Encourage windows on the southern exposure to capture sunlight in R-1 and R-3 areas. Windows should be in scale with wall masses.

PROGRAM 2I: Utility meters should not be placed facing a city street in R-1 and R-3 areas.

PROGRAM 2J: Parking lots on the north side of Hawthorne Street should be screened without blocking ocean views.

PROGRAM 2K: Investigate an ordinance to discourage abandoned cars, trash receptacles, trash, and litter in front yards.

PROGRAM 2L: Commercial trash receptacles shall be screened.

PROGRAM 2M: Retain existing stone walls within the neighborhood.

GOAL C: Where an existing house or houses have an established view of Monterey Bay, provide a balance between the preservation of that view and establishing use and view potential for new development.

POLICY 3: Construction of new structures or additions to existing structures in both the R-1 and R-3 areas should not fully block views from existing developed lots, should be in scale with the existing built environment, should save existing healthy trees, and should harmonize with site topography.

PROGRAM 3A: View analysis shall be done for construction of new structures or additions to existing structures in R-1 and R-3 areas. Where a proposed project would block existing views of Monterey Bay, the project shall be redesigned with the goal of providing a balance between protecting all or part of the view for the existing unit and also providing an equivalent view for the proposed project.

GOAL D: Adequate parking should be required while maximizing usable open space.

POLICY 4: Parking should not detract from front yard or rear yard open space. Provide more usable open space areas in apartment development. Provide adequate parking in apartment complexes

PROGRAM 4A: Parking between the building and the required rear yard should be discouraged.

PROGRAM 4B: Driveways should not be wide enough to park three cars abreast.

PROGRAM 4C: Encourage the City to re-examine open space and parking requirements for apartment development and to provide more usable open space areas in new apartment development as much as feasible.

GOAL E: Utilities should be placed underground
POLICY 5: Utility lines should be undergrounded to reduce visual intrusion, eliminate the need for excessive tree trimming, and minimize potential health hazards.

*PROGRAM 5A: Prepare a plan to underground utilities and explore potential for undergrounding throughout the neighborhood.
Figure 6
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5.4 PARKS, RECREATION, AND OPEN SPACE

5.4.1 EXISTING CONDITIONS

New Monterey had the highest priority for additional park acreage in the 1986 Parks and Recreation Master Plan because the neighborhood had a park deficiency of 17.19 acres. The major recommendations of the Parks and Recreation Master Plan -- acquisition of Hilltop School, addition of the Victorian House to the Archer Park Center site, and improvement of Cypress Park -- have been accomplished. These were also goals of the 1980 New Monterey Area Plan. Completion of these projects has reduced the deficiency by 4.08 acres. The neighborhood still has a deficiency of 13.11 acres.

5.4.2 PARKS AND RECREATION ISSUES

Public acquisition and park improvements have dramatically improved the park and recreation opportunities available to New Monterey. Opportunity acquisition of the two remaining parcels in the Archer Park/Hoffman Park block, if the property is offered on open market and funds are available, would assure that all of the existing parks in the neighborhood have rational boundaries.

The 1989 New Monterey Neighborhood Survey indicated that the strongest park and recreation desires were for greenbelts/nature preserves (54%), picnic/barbecue areas (46%), children's play areas (31%) and tennis (30%). These results are consistent in the R-1 and upper and lower R-3 areas, with the exception that the lower R-3 area would prefer tennis to children's play areas by a small margin (34%/30%).

The opportunity for significant greenbelts and nature preserves are only available outside of the neighborhood boundaries. The Huckleberry Hill Nature Preserve on the Presidio is available to all city residents. Access from New Monterey is limited to a small opening on Devisadero Street, which is a student access to the Defense Language Institute but not a planned access to the nature preserve.

Within the neighborhood boundaries, small passive parks providing open space and landscape areas are possible through the purchase of undeveloped residential lots if offered for sale on the open market and City funds are available. Purchase of undeveloped 25-foot-wide lots would correspond to the results of the survey and would also reduce neighborhood impacts resulting from development of very small lots. It is generally not cost efficient to develop these lots for more active uses such as tot lots or mini-parks.

The 1989 New Monterey Neighborhood Survey emphasized a desire for passive park use -- open space, picnic areas, tot lots, etc. Cypress Park and small parcels purchased in an opportunity buying program are most likely candidates for passive use. Active uses are not compatible with passive parks. Active use parks allow active play and sports such as basketball, volleyball, tennis, handball, etc. Oak-Newton Park, Archer Park, Hoffman Park, and Hilltop Center Park are active use parks.
5.4.3 PARKS, RECREATION, AND OPEN SPACE PROGRAM SUMMARY

The policies and programs of the Area Plan are focused on acquisition and maintenance of passive use parks, and placing picnic areas, and children's play areas in a manner which would not destroy the passive use function. Active uses should not be placed on passive use parks.

The major greenbelt and open space opportunity is on the Presidio. The area plan encourages better access and planned access to the Huckleberry Hill Nature Preserve.

Active uses were a lower priority in the neighborhood survey. Active use policies are directed toward developing active uses in existing active use parks.

Existing parks are being developed in accord with existing master plans. The area plan encourages that process to continue and to be expanded by development of the Victorian House in Archer Park Center and the lower floor of Hilltop Community Center. The plan also encourages upgraded play equipment in Oak-Newton Park and continued active use of Bay View School grounds.

5.4.4 PARKS AND RECREATION GOALS, POLICIES, AND PROGRAMS

GOAL F: Focus park acquisition and use priorities on greenbelts, nature preserves, open space areas, and expanding Archer/Hoffman Park.

POLICY 6: The highest priority for acquisition of park lands should be purchase of small lots for open space.

*PROGRAM 6A: Opportunity buy undeveloped lots and 25-foot-wide lots using Neighborhood Improvement Program, park acquisition funds, and funding from other sources.

PROGRAM 6B: Use existing parcels such as Irving Avenue Right-of-way, the triangular parcel at Prescott and Devisadero, and the 25-foot lot in the 700 block of Parcel to fulfill this policy.

PROGRAM 6C: Rezone existing City-owned park and open space properties to Open Space zoning. Rezone future open space acquisitions to Open Space zoning.

POLICY 7: The priority for use of greenbelt, nature preserve, and open space areas should be to retain passive, open space use. Park improvements should focus on open space, picnic areas, and childrens' play areas as specified in the New Monterey Neighborhood Survey.

*PROGRAM 7A: Small picnic areas and tot lots may be installed in larger greenbelt, nature preserve, and open space parks, but should not diminish the use of the parks as greenbelt/nature preserve areas. Active uses should not be placed on greenbelt/nature preserve lands.
GOAL G: Upgrade and maintain existing parks.

POLICY 8: Hilltop Park. Development of Hilltop Park should continue to follow the Hilltop Park Master Plan. Emphasis should be given to developing programs for use of the lower floor of the building.

PROGRAM 8A: Implement the Hilltop Park Master Plan programs for the lower floor of the building.

POLICY 9: Archer Park Center. Encourage development of the Victorian House for a wide variety of uses.

*PROGRAM 9A: Encourage parks and recreation use of the Victorian House within a five-year period.

*PROGRAM 9B: Opportunity buy the remaining parcels in the Archer Park/Hoffman Park block, as a long-term goal, if the property is offered on open market and funds are available.

POLICY 10: Oak Newton Park. Continue use of Oak Newton Park as an active play area.

*PROGRAM 10A: Upgrade and renovate play equipment on Oak Newton Park.

PROGRAM 10B: Investigate placing a picnic area closer to the Oak Newton active play area.

POLICY 11: Cypress Park. The primary goal for Cypress Park is to retain the park as open space, with a minimum of active park use.

PROGRAM 11A: Retain the remainder of Cypress Park as primarily an open space use.

POLICY 12: San Carlos Beach Park. Complete San Carlos Beach Park and improve access.

*PROGRAM 12A: Encourage increased access to San Carlos Beach Park from New Monterey and completion of the park.

POLICY 13: Pre-school Programs. Encourage pre-school programs.

PROGRAM 13A: Maintain pre-school programs in city park centers.

GOAL H: Encourage park and/or recreation and open space use on school sites, the Presidio of Monterey, and the California-American Water Company reservoirs.

POLICY 14: Presidio Open Space. Encourage the Army to make existing and future park and open space areas of the Presidio more accessible to neighborhood residents.

*PROGRAM 14A: The City should negotiate with the Army to establish better access into the Huckleberry Hill Nature Preserve.
PROGRAM 14B: The City should negotiate with the Army to provide pedestrian access from New Monterey into the lower-Presidio historic park when it is developed.

POLICY 15: Bay View School. Continue use of Bay View School as a location for active play and recreation and include trees in the landscape program.

PROGRAM 15A: Encourage the Monterey Peninsula Unified School District to continue allowing neighborhood use of the school as an active park site when not required for school use.

*PROGRAM 15B: Enter into a joint agreement with the Monterey Peninsula Unified School District for joint design of Bay View School play areas for active park use, and include trees in the landscape program while respecting existing views.

POLICY 16: Cal Am Reservoir. Encourage the water company to landscape and screen the commercial activities on the reservoir site on David Avenue.

*PROGRAM 16A: Encourage landscaping by the water company between the commercial uses and David Avenue to screen individual buildings, equipment, and storage area, while preserving the view of the reservoir.

PROGRAM 16B: Encourage employees to park on site rather than along David Avenue.
5.5 VEGETATION.

5.5.1 EXISTING CONDITIONS

New Monterey began as a subdivision of a hillside forest in the 1880s. Today, New Monterey is an almost fully developed urban area, yet there are remnants of the earlier forest, including a few stands of the original Monterey Pine forest. The upper New Monterey area retains the characteristics of an urban forest, with native vegetation. Lower New Monterey is a more typical urban neighborhood, with ornamental trees and landscaping.

The City street tree program installs approximately 1,000 trees per year throughout the city in non-drought years. In the current drought, installation is approximately 25% of normal. The City Parks division proposes to prepare a City street tree planting program in the 1990/91 fiscal year.

5.5.2 VEGETATION ISSUES

Tree Preservation received the strongest response of any questions in the New Monterey Neighborhood Survey, with 88% of the respondents favoring tree preservation (85% in R-1 areas and 92% in R-3 areas). 70% of those favoring tree preservation also favored adoption of City standards and requiring a permit to allow tree removal on private property.

There was also a positive response to City street tree planting, with 56% favoring City street tree planting. 69% of respondents in the R-3 area favored street tree planting, probably because apartment developments have minimal landscape areas. A majority of respondents in R-1 areas favored street trees (47% yes, 43% no, 10% don’t know).

This plan anticipates the preparation of the City-wide Master Street Tree Plan within the 1991/92 fiscal year.

5.5.3 VEGETATION PROGRAM SUMMARY

The policies and programs of the area plan encourage preservation of existing healthy prominent trees on public and private property. Prominent trees are trees of sufficient size and health to make a significant contribution to views from public streets or to the forested skyline of the city. Development project applications should be designed or redesigned to preserve as many prominent trees as possible. In the urban forest area, new planting should be native vegetation from native seed stock where possible -- Monterey Pine, Monterey Cypress, Bishop Pine, and Coast Live Oak trees.

Development plans should allow clear space for tree crowns and enough ground level clear area to protect trunks and roots for trees at maturity.

Trees should be protected during construction, and tree protection should be installed prior to construction.

Trees removed for development should be replaced as specified in the tree protection ordinance.
5.5.3 VEGETATION GOALS, POLICIES, AND PROGRAMS

GOAL I: Protect existing healthy prominent trees.

POLICY 17: Protect existing healthy prominent trees.

PROGRAM 17A: Healthy prominent trees should be preserved on public and private property to the maximum extent possible.

PROGRAM 17B: Healthy prominent trees should not be removed unless there is a valid reason for removal and the reason conforms to criteria for removal adopted by the Architectural Review Committee.

PROGRAM 17C: Emphasis should be placed on preventative care to maintain healthy prominent trees in a healthy and safe condition. Allow removal of diseased or damaged trees only when they cannot be brought back to healthy and safe condition.

PROGRAM 17D: The city should assure that tree trimming by utility crews is consistent with tree preservation goals.

POLICY 18: Development projects should be designed to preserve healthy prominent trees.

PROGRAM 18A: Development projects should be designed to preserve existing healthy prominent trees. The Architectural Review Committee should require redesign if significant trees can be preserved.

POLICY 19: Protect existing trees during construction.

PROGRAM 19A: Adopted Architectural Review Committee tree protection standards should be applied to all new development projects.

PROGRAM 19B: In all development projects, trees to be retained should be fenced prior to construction and protected from damage by construction, including damage to tree trunks from vehicles and damage to roots from soil compaction, paving, grading, and trenching.

GOAL J: Preserve and enhance native species in the Urban Forest Area (Figure 7).

POLICY 20: Maintain existing Monterey Pine, Monterey Cypress, Bishop Pine, and Coast Live Oak trees in a safe and healthy manner on both public and private property.

PROGRAM 20A: Development projects should be designed to preserve existing Monterey Pine, Monterey Cypress, Bishop Pine, and Coast Live Oak trees whenever possible. Architectural Review Committee review should require redesign of projects in order to preserve existing healthy trees.

PROGRAM 20B: Replace any trees removed and fill holes in the forest with native Monterey County vegetation derived from native seed stock where possible. Replace trees as specified in the tree protection ordinance.
GOAL K: Provide enough clear space for required trees.

POLICY 21: Project design should be sensitive to the space needed for existing and new tree growth at maturity.

*PROGRAM 21A: The Architectural Review Committee should develop standards for landscaping, including minimum ground level planting areas to protect trunks and roots and clear space for mature tree crowns.

GOAL L: Process tree removal permits quickly.

POLICY 22: Process tree removal permits quickly so that a property owner can know whether a tree should be preserved or whether it can be removed.

PROGRAM 22A: Tree removal permits should be processed quickly.

PROGRAM 22B: Where trees are removed, they shall be replaced and maintained as specified in the tree protection ordinance.

GOAL M: Street trees should support the overall vegetation goals of the neighborhood.

POLICY 23: The City and residents should promote a street tree planting program using trees as prescribed by a Master Street Tree Plan.

*PROGRAM 23A: There should be neighborhood participation in drafting the street tree program. There should be consultation with the neighborhood on street tree planting until the program is adopted.

PROGRAM 23B: Implement the New Monterey portion of the city street tree program.

PROGRAM 23C: Existing street trees and privately-owned trees shall be preserved in future street widening, utility work, and private project approval wherever practical.

PROGRAM 23D: Where street trees are removed, they shall be replaced as specified in the tree protection ordinance.

PROGRAM 23E: Street trees in the urban forest area should emphasize Monterey Pine, Monterey Cypress, Coast Live Oak, and Bishop Pine trees.

PROGRAM 23F: Priority for installation should be given to blocks which desired street tree installation in the 1989 New Monterey neighborhood survey (Figure 8).

PROGRAM 23G: Street trees should be installed when sidewalks are installed.
NEW MONTEREY NEIGHBORHOOD
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- Predominantly Live Oak
- Live Oak, Monterey Pine, Monterey Cypress
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NEW MONTEREY NEIGHBORHOOD
Blocks Desiring Street Trees

- Blocks wanting street trees
- Blocks not wanting street trees
- Blocks with insufficient returns
5.6 TRAFFIC AND PARKING,

5.6.1 EXISTING CONDITIONS

Streets and highways are designed for various intensity of use and are classified in the General Plan by function or purpose.

**Arterial** streets are intended to carry large volumes of through traffic. Intersecting streets are normally required to stop for an arterial street. The intersection of two arterial streets is typically controlled by a traffic signal. David Avenue and Hawthorne Street are shown as arterial streets in the General Plan.

**Collector** streets are intended to carry traffic from within a neighborhood to an arterial. Local streets are normally required to stop for collector traffic. Intersection of two collectors is typically controlled by a four-way stop or traffic signals. Prescott, Pine, and Taylor Street from Prescott to the Presidio are designated as collector streets in the General Plan.

**Local** streets are intended to carry low volumes of traffic for local travel and direct access to neighborhoods. There are usually no controls (stop signs or signals) on local streets.

New Monterey's streets were designed in the 19th century, when a grid pattern was superimposed over the neighborhood without considering the hillside topography. The resulting streets are often steep or narrow and create intersections with limited sight distance.

All streets in New Monterey are residential streets, so the concentration of traffic on arterial or collector streets affects a residential area. The Lighthouse Corridor has non-residential streets which can carry arterial levels of traffic without affecting a residential area.

Streets in the upper area of New Monterey (above Grace Street) typically are narrow and do not have curbs or sidewalks. In middle New Monterey, streets are developed with curbs and a narrow pavement width, which allows one through lane if cars park on both sides. In the lower (apartment) area, the streets also have narrow pavement but have been intermittently widened in front of new apartment development.

Many of the traffic controls in New Monterey do not relate to functional classification. Most of the up/down local streets have stop signs favoring the up/down traffic. There is a signal at the neighborhood/collector intersection of Taylor and Prescott. Arterial Hawthorne Street has several four way stops, requiring arterial traffic to stop at a local street.

Traffic patterns in the neighborhood are influenced by local and through traffic. Local traffic is substantial because of the size of the neighborhood. Through traffic is composed primarily of drivers attempting to bypass the Lighthouse corridor, traffic from the Defense Language Institute to Pacific Grove or Highway 68, and traffic going from Highway 68 to the Lighthouse corridor.

Most New Monterey streets do not have the pavement width and paved parking which would be required if built to current standards.
5.6.2 TRAFFIC AND PARKING ISSUES

Traffic and parking issues were a major concern in the New Monterey Neighborhood Survey. Speeding was noted as a concern by 54% of the respondents. Parking was noted as a problem always or sometimes by 67% of respondents, but 66% of the respondents did not favor street widening, which could provide more parking. Public transportation was not noted as a potential solution, as 71% do not ride the bus, and 69% indicated they would not ride the bus even if service were more convenient.

Speeding was noted most as a problem on up/down streets, particularly those which have stop signs which stop the side street traffic.

Lighthouse Corridor. The Lighthouse Corridor carries arterial traffic from central Monterey to Pacific Grove, Pebble Beach, and Highway 68. It currently consists of Hawthorne Street, Lighthouse Avenue, and Foam Street, with Hawthorne and Foam designated as arterial streets and Lighthouse designated as a collector street. The working papers developed for the city-wide traffic study note that Lighthouse Avenue is functioning as an arterial street but is designated as a collector, while Hawthorne Street functions as a collector but is designated as an arterial.

The capacity of the Lighthouse corridor is determined in large part by constraints at either end -- a four-lane tunnel to the east and the discontinuous interface between Lighthouse in Monterey and Lighthouse in Pacific Grove to the west. Any significant improvement in traffic flow along the corridor would result in backups at either end, unless those constraints are also removed. The traffic signals and stop signs in the corridor act as traffic metering devices which minimizes single-point traffic congestion to the east and west.

Hawthorne Street has residential zoning and is primarily developed with residential uses and has stop signs as traffic controls. The street configuration, capacity, and traffic controls are generally those of a collector street. Lighthouse and Foam are commercial streets with traffic signals. Traffic volumes, street configuration and traffic controls on these streets are typical of arterial streets.

Access from central Monterey to the New Monterey neighborhood will generally involve traffic from the Lighthouse Corridor into the neighborhood. Access can be concentrated onto collector and arterial streets, or traffic can be encouraged to filter into the neighborhood so that Prescott and David Avenues do not carry extraordinarily high levels of traffic.

Traffic in the Lighthouse Corridor is a city-wide issue, and solutions desired by the neighborhood must also be viewed in a city-wide context.

Defense Language Institute Traffic. Traffic from the Defense Language Institute exits primarily into the residential neighborhoods of Old Town and New Monterey. In addition, some through traffic passes through the Defense Language Institute to avoid the Lighthouse Corridor or because it is a more direct route to their destination. The Environmental Impact Statement for the Presidio Master Plan discussed the possibility of direct Highway 68 access, but did not require that access as a mitigation measure. Direct access to Highway 68 would reduce the impact of both Defense Language Institute and through traffic on the New Monterey neighborhood.
Traffic exiting from the Defense Language Institute on Taylor Street is generally destined for Highway 68. One would expect that the route for this traffic would be Taylor to Prescott to Highway 68. However, some of this traffic cuts through local streets (Lottie, Lobos, Jessie, Devisadero) because of delays at the Prescott/Highway 68 intersection in Pacific Grove. Improved intersection design and signal timing at that intersection could potentially discourage the use of local streets.

Taylor Street is now configured as a local street. It should not be improved to collector width or status, even though it carries Defense Language Institute traffic.

**Speeding and Traffic Levels.** In the New Monterey Neighborhood Survey, traffic was noted as a problem by 48% of respondents. 54% of the responses noted that speeding was a concern. 31% noted that traffic levels was a concern. The comments section of the survey noted speeding as a problem on the arterial and collector streets, which have high traffic volumes and through traffic. Figure 10 shows streets where speeding was most noted as a problem. Speeding on the up/down streets may be attributable to the number of streets which have through traffic and stop signs on side streets. These streets have relatively little traffic, and cross traffic is required to stop. This combination, along with the hilly terrain, contributes to higher speeds. Five of the up/down streets with speeding problems are local streets, which would not normally have stop signs over their entire length.

**Parking.** Parking was listed as a problem always or sometimes by 67% of survey respondents. Parking problems were noted in all portions of the neighborhood; however, the R-3 area response was the highest, with 74% noting a problem always or sometimes.

Parking problems are primarily the result of inadequate on-site parking and narrow streets which do not have the width to allow two travel lanes and parking on both sides. In the lower R-3 area, streets have been widened in front of recent apartment development, but the widening is sporadic. Where streets have not been widened, parking is limited to the downhill side of the street, to allow two travel lanes. This has created substantial parking problems because, even though the R-3 standards are based on surveys of a theoretical "average" parking demand for apartment residents, the standards may fall short in individual apartment complexes, and the standards do not provide for guest parking. In the middle R-1 areas, parking is allowed on both sides, which results in a single travel lane when cars are parked on both sides. Cars often park in the dirt between the curb and the front property line. In the upper R-3 area, topography limits the amount of on-street parking available to apartment complexes. And in the upper R-1 area, parking is found on the shoulder area of streets without curbs and gutters.

There are no easy solutions to the parking problems in New Monterey. In the lower R-3 area, street widening to two travel lanes and two parking lanes would minimize the problem. In the middle R-1 area, street widening would be a solution, but limited parking on one side would also provide a possible solution. In the upper area, the primary way to provide more parking would be to diminish the urban forest, which is generally not a desired option.

One of the results of narrow New Monterey streets is the possibility that parking on both sides could limit emergency vehicle access. The Fire Department has not had any occasions to date where access has been blocked. The Uniform Fire Code, as adopted by the City, requires 20 feet of clear width for the access of Fire Department vehicles. Most of the unwidened streets in
New Monterey have a pavement width of 24 feet, which leaves 10-12 feet or less of clear space when cars are parked on both sides.

**Highway 68 Access.** There are only two reliable public access routes into and out of New Monterey -- Lighthouse Curve and Highway 68. Pine and Taylor Streets through the Presidio can be closed without notice. Highway 68 is New Monterey's primary access to Community Hospital.

5.6.3 TRAFFIC PROGRAM SUMMARY

**Lighthouse Corridor.** The neighborhood recommends changing Hawthorne from an arterial to a collector street and removing the Hawthorne/Private Bolio connection from the General Plan if approved after completion of the City-wide Traffic and Parking Study. Reduction in traffic volumes on Hawthorne is not anticipated; however, increased traffic levels are not desirable.

This plan also proposes filtering of local traffic from the Lighthouse Corridor into the neighborhood, rather than concentrating on a few streets, by use of traffic controls.

**Defense Language Institute Traffic.** The City-wide Traffic Study should investigate the possibility of a direct access from the Defense Language Institute to Highway 68. The City-wide Traffic Study should investigate intersection design and traffic signal improvements at Highway 68 and Prescott Avenue so that Defense Language Institute traffic does not use local streets to bypass that intersection. Taylor Street should retain the character of a local street.

**Speeding and Traffic Levels.** The City-wide Traffic Study should investigate ways to reduce speeding, particularly on up/down local streets.

**Parking.** Streets should be widened in the lower R-3 area to provide parking on both sides. Streets should be widened in the R-1 area where desired by the neighborhood or where problems of emergency access are identified.

5.6.4 TRAFFIC AND PARKING GOALS, POLICIES, AND PROGRAMS

GOAL N: Traffic in the Lighthouse Corridor should be minimized on Hawthorne Street.

POLICY 24: The arterial-level traffic in the Lighthouse Corridor should not be carried on Hawthorne Street.

PROGRAM 24A: The New Monterey Area Plan recommends reclassifying Hawthorne as a collector street, and reclassifying Lighthouse Avenue as an arterial street. Defefer decision until completion of the City-wide Traffic Study.

PROGRAM 24B: The New Monterey Area Plan recommends retaining Hawthorne as a two-way street with no traffic signals, except at David Avenue. Defeer decision until completion of the City-wide Traffic Study.

PROGRAM 24C: The New Monterey Area Plan recommends deleting the Hawthorne/Private Bolio connection from the General Plan. Defeer decision until completion of the City-wide Traffic Study.
POLICY 25. Access for local traffic from the Lighthouse Corridor into the neighborhood should be designed so that traffic filters into the neighborhood on a variety of streets, rather than concentrates onto one or two collector and arterial streets.

PROGRAM 25A: Establish traffic controls on Foam and Lighthouse so that there are several entrances to New Monterey with equivalent levels of traffic control. Add one more protected access (Drake suggested) at the east end of Hawthorne Street.

PROGRAM 25B: The Reeside/Lighthouse intersection should be improved to facilitate turning movements.

PROGRAM 25C: The City-wide Traffic Study should investigate ways to increase through traffic use of Lighthouse Avenue and Foam Streets, including improved transition from Pacific Grove Avenue to Monterey Lighthouse Avenue.

PROGRAM 25D: The City-wide Traffic Study should investigate the possibility of returning Foam Street to two-way traffic to determine if such a change would improve traffic flow in the Lighthouse Corridor.

GOAL 0: Improve access to the Defense Language Institute from Highway 68 and Lighthouse Avenue. Redesignate Taylor Street from the Presidio of Monterey to Prescott Avenue as a local street.

POLICY 26: The Defense Language Institute should be encouraged to create direct access to Highway 68.

PROGRAM 26A: Work with the Army and the City of Pacific Grove to encourage a direct access from the Defense Language Institute to Highway 68.

POLICY 27: Through traffic from Defense Language Institute gates should be encouraged to remain on collector streets to the nearest arterial. Traffic from the Taylor Street gate should be encouraged to take Prescott to Highway 68.

PROGRAM 27A: The City-wide Traffic Study should investigate ways to direct traffic entering and leaving Defense Language Institute at Taylor Street to use Prescott Avenue as a direct access to Highway 68, and to discourage this traffic from continuing along Taylor Street or using local streets to reach Highway 68 via David Avenue.

PROGRAM 27B: Revise traffic controls to discourage through traffic use of local streets.

PROGRAM 27C: The New Monterey Area Plan recommends designating Taylor Street from the Presidio of Monterey to Prescott Avenue as a neighborhood street. Defer decision until completion of the City-wide Traffic Study.

PROGRAM 27D: It is advantageous to have improved access from the Defense Language Institute to Lighthouse Avenue.
GOAL P: Through traffic should be encouraged to use arterial and collector streets. Local streets should be reserved for local traffic.

POLICY 28: With the exception of the Lighthouse Corridor, traffic controls (stop signs, yield signs, traffic signals) should be appropriate to functional classification of streets unless needed for safety purposes.

PROGRAM 28A: The City-wide Traffic Study should investigate ways to reduce speeding on local streets.

*PROGRAM 28B: Use traffic controls to encourage use of Prescott Avenue as a collector and not as a through street.

PROGRAM 28C: In the Lighthouse corridor, Hawthorne Street traffic controls should be limited to stop signs, except at the intersection with David Avenue. Traffic controls which allow filtering into the neighborhood are desirable even if not consistent with functional classification.

POLICY 29: Speeding should be discouraged by use of street design and traffic controls appropriate to street classification.

PROGRAM 29A: A speed survey should be conducted on streets noted to have speeding problems to determine where enforcement activities should be concentrated.

PROGRAM 29B: Speeding should be discouraged by selective enforcement activities in those areas identified as having particular speed problems, such as increased enforcement, use of the speed wagon, increased signage including painted speed limits on streets.

PROGRAM 29C: Speeding should be discouraged by street design features such as trees with overhead canopy, narrowed pavement sections at corners, and discouragement of pavement widths in excess of that appropriate to the street classification.

GOAL Q: Minimize pedestrian hazards.

POLICY 30: Pedestrian hazards in the lower New Monterey area should be addressed, particularly for children walking to Bay View School.

*PROGRAM 30A: Establish a "Safe Route to School" program for Bay View School.

GOAL R: Widen streets in lower R-3 areas. Widen streets in R-1 areas if appropriate.

POLICY 31: Streets in the lower R-3 area should be widened. Streets in the middle R-1 area should be widened only if desired by a majority of residents on the block. Streets in upper New Monterey should not be widened.

PROGRAM 31A: Streets should be widened and curbs, gutters, and sidewalks should be installed on all property frontages when any new development occurs in the lower R-3 area.
*PROGRAM 31B: All streets with apartment development in the lower R-3 area should be widened to accommodate increased traffic and parking needs.

*PROGRAM 31C: Capital Improvement funds should be used to widen streets in the lower R-3 area.

PROGRAM 31D: Apartment developers should reimburse the City for street widening which was accomplished with Neighborhood Improvement Program and Capital Improvement Program funds.

*PROGRAM 31E: Streets in the middle R-1 area should be widened where desired by the neighborhood or where problems of emergency access are identified.

PROGRAM 31F: Streets should not be widened in upper New Monterey. There should be no curbs, gutters, or pavement widening in the upper New Monterey area.

POLICY 32: Remove street impediments which obstruct fire, ambulance, and emergency vehicle access.

PROGRAM 32A: Parking restrictions should be placed on areas where necessary to assure emergency vehicle access.

GOAL S: Provide acceptable level of service on Highway 68.

POLICY 33: Restore Highway 68 to Level of Service C.

PROGRAM 33A: Work with neighboring jurisdictions to restore Highway 68 to Level of Service C.
STREET COMPARISONS

COMPARISON OF EXISTING CONDITIONS WITH CITY STANDARDS
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Prescott & Pine not planned for widening in the near future
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5.7 PUBLIC SERVICES

5.7.1 EXISTING STATUS

New Monterey receives several public services from government, public utilities, and private business with City franchise. The City of Monterey provides police, fire, sewer, animal control, building and zoning inspection, museum, library, and senior citizen programs. Utility companies provide electricity, telephone, and natural gas. Private companies provide water and trash removal.

5.7.2 PUBLIC SERVICES ISSUES

**Water.** Water pressure was identified as a concern by neighborhood residents in the 1980 Area Plan. The 1989 New Monterey Neighborhood Survey identified low water pressure as a concern in upper and lower areas of the neighborhood. Water supply is a concern for two reasons. First, there are several areas of New Monterey which have two- and four-inch water mains. Second, many water mains in New Monterey are old. Water system design practices and the California Public Utilities Commission require that any new mains serving fire hydrants should be at least six inches in diameter. Sixteen fire hydrants in New Monterey are supplied by four-inch mains. No hydrants are supplied by two-inch mains.

Water supply is continuously being upgraded by the water services improvement fund, which is financed by development fees. This fund improves supply and pressure to fire hydrants, which also improves residential service. Water system improvements are made after testing fire hydrants. Testing has been limited over the past ten years. Currently, no testing is being done because of the drought. Testing requires flowing several thousand gallons of water from a hydrant. Water services fund improvements must be reasonably related to the developments upon which the fee was assessed, so not all deficiencies can be addressed by improvement fund money. Sixteen sections of two-inch water mains remain in New Monterey. Eight of those sections are scheduled for replacement as parts of the Cal-Am four-year replacement program 1990-93.

**Storm Drainage.** Storm drainage was a concern in the 1980 New Monterey Plan. Since that time, the City has made several improvements, and several additional projects are pending. These projects are funded by Neighborhood Improvements Program funds and the New Monterey Storm Drain Fund, which is supported by fees placed on new development. The major flooding problems identified in 1980 have been minimized, and there are no significant flooding or ponding problems remaining. There are several drainage-related concerns which do not result in flooding. These are open drainage ditches in the upper New Monterey area and intersection drainage systems with headwalls for inlets and outlets (drainage pipes which cross a street and have open ends in the gutter area) on street corners. The open ditches are gradually being replaced by pipes, and intersection drainage systems with headwalls for inlets and outlets are gradually being replaced where requested by property owners through Neighborhood Improvements Program funds. Improvements to date have been provided by street funds, drainage funds, and Neighborhood Improvement Project funds. At present, Neighborhood Improvement Program funds are the only active source of drainage improvements.

**Emergency Services.** The 1989 Loma Prieta Earthquake raised an issue of emergency preparedness for an area such as New Monterey and whether emergency centers should be established to provide for neighborhood needs.
Library. The existing bookmobile service is an asset to the neighborhood and is well used. Continued bookmobile service is desired by the neighborhood.

5.7.3 PUBLIC SERVICES PROGRAM SUMMARY

Test fire hydrants to determine if water supply and the water delivery system is adequate. Replace undersized or old mains using the Water Services Improvement Fund. Replacement should be consistent with city-wide policies for water main replacement.

Remove intersection drainage systems with headwalls for inlets and outlets from the New Monterey Neighborhood using Neighborhood Improvement Program funds, Capital Improvement Program funds, and other funding sources.

Provide for emergencies, such as earthquakes, when the neighborhood could be cut off from the balance of the city.

5.7.4 PUBLIC SERVICES GOALS, POLICIES, AND PROGRAMS

GOAL T: Provide adequate water supply for residential use and fire fighting purposes.

POLICY 34: Water pressure and water supply should be satisfactory for residential use and fire suppression.

PROGRAM 34A: Test hydrants prior to all new development where current flow data is unavailable. Require hydrant upgrade consistent with Fire Department policies.

PROGRAM 34B: Continue to test fire hydrants on a routine basis, unless drought conditions prevent testing. Hydrant flows should be calculated to determine flow at 20 p.s.i. residual pressure. Areas of inadequate delivery should be identified based on flow requirements for the surrounding land use, exposures, etc. A plan and schedule to improve the water system for needed flows should be developed. Replacement should be consistent with city-wide policies for water main replacement.

*PROGRAM 34C: Replace two-inch water mains as proposed in the Cal-Am four-year replacement plan. Replace remaining two-inch water mains as funding is available.

GOAL U: Continue to improve storm drainage facilities

POLICY 35: Remove all intersection drainage systems with headwalls for inlets and outlets from the New Monterey neighborhood.

*PROGRAM 35A: Replace intersection drainage systems with headwalls for inlets and outlets using Neighborhood Improvement Program funds and other funding sources such as developer requirements, Capital Improvement Program, street improvement funds, and drainage improvement funds.

POLICY 36: Replace ditches with underground or surface drainage where desired by residents.
*PROGRAM 36A: Replace ditches with underground or surface drainage where desired by residents using Neighborhood Improvement Program funds and other funding sources such as developer requirements, street improvement funds, and drainage improvement funds.

GOAL V: Provide emergency services for the neighborhood.

POLICY 37: Provide for extraordinary emergencies such as earthquakes, where New Monterey may be cut off from normal emergency services.

PROGRAM 37A: Investigate use of Bay View School and Hilltop Center as emergency centers with generators, food, medical supplies, and water supply as appropriate.

PROGRAM 37B: Assure water supply to the neighborhood. Investigate contingencies should the water system fail (e.g., acquisition of generators).

*PROGRAM 37C: Prepare a neighborhood emergency plan to include issues such as access, medical services, and communications.

GOAL W: Maintain Library Bookmobile Service

POLICY 38: Library bookmobile service should be maintained at its present level.

PROGRAM 38A: Maintain library bookmobile service at its present level.
5.8 SOILS AND GEOLOGY

5.8.1 EXISTING SETTING

New Monterey is a hillside area based on stable rock. This provides a firm foundation for the neighborhood, which is more resistant to seismic damage than alluvial or ocean sand bases. On top of this base are two soil types -- Narlon Loamy Fine Sand and Sheridan Coarse Sandy Loam.

5.8.2 SOILS AND GEOLOGY ISSUES

The Sheridan soils do not have severe problems and provide a good building foundation. The Narlon soils have several problems. They are moderately erosive and will wash away if left exposed. They have severe wetness and expansive characteristics. Because of limited depth to rock, runoff can be very high (rainwater not absorbed by the soil). The erosiveness and runoff characteristics can be minimized by provision of holding basins, planting vegetative cover, and maximizing open areas and permeable surfaces. The Narlon soils are found in lower New Monterey, from Monterey Bay to Belden Street, and in a crescent formation in upper New Monterey between Lily and Devisadero Streets.

5.8.3 SOILS AND GEOLOGY PROGRAM SUMMARY

Drainage plans on the Narlon Soils should be reviewed to minimize erosion and runoff.

5.8.4 SOILS AND GEOLOGY GOALS, POLICIES, AND PROGRAMS

GOAL X: Minimize grading and runoff on sloped areas.

POLICY 39: Minimize grading, erosion, and runoff in sloped areas.

PROGRAM 39A: Building permits for development or remodeling projects on Narlon soils should require erosion control by one or more of the following methods: ponding of runoff water, provision of drainage systems to minimize erosion, maximizing permeable surfaces, and maximizing vegetation and ground cover.

PROGRAM 39B: Grading for single-family dwellings and multi-family dwellings shall follow the City's Guidelines for Single-family Dwellings Design Review Areas.

PROGRAM 39C: Architectural Review Committee should prepare landscape guidelines which would minimize erosion on Narlon soils.
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5.9 HISTORIC PRESERVATION

5.9.1 EXISTING SETTING

The City's primary historic preservation tool is "H" zoning. There are no "H" buildings in New Monterey; however, a small number of buildings would qualify for "H" zoning. Designation of qualifying structures in New Monterey is not expected in the near future because the general direction of the Historic Preservation Commission is to initiate "H" zoning on nonresidential structures before exploring the possibility of "H" zoning in residential neighborhoods.

5.9.2 HISTORIC PRESERVATION ISSUES

A comprehensive study of historic buildings was conducted in 1978 (Nomellini-Wileman). There are approximately 35 Nomellini-Wileman buildings in the New Monterey neighborhood (including the inland side of Lighthouse Avenue). In 1987, the City surveyed the R-3 areas for historic buildings (Brovarney). This survey identified 168 structures with varying levels of historic importance.

Preservation was one of the strongest responses in the 1989 New Monterey Neighborhood Survey, with 74% of respondents favoring preservation of historic buildings. There are many distinctive buildings which contribute to the character and uniqueness of the neighborhood. These buildings can be identified, and maintenance of their distinctive features and contribution to the neighborhood can be encouraged in the design review process.

5.9.5 HISTORIC PRESERVATION PROGRAM SUMMARY

A list of significant buildings in the neighborhood should be prepared. The elements which make these buildings an asset to the neighborhood should be preserved in the design review process. "H" Historic Overlay zoning should be placed on the most significant buildings in the neighborhood.

5.9.4 HISTORIC PRESERVATION GOALS, POLICIES, AND PROGRAMS

GOAL Y: Establish "H" zoning on the most important buildings in the neighborhood.

POLICY 40: Buildings meeting criteria for "H" designation should be identified and proposed for "H" zoning.

PROGRAM 40A: The Historic Preservation Commission should survey the New Monterey neighborhood to identify properties eligible for "H" zoning and should initiate rezoning in accord with Historic Preservation Commission timing priorities.

PROGRAM 40B: The neighborhood does not support additional uses beyond those allowed in the base zoning in "H"-zoned buildings because of traffic, parking, street width, and density of development, which do not favor increased intensity of use.

PROGRAM 40C: The Historic Preservation Commission should investigate "H" zoning of the Victorian house at Archer Park Center.
GOAL Z: Establish a list of buildings of architectural and historic significance to the neighborhood but which would not qualify for "H" zoning.

POLICY 41: Buildings of architectural, cultural, historic interest which would not qualify for "H" zoning should be identified, and the distinctive features of these buildings should be retained in the Historic Preservation Commission and Architectural Review Committee review process wherever possible.

PROGRAM 41A: A list of buildings and sites with design, architectural, historic, or cultural significance to the neighborhood but which would not qualify for "H" zoning should be prepared. Nominations to the list may be submitted by residents, property owners, or the Historic Preservation Commission. The list shall include an assessment of levels of importance and shall be maintained by the Historic Preservation Commission.

PROGRAM 41B: Architectural Review Committee review should encourage maintenance of the distinctive features of the listed buildings during the design review process.
5.10 COMMERCIAL USES

The neighborhood-serving market at the corner of Prescott Avenue and Taylor Street provides a unique service to the neighborhood. This site is not proposed for rezoning to commercial because it is more likely to remain as a neighborhood-serving market as a nonconforming use; whereas, commercial zoning may lead to commercial uses other than a neighborhood market. This plan retains residential zoning on Hawthorne Street, so that no new commercial uses will be established with Hawthorne Street frontage. The bakery site at 360 McClellan Avenue is a special case in that it adjoins the C-2 zoning fronting on Lighthouse Avenue but does not have Hawthorne Street frontage.

GOAL AA: Preserve commercial uses at 360 McClellan Avenue

POLICY 42: If approved by vote, provide commercial zoning at 360 McClellan Avenue.

PROGRAM 42A: If approved by vote, amend the General Plan and rezone 360 McClellan Avenue to commercial designation (see Figures 4 and 5).
6.0 NEW MONTEREY AREA PLAN IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM

A majority of the programs set forth in this plan are statements of actions which implement the adopted goals and policies. Those programs which require City Council appropriation or result in an increased or new level of City services will be referred to the appropriate budget review process. These programs are identified with an asterisk (*) and will be reviewed annually for items to be considered for funding in the annual City budget.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTED BY</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAM 1A: Retain the present residential General Plan and zoning.</td>
<td>Planning Commission -- initiate General Plan amendment and rezoning to conform.</td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAM 1B: Encourage maintenance and new construction of single-family houses in R-3 areas as stand alone single-family houses or single-family houses with secondary units.</td>
<td>Community Development Department -- inform property owners of floor area ratio incentives and secondary unit provisions</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAM 1C: Provide City assistance through the City Housing Rehabilitation Program for rehabilitation of single-family houses for home owners who qualify for the program.</td>
<td>Housing and Property Management Division -- implement following city-wide guidelines.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAM 1D: No new Planned Unit Developments will be allowed in New Monterey.</td>
<td>Planning Commission -- implement in the use permit approval process. Use Permits must conform to the adopted Area Plan.</td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAM 1E: Minimum lot size for subdivisions shall be 5,000 square feet. Lots less than 5,000 square feet may be approved for re-combination of substandard lots in accord with the City's substandard lot policy.</td>
<td>Planning Commission -- implement in the subdivision map process.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAM 1F: The neighborhood supports consistent enforcement of zoning regulations and City ordinances.</td>
<td>All City Departments -- implement in normal City activities.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*PROGRAM 2A: The D-1 Design Review Overlay zone shall be placed on the single-family-zoned areas of New Monterey.</td>
<td>Planning Commission -- rezone along with program 1A.</td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAM 2B: Architectural Review Committee Guidelines for Single-family Dwellings in Design Review Areas shall apply to developments in R-1 areas and for R-3 developments with a single-family house and secondary unit.</td>
<td>Planning Commission/Architectural Review Committee -- implement in the use permit, variance, and design review process.</td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROGRAM 2C: Design guidelines shall be prepared for apartment areas. New and remodeled apartments should have single-family design elements facing the street.

Architectural Review Committee -- prepare design guidelines. 1992

PROGRAM 2D: On lots greater than 5,000 square feet which have a single-family house existing, secondary unit additions and apartment development should be incorporated within the existing structure as much as feasible.

Planning Commission/Architectural Review Committee -- implement in the use permit, variance, and design review process. Ongoing

PROGRAM 2E: In addition to existing Guidelines related to height on hillside lots, buildings on slopes greater than 15% should step up or down the hill to minimize apparent building height. Building understory and wall heights should be kept to a minimum.

Planning Commission/Architectural Review Committee -- implement in the use permit, variance, and design review process. 1992

PROGRAM 2F: City-wide height standards for hillside areas should be reviewed to consider potential amendment to specify that building height should be measured from the building element to the existing grade or final grade, whichever is lower, directly below that element. Height may be measured to the midpoint of a pitched-roof element.

Planning Commission/Architectural Review Committee -- implement in the use permit, variance, and/or design review process. 1992

PROGRAM 2G: Projects shall be designed to save existing trees.

Planning Commission/Architectural Review Committee -- implement in the use permit, variance, and/or design review process. 1992

PROGRAM 2H: Encourage windows on the southern exposure to capture sunlight. Windows should be in scale with wall masses.

Planning Commission/Architectural Review Committee -- implement in the use permit, variance, and/or design review process. 1992

PROGRAM 2I: Utility meters should not be placed facing a city street.

Planning Commission/Architectural Review Committee -- implement in the use permit, variance, and/or design review process. 1992

PROGRAM 2J: Parking lots on the north side of Hawthorne Street should be screened without blocking ocean views.

Planning Commission/Architectural Review Committee -- implement in the use permit, variance, and/or design review process. 1992

PROGRAM 2K: Investigate an ordinance to discourage abandoned cars, trash receptacles, trash, and litter in front yards.

Planning Commission -- initiate ordinance review. 1992
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PROGRAM 2L: Commercial trash receptacles shall be screened.

PROGRAM 2M: Retain existing stone walls within the neighborhood.

PROGRAM 3A: View analysis shall be done for construction of new structures or additions to existing structures in R-1 and R-3 areas. Where a proposed project would block existing views of Monterey Bay, the project shall be redesigned with the goal of providing a balance between protecting all or part of the view for the existing unit and also providing an equivalent view for the proposed project.

PROGRAM 4A: Parking between buildings and rear property line should be discouraged.

PROGRAM 4B: Driveways should not be wide enough to park three cars abreast.

PROGRAM 4C: Encourage the City to re-examine open space and parking requirements for apartment development and to provide more usable open space areas in new apartment development as much as feasible.

*PROGRAM 5A: Prepare a plan to underground utilities and explore potential for undergrounding throughout the neighborhood.

*PROGRAM 6A: Opportunity buy undeveloped lots and 25-foot-wide lots using Neighborhood Improvement Program, park acquisition funds, and funding from other sources.

Planning Commission/Architectural Review Committee -- implement in the use permit, variance, and/or design review process.

Planning Commission/Architectural Review Committee -- implement in the use permit, variance, and/or design review process.

Planning Commission/Architectural Review Committee -- implement in the use permit, variance, and/or design review process.

Plan is funded and is being prepared. Funding sources are being explored in 1990 using Neighborhood Improvement Program funds. Implement the plan as funds are available.

Parks and Recreation Commission should monitor availability of parcels.

Prepare Plan in 1990. Implement as funding is available.

Ongoing
PROGRAM 6B: Use existing parcels such as Irving Avenue right-of-way, the triangular parcel at Prescott and Devisadero, and the 25-foot lot in the 700 block of Parcel to fulfill this policy.

Parks and Recreation Commission should review the Parks and Recreation Master Plan for conformity to area plan policy. When improvement plans are prepared.

PROGRAM 6C: Rezone existing City-owned park and open space properties to Open Space zoning. Rezone future open space acquisitions to Open Space zoning.

Planning Commission -- rezone along with Program 1A.

*PROGRAM 7A: Small picnic areas and tot lots may be installed in greenbelt, nature preserve, and open space parks, but should not diminish the use of the parks as greenbelt/nature preserve areas. Active uses should not be placed on greenbelt/nature preserve lands.

Parks and Recreation Commission should review the Parks and Recreation Master Plan for conformity to area plan policy. Review in 1991

PROGRAM 8A: Implement the Hilltop Park Master Plan programs for the lower floor of the building.

Parks and Recreation Commission should make building improvements by 1992 and install equipment & phase in programs by 1996.

**PROGRAM 9A: Encourage parks and recreation use of the Victorian House within a five-year period.

Parks and Recreation Commission should develop program. Funding should be provided through NIP or CIP funds. Plans 1991. Development by 1995.

*PROGRAM 9B: Opportunity buy the remaining parcels in the Archer Park/Hoffman Park block, as a long-term goal, if the property is offered on open market and funds are available.

Parks and Recreation Commission should monitor offers to sell these properties on the open market. No time specified.

*PROGRAM 10A: Upgrade and renovate play equipment on Oak/Newton Park.


PROGRAM 10B: Investigate placing a picnic area closer to the Oak/Newton active play area.


PROGRAM 11A: Retain the remainder of Cypress Park as primarily an open space use.

Parks and Recreation Commission should review the Parks and Recreation Master Plan for conformity to area plan policy. Review in 1992.

*PROGRAM 12A: Encourage increased access to San Carlos Beach Park from New Monterey and completion of the park.

Parks and Recreation Commission should review the Parks and Recreation Master Plan for conformity to area plan policy. Review in 1992.
PROGRAM 13A: Maintain pre-school programs in city park centers.

*PROGRAM 14A: The City should negotiate with the Army to establish better access into the Huckleberry Hill Nature Preserve.

PROGRAM 14B: The City should negotiate with the Army to provide pedestrian access from New Monterey into the lower Presidio historic park when it is developed.

*PROGRAM 15A: Encourage the Monterey Peninsula Unified School District to continue allowing neighborhood use of Bay View school as an active park site when not required for school use.

*PROGRAM 15B: Enter into a joint agreement with the Monterey Peninsula Unified School District for joint design of Bay View School play areas for active park use, and include trees in the landscape program while respecting existing views.

*PROGRAM 16A: Encourage landscaping by the water company between the commercial uses and David Avenue to screen individual buildings, equipment, and storage area, while preserving the view of the reservoir.

PROGRAM 16B: Encourage water company employees to park on site rather than along David Avenue.

PROGRAM 17A: Healthy prominent trees should be preserved on public and private property to the maximum extent possible.

PROGRAM 17B: Healthy prominent trees should not be removed unless there is a valid reason for removal and the reason conforms to criteria for removal adopted by the Architectural Review Committee.

Parks and Recreation Commission should review the Parks and Recreation Master Plan for conformity to area plan policy.

City initiate discussions with the Army.

Access should be provided in the Presidio Historic Park Master Plan.

Continue discussions with the school district.

Initiate discussions with the water company.

Planning Commission/Architectural Review Committee/Zoning Administrator/staff -- implement in the use permit, variance, and/or design review process.

Planning Commission/Architectural Review Committee/Zoning Administrator/staff -- implement in the use permit, variance, and/or design review process.
PROGRAM 17C: Emphasis should be placed on preventative care to maintain prominent trees in a healthy and safe condition. Allow removal of diseased or damaged trees only when they cannot be brought back to a healthy and safe condition.

PROGRAM 17D: The City should assure that tree trimming by utility crews is consistent with tree preservation goals.

PROGRAM 18A: Development projects should be designed to preserve existing healthy prominent trees. The ARC should require redesign if significant trees can be preserved.

PROGRAM 19A: Adopted Architectural Review Committee tree protection standards should be applied to all new development projects.

PROGRAM 19B: In all development projects, trees to be retained should be fenced prior to construction and protected from damage by construction, including damage to tree trunks from vehicles and damage to roots from soil compaction, paving, grading, and trenching.

PROGRAM 20A: Development projects should be designed to preserve existing Monterey Pine, Monterey Cypress, Bishop Pine, and Coast Live Oak trees whenever possible. ARC review should require redesign of projects in order to preserve existing trees.

PROGRAM 20B: Replace any trees removed and fill holes in the forest with native Monterey County vegetation derived from native seed stock where possible. Replace trees as specified in the tree protection ordinance.

PROGRAM 21A: The Architectural Review Committee should develop standards for landscaping, including minimum ground level planting areas to protect trunks and roots and clear space for mature tree crowns.

Planning Commission/Architectural Review Committee/Zoning Administrator/staff -- implement in the use permit, variance, and/or design review process.

Engineering and Maintenance Department -- work with utility companies to implement this policy.

Planning Commission/Architectural Review Committee/Zoning Administrator/staff -- implement in the use permit, variance, and/or design review process.

Planning Commission/Architectural Review Committee/Zoning Administrator/staff -- implement in the use permit, variance, and/or design review process.

Building Division -- Building Permits should not be activated until tree protection is confirmed on site. Adopt modifications to Building Code to allow enforcement. Check for conformity to standards during construction.

Build Standards and implement in 1992.

Planning Commission/Architectural Review Committee -- implement in the use permit, variance, and/or design review process.

Planning Commission/Architectural Review Committee -- implement in the use permit and/or design review process.


Architectural Review Committee should develop standards. Planning Commission and Architectural Review Committee should implement in the use permit, variance, and/or design review process.
PROGRAM 22A: Tree removal permits should be processed quickly.

Follow standards of the tree protection ordinance.

1992

PROGRAM 22B: Where trees are removed, they shall be replaced and maintained as specified in the tree protection ordinance.

Follow standards of the tree protection ordinance.

1992

*PROGRAM 23A: There should be neighborhood participation in drafting the street tree program. There should be consultation with the neighborhood on street tree planting until the program is adopted.

Engineering and Maintenance Department --implement after the area plan is adopted.

Implement after neighborhood plan is adopted.

PROGRAM 23B: Implement the New Monterey portion of the City street tree program.

Engineering and Maintenance Department --implement after the area plan is adopted.

Implement after neighborhood plan is adopted.

PROGRAM 23C: Existing street trees and privately-owned trees shall be preserved in future street widening, utility work, and private project approval wherever practical.

Engineering and Maintenance Department --implement with street widening projects.

Implement as projects are proposed.

PROGRAM 23D: Where street trees are removed, they shall be replaced as specified in the tree protection ordinance and the City street tree plan.

Engineering and Maintenance Department --implement with street widening projects.

Implement as projects are proposed.

PROGRAM 23E: Street trees in the urban forest area should emphasize Monterey Pine, Monterey Cypress, Oak, and Bishop Pine trees.

Engineering and Maintenance Department --implement with street widening projects.

Implement as projects are proposed.

PROGRAM 23F: Priority for installation should be given to blocks which desired street tree installation in the 1989 New Monterey Neighborhood Survey (Figure 10) or where property owners request installation.

Engineering and Maintenance Department --implement as part of the city street tree program.

Ongoing

PROGRAM 23G: Street trees should be installed when sidewalks are installed.

Engineering and Maintenance Department --implement with street widening projects.

Implement as projects are proposed.

PROGRAM 24A: The New Monterey Area Plan recommends reclassifying Hawthorne as a collector street, and reclassifying Lighthouse Avenue as an arterial street. Defer decision until completion of the City-wide Traffic Study.

Add as an issue to the City-wide Traffic Study.

Traffic study 1991/92.
PROGRAM 24B: The New Monterey Area Plan recommends retaining Hawthorne as a two-way street with no traffic signals except at David Avenue. Defer decision until completion of the City-wide Traffic Study.

Add as an issue to the City-wide Traffic Study. 1992

PROGRAM 24C: The New Monterey Area Plan recommends deleting the Hawthorne/Private Bolio connection from the General Plan. Defer decision until completion of the City-wide Traffic Study.

Add as an issue to the City-wide Traffic Study. 1991/92

PROGRAM 25A: Establish traffic controls on Foam and Lighthouse so that there are several entrances to New Monterey with equivalent levels of traffic control. Add one more protected access (Drake suggested) at the east end of Hawthorne Street.

Add as an issue to the City-wide Traffic Study. 1991/92

PROGRAM 25B: The Reeside/Lighthouse intersection should be improved to facilitate turning movements.

Add as an issue to the City-wide Traffic Study. 1991/92

PROGRAM 25C: The City-wide Traffic Study should investigate ways to increase through traffic use of Lighthouse Avenue and Foam Streets, including improved transition from Pacific Grove Lighthouse Avenue to Monterey Lighthouse Avenue.

Add as an issue to the City-wide Traffic Study. 1991/92

PROGRAM 25D: The City-wide Traffic Study should investigate the possibility of returning Foam Street to two-way traffic to determine if such a change would improve traffic flow in the Lighthouse Corridor.

Add as an issue to the City-wide Traffic Study. 1991/92

PROGRAM 26A: Work with the Army and the City of Pacific Grove to encourage a direct access from the Defense Language Institute to Highway 68.

Add as an issue to the City-wide Traffic Study. 1991/92

PROGRAM 27A: The City-wide Traffic Study should investigate ways to direct traffic entering and leaving Defense Language Institute at Taylor Street to use Prescott Avenue as a direct access to Highway 68, and to discourage this traffic from continuing along Taylor Street or using local streets to reach Highway 68 via David Avenue.

Add as an issue to the City-wide Traffic Study. 1991/92

New Monterey Area Plan
October 1991 51
PROGRAM 27B: Revise traffic controls to discourage through traffic use of local streets.

Add as an issue to the City-wide Traffic Study.

PROGRAM 27C: The New Monterey Area Plan recommends designating Taylor Street from the Presidio of Monterey to Prescott Avenue as a neighborhood street. Defer decision until completion of the City-wide Traffic Study.

Add as an issue to the City-wide Traffic Study.

PROGRAM 27D: It is advantageous to have improved access from the Defense Language Institute to Lighthouse Avenue.

Add as an issue to the City-wide Traffic Study.

PROGRAM 28A: The City-wide Traffic Study should investigate ways to reduce speeding on local streets.

Add as an issue to the City-wide Traffic Study.

*PROGRAM 28B: Use traffic controls to encourage use of Prescott Avenue as a collector and not as a through street.

Add as an issue to the City-wide Traffic Study.

PROGRAM 28C: In the Lighthouse corridor, Hawthorne Street traffic controls should be limited to stop signs, except at the intersection with David Avenue. Traffic controls which allow filtering into the neighborhood are acceptable, even if not consistent with functional classification.

Add as an issue to the City-wide Traffic Study.

PROGRAM 29A: A speed survey should be conducted on streets noted to have speeding problems to determine where enforcement activities should be concentrated.

Engineering and Maintenance Department should conduct surveys as needed.

PROGRAM 29B: Speeding should be discouraged by selective enforcement activities in those areas identified as having particular speed problems, such as increased enforcement, use of the speed wagon, increased signage including painted speed limits on streets.

Police Department should identify areas with speeding problems and develop and implement enforcement programs.


PROGRAM 29C: Speeding should be discouraged by street design features such as trees with overhead canopy, narrowed pavement sections at corners, and discouragement of pavement widths in excess of that appropriate to the street classification.

Street improvement projects should be reviewed with the goal of speed reduction in mind.

Ongoing
PROGRAM 30A: Establish a "Safe Route to School" program for Bay View School.

Traffic Committee should investigate potential program and should coordinate with the school and parent groups.

PROGRAM 31A: Streets should be widened and curbs, gutters, and sidewalks should be installed on all property frontages when any new development occurs in the lower R-3 area.

Planning Commission -- impose as conditions on project approval.

PROGRAM 31B: All streets with apartment development in the lower R-3 area should be widened to accommodate increased traffic and parking needs.

Widening should be an ongoing program using Neighborhood Improvement Program and other funding sources.

PROGRAM 31C: Capital Improvement funds should be used to widen streets in the lower R-3 area.

City -- add to Capital Improvement Program funding list

PROGRAM 31D: Apartment developers should reimburse the City for street widening which was accomplished with Neighborhood Improvement Program and Capital Improvement Program funds.

Engineering and Maintenance Department -- develop program and collect reimbursement funds.

PROGRAM 31E: Streets in the middle R-1 area should be widened where desired by the neighborhood or where problems of emergency access are identified.

Widening should be an ongoing program using Neighborhood Improvement Program and other funding sources.

PROGRAM 31F: Streets should not be widened in upper New Monterey. There should be no curbs, gutters, or pavement widening in the upper New Monterey area.

Street widening programs should not be initiated in this area.

PROGRAM 32A: Parking restrictions should be placed on areas where necessary to assure emergency vehicle access.

Program would be implemented if emergency access is determined to be restricted.

PROGRAM 33A: Work with neighboring jurisdictions to restore Highway 68 to Level of Service C.

Add as an issue to the City-wide Traffic Study.

PROGRAM 34A: Test hydrants prior to all new development where current flow data is unavailable. Require hydrant upgrade consistent with Fire Department policies.

Hydrant testing and improvements should be condition of development approval.
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PROGRAM 34B: Continue to test fire hydrants on a routine basis, unless drought conditions prevent testing. Hydrant flows should be calculated to determine flow at 20 p.s.i. residual pressure. Areas of inadequate delivery should be identified based on flow requirements for the surrounding land use, exposures, etc. A plan and schedule to improve the water system for needed flows should be developed. Replacement should be consistent with city-wide policies for water main replacement.

*PROGRAM 34C: Replace two-inch water mains as proposed in the Cal-Am four-year replacement plan. Replace remaining two-inch water mains as funding is available.

*PROGRAM 35A: Replace intersection drainage systems with headwalls for inlets and outlets using Neighborhood Improvement Program funds and other funding sources such as developer requirements, Capital Improvement Program, street improvement funds, and drainage improvement funds.

*PROGRAM 36A: Replace ditches with underground or surface drainage where desired by residents using Neighborhood Improvement Program funds and other funding sources such as developer requirements, street improvement funds, and drainage improvement funds.

*PROGRAM 37A: Investigate use of Bay View School and Hilltop Center as emergency centers with generators, food, medical supplies, and water supply as appropriate.

PROGRAM 37B: Assure water supply to the neighborhood. Investigate contingencies should the water system fail (e.g., acquisition of generators).

*PROGRAM 37C: Prepare a neighborhood emergency plan.

PROGRAM 38A: Maintain library bookmobile service at its present level.

Fire Department should set schedule and should coordinate program for water system improvements.

California-American Water Company will continue its water system improvements.

Neighborhood and Engineering and Maintenance Department coordinate replacement and funding.

Neighborhood and Engineering and Maintenance Department coordinate replacement and funding.

Disaster Council will develop program.

Disaster Council will develop program.

Disaster Council will develop program.

Library continue service.
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PROGRAM 39A: Building permits for development or remodeling projects on Narlon soils should require erosion control by one or more of the following methods: ponding of runoff water, provision of drainage systems to minimize erosion, maximizing permeable surfaces, and maximizing vegetation and ground cover.

PROGRAM 39B: Grading for single-family dwellings and multi-family dwellings shall follow the City's Guidelines for Single-family Dwellings Design Review Areas.

PROGRAM 39C: Architectural Review Committee should prepare landscape guidelines which would minimize erosion on Narlon soils.

PROGRAM 40A: The Historic Preservation Commission should survey the New Monterey neighborhood to identify properties eligible for "H" zoning and should initiate rezoning in accord with Historic Preservation Commission timing priorities.

PROGRAM 40B: The neighborhood does not support additional uses beyond those allowed in the base zoning in "H"-zoned buildings because of traffic, parking, street width, and density of development, which do not favor increased intensity of use.

PROGRAM 40C: The Historic Preservation Commission should investigate "H" zoning of the Victorian house at Archer Park Center.

PROGRAM 41A: A list of buildings and sites with design, architectural, historic, or cultural significance to the neighborhood but which would not qualify for "H" zoning should be prepared. Nominations to the list may be submitted by residents, property owners, or the Historic Preservation Commission. The list shall include an assessment of levels of importance and shall be maintained by the Historic Preservation Commission. Building Department review for special conditions.

Planning Commission/Architectural Review Committee -- implement in the use permit, variance, and/or design review process.

Planning Commission/Architectural Review Committee -- implement in the use permit, variance, and/or design review process.

Historic Preservation Commission should initiate survey after commercial studies and designations are completed.

Implement by denial of use permit, variances, based on program findings.

Historic Preservation Commission should initiate study and rezoning.

Neighborhood and Historic Preservation Commission may initiate studies when the neighborhood deems appropriate. Ongoing
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PROGRAM 41B: ARC review should encourage maintenance of the distinctive features of the listed buildings during the design review process.

PROGRAM 42A: If approved by vote, amend the area plan and rezone 360 McClellan Avenue to commercial designation.

Architectural Review Committee -- implement in the use permit, variance, and/or design review process.

City should initiate project and submit to a vote in accord with the City Charter.

Implement when list is adopted.

Timing depends on City initiation.