AGENDA

1. Introduction and Project Overview
2. Mobility/Parking Alternatives Exercise and Discussion
3. Development Alternatives Exercise and Discussion
4. Wrap Up and Next Steps
MEETING OBJECTIVES

- Introduce the Specific Plan Update project
- Summarize background information and community input received
- Solicit input on the potential development and mobility alternatives

What’s your vision for the future of Smoky Hollow?
GROUND RULES

- Common conversational courtesy
- Suspend judgement
- All ideas and points of view have value
- Focus on ideas
- Speak up and share the time
- Cell phone courtesy
- Be comfortable
- Have fun!
PROJECT OVERVIEW
SPECIFIC PLAN GOALS

- Establish a clear vision
- Identify allowable uses and businesses, and explore incentives to encourage preferred land uses
- Establish building design and development standards and guidelines, including floor area ratio, height, and setbacks
- Develop parking solutions
- Identify opportunities for mobility enhancements and place-making strategies that will encourage economic investment and create a distinctive business district
Multiple studies have recommended an update to the 1986 Smoky Hollow Specific Plan.
## Schedule and Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Conditions</th>
<th>• Existing Conditions Background Report (published December, 2015)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visioning and Alternatives</td>
<td>• March 8, 2016: Community Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• TODAY: Concept Alternatives Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Specific Plan and EIR</td>
<td>• Draft Specific Plan: Winter 2016/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Draft EIR: Summer 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Hearings and Adoption</td>
<td>• Study Sessions: Spring/Summer 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Public Hearings: Fall 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXISTING CONDITIONS
EXISTING CONDITIONS
EXISTING CONDITIONS
EXISTING CONDITIONS
EXISTING CONDITIONS
EXISTING CONDITIONS
WHAT WE’VE LEARNED: TECHNICAL STUDIES
• Smoky Hollow’s renaissance driven by demand for creative office and flexible/research and development (flex/R&D) space

• Demand is growing as the regional economy shifts toward increasing shares of professional services firms and creative businesses (growth of “Silicon Beach”)
  • Newer uses in Smoky Hollow skew strongly toward office-based industries (more than half of new businesses in past 10 years)

• Development pressure and price competition will result in a long-term decline in traditional industrial uses
# Traffic Findings

## 2015 Peak Hour Traffic Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Intersections</th>
<th>A.M. Peak</th>
<th>P.M. Peak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ICU or Delay (sec.)</td>
<td>LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Main Street &amp; Holly Avenue</td>
<td>0.322</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Main Street &amp; Grand Avenue</td>
<td>0.435</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Eucalyptus Drive &amp; Grand Avenue *</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Lomita Street &amp; Grand Avenue</td>
<td>0.345</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Center Street &amp; Grand Avenue *</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Kansas Street &amp; Grand Avenue</td>
<td>0.347</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Sepulveda Boulevard &amp; Grand Avenue #</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Main Street &amp; Franklin Avenue *</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Standard Street &amp; Franklin Avenue *</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Lomita Street &amp; Franklin Avenue *</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Maryland Street &amp; Franklin Avenue *</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Oregon Street &amp; Franklin Avenue *</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Main Street &amp; El Segundo Boulevard *</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Illinois Street &amp; El Segundo Boulevard</td>
<td>0.390</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Sepulveda Boulevard &amp; El Segundo Boulevard #</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TRAFFIC FINDINGS

Bicycle/Pedestrian Study Intersections

=Robust Pedestrian Intersections

SMOKY HOLLOW SPECIFIC PLAN
WHAT WE’VE LEARNED: COMMUNITY INPUT
COMMUNITY WORKSHOP #1

Smoky Hollow

park/parking

El Segundo

business

SMOKY HOLLOW SPECIFIC PLAN
STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEWS

- Focus group interviews with:
  - Planning Commissioners
  - architects
  - developers
  - real estate brokers
  - business representatives
  - property owners
- Economic Development Advisory Council (EDAC)
STAKEHOLDER INTERVIEWS

KEY THEMES

- Long-term transition to office, creative, and working lifestyle uses
- Inadequate parking supply
- Improve streetscapes and rights-of-way
- Tweak the development standards to more easily accommodate desired uses
- Streamline development review processes
KEY THEMES

- Develop catalytic projects/improvements, and create clusters of more intense experiences
- The sense of history and authenticity are valued
- Smoky Hollow has a positive future: "Prime for Renaissance"
ENVISIONING CHANGE IN SMOKY HOLLOW
POLLING

• Use your clicker to select your answer preference for each question
• Each question’s responses are a set of alternatives
• Answer choices are labeled A through E
• If you do not like any of the alternatives, select “Other”
Who’s happy the RAMS are back in LA?

A. YES! It’s been too long!
B. No! Traffic is bad already.
C. They should have stayed in St. Louis.
D. I don’t like football.

Response Counter
PARKING/MOBILITY SOLUTIONS
ISSUES TO ADDRESS

Smoky Hollow

park/parking

El Segundo

business

SMOKY HOLLOW SPECIFIC PLAN
PARKING SOLUTIONS

- Increase supply of on-street parking through roadway modifications
- Increase supply of off-street parking
ON-STREET PARKING

Add angled parking with one-way traffic flow on select north-south roadways
ONE-WAY & ANGLED PARKING

SMOKY HOLLOW SPECIFIC PLAN
PARKING SOLUTIONS

Summary: Parking space increase due to roadway restriping:

– North-south roadways: 85 spaces
– El Segundo Boulevard: 101 spaces

– TOTAL: 186 spaces
QUESTION 1

Which north/south alternatives do you prefer?
North/South Streets

- Goals
  - Provide additional parking
  - Consider need for loading
  - Improve walkability
ALTERNATIVE B: Wider Sidewalk

North/South Streets

Alternative B
- Key Change: Wider sidewalks
- Gain: Improved pedestrian accommodations
- Downsides:
  - Limited gain (increases sidewalk width by just 1 foot), continued obstruction by utility poles
  - High cost associated with moving curb and gutter
ALTERNATIVE C: Angled Parking, One Way Travel/Loading Lane

North/South Streets

Alternative C
- Key Changes:
  - Angled parking
  - One combination travel/loading lane
- Gains:
  - Low-cost restriping
- Downsides:
  - Need to identify loading areas
  - Unconventional one-way circulation pattern
QUESTION 1 SUMMARY

A. Existing Condition

B. Wider Sidewalks

C. Angled Parking, One Way Travel/Loading Lane
Q1. Which north/south alternative do you prefer?

A. Existing Condition
B. Wider Sidewalk
C. Angled Parking/One Way
D. Other

Response Counter
QUESTION 2

Which El Segundo Boulevard alternative do you prefer?
Proposed changes to El Segundo Boulevard
El Segundo Blvd.

Existing Condition
- Four travel lanes
- No on-street parking allowed
- 4’ Sidewalk

Goals:
- Provide additional on-street parking
- Implement the Bicycle Master Plan
- Enhance walkability
ALTERNATIVE B: Two Travel Lanes, Turn Lane, Cycle Track, Wider Sidewalk, On-street Parking

El Segundo Blvd

Alternative B
- Key Changes:
  - Two travel lanes
  - One turn lane
  - Cycle Track on south side
  - On-street parking
  - Wider sidewalk
- Gains:
  - Additional parking at a low-cost (option for restriping prior to curb bulb-out installation)
  - Dedicated cycle track implements Bicycle Master Plan
  - Increased sidewalk width
- Downside: Construction cost (seek grants to fund implementation)
El Segundo Blvd

Alternative C

- Key Changes:
  - Two travel lanes
  - One turn lane
  - Bike lanes on both sides
  - On-street parking
  - Wider sidewalk

- Gains:
  - Additional parking at a low-cost (option for restriping prior to curb bulb-out installation)
  - Increased sidewalk width
  - Bike lanes implement Bicycle Master Plan

- Downside: Higher construction cost associated with adjusting curb on north and south sides of the street (seek grants to fund implementation)
A. Existing Condition

B. Three Lanes, Cycle Track, Wider Sidewalk, On-street Parking

C. Three Lanes, Bike Lanes, Wider Sidewalk, On-street Parking
Q2. Which El Segundo Boulevard alternative do you prefer?

A. Existing Condition
B. Cycle Track and Parking
C. Bike Lanes and Parking
D. Other

Response Counter
QUESTION 3

Which Grand Avenue alternative do you prefer?
Proposed changes to Grand Avenue
A. EXISTING CONDITION

Grand Avenue
Existing Condition
- Four travel lanes during peak travel times
- Two travel lanes and two parking lanes during off-peak times

Goals:
- Road diet to improve circulation and parking
- Increase on-street parking through dedicated curb parking
- Implement Bicycle Master Plan
ALTERNATIVE B: Parking, Narrower Lanes, Turn Lane, Two Bike Sharrows

Grand Avenue
Alternative B

- Key Changes
  - Dedicated parking
  - Narrower lanes
  - Shared turn lane
  - Shared bike route (sharrow)

- Gains:
  - Additional all-day parking at a low cost (restriping)
  - Dedicated turn lane
  - Bike route implements Bicycle Master Plan

- Note: Roadway capacity can easily accommodate existing traffic
QUESTION 3 SUMMARY

A. Existing Condition

B. Travel & Turn Lanes, Parking, and Sharrows
Q3. Which Grand Avenue alternative do you prefer?

A. Existing Condition

B. 3 Lanes, Parking, Sharrows

C. Other

Response Counter

SMOKY HOLLOW SPECIFIC PLAN
QUESTION 4

Which Franklin Avenue alternative do you prefer?
Proposed changes to Franklin Avenue
A. EXISTING CONDITION

Franklin Avenue

Existing Condition
- Ranges from 40- to 50-foot right-of-way
- Goal: Provide opportunities for place-making
Alternative B: Inclusive Street

Franklin Avenue

Alternative B
- Key Change: Inclusive/Shared Street
  - Designed to allow drivers, cyclists, and pedestrians to share the same space, making the street much more welcoming and appealing
  - Street functions as a social space; not limited to just vehicular mobility
  - Slower speeds; focus on landscaping and signage/street furniture
  - Would integrate on-street parking
ALTERNATIVE B: Inclusive Street
ALTERNATIVE B: Inclusive Street
ALTERNATIVE C: Promenade

Franklin Avenue

Alternative C

- Key Change: Promenade
  - Portions of the roadway closed to vehicular traffic
  - Priority is given to pedestrians and cyclists
  - Street functions as a social space; not limited to just vehicular mobility
- Potential for parklets, installations, and expansion of existing work spaces
- Would reduce on-street parking currently allowed on Franklin
- Some properties receive access from Franklin
ALTERNATIVE C: Promenade
ALTERNATIVE C: Promenade
QUESTION 4 SUMMARY

A. Existing Condition

B. Inclusive Street

C. Promenade
Q4. Which Franklin Avenue alternative do you prefer?

A. Existing Condition
B. Inclusive Street
C. Promenade
D. Other

Response Counter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Condition</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive Street</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promenade</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SMOKY HOLLOW SPECIFIC PLAN
Do you support in-lieu fees as an additional parking solution?
To increase supply of off-street parking:

- Cities can offer developers the option of paying a fee “in lieu” of providing required parking.

- In-lieu fee cost: $37,090 per space (estimated)

- In-lieu fees are banked to fund the cost of parking structure construction
Q5. Do you support in-lieu fees as an additional parking solution?

A. Yes
B. No
C. Other
Floor area ratio (FAR) describes the ratio of the building size to the lot size.

$$\text{Floor area ratio} = \frac{\text{Total "net floor area" (including all floors of all buildings on a site)}}{\text{Total lot area}}$$

Note: Net floor area does not include areas devoted to elevator shafts, stairwells, mechanical rooms, restrooms, and parking garages.
FLOOR AREA RATIO

0.5 FAR
- 1 Story
- 2 Stories

1.0 FAR
- 1 Story
- 2 Stories
- 4 Stories

2.0 FAR
- 2 Stories
- 4 Stories
- 8 Stories

Entire Lot Area
Half Lot Area
Quarter Lot Area
FLOOR AREA RATIO

Floor-to-Area Ratio (FAR)

- < 0.6 FAR
- >0.6 FAR
FLOOR AREA RATIO

0.6 FAR Example

Flexible office space building with rear off-street parking
0.6 FAR Example

Older light industrial building with front off-street parking
FLOOR AREA RATIO

1.0 FAR Examples

Light industrial building with off-street parking on side and front
FLOOR AREA RATIO

>1.0 FAR Examples

Office/light industrial building with full two stories and ground floor parking area/open space
QUESTION 6

Which concept alternative do you prefer?
CONCEPT ALTERNATIVES

GOALS AND SHARED CHARACTERISTICS

- Allow for market shifts to continue
- Support emerging businesses
- Identify creative solutions to parking
- Encourage district identity
- Limit residential uses
CONCEPT ALTERNATIVES

A • Existing Condition (0.6 FAR)

B • No FAR standards

C • Hybrid A/B: No FAR on east; 0.6 on west

D • 1.0 FAR
CONCEPT A: EXISTING CONDITION

Specific Plan Boundary

0.6 FAR

Parking

Public Facilities

SMOKY HOLLOW SPECIFIC PLAN
CONCEPT B: NO FAR
CONCEPT C: HYBRID
0.6/NO FAR
CONCEPT D: 1.0 FAR

Specific Plan Boundary

1 FAR
Parking
Public Facilities
COMMON ASSUMPTIONS:

- Redevelopment would occur on underutilized sites (developed at less than 0.6 FAR)
- In the future, (given current market trends) we could assume:
  - 63% Office
  - 34% Industrial
  - 3% Retail
## Concept Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Non-Residential Square Feet</th>
<th>Increase Compared to Concept A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concept A: Existing Conditions</td>
<td>2,486,001</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept B: No FAR</td>
<td>4,009,075</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept C: 0.6 FAR/No FAR</td>
<td>3,653,196</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept D: 1.0 FAR</td>
<td>3,282,193</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How do the Concept Alternatives impact car trips, demand for parking, water use, and jobs over the life of the Specific Plan (15-20 years)?
Vehicle Trips/Day

- **A**: 22,386, +107%
- **B**: 41,566, +86%
- **C**: 37,334, +67%

Off-street Parking Space Demand

- **A**: 5,875
- **B**: 10,812, +147%
- **C**: 9,775, +119%
- **D**: 8,984, +104%
CONCEPT INDICATORS

Water Use (gallons/day)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>303,747</td>
<td>766,168</td>
<td>680,793</td>
<td>611,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>+152%</td>
<td>+124%</td>
<td>+101%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Employment (Jobs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,953</td>
<td>5,088</td>
<td>4,636</td>
<td>4,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>+161%</td>
<td>+137%</td>
<td>+113%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONCEPT SUMMARY

Concept A: Existing Conditions
- FAR 0.6

Concept B: No FAR
- No FAR

Concept C: 0.6 FAR/ No FAR
- FAR 0.6/No FAR

Concept D: 1.0 FAR
- 1.0 FAR
Q6. Which concept alternative do you prefer?

A. Existing Conditions
B. No FAR
C. 0.6 FAR/No FAR
D. 1.0 FAR
E. Other

Response Counter
NEXT STEPS
NEXT STEPS

- Concept Alternatives Online Survey
- November 16, 2016: EDAC/CC/PC Study Session to review Concept Alternatives and community input

The input and direction received at today’s meeting, through the online survey, and at the EDAC/CC/PC session will be used to confirm a preferred mobility/land use alternative for the Specific Plan, with a draft Plan anticipated in Jan-Feb, 2017.
CITY OF EL SEGUNDO

Smoky Hollow Specific Plan Update

Community Workshop #2

Concept Alternatives

November 3, 2016