

Pedestrian Advisory Council Response to CodeNEXT Mobility Prescription Report

August 8, 2016

Overview

On July 27, the Project Subcommittee of the Pedestrian Advisory Council (PAC) met to review and respond to the CodeNEXT Mobility Prescription Report.

The group found agreement that the general philosophy toward transportation solutions contained within the report is consistent with the mission of the PAC. However, there are many instances in which the report lacks needed details. Further, while some of the PAC's recommendations from 2 years ago were included, many were not. PAC recommends staff review the Mobility Prescription Report against the PAC/BAC Recommendations to CodeNEXT.

Response

P. 3 – Report doesn't focus on the diversity of land uses sufficiently. It speaks to the importance of proximity to transit and density along transit. While those are good, it is important to more strongly make the case for diverse land use patterns. The PAC recommendations asks for this (p.2).

P. 15, 17 – Plan for Density Along Transit Corridors. The document emphasizes ¼ mile of transit for increasing density. Many studies indicate that people are comfortable walking ½ a mile. ½ or ¾ mile should be the distance of focus for density and high priority pedestrian infrastructure. PAC/BAC recommendations state ½ mile (p.4).

P.35 – Density along corridors isn't the only issue. Diversity of land uses is also needed. PAC recommendations (p.2)

P. 11, 17 – Remodels versus redevelopment. The need to ensure remodels trigger streetscape improvements is good and aligns with PAC recommendations (p. 8).

Report should address Subchapter E. PAC recommendations (p. 4) identifies issues with those standards applying only to commercial properties.

P. 34 – Lack of Connectivity addressed but more specifics are necessary. PAC recommendations provide some ideas (p.3).

P 44 – Elements relating to safety need to be elevated in emphasis. More detail is also needed. Perhaps include specific elements of the Vision Zero Action Plan. Or, specify that every single item of CodeNEXT be evaluated against safety and connectivity.

P. 47, 49 – Transportation Impact Assessments. Document needs to elaborate on how they will be more multi-modal. The PAC recommendations (p.7) spell out some specific opportunities. Transportation Demand Management should be a standard.

Mobility Prescription report doesn't address exemption/variance/Alternative Equivalent Compliance/PUD/PDA and how they will be treated in new Code. While the new Code will [hopefully]

significantly reduce need for variances, etc., the prescription report should outline what processes and standards will be in place to provide for these alternative development scenarios. The PAC recommendations address this (p. 3-4, 8).

The report does not address wayfinding. Wayfinding for pedestrians is an important mobility goal. The PAC recommendations address this (p. 4).

Alleys are not addressed within Mobility Prescription Report. These are important for service provision within our transportation system and should be included within the report. Alleys also enhance the pedestrian realm and are addressed within the PAC recommendations (p. 3).

Shared streets should be included as topic within the Mobility Prescription Report. The recently adopted Sidewalk Master Plan includes plans for shared streets pilots. The Mobility Prescription Report should address how the Land Development Code will enable shared streets (p. 3).

Pedestrian Rights Flyer - The Pedestrian Advisory Council Technical Subcommittee is producing a pedestrian rights flyer to clarify the legal rights and expectations of pedestrians and drivers throughout the transportation system, particularly at intersections. There are implications for how we allow private driveways (function as intersections but with different legal rights for pedestrians) and parking lots, etc.

P. 5 – Report mentioned repeatedly the Strategic Mobility Plan (*p.6, 18). More information is needed here and needs to spell out details of lane widths, street types, design speeds, etc. Understanding that this document can't be complete BEFORE the CodeNEXT process, this document should establish some important foundational standards that will be included in the SMP and CodeNEXT moving forward. (Boulevards, Street Trees, Wayfinding, Urban Design, etc. are elements that need more details). In other words, the Mobility Prescription Report should clarify important/foundational street design components.

P. 13 – What is the difference between the Strategic Mobility Plan referenced earlier and the City's Transportation Plan? These plans are both mentioned but the purpose of each and the relationship is unclear.

P. 18, 34 – What are the “best practices in multi-model design” for connectivity? Need for connectivity addressed within PAC recommendations

P.23 – Site Plan exemptions are identified as having unintended consequences. How do we provide criteria for making exemptions to minimize those negative effects?

P. 29 – Parking minimums eliminated and maximums established. This aligns with the PAC recommendations for vehicle and bicycle parking (p. 5).

P.11 – Under Transit, “A poor quality streetscape or the perception of danger discourages transit use.” Actually, real danger exists, too.

P. 6 – Traffic injuries and deaths should be mentioned under environmental and health considerations.

Staff should prepare a table of all Code standards and processes which details whether current Code elements are being incorporated into the new Code, whether they are being eliminated, or changed. If changed, specify in what way the standards are changing. This is essential for community members to evaluate the draft Code when released.

P. 14 – There is a redundant Utilities section.