

CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION

CENTRAL COAST DISTRICT OFFICE
725 FRONT STREET, SUITE 300
SANTA CRUZ, CA 95060
PHONE: (831) 427-4863
FAX: (831) 427-4877
WEB: WWW.COASTAL.CA.GOV



W22a-e

Appeal Filed: 4/19/2018
49th Day: 6/28/2018
Staff: Sarah Carvill - SC
Staff Report: 5/18/2018
Hearing Date: 6/6/2018

APPEAL STAFF REPORT: SUBSTANTIAL ISSUE DETERMINATION ONLY

Appeal Number: A-3-STC-18-0024, A-3-STC-18-0025, A-3-STC-18-0026, A-3-STC-18-0027, A-3-STC-18-0028

Applicant: City of Santa Cruz

Appellants: Phillip and Jean Crawford, Megan and James Dawson, Jonathan and Dorinda Parker, and Aldo and Joan Giacchino

Local Government: City of Santa Cruz

Local Decision: Coastal development permit application numbers CP18-0003, CP18-0004, CP18-0005, CP18-0006, and CP-0013 approved by the City of Santa Cruz Zoning Administrator on March 21, 2018.

Locations: Adjacent to Lighthouse Museum (APN 004-302-02-000) in a landscape strip; adjacent to 25 Beach Street (APN 004-091-02-000); adjacent to 400 Beach Street (APN 007-321-04-000); adjacent to 225 San Lorenzo Boulevard (APN 007-423-01-000); adjacent to 204 Swanton Boulevard (APN 003-254-12-000).

Project Description: Install, in each location, a five-foot-three-inch wide and approximately 38-foot-long bicycle parking station holding 14 bicycles and an accompanying, two-faced steel sign approximately six feet in height and 11.5 inches in width.

Staff Recommendation: No Substantial Issue

Important Hearing Procedure Note: This is a substantial issue only hearing. Testimony will be taken only on the question of whether the appeal raises a substantial issue. Generally and at the discretion of the Chair, testimony is limited to three minutes total per side. Please plan your testimony accordingly. Only the Applicant, persons who opposed the application before the local government (or their representatives), and the local government shall be qualified to testify at this stage of the appeal. Others may submit comments in writing. If the Commission determines that the appeal does raise a substantial issue, the de novo phase of the hearing will occur at a future Commission meeting, during which the Commission will take public testimony. (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Sections 13115 and 13117.)

SUMMARY OF STAFF RECOMMENDATION

As part of an effort to establish a City-wide bike share program, the City of Santa Cruz approved coastal development permits (CDPs) for five bike parking stations and associated, explanatory signage in the Coastal Appeal Zone. A row of bike docks and an accompanying sign (known collectively as a “hub”) would be located (1) in an existing, iceplant-vegetated landscape strip in Lighthouse Point Park; (2) in what is now a “no parking zone” within a public parking lot at 25 Beach Street; (3) in the Beach Street right-of-way in front of the Santa Cruz Beach Boardwalk, in the current location of two metered parking spaces; (4) in the Mike Fox Skate Park; and (5) in a “no parking” zone in the right-of-way on Swanton Boulevard near its intersection with West Cliff Drive. These five hubs, as well as 22 others,¹ have been approved for various locations near the City’s existing network of bike paths and trails, and will be stocked with electric bicycles featuring “pedal-assist” technology,² onboard rental software, GPS, and locking systems, allowing users to return the vehicles to any public bicycle rack. Bicycles would be “rebalanced” among the hubs, maintained, and monitored by vendor Social Bicycles, operating under contract with the City.

The Appellants contend that the approved projects are inconsistent with City of Santa Cruz Local Coastal Program (LCP) policies related to coastal access, visual and scenic resources, and neighborhood character, as well as Coastal Act policies related to coastal access. After reviewing the local record, Commission staff has concluded that the approved projects do not raise a substantial issue with respect to their conformance with the Coastal Act or the City’s LCP.

Specifically, the Appellants’ coastal access contention is based on concern that the approved projects will increase bicycle traffic on a multiuse coastal path, rendering the path unsafe and undesirable for pedestrians. The path is already used by cyclists and pedestrians, however, and the LCP explicitly designates it for both user groups. Second, with respect to the Appellants’

¹ The bike share program is intended to include 27 hubs, seven of which are in the appealable portion of the City’s coastal zone. Aside from the five coastal hubs that are the subject of this report, a hub proposed for the right-of-way adjacent to 102 Woodrow Avenue (City CDP No. CP18-0002) was appealed to the Planning Commission and will be heard on May 17, 2018. The Appellant in that case is one of the eight Appellants named in the Coastal Commission appeals that are the subject of this report. With respect to the remaining coastal hub, which will be located in the right-of-way adjacent to 1305 East Cliff Drive (City CDP No. CP18-0007), the Commission received a Final Local Action Notice for the project on Thursday, April 5, 2018. The ten-working-day appeal period for that action concluded at 5 p.m. on Thursday, April 19, 2018, with no appeals received.

² “Pedal assist” refers to a system in which an electric motor provides power in proportion to that provided by the person pedaling.

visual resource contentions, the development that would occur as part of these projects is small-scale and low-profile, and all five approved projects were sited to minimize impacts to visual resources, consistent with the LCP. Finally, with respect to neighborhood compatibility, all five projects provide recreation to coastal visitors, and are located within or immediately adjacent to parks or commercial areas where such recreation already occurs.

As a result, staff recommends that the Commission determine that the appeal contentions do not raise a substantial LCP conformance issue, and that the Commission decline to take jurisdiction over the CDPs for these projects. The motion necessary to implement this recommendation is found on page 4 below.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. MOTION AND RESOLUTIONS.....	5
II. FINDINGS AND DECLARATIONS.....	5
A. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND LOCATION.....	5
B. CITY OF SANTA CRUZ CDP APPROVAL.....	7
C. APPEAL PROCEDURES	7
D. SUMMARY OF APPEAL CONTENTIONS	8
E. SUBSTANTIAL ISSUE DETERMINATION	9
1. Coastal Access	9
2. Visual Resources.....	13
3. Neighborhood Compatibility and Community Character.....	16
4. Other Contentions	17
F. CONCLUSION.....	18

APPENDICES

Appendix A – Substantive File Documents

Appendix B – Staff Contact with Agencies and Groups

EXHIBITS

Exhibit 1 – Map of City-Approved Bike Share Hubs in Coastal Appeal Zone

Exhibit 2 – Project Site Images

Exhibit 3 – City-Approved Sign

Exhibit 4 – City’s Final Local Action Notices

Exhibit 5 – Appeal of City of Santa Cruz CDP Decisions

Exhibit 6 – Applicable LCP Policies and Standards

Exhibit 7 – Hub Locations Relative to the West Cliff Drive Overlay

Exhibit 8 – Swanton Hub Location Relative to Zone Districts

CORRESPONDENCE

I. MOTION AND RESOLUTIONS

Staff recommends that the Commission determine that **no substantial issue** exists with respect to the grounds on which the appeals were filed. A finding of no substantial issue would mean that the Commission will not hear the applications de novo and that the local actions will become final and effective. To implement this recommendation, staff recommends a **YES** vote on the following motion. Passage of this motion will result in a finding of No Substantial Issue and the local actions will become final and effective. The motion passes only by an affirmative vote of a majority of the Commissioners present.

***Motion:** I move that the Commission determine that Appeal Numbers A-3-STC-18-0024, A-3-STC-18-0025, A-3-STC-18-0026, A-3-STC-18-0027, and A-3-STC-18-0028 raise no substantial issue with respect to the grounds on which the appeals have been filed under Section 30603. I recommend a yes vote.*

***Resolution to Find No Substantial Issue.** The Commission finds that Appeal Numbers A-3-STC-18-0024, A-3-STC-18-0025, A-3-STC-18-0026, A-3-STC-18-0027, and A-3-STC-18-0028 do not present a substantial issue with respect to the grounds on which the appeals have been filed under Section 30603 of the Coastal Act regarding consistency with the Certified Local Coastal Plan and/or the public access and recreation policies of the Coastal Act.*

II. FINDINGS AND DECLARATIONS

A. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND LOCATION

The five City-approved projects that are the subject of these appeals are part of a larger City effort to establish a public bike share system. The City program, which would be operated by contract vendor Social Bicycles, would distribute 250 electric bicycles among 27 “hubs” that hold around 14 bicycles each. Twelve of the approved hubs are for locations in the Coastal Zone; however, five of those fall within Coastal Exclusion Zones A and B, and are exempt from the CDP process under Local Coastal Program (LCP) Implementation Plan (IP) Sections 24.08.230.2(a)(2) and (b)(2). The appeals challenge five of the seven City-approved hubs located in the appealable portion of the coastal zone.³

Unlike so-called “station-based” bike share programs, in which individual bicycles are rented from software installed in the hub and must be returned to another hub at the end of the rental period, the Social Bicycles program utilizes bicycles with on-board GPS, rental software, and locking systems. Users are therefore not limited to trips between hubs. However, returning a rented bicycle by locking it to itself is prohibited; bicycles must be affixed to a hub or a standard

³ One of the remaining two bike hubs, proposed for the right-of-way adjacent to 102 Woodrow Avenue (City CDP No. CP18-0002) was appealed to the Planning Commission and will be heard on May 17, 2018. The Appellant in that case is one of the eight Appellants named in the Coastal Commission appeals that are the subject of this report. With respect to the other hub, which would be located in the right-of-way adjacent to 1305 East Cliff Drive (City CDP No. CP18-0007), the Commission received a Final Local Action Notice for the project on Thursday, April 5, 2018. The ten-working-day appeal period for that action concluded at 5 p.m. on Thursday, April 19, 2018, with no appeals received.

A-3-STC-18-0024, A-3-STC-18-0025, A-3-STC-18-0026, A-3-STC-18-0027, A-3-STC-18-0028
(Bike Share Hubs)

non-hub bicycle rack to be considered returned under the terms of the user agreement. This feature is intended to prevent nuisance conditions stemming from haphazard abandonment of bicycles.⁴ Under its contract with the City, Social Bicycles is responsible for monitoring the distribution of bicycles within the City and “re-balancing” them among stations as needed.⁵ The bicycles are electric, however they use “pedal assist” technology, meaning that the electric motor provides power in proportion to that provided by the person pedaling.⁶

Generally, the locations for the appealed hubs are within the City’s right-of-way or in existing facilities such as parks or parking lots, near the City’s network of bike lanes and paths. Each hub would be five feet three inches wide, around 38 feet long, and equipped with 27-inch-tall powder-coated steel bicycle docks that can be securely bolted into the ground. In addition to bicycle parking, each hub also includes a two-sided steel sign approximately six feet in height, 11.5 inches in width, and four inches thick, showing maps, safety information, and instructions on how to utilize the system. The sign and docks would be gray in color, while the bicycles themselves would be orange. The brighter color of the bicycles is intended to promote visibility and deter theft. Additional information on each proposed hub site is provided below.

A-3-STC-18-0024 (CP18-0003) Bike share hub adjacent to Lighthouse Surfing Museum.

One of two appealed bike hubs approved for sites between the first public road and the sea, this 17-bicycle hub would be located in an existing, iceplant-vegetated landscape strip in City-owned Lighthouse Point Park, adjacent to a multiuse pathway. The landscape strip and the pathway separate West Cliff Drive from a public parking lot; the Lighthouse Surfing Museum is seaward of the lot. This location is in the Ocean Front Recreation (OF-R) zone district.

A-3-STC-18-0025 (CP18-0004) Bike share hub adjacent to 25 Beach Street. The bike hub approved for this location would provide space for 25 bicycles in what is currently a “no parking” zone within a public parking lot. The site is adjacent to a rail line that is the proposed future location of a multiuse trail, and is across Beach Street from an existing separated bicycle lane. It is located between Cowell Beach, the Municipal Wharf, and the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary Exploration Center, in the Public Facilities and Parks (PF/PK) zone district.

A-3-STC-18-0026 (CP18-0005) Bike share hub adjacent to 400 Beach Street. This approved bike hub would be located in the Beach Street right-of-way in front of the Santa Cruz Beach Boardwalk, and would replace two metered parking spaces with 17 bicycle parking spaces. The site for this hub is located between the first public road and the sea, however a separated bicycle lane, a landscape strip, a rail line, a Boardwalk service road, and the Boardwalk itself would all be located seaward of the propose hub. The site is in the Beach Commercial (C-B) zone district.

⁴ Additionally, there are penalties for program users who discontinue use of their bicycles in a manner that violates the rules. A first offense results in a warning, and users are barred from the system after a second such incident.

⁵ Incentives also exist to motivate system users to return stray bicycles: Those who do so are rewarded with a credit to their account.

⁶ This type of electric bicycle is designed to provide an assist to the rider in difficult cycling conditions (i.e., uphill), but not to significantly speed up the ride. Between the pedal-assist technology and the weight of the custom bicycles, which exceed that of a standard, non-electrified bike, a cyclist would need to pedal quite vigorously to achieve speeds at the higher range of the motor’s capability (around 20 miles per hour).

A-3-STC-18-0027 (CP18-0006) Bike share hub adjacent to 225 San Lorenzo Boulevard.

This 15-space hub would be located on an existing paved area between the San Lorenzo Boulevard sidewalk and the fenced basketball courts at Mike Fox Skate Park, in the Parks (PK) zone district. A transit stop is located a few feet away from the site, and the Santa Cruz Riverwalk multipurpose path runs along the San Lorenzo River levee adjacent to the park.

A-3-STC-18-0028 (CP-0013) Bike share hub adjacent to 204 Swanton Boulevard. The 16-space bike hub approved for this location would be located in an existing “no parking” zone on the west side of the Swanton Boulevard right-of-way, at the intersection of Swanton and West Cliff Drive. The site is adjacent to Natural Bridges State Beach. The West Cliff Drive bicycle-pedestrian pathway terminates across the street to the south, and a residential neighborhood is across the street to the east. The site is located in the Single Family Residence (R-1) zone district.

A map of all City-approved bike share hubs in the Coastal Appeal Zone is provided as **Exhibit 1**; see **Exhibit 2** for photos of the appealed locations showing the placement of the hubs relative to existing site features. **Exhibit 3** shows the size and design of the signs that would be placed at each hub.

B. CITY OF SANTA CRUZ CDP APPROVAL

On March 21, 2018 the City of Santa Cruz County Zoning Administrator approved the bike share hubs located in the appealable area of the coastal zone. The City’s Final Local Action Notices (**Exhibit 4**) were received in the Coastal Commission’s Central Coast District Office on Thursday, April 5, 2018. The Coastal Commission’s ten-working-day appeal period for this action began on Friday, April 6, 2018 and concluded at 5 p.m. on Thursday, April 19, 2018. One valid appeal (see below) was received for each of five bike share hubs during the appeal period, all from the same group of Appellants.

C. APPEAL PROCEDURES

Coastal Act Section 30603 provides for the appeal to the Coastal Commission of certain CDP decisions in jurisdictions with certified LCPs. The following categories of local CDP decisions are appealable: (a) approval of CDPs for development that is located (1) between the sea and the first public road paralleling the sea or within 300 feet of the inland extent of any beach or of the mean high tide line of the sea where there is no beach, whichever is the greater distance, (2) on tidelands, submerged lands, public trust lands, within 100 feet of any wetland, estuary, or stream, or within 300 feet of the top of the seaward face of any coastal bluff, and (3) in a sensitive coastal resource area; or (b) for counties, approval of CDPs for development that is not designated as the principal permitted use under the LCP. (Coastal Act Sections 30603(a)(1)-(4).) In addition, any local action (approval or denial) on a CDP for a major public works project (including a publicly financed recreational facility and/or a special district development) or an energy facility is appealable to the Commission. (Coastal Act Section 30603(a)(5).) The five projects discussed in this report are appealable because they are located within 300 feet of the beach and/or a coastal bluff (A-3-STC-18-0024/Lighthouse Museum, A-3-STC-18-0025/400 Beach St., A-3-STC-18-0027/Swanton Blvd, and A-3-STC-18-0028/25 Beach St.) or within 300

A-3-STC-18-0024, A-3-STC-18-0025, A-3-STC-18-0026, A-3-STC-18-0027, A-3-STC-18-0028 (Bike Share Hubs)

feet of the mean high tide line (i.e., the lower portion of the San Lorenzo River) (A-3-STC-18-0026/Mike Fox Skate Park).

The grounds for appeal under Section 30603 are limited to allegations that the development does not conform to the certified LCP or to the public access policies of the Coastal Act. Section 30625(b)(2) of the Coastal Act requires the Commission to consider a CDP for an appealed project de novo unless a majority of the Commission finds that “no substantial issue” is raised by such allegations.⁷ Under Section 30604(b), if the Commission conducts the de novo portion of an appeals hearing (upon making a determination of “substantial issue”) and finds that the proposed development is in conformity with the certified LCP, the Commission must issue a CDP. If a CDP is approved for a project that is located between the nearest public road and the sea or the shoreline of any body of water located within the coastal zone, Section 30604(c) also requires an additional specific finding that the development is in conformity with the public access and recreation policies of Chapter 3 of the Coastal Act. The approved bike share hubs at Lighthouse Museum (A-3-STC-18-0024) and 400 Beach St. (A-3-STC-18-0025) are located between the first public road and the sea and thus this additional finding would need to be made for those specific projects (in addition to a finding that the proposed development is in conformity with the City of Santa Cruz LCP) if the Commission were to approve those projects following the de novo portion of the hearing.

The only persons qualified to testify before the Commission on the substantial issue question are the Applicant, persons opposed to the project who made their views known before the local government (or their representatives), and the local government. Testimony from other persons regarding the substantial issue question must be submitted in writing (California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Section 13117). Any person may testify during the de novo CDP determination stage of an appeal (if applicable).

D. SUMMARY OF APPEAL CONTENTIONS

The Appellants contend that the City-approved projects raise LCP consistency questions relating to coastal access, visual and scenic resources, and neighborhood character. Specifically, the Appellants argue that the approved projects would violate applicable LCP policies because: 1) increased bicycle use of the West Cliff Drive multiuse path would endanger pedestrians and discourage their use of this feature to access the coast; 2) the bike hubs would displace parking spaces that are necessary for coastal access; 3) the color of the bicycles and the hub infrastructure would degrade and block protected coastal views; and 4) the bicycles and the “commercial” signage associated with them are inconsistent with the residential character of the adjacent neighborhoods, and not allowable under the zoning ordinance section of the IP. The Appellants

⁷ The term “substantial issue” is not defined in the Coastal Act or in its implementing regulations. In previous decisions on appeals, the Commission has considered the following factors in making substantial issue determinations: the degree of factual and legal support for the local government’s decision; the extent and scope of the development as approved or denied by the local government; the significance of the coastal resources affected by the decision; the precedential value of the local government’s decision for future interpretations of its LCP; and, whether the appeal raises only local issues as opposed to those of regional or statewide significance. Even when the Commission chooses not to hear an appeal (by finding no substantial issue), appellants nevertheless may obtain judicial review of a local government’s CDP decision by filing a petition for a writ of mandate pursuant to the Code of Civil Procedure, Section 1094.5.

also raise non-Coastal Act/LCP contentions related to the adequacy of the City’s environmental review and RFP (Request for Proposal) process, loss of residential home value, the safety of the bike share program, and the greenhouse gas impacts of the program. Please see **Exhibit 5** for the appeal contentions.⁸

E. SUBSTANTIAL ISSUE DETERMINATION

1. Coastal Access

Two of the City-approved projects are located between the first public road and the sea; consequently, in addition to the City’s approved LCP, the Coastal Act’s public access and recreation policies apply to these projects. Coastal Act Section 30210 emphasizes the fundamental importance of public access and recreational opportunities along California’s coastline, requiring maximum access for all people. Coastal Act Section 30211 mandates that development shall not interfere with the public’s right of access to the sea. Additionally, Section 30212.5 encourages the distribution of public facilities, including those for parking, throughout coastal areas.

The City’s LCP implements Coastal Act directives related to coastal access in its Land Use Plan (LUP), which consists of three components: A suite of policies that apply throughout the City’s coastal zone; area-specific policies adopted as part of various area plans; and a Coastal Access Plan. The Coastal Access Plan inventories existing coastal access so that it can be maintained and improved; it identifies key coastal recreation areas and describes how each area can be accessed by various modes of transportation, including roadway (i.e., private car), mass transit, bicycle, and on foot. Various LUP policies outline the City’s goals for improving access via each mode, both City-wide and in particular areas. Generally, these policies call for increasing, or at least maintaining, car parking opportunities in key visitor-serving areas such as the Wharf and Cowell Beach while also increasing alternative access in order to reduce vehicle traffic (see, e.g., Circulation Policy 5.6). Improved bicycle and pedestrian access to coastal areas is an explicit policy goal (see Parks and Recreation Policies 1.7.1 and 1.7.1.4), as is the provision of bicycle parking (Parks and Recreation Policy 1.7.1.5). For a complete list of relevant LCP policies, see **Exhibit 6**.

The Appellants contend that placing bike share hubs at the appealed sites will result in increased bicycle presence along the West Cliff bicycle/pedestrian path,⁹ and that the increase in bicycle traffic will pose a safety hazard to pedestrians, ultimately discouraging their use of the path and reducing public access inconsistent with the LCP and the Coastal Act. Particularly, they cite Coastal Act Section 30210, under which maximum coastal access must be provided “consistent

⁸ The Appellants’ contentions are contained in two letters, each with extensive supporting materials. The first was received on April 19, 2018 (**Exhibit 5**, p. 5), and the second (**Exhibit 5**, p. 41) was received on May 16, 2018.

⁹ In addition to serving as a vehicular roadway, West Cliff Drive also includes a popular bike and pedestrian pathway that constitutes a 2.5-mile-long segment of the California Coastal Trail (CCT), with otherwise unobstructed views of the ocean across the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary. While the Appellants discuss “a cumulative stretch of seven orange electrified bicycle stations accompanied by six-foot commercial signs along the 2.5-mile stretch of West Cliff Drive,” it is important to note that only two of the appealed hubs (and three hubs in total) would be sited along this 2.5-mile trail segment; the remaining three appealed hubs are located east of the eastern extent of the West Cliff Drive bicycle/pedestrian path.

with public safety needs and the need to protect... natural resource areas from overuse.” The Appellants argue that the availability of rental bikes along West Cliff Drive poses a threat to public safety and will contribute to overuse under Section 30210, justifying limits on the provision of access consistent with Section 30214(a)(2) of the Coastal Act, which states that the public access policies of the Act shall be implemented in a manner that takes into account, among other factors, “the capacity of the site to sustain use” at a given level of intensity. They additionally claim that the approved hubs violate Coastal Act Section 30212.5, and cite LUP Community Design Policies 3.6 and 3.7, which require building design to be responsive to the pedestrian environment and require development to incorporate features that promote pedestrian use, respectively. The Appellants also cite LUP Parks and Recreation Policies 1.7 and 1.7.6, which require the City to develop plans to maximize public access, safety, and recreation in coastal areas generally (1.7) and along West Cliff Drive particularly (1.7.6), as evidence that pedestrian uses in this corridor must be protected from increased bicycle traffic.¹⁰ See **Exhibit 5** for the full text of the Appellants’ contentions.¹¹

With respect to the Appellants’ Coastal Act contentions, the City-approved bike hubs will not block access to the sea, which is provided at many locations along West Cliff Drive and Beach Street, so the City-approved project does not raise a substantial issue with respect to Section 30211. Sections 30210 and 30214(a) do provide for some limitations on public coastal access to protect sensitive natural resources, provide for public safety, and prevent overuse. However, the hubs in question here are adjacent to a paved multiuse pathway abutting a paved road and urban development; the path can support heavy use, and continued use by cyclists will not affect sensitive resources. Further, it is not clear that safety requires limits to coastal access in this case, or that overuse is presently occurring. The Appellants have not provided evidence that the West

¹⁰ In the text of the appeal, the Appellants describe both of these policies, then include parenthetical references to several additional policies, including Community Design Policies 3.4.2 and 3.4.3, Environmental Quality Policy 4.1, Land Use Policy 3.5, and Safety Policy 1.2.3 (see p. 8 of **Exhibit 5**). The City’s LCP often cross-references other LCP and General Plan policies in a similar format. While the parenthetically cited policies are related to the policies they follow, they are not necessarily relevant to this case. For example, Environmental Quality Policy 4.1 is a broad policy requiring protection of the natural ecosystems of the Monterey Bay and shoreline, which will not be impacted by the approved bike hubs, and Safety Policy 1.2.3 defines the circumstances under which shoreline armoring is permissible under the LCP, which is not an issue raised by the City-approved projects. Community Design Policies 3.4.2 and 3.4.3 require the City to maintain physical and visual linkages between specific coastal areas and adjacent uses, and are discussed with respect to visual resources below; with respect to physical linkages, and as stated above in the discussion of Coastal Act access policies, the approved bicycle hubs will not physically block access between the shoreline and adjacent land uses (3.4.2) or among West Cliff Drive, the Beach, and/or East Cliff Drive (3.4.3). Land Use Policy 3.5 is relevant but broad, requiring the City to “protect coastal recreation areas,” and “enhance public access... and recreational enjoyment in a manner that is consistent with the California Coastal Act.” As discussed above, the proposed bike hubs can be found consistent with relevant access and recreation policies in the Coastal Act, and can be found consistent with Land Use Policy 3.5 by extension.

¹¹ The Appellants additionally cite Coastal Act Sections 30001(c) and 30006.5, which provide legislative findings and declarations related to ecological balance and use of scientific recommendations, and they also cite Section 30253(a), which requires new development to minimize risk to life and property in areas of high geologic, flood, and fire hazard, and prefatory text of the LCP. The three Coastal Act policies are not public access and recreation policies, so they are not part of the standard of review for a substantial issue determination. The prefatory text of the LCP is part of the LCP and, therefore, part of the standard of review for this determination; however the cited text on this page describes the suite of “shoreline access issues” addressed in the LCP, including “preventing development from encroaching into shoreline areas.” It does not provide any standards against which to evaluate projects.

Cliff Drive pathway is hazardously crowded,¹² and while California Vehicle Code Section 21207.5 allows local governments to prohibit certain classes of electric bikes from multiuse trails, they are not required to do so.

The proposed bike hubs are, however, broadly consistent with the primary purpose of Section 30210, which is to ensure that all people are provided with maximum access to the coast. The appealed hubs and the bike share system they would support maximize coastal access by providing a convenient and affordable (relative to private vehicles) means of traveling to and among coastal recreation areas such as the Santa Cruz Beach Boardwalk, the Wharf, and West Cliff Drive. A network of bike paths and trails already connects inland Santa Cruz to these and other coastal features; however, bicycle ownership can be a financial risk in areas where bicycle theft is common, as it is in Santa Cruz, and coastal visitors may lack the equipment or vehicle space needed to travel with bikes they have at home. A bike share program provides residents and visitors with the opportunity to access the coast by bicycle even if they do not own or cannot bring one with them. The program is also consistent with Coastal Act Section 30212.5 because it provides bike share facilities at several locations along the City's coast, including on Beach Street, along the San Lorenzo River, and on East Cliff Drive.

Further, the LCP does not establish a priority for pedestrian use of the West Cliff Drive path, however. This is evident in the aforementioned Coastal Access Plan, which defines West Cliff Drive and four adjacent areas for which bike share hubs have been approved (Lighthouse Point/Steamers Lane, Natural Bridges State Beach, Cowell Beach, and Main Beach) as coastal recreation areas. The West Cliff Drive path is identified as an accessway for both cyclists and pedestrians for each of these areas. Moreover, the path is consistently referred to in the LCP as "the West Cliff Drive bicycle-pedestrian pathway," indicating that it is intended by the City to accommodate both uses. Parks and Recreation Policy 1.7.1.5 additionally supports provision of additional bike parking at Natural Bridges, West Cliff Drive pocket beaches, and Main Beach. Rather than discouraging bicycles from use of the West Cliff Drive path to preserve the pedestrian experience, as the Appellants suggest, the LCP *promotes* bicycles, in conjunction with pedestrian access, as a means of accessing coastal recreation opportunities along West Cliff Drive through provision of supporting infrastructure.

The Appellants further note that Parks and Recreation Policy 1.7.6 requires the City to prepare a management plan for West Cliff Drive, in part to ensure that the competing demands on this incredibly popular coastal recreation feature are balanced to maximize public access and safety. The City has taken steps to prepare that plan.¹³ However, a policy articulating an intent to

¹² As exhibits to their appeal, the Appellants provide some general data relating to traffic injuries and fatalities in Santa Cruz that makes no specific mention of electric bicycles (**Exhibit 5**, pp. 105-108); an excerpt from a recent *Wall Street Journal* article in which the author speculates that increasing use of electric bicycles nationally has led to an uptick in accidents involving these vehicles and pedestrians (neither a source nor specific data that quantifies the increase are included in the excerpt) (**Exhibit 5**, p. 104); and a letter to the editor printed in the Santa Cruz *Sentinel* on April 16, 2018, in which the writer describes driving by an injured pedestrian and a cyclist and infers that the injury was caused by a collision between them (**Exhibit 5**, p. 25).

¹³ The City of Santa Cruz received comments from the Commission on a preliminary West Cliff Drive Plan in 2002, but it did not submit a final plan for certification. The City initiated a second planning effort two years later, this one resulting in a draft plan that was reviewed by the Planning Commission before funding constraints prevented further progress. This year, the City applied for a CalTrans grant to study the condition of West Cliff Drive and the array of

A-3-STC-18-0024, A-3-STC-18-0025, A-3-STC-18-0026, A-3-STC-18-0027, A-3-STC-18-0028 (Bike Share Hubs)

institute a management plan for a site does not itself establish standards for projects affecting that site; until a plan for West Cliff Drive is approved by the City and by the Commission, the standard of review for projects that affect use of this area is limited to the certified LCP and the public access policies of Chapter 3 of the Coastal Act.

The Appellants also cite Community Design Policies 3.6 and 3.7, which require building design in pedestrian areas to be responsive to the pedestrian environment and require development to incorporate features to promote pedestrian use (respectively). However, the former applies to buildings, not all development. The latter policy applies more broadly, but it requires the incorporation of pedestrian-friendly features into development. Neither policy prioritizes pedestrian traffic over bicycles.

The Appellants additionally argue that the physical location of the bike hubs will reduce coastal access by displacing car parking spaces. Only one of the appealed hubs would be sited in an area that is currently available for car parking, however.¹⁴ Specifically, the hub at 400 Beach Street would replace two metered parking spaces with 17 bicycle docks. The loss of two parking spaces in the beach area is acceptable under the City's LCP, however: Beach/South of Laurel (BSOL) Area Plan Policy 3.34 requires the City to maintain a minimum of 3,690 public parking spaces in the overall BSOL area, and approve no projects that would reduce the number of public parking spaces below that amount. The City estimates that it currently provides around 800 parking spaces above that minimum; the loss of two parking spaces is negligible relative to its existing surplus, and would not meaningfully impact vehicle access under the standard established in the LCP.

The approved bike hubs and the bike share system also reflect the LCP's emphasis on providing and encouraging use of alternative transportation, both generally and to visitor-serving and coastal areas particularly. In addition to the policies cited by the Appellants, Circulation Policy 6.4.2.7 requires the City to "provide adequate parking or alternative access" to the Wharf and Cowell Beach based on analysis of parking supply and demand; BSOL Policy 3.9 requires the City to make "reduction of automobile trips by [among other means] the creation of viable alternative transportation modes" the "highest priority" of its circulation planning program; BSOL Policy 3.11 requires the City to develop a bikeway system that connects recreation areas with a variety of other uses (e.g., schools, work, and residential neighborhoods); and San Lorenzo Urban River Plan Policy SRFA-19 requires the City to "encourage use of the Riverway trail for alternative transportation access to the beach area." Both policies suggest that alternative

armoring devices that protect the coastal bluffs below it. As this action implies, erosion has long been the primary threat to West Cliff Drive and associated coastal recreation opportunities, and LCP references to managing "public safety" on West Cliff Drive should be read in this context. Such a study will help to inform the elements of the West Cliff Drive Plan, which the City will then bring forward for Commission certification.

¹⁴ The approved Swanton and 25 Beach Street hubs would be located in existing no parking zones in the public right-of-way and a public parking lot, respectively; the Mike Fox Skate Park hub would be off the street, in the space between an existing sidewalk and basketball court; iceplant would be cleared from an existing landscape strip to accommodate the Lighthouse Museum hub. The City notes in its staff report that it selected the Lighthouse Museum location in order to maintain all existing car parking spaces at Lighthouse Point.

transportation is an important component of the City’s vision for its coastal access program.¹⁵ Moreover, the City’s bike share program, which will operate at no cost to the City, seems to reflect the explicit requirements of BSOL Policy 3.20, which instructs the City to “pursue outside funding sources for alternative transportation projects.”

In sum, it appears that the bike share program would not negatively impact coastal access and recreation opportunities in Santa Cruz; rather, the program seems likely to *expand* access in a manner consistent with the certified LCP and the Coastal Act. The City-approved bike share hubs therefore do not raise a substantial issue of LCP or Coastal Act conformance with respect to coastal access.

2. Visual Resources

The City’s LUP provides a variety of policies that are protective of visual resources, both in the coastal zone and generally. Community Design Policy 2.1.3 includes a broad mandate to protect “views to and along the ocean,” while Community Design Policy 2.2 requires the City to ensure that the scale, bulk, and setback of new development does not impede or disrupt “important public views and viewsheds.” Community Design Policy 3.4 identifies areas in the City between which “visual linkages” are to be “developed and maintained.” The shoreline and its adjacent uses, as well as West Cliff Drive and the beach, are examples of connections protected by this policy. Additionally, Economic Development Policy 5.3 applies visual resource standards to visitor-serving facilities and services particularly, requiring, among other things, that they protect “important views.” Land Use Policy 1.4 calls for utilizing the environmental review process and the zoning ordinance to protect a variety of natural resources, including “scenic views.” Land Use Policy 1.6 requires the City to minimize, “when practical,” obstruction of “important” views by new development, and requires that new development in the coastal zone be sited and designed to, among other objectives, “be visually compatible with the character of surrounding areas.” In the City’s IP, Sections 24.10.2400-2440 establish a Shoreline Protection Overlay District (SP-O) which, among other purposes, is intended to protect public views. To approve development in the SP-O, the City must find that a project “maintain[s] public view corridors between the sea and the first public roadway parallel to the sea and maintain natural views of the coastline.” Thus, while a variety of LUP policies articulate protection of views as a broad priority, the IP specifically protects public, coastal views from the first public roadway paralleling the sea. For a complete list of relevant LCP provisions, see **Exhibit 6**.

The Appellants argue that the bicycles and associated hub infrastructure will impede coastal views inconsistent with Land Use Policy 1.6 and the SP-O, and that the color of the bicycles will detract from coastal views. Additionally, the Appellants contend that Land Use Policy 1.4 requires the City to carry out an environmental review to protect scenic views. With respect to the approved Lighthouse Museum location particularly, they note that Lighthouse Field State Beach Area Plan Policy 2.1 requires “the dramatic views from West Cliff Drive” to remain “unimpaired and unobstructed by vegetation, structures or accumulated refuse,” and that Community Design Policy 3.5 requires new development to add to, and not detract from, City-identified landmarks. The Appellants contend that the bike hub proposed for this location would

¹⁵ As defined in the LCP, the term “alternative transportation” includes “any form of transportation... other than the single-occupancy vehicle,” including bicycling.

A-3-STC-18-0024, A-3-STC-18-0025, A-3-STC-18-0026, A-3-STC-18-0027, A-3-STC-18-0028 (Bike Share Hubs)

“physically impair” the protected public view from West Cliff Drive, and impose an “offensive distraction” from the nearby lighthouse landmark. They additionally cite Beach Area/South of Laurel Policy 1.15, which requires the City to provide bicycle racks that are “aesthetically integrated” with the surrounding area. Finally, the Appellants contend that the bike share hubs are a commercial enterprise and therefore inconsistent with the residential character of adjacent neighborhoods along West Cliff Drive.¹⁶ See **Exhibit 5** for the full text of the Appellants’ contentions.

To the contrary, however, the City selected all of the bike hub locations in order to minimize impacts to public views (see **Exhibit 1** for the locations of the hubs and **Exhibit 2** for project site images and photographic simulations of the hubs). As described above, two of the appealed hubs (25 Beach Street, 204 Swanton Blvd) are proposed for locations on the landward side of the nearest public road to the sea, so there is no possibility that they would block views protected by the SP-O. Moreover, the 25 Beach Street hub location is between a visitor-serving marine science and education center and a public parking lot, in a commercial area with significant multicolored signage and storefronts. The Swanton hub would extend parallel to a landscape strip along Natural Bridges State Park, less than fifty feet from a tall slatted fence. The fence and two thick trees already block views up the coast from Swanton Boulevard, and the hub would not impede existing views down the Swanton right-of-way to West Cliff Drive and the sea. The approved hub at Mike Fox Skate Park would be located between San Lorenzo Boulevard and the San Lorenzo River. There is no coastal view in this location, and a fenced basketball court and the levee block sightlines to the river. The 400 Beach Street location is between the first public road and the sea, but (as described above) views of the shoreline are already disrupted by Boardwalk infrastructure, most notably the Undertow, a 50-foot-high roller coaster.

The approved Lighthouse Museum bike hub location also minimizes impacts to views. The West Cliff Drive bicycle-pedestrian pathway has two branches in this area: One following the edge of the coastal bluff and the other staying inland along West Cliff Drive. The branches merge at the east and west ends of the park. Between them are Lighthouse Museum and a public parking lot with space for two rows of vehicles. The approved bike hub would be on the seaward side of the inland branch of the path (see page 1 of **Exhibit 2**). As the Appellants point out, this is a sensitive visual area; however the bike hub would have a lower profile than the cars in the lot. The lot experiences heavy use, so views of the lighthouse and the coast from West Cliff Drive are already partially obstructed by the tops of parked vehicles on a nearly continuous basis during daylight hours. The lot is used by vehicles of a variety of colors, as well as vans that exceed the height of the proposed bike hub signs. The features of the bike hubs that the Appellants have identified as a “distraction” and an impediment to views are therefore within the size and color range (i.e., gray) of uses that have already been allowed in the same area under the existing LCP for the purpose of providing public access to the coast.¹⁷ Consequently, the hub

¹⁶ Neighborhood character is also a type of visual resource, but this aspect of the appeal contentions is addressed in the “neighborhood compatibility and community character” section below.

¹⁷ As noted above, the bicycles themselves are orange, in part because brighter colors provide safety benefits. It is also important to note that the parking area that blocks coastal views from West Cliff Drive in this location is, like all public parking lots, utilized by cars and vans in a variety of colors. The features of the bicycles themselves that the Appellants have identified as a distraction and an impediment to views (i.e., their color) are therefore also within the color range of the vehicles that are allowed in the same area under the existing LCP.

would not “physically impair” the protected views from West Cliff and of the lighthouse any more than they have already been impaired by existing use of the parking lot. It is also important to note that an unimpeded view of the coast is available to walkers and cyclists from the seaward branch of the bicycle-pedestrian path, as well as from the sidewalk that rings the outer portion of the parking lot. This approved hub would be located landward of both of these locations and thus would not be disruptive of the existing pristine view from these locations. Finally, due to the low height profile of the bike hubs (i.e., less than three feet in height, with the exception of the six-foot signs) relative to their distance from coastal bluffs and/or the presence of intervening structures, neither the Lighthouse Museum hub nor any of the other appealed sites would be visible from any beach.

The Appellants also cite Community Design Policies 2.2.1 (requiring the City to develop design guidelines for visually sensitive areas, including “scenic coastal areas”) and 2.1.1 (prohibiting land divisions that can degrade distinctive natural features), arguing that “the location of Steamer Lane, the Lighthouse, [and] Lighthouse Field State Park contain a reserve area dedicated to the natural coastal trees, shrubbery, cliffs, and bluffs,” and that the bike hubs and signage qualify as a degradation to these features. The approved bike share hubs would violate neither of these policies, however, for the following reasons: A policy requiring the development of design guidelines by the City does not serve the same function as the guidelines themselves would (i.e., it provides no standard of review for proposed projects), and none of the approved bike share hubs involve a division of land.

The Appellants further allege that the bike hubs violate BSOL¹⁸ Policy 1.15, which requires the City to provide public amenities (including bicycle racks) that are “functionally and aesthetically integrated into the streetscape for pedestrian comfort, convenience and safety.” As the Appellants note, the LCP references the BSOL Design Guidelines as the source of this policy. No further definition of “functional and aesthetic integration” is given with respect to bicycle racks in that document; however the gray color of the approved bike hubs and signs is subtle and within the range of typical bike rack colors, and the two appealed hubs within the BSOL planning area would be located in a “no parking” zone within a public parking lot or at the edge of the Beach Street roadway; they will not be located on the sidewalk or pose a tripping hazard to pedestrians. The policy does not extend to bicycles themselves, either with respect to their color or potential for conflict with pedestrian uses of the streetscape.

Finally, with respect to the Appellants’ contentions regarding environmental review, Land Use Policy 1.4 identifies the environmental review process as one means of safeguarding certain resources, including visual and scenic resources; however, it does not require that a particular type of environmental review be conducted for a project that is in or near a visually sensitive area.

For all of the above reasons, the approved projects do not raise a substantial issue of LCP conformance with respect to visual resources.

¹⁸ Only two of the approved hubs are located within the BSOL planning area, i.e. the hubs at 25 Beach Street and 400 Beach Street.

3. Neighborhood Compatibility and Community Character

The LCP's protections for special communities and neighborhoods include broad standards for development within or adjacent to historic or architecturally significant areas (e.g., Community Design Policy 3.5 and Cultural Resources Policies 2.2.2, 2.3, and 2.3.2) as well as policies that require the City to develop more specific criteria for particular areas (see, e.g., Community Design Policy 2.2.1 and Land Use Policy 2.4.3 and 2.6.5). None of the appealed bike hubs fall within historic districts, so with respect to neighborhood compatibility concerns, the best evaluative standards are the more specific criteria provided in the IP pursuant to the latter group of policies.

The Appellants argue (see **Exhibit 5**) that the bike share hubs are components of a commercial enterprise that is not compatible with adjacent residential uses. The Appellants cite IP Section 24.10, which defines the City's zone districts, as well as the West Cliff Drive Overlay (IP Section 24.10.4200; see **Exhibit 6**). However, none of the appealed bike hub locations are within the West Cliff Drive Overlay; its protections for "residential neighborhood character" therefore do not apply to these sites (see **Exhibit 7**).¹⁹ With respect to the underlying zoning, all but one of the appealed sites are located in non-residential zone districts; generally, the approved hub locations are within or adjacent to parks, near commercial enterprises, and/or in districts where recreational and/or parking facilities are among the permitted or principally permitted uses.²⁰ Only the Swanton hub would be located in the R-1 zone. Both practically speaking and with respect to zoning, this is an area of transition between recreational and residential uses: Swanton Boulevard divides the neighborhood on the east side of the street from Natural Bridges State Beach to the west. There are no residential uses anywhere along the west side of Swanton Boulevard, and State Parks property extends to the Swanton median. The park is in the OF-R

¹⁹ The West Cliff Drive Overlay is intended to "reinforce the residential neighborhood character of the north side of West Cliff Drive" (IP Section 24.10.4200); it extends approximately 100 feet inland from the northern (i.e., inland) side of the West Cliff Drive right-of-way between Cowell Street on the east end and Swanton Boulevard on the west end. However, it does not include the area between Pelton Avenue and Columbia Street. Lighthouse Field State Park occupies almost all of the north side of this segment of West Cliff Drive, and residential uses are limited to two multifamily structures near the intersection of West Cliff and Columbia. The Lighthouse Museum hub would be located in City-owned Lighthouse Point Park, on the southern side of the West Cliff Drive segment not covered by the Overlay. On the far west end of West Cliff Drive, the Overlay extends to the east side of the Swanton Boulevard right-of-way, across the street from, but not including, the site of the approved Swanton hub (see inset in **Exhibit 7**). The remaining appealed hubs would all be located east of Cowell Street.

²⁰ The Lighthouse Museum hub would be located in the OF-R zone district, which is intended to protect coastal resources and provide public access. Parking areas are a principally permitted use, and limited development of structures is permitted to support recreational uses (see IP Sections 24.10.1900 - 1910). A combined café and surf shop is located across West Cliff Drive in Lighthouse Field State Park, and the nearest residential uses are located north of the State Parks property, nearly 1000 feet away from the approved hub.

The 400 Beach Street hub would be located in the C-B district, which is intended to support commercial uses that are primarily coastal-dependent and serve tourists and visitors to coastal recreational areas. Recreational facilities are a principally permitted use (see IP Sections 24.10.1100 - 1110).

The 25 Beach Street hub would be located on one of two PF/PK-zoned parcels surrounded on three sides by C-B-zoned land. Recreational facilities are permitted uses in both the PF and PK zone districts (see IP Sections 24.10.1745 and 1770). The Mike Fox Park hub would be located in the PK zone district, across San Lorenzo Boulevard from an area zoned Motel Residential (R-T(B)), a designation intended "to ensure a compatible mixture of uses addressing the needs of residents and tourists" and including residential and commercial uses (IP Section 24.10.610).

zone district,²¹ which prioritizes coastal recreation; however the boundary between the R-1 and OF-R zone districts does not perfectly align with the property boundary or the change in use it reflects; rather, the R-1 zone district extends onto State Parks property and about 25 feet west of the Swanton Boulevard right-of-way (see **Exhibit 8**). Thus, while the proposed hub would be located on the park side of Swanton, on park property, and is consistent with the purpose of the zone district that covers most of the park in that area, it is approximately 25 feet outside of that district. However, IP Sections 24.10.330-340 (pertaining to the R-1 zone district) allow a variety of non-residential uses in the R-1 zone, including parks and public facilities, and allow the Zoning Administrator to issue permits for similar uses at his or her discretion. Not only is the Swanton hub consistent with existing public access and recreation uses at that location, it can be found consistent with the IP.

In summary, the approved hubs are appropriately located adjacent to or within areas intended for recreational and/or commercial uses. The Zoning Administrator's determination that the hubs are an appropriate use in these areas reflects reasonable use of the discretion granted to him by the City's IP. For all the above reasons, this contention does not raise a substantial issue of LCP conformance with respect to community character and neighborhood compatibility.

4. Other Contentions

The Appellants additionally contend that the City may have inappropriately granted a CEQA Categorical Exemption for the approved projects; that the RFP "did not address environmental compatibility" between the bike share program and sensitive coastal areas; that the City's decision on the bike hubs was based on incomplete information;²² that the presence of "commercial" bike hubs in or near residentially-zoned areas will result in a "significant loss of value" of nearby homes; that the bike share program is unsafe because it does not require users to wear helmets;²³ and that the program will not reduce greenhouse gas emissions to the degree anticipated by the City. However, the only appropriate grounds for an appeal to the California Coastal Commission are issues related to the project's consistency with the certified LCP and the Coastal Act's public access policies. Contentions related to CEQA, the RFP process, helmet requirements, property values, and the means by which the greenhouse gas benefits of projects are calculated are not appropriate grounds for this appeal, as none of these matters are regulated by the City's LCP.

²¹ Natural Bridges State Beach is also comprised of land in the Floodplain (F-P) and PK zone districts; however most of the coastal area, including the land adjacent to the southern part of Swanton Boulevard where the hub would be located, is zoned OF-R.

²² Specifically, the Appellants contend that correspondence from project opponents was improperly excluded from the files on which the Zoning Administrator based the decision to approve CDPs for the appealed hubs. This correspondence, which the Appellants submitted as an attachment to their appeal, was submitted to the City Council, most of it in advance of that body's March 13 and April 10, 2018 hearings, in which it considered non-CDP encroachment permits for sixteen bike hubs (on March 13) and seven bike hubs (on April 10), including the 25 Beach Street, 400 Beach Street, Mike Fox Skate Park, and Swanton Boulevard locations (April 10). These were separate proceedings from the March 21, 2018 Zoning Administrator hearing in which CDPs for the hubs were considered and approved.

²³ Users of the City's bike share program must be at least 18 years old. While California Vehicle Code Section 21212 requires cyclists under the age of 18 to wear a helmet, there is no helmet requirement for adult riders.

F. CONCLUSION

When considering a project that has been appealed to it, the Commission must first determine whether the project raises a substantial issue of LCP conformity, such that the Commission should assert jurisdiction over a de novo CDP for such development. At this stage, the Commission has the discretion to find that the project does not raise a substantial issue of LCP conformance. As explained above, the Commission has in the past considered the following five factors in its decision of whether the issues raised in a given case are “substantial”: the degree of factual and legal support for the local government’s decision; the extent and scope of the development as approved or denied by the City; the significance of the coastal resources affected by the decision; the precedential value of the City’s decision for future interpretations of its LCP; and, whether the appeal raises only local issues as opposed to those of regional or statewide significance.

These five factors, considered together, support a conclusion that the five appealed projects discussed in this report do not raise a substantial issue of LCP conformance. First, regarding the degree of factual and legal support for the local government’s decision, the Appellants’ coastal access contention is based in part on concern that the approved projects will increase bicycle traffic on a multiuse coastal path, and that this will render the path unsafe and undesirable for the pedestrians who use it currently. The path is already used by both cyclists and pedestrians, however, and the LCP explicitly designates it for both user groups. The City-approved projects will only incrementally intensify an existing, allowed use, and to the extent that they do so, they will actually *increase* coastal access as encouraged under the LCP. With respect to the Appellants’ visual resource contentions, four of the five appealed projects would be located inland of protected coastal views, and the fifth site is inland of a parking lot that already impedes views from the first public road to the sea. All five appealed projects were intentionally sited to minimize impacts to visual resources consistent with the LCP, and the development that would occur as part of these projects is small-scale and low-profile. With respect to neighborhood compatibility, all five projects provide recreation to coastal visitors, and are located within or immediately adjacent to parks or commercial areas where such recreation already occurs. This factor supports a finding of no substantial issue.

Second, regarding the extent and scope of the development approved, each hub would be five feet three inches wide, approximately 37 feet long, equipped with 27-inch tall bicycle docks and bicycles, and include a two-sided steel sign approximately six feet in height, 11.5 inches in width and four inches thick. The extent and scope (i.e., footprint) of each hub is not significant relative to the built environment in the locations of each hub. Third, regarding the significance of the coastal resources affected by the decision, as discussed in Section E above, the projects will not adversely impact any significant coastal resources. Fourth, regarding the precedential value of the City’s decision for future interpretations of its LCP, as discussed in Section E above the City has provided adequate factual and legal support for its decision that the projects would be consistent with the certified LCP. Because the project is consistent with the LCP, a finding of no substantial issue will not create an adverse precedent for future interpretation of the LCP. Finally, regarding whether the appeal raises only local issues as opposed to those of regional or statewide significance, the project does not raise issues of regional or statewide significance because the appeal contentions relate specifically to LCP provisions regarding allowability of bicycles to facilitate public access, and visual impacts and community character relative to the

A-3-STC-18-0024, A-3-STC-18-0025, A-3-STC-18-0026, A-3-STC-18-0027, A-3-STC-18-0028
(Bike Share Hubs)

specific locations of the bike hubs.

For the reasons stated above, the Commission finds that Appeal Numbers A-3-STC-18-0024, A-3-STC-18-0025, A-3-STC-18-0026, A-3-STC-18-0027, and A-3-STC-18-0028 do not present a substantial issue with respect to the grounds on which the appeal has been filed under Section 30603 of the Coastal Act.

A-3-STC-18-0024, A-3-STC-18-0025, A-3-STC-18-0026, A-3-STC-18-0027, A-3-STC-18-0028
(Bike Share Hubs)

APPENDIX A – SUBSTANTIVE FILE DOCUMENTS²⁴

- City of Santa Cruz Local Coastal Program
- CDP Appeal file A-3-STC-18-0024
- CDP Appeal file A-3-STC-18-0025
- CDP Appeal file A-3-STC-18-0026
- CDP Appeal file A-3-STC-18-0027
- CDP Appeal file A-3-STC-18-0028

APPENDIX B – STAFF CONTACT WITH AGENCIES AND GROUPS

- CITY OF SANTA CRUZ PLANNING STAFF
- APPELLANTS PHIL AND JEAN CRAWFORD AND MEGAN DAWSON

²⁴ These documents are available for review in the Commission's Central Coast District office.