

Downtown Operations Team (DOT)

2006 minutes

letter to City Council 12/11/06

December 11, 2006

RE Downtown Specific Plan Parking recommendations

Dear Councilmembers, Mr Cole and staff:

The Parking Task Force of the Downtown Ventura Organization (or DVO) has met a number of times over the last month, in hopes of creating specific suggested language for the Downtown Specific Plan's parking strategy. Key to our discussions, which were quite involved and in-depth, was the notion that downtown Ventura's parking situation is in a sorry state, at best. Parking is the key to downtown's future vitality, and its needs - and the basic requirements for future needs - have not been adequately addressed to date. The consensus at these meetings - now upwards of 25 people representing owners, developers, landlords, tenants, merchants and residents - is that there are a number of key issues that must be addressed now, before the plan takes effect, to insure that downtown's parking situation does not deteriorate any further. To that end, the executive board of the DVO wishes to state - in detailed terms - the following:

1. Downtown parking must be managed as a business to accommodate and facilitate future growth. This will require a paid-parking strategy;
2. DVO supports actively pursuing additional multi-level public parking facilities immediately, based on the loss of existing parking, the anticipation of future growth and its needs, and the extensive time required to go from conception to an operating facility ;
3. DVO supports and encourages the concept of an empowered public-private partnership for management of the Parking District. It is anticipated that 100% of funds raised by paid parking shall remain in the district for use in the district's management of downtown parking;
4. DVO supports a system where in-lieu parking fees may be paid directly in to the Parking District fund to allow off-site creation of additional parking within the downtown specific plan area;
5. DVO supports the concept that any new application to the City that may result in additional parking needs shall require a parking plan prior to issuance of the permit;
6. DVO supports the concept that all new development on city-owned property in the downtown specific plan area - including Main Street - should be subject to the then-current parking requirement, and in addition to said requirement, any parking lost must be replaced at a minimum ratio of 1:1 .
7. DVO supports the elimination of the current Main Street exemption from existing parking requirements.
8. DVO recommends angled parking be extended to the 900 block of Main, and that evaluation of all Main Street blocks take place to take advantage of maximum use of parking availability. Many unloading zone parking locations now serve little purpose based on current businesses in some areas, and these inefficient loading zone locations could be better served to open up additional immediate-need areas.

The Parking Task Force would like to continue to work with the City to resolve these issues and move forward on managing downtown's current parking situation. The following members of the committee are open to discussion, both online and in person.

Jim DeArkland

Tom Wood
Dan Frederickson
Mark Hartley
Ray Mulokas
Greg Smith
Clarey Rudd
Mike Apple
Jeff Smith
Barbara Evans
David Wilson
Ed Warren
and yours truly, Jerry Breiner

[GO TO TOP](#)

11/30/06

Present were Jim DeArkland, Barbara Evans, Clarey Rudd, Dan Frederickson, Ed Warren, Christy Weir, Dave Armstrong, Greg and Jeffrey Smith, Quinn Fenwick, Tom Wood, Tom Mericle, Mike Apple, Terry Ragan, Robin Elander and Jerry Breiner.

Currently there are 3 parking districts, started by the City as early as the 1940s, in Ventura. 2 of the districts are in the downtown area (see previous email with descriptions and map, courtesy Tom Wood). Apparently, no one is quite sure as to the accounting and collected fees taken from property owners who are beneficiaries (?) of the districts. There was an amendment to the district in the early 90s to add the Tolman/Wiker building. Jerry requested that Dave help us out, getting started, by stating the current status and requested changes that DVO has expressed and he sees as obvious.

1. The DSP language must state that the parking situation MUST be dealt with, for its financial and legal obligations, prior to any further development agreements get passed thru planning. This is evident in every conversation and discussion DVO has had and a lot of the folks sitting around the table have had between themselves, planning desk and economic development staff members for years;
2. It is undetermined what the City actually owns, as the assessors records are probably incorrect when it comes to the accurate records detailing the parking lots that a parking commission will require;

The City Attorney has stated that all assets once belonging to the district have been paid for by the City and hence are now City property. There was wide-spread disbelief and disagreement around the table at this bit of news. The question was raised to Dave: how long would it take to inventory downtown's parking assets? Dave said pulling deeds would be the most efficient and correct way to assess if there are deed easements, grants of use and the like, as title reports don't always come up with that information. One possibility of moving forward is to use the existing districts as defined as late as the early 90s and expand them.

DVO will ask for an action item in the plan speaking to this subject. The creation - or re-creation - of a parking commission will not require a public vote, and the City attorney's office is apparently looking in to the situation currently. Benchmarks that use the type of district funding and managing we seem closest to emulating are Santa Barbara and Oxnard. Santa Barbara's (90 minutes "free" and paid after) seems to work well for them, but they got their parking in early, prior to the redevelopment.

The goals, then, were simple:

1. DOWNTOWN PARKING MUST BE MANAGED AS A BUSINESS.
2. A PAID PARKING STRATEGY IS NECESSARY
3. A FUNDING SOURCE IS REQUIRED TO MANAGE THE DOWNTOWN PARKING DISTRICT (S) AS A BUSINESS.

[GO TO TOP](#)

Discussion continued on building requirements and development, the second part of the strategic changes we will be asking for. Free parking mitigates any incentive to build a free-parking structure. It has no value - unless we charge, we won't have a system to back it up, funding wise. This goes to maintenance, security, safety, etc. Tom Wood noted that meters were installed and pulled out twice in the past at the insistence of the merchants. That doesn't seem to be the way to go. In parking studies done since at least as far back as 1973, the conclusions are all the same: there is "adequate supply and incremental increase, study to study". Not once has the future needs been addressed adequately, so the consensus seemed to be in discussion. Not a lot of action, historically, in addressing the obvious future needs has been done, and with the onslaught of external and internal development occurring right now, it seems almost necessary to ask and insist that the DSP address the future, not just the present.

State law allows assessments by parking districts to raise money for maintenance issues and the like, but to present this appropriately we would need an overview of what we want and what is the "right thing to do" in terms of downtown's needs. Right now, in-fill parking and development are all the city wants to see, and DVO noted to staff that one of the constraints to development was requiring individual developers to create their own parking on-site. The current exception to Main and California Streets is unacceptable in the view of the majority of those present, and that particular exemption must sunset.

The group focused on suggesting that our request include a "decision-making, empowered board of commissioners/directors, consisting of members of the public whether DVO members or not, but publicly-driven and NOT a City board." The decisions of this board should be set by the board and not the City, and policies created by the board should be carried out by the board, not the City. The rates MAY possibly be set by Council with adequate and well-researched input from the commission.

We then set out, at long last, to do a straw vote on the wording of the second part of our request to Council (see numbered items above of the first part). After much discussion, the following were put forth for input from the group (this, in addition to notes 1-3 above):

4. DVO SUPPORTS ADDITIONAL PUBLIC PARKING STRUCTURES BASED ON THE ANTICIPATION OF HISTORICALLY-PROVEN FUTURE NEED

5. DVO SUPPORTS THE CONCEPT OF AN EMPOWERED, LOCALLY-DRIVEN, CITIZEN-MANAGED PARKING DISTRICT. ALL FEES PAID IN TO THE DISTRICT SHALL REMAIN IN THE DISTRICT

6. DVO SUPPORTS AND ENCOURAGES PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS TO BUILD AND DEVELOP MULTI-LEVEL PARKING STRUCTURES IN DESIGNATED LOCATIONS, TO BE DESIGNATED BY THE PARKING DISTRICT BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

7. DVO SUPPORTS A SYSTEM WHERE IN-LIEU PARKING FEES MAY BE PAID DIRECTLY IN TO THE PARKING DISTRICT FUND TO ALLOW OFF-SITE CREATION OF ADDITIONAL PARKING

8A. DVO SUPPORTS THE CONCEPT THAT EVERY NEW USE OF A STRUCTURE IN THE DOWNTOWN ADEQUATELY ADDRESS THE IMPACT ON PARKING PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF OCCUPANCY PERMIT

OR

8B. APPLICATIONS TO THE CITY THAT MAY RESULT IN ADDITIONAL PARKING NEEDS SHALL REQUIRE A PARKING PLAN PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF PERMIT

...and carried over from the first meeting, the following:

9. ALL NEW DEVELOPMENT IN THE DOWNTOWN SPECIFIC PLAN AREA MUST ADDRESS THE CURRENT PARKING REQUIREMENT AND, IF ALTERING SAID PARKING ALLOCATION, MUST REPLACE LOST PARKING SPACES AT A MINIMUM OF A RATIO OF 1:1

10. ALL NEW DEVELOPMENT IN THE DOWNTOWN SPECIFIC PLAN AREA AFFECTING THE SUPPLY OF PARKING MUST HAVE AN APPROVED PARKING PLAN THAT MUST MATCH OR INCREASE (1:1+) THE CURRENT AND FUTURE USE, EITHER ON-SITE OR OFF-SITE, WITHIN THE DISTRICT

We adjourned around 10:30 or so. Please comment on the above, and if you can figure out a way to encapsulate items 1 - 7 into fewer but more straight-forward verbiage let me know. Again, we need bodies at council on the 11th. Please consider giving just a few minutes - they want to hear from you, and emails sent will help but there is no substitute for being in their face.

[GO TO TOP](#)

11/16/06

This is long, but here are my impressions of the meeting Thursday morning. There was much discussion that I have tried to cobble together here, but if I miss something please respond to me and everyone else, so we can move forward on the same page. DVO appreciates the time you are taking to research the situation and give input - we should be able to give comment to Council by the December deadline if we can work on this as a team.

Present were Jim Dearkland, Barbara Evans, Clarey Rudd, Dan Frederickson, Ed Warren, Ron Barrett, Christy Weir, Dave Armstrong, Greg and Jeffrey Smith, Ray Mulokas, Quinn Fenwick, David Wilson and Jerry Breiner. Meeting started approx 8:40am at the current DVO offices on Oak Street. Discussion was wide-ranging and driven by Dave Armstrong with comments from all. These are in basic chronological order and reflect the author's view of the meeting's procedures - I make no guarantee or warranty on the info, only my impressions of the events.

The Mobility and Parking Plan of fall 2006 is referenced in the current DTSP Draft to be brought to public comment within the next three weeks. In the near term, parking regulations for new development reduces the number of spaces without variance. Current code reads 2 spaces/1000 ft/business and 1 space/1500 ft/residence, based on supply. Dave suggested that an actual supply AND demand study be utilized, where the current 55% capacity may be misleading. Dan suggested getting a monthly or even quarterly analysis to at least be more precise. We need reliable data, the City needs reliable data, to make any determination for the future to see if we need to ADD parking. Dan mentioned that a study he has shows large scale offices require 2.5 spaces/1000 ft. That is too little and planning as low as this indicates will most probably be problematic, as it doesn't nearly or correctly address the actual needs of a future downtown.

Dave noted there is a great need to understand our current demand in context, and to that end public works has done (or will do) a 'demand & allowance' study per lot per space. Bottom line: the demand now is not what the future demand will be. Ed brought up the subject of controlled parking, not necessarily meters but paying for space and the lack of current enforcement of the existing parking regs downtown. In particular, employers and employees who park in choice spots, some for all day, run the risk of curtailing any advance in public street traffic by holding onto and nearly reserving choice retail parking locations where they should not be. We need a system that manages itself to a great degree: Santa Barbara has only been able to do it with planned parking, and the group's consensus is that their model works very efficiently and seamlessly.

Historically, there have been in existence at least 2 designated parking districts in the downtown. Whether they are retired or not is up for debate, though Dave and Tom Wood have background information on the subject. Tom supplied Jerry some documents this morning regarding the districts historic context as well as a 1984 map of the downtown parking study, showing two parking districts: one bordered by Oak/Thompson/Junipero//Poli (roughly) and the other bordered by Poli/Fir/Thompson/Oak). From the documents, it states that Parking district 1 was established in 1952 and contained 545 city-owned, 109 city-leased and 199 privately owned spaces. The second parking district was established in 1954 and contained 215 city-owned, 68 city-leased and 680 privately owned spaces.

Please print out and review the attached docs Tom has supplied for further discussion

Also, here are links to the California State Streets and Highways code. They directly address the legalities and documented bases for creating and maintaining a parking district. I personally believe we should all be aware of the ordinances and the current situation in Ventura:

<http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/waisgate?WAISdocID=81515728012+0+0+0&WAISaction=retrieve>

<http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/waisgate?WAISdocID=81524228106+0+0+0&WAISaction=retrieve>

<http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/waisgate?WAISdocID=81528528200+0+0+0&WAISaction=retrieve>

<http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/waisgate?WAISdocID=81531328234+0+0+0&WAISaction=retrieve>

<http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/waisgate?WAISdocID=81533328261+0+0+0&WAISaction=retrieve>

<http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/waisgate?WAISdocID=81535828298+0+0+0&WAISaction=retrieve>

Dave then made some suggestions he had been thinking about: first, to do it right (as it hasn't been) we need a professional staff or contractor to run the district. DVO needs to make a recommendation to Council from this group, and our time is limited - we need to get something to council before December 11. The issues are obviously significant enough to warrant such a move, but who is to pay? Is there already a mechanism in place? Ray mentioned examples of other cities he has visited in the east and south that have a strong control of the parking and a seemingly effortless way to approach it. The public and the government MUST buy in to the fact that we need and require parking as the first consideration with any new development. Pasadena and Culver City built their structures before their downtowns re-emerged from the blighted conditions they were experiencing. True, it is hard to get the private sector involved without incentive, and these large structures were publicly funded with bonds. The Ventura beach structure is now getting paid parking, so the concept can obviously work downtown. Question is how.

Straw poll around the table came up with a unanimous agreement that

A PAID PARKING STRATEGY IS NECESSARY.

Certain council members have expressed their opinion on the subject, not all in favor of meters, but this discussion only mentions meters as a possibility, not a 'given.' We discussed other versions of paid parking, including wireless pay, "90-minutes-free" parking in the structure. Various councilmembers have expressed the opinion that "since land is expensive, why use it for cars?" Seems to be a disconnect between some viewpoints as the undeniable fact that parking is the first situation that must be solved before any development can sensibly begin. Add to this the fact that no one of late has brought to Council a proposal for a parking district, if such a proposal is even necessary (see Tom Wood notes). Even in the 2006 parking and mobility study, they found that structures are NOT the 1st solution to the problem. Let's design them so they can also have other uses, such as retail, commercial, perhaps residential if their use as parking structures in the future become not as viable as they would be now.

Dave spoke of a model we might consider: a joint public/private partnership with the city joining forces with new development in the downtown. Current estimates show a parking space costs roughly \$30K/stall. Dan wondered if we charge for parking (making a case for this concept at zero cost to the city), the City would have to help "sell" the idea to the public. At \$3/day x 30 = \$90/month per space - there should be a way to get the numbers to work mathematically with the City investing in the building of the lots/structures and then charging for parking or the public/private partnership doing same.

The parking situation, as dire as it is, is actually preventing product from coming to market. The surveys bear this out when you have to circle downtown at least 3 times to find a space in the middle of the week in the middle of the day. The surveys have plainly said "we don't have enough parking." It is actually a disincentive to owner/developers on Oak and Palm to develop. Another straw poll showed we all agreed that

PARKING HAS TO BE RUN AS A BUSINESS.

The 1993 DSP has verbiage that does not require Main Street redevelopment to include parking in the design. By lowering the parking requirements and putting in-lieu fees we are defeating the economic process that must drive downtown. The 2005 Nelson/Nygaard survey report calls parking a "public utility", so should it be private then? The solution perhaps: parking must be paid for. How? Perhaps outsource the management to a private organization to manage/fund the lots/spaces/district. Available land is fast disappearing, and in-lieu fees cannot replace it when it's gone. Solution? Go up. 4 stories, over the next 15 years, may not be a realistic high limitation to the downtown core.

The groups immediate need is input recommendations to Council's DSP draft PRIOR to December 11. In Dan's opinion (and group consensus that followed) the logical sequence might be:

- prove the need
- complete the additional data input as per square footage
- realistically project 15-20 years
- use the same analysis to drive a financial model for the district
- propose a public-private partnership deal with the City and the development community to share the parking needs, supplies
- develop firm guidelines to create the parking lots/district/structures if suggested

The resource of vacant land is finite - all agreed - and it's going away. The group consensus is that

ANY NEW DEVELOPMENT MUST REPLACE PARKING SPACES LOST AT LEAST AT A 1:1 RATIO

Incentives could be added for any additional spaces returned to the downtown supply. Bottom line: the parking rules and regs must absolutely reflect reality. The focus to date has been on demand but the supply side has been sorely undervalued and underplanned.

NEXT STEPS: A letter from DVO's board with significant representation from the development community should state the actual recommendation of paid parking with no concessions made to anyone for any reason, save the above suggested incentive to increase the supply. We need correct data. Dan suggested the data reflect the following **A PROVEN DEMAND RESULT** (the result of the existing methodology plus his earlier-suggested per-square-foot model), including the number of structures over the next 15-20 years. The group then worked on the wording for the proposal to council. The following was suggested:

INITIATE A PROPOSAL THAT ALL NEW DEVELOPMENT AFFECTING THE SUPPLY OF PARKING IN THE DOWNTOWN SPECIFIC PLAN AREA MUST HAVE AN APPROVED PARKING PLAN THAT MUST MATCH OR ADD (1:1+) TO THE CURRENT AND FUTURE USE EITHER ON-SITE OR OFF-SITE WITHIN THE DISTRICT.

Additionally, we came up with following as a possible adjunct to the above:

EACH NEW DEVELOPMENT PROJECT SHALL BE REQUIRED TO ADDRESS THE IMPACTS TO THE CURRENT SUPPLY AND DEMAND TO THE LOSS OF FUTURE PARKING IN THE DISTRICT

And

PARKING IN-LIEU FEES SHALL INCLUDE ALL STREETS AND PROPERTIES IN THE DOWNTOWN SPECIFIC AREA FOR ALL NEW DEVELOPMENT

We adjourned at 10:45. **OUR NEXT MEETING IS NOVEMBER 30, THURSDAY MORNING, at 8:30.** Christy said she would see if she can get copies of the 2006 and 2005 Nelson/Nygaard parking data to everyone via email within the week.

RS,
Jerry Breiner - chair, DOT

[GO TO TOP](#)**June 1, 2006**

In attendance today: Jerry Breiner - Re/Max Gold Coast Realtors, Ed Warren - Downtown property owner, Clarey Rudd - Chair of DVO, Bank of Books, Christie Weir - Councilmember - City of Ventura, Dave Armstrong - Downtown Project Manager - City of Ventura, Barbara Evans - Downtown resident, Tom Mericle - Engineer - City of Ventura, and Neil Andrews - Councilmember - City of Ventura.

Approval of Action Notes for May 11, 2006

Motion to approve with corrections - Barbara Evans, 2nd - Ed Warren

Review of Downtown Specific Plan:

" Continuation of review of document Downtown Specific Plan (DTSP)

" Pages I-26, I-27 Move table and text to economic diversity.

" If action is to go to Paid Parking, an ad hoc committee for Downtown Parking District should be formed. Members to be appointed by Council, DVO to participate. Council to set policies in terms of range of rates and responsibilities of committee. Committee to set actual rates.

" Loading zones - Where are they needed and what times should they be designated as loading and when can they be used for general parking? Enforcement must be part of policy. VIP's could be used to issue citation for violations.

" Page II-29 Where to put comment. Need to address scale of public transportation. (SCAT, Tour buses and larger scale buses)

" Page II-30 Action 6-4 should provide 2 separate bus routing systems, express or limited service on Thompson and run a more local service throughout Downtown. To provide an opportunity to explore a diversified vehicle fleet that meets the needs of Downtown. Encourage local transit of Main Street and limited stop or express service on Thompson.

" Page II-30 Action 6-4 ...of a Downtown shuttle or tram that will connect key destinations including Grant Park, parking lots/structures, Downtown, and the beach.

" Grant Park should be part of Downtown. What is rationale as to why it is not?

" Page II-18 Action 3-C add wording: ...other natural areas, such as Grant Park, the hillside, and Ventura River...

" Map I-19 Grant Park should be part of Downtown Area.

" Page II-15 Goal 3 hillside would cover Grant Park issue.

" Page II-31 6-7 discount parking fees for alternate fuel vehicles, encourage service stations to provide alternative fuels.

" Page II-31 Action 6-7 Change wording: Facilitate establishment of a Car-sharing Program. Refer to the Parking Mobility Plan.

" Page II-31 Action 6-7 #1 strike replace, add replacement

" Page II-31 Action 6-7 #3 strike require, add facilitate and develop

" Remove everything after service and refer to parking mobility plan

" Page II-31 6-7 car share program. Car share more feasible than car rental service.

" California street improvements should also include solar electric panels installments on rooftops. Insert solar electric information. Need to create new policy.

" Page II-39 first sentence, strike "are vital", replace with "is vital". Delete rest of sentence.

" Page II-32 6-B Should state what the City's desire is as it relates to the Fairgrounds. Change last sentence to: other connections shall be reinforced or re-established on Figueroa Street, Garden Street, San Jon Road, the Ash Street pedestrian bridge, and the pedestrian tunnel under the freeway at Ventura Avenue.

" Page II-32 6-10 delete wording, replace with: Improve pedestrian crossing safety at all crosswalks.

" Page I-29 Figure I-5 Before General Plan was adopted Main Street was designated as a local street. After adoption it is designated as a collector street, speed limit will be based upon state guidelines.

" Recommendation that all Downtown Streets, with the exception of Thompson, be designated as local streets (25mph).

" Page I-29 Figure 1-5 Main collector

o Oak, Chestnut, Kalorama, Santa Clara, Garden, Kellogg, Cedar and Main, should be local

o California should be collector

- " Page I-29 Figure 1-5 should be referenced in the Mobility Section
- " Poli as a collector ends at Seaward then becomes local.
- " Add extending Garden to Garden as dashed. New symbol as local extension.
- " Delete designation as collector to Cedar, Kalorama, Santa Clara, Oak, Chestnut, Kellogg, Poli, and Main Street east of Ventura Avenue and alter them as local streets. Add extension of Garden so that it meets the correlation above Von's as a dotted line.
- " Page II-33 Action 6-D Change wording: Maintain all Downtown streets at their current number of lanes or less. Discourage street widening that detracts from the goal of pedestrian oriented mobility.
- " New Action 6-15 Allow minor widening of streets to provide on-street parking in conjunction with new developments where no other alternatives are feasible.
- " New Action 6-16 Require new development on North side of Thompson from Oak to Ventura Avenue to dedicate a right of way for on-street parking and/or bike usage.

[GO TO TOP](#)

May 25, 2006

In attendance today: Jerry Breiner - Re/Max Gold Coast Realtors, Ed Warren - Downtown property owner, Clarey Rudd - Chair of DVO, Bank of Books, Christie Weir - Councilmember City of Ventura, Dave Armstrong - Downtown Project Manager - City of Ventura, Barbara Evans - Downtown resident, and Linda Peterson - DVO.

Approval of Action Notes for May 11, 2006
Not reviewed/approved

Review of Downtown Specific Plan:

- " Continuation of review of document Downtown Specific Plan (DTSP)
- " Page I-27 Remove table - Should not be in this section, it should be moved to a more appropriate section. The Housing Renaissance Section cannot address office-retail-hotel; it only addresses Housing.
- " Page II-19 Economic Diversity - Changes may be costly to recover from. 17 businesses have recently closed only 7 have opened to replace them. Need to evaluate businesses that are remaining, how changes will affect them as well as effects on new businesses drawn in.
- " Page II-22 Action 4.8 Change wording to: Require new development incorporate non-residential uses on the ground floor, allowing upper floor use for office, residential, retail, hotel and educational uses in buildings fronting the following streets...
- " Page II-19 high wage/value jobs. Define high wage, high value jobs. Goal of City always has been to attract high wage jobs. Goal is to incorporate higher level into current mix.
- " Page II-20 Action 4.2 disregard comments
- " Page II-21 Action 4.4 add item #5 Educational Facilities
- " Page II-21 Action 4.6 change wording to: Develop a retail and office strategy to facilitate the provision of job-rich and retail developments, especially in the urban core. (see Focus Area A, Figure I-7, page I-39)
- " Page II-22 Action 4.9 DVO should be listed as supporting agency.
- " Page II-22 Policy 4.C Urban Campus - incorporate wording or additional action. Add to 4.4 another item, add educational facilities.
- " Page 11-23 Action 4.11 ratio - check points
- " Page II-26 Action 5.2 Correct name of DVO
- " Page II-26 Action 5.3 Can you reduce parking options without improving transportation options? Strike all wording before incentivize, replace with: Encourage participation in parking management programs by offering reduced parking requirements for new developments that include low-income and very low-income affordable housing.
- " Page II-29 Any section included in plan that allows developer the right to sell off unused parking spaces? Or get incentive to multi-use spaces? Review next week with Tom Mericle.
- " Page II-27 Action 5-6 Change wording to: Update Quimby fee for Downtown projects to improve Downtown parks and public plazas and to provide funding for development of the Cultural Arts Village.
- " Page II-27 Action 5-7 DVO should be listed as supporting agency.
- " Page II-28 Policy 5C Action 5.9 Need clear and concise compatibility guidelines for integration on new

- developments into the existing historic fabric adhering to the Secretary of the Interior standards. Insert after development code: and Secretary of the Interior standards.
- " Good idea to include copy of Secretary of interior Standards with this section.
 - " Page II-29 Goal 6 - Address scale of Public Transportation - Review next week with Tom Mericle.
 - " Page II-36 Policy 7A Action 7.1 Add item 6: Managed parking shall encourage Downtown hotels to provide valet service and park vehicles on upper levels of parking garages away from street levels.
 - " Page II-36 Policy 7A Pay parking should be more user and commercial friendly based on Santa Barbara concept. (Downtown organization sponsors the program, also receives revenue from program.)
 - " Add to 7.4 #4 Implement per hour pay strategy based on successful models/programs of other cities.
 - " Page II-36 Action 7.1 #5 Delete current wording, replace with: Encourage market driven parking strategy.
 - " 2-37 7.4 #3 City has no provision to monitor that. Data based on 2000 info.
 - " DVO needs to make clear recommendations for or against in regards to parking meters - continue discussion on this section next week when Tom Mericle is available for input.
 - " Page II-39 Goal 8 Add wording: All utilities should be moved underground along Oak Street.
 - " Page II-42 8.10 Strike citywide. Add wording that stresses importance of maintaining and enhancing species native to area.
 - " Page II-43 Action 8-12 Change wording: ...or detain runoff; encourage the building of water permeable surfaces.
 - " Page II-45 Action 8-18 Remove first sentence.
 - " Page II-46 Action 8-19 Include wording, incorporate screening landscaping or public art to obscure view of enclosure. Add Public Art funds to funding list.
 - " Code Enforcement - can use VIP to write citations for code violations re: signage, sidewalk easements.
 - " Page II-49 Action 8-19 insert after occupancy checklist: all new businesses to have Trash-disposal Plan before receiving business license.
 - " Page II-47 Action 8-25 Correct name to E. P. Foster Library. Add to end of sentence: with extended hours and services. Under funding, add County Library Fund.
 - " Page II-47 Action 8-26 Strike reference to new schools. Partner with Ventura Unified School District (VUSD), Ventura County College District, and other college districts to facilitate educational facilities and opportunities to serve a growing residential population.
 - " Page II-48 Action 8.28 Skip the evaluation: Install public wireless internet (Wi-Fi) in the Downtown.
 - " Page II-47 Action 8-27 Strike access. Change wording: Provide safe clean public restrooms in the Downtown. Include diaper-changing stations in all public restrooms, in both mens and womens facilities.
 - " Chart and Map Pages III-8 & III-9 Thompson from Figueroa to Olive should not be zoned Urban General 3. Figueroa to Garden and up to Olive should be same zone. UG3 for this area is ridiculous and offensive. Bring back to table next week for discussion with Tom Mericle.
 - " Page III-18 (UG-3) & III-28 (COR-3) Standards are the same.
 - " Change use table of UG-3 to allow P-Permitted by Right: Museum/Theatre, Personal Services, Retail, Restaurants/Café, and Office, & U-Use Permit: Health/Fitness and School.
 - " Dave Armstrong to request summary 1-page sheet of zoning matrix.
 - " Page III-11 Allow unused allowable height to be sold off to neighbors. Impose TDR system. Air rights could be bought, transferred - caps on maximum levels and must be appropriate for the area.
 - " Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) should be included into Plan as separate section

[GO TO TOP](#)

May 11, 2006

In attendance today: Jerry Breiner - Re/Max Gold Coast Realtors, Ed Warren - Downtown property owner, Glenda Lewis - DVO, Christie Weir - Councilmember City of Ventura, Dave Armstrong - Downtown Project Manager - City of Ventura, Barbara Evans - Downtown resident, and Cynthia Thompson - San Buenaventura Conservancy.

Approval of Action Notes for April 27, 2006
Motion to approve Ed Warren 2nd Glenda Lewis - Approved

Review of Downtown Specific Plan:

- " Continuation of review of document Downtown Specific Plan (DTSP)
- " Page II-13 Action 2.7 Delete both funding names and change to private. Time frame should be changed to TBD
- " Page I-47 Note from Jim Luttjohann - focus area B - East End loft style infill construction should be encouraged and built onto the triangle property and re-name district SOTO (South Of Thompson)
- " Page II-1 Planning Goals - Define the definition of Economic Diversity, is there a better way to describe that - change to Economic Vitality
- " Page II-3 Define Notable - Ventura County Municipal Code, Ordinance 2005-004, Section 24.455.120 under Definitions, it does state what constitutes "Notable" lists specific criteria - critical point - must adhere to Governmental Guidelines in order to be eligible for grants & funding
- " Page II-4, Policy 1A, Action 1A - Historic Preservation Plan - Supporting agency should be HPC & SBC
- " Additional note on Notable Structures: any property left off the list is fair game - no agreement from group on that statement, if property meets criteria it automatically goes on the list, which will be updated regularly. Need to complete citywide survey.
- " Suggestion to incorporate wording " to encourage an incentive based historic preservation plan (HPP) using public/private partnerships to acquire preservation easements, façade easements and/or in-fee purchases of identified historic resources.
- " Page II-4 Action 1-2 Adjacent to Notable Structure - lead agency Community Development, supporting agency should be HPC & SBC
- " Alter paragraph 3 to cover section to amend moving of historic structures not to enforce notable regulations for existing structures.
- " Downtown core is different, stair stepping already exists, and it works.
- " Dave Armstrong will try to locate photos that detail incorporation. Need to establish one go-to informational site for environmental standards. Need HP element. Follow section of interior standards. Goal is to create clarity. Add wording "This does not apply to Notable buildings relocated after January 1, 2006. "
- " Page II-4 Policy 1A Action 1-2 - comment that this should not apply to commercial streets - change wording to: should not apply to Urban Core.
- " Page III-30 limits on height and setbacks locked in place. Needs to be changed. Dave Armstrong to craft some verbiage for this section - will refer to a couple of sources i.e. Dave Sargent.
- " Provide exception to height in the Urban Core
- " Page III-31 Hillside Overlay - Possibility - look at Los Angeles Overlay Policy
- " Historic District - zone/area defined by how it was designed/developed within a historic context.
- " Historic American Building Survey - Archived photo documentation.
- " Page III-30 2-20-090 Notable Site Overlay - add verbiage - "notable property shall include not only the subject property but adjacent properties that define the historical context of neighborhoods"
- " Definition of Notable - Property or subject property meets one of the four criteria of either the National Register or the California Register or the criteria outlined in the Ventura Municipal Code of either the Historic District, landmark or point of interest.
- " Two points to consider, what is a Notable building and if building next to a Notable building how to not overwhelm Notable building

[GO TO TOP](#)

April 27, 2006

In attendance today: Jerry Breiner - Re/Max Gold Coast Realtors, Clarey Rudd - Banks of Books & DVO Chairman, Sid White - EDR Manager City of Ventura, Ed Warren - Downtown property owner, Linda Peterson - DVO, Glenda Lewis - DVO, Loretta Merewether - Downtown Property Owner, Dan Fredrickson - Downtown property owner, resident and developer, Christie Weir - Councilmember City of Ventura and Barbara Evans - Downtown resident.

Approval of Action Notes for February 9 & April 13, 2006
Motion to approve Ed Warren 2nd Glenda Lewis - Approved

Discussion of participation in the upcoming DTSP workshop
Encourage merchants & property owners to attend.

Ideas for Downtown location for Trader Joe's

" Sid - Asking for suggestions for placement of TJ's in Downtown. Prime location would be Rusty's Pizza or on that same block.

Review of Downtown Specific Plan:

" Continuation of review of document Downtown Specific Plan (DTSP)

" Letter regarding DTSP comments should be a critical listing of issues/verbiage/specifics that should be addressed/added/changed. DVO will compile all comments and present one list to Nicole Horn.

" Page II-1 Referring to Goals and Policies - need more specific language focusing on economic vitality rather than diversity.

" Commercial office jobs. Need to put more emphasis on developing, attracting small business offices downtown. Roadblocks have been: Downtown rents too high, condition of available office space usually poor, and not sufficient parking. Parking main issue.

" Page I-22 constraint to development - parking not even addressed

" Page II-16 Public Realm - Furnishings and Improvements - a number of the projects mentioned in the Policy are already covered by Public Works.

" Idea of New York style newsstand should be considered.

" To consider style of bench with armrest in the middle to prohibit laying across/sleeping on bench.

" Page III-5 development of a program permitting a requirement and identified funding for placement and design of the consolidated network of newsracks. Wanting to alter wording to add - install newspaper/magazine rack combos that combine a cohesive look and feel of the downtown incorporating street furniture and benches the newspaper racks two in each in each of the five major blocks of Main Street as well as two per block on South California.

" Trashcan placement on Main Street - 6 per block. 2 per block on feeder streets.

" IV-12 Street Improvements - DO NOT remove Queen Palms that have just been planted on Figueroa Streets.

" Street lighting - more posts, brighter lights. 2009 Retrofit for tree underlighting scheduled. Lighting of storefronts should be cohesive -need to use lighting engineers for project.

" Page IV-14 & -15 Oak Street lighting - reference to swag lighting needs to be removed. This idea has been voted down many times before.

" Need to have better markers/marking for crosswalks, i.e. vertical indicators or bump-outs.

" Page II-17 Policy 3B Gateway improvements not to begin until after freeway improvements. Pull out parenthesis area. Too vague and confusing as to which area they are referring to.

" Page II-12 & -13 New Art City - Do not agree with term. If Ventura is going to call itself the New Art City, we should have art gallery Downtown, subsidize by 1)% of sales of art sold 2) City Grants and 3) property owners willing to pay for rent. Artist Union is open limited hours, limited days, is staffed by volunteers. Need a director and full time staff, need to develop a marketing plan. Potentially develop a partnership with Cal State Channel Island and the City to open Gallery on Main Street to incorporate some of the art from CSCIU.

" Page III-30 Notable Sites - What constitutes a notable site? Guidelines too vague, defined as one of three ways, leave property up to discretion. Rule can be applied as an OR - not an AND, leaves too much room for interpretation.

o Notable properties shall include not only the subject but also adjacent properties that define an historical context of that neighborhood.

o The definition of notable structure must include the demand that if the structure meets any of the criteria in the definition, it then becomes notable.

o Loretta Merewether to create a photo-journal to document Hillside Overlay

" SEQUA Guidelines should be lead of document

" Staff recommendations need to be more firmly considered/followed by discretionary committee. Need firm guidelines not interpretations; variances will always be in place.

[GO TO TOP](#)

April 13, 2006

In attendance today: Jerry Breiner - Re/MaxGold Coast Realtors, Clarey Rudd - Banks of Books & DVO Chairman, Sid White - EDR Manager City of Ventura, Ed Warren - Downtown property owner, Linda

Peterson - DVO, Glenda Lewis - DVO, Vicki Musgrove - City of Ventura, Nicole Horn - Associate Planner - DTSP, and Barbara Evans - Downtown resident.

Review of Downtown Specific Plan:

- " Review document to identify items that require the attention of the DOT
- " Page I-15 One task assigned to the Design and Operation Committee of the national trust organization is to look out for historic preservation guidelines. This particular section seems to address that specifically. Ventura does not have a citywide survey regarding Historic Preservation. That means that any house that is not currently designated as a historical site would have a very difficult time fighting that developer. Need to incorporate verbiage that a complete citywide historical survey that meets state and federal standards needs to be done. Get comments to Dave Ward and Kevin Colin ASAP.
- " Page II-3 Action 1-2,3,4 Plan can only work if there is a new survey. Action 1-1 Prepare Historic Preservation Plan - Plan is contingent on survey.
- " Public works - Dates listed for projects that PW has no money in the budget for, i.e. Master Drainage Plan.
- " Page II-9 Action 1-18,19 DVO mentioned. 1-19 possibly refers to Mission Plaza Shopping Area. Is this within the scope of the DVO finance committee?
- " Page II-16 Beautification recommendations - trees, bike racks, landscaping, etc. Plan for streetscape recommendations include Oak Street improvements (has funding) and do take into consideration future plans that the freeway off-ramp connecting to it. Also includes plans for the California street off-ramp.
- " Page II-16 Action 3-1 Figueroa Street between Main & Santa Clara - open for traffic again? Not indicated in plan. Does indicate that priority should be given to California & Figueroa.
- " Page II-20 Action 4-1,2 DVO listed as Lead Agency. Action 4-2 How to accomplish? Possibly form an adjunct committee that could be a local development corporation (doesn't have to be a public benefit local dev corp.) to own & manage property, consolidate property, organize a leasing management company, could help construct/manage parking structure. The RDA will not be in existence forever, this could tail on after the RDA ends. Adjunct committee can develop, own, and operate property whereas the RDA cannot.
- " Page III-77-81 Sign standards - Addresses signage standards, establishes guidelines. Incorporate specific wording from this section into DOT notification letter. Jerry Breiner had asked for photos of storefronts - examples of signs, banners or windows with possible code violations
- " III-78 2.b. Wording is "one per building only", not specific regarding arcades & courtyards. Need to be specific re: how many signs per building - arcade - courtyard (is it one per business in arcade/courtyard or one per arcade/courtyard).
- " Page II-17 Action 3-5 Consistency of: Signage-Newspaper Racks-Trash Receptacles - Bike Racks. Provide comments regarding design and location for signage and newspaper racks.
- " Page II-17 3-4, -7 all items have been discussion items for the DOT.
- " Page II- 17 Action 3-4 California Street - Green & blue banner brackets are too loose and too low.
- " Page III-77 Purpose statement states intent of the design of the sign and what they are supposed to do.
- " Page VI-8 Park Once - Parking Management Program -need specifics as to when, where, how long, where do funds/revenue go?
- " Page VI-9 Item F Parking Revenue Allocation
- " Page II-35 "Park Once" Purpose Statement "Charging for parking is vital to creating a market mechanism that will promote the conversion of surface parking to more efficient structures and provide adequate funding for enhancing security and pedestrian amenities"
- " Page II-7 35,36 Park Once Program - Parking Meters - Sid White was certain that DVO was listed as a potential beneficiary of the funding. (Could also be included in 7-9)
- " Plan does address issues of truck loading locations, parking time allowed, etc.
- " Parking violation revenue goes into general fund
- " All DVO sub-committees will review document and provide comments to board. The Board will then organize the four list and present comments to Nicole.
- " Comments due to Nicole Horn by June 19th
- " Workshop June 19th - Public Comments

Trash Containers/Enclosures - Update: Vicki Musgrove

- " Trash Committee - Jim Luttjohann, Loretta Merewether, Doug Halter
- " Pressboard recycle bins will be removed and replaced with concrete bins that match the existing concrete trash bins.

- " 3' Multi-colored totes will be pulled too. Too mix-matched. Ambassadors have increased trash pick-up, will evaluate if levels start overflowing again.
- " New solar powered compactor to be installed at California & Main, in front of the Ventura Inn. Suggestion of alternate placement - blank wall in front of Bank of America.
- " Enclosures will be ready within the next 6 weeks. Agreements must be signed by businesses before access to enclosure is given.
- " Indemnification clause - City not responsible for injury or damages to persons (employees) or property.
- " Letter to be sent out regarding removal of trashcan within 2 months. Agreement to be signed by owner.
- " Dumpsters located - California/Chestnut/Main - Parking Structure - Oak /Poli. Each location will have separate set of keys, stamped Do Not Duplicate.
- " Parking structure issues being addressed
 - o 2nd floor trash containers
 - o Jumpers from Star Free Press Building - plan to install railings.
- " Sidewalk cleaner working great - Will seek approval from Council regarding funding for the purchase of the machine.

[GO TO TOP](#)

February 9, 2006

In attendance today: Jerry Breiner - Re/Max Gold Coast Realtors, Clarey Rudd - Bank of Books, DVO Chairman, Dave Armstrong - ED&R City of Ventura, Linda Peterson - DVO, Glenda Lewis - DVO & Ventura resident, Robin Elander - Cultural Affairs City of Ventura, Anna Garcia - Ventura Investment Co., Loretta Merewether - Downtown property owner, Barbara Evans - Downtown resident

Approval of Action Notes for December 1, 2005
Motion - Glenda Lewis 2nd - Barbara Evans - Approved

Listing for Kiosk:

- " Please forward to Jerry Breiner the names of any businesses due to open soon so that they can be included in the listing.
- " Review blocks - who is opening, who is closing
- " May be able to develop listing from GIS/Business tax licensing.
- " May be able to get funding from VCB to update kiosk at Santa Clara as well as duplicate kiosk at the train depot.

Storefront windows - Signage & Painted Windows

- " Listing of concerns to present to Code Enforcement
- " Suggestion that DVO send letter to City regarding standardizing format of signs indicating for lease, closing, opening soon, etc. Provide a more cohesive look to Downtown.
- " Suggestion that DVO send notification letters to businesses 1) raising awareness of what is needing to be done to keep in compliance with Codes 2) informing of positive efforts of DVO for Downtown. Jerry Breiner to formulate cover letter
- " Should document (photograph) businesses that have violations.

Merchant Survey

- " How to address the homeless issue
- " Police Visibility
- " Other Concerns
- " Public Meetings
- " Need to compile listing of e-mail addresses of Downtown property owners and businesses

Work Plan

- " Performance Measures
- " Security
 - o Reduce number of service calls
 - o Officer in Downtown full-time

- " Increase frequency of street sweepings
 - o Baseline survey based on current frequency
 - o Satisfaction survey based increased frequency
- " Measurable goals
 - o What each group is doing to achieve goals
 - o Are we meeting our goals
- " Visitor satisfaction survey
 - o Reference: VCB Visitor Report Card
 - o Satisfaction survey
- " Online customers
- " Property Owners
- " Business Owners
- o Grade Results - (A B C D F)
- " Summarize the survey results

Municipal Art

- " Discussed possibility of displaying artwork in vacant storefronts, listing for each piece artist and pricing.

Downtown Restrooms

- " Reference: San Jose example of self-cleaning bathrooms
- " Pre-made units available
- " Possibility of advertisement on outside of facility

Items to keep on the Radar

- " Magazine Racks - Letter from DVO to Code Enforcement regarding encroachment permits.
- " Lighting - Street lighting and Holiday Decorations
- " Street furniture
- " Wayfinding Program

[**GO TO TOP**](#)