



**MOUNTAINS RECREATION & CONSERVATION AUTHORITY**  
 Ramirez Canyon Park  
 5810 Ramirez Canyon Road  
 Malibu, California 90265  
 Phone (310) 589-3230 Fax (310) 589-3237

Agenda Item 11 SMMC 6/26/2017
-------------------------------------

March 29, 2017

Public Safety Commission  
 Public Works Commission  
 City of Malibu  
 Planning Department  
 23825 Stuart Ranch Road  
 Malibu, California 90265

**Pacific Coast Highway Parking Study Draft Final Report,  
 Joint Special Meeting March 29, 2017**

Dear Commissioners:

Mountains Recreation and Conservation Authority (MRCA) staff offers the following comments on the Pacific Coast Highway Parking Study Draft Final Report. We previously provided comments on this effort in a December 16, 2016 letter and February 10, 2016 email.

**Overall Comments**

According to the report, there would be a net loss of 675 equivalent parking spaces (p. 5.29). We are concerned with this proposed loss of parking, particularly near existing and proposed public access points (parks, trails, beach accessways, etc.). We recommend that the final report incorporate an increase in the number of new public parking spaces and a reduction in the number of spaces to be lost.

Need to Identify Encroachments and Opportunities for Enhancement of Public Parking

Consistent with the City of Malibu Local Coastal Program (LCP) Land Use Plan (LUP) Policy 2.31 (see Attachment A), the City should conduct an inventory of Pacific Coast Highway (PCH) to identify all unpermitted signage or physical barriers to public parking and to establish a database to aid in preventing future loss of legal public access and parking. The policy further states that all unpermitted signs and/or physical barriers which prevent public parking near the shoreline shall not be permitted.

For example, there may be dense landscaping, fences, or other physical barriers in the public PCH right-of-way, which results in a narrow shoulder in some areas. It is not appropriate for the report to recommend that no parking signs be installed and no parking be instituted or enforced in this area without additional consideration of public parking need and alternatives such as removing encroachments. If the report recommends no parking

Public Safety Commission and Public Works Commission  
City of Malibu  
PCH Parking Study  
March 29, 2017

Page 2

be enforced in these areas with encroachments, the City is validating the encroachments.

There may be relatively simple solution in some areas, such as removing the encroaching landscaping or other barriers for one or two feet in width, to widen the dirt areas available for public parking. This is particularly important in areas near existing and proposed beach accessways, park entrances, and other public accessways.

Without a survey of the encroachments, particularly in these key areas, the City is not playing with a full deck. We echo the California Coastal Commission staff's recommendation for a survey of the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) right-of-way (Malibu staff report, p. 3).

#### Need for Replacement Public Parking

In addition, the report must fully address and implement LCP LUP policies 2.27 and 7.12 (Attachment A), which specify requirements for replacement public parking spaces.

#### Need for Clarification of Existing Conditions in Order to Evaluate Opportunities for Public Parking Enhancement

There is a red line of the maps (Appendix C-Recommendations) identified on the legend as "Parking Prohibited or <8' Shoulder." It is important that the figures distinguish between the areas where there is existing prohibited parking versus where the shoulder is less than 8-feet-wide. Currently, these two categories are lumped together. Lumping these two categories is a disservice to the decision-makers and public in evaluating the existing conditions and public parking opportunities. This is particularly important in areas where people currently park but where parking is proposed to be removed, near existing and proposed beach accessways, park entrances, and other public accessways (some of these specific areas described below).

For example, there may be areas where the paved shoulder is less than 8-feet-wide, but there is one or two feet of existing dirt which could be used for public parking. That opportunity should be considered, particularly near existing and proposed public access points. On the other hand, it is important to know where existing parking is prohibited and why it is prohibited (e.g., a specific code). If parking is prohibited (per the solid red line) near key public access points, it is worthwhile to reconsider those areas to allow some public parking near these public access points. For example, while line of site is important looking left when pulling out of a driveway, perhaps some public parking areas could be maintained in some areas looking right. This warrants additional consideration and discussion with the City, Stantec, Caltrans, California Coastal Commission, and the park agencies such as MRCA, particularly where no parking is proposed to be enforced near key public access points (existing and proposed).

### **Site Specific Comments**

The maps in the following sections refer to Appendix C-Recommendations.

#### Meadows Court, Inland Side (Page 31)

There is an existing trail easement (running north-south) on the west side of Meadows Court road (by the guard gate)<sup>1</sup>, which then traverses in an east/west direction along the south border of the subdivision. The trail easement connects to PCH right-of-way at the east side of the subdivision. (The trail easement is depicted on parcel maps.) The upper (northerly) portions of this trail exist on the ground and are used. The southerly portion of the trail is not yet built within the easement.

Vehicles currently park along the shoulder west of the west side of Meadows Court subdivision. (For example, Google Earth shows ten vehicles parked between the parcel identified as 27355 and the Meadows Court driveway [by the guard house]). Severe reductions in public parking are not warranted in this Meadows Court area. Public parking should be expanded in this Meadows Court area.

It appears that there is an approximately 600-foot-long stretch south of the Meadows Court subdivision shown as a red line, identified as "Parking Prohibited or <8' Shoulder" (p. 31, parcels identified as 6428, 6437, 27353, and 27355). The report should clarify which category this falls into—parking prohibited, or less than 8-foot-wide shoulder. It appears that this would be left status quo—please let us know if our understanding is incorrect. In addition, at the east side of the parcel identified as 27405, it looks like the proposal shown as a light blue dashed line is to "Improve signs, install missing signs - existing parking restriction."

Opportunities should be explored here in the Meadows Court Area to make public parking available, particularly west of the Meadows Court subdivision. It is obvious that it is possible to park there, people park there now, and the current parking situation is good. The report must explicitly define why this area was designated as a red line and what minor improvements could be made to improve the existing parking, in front of the parcel identified at 27353 (approximately 300 feet long).

---

<sup>1</sup>There are two driveways/streets identified as Meadow Court on this page 31. In this letter, we refer to Meadows Court as the easterly one, within the Meadows Court subdivision, with the guard house.

On the east side of the Meadows Court subdivision (by the parcel identified as 6447 on page 32), we make similar recommendations. Goggle Earth shows about four vehicles parked along the shoulder at the east side of the parcel identified as 6447 on p. 32. The report should clarify which category this area identified as a solid red line falls into—parking prohibited, or less than 8-foot-wide shoulder. Parking enhancements should be considered.

Via Escondido Drive, Inland Side (Page 32)

Our agency has deeded road easement rights over Via Escondido Drive to Pacific Coast Highway, which were acquired along with the MRCA's Escondido-Flood property (Assessor Parcel Numbers 4460-003-900 and 4460-003-901). Parking in this area also serves the beach across the beach. There is an approximately 300-foot-long stretch east of Via Escondido Drive (on the ocean side) and an approximately 450-foot-long stretch west of Via Escondido Drive depicted as a solid red line (p. 32). The report should clarify which category this falls into—parking prohibited, or less than 8-foot-wide shoulder. Vehicles can be seen on Google Earth parking on the dirt west of Via Escondido, outside the paved shoulder.

The text states: "Improve signage on inland and ocean sides to clearly prohibit parking on the bus zones." The report should clarify what is the length of PCH where the signage would be installed for the bus stop. Would signage be installed along this entire length (300 feet plus 450 feet), or just in a small subset of this stretch? It should just be a small subset for the bus stop.

Goggle Earth shows that vehicles park on the inland side of PCH between the west side of the Meadows Court subdivision and Via Escondido Drive. We recommend that parking be enhanced west of Via Escondido Drive and west of the bus stop (outside of the bridge) within this 450-foot-long stretch identified as solid red line. The parking situation is already quite good. The final report must identify what minor enhancements would be implemented to improve the public parking. This can include expanding the pavement and/or reconsidering existing parking restrictions (if there are any). Another option would be to allow parking on the dirt and installing signage directing visitors to park outside of the white line. It would be unacceptable to lose the public parking here west of Via Escondido Drive (other than prohibiting parking at the bus stop). (These comments were already stated above, when describing east of Meadows Court subdivision; they are reiterated here.) This is important so that public parking can be maintained for access to Via Escondido Drive, the trail easement (lower part of trail not yet built within the easement) at the Meadows Court subdivision, and the beach access across the street.

Regarding the stretch of the PCH shoulder east of Via Escondido Drive, some of it is shown as a solid red line and some is shown as a dashed red line ("Prohibit Parking-New").

Public Safety Commission and Public Works Commission  
City of Malibu  
PCH Parking Study  
March 29, 2017

Page 5

Again, it is critical information for Caltrans, the public, and decision-makers to know what public resources are there. The report must identify which category this area shown as a solid red line is designated as: parking prohibited, or less than 8-foot-wide shoulder, rather than hiding behind the catch-all designation. Is the red line in this area based on a code, or a subjective call? The City should explore widening the pavement into dirt areas in order to enhance public parking in some of this area, while still maintaining adequate site distance to Via Escondido Drive. Enhancing public parking east of Via Escondido Drive may be more challenging than west of Via Escondido Drive. However, it should not be categorically dismissed without a more in-depth analysis.

#### Escondido Beach Area, Ocean Side (Page 29)

Goggle Earth shows vehicles parked along the shoulder on the ocean side where the map currently shows a solid red line identified as "Parking Prohibited or <8' Shoulder" along parcels identified as 27832, 27808, 27800, and 27768. The map also proposes new parking prohibitions on the ocean side along parcels identified as 27852, 27834, and 27768. However, Google Earth shows that vehicles currently park along the shoulder on the ocean side at these locations.

There is a note on p. 29 stating: "Prohibit parking on ocean side from W. Winding Way to E. Old Road due to shoulder width and roadway curve." This would essentially create a solid wall of no parking approximately 600-foot-long in front of, and eastward, of a proposed beach accessway located at 27910 PCH. This is in addition to another 500 feet of no parking west of the parcel at 27910 PCH. This is unacceptable. The final report must clarify which category this falls into—parking prohibited, or less than 8-foot-wide shoulder, for the two solid red lines from 27910 PCH eastward to East Winding Way. The final report must reevaluate the potential for include enhanced public parking the vicinity of 27910 PCH, such as widening the shoulder, particularly in front of and east of 27910 PCH.

#### East Winding Way, Inland Side (Page 29)

The public parking lot for Escondido Canyon Park is located on the inland side at the intersection of East Winding Way and PCH. The parking lot fills up quickly, which frequently leads to visitors parking on the PCH shoulder. We support the proposal to widen the existing shoulder on the inland side of PCH, both west and east of East Winding Way. at parcels identified as 27841, 27777, 27727, and 27715.

#### Geoffrey's Restaurant, Ocean Side (Page 31)

A blue dot should be added to Geoffrey's Restaurant eastern driveway at the parcel east of the parcel shown as 27400 on p. 31, in order to depict an existing public access..

Public Safety Commission and Public Works Commission  
City of Malibu  
PCH Parking Study  
March 29, 2017

Page 6

Many vehicles park along the shoulder from the Geoffrey's eastern driveway (across PCH from the parcels identified as 27355 and 27353 on p. 31) eastward to approximately the parcel identified as 27314. Much of this area is identified as a solid red line on p. 31. The report should clarify which category this falls into—parking prohibited, or less than 8-foot-wide shoulder. It appears that no action is proposed for this area east of the eastern Geoffrey's driveway—please let us know if our understanding is incorrect.

Based on our parcel data, it appears that there are encroachments (fences, landscaping, etc.) in the public right-of-way east of the eastern Geoffrey's driveway. These encroachments should be surveyed and the results included in the final PCH Parking Study. At the very least, the final report should include an aerial photo with parcel boundaries, showing these encroachments (e.g., from the Los Angeles County GISNET website).

There should not be a loss of the high volume of parking in this area east of the eastern Geoffrey's driveway, particularly given the apparent encroachments and the adjacency to an existing beach access. The City should consider options for enhancing parking here, including removing encroachments and widening the pavement, or using the newly created dirt opening and/or removing any parking restrictions (if they exist).

#### Lechuza Beach (Pages 11 and 12)

The blue dot on p. 12 indicating Public Access at Lechuza Beach should be moved to Lot I, across from the Bunnie Lane cul-de-sac, along Broad Beach Road (between the parcels identified as 31712 and 31736). This should also be shown on p. 11. There should also be a blue dot at the intersection of East Sea Level Drive and Broad Beach Road.

Thank you for your consideration. Should you have any questions, please contact Jessica Nguyen, by phone at (310) 589-3230, ext. 125 or by email at [jessica.nguyen@mrca.ca.gov](mailto:jessica.nguyen@mrca.ca.gov). I can be reached at the same phone number, ext. 128, or by email at [paul.edelman@mrca.ca.gov](mailto:paul.edelman@mrca.ca.gov).

Sincerely,



Paul Edelman  
Chief of Natural Resources and Planning

Public Safety Commission and Public Works Commission  
City of Malibu  
PCH Parking Study  
March 29, 2017

Page 7

cc: Elizabeth Shavelson, Assistant to the City Manager, City of Malibu

**Attachment A**  
**Some City of Malibu Local Coastal Program Elements**  
**Applicable to Pacific Coast Highway Parking Study**

Land Use Plan Policies:

**2.27** The implementation of restrictions on public parking, which would impede or restrict public access to beaches, trails or parklands, (including, but not limited to, the posting of “no parking” signs, red curbing, physical barriers, imposition of maximum parking time periods, and preferential parking programs) shall be prohibited except where such restrictions are needed to protect public safety and where no other feasible alternative exists to provide public safety. Where feasible, an equivalent number of public parking spaces shall be provided nearby as mitigation for impacts to coastal access and recreation.

**2.31** The City should complete an inventory of existing public parking along Pacific Coast Highway and public roads seaward of PCH to identify all unpermitted signage or physical barriers to public parking and to establish a database to aid in preventing future loss of legal public access and parking. All unpermitted signs and/or physical barriers which prevent public parking near the shoreline shall not be permitted.

**7.12** Restrictions on or elimination of existing on-street public parking on Pacific Coast Highway and adjacent side-streets shall not be permitted unless a comparable number of replacement parking spaces are provided in the immediate vicinity and it is demonstrated that such restrictions or elimination will not adversely impact public access to the shoreline.

2.