

Appeal

CITY ENGINEER

2024 AUG -6 PM 2:53



Date August 6, 2024

Submit 3 copies of this application to:

Public Works Engineering, 633 East Broadway, Rm. 205, Glendale, California, 91206 (Monday thru Friday, 7:30 am to 3:00 pm);

For more information, please call the Public Works Engineering Division at 818.548.3945.

Please complete (PRINT or TYPE) the following information:

PART 1 - NOTICE TO APPELLANT (please read carefully)

- A. This form must be prepared, and 3 copies filed, within 15 days of the date of the decision being appealed.
- B. Every question must be answered.
- C. If a question does not apply, you must answer "does not apply" or words to that effect.
- D. Failure to properly fill out this notice or failure to make a sufficient statement of a case in this notice, even if in fact you have valid and sound grounds for appeal, may cause your appeal to be dismissed forthwith.
- E. Attach additional pages for long answers.
- F. Prior to completing this form, read the Glendale Municipal Code, Title 2, Chapter 2.88 Uniform Appeal Procedure on the City's webpage at www.ci.glendale.ca.us/gmc/2.88.asp

PART 2 - APPELLANT INFORMATION

- | | | | | | |
|----|------------------------|------------------|-----------|--------------|-----------------------------------|
| A. | <u>Daniel</u> | <u>Hernandez</u> | | | <u>DaHernandez@Glendaleca.gov</u> |
| | First Name | Last Name | | | Email Address |
| B. | <u>633 E. Broadway</u> | <u>Glendale</u> | <u>CA</u> | <u>91206</u> | <u>(818) 548-3900</u> |
| | Street Address | City | State | Zip Code | Area Code - Phone Number |

PART 3 - APPEAL BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- A. State the name or title of the board, commission or officer from which this appeal is taken Transportation and Parking Commission
- B. Were you given written notice of the action, ruling or determination? Yes ☐ No ☒
If "Yes," attach a copy of the written notice and write the date you received it here

If "No," give the following information concerning your receipt of notice of the action, ruling or determination.
Date July 22, 2024 Time 7:30 p.m. Location City Council Chambers
Manner _____
- C. State generally what kind of permit, ruling, determination or other action was the basis for the decision from which the appeal is taken
Approval of installation of traffic calming measures recommended pursuant to the Traffic Calming Program.
- D. State the specific permission or relief that was originally sought from the board, commission, or officer
Approval of installation of all-way stop sign controls on Adams Street and Scofield Drive, as set forth in the report of the Interim Director of Public Works to the Transportation and Parking Commission, dated July 22, 2024.
- E. Were you the party seeking the relief that was originally sought? Yes ☐ No ☒
If "No," how are you involved with the permit, ruling, determination, or other action referred to above?
The foregoing relief was originally sought by residents of Adams Hill. However, the Public Works Department recommended that the Transportation and Parking Commission approve the relief sought.
- F. Does this matter involve real property? Yes ☒ No ☐
If "Yes," give the address, or describe the real property affected
This matter involves public rights-of-way at South Adams Street and Scofield Drive.

PART 4 - STATEMENT OF ERROR

- A. Do you contend that there was a violation of a specific provision of law, which forms the basis for this appeal? Yes X No If "Yes", state each specific provision of law that you contend was violated:
Does not apply.
- B. Do you contend that the board, and/or commission exceeded its authority by virtue of any of the provisions of law given in answer "A"? Yes X No If "Yes", state which provisions, and state specifically each act that was in excess of authority:
Does not apply.
- C. Do you contend that the board, and/or commission failed to fulfill a mandatory duty by any provision of law given in answer "A"? Yes X No If "Yes", state which provision, and the specific duty that it failed to exercise:
Does not apply.
- D. Do you contend that the board, and/or commission refused to hear or consider certain facts before rendering its decision? X Yes No If "Yes", state each such fact, and for each fact, state how it should have changed the act, determination or ruling:
Please see attached five pages submitted pursuant to Part 1.E.
- E. Do you contend that the evidence before the board, and/or commission or was insufficient or inadequate to support its action, determination or ruling or any specific finding in support thereof? Yes X No If "Yes", state what evidence was necessary, but lacking:
Does not apply.
- F. Do you contend that you have new evidence of material facts not previously presented, which if considered should change the act, determination or ruling? Yes X No If "Yes", state each new material fact not previously presented to the board, commission or officer. For each fact, state why it was not available, or with the exercise of reasonable diligence could not have been discovered and previously presented by the appellant:
Does not apply.

FOR STAFF USE ONLY

Date Stamp

Date received by Public Works Engineering Staff 8-6-24 Received by Adrian Patiño

Fee paid \$200 Receipt No. _____

On July 22, 2024, the Engineering Division of the Public Works Department ("Department") presented to the Transportation and Parking Commission ("Commission") a report recommending installation of all-way stop controls at the South Adams Street and Scofield Drive intersection ("Action"). The Action was moved, and the motion seconded. Two commissioners voted "yes"; two commissioners voted "no"; and one commissioner abstained. Having failed to garner three affirmative votes, the motion did not pass.

The City Council should reverse the Commission's determination and pass a motion approving the Action because it satisfies all implementation criteria under the Traffic Calming Program ("Program"). Undisputed and indisputable facts, and the record of the Commission, belie rationales underlying the two "no" votes. While substantively unanswered questions assertedly prompted the abstention, responsive information does not adversely affect the Department's recommendation.

I. BACKGROUND: EXCESS SPEED FOUND, AND OTHER TRAFFIC CALMING MEASURES ATTEMPTED, ON SOUTH ADAMS STREET.

Adams Hill is the southeasternmost neighborhood in the City of Glendale. A busy thoroughfare, South Adams Street, runs from East Broadway in Citrus Grove through Adams Hill to the city limits, where it becomes York Boulevard in the Glassell Park neighborhood of the City of Los Angeles. Approximately one-half mile of South Adams Street is located in Adams Hill.

As a street that carries traffic between the cities of Glendale and Los Angeles, South Adams has long seen complaints of excess speed and traffic calming measures intended to reduce them, including (1) four-inch-wide, marked, white edge lines—which give the effect of narrower lanes—adjacent to street parking, and (2) speed radar feedback signs, which encourage compliance with the posted speed limit.

In 2022, upon request of the Adams Hill community for additional traffic calming measures, the Department first proposed installing thermoplastic rumble strips and raised pavements markings. The first proposal was met with broad support from the Adams Hill community; thus, the rumble strips and pavement markings were installed in December 2022. However, noise precipitated from the rumble strips farther than the Department anticipated, prompting a reversal of community support. Consequently, the Department removed the additional traffic calming measures the same month in which they were installed.

With thermoplastic rumble strips and raised pavement markings unacceptable to the Adams Hill community, the Department next proposed installing a traffic circle at the South Adams Street and Scofield Drive intersection. The proposal constituted a pilot program, making features of the traffic circle temporary and removable. Nevertheless, the Adams Hill community largely opposed the proposal, so it did not advance beyond the conceptual phase.

Finally, the Department evaluated South Adams Street for potential installation of speed humps or speed lumps, which ultimately did not satisfy two implementation criteria. First, the

block length between intersecting streets is not at least 500 feet, as required under the Program. Second, South Adams Street is designated as a primary emergency response route, which, under the Program, excludes consideration of speed humps. The Fire Department recommended against the alternative speed humps due to their adverse impact on emergency vehicle responses and the limited availability of other routes.

II. RECOMMENDED ACTION: AN ALL-WAY STOP AT SOUTH ADAMS STREET AND SCOFIELD DRIVE SATISFIES ALL IMPLEMENTATION CRITERIA.

Having considered and ruled out both a traffic circle and speed humps or speed lumps—and having installed and removed rumble strips and pavement markings—the Department determined that all-way stop controls meet all implementation criteria under the Program for installation at South Adams Street and Scofield Drive.

First, the distance between existing traffic controls must meet or exceed a distance threshold of 1,500 feet. Here, the distance between existing traffic controls is 1,910 feet. Second, three collisions must have occurred along the traffic corridor within a single 12-month period over the past two years. Here, three multi-vehicle collisions occurred between East Palmer Avenue to the north and Stanford Drive to the south—the traffic corridor at issue—within a single 12-month period. Third, the 85th percentile speed must meet or exceed a speed threshold of 30 miles per hour (“MPH”). Here, the 85th percentile speed was measured at 35 MPH southbound, and 34 MPH northbound, averaged to 34 MPH.

The Department evaluated three intersections along South Adams Street for all-way stop controls that would reduce the unimpeded distance between the two stop-sign-controlled intersections at Palmer Avenue to the north and Stanford Drive to the south. The three intersecting streets are Yale Drive, Cornell Drive, and Scofield Drive.

Yale Drive is 18 feet wide, curb to curb; allows for parking on one side of the street; and does not have sidewalks on either side of the street. Physical features of the intersection, including limited public rights-of-way and a stairwell on adjacent private property, would not allow for ADA-accessible curb ramps to be installed in the future. The Department did not select the South Adams Street and Yale Drive intersection for all-way stop controls due to the lack of sidewalks and physical limitations.

Cornell Drive is 18 feet wide, curb to curb; does not allow for parking on either side of the street; and does not have sidewalks on either side of the street. The Department did not select the South Adams Street and Cornell Drive intersection for all-way stop controls due to the lack of sidewalks.

By contrast, Scofield Drive is 26 feet wide, curb to curb; allows for parking on both sides of the street; and includes five-foot-wide sidewalks on both sides of the street. Existing pedestrian curb ramps serve both the South Adams Street and Scofield Drive sidewalks. The Department selected the South Adams Street and Scofield Drive interaction for all-way stop controls due to

the wider pavement area, presence of sidewalks, and parking on both sides of the street, potentially prompting more pedestrian demand.

Notably, under Department policy, a community-led petition must be signed by one adult from at least 75% of dwelling units on the affected street within 500 feet of the proposed stop controls; if mid-block, the 500-foot threshold is extended to the next cross street. Here, the petition required support from 75% of dwelling units on South Adams Street between Crescent Drive to the north and Princeton Drive to the south. Importantly, one adult from 34 of the 44 affected dwelling units signed the petition—reflecting 76.7% support.

Having satisfied all implementation criteria, the Department presented the proposed all-way stop to the Commission, as required under the Program, at a public meeting held July 22, 2024. The Department recommended that the Commission pass a motion approving the Action. The Action was moved, and the motion seconded; however, the motion did not pass.

III. UNDISPUTED AND INDISPUTABLE FACTS, AND THE RECORD OF THE COMMISSION, BELIE RATIONALES UNDERLYING THE TWO “NO” VOTES; THE DEPARTMENT PRESENTED ALL INFORMATION PERTINENT TO ITS RECOMMENDATION.

Following a Department report, public comment, and discussion totaling more than one hour and twenty minutes, the Action was moved, and the motion seconded. With two commissioners voting “yes,” two commissioners voting “no,” and one commissioner abstaining, the motion to approve the Action did not pass. Distinct rationales underlie each of the “no” votes and the abstention.

A. Perceived Harm to One South Adams Street Resident.

During public comment, a resident of 1255 South Adams Street testified that the Action would (1) result in the loss of street parking for two vehicles adjacent to his residence, and (2) purportedly impede access to his driveway. Despite expressing strong support for traffic calming measures on South Adams Street, one commissioner opposed the Action expressly due to perceived harm that it might cause this resident.

As explained during the meeting, Department policy requires a clear, 30-foot line of sight in advance of all stop signs; any street parking must be replaced by a red zone. Notably, residences line both the northbound and southbound sides of South Adams Street between Crescent Drive to the north and the city limits to the south. The installation of an all-way stop at another intersection on South Adams Street will invariably result in the loss of street parking, and could impede driveway access, simply adjacent to a different residence.

While the Department evaluated the interactions of South Adams Street and Cornell Drive, and South Adams Street and Yale Drive, for potential installation of an all-way stop, the Department ultimately recommended the South Adams Street and Scofield Drive intersection because (1) Scofield Drive is a wider street more visible to cross traffic on South Adams Street,

and, (2) unlike Cornell and Yale Drives, sidewalks line the north and south sides of Scofield Drive, enabling the future installation of a pedestrian crossing on South Adams Street at Scofield Drive.

B. Perceived Deficiency in Public Outreach.

A second commissioner opposed the Action—not because it lacks merit—but rather, due to perceived deficiency in public outreach regarding the Department’s recommendation. Short of outreach to every resident, the commissioner would not support the Action.

To advance proposed traffic calming measures to the Commission, current Department policy requires that a community-led petition be circulated among dwelling units on the affected street within 500 feet of the proposed stop controls; if mid-block, the 500-foot threshold is extended to the next cross street. On South Adams Street, 44 dwelling units are affected by the proposed all-way stop. Under the Program, an adult residing at 75% or more of the affected dwelling units must sign the petition. Here, the petition received support from 76.7% of the affected dwelling units.

Additionally, the president of the Adams Hill Neighborhood Association (“AHNA”) testified during public comment that AHNA has a membership of 126 people, and that AHNA circulated emails among its membership, and posted on its Facebook page, regarding the proposed all-way stop. Another AHNA member testified, telephonically, that she canvassed the east side of South Adams Street, Yale Drive, Green Street, Princeton Drive, Oberlin Drive, East Palmer Avenue, Tyler Street, and Scofield Drive, and delivered to AHNA a petition bearing the signatures of people who support traffic calming measures on South Adams Street.

To require outreach regarding the proposed all-way stop to every Glendale resident, or all those who may be affected, generally, by the proposed all-way stop on South Adams Street—especially given that it carries traffic between the cities of Glendale and Los Angeles—is neither required nor practicable.

C. Information Responsive to Three Questions Was Not Readily Available.

A third commissioner—who did not opine on the merits of the Action—abstained from voting on the motion due to unavailable information assertedly necessary either to support or oppose the Action.

During the meeting, the Department did not readily have answers to three questions: (1) whether the 85th percentile speed would have been any different at the intersections of South Adams Street and Cornell Drive, or South Adams Street and Yale Drive; (2) what were the details of the three collisions that occurred on South Adams Street, including the type of each collision and where it occurred; and (3) what collision data at other intersections on South Adams Street would have reflected.

In fact, neither the 85th percentile speed nor collision data is specific to the South Adams Street and Scofield Drive intersection. Rather, the 85th percentile speed applies to, and collision data derived from, the traffic corridor as a whole—South Adams Street between East Palmer Avenue to the north and Stanford Drive to the south. The Department recommended the South Adams Street and Scofield Drive intersection for an all-way stop—rather than the intersections of South Adams Street and Cornell Drive, or South Adams Street and Yale Drive—because (1) Scofield Drive is a wider street more visible to cross traffic on South Adams Street, and (2) unlike Cornell and Yale Drives, sidewalks line the north and south sides of Scofield Drive, enabling the future installation of a pedestrian crossing on South Adams Street at Scofield Drive. Put simply, information not readily available at the public meeting on July 22, 2024, does not adversely affect the recommended action.

IV. CONCLUSION.

The City Council should reverse the Commission's determination and pass a motion approving the Action because the proposed all-way stop at South Adams Street and Scofield Drive satisfies all implementation criteria under the Traffic Calming Program. Undisputed and indisputable facts, and the record of the Commission, belie rationales underlying the two "no" votes. Moreover, the Department presented the Commission all information pertinent to its recommendation; additional information that the abstaining commissioner sought does not adversely affect the recommendation.