



PLANNING DEPARTMENT

City and County of San Francisco • 1660 Mission Street, Suite 500 • San Francisco, California • 94103-2414

MAIN NUMBER
(415) 558-6378

DIRECTOR'S OFFICE
PHONE: 558-6411

4TH FLOOR
FAX: 558-6426

ZONING ADMINISTRATOR
PHONE: 558-6350

5TH FLOOR
FAX: 558-6409

PLANNING INFORMATION
PHONE: 558-6377

MAJOR ENVIRONMENTAL
FAX: 558-5991

COMMISSION CALENDAR
INFO: 558-6422

INTERNET WEB SITE
SFGOV.ORG/PLANNING

Summary of Commissioner and Public Comments Market and Octavia Adoption Hearings

December 6, 2006

In response to Commissioners' requests for a summary of public comments, this document contains a complete set of both Commissioner and public comments from the first three Market and Octavia Area Plan adoption hearings. Outlined below, the general topics of these three hearings together cover the primary plan components.

For each hearing you'll see a table with commissioner comments that is followed by a separate table of public comments organized by topic. Where staff provided answers to Commissioner questions during the hearing, these responses are included.

Adoption Hearing 1 - October 26th

- Commissioner Comments
- Public Comments
 - Overview
 - Heights
 - Land Use

Adoption Hearing 2 – November 2nd

- Commissioner Comments
- Public Comments
 - Historic Preservation
 - Parking
 - Housing

Adoption Hearing 3 – November 9th

- Commissioner Comments
- Public Comments
 - Transportation
 - Open Space
 - Community Improvements

Planning Department staff compiled these tables from the SFG-TV closed captioning transcriptions. When possible we've made corrections to the transcripts to clarify errors.

Hearing

O Overview

L Land Use

H Heights

COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

Speaker	Comment
Commissioner Antonini	I think one thing that I see as we go forward is that design is important. You have some wonderful neighborhoods -- really fine grained, very compelling -- and I think that the idea of increased density and more height in areas is fine. But I think that it has to blend together, and that once we set the Plan in motion, projects have to be compatible with the neighborhood, not only in terms of height and bulk, but design, i.e., that they fit into the neighborhood.
Commissioner Antonini	The other thing that I think is important as you do the towers or other buildings is to interact. Unfortunately, some of the things that we have built have had their activity off of Market. That's not good because people go to the facilities (e.g., hotels, shopping) and go in and out. They don't go on the street, or go to Market Street as little as possible. That defeats the purpose. There has to be a way to make it necessary and desirable for people to go to Market (buildings interact) or you will lose the activity that you currently have, particularly on Market between Noe and Castro.
Commissioner Antonini	Finally, on transit, I think that particularly on Van Ness and South Van Ness, there is talk about Bus Rapid Transit. You will need a subway. It will begin to unite the southern part of San Francisco with the northern side. There is not good transit right now. There are a lot of buses clogging the street, and it is difficult to move. This is important if you expect people to live nearby, particularly if they don't have a car or don't use their car. They will have to access all parts of the city quickly: go Downtown on BART or Muni Metro but get to the Marina and the Mission too. We don't have that right now. I see 16 th Street being a link to Mission Bay – it would be a great start.
Commissioner Moore	I am pleased to see that the Market & Octavia Plan overall has strong support.
Commissioner Moore	I think that the issue of height is one which requires careful examination as we go through all aspects of the Plan in the coming months. The concern about blending height with adjoining neighborhoods is extremely important, as it includes wind and sun. I think that we all have experienced the intersection of Market and Van Ness, and see it as a difficult place. The issue of wind is to be examined as we move through the other neighborhoods. Sometimes, it takes only one building to screw it up for the rest.
Commissioner Moore	I want to touch on the blending of height and new buildings. The historic fabric of our city is one of the most powerful selling points about the city, and as we model height, we should be aware of where the strong historic height districts are and understand what it means to contrast new results. When we talk about height at Van Ness and Market, I'm concerned that the current view corridor to the Civic Center and City Hall are taken into consideration, and that we moderate height and bulk for key buildings identified in the core of the city so that they are visible at all angles.
Commissioner Bill Lee	I'm pleased with the Plan. I got the one-page handout that breaks down all of the concepts, and the articulation of open space. I think it's well done. With the separation of the towers, you are not talking about a lot of towers. Actually, the towers do fit into Market and Van Ness. It is a key intersection – we have BART, we have Muni, and some government offices. It is a good linkage from the Castro to Downtown to the South of Market and up Van Ness to 101. I'm very pleased with the presentation today. I know Hayes Valley is ready to go.
Commissioner Bill Lee	I have a couple of issues over at Church Street with the height. I have a question: the issue about adding another level but requiring parking. Is that feasible?
John Billovits, Department Staff	If I understand the concern expressed, I think that they were anticipating that the controls could lead to incentive for somebody to do that. We have no control that

Summary of Commissioner Comments

October 26, 2006

Hearing

O Overview
H Heights

L Land Use

Speaker	Comment
	requires parking if a store is added in that circumstance. We are suggesting in the upper portion of Market that heights which are 50 feet go to 85 feet because we think it suits the scale of Market. Concern there was we have other controls that are prohibiting curb cuts. The only place that some properties could park was on a side street. That was the concern: the spill-over effect from Market. With the issues concerning design and compatibility, the Plan sets a framework. There are so many circumstances that we have to rely on. With the review of projects, I hope we do a great job of integrating that through the Planning Department as opposed to what Ms. Hestor thought we could do.
Commissioner Bill Lee	John, I have a question on the neighborhood commercial streets, you're proposing or is this standard to have 75 percent transparency? Is this what we normally do (75 percent) or is this a recommendation by staff? Should we have more or less? We chose 75 percent, is that architecturally what we normally do?
John Billovits, Department Staff	Yes. That is normally what we do for the commercial store front portion of neighborhood commercial districts now. We also allow, in some of these cases, garage doors. This is saying that it will be 75 percent of the total. The other portion is left because residential entries will come off the same street (e.g., NC streets), such as off of Market would have residential entries combined with store front, so we're trying to establish that which we think is a practical maximum.
Commissioner Bill Lee	You will take into consideration Sue Hestor's request to look at issues on wind?
John Billovits, Department Staff	Absolutely, and the EIR did this in a general way. Some of the wind dynamics are configured to the orientation of the towers. We set performance standards in the Plan. If there are problems they will be analyzed as developed in future. We have guidance from wind experts that it is feasible at the programmatic level and we'll have to see how the proposals come forward.
Commissioner Bill Lee	Do circular buildings have less wind effect than rectangular, square buildings?
John Billovits, Department Staff	I'm not a wind expert, and I'll not venture there.
Commissioner Olague	I want to thank the public for their input. When considering or when creating a walkable neighborhood, a more walkable San Francisco, there are so many things to consider other than just the elimination of cars and parking.
Commissioner Olague	I think of the shadow and wind, and how you mitigate those, especially as Commissioner Moore pointed out, the height impacts on neighborhoods. I was listening to Jim Meko talk about the residential enclave districts. I would like to hear more consideration given to that, and also, the individual from Duboce neighborhood. I walked around the area, close to Noe, Church and Noe and I can sympathize with the 55-foot height recommendation that they are giving us.
Commissioner Olague	With the Historic Survey, I was wondering where we are in that process and how that information will be integrated into the discussions.
John Billovits, Department Staff	On height. I can briefly give you some perspective. There was testimony about a couple of properties in the SoMa West area. Near the residential enclave district we are trying to resolve those issues. We've brought heights down -- 130 foot heights from the major Streets and with no bulk controls they would allow a commercial building or storage building as built there. We are breaking it down substantially. The folks asked about the properties on the southern part of the block: why they are brought down to 50? These are on the south side. That's where the sun is most of the year. We're trying to resolve those issues. and similar to the upper Market situation, yes, there are impacts of building scales to each other. But we are dealing with a situation of properties that back up to Market and Van Ness and South Van Ness and Mission

Summary of Commissioner Comments

October 26, 2006

Hearing

O Overview
H Heights

L Land Use

Speaker	Comment
	<p>Streets. These are major intersections of importance and city scale. The debate about what the appropriate balance is fine to have. We welcome that, but that's the proposal we have to work with. We have to elaborate later.</p> <p>The Historic Survey is under way. They have the initial raw field data documenting what is there. In spring, we'll have the results and the comprehensive analytical basis on which to judge things. We don't have that, yet. We have a set of 17 (I believe) policies in the Plan, which we will talk about next week (the historic preservation item). Specifically next week, we have a substantial number of policies and interim controls that we will talk about.</p>
Commissioner Antonini	Okay, explain how the Plan deals with shadow, wind and the provisions we have to control them.
John Billovits, Department Staff	Typically, in planning they are handled as environmental review. Our office is located near the middle of the wind tunnels. We experience them on a daily basis. Essentially, on the alley streets, like the residential enclave districts, we produce controls to reduce height on the street fronting face, to allow for more sunlight and air. Commensurate with the scale of the street, wind is not a problem until you get to buildings on substantial scale and building wall. They require expert review and analysis. We do have performance standards, which we are picking up similar to the downtown areas of the plan that establish comfort and hazard levels that the projects must perform or they cannot be built. Beyond that I don't know what to say, now.
Commissioner Olague	Since we are looking at 400 feet in the Van Ness/Market Area.
John Billovits, Department Staff	One other point. You said there are other things beyond reducing auto traffic to improve the pedestrian environment. Beyond environmental aspects -- earth, wind air and shadow -- there is just the character of the design of that environment. This plan has a strong focus, which I think is groundbreaking (in existing neighborhood) of dealing with the public realm and utilizing the street and recognizing they are public spaces for people to gather and sit. The improvements on Noe Street demonstrate the success of that we want to expand it to small alley streets and create a comfortable living space.
Commissioner Olague	So, in this little area we are looking at a spike. Where else do we have this?
John Billovits, Department Staff	I don't know that we have a particular spike of height as designed here. We have two major streets that come together that express a wide open space. This is a transit center. We are trying to ensure that the 400 foot is really only allowed on three parcels (specific to that corner). It is not an area that height is allowed. It is intended to be a point and spike, which in that area 320 is currently allowed. Without the narrow bulk controls that we're recommending, they would be office or other commercial bulky commercial buildings. We are taking a relatively clunky form and use available under current controls and streamlining it to a residential place that denotes that as the demarcation of Downtown, the axis of Van Ness and Market. In terms of where that exists. they are being explored and larger buildings around the Transbay Terminal and Rincon Hill. These are isolated points that make a larger Downtown construct.
Commissioner Olague	I might be interested in seeing visual. Yeah, that would be great.
Commissioner Olague	Housing can be proposed. I will ask now since we are here, I'd like to understand what types of housing we are proposing, you know, what the unit mix would look like. The affordability being proposed to make this neighborhood.
John Billovits, Department Staff	We will talk about that next week. For the most part, we are, except for the freeway parcels, relying on citywide inclusionary standard. We have a 40 percent two-bedroom

Summary of Commissioner Comments

October 26, 2006

Hearing

O Overview
H Heights

L Land Use

Speaker	Comment
	or larger mix in the Plan. We will talk about that.
Commissioner Olague	From the MTA, if there is a chance of having someone to come in ...
John Billovits, Department Staff	<p>We will have that, too. We have made arrangements for Transportation Streets and Open Space to be discussed in two weeks. At that time, we will have planning person from MTA come in.</p> <p>We have programs and ideas. We will talk about that in the implementation stage. The processes that are in place now will be in place until the Plan is implemented.</p> <p>Concerning the design deadlines, we hope to provide a framework today to give clear guidance to the commission to what is appropriate or not and streamline the process by providing clear expectations on what should happen.</p>

Summary of Public Comments

October 26, 2006

Hearing

O Overview

L Land Use

H Heights

PUBLIC COMMENT

Speaker	O	H	L	Comment
Alan Martinez	X			Better neighborhood planning process has been long, however it is based on community feedback and is a worthy process
Aurefina Deleon, SoMa West	X			Support Plan, height and density generally well thought out. Has concerns in the West SoMa area, related to density, street trees and air quality. Can freeway be mitigated in West SoMa? Favors establishing a community facility with a workshop area that encourages artistic expression (e.g., limited work spaces).
Jared Braiderman	X			Reiterates the need for green space and supports the landmarking of trees as well as the development of inventories
Jim Haas	X			Interrelationship between Civic Center and Market/Octavia. Arts and education should be integral to the Plan. Staff urged to read comments to DEIR Billboards in the area need attention (e.g., two egregious billboards at Oak/Franklin). How about a measure to abate billboards?
Joe Curtin, President Castro Png. and Action	X			Support goals of plan. Advocates in-fill housing in upper Market and implementation of CU requirements for sites above 10,000 square feet (will ensure buy-in).
Karen Mauney-Brodek, Hayes Valley Resident)	X			It is important that the residents see all of the past efforts on the part of the neighborhood and the Planning Department.
Kurt Holzinger, DTNA	X			Would like clarification on design guidelines -- will they be issued as an addendum? Suggests pulling them out as a special document that everyone can refer to.
Tess Wellborn, Resident Laguna St	X			Principally favors the Plan, but is concerned that street trees and recreational facility mentioned at meetings have not been implemented yet.
Adam Millard-Ball		X		Supports the Plan, specifically its height limits and provisions for affordable housing. Many taller buildings, like the Orbit Room, are highly successful from an urban design perspective.
Bob		X		Concerned with height limits of up to 240 feet adjacent to Minna/Mission/Lafayette area
Charles Chase, Director Architectural Heritage		X		Change ability to modify the City, in terms of vertical heights and impacts that they have on potential historic resources, i.e., as you increase heights, you increase possibility of degrading resources. Integrate new construction within the residential and commercial areas.
Chris Peterson		X		Supports the Plan, particularly heights and residential development
Jason Henderson		X		Heights are already there, the neighborhood was zoned for higher heights a long time ago. Transit First requires transit-supportive land uses. Must plan ahead so that the huge influx of residential development brings community benefits to the neighborhood.
Jim Keith		X		Recommends a few changes to height proposals in the Plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 55-foot height on Grove Street should continue • 80-foot height should be maintained at Duboce and Market (proposed to drop to 50)

Summary of Public Comments

October 26, 2006

Hearing

O Overview
H Heights

L Land Use

Speaker	O	H	L	Comment
Jim Meko West SoMa Task Force.		X		Looking at the expansion of residential enclaves and the creation of buffer zones to protect them. Residents in West SoMa are concerned with developments occurring in the mid market and Market/Octavia. Proposal at 10 th /Mission (160 foot tower) would abut area, and a proposal at Mission and South Van Ness would include a building in excess of 100 Feet Respect our residential Districts and consider buffering them from higher densities.
Joanie Mizrac		X		In favor of dropping height limit to 85 feet, not 55 feet, as it is difficult to put residential above commercial at that 55 foot height.
Joel Yodowitz		X		Advocates for greater heights, arguing that Planning's macro level proposal is laudable at the micro level.. At 12 th /Howard, proposal is to lower building heights from 150 to 55 feet. – more reasonable to transition to 85 feet.
Kurt Holzinger, DTNA		X		With regard to height, concerned with changes on Market between Church and Noe, as the Plan raises them by more than 10 feet. There are concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional 10 feet will cast shadows on residential properties • No place in Plan to recognize significance of Castro/Market • Opposed to adding full story in NCT (recommend no parking)
Peter Lewis, Director Mission Association		X		Intend to get local area designated historic. Opposed to 85-ft. height limits at entrance to the Mission Dolores district.
Robin Leavitt		X		Density and increased heights will bring vitality to the neighborhood, however, addition of more people will bring more cars, negative impacts.
Sara Karlinsky, Policy Dir., SPUR		X		Supports the land use and heights brought forward in the Plan and asks that they be respected (as "fragile virtues")
Sue Hestor		X		Recommends review of past wind studies in the area around 10 th /11 th Streets and Market -- Fox Plaza be, B of A and AAA Buildings are subject to high winds. Believes that staff will not implement changes. Questions why towers above 120 feet are being considered.
Tess Wellborn, Resident Laguna St		X		Heights are good if towers are skinny so wind will not be bad.
Chris Peterson			X	Supports the Plan, particularly heights and residential development
David Dupree, Resident Hayes Valley			X	Favors inclusion of office space, maybe on the second floor. Would like the Planning Department to consider encouraging developers to include entertainment and arts venues. Encourages support for educational institutions (e.g., New College of California)
Jim Keith			X	The Plan seems to not want larger parcels, or to let them merge. He argues that there are sites where the lots could be merged, thus, more efficiently achieving the policy goals of the Plan.
Joe Curtin, President Castro Png. and Action			X	Supports residential parking policies. Church/Market best transit served neighborhood between Chicago and Tokyo. Favors incorporating recommendations of past charrette.
Paul Olson, President Hayes Valley Neighborhood Assoc.			X	Welcomes the residential zoning if it comes with strong urban design controls, i.e., altering parking ratios and making streets friendly to pedestrians
Peter Lewis, Director Mission Association			X	Residents will object to Corner stores throughout the Mission.
Sara Karlinsky, Policy Dir., SPUR			X	Supports the land use and heights brought forward in the Plan and asks that they be respected (as "fragile virtues")
Stefan Hastrup			X	The provision of 5 additional feet for ground floor retail use is critical to creating a vibrant neighborhood (e.g., reclaims street as public space).
Tess Wellborn,			X	Favors people working and living in San Francisco (e.g., mixed uses)

Summary of Public Comments

October 26, 2006

Hearing

O Overview L Land Use
H Heights

Speaker	O	H	L	Comment
Resident Laguna St				

Summary of Commissioner Comments

November 2, 2006

Hearing

HP Historic Preservation
P Parking

H Housing

Commissioner Comments

Speaker	Comment
Commissioner Olague	I support the recommendations of plan around parking.
Commissioner Olague	The elephant in the living room is the historic survey piece. Staff is working with the community groups. Mr. Martinez I know you want to make a recommendation and your time was cut short. The member of the landmark board, will you speak? [refer to last comment in the public comment section]
Commissioner Olague	How is the input being considered and how are the meetings with the community groups going?
Dean Macris, Planning Department	We continue to meet with the community leadership. We have a meeting tomorrow afternoon at 4 o'clock with many of the people in the room. We continue to meet. We are taken with Mr. Martinez' comment about spelling out what was after the survey is complete so there is assurance that steps will be taken to incorporate [results into] plan. We hope to be able to come back with specific recommendations. I think that will ameliorate a lot of the comments you heard this evening.
Commissioner Olague	The curb cut proposals that Peter Cohen mentioned, I know they are in the plan but I have not found them. I would like to hear more about that.
Commissioner Olague	The affordable housing piece; I don't know if the mayor, Doug Shoemaker or [we can] get something to talk about that piece of it. The three redevelopment agency sites... we shouldn't put it all on that in terms of affordability. Especially if there's an increase in density, heights and decrease in parking I was wondering how that would be translated in terms of community benefits or deeper affordability.
Commissioner Olague	Since we are encouraging families, the public open space and the recreation center and it's maintenance is something I would like to hear more about.
Commissioner Olague	And the affordable housing discussion, somebody mentioned the community land trust, we might want to look at such different forms.
Commissioner Olague	Shuttles; I thought about that in terms of the symphonies and parking.
Commissioner Olague	Then I guess the one site the housing is being proposed for disabled people. And it seems to be busy intersection right outside their front door, we are talking about walkability, a lot of intersections are busy in terms of traffic. A lot of the streets are not 2 ways. How is that mitigated. I don't find those streets walkable.
Commissioner Antonini	I think the parking issue is addressed well. I think the challenge is going to be--we have 3 areas in the plan with slightly different parking ratios between them. Certain areas within the plan people are interested in having more liberal parking and in other areas less parking. It's clear that places like Mission Dolores and Castro want more liberal parking, others want less. I don't know we are that far out of whack on the maps. Probably what will happen the percentage of car ownership will get higher. You will have a neighborhood with more people are going to be living and there may be higher homeownership. Just as a matter of course you will see a higher incidence of that.
Commissioner Antonini	I was concerned about the policy regarding anti-merger. We have a citywide policy and it should be consistent throughout the city. We have DR's that come before us. I think that that is already protected and should emulate what the case in the rest of the city and people who want to merge have to go through process. That doesn't need special projections on an area-basis.
Commissioner	I was interested about the area with the new parcels are and talk about it being 50

Summary of Commissioner Comments

November 2, 2006

Hearing

HP Historic Preservation
P Parking

H Housing

Speaker	Comment
Antonini	percent affordable and an additional 15 percent for inclusionary housing within the market. I want to make sure the funding is there and what redevelopment requires as far as affordable housing is concerned. I need hear detail on that. My fear is that we don't want to see the parcels sit vacant. We need the right mix of market rate and affordable housing such that the whole thing fits together and we end up with a nice product out of the wonderful piece of land available to us.
Commissioner Antonini	Curb cuts, we haven't gotten into the details, it's important to allow flexibility. In parts of Market Street downtown... Where you get to an area that's not dense like the Castro, you need some. The question may be that net curb cuts are an important issue. Are we diminishing curb cuts we have to look at that in new projects?
Commissioner Antonini	Parking for the arts. I'm supportive of the expansion of the garage. The garage is filled up.
Commissioner Antonini	The historic survey thing is something I hear a lot of people talking about, we have to work out a situation where the plan can go forward as soon as possible while protecting the historic resources there.
Commissioner Antonini	Staff has done a wonderful job. I think it's a good plan. We can't make it too fine-tuned where we look at results and have too much population control. We have to establish what's best for the neighborhood. We can't control who will live there. I think we should be honored—there was talk about not wanting people that work elsewhere—the gentleman who works for a tech company and likes to live here. We should be honored and try to get the businesses they are working for to come to San Francisco.
Commissioner Alexander	I want on thank staff. I want to thank all of you for listening to us and being in the trenches for the number of years and working on this. The effort shows the community planning process works. It's not pretty. It takes hours of head banging.
Commissioner Alexander	Parking is a huge issue. I would like to hear about the car share program. I'm curious to see how the numbers are growing and the kind of usership they are getting and whether people are using that as a viable alternative for transportation in the city. Understanding the programs will play into the parking discussion as we look to add in more in parking and transit modes and means of getting people from point a to b.
Commissioner Alexander	Historic preservation has been talked about. We need to add specificity to address the fears, but I don't think that's a reason to slow the plan. I think it needs to keep moving.
Commissioner Moore	I like to commend you on a strong plan. I think it's consistently strong. While you hear us comment on issues the issue of the historic survey informing the plan is strong. I regret we have a delay. I sit here and hope with a hard work we can catch up. And prioritize the areas [inaudible] look at it more in detail to push and show the public that we can do it. I think if we took one or 2 areas to lead the effort to make the subject less controversial, it can be done.
Commissioner Moore	I'm concerned about the transition of height and the buffer zone to protect certain areas from increased heights. I want to see a detailed presentation on height means. I want to see how new height proposals transitioning to new neighborhoods.
Commissioner Moore	Parking is an issue, that's an issue wherever you live in San Francisco. I think that summarizes my concerns.
Commissioner Moore	I was interested in hearing about housing and housing density, up zoning. I don't have a good handle on that. I hope we can get into more detail of that.

Summary of Public Comments

November 2, 2006

Hearing

HP Historic Preservation
P Parking

H Housing

Public Comments

Speaker	HP	P	H	Comment
Ed Bedard HVNA; Friends of 1800; and CAPA	X			Addition of garages to historic buildings. The problem is that Policy 3.2.7 doesn't have teeth to it. Rhythm of garden staircase not to be replaced by a rhythm of SUV-staircase.
Jason Henderson Chair of the Hayes valley association	X			Need to expedite this plan.
Sara Karlinsky, Spur	X			Historic preservation requirements in the plan. We feel that the interim controls that the department is putting forth really are extremely strong. Should be supported. We urge you to support all 3 elements of the plan you heard and move the plan forward.
Paul olsen Hvna	X			Historic preservation is an important part of the plan. We want to ensure the survey is completed. We urge that the planning department be given the resources this is to complete the entire process. We don't want it to be held up we think the planning department can get the done more quickly than planned.
GeeGee Platt Historic preservation professional	X			Troubled by the fact that the department did not do an architectural survey when the plan was in process. You can't complete the CEQA document until you have done this. You don't need to have the survey complete you need to map what's coming in by the middle of this month. The buildings that are mapped on there [refers to board] are things that were done with section 106 [of the National Historic Preservation Act calling for review when federal projects are undertaken]; none of the recently completed survey materials are there.
Dennis Richards President, Duboce Triangle Neighborhood Association	X			We worked with planning staff and pleased with the progress. We want to support this plan. We advocated that the plan [wait for results of survey] and we stand by that requirement. We appreciate the steps taken in the scrutiny areas and think they go a long way in the issues we face in the time survey is done and the time the [inaudible] we have to take a step back in terms of the life of the plan a 30 year plan we are a few months apart. Going back and undoing the zoning that took place is a lot of work. Have the surveyed areas already go first and we will wait for your

Summary of Public Comments

November 2, 2006

Hearing

HP Historic Preservation
P Parking

H Housing

Speaker	HP	P	H	Comment
				<p>survey data to be done and we will go second.</p> <p>There is a CEQA issue we don't want to fight about later.</p>
<p>Allen Martinez</p> <p>Landmarks board and the preservation fund committee</p> <p>Tonight I'm speaking for myself</p>	X			<p>What can it mean to have the survey incorporated into the plan?</p> <p>Is to identify and incorporate the historic districts, which I think it should mean.</p> <p>Anybody who walked through the neighborhood knows there's more than one historic district. We have the interim controls, which I think are good as far as they go.</p> <p>You have language fine-tuned to the district that explains what's appropriate and what isn't. This is missing from the interim controls.</p>
<p>Charles Chase</p> <p>San Francisco Architectural Heritage</p>	X			<p>Historic resource as the key component in the planning of the neighborhoods.</p> <p>We hope you will take this seriously and include not only the provisions that are provided by the plan but also look at how those conditions can be created that will include not only the findings but the implementation as it comes about.</p> <p>Include historic resource inventory as a final development of the plan.</p>
<p>Peter Lewis</p> <p>Safe, Clean, Green; MDNA</p>	X			<p>We believe that the historic survey should inform the plan.</p> <p>A lot of important buildings are not already landmarked.</p>
<p>Mark Paez, DTNA. Friends of 1800.</p>	X			<p>My organization has been working with the plan staff to address inadequacies and legal deficiency in this planning process pertaining to Historic Preservation and we have retained the services of Brandt-Hawley Law Group. This will provide legal background for our position.</p> <p>The plan was prepared without historic analysis to inform policies.</p> <p>Resources have individual needs to fit them, not a one size fits all approach throughout plan area will work.</p> <p>The plan needs to respond on a plan level rather than a case-by-case basis, which is what your staff is calling for with interim controls.</p>
<p>Judith Lamb</p> <p>Board of Friends of 1800</p>	X			<p>A great effort is being made to include a survey in the plan. But the idea of finalizing the plan before the survey is completed adds to the error that was made in not having a survey from the outset.</p> <p>We certainly appreciate the desire of those who don't want to see the plan delayed. There are good reasons for that, we recognize. However, the delay of months seems very little compared to the</p>

Summary of Public Comments

November 2, 2006

Hearing

HP Historic Preservation
P Parking

H Housing

Speaker	HP	P	H	Comment
				effect of implementing a plan that praises the historic resources of the area. But [staff] doesn't integrate [in the] the plan [a strategy] for preserving the historic resources as a whole.
Joe Curtin Castro Planning Association	X			We would like to support interim historic preservation controls and to implement the findings of the historic resource survey. We feel this is important to the neighborhood and we will help to preserve the character and create a great new neighborhood.
Cynthia Servetnick, San Francisco Preservation Consortium, speaking for herself	X			6 acre hole in the center of the Market Octavia plan, it's the Laguna Street campus where historic places is pending before the [State Historical Resources Commission?] Much of the proposed redevelopment of the Berkeley extension presents the kind of problem the San Francisco preservation consortium letter refers to. It could be demolished. The planning department disagreed [saying that it was a resource]; however, having an adopted Market Octavia resource survey would clarify this matter and consider this historic resource in the context of the entire neighborhood rather than case by case.
Robin Leavitt	X			Have been following this process since 99. We need to move forward. There are a lot of development pressures in this area; I think there are enough safeguards to protect historic resources such that they will not be threatened.
Karen Mauney-Brodek	X			I want to point out why the plan [need] be passed sooner. Interim provisions will protect against most of the concerns. This plan, in reducing heights many places, will help us further the character of our historic neighborhoods.
Adam Millard-Ball, a Hayes Valley resident.	X			There is no reason to delay the plan. It doesn't weaken the controls, it gives new protection. And staff lifted the [inaudible]. There is nothing to fear from this we will not tear down Victorians. Speculative development will happen with or without the plan. Lets get the plan this place that it can guide the development.
Jim Keith a property owner in The plan area.	X			A lot of efforts have been put into this plan. We have been waiting for this plan. If the plan is delayed I think we have had our delays for a short while. When this survey comes to inform our plan there will be controversy and process. It will not be a month it will be 8 months.

Summary of Public Comments

November 2, 2006

Hearing

HP Historic Preservation
P Parking

H Housing

Speaker	HP	P	H	Comment
				<p>We know how this happens. I wanted to say that the interim controls are adequate.</p> <p>You can build a building right now and impose an alteration to a historic resource. Putting these interim controls in place will protect the buildings whereas not passing the plan will jeopardize them.</p>
<p>Alan Martinez</p> <p>Resident</p>	X			<p>Nobody wants the plan to be delayed. A certain schedule for completing, what people are afraid of that the plan will get adopted and the survey will go on and on. If a schedule is adopted about how the survey will proceed, what does it mean to incorporate the survey into the plan. Spell it out. Spell it out it we are going to lower the height limits. There is very specific language in the historic district chapters about what's appropriate or that. We know from experience what they are this victorian neighborhood, look at the language in the tenderloin and incorporate that the to make the controls stringent. So, but, you know, the bottom line is, you know I think you know, if, if, if, it is planning department was willing to put in the over time hours and get it done we might not have a problem. Just get the thing done.</p>
<p>Ed Bedard</p> <p>HVNA; Friends of 1800; and CAPA</p>		X		<p>Addition of garages to historic buildings. The problem is that Policy 3.2.7 doesn't have teeth to it. Rhythm of garden staircase not to be replaced by a rhythm of SUV-staircase.</p>
<p>Jason Henderson</p> <p>Chair of the Hayes valley association</p>		X		<p>There is no reason why the grocery stores need to build the parking.</p> <p>[Referring to distributed map] Between 42 and 65 percent of the households are the dark, not the darkest, most of the area are without automobiles.</p> <p>Plan is not radical, but merely fitting in with existing conditions; however the current plan proposal is diluted from draft proposal.</p>
<p>Sara Karlinsky,</p> <p>Spur</p>		X		<p>The neighborhood is interested in housing people and not cars</p> <p>Spur is supportive of eliminating the minimum requirement for parking and instituting the parking maximums.</p>
<p>Paul olsen</p> <p>Hvna</p>		X		<p>We feel that the plan is diluted from the 2002 version where we are almost doubling the parking that was talked about at that point and allowing and encouraging more parking than the plan area currently has. We would prefer the original version of parking be honored.</p>
<p>Michael Skolnik</p> <p>SF Symphony; SF Opera; Asian Art museum; San Francisco Conservatory of Music</p>		X		<p>Many folks come from places not served by transportation and a lot are older who are not able to use public transportation.</p> <p>We are all making efforts to encourage public transit there will be a severe impact by the Market Octavia plan on parking at the ballet.</p>
Damian Quesnell		X		I realize the amount of time and energy invested in working on a

Summary of Public Comments

November 2, 2006

Hearing

HP Historic Preservation
P Parking

H Housing

Speaker	HP	P	H	Comment
Eureka Valley Promotion Association				<p>plan like this.</p> <p>The plan will have an impact on the Eureka Valley and the Castro.</p> <p>Most aspects of the plan are progressive and we support them. The reduced parking scheme is not supported [by our neighborhood]. The theory is that if housing is built without parking people will give up their cars, wrong. New residents will park in the streets. If you look in the Castro its a different picture than Hayes Valley. In this character our neighborhoods are very different. We would like MO Plan to not apply to charrette lots.</p>
Robert Rhine, Lafayette, Minna, & Natoma Neighborhood Association		X		We are next to the tallest buildings being proposed. I agree with the parking and the Goldilocks principle. 130 foot structures the Goldilocks principle is the porridge will be hot and there will be a lot of hungry bears looking for parking in our neighborhood.
Peter Lewis Safe, Clean, Green; MDNA		X		We believe any new construction should have one-to-one parking. Within the district of Mission Dolores we oppose the elimination of parking. Every weekend we have reduced parking as people park in our neighborhood.
Eric Dash Lafayette, Minna, & Natoma Neighborhood Association		X		Attractiveness of housing in the area is that it's close to freeways. Parking study showed there are a lot of people who live in this area because they can get in their car and go to Palo Alto and come back and live in the city.
Frank Weiss Eureka valley association		X		<p>The thing with the Market Octavia plan is it may tie up our options for planning in the Eureka Valley during the Castro Charrette.</p> <p>There is a different set of circumstances in Eureka Valley. We are not opposed to transit first planning, but we don't think that reducing off street parking in this area is as good a solution as people in other areas may think.</p> <p>New development on Market and Dolores will impact parking in our area.</p> <p>We don't want to hold up the implementation of the Market Octavia plan.</p>
Gabriel Prue Board of the Saint Francis Center		X		<p>Most of our 38 families and staff members use Muni or walk.</p> <p>We have the few child care gardens in the city. I understand the plan supports existing housing but does it support nonprofits?</p>
Peter Cohen Dtna		X		Discovered there is an existing .5 ratio of parking currently. That should be the reference point as suggested, as of right parking ratio should be .5, above or below should go through conditional use.

Summary of Public Comments

November 2, 2006

Hearing

HP Historic Preservation
P Parking

H Housing

Speaker	HP	P	H	Comment
				<p>On NCT we have no parking on commercial corridors there should be no parking minimum for housing in commercial corridors but with an allowable .5 with conditional use.</p> <p>Curb cuts--we thought it was important to protect on street parking. Evaluate retention of on-street parking. Garage additions should therefore not be allowed. Why allow removal of on-street if off-street is provided, a privatization of parking.</p> <p>We are opposed of parking permits.</p>
Joe Curtin Castro Planning Association		X		We take a position in supporting the relaxing of the parking requirements and having a maximum of .5 per housing unit.
Robin Leavitt		X		Parking, which is the most important part of this plan. I support increased densities in my neighborhood. If you bring people [inaudible] it supports neighborhood services. If you bring the people with car it causes harm to the neighborhood as you get traffic and noise and congestion. We have Oak, Fell, Franklin, Gough and so forth which are heavily trafficked streets. Build it [parking] and they will come.
Karen Mauney-Brodek		X		The residents [that] are excited and want to live in Hayes Valley are the people that don't have cars. Lowest car ownership levels in the city. It's a considered approach. This is a special place, we can do it.
Stefan Hastrup Resident		X		<p>Express my support for the parking provisions in the plan they would protect the historic resources and neighborhood.</p> <p>The parking controls are the best way to ensure we build center city neighborhood that's vibrant and encourages people who want to live in an urban neighborhood.</p>
Rufino DeLeon, resident, North Mission.		X		<p>I'm for the environment and all that. But I have to echo the gentlemen from earlier from mission Dolores and another person who was from the Lafayette area who really was against reducing parking.</p> <p>There are many of us who live their complex lives.</p> <p>We have families in San José; we can't bike to San Jose. And medical emergencies [necessitates a car].</p> <p>We need more parking for when there's increase of density and activity.</p>
Scott Clark Clinton Park		X		Own one car I commute to the east bay. I love driving my car. On the weekends I don't need it because I live in the city. One of the reasons I live in San Francisco because I love walking the store. I love the parks. If I wanted to I could move to LA. And work in a moves studio there and drive in traffic there.
Adam Millard-Ball, a Hayes Valley resident.		X		On parking, reducing it is essential to plan. Maximize housing, making sure we have affordable housing and making sure this doesn't become a bedroom community for people in San José that

Summary of Public Comments

November 2, 2006

Hearing

HP Historic Preservation
P Parking

H Housing

Speaker	HP	P	H	Comment
				want to live here because of the freeway ramp. If the price of housing goes up because of the price of parking I wouldn't be able to live the this neighborhood. Parking is compromised since draft plan. We would like to see stricter parking.
Sara Karlinsky, Spur			X	Density really helped to reinforce the transit orientation of the plan.
Robert Rhine, Lafayette, Minna, & Natoma Neighborhood Association			X	It appears a lot of the impacts are lining up along our border of Western SoMa and the plan area. Shift the heights to the South Van Ness that would fall on the street. Look at feathering transitions and setting up buffer zones.
Bernie Choden, resident				Wilbur smith who did the comprehensive traffic flow statement [is?] missing from this document. Looking at the idea of gateways, intercepts for the cars and the process would enable the paying of mass transit.
Eric Dash Lafayette, Minna, & Natoma Neighborhood Association			X	Echo Robert Rhine's comments in regard to buffer zones and parking. Along the proposed heights are down to 85 feet as you see if you look at the proposed heights in Hayes they have 55 feet in terms of a buffer zone. That's more appropriate not just put up an 85-foot wall in a 40-foot neighborhood.
Kurt Holzinger			X	Density. I think the planning staff says in relation to housing and population density that there may be no correlation if you look at the residential zoning district by density. Densities are increased in the residential areas they are increased significantly. On a standard San Francisco lot RH2 lot 45 percent year yard you have 5800 square feet to play with. Even with the requirement for 2 bedroom unit it's easy on a San Francisco lot to get to 6 or 8 units. In our area we feel housing should be built on Market Street on Church in of the neighborhood commercial transit areas. We do not support this incredible up zoning of the inner blocks of the Duboce Triangle, which are established neighborhoods.
Joe Curtin Castro Planning Association			X	Our members have been involved in the better neighborhoods planning process from the start. New development along Market Street would bring a lot of life and would also create a lot of new housing opportunities. We support the option of the density controls. Diversity of housing in the neighborhood that [should not only mean units for?] for family and groups but smaller units for individuals who

Summary of Public Comments

November 2, 2006

Hearing

HP Historic Preservation
P Parking

H Housing

Speaker	HP	P	H	Comment
				don't want to live in group housing or are single.
Tess Wellborn, resident			X	We need to go now. Bad projects are going through as we watch. I would like to speak on the increasing density. This is the place to do it; you heard how many bus lines go through the area. Having density helps it be affordable and helps the people who work here to live here. I like the plan's having flexibility for different housing models. The community land trust. There are different parking areas in the plan. Maybe we need to segment that. I'm sympathetic towards the arts community wanting more parking. Let's get the plan through, now.
Robin Leavitt			X	Another thing I want to mention is the measure of combining units. We might want to think about that. We want to have some sort of flexibility in housing in this neighborhood. The city is a dynamic place and housing needs to change. Maybe there is a place for combining units where we need to house families and existing residents.
Scott Clark Clinton Park			X	Concerns. This property at 35 Dolores street has currently a huge condominium plan for it. I'm all for new housing but I would hope that if this plan is put through, it can make developments like it fit into the neighborhood.

T Transportation
 O Open Space, Living Streets

CI Community Improvements

Commissioner’s Comments

Speaker	Comment
<p>Commissioner Antonini</p>	<p>Thank you to staff for an excellent presentation and to the public for really good comments. I don’t know how many of you ever looked at a map of the state Indiana.</p> <p>It’s in the middle and all the freeways. Same population of San Francisco. It has a dense downtown. They have the advantage of no bay. All the traffic is on a beltway that goes around it. In the middle there is an island of tranquility.</p> <p>I bring this up, while we consider parking ratios and the things we are doing for traffic calming within Market Octavia. SF is a peninsula and the traffic will get worse.</p> <p>In Rincon Hill, SOMA, and other areas, people travel to other areas on weekends - So, that has to be dealt with. Can’t control the Oak traffic. We had a freeway revolt. We built freeways all over, and we took some down. Wherever possible, arrange transit that does not compete with cars. Place transit in separate R-O-W or below ground. That’s the best solution.</p> <p>Sue Hestor brought up the point we have to consider the traffic situation on 16th and Van Ness and not just look at the situation in Market Octavia plan area.</p> <p>We Have to make sure [that any new] infrastructure [is] maintained.</p> <p>We do improvements and don’t maintain them or don’t come up with the physical solutions. In the 60s when they [rebuilt] Market Street they did a good job - [but it isn’t maintained]. A lot of parks in San Francisco are not being [maintained].</p> <p>We should earmark maintenance [funds] and have the necessary agencies involved to take care of the areas and keep them safe.</p> <p>Market and Church and the J –Church stop – is a congested area. This area I believe is planned eventually for the Muni Metro to go to the sunset tunnel without coming above ground. That would alleviate some of the problem. Should be a high priority.</p> <p>The open space concept on Oak street that James Haas brought up. That’s good we have the conservatory of music on the same block. Mint plaza is a great idea [for a] near-congested area. Could create an oasis in the middle of the street R-O-W. Oak St. doesn’t have a lot of traffic. Similar project would result in a public plaza.</p> <p>I encourage others to testify [and be] involved in the process. We want to be inclusive of the people in the community and [consider] all perspectives. .</p>
<p>Commissioner Bill Lee</p>	<p>Staff did a good job. I would like back up documents to staff report regarding the new development and the residential impact fees they would generate.</p> <p>If we increase the percentage of affordable housing there, the question is, 59 million dollars is a good chunk of change. I want to make sure our model includes (future costs) i.e. steel & cement.</p>

Summary of Public Comments

November 9, 2006 Hearing

T Transportation
 O Open Space, Living Streets

CI Community Improvements

Public Comment

Speaker	T	O	CI	Comment
Charlie Steler (resident)	X			<p>The densification along Market Street corridor could have an impact on the soil surrounding the Muni and Bart tubes.</p> <p>There are outstanding issues that need to be explored.</p>
Bernie Choden	X			<p>SF Tomorrow funded transportation study, which identified vehicle use and storage – not part of Plan. It was the only comprehensive transportation study for the city in the last 40 years. Should be part of Plan.</p>
Christopher Peterson, resident	X			<p>Transit improvements are crucial to [Plan] success. Traffic issues associated with Octavia boulevard are seriously degrading service on Haight street bus lines.</p> <p>Development in the Area will increase demand for transit and potential conflicts with traffic.</p> <p>Implement the Transit improvements identified in the plan, including bus route on van Ness.</p> <p>Eliminating the Page street detour. (??) The various transits identified in the plan. Plan looks nice on paper – make it a reality. I support the pedestrian improvements in the plan.</p> <p>Civic center arts organization expressed concerns. - [pedestrians going to symphony, opera] have to navigate a maze with no pedestrian crossing signs.</p>
Kurt Holzinger (DTNA)	X			<p>Support Plan proposals to increase density along transit streets, Church and Market.</p> <p>Don't support increased density in the "inner blocks" of Duboce Triangle – [land use / density & Transit]</p>
William Boekly Hayes Valley Association.	X			<p>I moved to Buchanan street ...to be independent from the automobile. Plan encourages this.</p> <p>Advocates the use of streets as green space. With a higher density we need more green space, street trees. The plan elements are a model for the city as a whole.</p> <p>Make Plan happen.</p>
Ed Bedard (neigh. Res)	X			<p>You are you are close to mass transit in plan area.</p> <p>Does not own car by choice. Want neighborhood where I can live a good life without a car.</p> <p>[Cars impact pedestrian safety]. One way [couplets make it make streets less safe for pedestrians.] Examples: Hayes/Gough and Hayes/Franklin. Support plan proposal to change Hayes To a 2 way</p>

Summary of Public Comments

November 9, 2006 Hearing

T Transportation
 O Open Space, Living Streets

CI Community Improvements

Speaker	T	O	CI	Comment
				street the whole way to Market St. All of the merchants in Hayes Valley are in favor of it.
Robin Leavitt Hayes valley res.	X			Use public transportation to get to Berkeley. The neighborhood is convenient and conducive to bicycling. It's where several major Bike routes converge. The plan complements neighborhood character and works on the things that make the neighborhood desirable. The plan will help the neighborhood, make it more walkable, pedestrian friendly, transit rich and balances all transit options.
Paul Olsen Pres. Hayes valley assoc.	X			3rd Generation SF resident. Walk to most places. Some neighborhoods are well situated for walking and Muni patronage. This is reflected in the plan. People chose where they live based on several things. I live less than a mile [from] where I was born and close to where I work. Diverse neighborhood, [with scale good for] walkability and people using bicycle. Transportation improvements are imperative for the plan to work.
Jim Haas	X			Dismayed that the citizens advisory group from Market & Octavia turned down the request for money to do the traffic study – study IS needed. Reduce some of the traffic. The plan is good on sidewalks. We need to emphasize that for visitors. High Priority: install bulbs on Grove, Hayes and Franklin. After concerts people bunch up at intersections. Dangerous. If you read the comments in the EIR it sounds infeasible? If it is, it should be incorporated in the plan and addressed.
Peter Cohen	X			Like the Plan goals on open space and transportation.
Tess Wellborn Prop owner	X			The plan looks at transit and streetscapes and density and shadows so the heights on the alleys and main streets are all taken into account. Need to address the interface of traffic at Octavia. Muni service is being delayed. Autos having trouble getting on to the freeway. Oak and Fell [problems?].
Sarah Karlinsky	X			SPUR is supportive of the transportation elements of this plan. Plan is conceived as a transit-oriented plan. The rest of the transportation improvements in the plan continue to

Summary of Public Comments

November 9, 2006 Hearing

T Transportation

CI Community Improvements

O Open Space, Living Streets

Speaker	T	O	CI	Comment
SPUR				<p>help this process go along.</p> <p>SPUR like other speakers is disappointed that not all of the transit and pedestrian improvements in the 2002 draft plan are included in 2006 plan.</p> <p>Weight given to cars (over other transport modes) is due to use of automobile LOS as the metric to analyze transportation projects. The Transportation Authority is in the process of coming up with a new metric that helps to analyze people as our metric. We urge you to learn more about This and try to speedup the Process of replacing auto LOS with a new metric.</p>
Tom Radulovich Exec. Dir. Transp. For a Livable City	X			<p>Commend the staff work on the transportation plan. The policies are all right, grounded. Great plan, make sure the plan goes as far as possible.</p> <p>Concerned that plan policies now stated as issues to “study.” Weakens plan from 2002 Plan. – [examples: “study” converting 1 way Hayes St. Into 2 way.</p> <p>The CEQA analysis is not sensitive to geographic differences in provision of parking. Standard traffic impacts are assumed regardless of how much parking is provided.</p> <p>The impacts of parking. Has been a reliance of LOS - The legacy of the 70s - - not relevant in urban areas. People will change their Travel behavior [before gridlock occurs].</p>
Adam Millard-Ball, Plan area resident – Page / Octavia	X			<p>There is a huge amount of Housing in this plan – good. We need the transportation [infrastructure] to support that amount of housing.</p> <p>Need to make sure all the Great projects - the living Streets- get implemented.</p> <p>Concern that the transportation projects are downgraded from plan policy to [“study”]. Provides no certainty that improvements will be implemented.</p> <p>Study transit stop at Market And speeding up a Hayes street Bus lines. Most important idea is converting Hayes to 2 way street. It’s a neighborhood street. We need calmer 2-way traffic as The plan suggests.</p>
Karen Mauney-Brodek Area resident: Oak / Laguna	X			<p>Majority of streets in the neighborhood are devoted to cars –not pedestrians, transit, bikes].</p> <p>Reconsider the primary role of some streets. I live on the corner of oak ask Laguna. 40,000 cars a day zoom past my window. It’s scary. Traffic too high, too fast for people to walk their dogs. The sidewalks are wider on other neighborhood streets. [Here its reduced to 5 feet wide.] Two</p>

Summary of Public Comments

November 9, 2006 Hearing

T Transportation

CI Community Improvements

O Open Space, Living Streets

Speaker	T	O	CI	Comment
Sue Hestor	X			<p>people can't safely pass.</p> <p>Follow on Mr. Eltorys comments. Map on p. 55 of General Plan amendment, [has] arrows that go outside of it [Plan Area]. What's not shown on the map is how the lines work. The next page has streets critical to transit. [Plan doesn't extend there]</p> <p>City has no comprehensive integrated plan. [Market Octavia] is a switching point - Van Ness, Mission, and Market bus lines traverse area.</p> <p>Proposals on Page 56 of the general plan amendment all involve other neighborhoods as well. We need to sort out Mission, Market street and Van Ness. We want to consider issues comprehensively.</p> <p>The Downtown Plan was under way after the transit improvements started being funded. The downtown plan was adopted 5 years after the TIDF was adopted. That funded downtown, Muni, Metro improvements. We are behind on making sure the transit improvements are funded and work.</p> <p>If buses, MUNI Metro cars are full, people can't use transit.</p>
Jason Henderson, Chair, Trans & Planning of Hayes Valley Assoc.	X			<p>We are supportive of the draft 2002 version of the Plan and have concerns about changes in language. For example: 2000 Plan called for converting Hayes Street into 2-way street. Current version calls for issue to be studied. A problem throughout the plan. Another example: Church Street. Several Muni converge here. The 22, the J- and the N-lines. It is a massive transit node but a despicable landscape.</p> <p>We are telling transit Passengers: 'We don't care about you.' In the 2002 plan version there was Language about making it more transit friendly. The big issue raised is the Level Of Service (LOS) issue. What about transit Level Of Service (LOS) and Bicyclist Level Of Service (LOS). Don't dilute the plan due to a metric.</p>
Tom Radulovich, BART Commissioner	X			<p>Please, think about Bart. And the Pedestrian links to Bart. Think about Grove Street - how People get from the civic center Station and into Hayes valley. Think about the corridor, Mission Street and think about Bart capacity. The planning department treats BART as [having] limitless well of capacity. It is at capacity. Civic center and 16th St. BART Stations are bookends of the plan area. [Increased BART ridership will require additional capacity – cars, infrastructure, etc.].</p> <p>Please, think about Bart when you are downtown and do impact development fees. It's a small expense. Otherwise BART competes with Muni.</p>

Summary of Public Comments

November 9, 2006 Hearing

T Transportation

CI Community Improvements

O Open Space, Living Streets

Speaker	T	O	CI	Comment
Jim Haas	X			<p>A constraint to get Arts organizations staff to take transit is scary condition of the Van Ness Transit stations. People don't come on a 9 to 5 basis; they come in the evening and weekends.</p> <p>Civic Center and Van Ness BART / MUNI stations are not appealing. They have not had major improvements since they were open. There is no signage. BART made some modest improvements - updated maps.</p> <p>The proposal for the Van Ness station is too modest – should be overhauled completely, especially with new high rises near the stations.</p>
Kurt Holzinger, DTNA	X			<p>Neighborhoods along the transit streets, Church and Market -- we support the Plan's increased density.</p> <p>In the inner neighborhoods of Duboce Triangle we don't support the increased density</p> <p>Density / Transportation There is confusion on the up-zoning. It's a significant change. In the RTO zone, density is regulated by height, bulk. With a standard lot you can get to 6 or 7 or 8 units per lot (vs. 2-3 units with the current zoning).</p> <p>This is a huge up-zoning. We are concerned about the impacts that may bring. The additional density should be directed to the transit corridors. We are very concerned that this amount of up zoning will have unexpected impacts on open space and transportation and the livability of the neighborhood.</p>
William Boekly Hayes valley association.		X		<p>Supports New mini-parks and safe pedestrian zones and landscaping.</p> <p>Landscape oriented pedestrian zones such as Church and Market are fantastic and encourages the best the city can be. Support Environmental sustainability - reduce impervious surfaces, [less Storm run off] and [use of] fossil fuels. These aspects of plan are consistent with DPW's reduced permit for sidewalk landscaping.</p> <p>Plan encourages neighborhood pride and activities that make streets safer, including commercial activity.</p>
Jim Haas		X		<p>Oak Street - The first block of oak (near Van Ness) with proposed Towers: should be converted to open Space and have the developer pay. Travel lanes too wide; expand the sidewalks, provide one lane for parking and an open space.</p>
Tess Wellborn Prop owner		X		<p>Like conceptual streetscape plan, improvements to the public realm. But we need open spaces that are more quiet, pocket parks. – not on busy streets.</p> <p>There are a number of lots in area not being well used - used as</p>

Summary of Public Comments

November 9, 2006 Hearing

T Transportation

CI Community Improvements

O Open Space, Living Streets

Speaker	T	O	CI	Comment
				<p>parking lots. Perhaps use eminent domain to acquire more open space.</p> <p>Plan has many good elements, have to work on tweaking some things.</p>
Charlie Steler (resident)			X	Extend transit impact development fee to residential districts (from commercial & industrial where there is densification - to help fund Muni system and the BRT (Bus Rapid Transit).
Bernie Choden			X	<p>Plan proposals impact affordability. The [fees] are regressive.</p> <p>We have a Problem with affordability. Plan raises the cost to invest and live In the area. Does not deal with the question on who pays for it.</p> <p>Forwarded material. Last week looked at land speculation and housing.</p>
Christopher Peterson, resident			X	[Good] that the department is looking at community benefits fees. I think that increases the Chance they [improvements] will be implemented.
Peter Cohen			X	<p>Duboce Triangle residents concerned about [infrastructure and impacts of development.]</p> <p>Neighborhood should have more say about type of community benefits in the future. Page 214 of the ordinance. This development will [have] an Extraordinary impact on the plan area's infrastructure.</p> <p>Want delineation of how improvements will be funded / implemented. Not described in the plan - the community benefits program or the plan itself.</p> <p>DTNA will provide list of Specific things needed - transit and open space improvements to ensure the increase of population can be absorbed by existing infrastructure. We will submit something to you.</p>
Karen Mauney-Brodek Area resident: Oak / Laguna			X	<p>We are happy with the proposals - the transportation improvements. We are interested in the Community benefits package.</p>
Tom Radulovich, BART Commissioner			X	<p>We Haven't seen this type of plan with any other community plan. We are pleased to see it. We are pleased that we are starting with the principle that " Growth should pay for growth."</p> <p>Growth should pay for growth. Suggest shifting development fees for transportation benefits (now a per unit Basis or square foot basis) to per parking space basis.</p> <p>The transit impact development Fee - in downtown, the biggest cost is</p>

Summary of Public Comments

November 9, 2006 Hearing

T Transportation
 O Open Space, Living Streets

CI Community Improvements

Speaker	T	O	CI	Comment
				<p>congestion. The parking spaces are creating this. The congestion is made not by the people. Bike safety. Its safety from cars. Cars are creating the impact. They should pay the fees. When you do your fee schedule make sure it's sustainable.</p>
<p>Jason Henderson Chair, Hayes Valley Transportation Committee</p>			X	<p>The Hayes valley neighborhood association and other organizations in the Market Octavia planning area and citywide welcome densification and new housing.</p> <p>However, without additional community infrastructure / benefits, the area will be impacted by increased density.</p> <p>Impact fees are used in Suburban jurisdictions around California. Unfortunately Prop 13 reduces ability of governments to raise money for infrastructure. We have to go with plan approach. This is a good start. The most impressive thing: tying planning to an implementation strategy and funding stream.</p> <p>[referring to map] When the plan was first drafted, the circles where the Intersections that were Indicated as the most important from a pedestrian safety perspective. Things have changed. Intersections near Octavia and height have become tricky and dangerous.</p>
<p>Tess Welborn Area Resident</p>			X	<p>Community Improvements - This is an important part of the Plan and one the public has had the least input on. I would like a larger view used in California and around the world see we look at what we are choosing from and how we pay for it.</p> <p>I'd like to speak up for the South of Market (where the Central Freeway remains). Streetscape is not attractive, area is noisy. There was talk about plantings, recreation, art, lighting to improve the area. I would like to see this back to the plan.</p> <p>Where density bonus is available at Van Ness and Market, provide affordable housing at 50 percent of San Francisco median income not area median income.</p> <p>Want a Community Center, meeting rooms, places where people can do things in addition to sitting in the park or on benches along Oak street.</p>
<p>Peter Cohen Duboce Triangle NA</p>			X	<p>Mechanisms for public benefits - Proposed Public Benefits Funding strategy is a new framework since the 2002 plan. I was the president during the 2002 hearings.</p> <p>We submitted a list of needs to the planning staff that we put together quickly. We would like those addressed. The question is: What's eligible for (funding by) Impact fees.</p> <p>Lets see how the communities can address the infrastructure and new projects.</p>

Summary of Public Comments

November 9, 2006 Hearing

T Transportation

CI Community Improvements

O Open Space, Living Streets

Speaker	T	O	CI	Comment
				<p>I have questions about specifics.</p> <p>Plan provides a shopping list of improvements - staff called them line items. If it's line items that's it.</p> <p>Community should be able to have discussion about [type of improvements to fund] – like the Rincon approach.</p> <p>I would like to know which way it is because we need to expand our list. Thank you very much.</p>
Robin Leavitt Resident			X	<p>Applaud the staff for this proposal. It's important to have the community benefits plan. Plan great - but need to implement a lot of Infrastructure improvements to make Plan work. Development impact fees and parking impact fees are good.</p> <p>Willing to pay a Special assessment to make some Of the improvements happen as well.</p> <p>Consider a special assessment fee in the neighbor for existing residents to pay to fund improvements.</p> <p>Add some specific projects: The trolley museum - perhaps the larger community should fund it.</p> <p>Need a swimming pool. None in neighborhood. There are a lot of kids / underprivileged kids in Neighborhood kids that could benefit from a pool.</p>
Alan Martinez Represent CAPA Also on Landmarks Board			X	<p>The Plan concept is generally Okay.</p> <p>However, the nexus that determined the fees did not take into account the needs of particular populations.</p> <p>The western part of the plan Area is part of the Castro. There is a large number of gay and lesbian people living in this area and that's the special population with particular needs.</p> <p>This Neighborhood is extremely important as a political place for gay people in San Francisco & around the world. This underlies the community input part of the plan. One reason the property values are so high and people want to build because gay and lesbian people want to live near other gay and lesbian people.</p> <p>The needs of gay and lesbian people have to be taken into account. Especially because of residential evictions of people with AIDS.</p> <p>If there are special needs for populations, plan should retain the CU process to ensure larger projects meet the values and needs of the community.</p>
Sue Hestor			X	<p>Page 28 talks about revenue and public resources. This is the first project area out of the box. Other [plans] are coming. And if the city says, "we are going to go first and therefore we will get funded because that's the order in which the project came through."</p>

Summary of Public Comments

November 9, 2006 Hearing

T Transportation

CI Community Improvements

O Open Space, Living Streets

Speaker	T	O	CI	Comment
				<p>Funding the Community Improvements requires dept. to compete for [limited] state, federal, local money.</p> <p>This project area abuts 2 areas that are undergoing planning. One is the Mission and the population abutting the area took the brunt of the freeway [impacts]. The freeway is there. It has a lot of poor people. Don't think they are less important to the city when they have the freeway, which is their issue for some of the people who live there.</p> <p>The other area, is West SOMA - the area east of South Van Ness and Market. West SOMA is not [populated] by wealthy people. It's small housing. We have got to use this public benefits statement to sort out how you will deal with that.</p> <p>Don't put blinders on. The planning department should not move this [plan] without acknowledging you have [the Mission] and West SOMA plans coming in this immediate area. Also Showplace Square, and Dog Patch. In the core area you have 5 planning areas.</p>
<p>Adam Millard-Ball</p> <p>Hayes Valley Resident</p>			X	<p>Echo the need for community improvements and the need for the fee. It's great to see it as part of the plan and I would like to support it. It covers some of the costs of the impacts of growth.</p> <p>This demonstrates we need to get the plan [adopted] soon. In process for up to 6 years - need to move forward.</p> <p>There are projects in the pipeline. The Ford sites and the other large parcels in the area. If we don't move forward we will lose the possibility of getting community benefits fees [from pipeline projects]. That's why we need to make sure the plan is in place as soon as possible. We need the broad based fee.</p> <p>[Proposed] height limits are great but there is another reason which this community benefits brings home we need it from a financial perspective as well. That should not be the only reason but its one.</p> <p>Community benefits fee is great but will not cover all the needs in the market Octavia plan area.</p>
<p>Sara Karlinsky</p> <p>SPUR</p>			X	<p>This is the first time a comprehensive plan for community benefits have been brought forward to you - exciting.</p> <p>I like how growth should pay for growth. Something to keep in mind. The [proposed] densities and heights is part of what will help pay for the community benefits package. I urge you to keep this in mind when you think of the plan as a whole.</p>