

India Basin/Hunters Point Shoreline (Area C) Workshops #4 and 5 September 24 and October 15, 2008

SUMMARY REPORT

Introduction

Workshops #4 and #5 for the India Basin/Hunters Point Shoreline planning process were organized as a 2-part series. The primary purpose of these workshops was to discuss and gather input on draft plan components: **an objectives and policies framework, a zoning concept, and a height concept.**

Workshop #4 was held on September 24, 2008 and Workshop #5 was held on October 15, 2008, both workshops were held at the Bayview Opera House. Linda Richardson (member of the Bayview Hunters Point PAC and chair of the PAC Land Use, Planning and Transportation committee) chaired both of the meetings.

The main focus of Workshop #4 was a presentation by Planning Department and Redevelopment Agency staff, which outlined the draft plan components. Following the presentation, workshop participants attended an informal “open house”, where staff members were available to answer questions. Participants also provided initial feedback on the materials presented during the open house. Materials containing the draft plan components were distributed, and also posted online. Workshop participants were encouraged to review the materials, and provide feedback at the second workshop, or via mail, fax, or email.

Workshop #5 was organized as a follow-up to Workshop #4, with a brief staff presentation, followed by a small group break-out session, which focused on several key questions pertaining to the plan components. Following the small group sessions, a representative from each group presented a summary of their discussion to the audience.

Community members provided a great deal of input and feedback on the draft plan components. A detailed transcription of the comments and questions received is attached to the end of this summary. Similar to previous workshops and discussions regarding the India Basin planning process, there were many areas of consensus and agreement within and among the small groups; and there were also key areas where workshop participants had varying ideas about how India Basin/Hunters Point Shoreline should develop in the future.

Summary of Major Themes

Following is a summary of the major themes from the small group discussions at the October 15 workshop, organized by concept. A comprehensive list of all comments received is included at the end of this report.

Objectives and Policies

Workshop participants reviewed the Objectives and Policies Framework, and provided input regarding important topics that the framework did not address, and also identified the highest priority within each category. Following is a summary of items that participants indicated are missing from the draft framework, or that should be addressed in additional detail:

- Waterfront-oriented, recreation destination

- India Basin should take into account, and be a unifying element, of surrounding neighborhoods and redevelopment projects (Hunters View, Hunters Point Shipyard/Candlestick Point)
- Bay protection and clean-up
- Employment and commercial opportunities
- Affordable housing

Additionally, workshop participants identified highest priority objectives. The following list includes the highest priority objective in each section of the framework; the full list of objectives is included at the end of this report.

- **Land Use:** LU-4: Create a mixed-use Neighborhood Maritime District that serves as the center of India Basin and takes advantage of the area's proximity to the waterfront.
- **Community Design:** CD-2: Promote an urban form that creates a walkable, pedestrian friendly environment and engaging public realm.
- **Preservation:** PR-1: Celebrate and enhance India Basin's history and character.
- **Transportation and Circulation:** T-2: Improve pedestrian and bicyclist circulation, safety, and comfort.
- **Open Space:** OS-4: Provide continuous open space along the shoreline in India Basin.
- **Community Services and Facilities:** CS-1: Provide and support essential community services and facilities to serve existing and future residents.
- **Sustainability:** S-2: Promote sustainable and green building practices in new development in India Basin.
- **Economic Development:** ED-2: Development economic programs to support existing and future local businesses in India Basin.

Prioritizing the objectives will help to focus development of the Plan document, as well as future implementation activities.

Zoning Concept

One of the key elements of the draft zoning concept is creating a new neighborhood commercial zoning district for India Basin. This neighborhood commercial district is intended to create a destination and retail core within the Plan area, and to encourage desired land uses. The questions regarding the neighborhood commercial district focus on the range of uses that should be permitted and encouraged to locate there (specifically, if limited industrial uses should be included), as well as the priority location for retail uses. Following is a summary of the input received regarding the neighborhood commercial district:

- Many workshop participants supported limited light industrial in this area, particularly with a maritime and arts focus. Participants stressed the importance of compatible land uses, and noted that industrial uses should operate in enclosed buildings.
- There was discussion about the location of light industrial uses. It was repeatedly noted that if they are located within the neighborhood commercial district, industrial uses should be separated from retail uses, to not detract from the character or pedestrian quality of the neighborhood.
- Workshop participants provided varying ideas about the location of retail uses within the Plan area. Some suggested that retail should be concentrated on Innes Avenue, since it is a major street. However, others feel that Innes Avenue is not an appropriate location for neighborhood serving retail.

The idea of concentrating retail on Hudson and Griffith was also discussed, with Hudson as the main retail street in the neighborhood. Additionally, other workshop participants supported neighborhood-serving retail on new streets within the India Basin “flats”.

Another main question that workshop participants considered is which part of the Plan area (specifically the PG&E site or India Basin “flats”) should be a priority site for large-scale employment generating uses, such as commercial or industrial.

- Once again, there was not a complete agreement about the best location for this type of use, however; the majority of comments received indicate that the PG&E site is the preferred location for an employment center.
- Some workshop participants indicated that both sites could be designed for commercial uses.
- Some workshop participants indicated that residential uses and mixed-use development is not appropriate on either site.
- It was clear from workshop discussion and comments that whatever future uses are planned in the Plan area, waterfront access and a shoreline buffer must be key elements of any future development programs.

The final discussion question regarding the zoning concept was the mix of uses envisioned for the “Hillside Transition District”, specifically if the zoning for this district should permit retail, or other commercial uses. Following is a summary of the main themes related to zoning for the Hillside Transition District.

- There were comments supporting commercial uses in this district, such as neighborhood retail uses.
- Other workshop participants indicated that commercial uses are not appropriate in this district, due to the site’s location, topography, as well as concerns about viability of commercial in this location.
- The natural habitat in this area should be preserved and maintained.
- An additional suggestion for a use for this area is childcare, or a small community center.

Height Concept

The height concept presented explored the idea of height bonuses or height transfers, to encourage the provision of desired community benefits. The first question workshop participants were asked to consider is whether they agree in general with the concept of linking increased height allowances to the provision of community benefits.

- Many workshop participants indicated that they supported, in general, the concept of a height transfer.
- Additional research and exploration is needed to illustrate how this concept would be implemented in the Plan area.
- Some workshop participants suggested that implementation of a height transfer should occur on a parcel-by-parcel basis; others supported setting up height regulations throughout the area based on performance standards.
- There were varying ideas about how height districts should be organized. Many participants agreed with the concept of lower heights by the water, but there was also the suggestion that heights do not need to be lower by the water; instead view corridors should be created to enhance visual access.

- Many comments focused on the importance of creating setbacks and access proximate to the shoreline.

After discussing the general question regarding height transfers, workshop participants discussed the community benefits that could be linked to allowable height increases. There were many suggestions for community benefits to consider, including:

- Open space and recreational facilities
- Historic preservation
- Affordable and special needs housing
- Wetland restoration
- Public transportation enhancements
- Space for non-profit organizations
- Retail uses

There were many creative suggestions for community benefits; a complete list is included in the transcript of comments at the end of this report.

Workshop participants also discussed locations for varied heights throughout the Plan area, in conjunction with the height transfer concept. There was a wide range of ideas and suggestions regarding the desired building heights within India Basin.

- Many comments focused on having a shoreline band, with the lowest building heights and limited land uses near the shoreline.
- However, other comments suggested that other urban form characteristics (such as setbacks, view corridors, and open space requirements) can work to achieve the desired vision for India Basin, without reducing building heights.
- Heights should reflect the topography of the Plan area.
- It was suggested that height districts should be flexible, to reflect different conditions within the Plan area.

The following list is a transcription of the comments and questions received as part of the September 24 and October 15, 2008 community workshops for the India Basin/Hunters Point Shoreline planning process. These comments were received at the workshops, within the small group discussions, from the feedback workbooks, as well as from emails to the Planning Department and Redevelopment Agency staff. We will also be developing a summary report, which provides an overview of the major areas of input, agreement, and disagreement on the Plan concepts.

September 24, 2008 Workshop Comments and Questions	
1.	Neighborhood commercial on Jennings – retail, commercial, no residential
2.	For upcoming workshops, provide a map with nearby zoning and height districts for context
3.	Consider rising sea levels. Areas close to the shoreline should have underground parking facilities, which would prevent against damage of habitable areas in the event of a storm surge.
4.	There should be a bike bridge on Hudson
5.	What can go under high-voltage power lines? What is PG&E going to do about the substation and transmission lines?
6.	Consider the constraints of the power lines along Hunters Point Boulevard – how will they affect development?
7.	Move or screen the PG&E transformer
8.	Consider adding community service providers to the desired community benefits list. For example, subsidizing non-profit space for organizations like LEJ.
9.	Attract more non-profits to the area, such as sustainable policy non-profits
10.	Think about sustainable furnishings – benches, picnic tables, garbage cans. Durable, local sources for furnishings.
11.	Support green jobs and youth programs to maintain the Bay Trail (i.e. LEJ)
12.	Seamless transition from Hunters Point Shipyard to Area C. No “curtain” on Earl separating the two areas.

Feedback Workbook: Comments and Questions (from October 15 Workshop Small Groups, and workbooks submitted via mail, email, and handed in at the workshop)	
Question #1: Are there any important topics not covered in the Framework? What additional topics should be addressed?	
1.	India Basin should be a waterfront-oriented recreation destination
2.	Blue Greenway
3.	The India Basin neighborhood extends beyond the survey area (from the Hill to the water)
4.	India Basin should play the role of a unifier of the surrounding areas (Hunters Point Hill, Cargo Way, etc).
5.	Objectives are comprehensive.
6.	The objectives serve the community's needs – that's good
7.	Need to come up with objectives that protect and clean up the Bay
8.	Jobs/business opportunities
9.	Incentives for private investment in the Plan area. How will the Plan encourage investment (outside of the Plan area and inside the Plan area) sources to become active in India Basin?
10.	The natural geography of India Basin is perfectly suited for a signature stairway leading from the hillside residential neighborhoods to the waterfront. The architecture of the stairway could tell the natural and maritime history of the area. Water runoff from the hillside could be incorporated into a wetlands planting theme with the water flowing through the architectural elements of the stairway all the way down to the shoreline. The stairway would serve as the connecting element between the upper neighborhoods and the waterfront. The sidewalk on the steep hillside would provide many opportunities for pedestrians to sit and take in the view from a higher elevation.
11.	Provide for additional educational institutions such as a boat building school and other apprentice programs for various maritime, green and clean tech trades.
12.	Provide for continuing and expanding programming such as America True's events, to promote water access from the land.
13.	In conjunction with water access from the land, provide access from the water to the land. This can be accomplished with a destination marine with guest slips and secure storage for visiting kayaks.

14.	Preserve and potentially enlarge the sand beach(es).
15.	Provide the opportunity for residential use along the waterfront, thus preserving the prime waterfront views for residential use and not industrial or commercial uses.
16.	Very important topics seemed to be covered well. If <u>all</u> come to fruition, Area C will be for <u>all</u> citizens of San Francisco, the state, nation and world – not developers’ bottom line.
17.	Health of the Bay
18.	Affordable housing
19.	Mixed-uses are important
20.	I think it’s great that a plan is being developed in keeping in mind the upcoming changes to Candlestick and the Hunters Point Shipyard. I would urge the same inclusiveness with respect to the approved plan for Hunters View.
21.	Hunters View should be fully considered in the Area C development planning.
22.	A large part of the Hunters Point Hillside should be designated open space to offset the planned high density in Hunters View and Area C and to protect the rare habitat found on the hillside.
23.	<p>Yes. I feel that the materials miss many of the incredible opportunities at India Basin. All of these plans created by the Redevelopment and Planning staff working on this consider standard planning practices without regard to this unique location! This is waterfront property. PLEASE review the materials development by Planning for Public Spaces: Creating a Vibrant Waterfront Community (www.pps.org) , such as these guiding principles:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Surrounding Buildings Enhance Public Space 2. Limits are Placed on Residential Development 3. Activities go on Round-the-Clock and Throughout the Year 4. Flexible Design Fosters Adaptability 5. Creative Amenities Boost Everyone’s Enjoyment 6. Access Made Easy by Boat, Bike and Foot 7. Local Identity is Showcased 8. The Water Itself Draws Attention 9. Iconic Buildings Serve a Variety of Functions 10. Good Management Maintains Community Vision <p>Let’s use these successful tips – gathered from waterfront sites around the world – to create the Recreation Destination at</p>

	India Basin that my neighbors and I have been advocating for 10 years.
Question #2: For each topic within the Objectives and Policies Framework (contained in the Draft Materials booklet), please circle the two objectives that you think are most important in each section.	
	<i>In addition to the following comments, please see the summary objectives sheet at the end of this document.</i>
1.	Regional recreation along the waterfront
2.	25% affordable housing
3.	T-3: Improve public transit
4.	OS-4: Provide continuous open space
5.	LU-7: Integrate with the larger Bayview Hunters Point community <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Linkages to community programs and neighborhood services
6.	LU-2: No residential on the Bay side of Innes Avenue, from Hudson to Earl
7.	LU-2.2: Jobs! Long term jobs
8.	CD-1.2: Taller buildings only on the uphill side of Innes Avenue. No residential on the Bay side, residential on the uphill side of Innes Avenue.
9.	PR-1.1: Maritime uses and recreation
10.	PR-1.3: Celebrate the maritime history
11.	T-1: Street network – calming, reduce speeding
12.	T-2.6: Improve pedestrian safety with intersection improvements and traffic calming
13.	OS-4: (Provide continuous open space along the shoreline in India Basin). It's the law.
14.	LU-4 (Create a mixed-use Neighborhood Maritime Center District that serves at the Center of India Basin and takes advantage of the area's proximity to the waterfront) and LU-6 (Identify a Shoreline Access Recreation Zone where new open spaces and shoreline will be encouraged and existing open spaces will be maintained and improved).
15.	Specifically, Policy LU-6.1 (prioritize water-oriented recreational uses, open space, walking, and bicycling paths, and public access to the waterfront in the shoreline access recreation zone) should be a top priority with an added point of programming to activate Policy LU-4.4 (encourage new public open space and maritime recreation facilities in the district, particularly along

	the waterfront)
16.	Community Design – the urban environment should be walkable and friendly and designed in an open and welcoming manner.
17.	Preservation – Objectives PR-1 (Celebrate and enhance India Basin’s history and character) and PR-3 (Encourage the rehabilitation of identified historic resources within India Basin) work together to bring the history of India Basin back to life.
18.	Transportation – Pedestrian and bicyclist accommodations are by far the most important for India Basin. However, public transport, including possible Ferry Service, should be easily accessible in the area.
19.	Open Space – Particular emphasis should be placed on securing adequate, long-term funding to maintain the programming that will be implemented to activate the shoreline and open spaces. Without this assurance, the open space, parks, and recreational areas will be at risk of becoming derelict.
20.	S-3 (Encourage sustainable storm water management systems in India Basin) is extremely important for the restoration of natural wetlands and shoreline habitats.
21.	Economic Development – similar to past efforts at the Shipyard, particular emphasis should be given to clean, green and new technologies that provide jobs for people living nearby.
22.	Linking within the Neighborhood – services, uses and transportation
Question #3a: The Zoning Concept calls for the creation of a new neighborhood commercial zoning district for India Basin called Neighborhood Commercial District-India Basin (NCD-IB) around the intersection of Griffith Street with Hudson and Innes. Should limited industrial uses, such as boat-building businesses and industrial arts uses, be allowed in the new NCD-IB district?	
1.	How will particular users interact with the larger economic development vision for this area in the context of development plans for adjacent areas? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Do you dilute the market? ▪ What are the advantages of clustering? ▪ Is there really a “there” there?
2.	Permit limited industry
3.	Make sure that uses are compatible
4.	What is going to happen with the energy infrastructure? It’s OK to keep the energy infrastructure, but how can it be secluded from the neighborhood (both visual and built)
5.	Enclosed light industrial is OK, with low noise levels

India Basin/Hunters Point Shoreline
 September 24 & October 15, 2008 Workshops: Transcription of Comments and Questions

6.	Boat-building (human powered boats)
7.	Be careful of big boxes
8.	Maritime-centric character and architecture
9.	Maritime themed uses such as a museum or community center.
10.	Fishing
11.	More piers, marina
12.	Ground floor retail with services, lighter industrial uses are OK
13.	Industrial uses should be located behind the retail (not interfere with retail access)
14.	Maritime uses should be closer to the water
15.	Yes, limited industrial uses should be allowed particularly when it is authentic maritime flavored industrial arts and businesses – i.e. wooden boat building, sail making, rigging, R&D for marine hardware, kite surfing board makers, surfboard shapers, etc.
16.	Yes, limited industrial uses should be permitted in the NCD
17.	Boat-building and industrial arts as they relate to the unique recreation of the site is good. General industry – your “mixed use” does not work. It is being designed and approved by people who live in residential only neighborhoods. Look at South of Market – “mixed use”, makes people on both sides unhappy. Even as part of recreation activities, special time and day agreements on these activities should be required because of the existing residential in and around this zone.
Question #3b: Within this district, are there certain areas or streets where ground-floor commercial uses should be required to create a “cluster” of retail uses? Where?	
1.	<p>Along Arelious Walker would allow transition to uses focused on a maritime theme. Intensity of retail should be focused at Arelious Walker and Hudson, though some retail (maritime) at Hudson and Griffith. This would allow for historic/maritime center at Hudson and Griffith. Historic/maritime center should contain the following types of uses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Kayak rental, bait shop, restaurant ▪ Boat building ▪ Sail-making, R&D for boat hardware, etc. ▪ “Arts PDR”
2.	Access at low-tide at Hudson and Griffith is an issue – there are better locations elsewhere along the India Basin waterfront for

India Basin/Hunters Point Shoreline

September 24 & October 15, 2008 Workshops: Transcription of Comments and Questions

	a maritime center.
3.	Line Hudson Street with all types of commercial
4.	Need to find a balance for commercial with existing and projected demand
5.	Emphasize water connections
6.	Make water available to the public
7.	Retail should be concentrated on Innes Avenue, since it is a major street
8.	Retail concentrated on Innes, concentrated with pedestrian orientation
9.	There is only one corner store in the neighborhood now, one restaurant was shut down
10.	Retail should not be located on Innes Avenue – Innes Avenue will be too crowded
11.	Some retail on Innes to serve through traffic
12.	Want parking near the shoreline so people can visit and access the water.
13.	Retail should be concentrated on Innes.
14.	Add more streets on India Basin Flats, don't just use the existing grid, these could be retail streets
15.	Hudson could be designed as a one-way street
16.	One-way streets attract speeding
17.	Retail opportunity on India Basin "flats"
18.	Residential and retail should be integrated, so that you have more eyes on the street and it is a safer environment
19.	Hayes Valley is a good model of a neighborhood commercial street; with retail on the ground floor with office or housing above.
20.	Yes, there should be clusters of retail uses on corners and near the water below Innes Street.
21.	Yes – retail on main streets.
22.	Ground floor retail/restaurant should be the norm throughout this area – with another use (driveway/garage) allowed only as a conditional use. Again, this is a unique area and needs to be treated that way. Most especially: Ground floor restaurants/retail

	along Jennings between Evans and Cargo with access behind – the idea of a “restaurant row” has been suggested many times.
Question #4: Both the PG&E site and the India Basin Flats have been designated as Mixed-Use Office (MUO). The MUO allows employment uses such as research & development space, as well as housing. The zoning controls can set a ratio of non-residential to residential uses to ensure mixed-use development. Should either area be considered more of a priority for commercial and industrial uses? Why?	
1.	Does an R&D park take full advantage of the beautiful waterfront location? (See PPS.org – Project for Public Spaces)
2.	Retail, tourist-oriented uses are better
3.	Let's be realistic about users and conflicts within districts
4.	Conference center for the PG&E site
5.	Want the broadest type of zoning, because the future is not determined – MUO would work for that
6.	New technology will at some point change the nature of the sub-station
7.	MUO zoning would need to include public water access
8.	Is the land under the substation under public trust jurisdiction?
9.	Utilize conditional use authority for the PG&E site to allow further discussion
10.	Need to emphasize employment in the MUO zone
11.	The whole area is small enough to be walked end-to-end
12.	Both areas can be mixed use
13.	Look into the financials – maybe a location for an office park
14.	There will be office/R&D space on the shipyard, so maybe do not need more on India Basin Flats.
15.	Prefer commercial over industrial for both locations
16.	PG&E site should have job generating uses.
17.	Encourage uses along the flat area that are commercial
18.	Uses that will generate jobs, including jobs for public housing residents

19.	Flexibility in providing jobs
20.	Prefer commercial uses on India Basin flats and the PG&E sites
21.	<p>PG&E site for commercial priority area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Also should be commercial because of the clean-up – will it really be clean enough for residential standards? ▪ Emerging technologies will need a larger site, and the PGE site has large enough parcels
22.	There should be a shoreline linkage/set-backs that runs through the entire area
23.	Maritime uses close to the edge of the PGE site
24.	India Basin should be more than residential
25.	Permanent residential does not mix with the uses we want to see along the waterfront; residence drive out businesses, nightlife and any lively tourist district.
26.	The PG&E site seems more natural for less housing and more industrial uses, as long as there is ALSO a continuous open space corridor/public walkway to connect the shoreline access recreation zone and wetlands with the Heron’s Head Park. If the flats area was more industrial than housing it would form an unnatural disconnect with housing further south and thus, should not be allowed.
27.	The PG&E site is better scaled for potential industrial uses. Historically an industrial site and adjacent to industrial sites.
28.	The PG&E site should emphasize jobs, not just job training, which would b located anywhere; think restaurant jobs, hospitality jobs, recreation-orientation jobs, etc.
29.	PG& E site needs an anchor institution that can only exist on the water
30.	A hotel is OK on the PG&E site, but no residential; residential uses should be on the other side of Hunters Point Blvd.
31.	Explore the option of putting a parking lot underneath the high-voltage lines, which adds value to the land without the expense of moving the lines, also precludes putting a building there.
32.	No. Both should have no permanent residential. Both need to include anchor entities that help create the recreation destination – hotel, conference center, major recreation spaces for children and dogs, supportive commercial. Office and homes on prime waterfront property? That is not creative at all!
33.	Residential no more than 50%.

Question #5: The southern portion of the Hillside Transition District is designated as RM-1 (Residential, Mixed-Types) to match the zoning of the Hunters View project. RM-1 does not allow commercial uses. Should the zoning be adjusted to allow retail or other commercial uses?	
1.	RM-1 might be too limited
2.	Look at what Benicia did
3.	Can you put residential along Hunters Point Boulevard?
4.	Could RM-1 be changed to UMU? It would provide needed retail to existing residential.
5.	Maritime NCD would serve visiting population, and UMU (instead of RM-1) would serve local residents
6.	Residential uses are ok
7.	Preserve the hillside and natural habitats.
8.	Maybe restore the natural habitat as a demonstration project.
9.	Possible other uses; dog park, benches, amphitheater designed which relates to the topography of the hill with seating in a bowl-like space.
10.	Sound carries in this area, an amphitheater might be a good idea.
11.	Do not need additional commercial in this area.
12.	Very steep site, so access will be difficult (in terms of building roads, driveways, etc)
13.	Larger residential housing with mixed use – development will have to be vertical because of the grade change (multi-family)
14.	Speed of traffic coming around the curve from Evans could be a problem for new residential development
15.	Ground floor commercial might not be viable
16.	Need density/community friendly uses to ensure financial feasibility
17.	No. Not only should retail or commercial uses not be allowed in the Hillside Transition District, the HTD should remain as open space until absolute maximum occupancy is reached in the industrial, commercial, and other residential areas. The people working in the MUO area at the PG&E site would be encouraged to walk down to the NCD area via the proposed open space

India Basin/Hunters Point Shoreline
 September 24 & October 15, 2008 Workshops: Transcription of Comments and Questions

	and public walkway.
18.	Stress residential, realistic about scale needed to develop sloping site.
19.	Yes – allow retail or other commercial use.
20.	LOVE the designation as “Hillside Transition! I would hope that the RM-1 designation, which does permit both private and public open space and, conditionally, greenhouse or nursery, will be used to preserve the serpentine grassland on this southern portion of the hillside.
21.	In favor of relaxing the zoning so that retail or other commercial users could be introduced on the bottom, flat portion of the parcel adjacent to Hunters Point Blvd. OR, follow up on the conditional provision to allow a childcare center or a small community center on the flat portion.
22.	I think there should be flexibility to allow for possible light commercial uses along parts of Hunters Point Blvd.
23.	Provide needed open space to compensate for the high density planned for Hunters View and Area C.
24.	Create a natural extension and connection to the India Basin Shoreline Park.
25.	Conserve rare serpentine habitat and lovely views for all to enjoy.
26.	No residential. No commercial of any kind if driveway is involved. How would people access this “zone” on a blind curve on what is going to be an even busier street than it is now? The lack of planning in context of the community is especially glaring in this transitional zone.
Question #6: The Height Concept considers allowing a “transfer of heights” or a “height bonus” in exchange for the provision of community benefits, as illustrated below. Do you agree or disagree with the concept of linking increased height allowances to the provision of community benefits? Why or why not?	
1.	Trade off should be based on building footprint
2.	30’ height limit is too high
3.	Within the BCDC 100’ foot band – no development, 20’ height district beyond that
4.	55’ heights at Innes will block the 30’ zone (??)
5.	Differential between 55’ and 30’ (or 0’) can create a wall between water and neighborhood, it would be better to have 40’ with the ability to step back to preserve views (solar access?)

6.	Taller buildings on Innes should be on the eastern side (current map has this “flipped”)
7.	Avoid a tunnel along Innes
8.	Lower heights should be focused along the water
9.	Density bonuses should be focused along Griffith
10.	The hillside should be up-zoned (for residential use)
11.	Height should follow the topography and the water
12.	The waterfront band should be wider <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Want to have transfer of height option – permit 60’ if waterfront height is reduced by 20’ ▪ Waterfront heights should be 25’
13.	Neighborhood commercial district should be 35’, especially at the block of Hawes, Hudson, and Innes
14.	On hillside use setbacks, start at 30’ but go up, stepping back up to 80’. The slope is very steep, and taller buildings would not block views from above. (Need a topo map to determine what the appropriate heights can be)
15.	Yes agree to the principle – needs to be done carefully <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Disagreement – some say that height should be regulated parcel-by-parcel, others that height should be regulated throughout the area by performance standards.
16.	Depends on the definition of community benefit
17.	Height swap is a good idea
18.	Be careful about blocking views
19.	Maybe have view corridors
20.	All buildings are taller than people, so we need public spaces
21.	Since there are many owners, this might be hard to coordinate
22.	In exchange for increased height, need more affordable housing and parking
23.	There should be 3 bands of height by the water – 20’, 30’, then 40’
24.	Re-orient the streets to create view corridors, rather than changing height designations

25.	Create potential new view corridors in new development areas
26.	The topography allows different height buildings, while preserving views of the bay
27.	Setbacks all along the shoreline, and then a second band of lower heights, so that there is a step down to the shoreline
28.	You can have setbacks and step-down requirements on one parcel – varied height within a parcel
29.	Need to work with BCDC to determine the appropriate setback requirements
30.	Create setbacks all along the waterfront – this can be reflected in the Planning Code
31.	If it is done in such a way that there is massing in different landmark points with a heavy emphasis on preserving valuable view corridors then it is a good idea but sensitivity should be shown to the existing historic homes in the area. Also other options should be explored such as building down and NOT putting parking on levels with great views. This needs to be decided when more specific information is available.
32.	No – reorient streets primarily perpendicular to waterfront. Need to show/understand water side setbacks.
33.	I agree with the height transfers concept. It gives more flexibility in the planning process.
34.	Very much agree.
35.	Trading concept is creative and generally a good thing.
36.	Trade should be height for height, not height for community benefits or retail; community benefits will already be a requirement from the developers in a redevelopment zone.
37.	Increased heights should come only with view corridors and/or side setbacks: the bigger your footprint, the lower your max height; the smaller your footprint, the higher your max height.
38.	Trade zones should conform to topography; development should conform to topography.
39.	In the flats, orient the streets and the buildings so that the streets run from Innes to the water rather than parallel to Innes; also leave the ends of the blocks open and orient the buildings so that the adjoining backyards form another set of view corridors.
40.	Include upzoning trade options in the areas around Area C; on the south side of Innes, in Westbrook/Hunters Point East, in Hunters View, in the India Basin Industrial Park, in Shipyard Parcel B.
41.	The open space created by trading should be contiguous / consolidated in general.

42.	I agree in concept – but don't agree with the idea of massive residential towers – again, please use the concepts learned by Planning Public Spaces from around the world about creating a vibrant waterfront – it isn't about short-term being afraid of property owners (especially the crooked, greedy, blight-creating property owners around here that Redevelopment seems so anxious to please), it is about creating a special vision for a special place
Question #7: Please consider the list of community benefits contained in the Heights Concept Overview that could be linked to allowable height increases on certain parcels in India Basin. Should other benefits be added to this list? Should any be removed?	
1.	Maritime center – like that wording better
2.	Must have funding for programming and maintaining both existing and new parks
3.	Must work on Heron's Head park
4.	Permanent open space
5.	Historic Preservation
6.	Center for African American History
7.	Green, LEED certified, Net Zero buildings
8.	Mix of housing types
9.	Senior housing and special needs housing.
10.	Priority housing for existing BVHP residents
11.	Additional wetlands/transitional ecological areas (not necessarily active areas for recreation)
12.	Preservation of existing community organizations
13.	Enhance transportation infrastructure <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Water taxi ▪ Public transportation
14.	Desired benefit – something that brings different cultures and communities together
15.	Incentivize the benefits list – to encourage people to provide them
16.	Community and recreational programming for the activation of the waterfront

17.	Wetland restoration and maintenance
18.	Public landscaping in adjacent and access corridors (walkways)
19.	Enhanced alternative transportation
20.	Library (or children's library) if one is not provided on the Shipyard
21.	Create a benefits district that encompasses Shipyard Phase 1, Area C, Hunters View, Westbrook/Hunters Point East, and south of Innes, to address benefits such as acquisition of public open space, transit improvements, and under grounding in a unified way rather than piecemeal.
22.	Whenever a height consideration is given to a district or any particular parcel, it should be accompanied by a permanent commitment for support and funding of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Community and recreational programming for the activation of the waterfront ▪ Wetlands restoration and maintenance ▪ Public landscaping in adjacent and access corridors (walkways)
23.	Wetland restoration
24.	Open space, recreation, and retail
25.	Library
26.	Enhanced alternative transportation
27.	If a branch library (perhaps just a children's library?) is not included in the plan for Candlestick Point/Hunters Point Shipyard redevelopment, then I agree that would be a valuable benefit. It may be difficult for children from Hunters Point to get to the existing branch in the Bayview.
28.	The overarching principle is the creation of value that can be captured and funneled towards community benefits.
29.	We need a better understanding of the value created by the TDR regime and how property owners would be affected by it.
30.	All heights need to follow the topography and the view lines to and from the Bay. Again this is a unique location.

<p>Question #8: The Height Concept map identifies strategic locations where buildings taller than 40 feet can be permitted in exchange for community benefits. This approach helps ensure variation in heights in India Basin and helps create focal points in the area. Given these goals, do you agree with the locations identified on the Height Concept map for buildings taller than 40 feet?</p>	
1.	Not all parcels are the same, need to be flexible
2.	If the maritime area is too built up, might lose neighborhood character
3.	Have the lowest heights near the shoreline
4.	The 65' height on Earl and Innes is OK, but some people are concerned about this.
5.	85' is too high on the PG&E site.
6.	On the India Basin Flats, could have lower heights near Innes Avenue, and higher heights near the water, since there is a slope.
7.	Hatched area on the Flats – shown as a 40/55 split (between Hudson/Arelious Walker/Galvez) – should be switched to the other side of the street
8.	There should be flexibility for heights within the neighborhood commercial district
9.	The areas around Griffith Street should have a height restriction of 30' or less because the Open Space NEEDS to be added at the 30' height corridor by the water at the PG&E site. The 30' height corridor right on the water near where the current boat yards are situated is completely unworkable and at cross purposes with many of the objectives stated in the report. The shoreline park needs to be completed such that there is a true walkway connecting all the shoreline parks and open spaces. There should be a setback at any water area of a minimum of 40', but preferably 100'.
10.	Yes – need to adjust at very specific points.
11.	The areas east and northwest of Hunters Point Blvd. should be limited to 30 feet or less to help preserve the view from Hunters View. Waterfront areas should be open space.
12.	Maximum height should be 30 feet with lower heights as you proceed down to the shoreline with the exception of the back part of the PG&E land that could reach a height of 40 feet.
13.	Favor low-density use of the Area C which will maintain the ecology of the shoreline and provide open space.
14.	Three height bands, not two: 0', 25' (or 30' with a requirement of 14' on the ground floor) and 40'+ (with 14' minimum ground

India Basin/Hunters Point Shoreline

September 24 & October 15, 2008 Workshops: Transcription of Comments and Questions

	floor height in retail zones); the primary goal of height trades should be to create open space and view corridors, not to end up with a 25' building next to a 55' building.
15.	We need a 0' height band for the Bay Trail that is a good 20' wide to accommodate pedestrian and a double bike lane.
16.	We need a shoreline band overlay throughout: no residential of any kind within the shoreline band.
17.	Yes, except need a 20' height limit along the shoreline.
18.	PG&E hillside should not be down zoned to 30' it is on a hill, no reason to downzone. Height should be at least 40' and the Shoreline Park/waterfront side should be the 25/30' zone, if not a 0' zone.
19.	In the Flats, create two bands parallel to the shoreline, e.g. one-story restaurants with rooftop decks in the first band, then a two-story band of retail below/office above, then a taller retail below/housing above band/zone.
20.	The parcel adjacent to Hudson and India Basin Shoreline Park should be 40' not 30'. The additional ten feet does not impact views, and BCDC does not view the forty foot height limit as negatively impacting the environment. Seattle, Vancouver, and other cities have built much higher buildings on their waterfront, and planners have given those areas high marks.
21.	The corner of Jennings and Evans should have a 40' by right/120' Conditional Use height designation and serve as a landmark welcoming people into a distinct neighborhood.
22.	The east corner of Innes and Fitch/Arelious Walker should be set at 40/85' to take advantage of the unbuildable hillside across the street and the stunning Bay views.
23.	The Innes/Hawes/Hunters Point Boulevard triangle should be limited to 30' and preferably purchased to facilitate reconfiguration of that intersection.
24.	Placing 65 feet heights on both sides of the corner of Jennings and Evans creates a ridiculous wall of steel on what should be a grand entrance to a historic district.
25.	Placing 30 feet heights on one side of Hunters Point Blvd and 55 feet across the street is again creating a wall that blocks the bay from the road. There isn't a wall if 55 feet buildings along Ocean Beach. Why here? Under the power lines is a good spot for a community parking lot that serves the conference center of the Power Plant site and the larger India Basin Shoreline Park that includes the concession businesses and the boating Center.
26.	Placing 85 feet heights on the power plant site is just completely out of balance with everything for miles around. As soon as the Planning Commission approves 85 feet along West Portal, we can talk about 85 feet in India Basin. Bad and selfish planning for decades in this city should not be "redeemed" by dumping density housing here. Amenities on the waterfront

	should be low and people friendly.
27.	According to ABAG, placing 30 feet heights along the waterfront around the power plant site and adjacent to India Basin Shoreline Park and along other waterfront is just plain not legal.
28.	Placing 40 feet heights next to the Shipwright’s Cottage defeats the purpose of a grand historic property.
29.	The entire concept of “mixed-use” on the India Basin flats is just wrong. Please quit trying to please the greedy absentee property owners, and the over zealous housing projections, and let’s make this a vibrant waterfront community that contributes to a livable city and fits best with our SF #1 industry, tourism.
Summary and General Comments from the Discussion Groups	
1.	Continuous and adequate setback for waterfront districts
2.	General support for the TDR concept, but height districts need to be refined
3.	Retail concentration should be along the waterfront, not along Innes
4.	Allowing and promoting industrial and maritime districts should be a priority
5.	Concern about Evans becoming a major traffic route – must have traffic calming in place
6.	Have to think about parking for the Plan area creatively, possibly remote parking or pods. There is a concern that some recent project approvals in the area do not provide for sufficient parking.
7.	If density increases, need to provide room and facilities (dog runs) for pets and dogs
8.	Priority objectives and policies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mixed use ▪ Unique place ▪ Flexibility for property owners
9.	Zoning: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Some retail on Innes to serve through traffic ▪ Retail opportunity on India Basin flats ▪ Enclosed industrial uses in the maritime district ▪ Prefer commercial uses on India Basin Flats and the PG&E site ▪ No commercial uses on the southern portion of the hillside
10.	Heights: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Like the concept

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Affordable housing and special needs housing should be added to the list of community benefits
Additional Comments and Questions	
1.	Whatever the final Area C plan, it is paramount that connection and communication between the Hunters View hilltop area and the India Basin waterfront area be made a high, high priority. To go through all this transition only to end up with disconnected islands would be an outcome that I know no one wants. I am pleased to see this stated so clearly in the objectives.
2.	Need continued comprehensive planning to account for potential traffic improvements, re-alignment of streets, water, transit, other.
3.	No curb cuts along the Evans/Hunters Point Blvd/Innes corridor; create alleys to access streetfront properties from behind the buildings.
4.	Incorporate existing development constraints: the switchyard, the cooling lagoon, the high-voltage lines
5.	<p>The materials have neglected some of the major constraints of India Basin. Among them:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There is a PG&E substation near the corner of Jennings and Evans that have not been addressed. ▪ There are high-power lines that run along Hunters Point Blvd that have not been addressed. ▪ There are Association of Bay Area Government rules about waterfront setback for the Bay Trail 100 feet from mean tide that have been completely ignored ▪ Potential shadows on the two existing public Recreation and Park Department parks at India Basin that have been completely ignored in the suggested heights. ▪ The incredible increase in density and traffic already generated by Hunters View and Shipyard developments must be considered in this planning process. There will be too many people here. The city needs some breathing room – like Golden Gate Park, like Marina Green, like the Presidio, like McLaren Park. Why not India Basin?

India Basin Shoreline: Objectives

This sheet contains all of the objectives from the draft Policy Framework. Workshop participants marked their top priority objectives (indicated in the number column). The objectives shaded in grey are the ones that received the most marks in each category.

Land Use

2	Objective LU-1	<i>Encourage a balanced mix of diverse land uses, and embraces India Basin's unique shoreline location and assets.</i>
1	Objective LU-2	<i>Identify an Emerging Technologies Employment District in India Basin that prioritizes job-generating, commercial uses.</i>
1	Objective LU-3	<i>Identify a Hillside Transition District along Hunters Point Boulevard to create a thoughtful transition between Hunters view and India Basin</i>
7	Objective LU-4	<i>Create a mixed-use Neighborhood Maritime Center District that serves as the center of India Basin and takes advantage of the area's proximity to the waterfront.</i>
2	Objective LU-5	<i>Create an Innovative Mixed-Use District around the India Basin Flats portion of India Basin.</i>
6	Objective LU-6	<i>Identify a Shoreline Access Recreation Zone where new open spaces and shoreline will be encouraged and existing open spaces will be maintained and improved.</i>
1	Objective LU-7	<i>Integrate India Basin with the larger Bayview Hunters Point community.</i>
4	Objective LU-8	<i>Develop new housing for a range of incomes to help address the City's and the region's housing shortfall.</i>

Community Design

5	Objective CD-1	<i>Encourage an urban form that reinforces India Basin's unique shoreline location, and strengthens its sense of place and character.</i>
11	Objective CD-2	<i>Promote an urban form that creates a walkable, pedestrian friendly environment and engaging public realm.</i>
2	Objective CD-3	<i>Encourage new buildings that contribute to the beauty and quality of the built environment, and respect India Basin's character.</i>

Preservation

9	Objective PR-1	<i>Celebrate and enhance India Basin's history and character.</i>
3	Objective PR-2	<i>Identify and evaluate historic and cultural resources within India Basin.</i>
6	Objective PR-3	<i>Encourage the rehabilitation of identified historic resources within India Basin.</i>

Transportation and Circulation

4	Objective T-1	<i>Improve and complete the street network in India Basin to serve existing and future development.</i>
9	Objective T-2	<i>Improve pedestrian and bicyclist circulation, safety and comfort.</i>
7	Objective T-3	<i>Improve public transit to better serve India Basin, and provide a viable transportation choice.</i>
3	Objective T-4	<i>Ensure the most efficient use of new and existing parking in India Basin.</i>

Open Space

4	Objective OS-1	<i>Provide attractive public parks, public places and open space areas that meet the needs of residents, workers and visitors and celebrate the area's proximity to the waterfront.</i>
1	Objective OS-2	<i>Create meaningful and accessible connections to other parks and open spaces in the area, to create a larger system of open space and recreational amenities in the area.</i>
2	Objective OS-3	<i>Ensure that existing and future open space, recreation, and park facilities are improved, well-used and well maintained.</i>
7	Objective OS-4	<i>Provide continuous open space along the shoreline in India Basin.</i>
2	Objective OS-5	<i>Require new development to provide high quality private open space areas.</i>
6	Objective OS-6	<i>Provide recreational amenities and programming to celebrate and activate India Basin's shoreline.</i>

Community Services and Facilities

8	Objective CS-1	<i>Provide and support essential community services and facilities to serve existing and future residents.</i>
5	Objective CS-2	<i>Improve linkages and access to community services and programming across neighborhoods within Bayview Hunters Point.</i>

Sustainability

3	Objective S-1	<i>Ensure the full clean-up and remediation of property in India Basin.</i>
9	Objective S-2	<i>Promote sustainable and green building practices in new development in India Basin.</i>
5	Objective S-3	<i>Encourage sustainable stormwater management systems in India Basin.</i>

Economic Development

3	Objective ED-1	<i>Develop economic programs to provide jobs for local residents.</i>
8	Objective ED-2	<i>Develop economic programs to support existing and future local businesses in India Basin.</i>
4	Objective ED-3	<i>Attract and retain sustainable and clean-tech businesses in India Basin.</i>