

***Below are a record of comments we have received to date on the Public Review Draft. These include both written comments and verbal ones from our November 20<sup>th</sup> community forum. (Verbal comments were transcribed from a tape and are as close as possible to a verbatim account of what was said.) Names have been removed from all the comments. The comments are in no particular order.***

-----

I have now read every page of the Balboa Park Neighborhood plan and feel even more strongly as if the city sent a genie who read my uncoagulated, inarticulate frustrations and longings about my neighborhood and solved them. I am so grateful for the enormous care and skill you directed toward discovering our problems and potential, and for the time and respect you accorded us residents in the process.

I am delighted with the improvements you came up with in every subsection of our Balboa Park area and amazed at the creativity of many, such as decking the freeway and consolidating the ramps and building over the Muni yards. I'm really happy with the multiple uses of space which keep the utilitarian and unlovely (parking, Muni infrastructure) unseen while gracing the visible with a pretty and village-like feel (human scale, art, landscaping, and outdoor amenities). I am fully satisfied with your identification of problem areas and thrilled with the changes you envision for each: the freeway changes, the multi-modal station, the Geneva Office building, both Muni yards, Balboa Park, the CCSF-station nexus, the reservoir, Phelan plaza, and the Kragen and Sunset lots. As a library employee, I'm looking forward to our new Ingleside branch. I am pleased with how your plan draws on our neighborhood's virtues and remedies its defects. I particularly like how you weave public open space, housing, small-scale enterprise, and civic works together, integrating the aspects of our urban existence in balance. I like the mix of incomes and vocations that your plan enables and the respect for scale and interactivity that goes along with the new housing and enterprise you map out. The very words you use convey humanistic warmth and conviviality, attributes that I value in a neighborhood. I used to live in the Inner Sunset, where these qualities obtain. I'm looking forward to seeing them develop here, for I miss them. In short, your values are my values and I'm delighted with your visions for my home.

I know that some of my neighbors are apprehensive about the private motor vehicle allowances in your plan. As a non-car-owning mass transit rider, by belief as well as preference, I share your orientation. I hope that the incentives and disincentives you provide have the desired effect of minimizing auto use. You've applied every trick in the book, so now it's just up to the citizens. Can car-sharing be done with a community low rate? The green VW company is still a bit steep for many sectors of our community (CCSF students, African-Americans, new immigrants, rental tenants).

I'm really happy with the prominent role you propose for art - the "art opportunities," the CCSF Performing Arts Center, and the uses of the Geneva Office Building. I'm glad you're building on our small but illustrious start: the Diego Rivera Theater and Cayuga Playground.

I have three concerns about the plan:

1) I worry that you, the guardian angels of the project, will disappear from the scene once the plan is finalized. Who or what will protect us from developer deals and City Hall cost-shaving? Who or what will mitigate the vocal, organized anti-housing minority and protect affordability? Does the plan have authority? I want to be sure that your beautiful ideas will be realized as written, with auto limits, housing/rental cost limits, and height and open space regulations intact.

2) The observation about artists being the spearhead of neighborhood renewal plants the dread of gentrification in me. You cited SoMa and SoHo: cases in point.

3) The demographics at all the meetings I attended were overwhelmingly Caucasian. If the other forms of input didn't offset that, I'm concerned. Our neighborhood is very mixed, with a large African-American substrate and a large recent Asian influx. Are these people's feelings and ideas included?

Can you do some targeted outreach before the plan is in stone - announcements and boosting of participation at the African-American churches and notices in Chinese, for example? One more time, thank you for your dedication, skill, and creativity in bringing forth this plan. If you need any writing, editing or proofreading work in future stages of publication of the plan, feel free to call on me. I would be very happy to be a part of the project, and those are my areas of skill.

-----

Dear Ken,

Although we have not been able to get a formal response from our entire organization, the Board of the Cayuga Improvement Association would like to commend the Better Neighborhoods project team for all their work in developing the Balboa Park Bart Station and surrounding neighborhood.

As a member of the District 11 Council, we support the D11 Council's comments on the draft plan.

We do have one major concern, however, that is unanimously shared by our membership. And that is regarding parking near the station. We are very concerned about housing units being built without adequate parking. We already have a severe parking problem east of the station, and with additional housing added, with no parking supplied, we anticipate even more problems.

Thank you for your consideration and we look forward to the next step in planning our neighborhood.

-----

Lick-Wilmerding High School would like to go on record as enthusiastically supporting all elements of the Balboa Park Station Area Plan. Last week, I attended the open session introducing the plans for City College's future development; the Health and Wellness Center especially should be a great addition to the neighborhood. We at the school are very excited about the transformation that seems to be in the works for our neighborhood.

-----

Dear Ken & team,

I live a block from Balboa BART station. Watching the neighborhood plan develop has given me such happy expectation and joy! Going on my daily rounds in our somewhat derelict, but redeemable neighborhood, I now see potential instead of stagnant decay. I love the vibrancy I can anticipate because of the parks, homes, small-scale shops, artwork, cultural centers and transportation improvements outlined in your plan. There is so much to look forward to! I have been very busy in school this semester and have been unable to attend the last two meetings or thoroughly review the draft you handed out in October, but I have it and will look it over well in December. I already know I love the general outline because my roommate told me it's very close to the earlier sketches. The freeway overpass/road sounds very good - much safer and traffic calming. The improved City College-BART connection sounds very positive. I will write more specifically in December or January, but for now, please take my gratitude for all the thought and creativity you've put into making our neighborhood what it can someday be. IMAGINE!

-----

## **Housing Action Coalition Comments on Balboa Park Station Area Plan**

The HAC feels that this is a fabulous planning document. The plan does an excellent job of articulating a vision for an area that is a hub of activity yet which is failing to live up to its potential as a vibrant urban place. The district, which includes a regional transit hub, a neighborhood commercial zone, a university campus, and community park space, is one of the Bay Area's major nodes. Yet, as the plan describes well, the area's many land use shortcomings sap it of vitality. The area can be so much more, and the plan succeeds in showing us that vision.

Our major concern is the lack of an Implementation Section. While the plan does an exceptional job at laying out a collection of key strategies, the absence of implementation guidelines substantially reduces the likelihood of attaining the plan's vision. A multitude of public and private entities are stakeholders in the area. As such, most key strategies require the actions of multiple parties. If each strategy section included a list of which entity needs to take what particular action, it would go a long way towards making this plan a reality. Furthermore, these actions should be presented in aggregate in an Implementation Section.

Overall, we are very impressed with the document. The layout is coherent. The graphic quality is high. It's easy to read. The language is clear. The document succeeds in communicating planning principles in terms that are understandable and engaging to both laypersons and professionals.

The following are more specific comments on the plan.

### **Document Organization:**

Great. Coherent structure makes sense.

### **Overview**

This is great work. We are very supportive.

We like the emphasis on connection between subareas within the district.

Page 5: we like the lack of a strong heart analogy. this is key.

Page 7: when you refer to decking over the freeway, give the page number where that is explained.

Page 8: where you talk about renaming the BART station to make a more "legible" sense of place... Consider developing this idea further in the document, to use a comprehensive signage program that promotes the district and helps create a sense of the larger district. (See page 32 discussion of Wayfinding Signage)

### **Background**

Pages 5, 15, others: the document gives inconsistent figures for the number of people who go to City College each day. Should stick with one, correct number.

Page 16: The subarea characterization is very helpful. The maps do a good job at identifying the areas. And the section does a good job of tying the problems to particular areas. That makes it more comprehensible.

Page 17: No direct pedestrian access causes pedestrians to take “shortcuts” through the maintenance yard. That’s an important clue we are getting from the users of the area about what works and what doesn’t work. Also, the crossing of busy streets is a big problem.

Page 19: Few City College students shop in the area – another key indicator of the lack of interconnection in the area.

Page 21: Reservoir subarea graphic – good.

Page 24: We like the 8 elements of a good neighborhood.

## **Key Strategies**

### **Design Streets for People**

The proposals are strong. Excellent street design principles. But it is unclear how they will be implemented. Will these just be ideas “sitting on a shelf” or will they happen? What’s the timetable? Who is responsible? How much will these improvements cost? Who will pay for them?

Page 27 and elsewhere where it says “Art Enhancement Opportunity”: Give a picture of art with the art enhancement opportunity text. It will make the point more effectively.

Page 28: Primary street map is good.

Page 32: Wayfinding signage: opportunity to create sense of place with a series of signs each showing the district as a whole and subareas & the pedestrian’s location within the district.

Page 39: Provide a graphic to go with the sidebar on the grid.

### **Quality Parks, Plazas, and Open Space**

Wonderful discussion about how to create great public spaces. But how will these principles be implemented? Who will build the new parks? Who will design them? Who will pay for them? Who will fix the sidewalks? Who will pay for the public improvements? When?

Page 41: lack of physical and visual linkages to Balboa Park is very important

Page 42: helpful cross referencing to other open space discussions. Should include more often through the document

### **Mixed Use Infill**

Page 47: add a discussion about the need for greater densities to support retail.

Page 47: make a stronger case for the need to increase densities on Ocean Avenue. Building on transit is where we have to meet our housing demand as a city. And this is part of a “deal” that keeps increased densities out of all the rest of the neighborhood.

Page 48: the reservoir site should be planned for a greater number of housing units. This site, in particular, is not being used to its potential.

Page 50, policy 2.1: the wording on the policy of lot mergers is unclear. Can one parcel be merged with another parcel, but not three parcels? Or no mergers at all? Prohibiting all parcel mergers might depress housing production more than necessary. Consider establishing performance criteria or maximum parcel sizes?

Page 50, policy 2.2: consider actually *requiring* all commercial uses to include a housing component. Prohibit single use (entirely commercial) development.

Page 52, policy 4.1: This case-by-case, conditional use policy is going to backfire terribly. The only way to encourage new housing development is to make developments that fit within “the plan” as-of-right, instead of conditional. Some developments may include demolishing existing units. But, that does not make the developments suspect per-se. The litmus test should be whether the proposed development conforms to the plan, not whether any housing units are demolished.

The way to get affordable housing is to increase the supply, have a strong inclusionary policy, and encourage subsidized affordable housing. This paragraph makes a false assumption that existing units are affordable. They are not, and over time they will be even less affordable. This policy would make virtually all new housing development, except on a few sites, conditional. This policy should be eliminated.

## **Build with A Sense of Place**

Pages 53, 4: It’s hard to read the colors on these maps, and the colors are quite important here.

Page 54: This map shows two critical areas where we believe the height limits should be increased: 1) the south side of Ocean Avenue should have 65 foot height limits; 2) the Phelan Loop and the Kragen sites should remain with the current 65 foot height limits. 65 feet is a very reasonable height for a neighborhood commercial street with rail running down it. Given the incremental nature of the proposed development, these height limits are probably the only way that enough housing will be added to revitalize the retail corridor.

Page 56: Add a new objective to this section: create an urban design response to the BART regional transit node. This objective needs to be balanced against the objectives of responding to existing neighborhood character. BART service here is as frequent as any major city in the country. There should be a visual marker of this node, a marker in an urban design sense. The quarter mile around the BART station is fundamentally different from the Ocean Avenue commercial street. Right next to BART, the densities should be significantly higher. This should include a tall building (200’) that would serve as a landmark for this important node.

Page 56: Again, keep the Kragen and Phelan Loop parcels at 65 feet.

Page 56: Increase heights on San Jose Avenue from 40 feet to 65 feet.

Page 56: The Upper Yard, on top of regional and local transit, should have taller buildings than 85 feet. The height limits along the 280 freeway should be at least 200 feet. The BART node deserves a tall, landmark building.

Page 56: Down-zoning the Geneva Office building is a good idea.

Page 56: The reservoir site would be more appropriately developed at 65 feet. And again, the south side of Ocean Avenue should be zoned for 65 feet buildings.

Page 57: Third bullet, restricting floor plate sizes. This is appropriate for small sites along Ocean Avenue. But some of the other, larger sites, should be able to have larger buildings, which would be regulated using other tools. Floor plates of 110 foot horizontal and 125 foot diagonal can be cost prohibitive due to the abundance of expensive exterior cladding. To enable a development proposal to “pencil-out”, horizontal plans of 220 feet and diagonal plans of 250 feet should be permitted. The goal of fine-grained streets and sidewalks can be achieved through façade treatments, setbacks, and other design features.

Page 60: Add Hardi Plank as an allowable material. This is a standard, high-quality construction material that is used in lieu of wood throughout the Bay Area.

## **Make Public Transit Work**

This section seems underdeveloped compared to the rest of the document. We need to be providing residents with some assurances that Muni will get faster. There should be a clear plan to achieve this.

## **Get Parking Right**

Great section. Very thoughtful. Very comprehensive.

This area is a transit node. People will continue to use the area’s many resources despite a control on parking. Maximum parking ratios will protect and enhance the pedestrian orientation of the plan. Currently, this area is unsafe for pedestrians. The three top characteristics of a Good Neighborhood identified by the Draft Plan are Walk to Shops, Safe Streets, and Getting Around Easily. Each one of these characteristics depends upon a safe and vibrant pedestrian environment. Parking maximums are a prime tool for creating such a place.

## **Transit Station Neighborhood**

This is an incredibly ambitious vision. We need to see more work on how to make it real. The parcels are controlled by public agencies whose mission is not to be developers. How will you solve the problem of motivating them to undertake redevelopment of their land? Who at the City will coordinate it? When will this happen?

Page 117: The Upper Yard should be zoned for much taller buildings. 200 feet would be more appropriate, stepping down to 65 feet on San Jose Avenue. This is the right thing to do from an urban design perspective (to mark the transit node) and from a housing perspective. It’s also the best way to actually convince the transit operators to develop their land. This parcel abuts a freeway. It’s an ideal place to put towers.

## **Phelan Loop Area**

Great urban design idea—extending the street grids.

Page 131 and 133: Allow 5 or 6 floors of residential, not 4. Heights should be 65 feet. Again, any commercial development such as grocery stores should be required to have housing above it. Like Ocean View Village and the Village at Petrini Place (Fulton/Masonic).

## Implementation Plan

This is the most important part of the document. The Housing Action Coalition would very much like to work with the Department to develop this. Every section should give a sense of implementation. And then it should be pulled together in the final section. It should include time lines, responsibilities, actions, and costs. We need to understand which agencies need to carry out which actions. If those agencies aren't bought into the plan, that should be resolved now. If the City doesn't want to fund aspects of the plan, that should be resolved now.

Overall, this is a superb document. It makes one excited about the possibility of creating dynamic urban areas. Good work.

-----

Greetings Ken,

I apologize for my late response regarding the proposed improvements to Balboa Park area. I'm visiting my Mom for the Holiday's and unfortunately don't have a copy of the plan with me. With that in mind I would like to mention what I support and what is of concern in your plan. I believe my comments are more specific to the Ocean Ave improvements.

I'm supportive of increasing the density of residents along Ocean Ave. I believe your proposal of increasing the density and number of floors of the units above the commercial space near City College is well thought out and will blend well with the height of the college buildings. I like the idea of expansive open spaces, street trees and other vegetation to help to break up the concrete and to improve the overall living conditions for everyone. In addition to the proposed open spaces I think it would be great if Valdez and Colon were continued further south with walking paths (green corridors) connecting these streets with the proposed parks to the south.

I live at 59 Hazelwood Ave. Traffic and parking is congested in this area when City College is in session. I recognize increasing the density of residents will in hand impact parking. With this in mind I believe to help alleviate this situation the narrow streets near City College should be turned into one way streets. Navigating the streets during high use hours is more of a problem than having to walk one or two blocks after finding a parking space.

The draft plan made no mention of an off leash dog area. Currently I walk my dogs around Balboa reservoir. It would be great if there was an area that I was permitted to bring my dogs to recreate off leash. Hopefully this will happen.

The overall plan if implemented will certainly improve and enhance the quality of life in our area therefore I support your proposals.

Thanks for your time.

-----

Ken

I want to thank for taking the time to present the Balboa/Ocean Avenue Plan to the Westwood Park Neighborhood Association (WPNA) last week. As you Can see, the Association and it's members are

interested and active enough to turn out in the numbers they did. I have been to other meeting with the city at Lick-Wilmerding over the past 6 months and have participated in the discussions there about the plan. I appreciate the city's view that Ocean Ave and Balboa Park need a redevelopment and I support most of the ideas put forth in the draft plan. I do, however, disagree with the city's idea that the neighborhoods will not be impacted by parking and traffic and your willingness to pass off this responsibility to DPT. Your plan does in fact impact the parking and traffic problems in Westwood Park and your plan requires it's own mitigation. In addition, the current traffic data available for Plymouth Avenue it not even being presented in the plan. Your data set is out of date and therefore your plan's conclusions are suspect. As I deal with the Westwood Park board, I will make certain that the Board's recommendation on the plan be heavily weighted toward the plan's mitigation efforts for parking and traffic. The reality is that a problem exists already and will only get worse if this plan is implemented. To circumvent a growing concern that the City's Planning department is trying to sweep this problem under the rug, I would suggest that the Planning Department contact the WPNA and provide written support for the Westwood Park Assn.'s application and request to DPT to initiate an Area-Wide Traffic Study for Westwood Park. It is the number one issue in this neighborhood and needs to be resolved. Thanks for the opportunity to comment on this plan.

-----

Dear Mr. Rich,

Thank you very much for presenting "The Plan" to the Westwood Park Association meeting. It was very informative.

It appears that you have put in a great deal of work into this plan, and I look forward to implementing it. I'm still a bit confused- where do we go from here? Do we lobby our supervisor? Does it get on a ballot somehow?

As for my comments on the substance of the plan, I agree with the people who spoke up about the need for infill. I understand I am in the minority, but I sincerely feel that my neighborhood has plenty of parking. I live at Plymouth and Montecito, and there are many spaces available for both residents and visitors. However, I would be happy to see a parking permit issued to discourage City College students from parking.

As for the Ocean Ave redevelopment project, I am very interested in forming a coalition to work with you on this. Please give me the names and phone numbers of everyone you think should be involved. This would include the property owners on Ocean Ave, the local business association members, and any neighborhood associations that might exist in Ingleside.

If the Westwood Park Association already has that information, please let me know, as I am not a Board member.

Thank you for your time.

-----

Ken,

Thanks for the opportunity to comment on the Balboa Park Station Area Plan. There's a lot here, so I am only able to comment on some of it. I have a few general comments, then some comments to specific sections of the plan. I would like to see the first priority be the immediate station area. Any redesign

should focus on making this an attractive and functional transit hub without impeding through traffic. Retail and commercial space at the station would be good, but I do not believe housing should be attempted at the Green Yard, the Upper Yard or the Geneva Yard. New housing should be located elsewhere in the plan area, and it should be designed for owner-occupied, family-oriented purposes. Adequate off-street parking should be designed with any new housing.

#### Street Trees (page 30)

It is unlikely that "closely spaced and sizable trees planted parallel and close to the curb ..." can be uniformly established in the sidewalk near the station. Please design attractive sidewalks, hardscape, and architecture around the station that look good without tree plantings. Planting tree clusters in places where trees will thrive is the right approach. Don't plant trees where they won't do well. You might want to hire a consulting arborist to evaluate any proposed plantings.

#### Pedestrian crossing at San Jose X Niagara

Crossing San Jose at Niagara St. by foot is difficult. I don't want to see a stop sign installed there at San Jose, but some kind of improvement should be made (pedestrian Island + yield-to-pedestrian sign?) should be made there as well as the other intersections mentioned.

#### Policy 1.6 (page 34 and 35)

Holloway Avenue would be a good place to emphasize bicycles.

Alemany is not a good place to emphasize bicycle. I'm not sure what is meant that Alemany is "overbuilt". It is an excellent thoroughfare for cars, and this should be its primary function. The Blvd already gets reduced to two travel lanes in certain spots to allow for safe left or right turn lanes. The focus should be to keep Alemany moving well for cars (and transit buses). Bicycles are more appropriate on the slower moving Cayuga and Mission Streets.

No bicycle improvements should be made to San Jose if it would reduce car, trolley or bus flow.

#### Policy 2.1 (page 36)

The area around Geneva X San Jose should be redesigned to allow good traffic flow through the intersection. Drop-off zones should be designed, so that they don't interfere with through traffic.

Currently, cars turning right (from Geneva west bound) to San Jose often are stopped by pedestrians crossing San Jose, so Geneva backs up there.

#### Policy 3.3 (page 38)

This policy only makes sense if adequate thoroughfares are available for cars, so people don't have an incentive to cut through neighborhoods (this means keep Alemany, San Jose, Geneva, and Ocean primarily designed for traffic flow ... including pedestrian).

#### Policy 1.2 thru 1.5 (page 49&50)

Focus on providing owner-occupied housing for families. Provide off-street parking in the planning process.

#### Policy 2.1 (page 63)

This is an excellent idea.

Please let me know if you have any questions about my comments.

Thanks.

-----

SAN JOSE AVENUE COALITION *SAVE OUR STREETS!*

163 Fair Oaks Street  
San Francisco, Ca.  
647-5183  
December 13, 2002

Planning Department  
City and County of San Francisco  
1660 Mission Street, Suite 500  
San Francisco, Ca. 94103-2414

Re: Public Review Draft Balboa Park Station Area Plan

Since 1998 our coalition of neighborhood and transportation groups has focused on the problems in the movement of people from the Mission District to the area covered in the Better Neighborhoods Plan for Balboa Park Station. We have worked with the Departments of Parking and Traffic and Public Works to make San Jose Avenue less of a freeway and more of a boulevard.

The Draft Plan that the Planning Department has prepared for the Balboa Park area contains many concepts we have long favored. Policy 1.6 focuses on Alemany, Holloway and San Jose as major bike routes through this area. Both Holloway and Alemany reach to the limits of San Francisco at the Ocean or Daly City. It might be well to point out in the final plan that the Valencia, Harrison and San Jose Avenue bike lanes carry bicyclists on safe and flat routes almost all the way to the Balboa Park Station from downtown. Balboa Park is the center of a cross-town bike route.

However planning needs to be done to connect the terminus of the present San Jose lanes at San Jose and Tiffany to Alemany and the Balboa Park area. Unsafe problems exist in a very small area that is highly congested by freeway and Bart traffic near Glen Park. The intersection of Bosworth and Lyell is particularly dangerous for pedestrians and bicyclists. We need to provide safer and flatter connections in this area in order to arrive at Balboa Park and Alemany.

Section 3 of Policy 1.6 needs to be rewritten to take note of the completion of the first phase of bike lanes in the Bernal Cut and to clarify the last sentence of the first paragraph which begins: "Where San Jose Avenue crosses under I-280..." We hope that the intention of the sentence is to make some improvement in the problem referred to above on Bosworth, but we cannot understand the sentence. The whole length of Bosworth needs to be studied. As to the Bernal Cut, our long-term solution for walkers, runners and bicyclists would be a two-way multiuse path on both sides of San Jose as it goes through the Cut.

We also would like to give our most fervent support to Policy 5.1 calling for person-movement-based performance measurements.

Finally, we would like to say that the draft document goes far beyond anything we could have imagined when the process began. The Planning Department should take great pride in having produced such a fine vision for the future.

Sincerely,

-----

After reviewing the Balboa Park Station Area Plan, I would like to express some comments. Overall, I believe the plan is very good. I like several of the ideas. However, the following are of concern to me:

1. Living in a close proximity to the BART station, I am concerned about parking situation in my area of the neighborhood. I feel the existing Parking Zone of V is not enough and that a new zone for the homes on the immediately surround streets to the BART station deserve a separate Parking Zone designation.
2. Crosswalks on both Geneva and San Jose Streets that are in non-controlled intersection should have the new flashing lights installed.
3. Street furniture that is recommended in the plan will become a target for homeless living and/or vandalism targets.

Additionally, I think the following are excellent ideas:

1. Bollards along sides of streets.
2. Cycling accessibility.
3. The redesign of San Jose (south of Geneva looking northeast) section DD in the plan.
4. The redesign of Balboa Park.
5. The Greatest Idea in the Plan, FREEWAY DECK!!!

-----

Ken,

I'm glad that we were able to attend the Westwood Park meeting to discuss the Balboa Park Station Area Plan. We learned a lot at the meeting, and look forward to other meetings/discussions as the plan continues on it's journey to completion. The plan is well thought out and quite comprehensive, but there are a few items that we would like to comment about and add to future versions of the plan.

As residents of Westwood Park, which is the most stable and wealthiest residential neighborhood affected by the plan, we would like to point out that all traffic, development and road changes must be done so as to ensure the continued health of the neighborhood. Parking, traffic and City College development are particularly worrisome with regard to Westwood Park. If the neighborhood is detrimentally affected by increased traffic, increased noise, more parking problems it could cause a drop in property values and desirability of the neighborhood. This would be tragic. The value and desirability of Westwood Park greatly benefits the nearby neighborhoods of Sunnyside and Ingleside and is already helping those neighborhoods achieve higher property values, desirability and pride of ownership.

The eastern and southern parts of Westwood Park are already negatively affected by parking/traffic problems from City College and Ocean Avenue. Some days and evenings we can barely drive down the streets with the congestion from parking and traffic from City College students. This affects many streets in the eastern part of Westwood Park, such as but not limited to Colon, Valdez, Hazelwood and Greenwood. Any City College plan must make realistic provisions for student parking. Westwood Park residents should also be provided permit parking. (It must be remembered that evening parking and traffic from City College is a huge problem which won't be addressed by permits.)

In addition any comprehensive plan for this area should include a new park with a children's playground. A park located in the reservoir would be fabulous and is much needed.

-----

Ken,

I'm a Westwood Park resident and Vice President of the Westwood Park Neighborhood Association (WPA). I have attended several of the community meetings at Lick-Wilmerding, read the Balboa Park Draft plan and helped organize the WPA neighborhood meeting last Tuesday.

I support much of the Draft Plan. The idea of bringing new vitality to this part of the city is very exciting. Specifically: a grocery store on the Kragen auto site, a new library, a revitalized Ocean Ave business district, and more small and large public green areas. Also, I support expansion of City College in a way that incorporates it into the community.

However, in Westwood Park there already exists significant PARKING and TRAFFIC issues. These are issues that affect the safety and livability of our neighborhood. My problem with supporting the Draft Plan as it is - is that it does not in any way adequately address these problems. These are not problems that are going to occur in the future when new housing is built - they exist now. They will only get worse. The Draft Plan only states that existing neighborhoods will not be affected except for traffic calming and beautification projects. Well, we need those traffic calming measures now! It is not realistic or genuine to state that the results of the Plan will not affect surrounding neighborhoods.

On Plymouth Avenue a recent traffic count by DPT found 7,000 vehicles per day traveling this street. Maximum speeds exceeded 60 mph. This count doubled from the last count 2 years ago. This is a narrow residential street and this traffic is a result of City College, Riorden HS and Ocean Avenue cut-through traffic. It is not safe to walk on this street with the speeds that people travel. It ruins the quality of the neighborhood. In the traffic data that was presented at one of the Lick-Wilmerding meetings, vehicular traffic was counted only on Miramar Ave at mid-afternoon when school was out of session. This data was presented as proof that there is not a current traffic problem. This leads me to believe that a much more thorough effort needs to take place to evaluate the current traffic and parking problems and solve them before I and I believe many people can support the final Balboa Park Plan.

As was evidenced at the WPA meeting on December 10th, I am not the only resident to feel this way. Approximately 10% of Westwood Park households showed up to this meeting and the overwhelming issue was that parking and traffic issues were brought up all along in the planning process and have not been adequately addressed in the Draft Plan.

Plymouth Avenue is only one example of current traffic and parking problems. There are many more. One concrete step that can be taken by the Planning Department to help build support for the Plan is to work with the Westwood Park neighborhood in their effort to get the Department of Parking and Traffic (DPT) to undertake an area-wide traffic study. DPT has officially recognized that we do have a significant problem by placing us on their list of neighborhoods eligible for the study. If the Planning Department can help us to get DPT to do the study early in 2003, I think that residents would feel better about supporting the final Balboa Park Plan.

The current Draft Plan proposes measures and incentives for encouraging new residents to not have cars. This may have an effect on some people, but not all. The bottom line is that more people, more business

and more public facilities will bring more traffic into the neighborhood. My impression of the Draft Plan is that it ignores this reality. And, of course, ignoring reality doesn't change reality.

Thank you and the rest of the Planning Department for all of your efforts to create a cohesive plan for this area. And thank you in advance for continuing to work specifically on these very real traffic and parking issues. We have a very active neighborhood in Westwood Park and I think you will find we are ready to work with you to identify and implement solutions.

I look forward to being able to support the plan.

-----

My primary concerns about the Balboa Park Station Area Plan are threefold:

1) I see too many parts of the plan depending on tight integration between the goals of the Planning Department and the policies of (and their enforcement by) other city departments. For example, if the use of automobiles is to be discouraged by restrictions on the number of new parking spaces attached to new construction, then DPT will have to develop effective parking rules, and be rigorous in enforcing those rules. My experience with parking problems in the Excelsior doesn't inspire any confidence in DPT's being able to come up with an effective solution to the problem, either here or around the Balboa Park Station area. Similarly, if population density rises along Ocean Avenue, then Muni will have to be able to provide additional service to that area. Muni has been under severe budgetary constraints for years, now, so I'm skeptical they'll be able to provide this additional service.

2) Some parts of the plan are simply too idealistic to be believable. Covering the freeway, or recapturing living space above a new Green Light Rail Center, are great ideas, but they're simply not going to happen. The cost for either project would be exorbitant, and the return too risky for an investor to take on. (As a matter of fact, one of the original proposals for the Light Rail Center was to bury it under Balboa Park. The project was feasible, but too expensive, and this at a time when the city's coffers were relatively full.) I think the Balboa Park Station Area Plan needs to provide a more realistic, fall-back position for improving and expanding access to the BART station and Muni transfer stops there, and the link between these areas and the Phelan Loop. Some parts of such a plan already exist, such as the Ocean Avenue reconstruction and BART's plans to reconfigure the Balboa Park station. Often, it's basic infrastructure improvements like these which have the greatest impact on revitalizing an area. It will be interesting to see what Ocean Avenue looks like two years from now.

3) I understand that the Planning Department is under much pressure to encourage as much new housing, especially affordable housing, in San Francisco as possible. However, the mayor's own Office of Housing's Consolidated report indicates that the number of affordable units which would need to be constructed in the city in order to have a negative effect on housing prices far exceeds that planned for all of the Better Neighborhoods projects combined. It's therefore questionable whether or not housing really should be such a priority item in the Balboa Park Station Area Plan.

I want to thank you and the rest of the Planning Department staff for this opportunity to comment on the plan, and for all of your efforts at outreach to the community.

-----

I personally cannot see much good about the plan for City College area Phelan to Ocean. At least half of the wild open space will disappear. There will be no more wild area in the middle of the neighborhood. Many people use the area but not to the detriment of its wildness. It is a great place to take a mile

walk or run without being in traffic. It is a great place to walk dogs and ride bicycles. That will not be true when the plan is finished.

Already Ocean between Plymouth and Miramar has lost a lot of parking places. Have you considered the fact that Ocean is a valley in between 2 steep hills? I for one, cannot shop on Ocean without parking spaces, because the hill where I live is too steep. The street now is not wide enough at intersections to do 45 degree parking making the loss of parking near the store a challenge for those who cannot walk well. There is no way I will shop on Ocean if I cannot park near the stores. I for one cannot carry heavy bags more than a few feet.

AS for moving the traffic, how do you think it is going to move if you've narrowed the street? People will now go through the neighborhood instead of the business district. Ocean is already a very busy street. How do you think making it narrower is going to make traffic move more smoothly?

It is clear to me that the people who made the plan do not live in this unique area and have no idea how our neighborhood works. Those people around Balboa park do not come to this neighborhood. Why would they when Mission Street is closer? Riding a bus to Ocean is not going to help them.

The people who come to Ocean Avenue live south over the hill in the Ocean View area. I eat almost everyday at the Mayflower restaurant. Most of the people that do not live within walking distance come from the Ocean View area. They drive to Ocean to do their eating and shopping and would not come unless there were enough parking places. Many are elderly and walk with the aid of a cane, or slowly and bent over.

I can't understand how anyone thinks we should be more connected to the bart station. All of our buses already go there. It is a long walk, but many people do it. The students will drive no matter what, because they work and cannot wait for the buses. It takes a good hour to get downtown from my house if I take the K or the bus to BART. Students often do not have an hour between the end of their shift and the start of a class or have to get to work right after class. Remember, we are on the outskirts of the city. Your plans will make it worse for all of us.

I also see no provision for parking spaces in the planned low income housing. If people cannot have an automobile, the place will become a ghetto. People need cars to get to jobs outside of San Francisco. Not everyone who lives in the city works in the city.

I really hope you rethink your "get parking right", because it is all wrong from my point of view, and I will soon leave the city if it all goes through. We live in a moderately dense area. There is room to walk dogs and ride bikes. You want to make it more dense along Ocean avenue. That will affect all of us even if we live a few blocks off Ocean. We will lose more than we gain. I have seen this happen to the area around the entrance to golden gate park. It has become so crowded, one cannot even shop there. I lived there before all of the changes and moved when it changed.

I own 129-31 Jules Avenue and don't like all of your so-called improvements.

-----

What follows are my personal comments on the Balboa Park Station Area Plan, from my perspective as a neighbor and transit rider. Generally, I think the Plan has many good elements, especially in the Ocean Avenue area, but is weak in how it analyzes infrastructure implications of transit improvements. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input.

1. Page 10: The Plan promises that a key strategy is to "Make Public Transit Work", but is in fact seriously deficient in exploring the infrastructure that will be needed to improve public transit at the Balboa Park Station hub. Passenger station and improved boarding logistics are proposed. But, unfortunately, the plan as a whole proposes reducing transit facility capacities while dramatically increasing the volume of transit passengers. It is proposed that Muni's Green Facility footprint is reduced; the Geneva Upper Yard is converted to housing; the Geneva Office Building is permanently converted to a non-transit use; and the Phelan Loop's capacity for layover and bus turnaround is reduced. No plan is offered for how these infrastructure elements will be replaced in kind, nor are there provisions for supporting the increased feeder service which a successful "transit hub" will require.

2. Page 10: The Plan offers a key strategy to encourage new housing, but fails to discuss the increased services which thousands of new residents will require. Can existing schools, utilities, roads and emergency services support the new development?

3. Page 36: There is a project in Muni's 20-year capital plan to construct a rail corridor along Geneva Avenue linking the Green Yard to the southern terminus of the new 3rd Street Light Rail line in Visitation Valley. This project would support a envisioned revitalization of the neighborhood around Geneva Ave, and link it more closely to the Balboa Park Station Hub. The Plan's proposal for Geneva Avenue east of San Jose does not take this rail corridor into account.

4. Page 37, Policy 2.4 & Page 127, page 130: The policy regarding redesign of the Phelan Loop should also support Key Strategy #5, "Make Public Transit Work." The level of service provided today by the 15 and 49 lines will not be adequate service in the future. Feeder service to Balboa Park Station is inadequate TODAY. If the overall Plan is successful, then increased passenger traffic and population densities will necessarily increase the demand for feeder service into the area, increasing demand for layover and turnaround capacity. Residents don't want layovers on neighborhood streets. Capacity equivalent to the current Phelan Loop, or greater, should be accounted for in the area; if not at the reconfigured Phelan Loop, then at another site in the Plan area; the current Plan REDUCES the Phelan Loop capacity. Capacity requirements should be included in the guidelines for development of the Phelan Loop facility.

5. Page 51, Policy 3.2: Establishing housing and retail as the principal land use in the transit station area promotes only one strategy, to the exclusion of the others. New housing is important, but should not trump all other concerns. For the transit station area especially, the principal goal should be making feeder transit attractive, safe and efficient for transit patrons. No matter how many housing units are built within the "transit village", the vast majority of transit patrons will be accessing the station from neighborhoods outside the immediate station area. For example, a major housing development at Geneva & Bayshore will dramatically increase patronage from the Geneva corridor. Land use in the station area should give priority to "transit first" improvements: the station and boarding areas, rail and bus feeder access, ride-share and parking (if any), uses consistent with the Geneva Office Building anchor, and passenger amenities with appropriate retail. Policies 3.3 and 3.4 should rank higher. Housing should be a subordinate priority in the immediate station area.

6. Page 51, Policy 3.3: The presumption that housing in the immediate station area must be maximized is flawed, and the statement that building height can be much larger than the surrounding neighborhoods is inconsistent with the policy to achieve balance with the neighborhood context. Glen Park Station is cited on page 47 as a model, where the scale of the station fits comfortably into its surroundings. West Portal and Noe Valley (also cited) share this characteristic. Imagine four-story or five-story structures around Glen Park station: They would dwarf the surrounding neighborhood, and isolate the area. Likewise, large multistory structures around Balboa Park Station would impose an urban canyon within

an otherwise residential neighborhood, and would permanently divide the neighborhoods, rather than uniting them. To create an inviting and "human-scale" public space, the new structures should match the scale of existing structures.

7. Page 56: If the height limit of the Geneva Office Building is 40 feet, then a height limit of 85 feet (5 to 7 stories) across the street in the Upper Yard would dwarf the historic structure.

8. Page 63, Objective 1: In order to maximize the potential of Balboa Park Station as a regional transit hub, there are many more infrastructure elements to consider than those cited. The most critical defect of this section is the failure to recognize the need to build for expanded future service. BART lines will carry more passengers in the future; and the existing MUNI lines will have to be expanded to support additional lines and increased passenger loads. The Plan should explicitly examine what facilities will be required to support future service expansions.

9. Page 64, Policy 3.1, & page 114: The Plan should not cite a brand-name product, "NextBus", which excludes competing suppliers who may win future contracts. The words "NextBus passenger information system" should be replaced with "vehicle arrival announcements and passenger information systems".

10. Pages 66: Policy 1.1 is ill-advised and should be deleted. Parking requirements for parcels near transit should retain the existing residential minimum. Most residents who live at the transit hub, even if they use public transit for their daily commute, will want a car for trips to places not served by transit, or out of the City, especially since their access to the freeway will be so convenient! Can a car-share facility (policy 6.1) meet this need? What actually is occurring, as densities in existing neighborhood housing increase, the street parking situation is getting out of hand. Parking on the sidewalk is now routine, beyond the capability of DPT to keep up. Proposing to solve the problem by relying on increased law enforcement is not good planning.

11. Page 70, Policy 5.1: No off-street parking for BART or MUNI is bad as a blanket policy. The parking lot at Glen Park Station is a good model, allowing parking for 5 hours only; I often use it myself, especially for night trips downtown. A small parking lot in the Balboa Park Station Area could function similarly, and could be combined with a car-share facility. The Geneva Car House will have a much better chance for a viable commercial use if parking is available. The statement that some parking "would preclude new mixed-use development" does not make sense and is not supportable. Development of some revenue-generating public parking at City College should also be considered.

12. Page 72, Policy 6.1: A car-share facility must be required for any residential development near the station area where the parking spaces are limited in the manner proposed by Policy 1.1.

13. Pages 103-108: The discussion of the Transit Station Neighborhood does not take into account Muni's Historic Rail fleet housed at the Geneva Yard. As Muni's historic fleet grows and the service evolves as a signature element of San Francisco's transit and tourist attractions, the questions of how and where the growing historic fleet will be housed and maintained cannot be brushed aside. Requirements for the Geneva Yard at this site should be recognized and planned for. There may also be opportunities which have not been explored: with the City restoring a historic rail structure within the station area, it would be logical to discuss how the historic fleet operating through the area could be integrated into the "transit village" ambiance.

14: Page 120, Geneva Office Building Rehab Guidelines: To attract a viable commercial use, the guidelines should be revised to provide at least some parking.

15: Page 120, Geneva Office Building Rehab Guidelines: There should be a policy to reserve some space in the historic rail building to be dedicated to recognizing the original use of the building, perhaps a combined small museum area with transit information and ticket sales. Muni's Cable Car Museum is a good model.

16: Page 121, "Donut Shop": Is the Donut Shop privately owned? Is an eminent domain action contemplated here, or simply a restriction on future development? In either case, the former Brentwood site at Ocean and San Jose would be a much larger site, and perfectly suited to a housing project. Has this site been considered?

17: Page 122, Green Yard Air Rights: The plan discusses residential units at street level along Ocean and San Jose Avenues. This implies that the existing footprint of the Green Yard would be significantly reduced. How does the plan propose to mitigate the reduction in rail yard capacity?

-----

December 15, 2002

Ken Rich  
San Francisco Department of City Planning  
1660 Mission Street  
San Francisco, CA 94103

Re: District 11 Council Comments on Draft Balboa Park  
Better Neighborhoods Plan

The District 11 Council enthusiastically supports the Draft Better Neighborhoods 2002 Balboa Park Station Area Plan. Thank you for undertaking this planning effort; the results are excellent. We particularly endorse the proposed design guidelines for the new buildings, streets and open spaces proposed for the plan area. The Council and its member organizations, working with the Better Neighborhoods project team, look forward to finalizing the document and implementing the development strategies presented in the plan.

We request that you extend the comment period for 30 days to January 15, 2003 so that our member organizations can prepare written comments on the plan. Here are our major comments on the draft plan.

District 11 Council Comments on the Draft Better  
Neighborhoods 2002  
Balboa Park Station Area Plan

Ocean Avenue commercial district west of Phelan:  
p 50, Objective 2: how about identifying Ocean Avenue  
landmark buildings, such as the El Ray Theater (Voice

of Pentecost church), first commercial building at east end of Ashton-Victoria block, Kimura building near Ashton on the south side of Ocean, the former American Legion building at Ashton, former Bank of America building at Faxon, Java on Ocean building at Faxon, Brannigan Building at Capitol, Ingleside Presbyterian Church at Granada.

p 58, bottom para: Make this composed façade discussion into a design strategy, objective, etc. for Ocean Avenue and other project streets!

p 59, 4th para: Special building elements and architectural expressions, For example, a building at Geneva and Ocean, the landmark building in the Phelan Plaza

p 80: we have enough fast food restaurants on Ocean! And adding greasy spoon fast food ground uses discourages virtually any multi-use upstairs uses. There is a pre-existing fast food moratorium for Ocean to accompany the West Portal financial institution moratorium. Are there any fast food restaurants that are not greasy spoons?

p 88, Policy 3.4: no parking lot entrances from Ocean should be allowed because cars will back up on Lee St extension and on Ocean itself trying to access this "short cut" entrance. If necessary, a vehicular exit only should be allowed, or perhaps only an emergency vehicular exit only. Pedestrian entrances and exits from the Phelan Plaza should be provided, to encourage pedestrian connections to the plaza and the Ocean Avenue businesses.

What is a necessary parking supply? City College students and staff seem to have an ever-increasing need for more parking. The Plan needs to be more specific on this subject. How about suggesting the new reservoir garage will have 10 percent fewer spaces than the existing reservoir striped parking places and alternative commute incentives will be developed starting now?

p 90, Bullet 3: why can't the new Brighton Avenue Green contain a linear children's playground? This may be a better location than the PUC right-of-way, in part because playground equipment must be anchored into the ground. See, for example, the new Crocker-Amazon play structures.

p 126: Phelan Loop Plaza: how about, no cars 8-5 weekdays; allow limited parking along east side evenings and weekends except during special events when cars are excluded. Use roll curbs in Phelan Plaza area.

p 126, East-West Lane: Buses should not be run through the Loop along this route because the Plaza is supposed to be a pedestrian sanctuary. If no better solution is developed, the buses should enter on Phelan, lay-over behind the fire station, and exit along the west side of the fire station. Thereby, pedestrians will have a way to avoid the bus route as they access City College.

pp 127-128: These two drawings of the proposed Phelan Plaza differ. The p 128 version is preferable because there is no vehicular access on the West side of the plaza. However, the p 127 drawing shows a very lively, active building with decks, bay windows and sidewalk retail enlivening the plaza space. Please combine the best features of each.

p 130: Phelan Loop building as Landmark building. Yes! But how can this be achieved?

p 134, Building Form and Massing: Why not allow mixed-use residential-retail on both Kragen buildings? Perhaps office spaces or art studio work spaces in conjunction with the Gallery GOB project? Why not require some types of active ground floor use here?

p 130, 2nd to bottom para, Phelan Loop development guidelines: Fourteen ft sidewalks are required along Ocean Ave. here.

Balboa Reservoir:

p 11, para 4: Key Strategy 9. Timeliness is a critical element in dealing with the never used Balboa Reservoir. The plan should say so here as you do earlier on the imagine page, para 5. Fifty-five years is long enough for a never used and not maintained reservoir to blight our neighborhood.

p 42, map: Please show the alternative Balboa Reservoir open space layout that features a 6 acre oval park surrounded by housing. For this graphic, show the oval open space area surrounded by housing. The housing on the west side should show landscaped back yards backing up to the existing back yards along Plymouth.

p 48, table: reservoir 2 housing totals should be about 500-600 housing units at 28ft for western half of the site and 35 ft for the eastern half –or perhaps 28 ft for both sides. How did you come up with the 1000 units of housing total?

p 86, last para, Objective 1: Landscaping of the Balboa Reservoir area is required on all sides, not only the West Side, during any redevelopment effort.

p 89, Policy 4.3: Reservoir housing should back up to the backyards along Plymouth. No backyards should face a public park/public street if possible. The new housing should face the new park space. An oval street should define the park space; the layout of the Westwood Park streets should be used as a suggestive model in laying out the new oval street and park. The new backyards—landscaping area—should be backed up to the Plymouth backyards. The percentage of park/open space and housing should be about 50-50: 6 acre park, 6 acre housing area.

p 90, Bullet 5, 2nd to last line, Balboa Reservoir design guidelines: add bicycle to pedestrian access

p 129 PUC easement: What is the reason for closing it at night? To protect the back yards of Plymouth Avenue homes? Is this proposed evening walkway closure the reason why the new Brighton green is the main pedestrian access from Ocean to the planned playground on the PUC reservoir site? This is an awkward proposal--who would manage this right of way space—open and close it, maintain it, etc.?

Ocean Avenue east of Phelan:

p 37, Policy 2.3: Please specify an alternative use for the parcels of public land on Ocean immediately east of the beginning of Geneva Avenue. Apartment building(s) on these sites will eliminate this messy eyesore. Also, I have been told that the pedestrian bridge does not meet current seismic standards. Should it be replaced with a well designed new structure, or be eliminated? Is a new bridge needed and who would pay for it?

p 37, Policy 2.3: Pedestrian improvements west of Phelan on Ocean should be extended east of Phelan to San Jose Avenue.

We need wider sidewalks on Ocean from Phelan to San Jose for pedestrians. This stretch also needs pedestrian lighting.

Transit station area:

p 46, bottom para: The corner of Balboa Park at San Jose and Ocean should not have vehicle parking. Is it possible to have a gateway pedestrian entrance to Balboa Park at or near Ocean and San Jose as well as on Ocean just east of the freeway, across from the BART entrance?

p 54, Objective 3: Link together isolated sections of the plan area with new mixed-use infill buildings, Yes, like the Ocean-Geneva parcel!

A 160 ft height for buildings on the Green Facility seems high. We recommend a Green Facility airspace height limit of 80 ft plus an additional 5 ft additional for buildings that will have retail space at the base. Shadow studies should be completed to see if any buildings would cast important public open spaces/buildings around the station area in excessive shadow.

Have you done a shadow study of the impact of Upper Yard development on the Geneva Office Building? What are the results?

p 64, Policy 2.3: wouldn't the decking over of the freeway provide for more MUNI lines to serve Balboa BART Station and make it a more comprehensive and useful transit center? This seems to be the main reason why such a deck would be funded by transit funding sources. A bullet listing of the advantages of such a deck should be provided in the plan.

p 117, 5: stores and restaurants should have a street presence as well as a plaza presence

p 118: no blank walls on sidewalk facing San Jose Avenue, please!

p 119, 1st para: distinct sections should be at 30 ft intervals, not 90 ft. How about 2-90ft buildings, each divided into 30 ft sections?

The bullet on San Jose Avenue massing seems to allow buildings up to 100 ft wide; if so, such a building should be divided into 25 ft sections. Or better, 25 ft wide buildings, per earlier urban design

guidelines.

p 123, No. 11, concluded: do not mention high rise here, although the heights for building on the Green facility does indicate high rise development. How do you define high rise? High rise buildings are inappropriate for this plan area. Town house, not high rise should be the operative word for the Balboa Park Station area plan.

p 71, top bullets: add Geneva Office Building to bullet 4, priority on-street parking categories for transit station neighborhood

Under-grounding, street-lighting, street furniture:  
p 38, Policy 3.2: As your photo on p 22—and other photos on other pages—shows, under-grounding of overhead utility wires on residential streets would eliminate a major source of government-sponsored blight on these streets. You should add a policy to make this point for the improvements of residential streets.

p 30: specify that main streets in the project area, San Jose Avenue and Holloway, have the overhead utility wires under-grounded.

Under pedestrian-scaled lighting, the plan should specify white light for major streets with high levels of pedestrian or bicycle activity. See San Francisco's Outdoor Lighting Plan for guidance.

p 32, 8: street furniture, What about some standards for utility boxes? They are the most ubiquitous and fastest growing category of street furniture.

p 99: add utility wire under grounding here. Photo on p 100 is another example of the need to underground.

Sidewalk width:

p 33, Policy 1.4: To carry out this policy, the sidewalk on the north side of Ocean Avenue from Plymouth to Phelan Avenue should be 14 ft wide, the width of the existing sidewalk from Granada to Plymouth on the north side. At locations such as the McDonald's block on the south side of Ocean, and other blocks where substantial redevelopment could occur, sidewalk widening to 14 ft should also be required. Also there should be a policy in this plan for widening sidewalks where appropriate when partial block redevelopment occurs in the future.

p 135 Building Setbacks: We need 14ft sidewalks along Ocean and other plan main streets wherever possible. What is the proposed width of sidewalks along the extended streets to the north at the Krage and Phelan Loop sites?

Bicycle routes:

p 34: We endorse your Bike Boulevard/landscaping proposal for Holloway! Maybe it should be called a Bike Avenue instead, given its narrow width. We understand that given Holloway's narrow width, bike lanes will not be painted-on; instead the street will be considered multi-use. How about generous bicycle lanes on Phelan Avenue that connect to Holloway and San Jose Avenue?

p 35, 3. Establish San Jose Avenue as a major north-south bicycle route: underground the existing overhead utility wires along this street. Landscape the route of the bike route.

Urban design and art enhancements:

p. 38, Policy 3.1: Provide special treatment at gateways to residential neighborhoods, Excellent idea, but how will this be accomplished?

p 51, Objective 3: If retail-restaurants spaces are to have a life after 6PM, they must have a presence on, be visible and easily accessible from, public streets.

p 53, art enhancement: City College, Caltrans and BART should have art enhancement programs of at least 2 percent for this plan area. Private developers who build in the project area should have a 1 percent arts requirement just as they do downtown.

p 60, 2: The Ground Floor: Add 5 ft height and require 15 ft ground floor spaces on all major project streets where ground floor retail is planned.

p 61, Standards 3rd para: why not prohibit surface parking within 30 ft of the curb on all lots in mixed use districts?

MUNI Metro:

p 39, Design Streets for People, Objective 5: say a few words about how this relates to San Francisco's Transit First policy here.

p 64, Policy 3.1: Institute a program of upgrades to transit stops. Yes!

p 105: these MUNI Metro route change alternatives have never been publicly discussed. The rationales for these alternatives are not presented here. There may be other alternatives as well as those presented. Therefore, it is premature to present them in this document.

Ken -

It's obvious that a lot of thought and planning has gone into this plan. However, as a 10-year resident of Westwood Park (Hazelwood Avenue), I have a few concerns:

1. Traffic/Parking - We signed to purchase our home in June (1992), when City College was off for the summer. Imagine our surprise when we moved in in August, to encounter the traffic and parking problems which exist in this neighborhood - speeding drivers who don't slow down even though the streets are narrow, parked cars that block driveways, very little respect for the people (including young children!) who live (and play) in this jewel of a neighborhood. The proposed plan will increase the density of housing, which can only mean more cars. This will only exacerbate the existing traffic/parking problems, especially since the plan proposes to develop the reservoir, with the net effect that parking spaces will be lost for City College students, who already view our neighborhood as their parking lot. And as the plan proposes to narrow Phelan Avenue and Ocean Avenue to 1 lane each direction. How do you think all the increased traffic is going to get around - because people who currently come/drive through this area will continue to do so, as will the new residents of all the developments proposed, as will people who come to shop/hang out in this area as a result of those enhancements.

2. Housing - I am greatly concerned (and opposed to) 5 story developments on the reservoir along Phelan Avenue. This is simply not acceptable, because it's too tall and too dense, and can only negatively impact our neighborhood traffic/parking-wise, not to mention the value of our homes.

While I certainly appreciate the desire to (re)vitalize the Balboa Park Area and make improvements that need to be made, I think that the impact on the surrounding neighborhoods needs to be more seriously considered and addressed, rather than assuming that appropriate measures will be taken in the future (as the plan seems to assume).

-----

I found a lot of typos, but I consider it your job to find them all, not mine.

I've attended most of the Balboa Park Better Neighborhoods meetings. I see that many ideas our neighbors brought to your planning team have been respected and added to your Public Review Draft. Thank you very much for acknowledging much of what we think.

I find little else to say on the older material, but I have had a few additional thoughts since the last meeting at Lick Wilmerding.

page 34: Bicycle Boulevard. I'd like more info about and pictures of the bike boulevard that Ken mentioned is in Berkeley. Right now, bikers and cars together are hell on Holloway Street. No stop signs?

I as a car or bike driver would love no stop signs on Holloway, but how does Berkeley stop cars from speeding? More details, please.

page 89: West Balboa Res. Are you continuing (extending) San Ramon and Wildwood Streets into this proposed residential area from Westwood Park? You should. I think the configuration of housing is not quite right. Why shouldn't the new housing have back yards abutting the already existing back yards of homes on Plymouth Street?

Housing with parking spaces, in general-- When I go by Holloway Terrace (an affordable housing project built in about 1990), and one of the Holloway Terrace residents has their garage door open, I always see that the garage is chock full of junk. All of these residents have decided to fill their car garages with junk and park their cars on the public street. To try to make sure that people really use their designated-built parking space for really parking a car, I suggest that new residential private parking spaces be constructed without privacy walls. Take for instance the housing proposed on West Balboa Res. Make sure the builder builds a large common area for residents' parking; do not build single walled-in garages for each unit, as was done on Holloway Terrace.

One last thing that I mention again since last meeting. How do we get all city departments to cooperate and follow through on all these good ideas? Our experience with MUNI, and just trying to get them to implement a few basic first steps on Phelan Loop planning has been very frustrating. Muni intends to build a full parking lot on their property in the Phelan Loop. The parking lot will go right up to a narrow sidewalk, where up to 70 City College students will be waiting in the rain and wind for a streetcar to come. DOES MUNI REALLY AND TRULY BELIEVE IN "TRANSIT FIRST"? Muni promised to work on improving the Phelan Loop with many of us. A Ms. Magaray from Muni just testified at the BOS last week that they are working with Better Neighborhoods on improving the Phelan Loop, yet in these times when budget shortfalls are over all our heads, MUNI persists in using precious funds to build a place where private cars will be parked and MUNI riders are standing on a narrow sidewalk in front of heavy Ocean Ave. traffic with no comforts or considerate designing for their riders' benefit. Disgusting! We really need to figure out how to get through to city bureaucracies that good city planning overrules their stubbornness and stupidity.

-----

Object: Balboa Park station Area Plan

Dear San Francisco Planning Department,

I read the public review draft, and I want to congratulate you for this outstanding study and the document that describe it.

But, as a SUNSET property owner, resident and father of three teenagers, I am concerned by the choices made for the redevelopment of this part of our city. The Balboa Park station area is not far away from the SUNSET district, and could provide his residents with some of the services and amenities that we are missing.

The 8<sup>th</sup> elements of a Good neighborhood read: "Part of a whole – great neighborhoods make great cities. .... Stand out on their own, YET ARE CONNECTED TO THE CITY. ...BUT ALSO A PART OF THE

CITY'S WIDER COMMUNITY". As a resident of the SUNSET, I do not think that this objective has been fulfilled.

The SUNSET district is a nice neighborhood, very enjoyable for families and young people enjoying open space and outdoor activities. But even we are part of San Francisco City, we are geographically isolated and could be easily described as a "suburb" within the city.

We do not have:

- Easy access to downtown
- Easy access to major commercial shopping area
- Easy access to entertainment's facilities (movie theaters, performance center, clubs...)
- Easy access to jobs

I do not have recent statistics on where do SUNSET residents go to work, shop, study and entertain themselves, but I bet a lot of them head south to the peninsula through the 101/280 freeways, instead of staying in San Francisco.

The new Ocean Avenue Commercial District and Balboa Park Station redevelopment, could be a place where residents from the Western part of the city find what they are currently missing, at a more closer location than SF downtown or the peninsula commercial malls.

· Major commercial shopping area: I do not understand why your plan does not include zoning for major retail tenants. Why limiting retail to 10,000 sq.?

· Movie Theater: the only modern movie theaters close to SUNSET are the Kabuki on Geary, the AMC1000 on Van Ness, and the new Century 21 by the daily City BART . We can NOT miss the opportunity to locate a new movie theater multiplex at the Balboa Park Station; movies are mainly viewed by teenagers ( I will be the father/stepfather of 3 by the time development start!), and students, and here they are nearby at CCSF!

· Community Performance Center: Not all San Francisco cultural performances have to be downtown! There are many schools and organizations in the western part of the city that need a public and modern facility (other than old churches...) to practice and present to the public and families their talents (through shows, choirs, concerts etc...) or local artist who wants to "experiment"; We NEED a Community Performance Center to serve the west/south part of the city, and the Balboa Park location fit well..

· Jobs: It said (page 47, Policy 1.1) that " housing is the most appropriate type of development in the plan area...supported by a modest amount of neighborhood-oriented commercial establishments". I disagree. If you observe neighborhood like West Portal, you realize that street animation peaks everyday after 4/5Pm, for a couple of hours, when commuters come back from work, and shop before heading home. And during the weekends. On the contrary, SF downtown maximum street animation is weekly between 11:00am and 2:00pm, when all the employees lunch and shop. During the weekend, downtown is a ghost town! So you need a mix of local residents and local jobs to bring "a critical mass of people living on or near main commercial streets (...) to give urban neighborhoods their vitality, interest, safety and convenience" at all time. The Balboa plan should incorporate some office space to bring jobs in the area.

The Balboa Park Station hub could be a “connector point” between the south/west part of the city and downtown at one level, and the Bay Area at another level through BART. It can also become a place where the residents from Sunset, Parkside, Forest Hill, St Francis Wood or Ingleside would converge to study, shop, entertain, perform, and even work. Only then, the new Balboa Park Intermodal Transit Station will be “part of the city’s wider community” and serve the needs of this community.

Thank you.

-----

Hi Ken:

Thanks for the chance to review the Balboa Park Station Plan. I have a few comments which might be useful for your review. Of course, these are my humble opinions and not necessarily representative of any FTA position.

1. Street Furniture: I would think that bus shelters might be useful in places where there are none. Also, I would consider "doggy waste bins" as a pedestrian amenity. I think that neighborhoods and residents would be much better off and congenial if dog waste receptacles were located in key locations where dog walking occurs.
2. Policy 1.2: p. 33: Crosswalks should be made friendly to those who are sight and hearing impaired. For those with impaired vision, audible beeps help us know when to cross streets and where.
3. Policy 1.6: p. 34: Bike lanes. Is there a way for the city to create a double-red traffic light pattern for exclusive bike use, no other vehicular movement -- a four way red light, which would allow bikes and pedestrians to make left or right hand turns crossing two lanes of traffic (as exists in the Financial District)? For example, if a bike is going eastward down Market Street, and wants to take a left to go up Polk Street, it cannot be done without going around the block, like a car, to get into a westbound lane. This is not a bike-friendly approach.
4. Quality Public Open Space. Is there any provision to create a quieter urban environment? Currently, as you know, there are no federal noise standards governing ambient vehicular noise, and predictably, cities rarely enforce noise ordinances restricting vehicular noise. The police will not enforce a vehicular noise complaint unless they are able to hear the offensive noise themselves. The noise level from one motorcycle is approximately 80-90 decibels, which is the same level as being within one foot of a high-speed blender. It would seem that a progressive urban environment would promote the establishment of lower ambient noise levels within the urban area. "Background" natural noise is about 40 db. Street noise could be proposed as < 60 db within 5 feet of a noise source.
5. Mixed-Use Infill Development, Emphasize Housing, p. 47. As I look at the various Better Neighborhood proposals, one of the things that I think they all might benefit from is a public-use facility: a meeting room, an auditorium, a dance hall, in effect. In the little towns of New England, there are village "granges" or Shaker "Meeting Places", which are buildings for public meetings, events, dances, etc. The "grange" served as a nondenominational, independent meeting place available for all people, regardless of affiliation. It is true that churches and schools serve this purpose, but they are not permanent neighborhood meeting facilities, nor is it their primary mission. In addition, now that the city has moved towards District-based elections, wouldn't it be useful to have a district-based public space for civic purposes?

6. Policy 1.5, P. 49. Parking Costs. Design building units without parking included, as you propose, but give residents who rent such units a 10% reduction in the market rent from other comparable units with parking. It could be consider a transit subsidy.

7. Policy 4.2: Control Dwelling Unit Mergers. Would it be feasible to establish covenants governing new developments such that some units in these new multi-density developments are given an "automatic" condo conversion option, if purchased and exercised appropriately, while others are not? The units that cannot be converted into condos would cost less, rent for less, and not be subject to rent control. I think one of the larger holes in the current condo conversion approach is that all units in a property must opt in, while those who do not agree to 'condo-ize' would get to rent such a unit for life. Current policy turns what should be a win/win into emotional trauma for all.

8. Objective 3, p. 64. Improve the Quality of the Transit Experience.

Propose the development of a "smart bus shelter", one that has internet capability, at least with data ports and connection to a WI-FI or wireless public LAN, and maybe an internet-capable terminal for cruising transit websites.

8. Public Transit

Objective 2, p. 63: Consider incorporating "Nextbus" - type passenger information displays at all bus stops. All bus stops should have transit information displays, toll-free numbers or telephones connecting to TRAVINFO, the regional transit information network hosted by MTC. The telephones could also serve an emergency function.

Policy 5.1: Do Not Provide Off-street parking to serve BART or Muni. I think this policy would discourage transit use and be somewhat counter productive to the goal of reducing vehicular traffic downtown. As some point, somewhere along BART or MUNI, there will have to be parking for commuters coming into the City from other parts of the region. It is true that commuters could park at Colma or SFO or elsewhere in the East Bay, but I think that a satellite parking facility -- especially a high-rise structure -- in San Francisco near a BART or Rail transit station, but not downtown, would be useful. CALTRAIN has parking at Fourth Street. Carpooling to a BART station would be more feasible if people had a central place to leave their vehicles. For example, Phelan Loop could be used a MUNI facility AND a public parking garage. Transit ridership could increase.

If vertical parking structures are proposed, the City should set forth strong design guidelines for the aesthetics of such buildings. It should be City policy to eliminate surface, horizontal parking lots. The City's approach seems to be to develop vertical parking only in the downtown, to draw crowds to Union Square/Chinatown. It would be better traffic management to have the City mandate new parking lots according to a "hub-and-spokes" system: vertical parking in outlying areas attached to termini of the BART and MUNI lines, with selected lots in between, but well away from the City Center. City policy initiatives such as these would benefit BART and MUNI because currently they can only build parking on lots that they already own, on which there is little open space.

Policy 5.3, p. 71. If TRANSLINK is successful, then there may not be any need to make the MUNI system pass a valid payment mechanism outside San Francisco county. The policy would appear outdated.

Page 112. Freeway deck and transit center. Very impressive idea. I didn't know the concept had been developed so well...

Page 114. "New large glass bus shelters". I would have to caution against glass sidewalls for bus shelters. Although I like the use of glass as roofing on the Embarcadero line, it would be better not to use glass. The shelter could be a roof supported by an I-beam, but without walls.

Page 121. Is there a way to develop direct "safe" pedestrian links/ROW between the SFUSD school parcels and MUNI/BART?

-----

#### Balboa Park Plan Comments

1. Page 59: Maximum building heights on Kragen Auto & Phelan Loop sites need to be reduced from 55 feet to 45 feet. The entire length of Ocean Ave from San Jose to Junipero Serra currently does not have more than 3 stories or less than 40ft. 55 ft height is completely out of character with all the neighborhoods in this area.
2. Page 59 Western half of reservoir height, closer to Westwood Park, needs to be reduced from 40 feet to 30 feet. Westwood Park height limit is only 28 feet. Again, you need to adhere to existing residential neighborhood guidelines.
3. Page 66 Residential minimum parking requirements must not be replaced with maximum. You continually insisted you wanted to give developers flexibility. By doing so, you have totally ignored the residents' needs. We have a severe parking problem already and this maximum will negatively impact our neighborhood quite severely.
4. Page 66 Commercial and institutional minimum parking must not be replaced with a maximum. There is not enough parking currently to serve current needs. Again you persevere in giving "flexibility" to developers without regard to the residents' needs.
5. Page 69 Explore potential for merchants and employees to park in reservoir should not be an option. City College does not have enough parking. Your studies of "empty spaces" are inaccurate in timing. During early morning class hours of 7:00 to 8:30 am, cars are backed up in both directions of Ocean Avenue due to the backup into their parking lot. Students would then park on our streets rather than deal with a full parking lot.
6. Page 134 Building Height. The westernmost of the two buildings in the Phelan Loop area can not be "encouraged" to step down, it must be regulated to be stepped down. At 55 feet, those of us near Ocean Avenue would be towered by "canyon" of buildings and our homes would be in shadow. This is absolutely unacceptable.

-----

Dear Mr. Rich,

I was happy to be part of the proceedings Tues. night. I actually spoke this time, to express gratitude for the work the Planning Dept. has undertaken for the potential benefit of our humble neighborhood. It makes sense that if neighborhoods work individually, so does the city as a whole. I'm glad I did speak because I felt many neighbors agreed with me that change is better than stagnation. Those who may be resistant to change, or concerned about the minutia of evolution, or just suspicious in general, miss the point of the core concept of "Imagine". At this point in the process, when the cake is unbaked and the

oven is barely up to temperature, it's enervating to fret about how much frosting to apply. We still have time to dream, and that's the fun part.

I agree with Director's Green's assertion that the proposed guidelines in the Draft are "holistic". The point I was trying to make when I spoke was that in the face of such a thoroughly professional and comprehensive document (I was thinking of it as the Balboa Bible by the night's end), Westwood Park residents should be jumping up and down for joy instead of worrying about legal loopholes concerning parking spaces, or roof heights, or any of that stuff. I mean, what difference do these details make if we are confident the Planning Department is on our side, and able to lead us to a neighborhood that ultimately thrives? The Planners have seen the big picture, and then drawn it for us, in soothing tones of green and brown.

The process is already in motion. Ocean Ave is not only repaved, but infrastructure has been improved. Wires are going underground. A neighborhood library could replace a garage. Blighted buildings have been leveled. Momentum has reached a critical pass. The time is right.

I moved to Westwood Park in 1986, and for the first few years attempts were made under Art Agnos' administration to get something done on the Reservoir. My reasons for opposing those attempts are the same reasons that I now support you and the Public Review Draft. Then, City College was given short shrift. (I was a student there circa 1974) The development was short-sighted and inward-looking. Arrogant posturing emanated from the mayor's office. Confusion and ill will reigned, and ad hoc committees were only productive in a negative way, to block whatever measures were offered to the voters. And then years later, with the exception of the excellent Westwood Park Residential Guidelines created and touted as a roadmap for other neighborhoods, our own quaint neighborhood slept.

Fast forward to a new millennium...and now I find myself reading and re-reading my Balboa Bible and dreaming about the future. It's exciting, but then again I have an active imagination.

-----

Dear Mr. Rich:

I have reviewed the Draft Balboa Park Station Area Plan and wanted to offer the following comments.

First, it is an excellent piece of work and you and your colleagues should be applauded for the effort. A real thorough, professional job.

On a substantive note, I believe the Draft Plan is missing a couple of key components:

\* Most importantly, the Draft Plan does not address a major problem in the plan area -- dirty streets and filthy storefronts. If you spend time walking around the area as I do, you'll notice trash along the streets on a constant basis and dirty, unpainted storefronts. The problem is particularly bad along the key Ocean Ave. and San Jose Ave. portions of the plan area, and (with regard to street trash) especially the portion on the west side of San Jose between Balboa Park and the BART station. I strongly believe that any effort to improve a neighborhood should recognize and address this issue because all of the best neighborhoods in the City, and in the country really, have clean streets and clean commercial areas. Consider the Marina, West Portal and Noe Valley, for example. If you walk around a neighborhood and notice trash up and down the streets and dirty buildings, even a beautiful and brilliantly planned neighborhood, it will detract from the use and enjoyment of the area.

Part of the problem may be that the residents and store owners in the plan area do not appreciate and respect the area, which is why they are willing to trash it. Some of that lack of respect could theoretically be alleviated if the area was nicer and therefore more appreciated by locals. However, we should not assume that will solve the problem. Some provision should be made to address the problem, whether it is

simply more trash cans, providing incentives to clean up commercial structures, an attempt to work with law enforcement to enforce the litter laws, or a combination of ideas. I would just like to see some effort to address it in the Plan.

\* Regardless of what Plan is ultimately decided upon, there will be some major construction in the area during the build out phase. Those of us in the area have experienced an absolute nightmare waiting for the improvements along Ocean Ave. to be completed. It's taken at least two years, and construction is still in progress, causing all kinds of parking and traffic problems in the area. If the build out of the Balboa Park Station Area Plan involves similar construction delays and problems, the local residents will be dealing with potentially years or decades of stress and disappointment. While any improvement should benefit residents in the future decades, those who live here now should not have to deal with years of construction-related hassle. To address this issue, I'd like to see some mention in the Draft Plan of time limits for construction projects, quality standards for contractors, or other provisions that will prevent seemingly never-ending road work and development.

-----

Hi:

I am very opposed to the idea of having 5 story buildings built on Ocean Avenue. I think that this is out of character with the rest of the neighborhood and will cause increased parking and congestion problems on Ocean and surrounding streets. Rather, I would argue that the plan suggest that the buildings be limited to 3 storeys -- even if these means the loss of a supermarket and/or public space in the vicinity.

-----

Ken,

As a homeowner and resident of Plymouth Avenue, I wanted to share my concern regarding the plans for the neighborhood since I will be unable to attend the community meeting this week.

I am very concerned, as are my neighbors, about the growing volume of traffic on Plymouth Ave. As you know, the street is quite narrow, without enough space for two cars to safely pass, and with the increasing traffic, the street is becoming more and more unsafe. I urge you to consider and advocate for traffic calming measures before any additional property damage or injuries occur. There are regular accidents on the street when two cars traveling in opposite directions attempt to pass each other. Many cars travel at a high rate of speed in addition to emergency vehicles from the fire station on Ocean Avenue. It has become unsafe for our families.

In addition, I'd like to add my opposition to additional development in the reservoir area.

Thanks for your consideration.

-----

Hi Ken,

My name is Mike Drake, and I live at 1501 Plymouth Ave. I just got a flyer for a neighborhood planning meeting tomorrow night, but unfortunately I can't make it. I saw that we're invited to send comments to you, however, so I just wanted to confirm what everyone already seems to know; Plymouth Ave. does indeed have a severe traffic problem.

## What's Happening

### Traffic Jams

The road is narrow to begin with, and cars park on both sides of the street. Cars are unable to drive "up" the block when another is driving "down", so they are forced to perform intricate and dangerous maneuvers while cars pile up behind them.

### Damage to Vehicles

Residents who park on the street frequently have their side view mirrors knocked off as cars attempt to squeeze past. There have been several accidents. In fact recently my neighbors across the street had a car actually hit their open car door as they were exiting the vehicle and drive away.

### Inconvenience & Danger to Pedestrians

Because of the risk of damage, most cars are forced to park on sidewalks, frequently blocking them entirely and making it difficult and dangerous for elderly and disabled people to walk & creating unsafe conditions for children. On one occasion, a car actually drove through our yard (not easy to do as it's somewhat of a hill) to cut around a traffic blockage. They were lucky no one was walking by at the time.

### Noise

It's not so much the noise of cars driving by that gets annoying, but rather the frequent honking as traffic clogs up and drivers lose their patience.

## Solutions?

I'm cc'ing my neighbor Fred Raker, because I know he's been involved in solving this problem for a few years already. I'm not sure what the best solution is, but it seems obvious that road itself is much too narrow to accommodate bi-directional traffic. Much of the traffic seems to be people using Plymouth Ave (instead of Miramar) as a connecting road between Monterey Ave. and Ocean Ave. which is unfortunate because Miramar, with it's wide split lanes, was obviously built with the intention of accommodating a much larger traffic flow than Plymouth.

It seems like some plan which deflects a portion of the ocean-Monterey traffic to Miramar might be the simplest solution, but the problem seems to be complex enough to warrant study by someone with professional expertise. Since the situation is getting worse, it's in the best interests of residents as well as commuters to get rolling on this as soon as possible.

Thanks a lot for taking the time to read this. I hope it adds something. If I can help clarify anything, feel free to contact me via email.

-----

Dear Mr. Rich,

My husband, mother and I have been going over some of the plan you sent. It is very ambitious and looks promising, however there are some concerns that need to be addressed. First let me say, that I have not been able to read every page of the plan but have gone over the key strategies. Please excuse me if some of the comments I make are addressed elsewhere in the plan, but in the interest of getting you some

comments, I wanted to email as soon as possible. I'll get right to the point. Our main concerns are the following:

- Limitations on specific types of new business that are allowed.

It seems that we are already oversaturated with Chinese Food Restaurants, Liquor Stores and Bars.

Will there be any type of limits proposed on these types of businesses? Many of these existing business look like "dives" and attract a low element. Currently, Ocean Avenue looks like some kind of BAZAAR.

Your plan mentions attracting business, and working with the merchant assn. on looking better, but I'm still not sure how this will be achieved.

- Parking and Parking Enforcement.

This is a huge issue for us, as we live across from the City College lower parking lot (south east) and we continually have to battle for the space in front of our home. People disregard the small spaces and either squeeze into the short curb or blatantly block our driveways altogether! We call DPT, but they have never come in time to clear the driveway before a student has finished a class and returned.

(This takes 75 mins or more!)

- Security

Your plan for new low income housing brings to mind the "projects" of old. Even the current housing above Blockbuster (Ocean Gardens?) is dicey. Have you ever been in the garage of that building. I fear for my young son and myself when we try to park in there to get a movie. He always comments on the graffiti (very foul) and it's a good thing he can't quite read it. Also it is very dark and menacing in there. I'd rather park on the street if I can. The new housing proposed above the Kragen does not give me much peace of mind. Are families going to be given any special considerations and will tot lots and safe parks be accessible in the plan?

- Traffic Focus

My mother has owned the building we live since the early 80's (819/821 Ocean Ave) I have lived here for the past seven years (and 3 years back in the 80's). There is a terrible problem at the corner of Howth and Ocean where pedestrians and cars are always in near miss or crash situations. The signal here is not very noticeable (especially behind the large trees on this corner) and cars are constantly zooming through the light to get to the I-280 freeway entrance. Many kids from City College and Lick Wilmerding are in jeopardy of being struck. Many cars get rear ended from braking to late and having the next car crash into them. I believe some kind of traffic survey should take place to monitor the true situation. There is also a problem with the illegal left turns for Ocean into City College Parking lot and conversely from I-280 exit up Howth! It's really an incredible sight.

- Construction Phase

Specifically....Timelines. Please address when the plan will begin implementation and how long it will take (I know you are still in the early stages of community comments and etc., but you must have some idea). Also, how will the inconvenience to residents be handled? Who's getting the construction contract and what kinds of fines or incentives will be established??? We have just lived through 18 months of the K-Line project and it's still not done (probably another 3-6 mos). When we went to the initial meetings we were informed of project phases which when everything finally started was completely turned around! The worst part was that we were told specific sections of Ocean would be impacted for 2 - 3 months at most. We were never informed that the project would "stage" all work directly in front of our home. Impacting us for all 18 Mos!!! Furthermore, Mitchell Engineering broke the code of conduct several times during this by starting before 7:00 am (the most egregious was recently at 4:45 am) with loud screeching, dragging of steel, booms, jackhammering, soldering steel, dumping heavy equipment, etc., let alone, the "dump" sight for it's trash and debris. I'm not kidding. This was so

rude, we were ultimately housed in a hotel downtown for two nights, (this past weekend) - at Mitchell's expense - just to get out of the "war zone".... you know, it occurs to me that these are tactics used by the Fed to get take care of hostage situations... anyway, I digress. It's probably obvious that we are a little sensitive to the whole thing.

Well, I've taken up a lot of space. I welcome any comments or questions you might have for me at any time.

I appreciate this forum to give some input. Please keep me posted on the developments.

-----

Dear Mr. Rich,

We read the Balboa Park Neighborhood Plan and we are very excited about the project. We've lived in the area for three years and enjoyed the convenient location but have been disappointed by the untapped potential.

My wife and I are homeowners in the area (251 Dorado Terrace) and have two small children. My concern and the concern of many of our neighbors is the lack of recreational areas for children. There is no place for the children to meet and play. Currently we have to get in our car and drive to West Portal playground. In the Neighborhood Plan, we did not see any specific plan for a playground. This area has a large number of families with small children, yet it is one of the few neighborhoods in the city with no adequate playground. We are not asking for anything elaborate, a simple swing set and sandbox would do.

There is plenty of available space around Ocean Avenue (the unused parking lot adjacent to McDonalds comes to mind) for a playground. And surely the city must have the money available for a small playground in our neighborhood, when they have sufficient money to upgrade the playground in the Marina and put another \$1.5 million into the Argonne playground in the Richmond.

Thank you for your time and this venue to air our concerns regarding the Balboa Park Project.

-----

Thanks so much for all the hard work. The plan was very impressive and the presentation was informative. I just had a couple of concerns:

\* traffic congestion at San Jose and Geneva. It was confusing to me what the proposed street changes were here. I know it's suggested that San Jose go down to one lane of cars, with muni in center. But this seems inadequate (unless it's different for this intersection), with the left hand turns to freeway onramps, high pedestrian volume, and large number of cars coming off the Geneva exit.

\* also, if housing goes into the muni parking lot there, it needs to have a parking garage, which would create more traffic from cars going in and out around this intersection. If muni goes underground before this intersection, that will help.

\* It was also unclear to me what the property behind the Old Geneva office building, where the trains currently park, will be used for (or proposed use). how is this incorporated into plan, or is it a special area reserved for the office building?

-----

Just a few comments, as generally I think that the station area plan is quite good. Although there is likely to be some controversy over the proposal to eliminate the 1 parking space per dwelling requirement, and

to make the renting of dedicated parking in a residential building separate from the renting of a residential unit, I can report that this is (to the best of my knowledge) the standard operating procedure in the City of New York, and it works fine.

One area of concern in the plan is the approach to affordable housing on tracts which are presently owned by public agencies (pages 48-50). As I read the table on page 48, the Tier 1 would include 200 units out of 797 on the Upper Yard, Tier 2 could include over 1000 units on the Reservoir, and Tier 3 would be 850 units on the Green Yard. All told, some 2000 units (out of 3145) fall under Policy 1.1 on page 49, "Give first consideration to development of affordable housing on publicly-owned sites."

While I am generally supportive of affordable housing requirements, I note that District 11 already has the lowest per-capita income of all of the supervisorial Districts in the city; given that, it may not make good sense that D11 should absorb an immense number of new below-market units. Furthermore, I am concerned that if the new housing in the Balboa Park area is dominated by below-market units, it will be difficult to attract retailers to the storefronts planned at ground level in the many buildings of the Plan.

In the course of recent meetings of the New Mission Terrace Improvement Association, I have noticed that many residents of these neighborhoods are extremely suspicious of city government. I believe that if the Plan does not spell out very clearly what is intended in the new residential units, the reaction here will be that "the planning department wants to build Sunnydale II at Balboa Park." If that reaction crystallizes, the plan will be dead on arrival in this neighborhood.

Finally, I also note that, as I understand City planning law, developers are required to set aside 10% of new residential units for affordable housing, but they are permitted to build the 10% affordable units and the corresponding 90% market-rate units in separate locations. If it becomes known that the Planning Department is contemplating 2000 units of affordable housing at Balboa Park, there will be some people who think, "If we build 2000 units of affordable there, we will be able to build 18,000 units of market rate housing somewhere else." Such a situation would develop a very unfortunate momentum, with developers looking to Balboa Park to be their "dumping ground" of affordable units.

In light of the foregoing, I suggest that the Planning Department consider numerical targets for affordable housing in the Plan area in general, and similar targets for each multi-unit building. If, for example, the Plan area adopted a target of 20% affordable housing, and the Plan also required that there be no more than 20% affordable housing per building in multi-unit dwellings, then there would still be the potential for a very large number of affordable units (just over 600), and the concerns I have outlined above would be largely addressed.

-----

Thank you for sending me a copy of the draft plan.

I just wanted to salute you for your inclusion of bike lanes, bicycle parking and of the Holloway boulevard. I live in the Excelsior and I really appreciate anything you can do to make our neighborhood more bicycle friendly.

The only other comment I have is regarding the Geneva Exit from 280 (when driving north on 280) Is there any chance that this can be improved in some way? Currently there is often a line of cars in the exit lane backing up clear into the actual highway lane. It also seems unpleasant that all of that highway exit traffic has to go right through the station area when most of those cars have destinations beyond.

I don't have any solutions, but that situation is really dangerous and not very pleasant for the pedestrians waiting on the sidewalk.

Thanks for all your good work!

-----

Ken,

I'm a daily user of Balboa Park BART station, walking from east of Mission, usually through the Muni yard from Ocean. Although I was unable to attend either of the meetings, I've skimmed the plan online, and it looks great. It's amazing how many stupid decisions have been made over the decades, apparently by people with no sense of financial or human value (even little things like "walling off" the park from the surrounding streets). If this plan is implemented, it will clearly create value far exceeding the cost of implementation (even though that cost will be described as prohibitive by short-sighted fools). Please let me know if there is anything I can do to help make it a reality.

I would appreciate it if you would send me a copy of the plan.

Thanks much.

-----

I've heard there is a proposal for bike lanes on these streets. I really support that. It would make commuting by bicycle on those streets much safer.

Thanks.

-----

Mr. Rich. Since I will not be able to attend the public meeting tonight on the draft Balboa Park Station Area Plan (part of the City's Better Neighborhoods program), I wanted to pass my general comments to you via email. I was able to read the draft report from your website. First, let me say how impressed I was with the Plan in general. I think it makes very progressive and sound recommendations that will result in an enormous improvement for this part of the City. More specifically, as a bicycle enthusiast and proponent of more bike-friendly roads in SF, I particularly like the recommendation in Policy Section 1.6 "Improve bicycle connections and safety throughout the plan area." If these improvements could actual be made, it would not only give this district a huge advantage, but also demonstrate to other neighborhoods the benefit of making our city streets more bike-friendly. Plans like this are one of the reasons I love living in San Francisco.

If you are keeping count, please register me as a (big) supporter of this Plan. Good luck with your meeting tonight.

-----

Dear Mr. Rich,

I'm an instructor at City College of San Francisco, and I teach a class on Wednesday nights, so I'm unable to attend tomorrow's public comment meeting, so I'm e-mailing to give you my feedback.

I teach full time at CCSF and I ride my bike to work every day, so I'm very happy to hear about the improvements you're suggesting, particularly the excellent ideas to facilitate bicycling. My current ride

takes me from my home in the Castro District down 18th to Valencia, then over to San Jose where I use that new bike lane, exiting at Monterey and riding along Circular to CCSF. It's not a bad ride - my only real complaint is the fast traffic on San Jose, so making it less freeway-like would certainly be welcome. And I fully support the other bike lanes and such in your plan - it would do a lot to encourage CCSF staff and students to bicycle to campus, reducing our parking headaches and improving quality of life.

When I don't ride to work I take Muni or BART to Balboa Park, so I also welcome the pedestrian improvements around that station; it feels like a very car-dominated area, and I'd love to see that change.

Feel free to contact me if you'd like more feedback. Thanks a lot.

-----

Mr. Rich,

I understand that you are accepting comments regarding the Balboa Park Station area plan. I would like to voice my support for bike lanes on Ocean, Alemany, Holloway, and San Jose and am, unfortunately, unable to attend the meeting tonight. Therefore, I hope you will consider my comments in future discussions of the plan.

Specifically, I would like to say that, as a resident of the Ingleside District, I frequently ride my bike in the area. Many of the streets in the region are very dangerous for bike riders. This is especially true of Ocean Avenue near City College where bike riders are forced onto Ocean because Holloway ends near there.

Geneva Avenue between Ocean and Mission is also extremely dangerous for bicyclists, especially in the westbound direction. I have nearly been sideswiped by aggressive motorists in this stretch more than once.

Bike lanes are also desperately needed on Alemany. Under current conditions it would be suicidal to attempt to ride a bike on Alemany. However, there are no other realistic options along this corridor. Therefore, residents are forced off their bikes altogether.

Thank you for considering my comments.

-----

To: Ken Rich or whomever it may concern,

I would like to voice my optimism for the improvements put forth by the planning department in the new Balboa Park neighborhood plan. I am especially excited by the proposed improvements for cyclists and pedestrians. I ride my bike to San Francisco State five days a week and though I live in the Richmond District, I sometimes ride to the Mission after class. It is always a dilemma for me to decide my route after ridding down Ocean and coming to San Jose. Often I ride down San Jose and get the crazy rush of watching my potential death go whizzing by me at 60MPH, horn blaring. Sometimes I have tried to take Alemany, but I have gotten lost both times, once I some how ended up on Bayshore. The proposed bicycle improvements on Holloway, Ocean and San Jose are very encouraging, and I urge the Planning department to approve these great plans they have created.

-----

I read most of the review draft and I support much of it; but of course, I have some concerns about parking and I also offer a couple of suggestions that might work. Please read my comments and reply.

Thanks,

Discouraging commuters from parking in the neighborhood is an excellent idea and long over do but that will only help during business hours. If there are a large number of new residential units built in the neighborhood and many of those units having minimal or no dedicated parking spaces, then new residents will be forced to park their cars along the streets throughout the neighborhood, competing with the existing residents for evening and weekend parking.

One of the few advantages the neighborhood has now over some others is that a pedestrian can usually walk along the sidewalks in the evening without the path being blocked by cars illegally parked in driveways. An evening walk along many of the streets in Noe Valley, where parking is scarce, will confirm the aggravation of having to constantly walk out on to the street to get around the cars. This must be daunting for wheelchair users.

May I suggest:

- 1) In order to further discourage car ownership, make residents living in the new housing units ineligible for parking permits.
- 2) You suggested decoupling the housing units with the parking spaces in the developments. Let me take it one step further: The monthly home owners dues or fees that come with the units should also have attached automatic enrollment in the Car Share program. All developments should have spaces dedicated for Car Share and part of the home owner dues should go to support that program.

We all pay taxes to support Muni, Bart, and even SFO whether or not we use them because it's good for society. Now imagine housing communities with the final part of the equation: Fees or taxes to support Car Share.

Muni = short distance

Bart = medium distance

SFO = long distance

Care Share = cargo capacity and non supported destinations when needed

Now that truly is complete public transportation.

-----

I am unable to attend this Wednesday's meeting at Lick Wilmerding, but I want you to know that I have lived in SF since 1978 and have ridden a bicycle during much of that time. Bike lanes have made my daily commute much safer!

During the 1980's I rode my bike daily from Noe Valley to SFSU and it was often a hair-raising ride! We need bike lanes traversing the city. Please do your part in making the streets safe for all bicyclists by continuing to expand the bike lane network in SF!!!

-----

Greetings!

I finally got a chance to look at the proposed changes to the Ocean / Balboa Park corridor, and it looks very nice. I did not get a chance to read every word, but I skimmed the text and looked at the pictures. It seems well thought-out, and definitely more attractive than what is there now. There was one thing that I did not notice in the text (although it may be there - if so, I apologize) and that is that you don't make mention of moving all the wires and cables underground. If you look at the pictures that you have in the proposal document, in most of them there is a rats nest of wiring hanging over the streets. It is not in the least attractive, and in areas where it is really dense it can seem almost oppressive.

It occurs to me that one of the opportunities that you have when the whole place is being torn up anyway, is to place all that stuff out of sight. I come originally from Holland, and the one thing that I noticed on my recent trip back there is that there are *\*NO\** wires visible anywhere. With the exception of an occasional row of the huge, high-voltage lines that pass over to the distribution points, everything is underground. Even out in the countryside, all utilities are invisible. Holland is always made out to be picturesque - I think that this is the main reason why. Even the catenary for the trams and trains is kept to their right-of-ways, and is done cleanly. Having the wires out of sight makes for far less outages due to weather, cars hitting poles (there aren't any...), wires aging in the sun, and so on. Again, this seems to be a perfect time to get the utilities to get their stuff out of sight - and maybe upgrade them at the same time. One can't help noticing that in the artists sketches of the streetscapes, there are none of the wires drawn in as they are festooned around in the picture on page 22, or even page 19 of your 148-page proposal document!

Anyway, that is what struck me about the plan. Sorry for the length of the letter, but I hope that it explained what I am thinking. Thanks so much for your attention, and for working so hard to get the public involved and allowed to give input. Keep up the great work!

Thanks again,

-----

Greetings;

We live in the area near City College that will be impacted by the Balboa Park Station area plan. We are unable to attend the public review meeting but wanted to provide our comments.

While the plan is admirable in some ways, it does not adequately take into account the parking problem faced by residents in the area. I do not believe that you or any of the planners have any idea of the problems with parking (or you don't care?) when you present a plan that argues against the construction of parking spaces or lots to accommodate the housing and merchant spaces that will be added to this area. When we went to an earlier meeting, we were presented with a plan that included one space per unit for parking in the new housing that was projected for the area. It certainly left us with the idea that the planners are doing their work in areas that they clearly don't (and probably wouldn't want to) live in.

City College, and the City College area, is a middle class community - or these days, a community struggling to remain middle class, where multiple generations of a single family or several individuals crowd into housing. One parking space per unit is ridiculous. On top of that, City College is so large, and students who are working adults (and therefore drive in order to fit school into their work day) are coming and going 6 days per week, literally fighting with residents and with each other for parking. One parking space per unit, and an argument against parking structures, says to us that there is no concern for our quality of life as residents of this community.

We are left with the rather cynical view that "pack them in" - which serves the developers in this city - is the rule of the day, and that those who plan and execute the plans must live in a different area. We would sincerely hope that you would rethink this part of the plan. Thank you for the opportunity to express our views.

-----

It is wonderful to work with a responsive city agency. Many of the community's ideas are in plan. My only issue is that I would like to not see buses going right through the Phelan Loop. You should look into other alternatives.

-----

How will the transportation alternatives (i.e. buses) presently serving the south side of BART be changed by the plan? How will transportation options on the south side of the station be available for CCSF students.

-----

Some parts of the plan are more ambitious than others. Where is the information on feasibility, cost, phasing, etc? Implementation is missing from the draft plan.

-----

I'm excited and nervous about the draft plan. I'm excited about improving the area and using public transportation instead of cars. But I'm nervous that once people move in, they will get cars. I'm concerned also that low income housing in San Francisco is probably expensive so I want it to be very low cost housing.

-----

There are a lot of interesting ideas, but there is a big gap between the plan and the implementation of the plan. Lots of things that make me nervous. The website and draft plan have no links to concrete information about why certain policy ideas are put forth in the plan. Parking is one issue. Various governing magazines have information that corroborate ideas about how you control parking and local transit. It would be helpful to have that on the website.

-----

It appears that there are no links in the draft plan to existing projects. I don't know how this affects existing projects. In addition more shops and services will cause a higher volume of traffic.

-----

Holloway is too narrow for a bike lane. It is very hazardous now for bike lanes. What would you lose from the street in order to accommodate a bike lane?

-----

The idea of having exclusive lanes for streetcars in the center of Ocean is fascinating. When I see that construction blocks one lane, the street backs up. I don't have a problem with backups, but the people caught in them often do and they expect it to go away when construction ends. I'm wondering if it backs up – will you do any traffic studies to see if this works? Holloway has 25% more traffic since construction on Ocean. Does this have to be backed up with traffic studies?

-----

I want to support pedestrian and bike improvements, especially extending bike lanes so they actually connect. I would be interested to see if it's possible to implement this sooner than more ambitious aspects of the plan. I would like to encourage this.

-----

Were any of the studies extended as far north as Monterey Blvd to look at spreading out traffic? Monterey is a straight shot to a lot of destinations.

-----

One of the things that I really like is the attempt to slow traffic on San Jose. I really support this because many young children are using it.

-----

The issue of San Jose Ave. is critical for families and kids. Traffic goes fast. But maybe you don't need a bike lane on San Jose; maybe someone needs to enforce better to slow down traffic.

-----

Geneva has a plan to extend light rail from Visitation. Valley to Balboa. Can the plan and the street accommodate this in the future?

-----

The city generally uses 40 feet as a height limit. But this is a specific plan that includes possibility of building housing and open space on PUC side of reservoir. I would like it to get more specific. The west side of the reservoir should have a three-story height limit with new backyards backing up to existing backyards. And the east side be no more than 4 stories.

-----

I Would agree with people who said that Ocean Avenue would be OK for 5 stories, but moving away from Ocean, buildings should not be over three stories.

-----

There is some new construction in RH-2 zones between Holloway and Ocean where they could have 2 or 3 stories over a garage. But they are only building 2 stories. I Would like to see some requirement to build out to maximum density.

-----

I got a sense last time that there would be no buildings on the west side of reservoir. Why does the draft plan now show this?

-----

The idea was mentioned at the last meeting about allowing an additional 5 feet of building height on Ocean to allow higher retail ceiling heights. I support that idea.

-----

Is there any way to reserve the housing to be built in the Upper Yard for low income people who work in the city so that we can provide affordable housing for those who are providing city services?

-----

The west side of the Phelan Loop should be developed with affordable senior housing.

-----

The plan mentions the idea of running parking meters on side streets in front of commercial buildings. I think it's a good idea.

-----

Parking in our neighborhood is pretty bad. Some people from farther-out neighborhoods drive to my neighborhood and park to use Muni and BART. That impacts the parking on my street all day long because they are part of my permit parking zone.

-----

Less than one parking space per unit for new housing on Ocean sounds absolutely insane to me.

-----

I think one of the emerging planning ideas is car sharing and I don't think the plan addresses that possibility. It would be a perfect application for this transit hub idea.

-----

I agree that residential units with one parking spot per unit will be a disaster. I would recommend parking underground or something for the people that live there. I want more than one parking unit per resident.

I realize the city's priorities are the transportation and the housing, but I hope you are also looking at certain other kinds of social engineering things that haven't really panned out such as the commuter lane on the freeways, in terms of the percentage that really subtracts from traffic.

-----

We have an increasingly ridiculous parking situation in the Excelsior and without some real integration of parking overall in the city and all these outlying neighborhoods, it's going to become just an out of control situation. That kind of integration and problem solving has to be done somehow.

-----

I live in a neighborhood where parking is really impossible and I can give you all sorts of anecdotal evidence that people who moved into that neighborhood did indeed sell their cars.

-----

The car share idea needs to be cheaper.

-----

We need to exclude new developments on Ocean Avenue and senior housing on the Phelan Loop from the residential permit parking program. The whole idea is to encourage those new residents to use public transit. You get something and you give something up. Also institute residential permit parking in the areas where it isn't now.

-----

As it is, there's not enough space at city college presently. Is there any other way that that college students can share spaces with people who live here? It is a rather large commuter college and lots of people drive in.

-----

Does the reservoir parking lot fill up on a regular basis?

-----

Without knowing what is going to happen on the reservoir in the long run, it is hard to visualize plans for it.

-----

I have a concern: San Francisco General hospital has a road that goes through the campus, but it is not really a public road and I envision Phelan ending up to be part of CCSF campus and not really a public thoroughfare and the neighborhood people would have to take other streets.

-----

Will the CCSF development be coordinated with the Public Utility Commission's development of the west side of the reservoir?

-----

I'm still interested in having more people using public transportation and it seems to me that the reason that students are not using it is time and money and if transit is working more efficiently that would take care of the time and the other thing is that I'm wondering if it is possible to work out some program for students to get Muni passes or something of the sort.

-----

The last two issues of the CCSF newspaper talk about the bad parking problem around the college. Students are also distressed about the backed up traffic and parking in neighbors driveways.

-----

I just want to say that we should make Muni free.

-----

I'd really like to thank you for the freeway decking idea. If nothing else in this plan gets done, please do that.

-----

When you talk in different parts of the plan about using the 25-foot articulation process for buildings that look like townhouses, that is a very effective way to do planning and design in this neighborhood. When you mention the word high-rise, that takes away the whole idea of articulation etc. You only mention it once, but you should take it out.

-----

I was disappointed that the plan to develop the Green yard was put in the 20-year plus time frame. I think that's a key part of the plan, especially for those of living on that side of the freeway who need a pleasant walk to the transit station. I understand that it is very expensive, but I would like a fuller explanation of why.

-----

I'm wondering if there is any more information about the status of the Kragen Auto site. That is probably going to be the first to develop.

-----

I think that part of the food issue could be solved by having a farmer's market in the Phelan Loop. The space in the plan right now is much too small for that.

-----  
One part of the plan that I really like in this area is the fact that you are taking the two freeway exits off of Geneva. This will make Geneva much nicer. I hope that the new offramps can handle the traffic load.

-----  
One thing that has been happening is the buses that stop there at the BART station don't pull into the bus stop and block the flow of traffic.

-----  
Where is a lot of competition between the buses and drop-offs.

-----  
I like what the plan says about how the building in the Phelan loop needs to be a landmark building, but I don't like is having the buses run at the north end of the new open space because it will separate the space from CCSF.

-----  
There is sort of an unfinished question about what to do with the firehouse in the Phelan Loop. Please clarify the fate of the fire station.

-----  
I want to talk about housing opportunities and the range of income levels. The chart on page 48 of the draft plan seems like most of the units are on public land and would be subject to the affordability requirement. I would like more information on affordability definitions. The intent here is to make a lively neighborhood so what mix makes a lively neighborhood? There is a possibility that if it is all affordable housing and there is the suggestion of eliminating controls on unit size, there is the possibility of getting a lot of SRO -type housing.

-----  
I think one thing that is absent from the plan is water features.

-----  
I believe that this area could benefit from having student housing here. By student housing I mean affordable housing for students – not necessarily run by CCSF.

-----  
Building a lot of units with minimal parking and hoping that people will not own cars but knowing that many will, what do we do with the cars?

-----  
I'd like to repeat a great idea that someone had – don't give those folks in the new housing rpp permits.

-----  
In the previous election, we passed a proposition to promote solar power. Have you been implementing that in these plans?

-----  
The lot that is across the street from the Geneva Yard? Is that discussed? Is there any plan to recapture that as open space?

-----  
A neighborhood effort could help fix up the Geneva strip.

-----  
When do you start the implementation idea phase?

-----  
I run the community service program at Lick-Wilmerding and part of my efforts involve coordinating with other high schools to provide opportunities for Lick students. Right now we're looking at any opportunity for community garden space.

-----  
A comment about implementation: The San Francisco public library has started working on their new branch proposed for the sunset auto site. This may be one of the quicker projects to begin.

-----  
The west side of the Phelan Loop should be set aside for affordable housing. An effort should be made to survey and discover if senior housing (affordable) would be the best choice. The plan should include a strong residential permit parking element as far north as the Sunnyside-North of City College and East of Balboa Park (in New Mission Terrace). New Units at Kragen and Phelan Loop should not be allowed permits for residential parking.

-----  
Positives: Revitalization of some unsightly, unused areas. New Parks a community spaces. Better and safer transportation. But all of this will have impact on surrounding neighborhoods. I am a resident of Westwood Park. We are currently heavily impacted by parking and cut-through traffic issues.. An increase in population density will increase these issues as well. The work on Ocean Avenue taking place now has doubled the traffic (daily) on Plymouth Avenue between Ocean and Monterey to 6,000 cars

daily. My comment-work with the surrounding neighborhoods now to mitigate traffic and parking issues- don't wait until it gets worse.

-----

Will the plan include signage? Really need directions from BART to the College and the Diego Rivera mural. Thanks.

-----

Ken Rich deserves a raise. Keep up the good work.

-----

Very thorough, professional planning with respectfulness towards citizen comment/opinion. We should still try to persuade MUNI to move the busses out of the Phelan Loop. they pollute and are noisy. (Will the busses there be only electric (that's better)). Either way, the busses should be out of the loop, ergo. per down Phelan or around the firehouse.

-----

We are writing as members of the Corpus Christi Local Organizing Committee, which is a member of the San Francisco Organizing Project. We have been participating in the Better Neighborhoods 2002 planning process for the Balboa Park Station Area Plan. We live on 420 Otsego Street, just a few blocks from the Balboa Park BART Station and the Phelan Campus of City College. We want to applaud the emphasis on the construction of new affordable housing at the Phelan Loop and throughout the plan. Housing is a critical need for our community and it will help the entire community to develop economically. As seniors, we are very aware of the lack of affordable housing and have had to pay nearly 100% of our income for housing to live in this community. There are thousands of other seniors in our church and throughout the community that live in the same situation. Something that we want to emphasize is a good portion of the plan is the section about parking. Many of us seniors do not drive and have no need for parking. In fact, many of the low-income families that are renting in our community do not have cars. I have heard statistics at the different meetings that support this point. Why should we have to pay for parking or have less housing build for people only to accommodate cars? It makes no sense, especially with all of the MUNI and BART service in the area. Please adopt the parking policy that will maximize affordable housing. We respect people's frustrations around parking convenience, but when we shortchange housing we are creating real suffering and denying seniors the right to live in dignity.

-----

Do not build any structures on Phelan Avenue over three stories. Provide two parking stalls per living unit. Do not reduce the number of lanes on Phelan Avenue leave two lanes in both directions. Five Story building on and along Ocean Ave is ok. Serious consideration must be given to the effect of traffic and parking in Westwood park based on the plans recommendations.

-----

Residential minimum fore off street parking should NOT be eliminated with a maximum of one space per unit parking in our neighborhood and you will aggravate the problem. Replacement commercial and institutional parking with maximum far parcels with transit should not ever be replaced. Serious problem

already exist to the point more streets are blocked from access due to patrons of businesses around our neighborhood.

-----

On the whole, I think your office has done a good job of balancing all needs. I do have ideas, though. I support the library moving, a good idea! I would like more parking for the residential units along Ocean Avenue and one less story for their height. Since I border the reservoir I have some thoughts there. I feel the 40' height is reasonable. I'm however, concerned over security at the Park Butter behind my house. I would like to see a high wall of some type built behind my house I would not like to see lights and people playing sports into the night hour in the park. I would be concerned about Drug Dealing in this park as is the case in the OMI Park now.

-----

I read the public review draft, and I want to congratulate you for this outstanding study and the document that describe it. But, as a SUNSET property owner, resident and father of three teenagers, I am concerned by the choices made for the redevelopment of this part of our city. The Balboa Park station area is not far way from the SUNSET district, and could provide his residents with some of the services and amenities that we are missing. The 8<sup>th</sup> elements of a Good neighborhood read: "Part of a whole-great neighborhoods make great cities...Stand out on their own, YET ARE CONNECTED TO THE CITY...BUT ALSO A PART OF THE CITY'S WIDER COMMUNITY". As a resident of the SUNSET, I do not think that this objective has been fulfilled. The SUNSET district is a nice neighborhood, very enjoyable for families and young people enjoying open space and outdoor activities. But even we are part of San Francisco City, we are geographically isolated and could be easily described as a "suburb" within the city. We do not have: Easy access to downtown, Easy access to major commercial shopping area, Easy Access to entertainment's facilities (movie theaters, performance center, clubs...), Easy access to jobs. I do not have recent statistics on where do SUNSET residents go to work, shop, study and entertain themselves, but I bet a lot of them head south to the peninsula through the 101/280 freeways, instead of staying in San Francisco. The new Ocean Avenue Commercial District and Balboa Park Station redevelopment could be a place where residents from the Western part of the city find what they are currently missing, at a closer location than SF downtown or the peninsula commercial malls. \*Major commercial shopping area: I do not understand why your plan does not include zoning for major retail tenants. Why limiting retail to 10,000sq.? \*Movie Theater: The only modern movie theaters close to SUNSET are the Kabuki on Geary, the AMC1000 on Van Ness, and the new Century 21 by the daily City BART. We can Not miss the opportunity to locate a new movie theater multiplex at the Balboa Park Station; movies are mainly viewed by teenagers ( I will be the father/stepfather of 3 by the time development start!), and students, and here they are nearby at CCSF! \* Community Performance Center: Not all San Francisco cultural performances have to be downtown! There are many schools and organizations in the western part of the city that need a public and modern facility (other than old churches...) to practice and present to the public and families their talents (through shows, choirs, concerts etc...) or local artist who wants to "experiment"; We NEED a Community Performance Center to serve the west/south part of the city, and the Balboa Park location fit well... \*Jobs: It said (pg47, Policy1.1.) that "housing is the most appropriate type of development in the plan area...supported by a modest amount of neighborhood-oriented commercial establishments"> I disagree. If you observe neighborhood like West Portal, you realize that street animation peaks everyday after 4/5pm, for a couple of hours, when commuters come back from work, and shop before heading home. And during the weekends. On the contrary, SF downtown maximum street animation is weekly between 11:00am and 2:00pm, when all the employees lunch and shop. During the weekend, downtown is a ghost town1 so you need a mix of local residents and local jobs to bring "a critical mass of people living on

or near main commercial streets (...) to give urban neighborhoods their vitality, interest, safety and convenience” at all time. The Balboa plan should incorporate some office space to bring jobs in the are. The Balboa Station hub could be a “connector point” between the south/west part of the city and downtown at one level, and the Bay Area at another level through BART. It can also become a place were the residents from Sunset, Parkside, Forest Hill, St Francis Wood or Ingleside would converge to study, shop entertain, perform, and even work. Only then, the new Balboa Park neighborhood will be “part of the city’s wider community”. Thank you.

-----

I am writing as a member of the Corpus Christi Local Organizing Committee, which is a member congregation of the San Francisco Organizing Project. I live in the New Mission Terrace neighborhood and we have lived in the area surrounding Balboa Park my entire life. As a participant in many of the “Better Neighborhood 2002” session, I would like to applaud the Planning Department for completing the plan and synthesizing community input given from the sessions. There are many significant aspects of the plan, but I would like to focus my comments on what I feel are the most critical. Affordable housing is a critical need not only for the entire city, but for many of the lifelong residents in the Excelsior and Outer Mission such as myself. The average rent for a two-bedroom apartment is nearly \$2100. That far exceeds the average income of our community and makes it nearly impossible for residents to continue living here. In addition, it forces many of us to pay over half of our income for rent. This has tremendous impact on our community: uprooting long-time residents and dividing families and communities. It also has a significant impact on local businesses as we see our disposable income continue shrink as rents continue to climb. This is money that could be invested locally and would help our local merchants and economy. Land is a critical component in any community development strategy. As the plan points out, there is a relative abundance of land in the area surrounding Balboa Park. Much of this land is publicly owned and could be easily developed into affordable housing. Parcels such as the MUNI upper yard and the Balboa Reservoirs are extremely valuable resources and need to be developed into affordable housing. For my entire life, these areas have done nothing more than store cars. Is this the best use of land for our community? The plan takes a positive step in realizing the real priorities for our community. Maximizing density in these areas and other available land parcels within the transit corridor is critical to developing as much housing as possible. I would like to encourage the Planning Department and Planning Commission to retain and if possible strengthen these measures that would maximize density for housing along this transit corridor and ensure that many of these parcels are dedicated to affordable housing.

-----

I am a member of St. Finn Barr parish and am an active leader in the San Francisco Organizing Project. I am writing to comment on the draft plan for the Balboa Park Station Area Plan. I think that the plan has many merits and would like to thank the Planning Department for their hard work in getting this document together. I would like to focus on the importance of the issue of affordable housing. I know that the plan has many other important components, but the need for more housing that our community can afford is a critically important need. I know of many seniors that are living in conditions that are simply unbearable. There are countless seniors that are living on a fixed income and are forced to rent places that are neither suitable nor safe to live in. On top of that, they are forced to pay nearly their entire SSI check for these makeshift accommodations. This problem is not just limited to seniors; there are many young families that live extremely cramped and have three or four families living in a single apartment or even a studio, Just down the street from the Balboa Park BART Station there is an old motel that has been converted into apartments. You will find two or three families living in what was once a single motel room. On top of that, they also pay relay 2/3 of

their income on rent. How can they pay for medicine or food or clothing for their children? My hope is that the final plan will continue to emphasize the importance of allowing both the young and old of our community to live in dignity. The plan takes good steps in this direction, but we have much further to go. Thank you.

-----

I am a new neighbor to this project and think it is terrific! I realize it will take several more years to see any one piece of it to completion via bond measure monies, public and private financial backing. I think it will help pull together a very fragmented and visually unattractive key area in San Francisco. I think the Freeway build over, idea is very optimistic, but I thoroughly support its concept. Other cities such as Boston have proven this can be successful. I lived there and frequently used the Green and Orange line subway @ Copley place area of backbay where the city built over the Massachusetts Turnpike. As a first phase I would be excited if the focus was on the beautification on both Ocean and General Avenues (and San Jose Avenue). Next to put the motion in place for the freeway build over and cleanup of a currently every inefficient vehicle and pedestrian traffic flow. There are extremely high volumes of traffic and key time periods at the transit and educational facilities in the area. There's the High School on Phelan, City College, the High School on Ocean (between Ocean down Geneva, the Bart station (which is horrible) and the Muni streetcar/bus lines on/at San Jose, Ocean & Geneva. This is a very active hub of the City, a place more important than I realized until I moved to this part of town. Lots of Blue Collar, working class and a mix of professionals that make this a real exciting place to "make something happen!" It can (and should) be a great model project for other urban areas. If there's any way that the neighborhoods and assistance/volunteer to "make something happen" sooner than later, please let us know through flyers and mailers!

-----

The Phelan Loop Area: I propose a plaza, about the size of the old parking area for the Vet. on Ocean (present site). It should sit in the center axis of the Reservoir (Lee Avenue) and provide views of the new park and college from Ocean Ave. A farmers Market should be held twice a week and Artists sell their goods in the day. At center a Fountain or Band shell. Large trees and Hardscape, no Lawns. Stores should be around the plaza. Bike parking and Bike lanes, paths to New Park, College from Ocean Avenue. The Plaza should be a Landmark known by all. It should be large outdoor eating area cafes etc. a must. A stage and informal seating to watch. As a true plaza the streets will form a box around the plaza. Native plants and many kinds of trees. No large stores. P.S. Bike lanes/parking. All major streets!

-----

It looks like the part I'm interested in (PART 5, Implementing the plan) has not been printed yet, so I am stuck with a flashy booklet (that no doubt cost plenty of taxpayer or BART ride money) that basically is a dream without any hope of realization. When there is a concrete plan to be implemented please let me know.

-----

I am sorry I didn't have room for what I like. These are the comments I consider most important. pg. 37- Policy 2.3 and 2.4: It would add much value if sections AA and BB included building profiles adjacent to streets. What are the fundamental features of the architecture which defines the street as a space, i.e., makes its edge? pg38-Policy4.1: This whole paragraph is pretty scary. You are using the unique xxx x San Francisco's grid as it exists in places like Nob Hill and Pacific Heights as

something of a defense for what will surely weakens the space of Ocean Avenue between Phelan and Plymouth- I refer to pedestrian cut-de-sacs propose for the side of Ocean adjacent to the existing reservoir. These will be dreary, pointless, little wind-blown no-mans-lands, which destroy the street edge, detract from shopping and other community-building activities, and breed both crime and fear by providing places for marginal people to hang out, deal drugs and sleep. If you truly intend to make Ocean Avenue vital, you must not shrink from building a strong edge along the section of Ocean in question. This edge is quite weak in your existing proposal. p.133 Ocean Avenue Elevation: Ground floor needs to be about 30% higher, particularly in building at right. The choppy verticality of this elevation is just the kind of cuteness that results in ennui, if you want some variety, sell different lots to different developers and then give standards for what they can do which provides a little uniformity.