



# SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

---

## Planning Commission Resolution No. 18164

HEARING DATE: AUGUST 12, 2010

*Project Name:* **Car-Share Controls**  
*Case Number:* 2009.0187T  
*Staff Contact:* Kevin Guy, Sharon Lai and Joshua Switzky  
[kevin.guy@sfgov.org](mailto:kevin.guy@sfgov.org), [sharon.lai@sfgov.org](mailto:sharon.lai@sfgov.org)  
*Reviewed by:* AnMarie Rodgers, Manager Legislative Affairs  
[anmarie.rodgers@sfgov.org](mailto:anmarie.rodgers@sfgov.org), 415-558-6395

*Recommendation:* **Recommend Approval**

1650 Mission St.  
Suite 400  
San Francisco,  
CA 94103-2479

Reception:  
**415.558.6378**

Fax:  
**415.558.6409**

Planning  
Information:  
**415.558.6377**

RECOMMENDING THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ADOPT A PROPOSED ORDINANCE THAT WOULD AMEND PLANNING CODE CONTROLS FOR CAR-SHARE VARIOUS SECTIONS, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO SECTIONS 151.1, 163, AND 166; ADOPTING FINDINGS, INCLUDING ENVIRONMENTAL FINDINGS, PLANNING CODE SECTION 302 FINDINGS, AND FINDINGS OF CONSISTENCY WITH THE GENERAL PLAN AND THE PRIORITY POLICIES OF PLANNING CODE SECTION 101.

### PREAMBLE

Whereas, at multiple public hearings during the fiscal year 2008/2009, the Planning Commission requested that staff explore the current controls and issues relating to car-share;

Whereas, our basic choices for urban transportation modes haven't changed much since the early 20th Century: public transit, walking, biking, and the single-owner automobile. The newest option, car-share, isn't a technological innovation but is a new way to use cars;

Whereas, San Francisco is a leader in the car-share movement. Car-sharing began in the United States just over 10 years ago. City CarShare began in 2001 and the Planning Commission instituted car-share requirements shortly thereafter, with the 2005 adoption of the Rincon Hill Plan;

Whereas, the City is still learning about how to best implement car-share and about how car-share relates to other policy goals;

Whereas, the Commission seeks to refine implementation of car-share controls in San Francisco.

Whereas, on April 8, 2010, the San Francisco Planning Commission (hereinafter "Commission") conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting to consider the proposed Ordinance; and

Whereas, pursuant to Planning Code Section 306.3 the Planning Commission adopted Resolution No. 18106 initiating amendments to the Planning Code on July 8, 2010; and

Whereas, also at the July 8, 2010 hearing, the Planning Commission adopted Commission policy in Resolution No. 18106 that established that:

1. The Commission recognized that voluntary car-share parking spaces are a valuable component to the success of San Francisco’s overall car-sharing program.
2. The Commission established that residential and mixed-use development proposals that would result in the loss of existing car-share spaces shall be reviewed in the context of our general preference outlined in the chart below.
3. Where the Commission finds extraordinary circumstances as described in Finding Number Three of Resolution Number 18106, the Planning Commission may require additional car-share at the amounts reflected in this table:

| <b>Project Description</b>   | <b>Proposed Replacement Policy</b>   |
|--|--|
| <b>Removal of Existing Required Car-Share Parking Where the Associated Project is Not Demolished.</b>                    | <b>1:1 Replacement Required</b>  |
| <b>Loss of Existing Required Car-Share Parking Where the Initial Project is proposed for Demolition and Replacement.</b> | <b>No Replacement Required</b><br>Benefits and impacts of new project should be evaluated as a whole. Project is subject to the car-share requirements of the Planning Code. |
| <b>Loss of Existing Fee-Based Car-Share Parking without new proposed project.</b>  | <b>No Replacement Required</b>   |

4. The Commission acknowledged that the arbitrary allocation of required car-share parking beyond that stated here may result in an imbalance of development and undue financial burden to the sponsor.
5. It behooves the City to establish a larger framework that works in coordination with the City’s proposed residential growth and plans for transportation infrastructure investment.
6. The benefit of providing on-street car-share spaces can significantly improve the quality of the City’s car-share program in the following ways: a) proliferation of spaces; b) legitimacy of car-sharing; c) perceived safety of car-share; and d) efficiency of on-street parking spaces.
7. The Commission requested that further exploration of these issues through independent analysis by the City and that the findings be part of an update to the City’s General Plan, especially the Transportation Element.
8. The Commission urged the Planning Department to engage the issue in coordination with other transportation agencies of the City and County and the region at large.

Whereas, the Commission has heard and considered the testimony presented to it at the public hearing and has further considered written materials and oral testimony presented on behalf of the applicant, Department staff, and other interested parties; and

Whereas, the pertinent documents may be found in the files of the Department, as the custodian of records, at 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco; and

**MOVED**, that the Commission hereby *adopts* this Resolution to recommend approval of the draft Ordinance to the Board of Supervisors with the following modification: allow the conversion of required commercial parking for car-share use; and

## FINDINGS

Having reviewed the materials identified in the preamble above, and having heard all testimony and arguments, this Commission finds, concludes, and determines as follows:

1. **General Plan Compliance.** This Resolution is consistent with the following Objectives and Policies of the General Plan:

### I. HOUSING ELEMENT (2004)

#### **OBJECTIVE 1**

TO PROVIDE NEW HOUSING, ESPECIALLY PERMANENTLY AFFORDABLE HOUSING, IN APPROPRIATE LOCATIONS WHICH MEETS IDENTIFIED HOUSING NEEDS AND TAKES INTO ACCOUNT THE DEMAND FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING CREATED BY EMPLOYMENT DEMAND.

#### **POLICY 1.6**

Create incentives for the inclusion of housing, particularly permanently affordable housing, in new commercial development projects.

### II. TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT

#### **OBJECTIVE 1**

MEET THE NEEDS OF ALL RESIDENTS AND VISITORS FOR SAFE, CONVENIENT AND INEXPENSIVE TRAVEL WITHIN SAN FRANCISCO AND BETWEEN THE CITY AND OTHER PARTS OF THE REGION WHILE MAINTAINING THE HIGH QUALITY LIVING ENVIRONMENT OF THE BAY AREA.

#### **OBJECTIVE 4**

MAINTAIN AND ENHANCE SAN FRANCISCO'S POSITION AS THE HUB OF A REGIONAL, CITY-CENTERED TRANSIT SYSTEM.

**OBJECTIVE 12**

DEVELOP AND IMPLEMENT PROGRAMS IN THE PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SECTORS, WHICH WILL SUPPORT CONGESTION MANAGEMENT AND AIR QUALITY OBJECTIVES, MAINTAIN MOBILITY AND ENHANCE BUSINESS VITALITY AT MINIMUM COST.

**OBJECTIVE 34**

RELATE THE AMOUNT OF PARKING IN RESIDENTIAL AREAS AND NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL DISTRICTS TO THE CAPACITY OF THE CITY'S STREET SYSTEM AND LAND USE PATTERNS.

**POLICY 34.1**

Regulate off-street parking in new housing so as to guarantee needed spaces without requiring excesses and to encourage low auto ownership in neighborhoods that are well served by transit and are convenient to neighborhood shopping.

**POLICY 34.3**

Permit minimal or reduced off-street parking supply for new buildings in residential and commercial areas adjacent to transit centers and along transit preferential streets.

2. This Resolution is consistent with the eight General Plan priority policies set forth in Section 101.1 in that:
  - A) The existing neighborhood-serving retail uses will be preserved and enhanced and future opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of such businesses will be enhanced.
  - B) The existing housing and neighborhood character will be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhoods.
  - C) The City's supply of affordable housing will be preserved and enhanced.
  - D) The commuter traffic will not impede MUNI transit service or overburden our streets or neighborhood parking.
  - E) A diverse economic base will be maintained by protecting our industrial and service sectors from displacement due to commercial office development. And future opportunities for resident employment and ownership in these sectors will be enhanced.
  - F) The City will achieve the greatest possible preparedness to protect against injury and loss of life in an earthquake.
  - G) That landmark and historic buildings will be preserved.

- H) Parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas will be protected from development.

I hereby certify that the Planning Commission ADOPTED the foregoing Resolution on August 12, 2010.



Linda Avery  
Commission Secretary

AYES: Miguel, Olague, Antonini, Borden, Lee, Moore, and Sugaya.

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

ADOPTED: August 12, 2010