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Vision
A sustainable neighborhood

Philosophy
Keep what’s great, fix what’s not

Strategy
– Accommodate demand
– Provide public benefits
– Respect and enhance neighborhood character
Goals

1. Accommodate a Substantial Amount of Jobs and Housing
2. Maintain the Diversity of Residents
3. Facilitate an Economically Diversified and Lively Jobs Center
4. Provide Safe and Convenient Transportation that Prioritizes Walking, Bicycling, and Transit
5. Offer an Abundance of Parks and Recreational Opportunities
6. Create an Environmentally Sustainable and Resilient Neighborhood
7. Preserve and Celebrate the Neighborhood’s Cultural Heritage
8. Ensure that New Buildings Enhance the Character of the Neighborhood and the City
PLANNING CODE AND ADMINISTRATIVE CODE AMENDMENTS

CONTENTS:

- Case Report
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LAND USE AND ZONING

• New “CMUO” Zoning District (Sec. 848):
  » Includes all relevant controls and references
  » Allows a wide range of uses

• New Central SoMa Special Use District (Sec. 249.78):
  » Requires large sites to be commercially-oriented
  » Requires PDR
  » Requires acquisition of Transferable Development Rights
  » Requires commercial uses on ground floor on major streets and micro-retail in large projects

• Historic buildings allowed to sell TDR (128.1)
PHYSICAL CHARACTER

• New bulk controls (Secs. 132.4, 261.1, and 270):
  » Create an “urban room”
  » Facilitate light and air through “skyplane”
  » For towers, limit floor size and require separation from each other

• Limit lot mergers to maintain fabric of fine-grained streets (Sec 249.78)

• Protect against strong winds (Sec 249.78)
OPEN SPACE, GREENING, AND ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY

- Require POPOS – at ground floor, open evenings and weekends, open to sky (Sec 138)
- Required “living roofs”, use of 100% GHG-free electricity (Sec. 249.78)
PARKING AND LOADING

• Residential parking maximum of 0.5 space per unit – no CU possible (Sec. 151.1)

• Office parking maximum of one space per 3,500 square feet (i.e., 15-20 employees) (Sec. 151.1)

• Curb cuts banned or require CU (Sec. 155)

• Projects require “Driveway and Loading Operations Plan” (Sec. 155)
EXACTIONS

• New fee tiers for properties getting the most increase in development capacity (Sec. 423)

• New fee to pay for community facilities (Sec. 432)

• New fee to pay for more transit (Sec. 433)

• New requirements that affordable housing fees would be expended within SoMa (Secs. 413, 415, 417, and 419)

• Updated “fee out” fees for open space (Secs. 426 and 427)

• New Mello-Roos Community Facilities District (Sec. TBD – in progress)

• New fee waiver options to facilitate the new Central SoMa Park (Sec. TBD – may be separate legislation)
PROCESS

• Increases threshold for sites requiring Large Project Authorization (Sec. 329)

• Provides CPC additional flexibility in review of the area’s largest projects (Sec. 329)

• Precludes “grandparenting” from requirements for projects benefitting from Central SoMa upzoning (Secs. 169, 411A, and 415)

• Allows “grandparenting” for projects not getting Central SoMa upzoning (Sec. 175.1)

• Remove CU requirement for PDR replacement under Prop X

• Precludes noise complaints against legally operating PDR uses (Admin Code 35)
ZONING MAP AMENDMENTS
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No Plan = $500 million in Public Benefits

Central SoMa Plan = $2.0 Billion in Public Benefits

400% increase due to the Plan

Plus ~$1 billion in increased General Fund tax revenues
## IMPLEMENTATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BENEFIT</th>
<th>TOTAL REVENUES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing</td>
<td>$940,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38% of new/rehabilitated housing is Below-Market Rate (BMR) (35% low/moderate income and 3% middle income)</td>
<td>$940,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>$500,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local transit improvements to enhance convenience and safety</td>
<td>$340,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional transit capacity enhancement and expansion</td>
<td>$160,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production, Distribution, &amp; Repair</td>
<td>$180,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation and creation of PDR space to ensure no net loss of PDR due to the Plan</td>
<td>$180,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks &amp; Recreation</td>
<td>$170,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gene Friend Recreation Center Reconstruction/Expansion</td>
<td>$25,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Manalo Draves Park Programming</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New 1-acre park in Southwest portion of Plan Area</td>
<td>$35,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New public recreation center</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New large (2+ acre) SoMa park (initial site identification)</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Bluxome linear park</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New under-freeway public recreation area</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privately-Owned Public Open Spaces (POPOS)</td>
<td>$80,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit</td>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Complete Streets</strong></td>
<td><strong>$130,000,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redesign of all major streets in the Plan Area to be safe and comfortable for people walking, biking, and on transit.</td>
<td>$130,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental Sustainability &amp; Resilience</strong></td>
<td><strong>$68,000,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced stormwater management in complete street projects</td>
<td>$32,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway corridor air quality and greening improvements</td>
<td>$22,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Roofs enhanced requirements</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other energy and water efficiency projects</td>
<td>$8,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Schools &amp; Childcare</strong></td>
<td><strong>$58,000,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New childcare centers</td>
<td>$26,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New schools serving K-12 population</td>
<td>$32,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural Preservation</strong></td>
<td><strong>$40,000,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restoration of the US Mint Building</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation and maintenance of historic buildings</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community services</strong></td>
<td><strong>$20,000,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New community facilities (e.g., health care clinics and job training centers)</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TO BE DETERMINED</strong></td>
<td><strong>$70,000,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,176,000,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART II – THEMES FOR DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE AMENDMENTS
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MAXIMIZE HOUSING

- Review of amount available studied in EIR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Maximum Studied per Central SoMa EIR</th>
<th>Assumption under Central SoMa Plan</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EIR “Study Area”</td>
<td>14,500</td>
<td>13,240</td>
<td>1,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Downtown + Central SoMa)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central SoMa Plan Area</td>
<td>8,320</td>
<td>7,060</td>
<td>1,260</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• What if we amend the Plan to exceed EIR housing maximum?
  » Require a new EIR (3-5 years and $ millions)
  » If goal to create jobs/housing balance at proposed densities:
    10,500 units and 15,000 jobs
  » I.e., 3.5K more units and 25K less jobs
• Review: why we are supporting jobs-orientation of Central SoMa

  » It’s not that jobs won’t come - they’ll go elsewhere or squeeze out our current jobs
  
  » Jobs elsewhere =
    
    » More driving (bad for traffic, air quality, and equity)
    
    » Different public benefits (can’t “fix what’s not great”)
  
  » Jobs locations are scarce - and housing sites abundant
  
  » Thousands of housing units queued up to be entitled in ’18–’19
• Ways to maximize Central SoMa housing within the EIR
  » Idea #1: Raising “commercial-orientation” site threshold from 30k to 40k:
     » Affects two known sites: “Wells Fargo” (4th and Brannan) and 330 Townsend
     » Could result in 800 units (check w Maia)
     » “Tower sites” are good for housing
• Ways to maximize Central SoMa housing within the EIR

• Idea #2 Rezoning WMUO to CMUO:
  » Affects 28 parcels in area on 6th and Bryant wrapping the Flower Mart and Bryant just east of 5th
  » Could result in 600 units
    » ~250 units east of 5th Street
    » ~250 units between 5th and 6th Street
    » ~100 units along 6th Street
  » Units between 5th and 6th would back onto shared Flower Mart service alley
THEMES FOR DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE AMENDMENTS
• Ways to facilitate housing
  » Idea #1: Speed up entitlement process via AB73
  » Idea #2: Make rental housing more economically feasible
  » Idea #3: Limit hotels
• Additional Issues
  » Development of social and cultural benefits package
  » Development of a SoMa CAC
  » Mid-Rise Option along 2nd Street
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