



San Francisco
Planning

CENTRAL SOMA

PLAN & IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY

**DRAFT FOR PUBLIC REVIEW
AUGUST 2016**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

PLAN PURPOSE

Central SoMa is a 230-acre area that sits adjacent to downtown, has excellent transit access, and contains numerous undeveloped or underdeveloped sites, such as surface parking lots and single-story commercial buildings. As such, the neighborhood is well positioned to accommodate needed employment and housing in the core of the city and Bay Area region. It is also a neighborhood with an incredible history and a rich, ongoing, cultural heritage. As it grows and evolves over the next 25 years, Central SoMa has the opportunity to become a complete, sustainable, and vital neighborhood without losing what makes it special and unique today. The Central SoMa Plan contains the goals, objectives, and policies to guide this growth and evolution such that the results serve the best interests of San Francisco – in the present and the future.

PLAN AREA BOUNDARY

The Central SoMa Plan Area is bounded by 2nd Street in the east, 6th Street in the west, Townsend Street to the south, and an irregular border to the north generally south of Folsom Street east of 4th Street and Howard Street, Clementina Street between 4th and 5th Streets, and Natoma Street between 5th and 6th Streets. It is within the larger Eastern Neighborhoods Plan Area and is comprised entirely of areas currently part of the East SoMa Plan Area and Western SoMa Plan Area. The Central SoMa Plan Area boundaries were created to include areas within easy walking distance (i.e., two blocks) of the Central Subway's 4th Street alignment.

PLAN VISION

The vision of the Central SoMa Plan is to create a social, economic, and environmentally sustainable neighborhood by 2040, where the needs of the present are met without compromising the opportunities of future generations. Additionally, achieving sustainability in Central SoMa should complement movements towards sustainability in the city, region, nation, and planet.

PLAN PHILOSOPHY, STRATEGY, AND GOALS

The Plan's philosophy for achieving neighborhood sustainability is to maintain what is already successful about the neighborhood, and improving what is not. Doing so requires implementing the following three strategies:

- Accommodate growth
- Provide public benefits
- Respect and enhance neighborhood character

Implementing the Plan's strategy will require addressing all the facets of a sustainable neighborhood. Doing so can be accomplished by meeting all of the Plan's eight goals to achieve the following results:

- Increase the Capacity for Jobs and Housing
- Maintain the Diversity of Residents
- Facilitate an Economically Diversified and Lively Jobs Center
- Provide Safe and Convenient Transportation that Prioritizes Walking, Bicycling, and Transit

- Offer an Abundance of Parks and Recreational Opportunities
- Create an Environmentally Sustainable and Resilient Neighborhood
- Preserve and Celebrate the Neighborhood's Cultural Heritage
- Ensure that New Buildings Enhance the Character of the Neighborhood and the City

EXPECTED RESULTS

Under existing City rules, there is potential to build space for approximately 10,000 jobs and 2,500 housing units. With adoption of the Central SoMa Plan, there would be potential to build space for approximately 45,000 jobs and 7,500 housing units. The Plan therefore represents an increase in development capacity of 450 percent for jobs and 300 percent for housing.

Increasing the population of the neighborhood requires significant investments in infrastructure. As such, the City places requirements on new development to help ameliorate and mitigate its impacts. As well, various land use controls are also put in place to ensure that new development in Central SoMa reflects the characteristics of the neighborhood and achieves the ideals put forward by the Plan. These requirements and controls would result in up to \$2 billion in public benefits to serve the neighborhood – compared to the \$300 million that would occur without the Plan. The public benefits expected in Central SoMa include:

- **Affordable Housing:** 33 percent of total units produced after Plan adoption;
- **Transit:** \$500 million investment in both near and long term service and capacity enhancements to both local and regional transit;
- **Parks and Recreation:** Transformative investments in new facilities and enhancements to existing ones (e.g.; parks, recreation centers, privately-owned public open spaces (POPOS));
- **Complete Streets:** Safe and comfortable conditions for people walking and biking on 100 percent of all major streets in the Plan Area;
- **Production, Distribution, and Repair (including Arts):** No net loss of space due to Plan;
- **Environmental Sustainability:** Investment towards becoming a truly sustainable (healthy, green, efficient), resilient, and regenerative neighborhood;
- **Community Services:** Space for services, such as health clinics and job training, to support an expanding population;
- **Cultural Preservation:** Funding towards preservation of the area's historic buildings and rehabilitation of the Old Mint; and
- **Schools and Children:** Funding to support the expanding population.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Central SoMa Plan is the result of six years of intensive public engagement, involving over a thousand people and an untold number of conversations. We appreciate all the input we received and everyone's willingness to share their concerns, insights, and dreams. The goal of this Plan is to reflect the collective wisdom of the community at this time in a way that sustains it far into the future.

We want to thank Mayor Edwin Lee and Supervisor Jane Kim, who provided leadership and guidance through the entire planning process. We would also like to thank all of the City Departments who participated in its development to make sure that the City Family will speak with one voice from the adoption to the implementation of this Plan. And most of all we would like to thank every member of the community who participated in the creation of this. This Plan would not be possible without the many days and evenings you spent coming to our community open houses, hosting us at your community groups, sending emails, making phone calls, answering surveys, and otherwise making sure your ideas were heard.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART I: CENTRAL SOMA PLAN

Overview: Central SoMa, a Sustainable Neighborhood

Goal 1: Increase the Capacity for Jobs and Housing

Goal 2: Maintain the Diversity of Residents

Goal 3: Facilitate an Economically Diversified and Lively Jobs Center

Goal 4: Provide Safe and Convenient Transportation that Prioritizes Walking, Bicycling, and Transit

Goal 5: Offer an Abundance of Parks and Recreational Opportunities

Goal 6: Create an Environmentally Sustainable and Resilient Neighborhood

Goal 7: Preserve and Celebrate the Neighborhood's Cultural Heritage

Goal 8: Ensure that New Buildings Enhance the Character of the Neighborhood and the City

PART II: CENTRAL SOMA IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY

A. Implementation Matrix

B. Public Benefits Package


C. Requirements for New Development

D. Guide to Urban Design

E. Draft Key Development Site Guidelines



**PART I:
CENTRAL
SOMA PLAN**



OVERVIEW

CENTRAL SOMA

a sustainable

NEIGHBORHOOD

PLAN PURPOSE

Central SoMa is a 230-acre area that sits adjacent to downtown, has excellent transit access, and contains a substantial amount of developable land. As such, the neighborhood is well positioned to accommodate needed employment, housing, and visitor facilities in the core of the city and Bay Area region. It is also a neighborhood with an incredible history and a rich, ongoing, cultural heritage. As it grows and evolves over the next 25 years, Central SoMa has the opportunity to become a complete, sustainable, and vital neighborhood without losing what makes it special and unique today. The Central SoMa Plan contains the goals, objectives, and policies to guide this growth and evolution such that the results serve the best interests of San Francisco – in the present and the future.




Figure A
PLAN AREA BOUNDARY



2,000 Feet

- - - Central Subway
 under construction, expected to open in 2019
- - - BART/Muni Metro Subway
- Muni Metro (Surface)

PLAN AREA BOUNDARY

The Central SoMa Plan Area runs from 2nd Street to 6th Street, Market Street to Townsend Street, exclusive of those areas that are part of the Downtown Plan (see Figure A). It is an “Eastern Neighborhoods Plan” comprised entirely of areas formerly part of the East SoMa Plan Area and Western SoMa Plan Area, whose boundaries shall be adjusted accordingly. The Central SoMa Plan Area boundaries were created to include areas within easy walking distance (i.e., two blocks) of the Central Subway’s 4th Street alignment.

PLAN VISION

The vision of the Central SoMa Plan is to create a sustainable neighborhood by 2040, where the needs of the present are met without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. The Central SoMa Plan seeks to achieve sustainability in each of its aspects – social, economic, and environmental. Additionally, achieving sustainability in Central SoMa should complement movements towards sustainability in the city, region, nation, and planet.



PLAN PHILOSOPHY

Achieving neighborhood sustainability requires keeping what is already successful about the neighborhood, and improving what is not. On the sustainable side of the ledger, assets include the diversity of residents (in every sense), its central location complemented by abundant regional and local transit, the unique character of the collection of buildings that constitute the neighborhood, its rich economic heritage as an industrial center for a century and more recently a hub of innovation in media and technology, and the cultural and nightlife amenities

that make this a regional and worldwide destination. On the non-sustainable side of the ledger include an equally impressive and daunting list of challenges: rents that are unaffordable to the vast majority of residents and businesses; streets that are unsafe and unpleasant for people walking and bicycling; a distinct lack of green coupled with an noisy and often polluted environment; and land that is not effectively being utilized to provide space for jobs and housing in a fashion that can greatly reduce the emissions of greenhouse gases per person and add to the stock of space to help meet demand.

neighborhood strengths




Diversity of Residents
and Jobs



Transit-Served
Central Location



Diversity of Buildings
and Architecture



Culture and
Nightlife

neighborhood challenges



Rents



Conditions for People
Walking and Biking



Lack of Parks and
Open Space



Inefficient
Use of Land


PLAN STRATEGY

Utilizing the Plan’s philosophy to achieve the Plan’s vision will require implementing the following three strategies:

- Accommodate growth
- Provide public benefits
- Respect and enhance neighborhood character

This Plan asserts that Central SoMa should play a major role in accommodating the City’s share of anticipated regional growth in jobs and housing. Accommodating substantial growth here can help address the local and regional issues of high rents, sprawl, and congestion, and the global issue of greenhouse gas emissions. The addition of millions of square feet of residential and commercial space is certain to help relieve price pressure. Simultaneously, dense development in this transit-rich, temperate, and walkable neighborhood can drastically reduce the amount of greenhouse gas emission per person from both buildings (e.g., for heating and cooling) and transportation (in terms of the amount of miles traveled in private vehicles), while reducing pressures for growth in more outlying areas of the region.

While new growth can have economic and environmental benefits, new residents and workers also place a strain on the neighborhood’s infrastructure. In an era where other levels of government are either unwilling or unable to fund the needs of its urban communities, it is necessary that new growth address its own impacts. Fortunately, Central SoMa includes some of the world’s most valuable land. The rents commanded by this land enable new development to ameliorate and mitigate its impacts while meeting other City objectives. New development does so through the direct provision of public benefits, through the payment of impact fees, and through taxes. The public benefits created by new development can include affordable housing,



transit service, parks and recreational amenities, safe and convenient streets for people walking and biking, child care, schools, community services, space for production, distribution, and repair jobs, preservation of cultural resources, and amenities to support environmental sustainability and resilience.

Given the desirability of land in Central SoMa, there’s likely demand for buildings of heights currently only seen in the downtown. While such heights could come with even greater public benefits, they would also come at the expense of what makes the neighborhood great in the first place – its character. And its character is a huge part of what makes the neighborhood socially and economically sustainable. Central SoMa should not be like downtown – just like it should not be like Mission Bay, or the Richmond, or any other neighborhood in San Francisco. It should just be the best Central SoMa it can be. Therefore, this plan attempts to both accommodate a substantial amount of growth and retain much of the character of the district. Respecting and enhancing the neighborhood’s character includes measures such as requiring active ground floors that promote positive social interactions and commerce, design requirements that ensure ample light and air reach all sidewalks, and banning the consolidation of certain lots so as to maintain the diversity of buildings and building styles in the neighborhood.

PLAN GOALS

Implementing the Plan’s strategy will require addressing all the facets of a sustainable neighborhood. Doing so can be accomplished by meeting all of the Plan’s eight Goals:

- Increase the Capacity for Jobs and Housing
- Maintain the Diversity of Residents
- Facilitate an Economically Diversified and Lively Jobs Center
- Provide Safe and Convenient Transportation that Prioritizes Walking, Bicycling, and Transit
- Offer an Abundance of Parks and Recreational Opportunities
- Create an Environmentally Sustainable and Resilient Neighborhood
- Preserve and Celebrate the Neighborhood’s Cultural Heritage
- Ensure that New Buildings Enhance the Character of the Neighborhood and the City

Each of these eight Goals receives its own chapter in the Central SoMa Plan. For each Goal there is a context section intended to explain existing conditions – and why meeting the goal is necessary. There is also a list of the Objectives and Policies whose implementation would enable the Plan to meet the Goal. And finally there is a summary section that shows how meeting the Goal would help fulfill the Plan’s vision.



OTHER PLANNING EFFORTS

The Central SoMa Plan is only one of many local and regional efforts intended to accommodate growth. In the past 10 years, the City has completed a number of Area Plans, generally in the southeastern part of the city. As shown in Figure B, these include Rincon Hill (2006), Market & Octavia (2008), Central Waterfront (2008), East SoMa (2008), the Mission (2008), Showplace Square/Potrero Hill (2008), Transit Center (2012), and Western SoMa (2013). This time period has also seen a substantial build out of the Mission Bay Redevelopment Plan (1998). The City is currently undergoing studies related to the future of the Caltrain station and yards at 4th and King Streets.

In addition to all of these local plans, there are many efforts being undertaken throughout the region. Most of these are in “Priority Development Areas” identified in the Bay Area’s regional planning strategy, Plan Bay Area (2013) (see Figure C). The preponderance of growth in the region is expected to occur in these Priority Development Areas.

Central SoMa should play a major role in accommodating the City’s share of anticipated regional growth in jobs and housing.





Figure B
COMPLETED AND ONGOING PLANS

Figure C
PRIORITY DEVELOPMENT AREAS



PLANNING PROCESS

The desire for a Central SoMa Plan began during the Eastern Neighborhoods planning process. In 2008 the City adopted the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan, including new land use controls and proposed community improvements for the eastern part of the South of Market neighborhood (SoMa), as well as the Central Waterfront, Mission, and Showplace Square/Potrero Hill neighborhoods. At that time, the City determined that the development potential of the industrially zoned part of East SoMa, coupled with the improved transit provided by the Central Subway, necessitated a subsequent, focused planning process that took into account the city's growth needs and City and regional environmental goals. The Central SoMa Plan is that subsequent process.

The process of creating the Central SoMa Plan began in earnest in 2011, just as the public and private sectors were climbing out of the Great Recession. From its inception, the Planning Department has prioritized listening, engagement, and dialogue. As of July 2016, this has included: seven public open houses; seven public hearings at the Planning Commission; additional hearings at the Historic Preservation Commission, Arts Commission, and Youth Commission; a "technical advisory committee" consisting of multiple City and regional agencies; regularly scheduled check-ins with the Mayor's Office and

Supervisor Kim's office; a "storefront charrette" (where the Planning Department set up shop in a retail space in the neighborhood); two walking tours, led by community members; two community surveys; an online discussion board; meetings with the neighborhood's community groups, homeowners associations, merchants' associations, and activist groups; and thousands of individual meetings, phone calls, and emails with stakeholders ranging from developers, property owners, business owners, renters, workers, media members, and anyone else who has interest in the Plan. Throughout the planning process, the Planning Department's policy towards engagement has always been "anywhere, anytime." If a community group or individual wants to talk about Central SoMa the answer is always say yes. To ensure people feel free to speak their mind, the Planning Department has always agreed to meet on people's own turf, with their own rules, format, and questions.

The Draft Plan you are reading is the result of all of this intensive public engagement, involving over a thousand people and an untold number of conversations. The City appreciates all the input received and everyone's willingness to share their concerns, insights, and dreams. The goal of this Plan is to reflect the collective wisdom of the community at this time in a way that sustains it far into the future.



Photos by SF Planning.




Photo by SF Planning.



This moment reflects the culmination of major environmental, economic, and social trends that are simultaneously working at multiple geographic levels and timeframes.

Photo by Daniel Austin Hoherd, Flickr (CC BY-NC 2.0).

Increase the Capacity for Jobs and Housing

CONTEXT

Since its inception, San Francisco has seen more than its share of tumultuous economic times: the Gold and Silver Rushes (and busts), the earthquake and fire of 1906, the influx of World War II, population decline due to suburbanization, the Dot Com boom and bust. They have all left lasting shrines and scars on this city.

As of the writing of this Plan in 2016, San Francisco is having another one of those “moments”. This moment reflects the culmination of major environmental, economic, and social trends that are simultaneously working at multiple geographic levels and timeframes.

Environmentally, there is an increasing awareness of the need to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in recognition of the consequences of climate change. At the State level, this led to the adoption of Senate Bill (SB) 375 in 2008. SB 375 mandated the State’s regions to identify how they would combine transportation investments and land use policy to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. At the regional level, this mandate led to the adoption of Plan Bay Area in 2013, which

determined that meeting the State’s targets would require densification and investment in “Priority Development Areas” that exhibit and/or have the potential to combine density of development with excellent transit service. At the local level, the City identified a number of such “Priority Development Areas” that span much of the eastern half of the city.

Economically, there is the continuing national and regional shift from an economy based on things to one based on ideas. Nationally, in the aftermath of the Great Recession (2007-2009), job growth has been led by “knowledge” sector businesses such as high tech. These knowledge sector businesses tend to cluster in regions – and the Bay Area is the world’s leading knowledge region. The result is that job growth in the Bay Area the past several years has nearly doubled that of the rest of the nation, and commensurately so has the demand for housing. Bay Area job growth has been particularly high in the last six years (2010-2015), concurrent with the development of this Plan, as the region moved from the nadir to the peak of the current business cycle.



Photo by David Leong, SF Planning.

Socially, Americans are showing an increasing preference for an accessible and dynamic urban lifestyle.

After rapid suburbanization in the decades after World War II, cities such as San Francisco have seen long-term population and job growth since the 1980s, despite temporary peaks and dips along the way. This trend has accelerated in recent years, as both “Millennials” and Baby Boomers have shown a strong preference for cities. This trend has focused demand on those portions of the Bay Area where jobs can be easily accessed by transit, daily needs can be met by walking, and there are a range of amenities and options nearby. In this largely suburban and auto-dependent region, many of the accessible and dynamic urban neighborhoods are in San Francisco.

Cumulatively, these trends have created an ongoing and strong demand for space in San Francisco. Accommodating this demand would require building additional space for jobs, housing, and other needed facilities. However, building in San Francisco is a challenging and time consuming process. New buildings often require years of review and deliberation before they are even allowed to be constructed, and construction itself can take one to three years, depending on the size of the building.



Photo by David Leong, SF Planning.

In 2016, housing prices have risen to a level that is socially unsustainable.

When demand is high relative to supply, the price inevitably goes up. In 2016, prices have risen to a level that is socially unsustainable – rents for housing are the highest in the country, and greatly exceed what can be afforded by the majority of today’s San Franciscans. Rents for commercial space are similarly unaffordable, pushing out non-profit organizations, mom-and-pop businesses, artists and industrial businesses.

To some degree, the intensity of this “moment” will pass when the current business cycle inevitably cools. However, the other environmental, economic, and social factors that have created this moment are likely to persist over a longer timeframe than the typical 5-10 year business cycle. They are also national or even global forces exogenous to San Francisco – and thus the demand they exert are beyond the ability to control locally.

The City has been planning for growth over the last 20 years; however, there is still substantial demand for jobs and housing in transit-rich, walkable, amenity-laden neighborhoods.

By contrast, what is within our ability to control locally is increasing the capacity for jobs and housing in San Francisco, and to ensure that new growth provides public benefits to improve the lives of residents and workers. The City has been planning for such growth over the last 20 years, through major Redevelopment and Area Plans as Mission Bay, Hunters Point, Rincon Hill, Eastern Neighborhoods, Market & Octavia, and the Transit Center District. The results of these Plans can be seen in the cranes and construction sites dotting San Francisco. However, there is still substantial demand for development of space for jobs and housing in transit-rich, walkable, amenity-laden neighborhoods.



Photo by Daniel Austin Hoherd, Flickr (CC BY-NC 2.0).



Photo by Petar Iliev, SF Planning.

Central SoMa is an appropriate location for development, served by some of the region's best transit.

Fortunately, Central SoMa is an appropriate location for such development. The area is served by some of the region's best transit, including BART and Caltrain, Muni Metro and many bus lines, in addition to the Central Subway currently under construction. Flat streets and a regular grid pattern can make destinations easy to reach for people walking and bicycling (as facilitated by improvements discussed in Goal 4). There is already an incredibly strong cluster of technology companies that new and growing companies want to locate near. There is also a diversity of other uses, including thousands of residential units, local- and regional-serving retail, cultural and entertainment facilities, hotels, and production/distribution/repair businesses. Simultaneously, there is substantial opportunity to increase density in Central SoMa. There are numerous undeveloped or underdeveloped sites, such as surface parking lots and single-story commercial buildings.



Central SoMa has numerous underdeveloped parcels. Photo by Josh Switzky, SF Planning.

OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES

The Objectives and Policies below are intended to fulfill the Plan’s Goal of increasing the capacity for jobs and housing in Central SoMa.

OBJECTIVE 1.1

INCREASE THE AREA WHERE SPACE FOR JOBS AND HOUSING CAN BE BUILT

Central SoMa includes two types of areas: one that has always allowed development of new residential and non-residential space (including office), and one that has prevented the creation of new space since the late 1980s. To be able to increase the capacity for jobs and housing in Central SoMa, it is necessary to increase the area where new development can occur.

Policy 1.1.1 Retain existing zoning that supports capacity for new jobs and housing.

To expand the area where new development can occur necessitates maintaining the existing areas where development can occur, as shown generally in Figures 1.1 and 1.2 and specifically in Figures 1.3 and 1.4.

Policy 1.1.2 Replace existing zoning that restricts capacity for development with zoning that supports capacity for new jobs and housing.

The Plan Area includes a substantial amount of area whose zoning generally does not allow either new housing or new commercial space such as office (see Figure 1.1). These districts should be replaced with zoning that permits new housing and office uses (see Figure 1.2), except in limited locations as discussed in Chapter 3.



Figure 1.1
EXISTING ZONING (GENERALIZED)





Figure 1.2
PROPOSED ZONING (GENERALIZED)

Figure 1.3

EXISTING ZONING



1,000 Feet

Figure 1.4

PROPOSED ZONING



1,000 Feet

OBJECTIVE 1.2

INCREASE HOW MUCH SPACE FOR JOBS AND HOUSING CAN BE BUILT

The amount of development allowed on a piece of land is controlled in a number of ways, foremost being the limits on how tall and how bulky a building can be, and secondarily through strict density controls.


Policy 1.2.1 Increase height limits on parcels, as appropriate.

In Central SoMa, the typical height limit on the major streets has been 65-85 feet, although it has been up to 130 feet on a handful of parcels adjacent to the downtown (see Figures 1.5 and 1.7). However, there are several areas along major streets where height limits have been held substantially lower – including as low as 30 feet along the freeway. Despite this, there are numerous locations where the wide streets and urban context support higher densities and building heights

above 85 feet, as long as they are complemented by appropriate controls on building massing. To be able to increase the capacity for jobs and housing in Central SoMa, it is necessary to increase the allowable heights at these locations (see Figures 1.6 and 1.8).

Policy 1.2.2 Allow physical controls for height, bulk, setbacks, and open space to determine density.

Throughout much of Central SoMa, residential developments are not subject to such density controls, and the controls for non-residential uses are not a substantial impediment to the amount of development that can occur. However, where heights are proposed to increase above 85 feet, existing density controls for non-residential uses would likely restrict development. To be able to increase the capacity for jobs in Central SoMa, it is necessary to lift these density controls in a way that supports development but still fulfills all of the design controls for new buildings articulated in Goal 8 of this Plan.



333-345 Brannan, an example of new office buildings in Central SoMa. Photo by [Google Street View](#).




Figure 1.5
EXISTING HEIGHT LIMITS (GENERALIZED)




Figure 1.6
PROPOSED HEIGHT LIMITS (GENERALIZED)



New housing development in the Plan Area. Photo by [Google Street View/Images](https://www.google.com/maps/@37.7749394,-122.4212122,15z).

Figure 1.7

EXISTING HEIGHTS AND BULK LIMITS



For bulk controls, reference Planning Code Section 270.



1,000 Feet

Figure 1.8

PROPOSED HEIGHT AND BULK LIMITS



For "CS" bulk controls reference the Central SoMa Implementation Matrix.
 For all other bulk controls, reference Planning Code Section 270.



Overall Change in Development Capacity

The maps below are intended to convey how the zoning controls and height limits interact to result in development capacity. The “Existing Development Capacity” map (Figure 1.9), shows the substantial amount of area where new space for housing and most jobs are not allowed, and the lower height limits in the preponderance of the Plan Area. The “Proposed Development Capacity” map (Figure 1.10), shows the increase in the area that is available for jobs and housing, as well as the increase in the amount of development allowed – particularly in the northeast and southwest portions of the Plan Area.

The change of development capacity in the Plan Area could lead to the development of space for 45,000 jobs and 7,800 housing units.




Figure 1.9
**EXISTING DEVELOPMENT CAPACITY
(GENERALIZED)**



Figure 1.10
**PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT CAPACITY
(GENERALIZED)**

The diagrams on the right convey where this new development potential may occur, based on the proposed zoning, height limits, and bulk controls (discussed in Goal 8). Figure 1.11 conveys existing buildings. Figure 1.12 shows where new development may occur in Central SoMa (yellow), as well as projects outside the Plan Area that are either already under construction or that have submitted an application for development to the Planning Department (blue).



Figure 1.11
3-D MODEL OF EXISTING BUILDINGS (2016)

SF Digital Model by SOM




Figure 1.12
3-D MODEL OF POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

This image is intended to visualize the overall development capacity of the Central SoMa Plan. It is not meant to be a precise assessment of potential at the individual parcel level. It is certain that eventual development at these locations will look differently than rendered in this image.

SF Digital Model by SOM



Flora, a Folsom + Dore resident. Photo by B.J. Owens.



FULFILLING THE VISION

Increasing the capacity for jobs and housing in Central SoMa (as shown in Figures 1.10) would help fulfill the Plan's vision of creating a sustainable neighborhood by:



Supporting **social sustainability** by helping address the supply/demand imbalance that has caused rents to become unaffordable.



Supporting **economic sustainability** by providing space for the knowledge-sector jobs that are a key driver of the city's economy, and for other jobs that support economic diversity.



Supporting **environmental sustainability** by enabling dense urban development that requires less greenhouse gas emissions per person (from both buildings and vehicles) and reduces demand to convert natural areas and/or farmlands into areas for human habitation.



2



SoMa has always played an important role in housing low- and moderate-income San Franciscans.

Photo by David Leong, SF Planning.

Maintain the Diversity of Residents

CONTEXT

SoMa has always played an important role in housing low- and moderate-income San Franciscans in various forms, from the single-room occupancy (SRO) hotels that historically primarily housed single men and residential towers dedicated to housing seniors, to the modest family-oriented housing that has lined the alleys. In more recent decades, a substantial amount of market-rate housing (generally affordable to those with higher incomes) has been created, as well as conversions of older warehouses. These buildings included condominiums, apartment buildings, and live-work lofts. The neighborhood also includes a homeless population, many of whom come to the neighborhood to use the services available here, including a large shelter currently located at 5th and Bryant Streets.

The result is that today SoMa has an incredibly diverse population, in terms of race, income, and unit size. This diversity is a critical part of its neighborhood character. Respecting this neighborhood character requires that the variety provided by the existing residents should be maintained, and that future development would replicate this pattern to the highest degree possible.



Photo by Sergio Ruiz.

SoMa has an incredibly diverse population, in terms of race, income, and unit size – a critical part of its neighborhood character.

However, doing so will be a substantial challenge, given current market conditions that favor those with higher incomes in the competition for both existing units and new units.

OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES

The Objectives and Policies below are intended to fulfill the goal of maintaining the diversity of residents in Central SoMa.

OBJECTIVE 2.1

MAINTAIN THE EXISTING STOCK OF HOUSING

In the effort to address San Francisco’s lack of housing, it is important to preserve as many of the existing units as possible.

Policy 2.1.1 Continue implementing controls that maintains the existing supply of housing.

The City’s current policy is to limit the loss of housing due to the merger or demolition of units and the conversion of units to non-residential uses. The City should continue to implement these policies, and seek new strategies that accomplish their goal.

OBJECTIVE 2.2

MAINTAIN THE AFFORDABILITY OF THE EXISTING HOUSING STOCK


Central SoMa contains a substantial stock of affordable housing, including 100 percent affordable buildings (mostly clustered around the Moscone Center in the former Yerba Buena Redevelopment Area) and rent controlled buildings (including many in the more residentially-focused area west of 5th Street and north of the freeway). The Plan supports the preservation of this housing and the protection of tenants who occupy this housing. It also supports programs to expand the stock of affordable housing.

Policy 2.2.1 Continue implementing controls and strategies that help maintain the existing supply of affordable housing.

The City seeks to maintain the existing supply of affordable housing through measures that keep people in their homes, such as rent control and eviction protections. The City also seeks to ensure that affordable units stay both affordable and habitable, through such strategies as the Rental Assistance Demonstration Program. The City should continue to implement such policies and programs, and seek new strategies that accomplish their goal.

Policy 2.2.2 Support the conversion of existing housing into permanently affordable housing.

Through the “Small Sites” program, the City is currently seeking to expand the existing supply of affordable housing by purchasing units and making them permanently affordable. The City should continue to implement such programs, and seek new strategies that accomplish their goal.



Plaza Apartments, 988 Howard Street. Photo by SF Planning.



An example of existing affordable senior housing in the Plan Area. Photo by [Google Street View](#).

OBJECTIVE 2.3

ENSURE THAT AT LEAST 33 PERCENT OF NEW HOUSING IS AFFORDABLE TO VERY LOW, LOW, AND MODERATE-INCOME HOUSEHOLDS

Through the adoption of Proposition K in 2014, San Francisco has set a target that 33 percent of all new housing is affordable to very low, low, and moderate income households (i.e., households making up to 100 percent of the Area Median Income). The Central SoMa Plan aims to ensure that new development in the Plan Area meets this target.

Policy 2.3.1

Set affordability requirements for new residential development at rates necessary to fulfill this objective.

The City already requires residential development of 10 or more units to provide affordable housing. As discussed in Goal #1, the Central SoMa Plan will increase the development capacity on a substantial portion of the parcels of land in the Plan Area where residential development may occur. Such development capacity will increase the demand for affordable housing commensurately. Therefore, new residential development on parcels that received increased value shall be required to provide additional affordable housing compared to residential development on those parcels that did not receive increase value.

Policy 2.3.2 Require increased contribution to affordable housing from commercial uses on land where development capacity is substantially increased.

The City already requires commercial development of 25,000 square feet or more to contribute to the development of affordable housing (typically through the payment of a fee). As discussed in Goal #1, the Central SoMa Plan will increase the development capacity (and thus land value) on a substantial portion of the parcels of land in the Plan Area where commercial development may occur, such as offices, hotels, and retail. In order to address the impacts of this increased commercial density, new commercial projects on these parcels shall be required to provide an increased contribution to affordable housing.

To fulfill the goal of maintaining the diversity of residents, it is necessary that any fees collected by the City be invested within or near the neighborhood.

Policy 2.3.3 Ensure that affordable housing generated by the Central SoMa Plan stays in the neighborhood.

New residential and commercial development in Central SoMa Plan will generate a substantial amount of affordable housing, either by building it directly (within the building or nearby), paying a fee to the City, or dedicating land for the City to build on. To fulfill the goal of maintaining the diversity of residents, it is necessary that any fees collected by the City be invested within or near the neighborhood. Additionally, any land dedicated to the City for affordable housing should similarly be within or near the neighborhood.

Policy 2.3.4 Allow affordable housing sites to sell any unused development rights.

Affordable housing development typically is built to heights of 85 feet or below, where it can benefit from cheaper construction costs. In areas where height limits exceed 85 feet, this means that the affordable housing is not utilizing its full development capacity. The City should support the financial feasibility of affordable housing developments by utilizing its ability to sell its unused development rights so that others can fulfill their potential.



Example of new affordable housing in San Francisco. Photo by [Google Street View](#).



Example of new affordable housing in San Francisco. Photo by Taggart Architects.

The lack of availability and production of housing affordable to these households is a large factor in the decrease in San Francisco’s middle class in recent years.

OBJECTIVE 2.4

SUPPORT HOUSING FOR OTHER HOUSEHOLDS THAT CANNOT AFFORD MARKET RATE HOUSING

There is a large swath of the population whose income disqualifies them from “affordable” housing under existing programs at the federal, state and local levels (up to 120 percent of Area Median Income), but who often cannot afford prevailing prices for market-rate housing. The lack of availability and production of housing affordable to these households is a large factor in the decrease in San Francisco’s middle class in recent years.

Policy 2.4.1 Continue implementing strategies that support the development of “gap” housing.

The development of housing above 120 percent Area Median Income is challenging, because such housing lacks access to federal tax incentives – often making it more expensive to build than affordable housing. That being said, the City is developing strategies to create more housing in this “gap”, including through funding created through 2015’s Proposition A and down payment assistance loan programs. The City should continue to implement such strategies, and continue to seek new ways that accomplish their goal.



Child care is an important part of supporting residential diversity. Photo by Taggart Architects.

OBJECTIVE 2.5

SUPPORT HOUSING FOR A DIVERSITY OF HOUSEHOLD SIZES AND TENURES

The diversity of SoMa’s housing is not just about incomes, but the size of households as well. The Central SoMa Plan aims to ensure that new units are reflective of this broad mix.

Policy 2.5.1 Continue requiring family-sized units.

Central SoMa has traditionally been a neighborhood with a diverse mix of housing types, from small single-room-occupancy units to larger homes for families. By contrast, new development often wants to provide mostly smaller units (studios and one-bedrooms) that do not meet the needs of families. The City’s current policy in Central SoMa is to require that new residential development contain a high percentage of family-sized units with two or more bedrooms. The City should continue to implement this policy, and seek new strategies that accomplish its goal.



Bessie Carmichael School is the only public school in the Plan Area.
Photo by [Google Street View](#).



Photo by St. Vincent de Paul Society, San Francisco.

To maintain a diversity of residents it is necessary to provide the services they need; including schools, child care, and community services.

OBJECTIVE 2.6

SUPPORT SERVICES – SCHOOLS, CHILD CARE, AND COMMUNITY SERVICES – NECESSARY TO SERVE LOCAL RESIDENTS

To maintain a diversity of residents it is necessary to provide the services they need; including schools, child care, and community services. The Central SoMa Plan aims to ensure that sufficient amenities are available to residents.

Policy 2.6.1 Help fund public schools.

The San Francisco Unified School District already collects impact fees from new development. This funding is utilized for capital improvements of existing schools and for new ones, including the proposed new school in Mission Bay. Development in the Plan Area should continue to contribute to the School District’s funding.

Policy 2.6.2 Help fund childcare facilities.

San Francisco is suffering from a lack of licensed childcare. This is due to a lack of funding and a difficulty in finding space that meets the State’s strict requirements for childcare centers. From the funding standpoint, the City currently supports the creation of childcare through both the Child Care Impact Fee and the Eastern Neighborhoods Impact Fee. Development in the Plan Area should contribute to child care via these fees.

Policy 2.6.3 Help fund the creation of new community services.

“Community services” include space for non-profit and government organizations that provide services to the community, such as health clinics and job training. The City should support these uses in Central SoMa, including creation of an impact fee on new development to help provide community facilities.

FULFILLING THE VISION

Maintaining the diversity of residents in Central SoMa would help fulfill the Plan’s vision of creating a sustainable neighborhood by:



Supporting **social sustainability** by ensuring a wide range of San Franciscans have the opportunity to live in the neighborhood.



Supporting **economic sustainability** by supporting the housing of a diversity of people near jobs, thereby supporting the hiring needs of those organizations and the access to opportunity of those residents.



Supporting **environmental sustainability** by placing a diversity of people near the diversity of jobs, thereby reducing car trips.



SoMa has been a commercial center for San Francisco for well over a century and is well positioned to be a center for job growth.

Facilitate an Economically Diversified and Lively Jobs Center

CONTEXT

SoMa has been a commercial center for San Francisco for well over a century. Historically an industrial district, such businesses now sit cheek by jowl with offices, retail, hotels, and entertainment venues. This combination creates an environment that is both incredibly lively and unique in San Francisco.

Moving forward, Central SoMa is also well positioned to be a center for job growth. As discussed in Goal #1, it is well located, being served by some of the region's best transit and having a lot of developable land. Much of that demand will be for office-oriented jobs, particularly in the "knowledge-sector" industries that drive our economy. However, in allowing for that growth it is important that the neighborhood maintains and grows its other sectors to sustain its unique diversity of economic activities and the liveliness that SoMa is known for.

OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES

The Objectives and Policies below are intended to fulfill the goal of facilitating an economically diversified and lively jobs center.

OBJECTIVE 2.1

FAVOR NON-RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OVER OTHER KINDS OF GROWTH

In the overall city context, it is critical to favor growth in Central SoMa towards non-residential development. Previous City planning efforts have already identified areas to meet our housing needs – including over 100,000 units in the next 25 years. By contrast, previous planning efforts have not identified areas to meet the expected jobs growth of at least another 100,000 jobs in the same timeframe. Such jobs should be located adjacent to major local and regional transit stations, as commuters are most likely to use transit when stations are very close to their jobs than when transit is very close to their homes but their jobs are more distant. The Plan Area has some of the best transit in

the region, being proximal to two regional train lines (BART and Caltrain), Muni Metro (including the under-construction Central Subway), and myriad regional and local bus lines. Jobs should also be located near other jobs, because they benefit from the synergies of co-location and infrastructure. By being located between the existing jobs centers of downtown and Mission Bay, the Plan Area not only is proximal to other jobs, but actually better ties those two areas together.

Policy 3.1.1 Require non-residential uses in new development on large parcels.

Many of the parcels of land in Central SoMa are quite large – reflecting its industrial heritage. And like industrial development of the past, modern companies seek buildings with large floors, which facilitate flexibility and intra-company communication. Given the limited availability of such large parcels in the city near excellent local and regional transit, and the need to identify appropriate transit-served space for job growth, the City should promote non-residential development at these locations. Even if circumstances, such as market or broader regulatory factors, require forgoing near-term development on these major parcels, ensuring that these parcels are “land-banked” for significant jobs-oriented development is a necessary long-term strategy for the economic and environmental health of the city and region. These large parcels need not be exclusively non-residential, but they must feature a significant percentage (e.g. at least half) of non-residential and job space.

Policy 3.1.2 Reduce current restrictions on non-residential development.

Central SoMa includes areas whose zoning precludes non-residential development beyond ground floor retail, so as to direct new development towards being residential. While housing is still appropriate in these

locations, the City should support the development of significant non-residential uses in these areas as well, given their adjacency to the downtown and to excellent transit (including Central Subway and Caltrain).



The open floor plan is common in modern offices. Photo by Sylvain Kalache, Flickr (CC BY 2.0).

In keeping with national trends, about 60 percent of all jobs are located in offices – and the percentage is growing.

OBJECTIVE 3.2

SUPPORT THE GROWTH OF OFFICE SPACE

About 60 percent of all jobs in the city are located in offices – and the percentage is growing (in keeping with national trends). There is a wide range of jobs that utilize office space, including technology, non-profits (civic, advocacy, community service, research), legal, finance, and the administrative side of all industries, just to name a few. Additionally, a lot of other jobs, including many scientific and “hands-on” kinds of jobs depend on significant amounts of office space as part of their operations to function effectively.

Policy 3.2.1 Facilitate the growth of office.

The City should support the development of office space in Central SoMa. Office space typically has a high amount of jobs per square foot, and thus benefits from proximity to the neighborhood’s excellent transit. This office space can also support the success of these knowledge-sector companies that are driving the overall economy (including the need for local-serving jobs throughout the city, like health care, education, and retail). Increasing the supply of office space will also support non-profits and other organizations that have been challenged to find space in the city, forcing some to move elsewhere in the Bay Area (such as Oakland) or out of the region altogether.



The Plan Area still contains many industrial buildings and PDR jobs. Photo by [Google Street View](#).



OBJECTIVE 3.3

ENSURE THE REMOVAL OF PROTECTIVE ZONING DOES NOT RESULT IN A LOSS OF PDR IN THE PLAN AREA

The production, distribution, and repair (PDR) sector is critical to San Francisco. Companies in the PDR sector tend to provide high-paying jobs for people without a four-year college degree. PDR also provides economic diversity and therefore greater ability to weather recessions. PDR companies also serve the needs of local residents and businesses – after all, you cannot offshore your auto repair or your parcel delivery service.

As discussed above, SoMa’s legacy is as a home for blue-collar jobs. Over the decades, the nature of the economy – local, regional and national – has changed, being more service-oriented than production-oriented. The PDR sector in Central SOMA is emblematic of the neighborhood’s cultural history.

Policy 3.3.1 Maintain existing zoning that restricts non-PDR development in certain locations.

Central SoMa contains substantial areas that protect PDR uses by not allowing office or housing. As discussed in Goal #1, the Plan is proposing to allow new development in much of this area. However, the City should maintain some of this PDR-protective zoning along the freeway west of 4th Street, because of its proximity to other PDR areas to the west and lot configuration and location that is challenging for other development.

SoMa’s legacy is as a home for blue-collar jobs.

Policy 3.3.2 Limit conversion of PDR space in formerly industrial districts.

The Central SoMa Plan is intended to facilitate the development of new construction of housing and office in areas where they currently are not allowed. However, where existing buildings are to remain in these areas, the City could require that some amount of PDR space is maintained. When new buildings are constructed, the City could require that some amount of replacement PDR space is provided.

Policy 3.3.3 Require PDR space as part of large commercial development.

Given the amount of new development expected, maintaining the existing PDR presence in Central SoMa will necessitate requiring PDR space as part of new development, regardless of whether PDR space exists on the site prior to redevelopment. Such PDR space can be designed to be highly compatible with large commercial space, given the larger floors, building materials that are less conducive of sound and vibration, and higher tolerance for truck deliveries at all hours. The City should consider alternative means of satisfying this requirement, such as allowing off-site construction of PDR space and/or protection of existing PDR space at risk of displacement due to being located in districts that do not protect PDR.

Policy 3.3.4 Provide incentives to fund, build, and/or protect PDR.

In the past 10 years the City has exhibited renewed commitment to its PDR sector.

This includes protecting industrial land, providing technical and real estate assistance to PDR businesses, funding arts organizations and programs through the existing 1% Art Program's Public Art Trust, and supporting new construction through creative mechanisms that leverage local and federal funding. The City should continue its commitment to the PDR sector, and explore new strategies to build and/or protect PDR space.

OBJECTIVE 3.4

FACILITATE A VIBRANT RETAIL ENVIRONMENT THAT SERVES THE NEEDS OF THE COMMUNITY

Central SoMa already contains a diversity of retail uses, including stores, restaurants, and personal services like beauty salons and dry cleaners. These help meet the needs of residents, workers, and visitors. They also provide a level of positive activity on the streets that make them safer and more pleasant.

Policy 3.4.1 Allow retail throughout the Plan Area.

Currently, retail uses can be located anywhere in the Plan Area, and this allowance should continue.

Policy 3.4.2 Require ground-floor retail along important streets.

Retail uses are currently required at the ground floors of buildings on 4th Street between Bryant and Townsend Streets, and on 6th Street between Market and Folsom Streets. The City should extend this requirement along important pedestrian thoroughfares, including Folsom Street and the rest of 4th Street.



Retail is a critical part of an active neighborhood. Photo by David Leong, SF Planning.

Policy 3.4.3 Support local, affordable, community-serving retail.

One of the many unique characteristics of the neighborhood is its diversity of retail offerings, in terms of types, prices, and independence. By contrast, new development often will seek to fill its retail space with chain stores, businesses aimed at higher income clientele, and/or businesses that cater to tourists and other visitors. While such uses have a place in the neighborhood, the City should ensure that there is also space for those retail uses that are local, affordable, and/or community serving, by considering limitations on formula retail and stand-alone big box stores and requirements for micro-retail in larger development sites.

Hotels can make very good neighbors, providing lively ground floors, near 24-hour activity, and customers for local shops and restaurants.

OBJECTIVE 3.5

SUPPORT DEVELOPMENT OF HOTELS

Hotels are important to the wellbeing of San Francisco – enabling our tourism sector to flourish while also supporting important civic functions through room taxes. Simultaneously, hotels can make very good neighbors, providing lively ground floors, near 24-hour activity, and customers for local shops and restaurants. Hotels are particularly important in Central SoMa, given the area’s proximity to the Moscone Convention Center and its transit accessibility.

Policy 3.5.1 Allow hotels throughout the growth-oriented parts of the Plan Area.

Currently, there are parts of the Plan Area where hotels are not permitted, even if they otherwise allow residential and commercial growth. Where hotels are permitted, they are typically restricted to “boutique” sizes of 75 rooms or less. However, the City is in need of multiple new hotels to meet demand, particularly new “conference sized” hotels of at least 500 rooms plus meeting facilities. As such, the City should support increasing the area where hotels are permissible to include those areas where new growth is anticipated, and to remove the cap on room count.



Bindlestiff Studios and Hotel Utah are examples of important nightlife uses in the Plan Area. Photo by [Google Street View](#).



Photo by Chris Chabot, Flickr (CC BY-NC 2.0).

OBJECTIVE 3.6

RECOGNIZE THE IMPORTANCE OF NIGHTLIFE USES IN CREATING A COMPLETE NEIGHBORHOOD

Nightlife is an essential part of what makes San Francisco a lively, world-class city. SoMa has a long tradition of being a destination for nightlife, reflecting its central location and industrial legacy with flexible building types, historically cheaper rents and relatively fewer residential neighbors. Even as the neighborhood evolves, it is important to ensure that these uses can continue to thrive as a place for people to have fun, while being mindful of the potential for conflicts between these and sensitive uses like housing.

Policy 3.6.1 Allow nightlife where appropriate.

Currently, many nightlife uses are permitted in much of the Plan Area, including restaurants, bars, and venues for arts performances. Nightclubs are permitted in the area west of 4th Street and south of Harrison, and are permissible with a Conditional Use Permit in much of the rest of the neighborhood. The City should support continuing allowances for nightlife uses.

FULFILLING THE VISION

Creating an economically diversified and lively jobs center in Central SoMa would help fulfill the Plan's vision of creating a sustainable neighborhood by:



Supporting **social sustainability** by ensuring a range of jobs for people of many backgrounds, education levels, and interests.



Supporting **economic sustainability** by providing a diversified economy while simultaneously supporting our two biggest economic engines – knowledge-sector office jobs and tourism.



Supporting **environmental sustainability** by providing a neighborhood where people can get to their jobs without driving and can meet nearly all of their needs locally, thereby minimizing the need for auto use.



4

The present design of the major streets does not serve pedestrians well and will certainly not accommodate the pedestrian needs of the new residents, workers and visitors contemplated by this Plan.

Photo by Sergio Ruiz.

Provide Safe and Convenient Transportation that Prioritizes Walking, Bicycling, and Transit

CONTEXT

Central SoMa is served by a widely spaced grid of major streets that form large blocks, often subdivided by narrow streets and alleys in patterns that vary from block to block. While the narrow streets and alleys typically serve only very local needs, the continuous grid of major streets connects city neighborhoods and links the city to the region via Interstates 80, 280 and 101. The major streets in SoMa have multiple lanes, widely spaced traffic signals, and are often one-way – all strategies to move automobiles and trucks through the district at rapid speeds.

While the existing street pattern still works for traffic circulation in off-peak hours, as traffic congestion has worsened over the decades, these streets are now often snarled with automobiles, trucks, transit, and taxis/ridesharing services. The resulting traffic is a substantial source of air and noise pollution and disproportionate rates of traffic injury, degrading the quality of life for residents, workers and visitors to the area.

Whether at congested times or not, the present design of the major streets does not serve pedestrians well and will certainly not accommodate the pedestrian needs of

the new residents, workers and visitors contemplated by this Plan. Design that primarily accommodates the needs of motor vehicles relegates the needs of people walking to a secondary status. The result is unsafe and unpleasant conditions for pedestrians: many sidewalks do not meet minimum city standards; signalized or even marked crosswalks are few and far between; many crosswalks at major intersections are closed to pedestrians; and long crossing distances increase exposure to traffic. The combination of high traffic speeds and volumes and poor pedestrian infrastructure is reflected in the high rate of pedestrian injuries seen throughout the Plan Area.

The existing conditions are also quite poor for people riding bicycles, and discourage others from cycling in this neighborhood. On most streets, bicycles are expected to share lanes with much heavier and faster moving motor vehicles. Where bicycle lanes exist, they place cyclists between moving traffic and parked cars and do not protect cyclists from right-turning vehicles at intersections. Insufficient facilities for people riding bicycles are reflected in the high rate of injuries to bicyclists seen throughout the Plan Area.



Photos by David Leong, SF Planning.

For people on transit, the story is more mixed. The Plan Area is well served by regional transit systems with dedicated rights-of-way, such as BART and Caltrain. Transit service to the neighborhood will be greatly improved with the completion of the Central Subway project, providing frequent and rapid north-south service through the heart of Central SoMa. Myriad local and regional bus lines serve the area. However, those buses that share the street network with other vehicles are often delayed by traffic.

As San Francisco continues to grow, conditions will only worsen unless substantial changes are made both to the design of the streets and to the way people travel. The Central SoMa Plan provides a timely opportunity to rethink how people get to and move through the neighborhood. Pedestrian improvements combined with traffic calming could enhance both livability and public health. With a comprehensive network of high-quality bicycle routes, the area's flat topography and relatively good weather could encourage more bicycling, relieving some demand on transit and for additional car trips. The dense network of transit options makes the neighborhood a great candidate for even higher ridership, if proper measures are put into place to enhance the reliability and speed of transit. As well, while the neighborhood continues to grow, investment in additional capacity and new



connections will be needed to enhance and expand the existing transit network to meet the needs of the future. All of these improvements rely on shifting the way people travel from private automobile into these other modes.

The goal of providing safe and convenient transportation in Central SoMa is admittedly daunting, considering the existing conditions. Fortunately, several other complementary strategies being undertaken by the City support this effort, in both the near and long term, including:

- The **Better Streets Plan**, which facilitates improvements to sidewalks and other pedestrian amenities;
- The **Bicycle Plan**, which delivers improvements in the bicycle network;
- **Vision Zero**, which provides infrastructure improvements at key locations designed to minimize conflicts between motor vehicles and people walking and bicycling;
- **Muni Forward**, which implements local transit improvements;


- The aforementioned **Central Subway**, which will connect BART and Caltrain (in addition to running from Chinatown to the Bayview)
- The **electrification of Caltrain**, which will facilitate more frequent service; and
- The implementation of **High Speed Rail** service to San Francisco, creating convenient connections between the economic centers of the State.
- The implementation of the City's **Transportation Demand Management** program

Multiple major studies and transportation planning efforts will inform future transportation investment. These studies will identify future investments necessary to support the continued evolution of SoMa and prioritize the public benefit resources that come out of the Plan. These include:

- **Connect SF:** This effort, launched in 2016, will produce a 50-year vision of the City's transportation network and will culminate in a new, updated Transportation Element of the General Plan and a refreshed set of major investment priorities.
- **Core Capacity Study:** This regional study led by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) was started in 2015. It is investigating near, medium and long-term strategies to meet the growing needs of transportation connections between San Francisco and the East Bay (i.e., the Transbay corridor) as well as core aspects of travel to and from the "Core" of San Francisco (which includes downtown, SoMa, and Mission Bay).



Figure 4.1
SIDEWALK WIDTHS



- No sidewalk
- No sidewalk, pedestrian walkway provided (no curb)
- Sidewalk width less than Better Streets Plan (BSP) minimum (12' for major streets, 9' other)
- Sidewalk width meets BSP minimum but less than recommended (15' for major streets, 12' other)
- Sidewalk width meets BSP recommended width

OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES

The Objectives and Policies below are intended to fulfill the goal of providing safe and convenient transportation that prioritizes walking, bicycling, and transit.



Photo by SF Planning.

A complete, high quality, walking network is necessary to make all aspects of the transportation system function well.

OBJECTIVE 4.1

PROVIDE A SAFE, CONVENIENT, AND ATTRACTIVE WALKING ENVIRONMENT ON ALL THE STREETS IN THE PLAN AREA

As a major convention and tourism destination, employment center, and residential area, Central SoMa attracts thousands of people daily, the overwhelming majority of whom will either begin or end their trip as pedestrians. And as anticipated development occurs, new workers, visitors and residents will join the thousands already there and place additional demand on the already inadequate pedestrian infrastructure. A transformation of the streets and sidewalk will be

required to accommodate people on foot and give them enjoyable paths to travel, linger, shop, and socialize. Streets are not just for movement, but for slowing down to socialize and take in the rhythms of the City. A complete, high quality, walking network is necessary to make all aspects of the transportation system function well.

Policy 4.1.1 Widen sidewalks on major streets to meet Better Streets Plan standards.


Adequate sidewalk width is an essential ingredient in making walking a safe, convenient, and attractive transportation option. In addition to accommodating pedestrian movement, sidewalks should be wide enough for amenities such as trees or other landscaping and fixed or moveable seating. The Better Streets Plan recommends fifteen feet as the optimal sidewalk width for most major streets in the Plan Area, with twelve feet as the minimum. Some locations that attract extremely high pedestrian volumes (e.g. next to transit stops or large office buildings) should have even wider sidewalks than fifteen feet in order to maintain safe and pleasant walking conditions. As shown in Figure 4.1, most major streets in the Plan Area do not meet even the minimum recommended sidewalk width.

Policy 4.1.2 Prohibit new curb cuts on key major streets and limit them elsewhere.

In sensitive places, access to parking and loading degrades the pedestrian experience, transit operations, bicyclist safety, and general circulation. Additionally, curb cuts remove valuable sidewalk space for trees, bicycle parking, landscaping, and other amenities. For these reasons, curb cuts should be limited along major streets, and off-street parking and loading should be accessed from alleys and narrow streets, where conflicts are reduced. See Figure 4.2 for a map of limitations on curb cuts.

Figure 4.2

CURB CUT RESTRICTIONS



.....
New curb cuts currently prohibited

—————
Proposed prohibition on new curb cuts

—————
Proposed Conditional Use for new curb cuts

—————
Proposed Howard Street south side, 3rd to 11th Street:
New curb-cuts prohibited on one-way blocks
New curb-cuts require Conditional Use on two-way blocks.



Policy 4.1.3 Provide additional signalized crosswalks across major streets.

Long distances between crosswalks inconvenience people walking and reduce the viability and attractiveness of walking as a transportation option. They also provide powerful incentives for some pedestrians to risk crossing against traffic, and are thus a serious safety concern. The current practice of providing signalized crosswalks at intersections of two major streets means that crosswalks are usually over 800 feet apart on major east-west streets, and 550 feet apart on major north-south streets. North of Market Street, an area renowned worldwide for its walkability, crosswalks are at most 425 feet apart in the east-west direction and not more than 275 feet apart in the north-south direction. To create a more pedestrian-friendly environment, the City should provide an additional signalized crosswalk roughly halfway between each major intersection, wherever possible. This would produce distances between crosswalks roughly equivalent to those found north of Market Street. In addition, providing crosswalks at the intersections of major and narrow streets would enhance the role of the narrow streets in the pedestrian network. Figure 4.3 shows the locations of recommended crosswalks.



The neighborhood has many seniors who would benefit from shorter and safer street crossings. Photo by Sergio Ruiz.

Policy 4.1.4 Open currently closed crosswalks at signalized intersections.

Several signalized intersections of major streets in the area prohibit people walking from crossing one leg of the intersection, resulting in inconvenient and potentially unsafe detours for pedestrians in dense areas and along major corridors, such as 3rd and 4th Streets. Existing City policy recommends opening such closed crosswalks. The City should open closed crosswalks in the Plan Area whenever possible. Figure 4.3 shows the location of currently closed crosswalks at signalized intersections.


Policy 4.1.5 Improve intersections and freeway ramps.

The Plan Area has five freeway ramps: four serving I-80 at each intersection of 4th, 5th, Harrison, and Bryant Streets, and one serving I-280 at 6th and Brannan. Each of these intersections presents challenges, as cars used to traveling unobstructed at rapid speeds suddenly enter a street grid with more complex traffic patterns and must be attentive to people walking and bicycling. The City should work with Caltrans to improve these transitions to better serve the needs of all modes of transportation.

Policy 4.1.6 Provide corner sidewalk extensions to enhance pedestrian safety at crosswalks, in keeping with the Better Streets Plan.

Sidewalk corner extensions (“bulb-outs”) shorten the length of crosswalks and make pedestrians waiting to cross more visible to drivers. The Better Streets Plan recommends installing sidewalk corner extensions on certain street types to enhance safety and to provide additional space for amenities such as benches and landscaping. The City should work to implement this recommendation of the Better Streets Plan.

Figure 4.3
SIGNALIZED CROSSWALKS



-  New crosswalk
-  New crosswalk proposed in other plans and projects
-  Closed crosswalks at existing signalized intersection, to be opened
-  Existing crosswalks across major streets at minor streets
(existing crosswalks at the intersection of two major streets are not shown)



Policy 4.1.7 Improve the conditions on narrow streets and alleys for people walking.

SoMa's narrow streets and alleys provide an important, quieter alternative to walking on the busier major streets. Yet many of these streets do not have inviting environments for people on foot, including insufficient (or even absent) sidewalks. On these streets, the City should enhance and improve the experience for people walking.

Policy 4.1.8 Add street trees and street furnishings to sidewalks wherever possible, in keeping with the Better Streets Plan.

Landscaping and street furnishings, such as fixed or moveable seating, are important in creating an inviting environment for walking and public life. The Better Streets Plan discusses strategies for locating amenities to create attractive and functional pedestrian environments. The City should continue implementing its recommendations in the Plan Area.

Policy 4.1.9 Expand the pedestrian network wherever possible through creation of new narrow streets, alleys, and mid-block connections.

Existing City policy and zoning regulations require midblock paths through large lots in certain zoning districts. These requirements should be retained where



Alleys are an important part of the pedestrian network. Photo by Sam Kirchner.

they exist and extended to any new zoning districts created in Central SoMa.

Policy 4.1.10 Use public art, lighting, and other amenities to improve the pedestrian experience beneath elevated freeways.

The unwelcoming environment beneath the freeway creates an imposing physical and psychological barrier that divides the Plan Area into two halves. This noisy, dark, car-dominated environment makes walking from one side of the freeway to the other an unpleasant or even intimidating experience. The City should use public art, enhanced lighting, and other streetscape amenities to help improve this dreary condition. To facilitate the addition of art, the City should also encourage new development to locate their required public art in this area.




Public art enhances the experience of the neighborhood. Photo by Sergio Ruiz.



Photo by Flickr user wiredforlego (CC BY-NC 2.0).

Figure 4.4

EXISTING AND PROPOSED BICYCLE LANES



-  Proposed one-way cycletracks
-  Proposed bicycle lanes
-  Existing bicycle lanes
-  Bicycle lanes and cycle tracks in other plan and projects



Existing and proposed bicycle network (assuming two-way Folsom and Howard streets)



Biking continues to grow in importance to, from, and within the neighborhood. Photo by Sergio Ruiz.

Central SoMa is well situated for bicycle travel, and has a much higher bicycle mode share than other parts of the City.

OBJECTIVE 4.2

MAKE CYCLING A SAFE AND CONVENIENT TRANSPORTATION OPTION THROUGHOUT THE PLAN AREA FOR ALL AGES AND ABILITIES

As a mode of transportation, bicycles have many advantages: they require no fuel, produce no emissions, and facilities to accommodate their use are generally less expensive and space intensive than other transportation modes. Central SoMa (and SoMa in general) is flat, sunny, and well situated for bicycle travel, and thus has a much higher bicycle mode share than other parts of the City despite poor cycling infrastructure. The use of bicycles can be increased with the provision of a comprehensive network of safe and convenient bike routes, as well as destination amenities such as secure parking and shower facilities.

Policy 4.2.1 Create a network of convenient and safe bicycle lanes.


In order to ensure that cycling is an attractive transportation option, people must be able to cycle close to their destination safely. The planned bicycle network is expected to provide good connectivity to and from the Plan Area. However, within the Plan Area, there are only existing bicycle lanes along 2nd, Howard, Folsom, and Townsend Streets leaving a gap of up to a half-mile between east-west bicycle lanes, and no north-south bicycle lanes west of 2nd Street. The City should support the creation of a more robust network of bicycle lanes in the Plan Area. See Figure 4.4 for a map of streets recommended for bicycle route improvements in the Plan Area.

In addition to being convenient, bicycling needs to be safe and comfortable. Many existing bicycle lanes place people bicycling between parked cars and moving vehicles, with no buffer or barrier to protect cyclists. The Plan therefore supports the creation of protected bicycle lanes or separated “cycle tracks,” which offer safer and calmer cycling conditions for a much wider range of cyclists and cycling purposes, especially on streets with large traffic volumes travelling at relatively high speeds.

Policy 4.2.2 Provide additional bicycle infrastructure, such as bicycle parking, to support ridership.

In addition to safe and convenient cycling routes, increasing the proportion of trips taken by bicycles depends on other supportive facilities including bicycle parking. The City should study additional methods for increasing on- and off-street bicycle parking. Space needs for bike-sharing stations should also be considered a key component in the design of streets as well as major new developments and open spaces.

Figure 4.5
TRANSIT-ONLY LANES



- Full-time dedicated transit lane
- Peak period dedicated transit lanes



Proposed dedicated transit lanes (assuming one-way Folsom and Howard streets, showing transit lines as Proposed in the Transit Effectiveness Project. Transit on Market, Mission and Townsend Streets is not shown)



Effective transit service is critical for both residents and workers. Photo by Sergio Ruiz.

OBJECTIVE 4.3

ENSURE THAT TRANSIT SERVING THE PLAN AREA IS ADEQUATE, RELIABLE AND PLEASANT

Public transportation is fundamental to accommodating the movement of large populations of workers and residents to, within and through the City. The levels of density and activity proposed for Central SoMa are possible only when the majority of its workers, visitors, and residents use transit to move about. A circulation network that prioritizes transit will support the creation of the public spaces, walking environment and bicycle network that are envisioned for the area. Moreover, several Central SoMa streets are part of the central hub of San Francisco's and the region's transit network, and service delays or problems in the Plan Area can radiate throughout the network. For these reasons it is critical to facilitate transit movements in the area.

Policy 4.3.1 Provide a robust network of lanes that are exclusively for transit.

Dedicated transit lanes expedite surface transit movement, improve transit travel time, and support more efficient operating costs by allowing for more reliable and consistent headways, especially during peak hours. Existing dedicated transit lanes within the plan area are located along portions of 3rd, 4th and Mission Streets. New dedicated transit lanes will be

Public transportation is fundamental to accommodating the movement of large populations of workers and residents to, within and through the City.

necessary on other major streets in the Plan Area. See Figure 4.5 for a map of existing and potential transit-only lanes.

Dedicated transit lanes should be designed with “self-enforcing” elements, wherever possible, to discourage or prevent use by unauthorized private vehicles. These include curbs, channelizers and colored or textured pavements.

Policy 4.3.2 Support funding for maintaining a state of good repair of the existing fleet and infrastructure.

As the Plan Area develops, it will contain a higher percentage of the city's jobs and residents than it does today. As such, it should contribute commensurately to ensuring that the existing fleet and infrastructure is able to move those workers and residents throughout the city.

Policy 4.3.3 Support funding to implement the Muni Forward program.

The Muni Forward program is the City's ongoing effort to modernize and rationalize the transit system, including an emphasis on the most heavily traveled lines. Many of these heavily traveled lines serve Central SoMa. As such, new development in the Plan Area should contribute their share towards implementing the Muni Forward program.

Policy 4.3.4 Support funding to meet future needs for local and regional transit service to the Plan Area.

As a jobs center, a substantial portion of workers coming to Central SoMa will do so from the

surrounding counties. Many of these workers will rely on transit systems that even today are facing capacity constraints – including BART, which is the regional transit workhorse, especially in the Transbay corridor. Caltrain too, which directly serves the Plan Area, is straining under booming ridership. As such, development in Central SoMa should support necessary transit investments, serving as a source of local money to advance critical improvements in expanding service and capacity to serve SoMa and to leverage larger regional, state, and federal contributions for major projects.

Policy 4.3.5 Study adjustment of transit services to serve the demand from the increase in jobs and housing in the neighborhood.

As the area develops, transit service needs are likely to evolve as well. As such, the City should study adjustments to the transit network and levels of service to the Plan area to ensure that it adequately serves evolving needs, particularly in the area south of the freeway, which is expected to experience the most growth and transformation from low-intensity to high-density uses.

Strategies should also provide incentives to choose more sustainable modes of transportation.

OBJECTIVE 4.4
ENCOURAGE MODE SHIFT AWAY FROM PRIVATE AUTOMOBILE USAGE

Implementing the Objectives above can provide the physical improvements necessary to encourage efficient and environmentally sustainable modes of transportation, and commensurate reduction in private automobile trips. This mode shift will also require providing only as much parking as is appropriate for the urban context and availability of transportation alternatives. Other strategies should

also provide incentives to choose more sustainable modes of transportation.

Policy 4.4.1 Limit the amount of parking in new development.

The availability and price of parking play an important role in individual mode choice –plentiful and cheap parking encourages automobile use. Existing off-street parking maximums should be retained and strengthened, reflective of the plentiful availability of transit options and investments planned and underway.

Policy 4.4.2 Utilize Transportation Demand Management strategies to encourage use of alternatives to the private automobile.

The City has successfully used Transportation Demand Management tools in the downtown area to achieve very high pedestrian, transit and bicycle mode shares. Central SoMa provides an excellent opportunity to employ similar measures for all new development, such as parking management and pricing, free or discounted transit passes, coordination of private shuttle services, and coordination of car sharing and bicycle sharing distribution, discounts, and related programs.

OBJECTIVE 4.5
ACCOMMODATE REGIONAL, THROUGH, AND DELIVERY TRAFFIC WHERE NECESSARY, BUT MITIGATE THE IMPACTS OF SUCH TRAFFIC ON LOCAL LIVABILITY AND CIRCULATION

For the foreseeable future, some streets in Central SoMa will serve as citywide and regional auto connections, mainly because of their relation to freeway access points. There is also pressure on the streets caused by demand from ride sharing and e-commerce. These important demands on the street should be balanced with other necessary street functions.

Policy 4.5.1 Maintain the ability of certain streets to accommodate through-traffic while ensuring they meet minimum needs for safety and comfort of all road users.

Bryant and Harrison Street should continue to accommodate through-traffic in SoMa. However, increasing livability and protecting local circulation on these streets may require some reduction in vehicle capacity, a reduction that may to a certain extent be balanced by shifting local travel to other modes.

Policy 4.5.2 Design buildings to accommodate delivery of people and goods with a minimum of conflict.

The movement of people and goods will continue to be important in the neighborhood. The rise of ride sharing has created new demands to accommodate convenient loading at both residential and non-residential buildings. The uptick in internet sales means residential buildings will need to accommodate increased deliveries. Additionally, Central SoMa will continue to be a neighborhood with many businesses, and these businesses will need loading capacity for goods. All of these trends are supportive of the goal of enabling people to live without private automobiles. The City should ensure that loading is considered and prioritized in the context of street redesign projects and on-street parking management. Off-street loading facilities, particularly for larger projects, should not compromise the interface of buildings with the public realm.

FULFILLING THE VISION

Providing safe and convenient transportation that prioritizes walking, bicycling, and transit would help fulfill the Plan’s vision of creating a sustainable neighborhood by:



Supporting **social sustainability**

by enabling people to move within and through the neighborhood safely, conveniently, and (if they choose), inexpensively.



Supporting **economic sustainability**

by enabling people to get to and from work efficiently.



Supporting **environmental sustainability**

by reducing emissions of greenhouse gas and other air pollutants by reducing the amount of miles traveled by vehicles in the Plan Area.



5

The Central SoMa Plan presents an excellent opportunity to build new parks and recreational facilities, provide the funding to maintain them, and the activity to keep them well used.

Offer an Abundance of Parks and Recreational Opportunities

CONTEXT

Central SoMa currently suffers from a shortage of public parks and recreational opportunities relative to number of residents, workers and visitors to the area. This is largely due to its industrial history. Within the Plan Area there is only one outdoor recreational space: South Park. There are also smaller indoor and outdoor passive spaces as well as private indoor gyms. There are also three large public facilities just outside the Plan Area that serve the people of Central SoMa: Yerba Buena Gardens, Gene Friend Recreation Center, and Victoria Manalo Draves Park. Given the superior public transit in Central SoMa, area residents have access to a broad range of other recreational opportunities in the City. However, given the length of blocks and limited number of facilities, substantial portions of the Plan Area lack easy access to playgrounds, public sports courts, and quiet spaces for more contemplative activities.

By increasing the population in Central SoMa, the need for parks and recreational opportunities will only increase. Fortunately, the Central SoMa Plan presents an excellent opportunity to build new parks and recreational facilities, provide the funding to maintain them, and the activity to keep them well used. Seizing these opportunities will require dedicated and strategic focus.

OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES

The Objectives and Policies below are intended to fulfill the goal of offering an abundance of parks and recreational opportunities in Central SoMa.

OBJECTIVE 5.1

MAXIMIZE THE BENEFIT PROVIDED BY EXISTING PARKS AND RECREATIONAL FACILITIES

The existing parks in and around Central SoMa, though modest in size, provide important resources. However, they will need investment to enhance their long-term viability. It is also likely that new parks and recreational opportunities will not be built until several years after adoption of the Plan. Therefore, it is necessary to ensure that existing parks and recreational centers are optimized.

Policy 5.1.1 Support funding for the rehabilitation of Gene Friend Recreation Center.

The Gene Friend Recreation Center is a park and recreational center at the northwest corner of 6th and Folsom Streets, just outside the Plan Area. It serves the residents and workers of SoMa with



South Park.

indoor and outdoor basketball, weight room, lawn area, playground, and indoor space for dancing, art, and events. The Recreation and Parks Department is currently developing a renovation plan to update the facilities and increase capacity. As an important resource for the community, new development in Central SoMa should contribute to the funding of this important project.

Policy 5.1.2 Support funding for improved programming at Victoria Manalo Draves Park.

Victoria Manalo Draves Park lies half a block west of the Plan Area between Folsom and Harrison Streets. At 2.5 acres, the park is the largest green space in the SoMa neighborhood and enjoys abundant sunlight due to its southern orientation and wide street frontages. Despite the opportunity, it is currently not being utilized to its full potential, often due to a lack of programming and other forms of activation. Added density will increase the demand for outdoor recreation and green spaces. To best utilize this resource, new development in Central SoMa Plan should contribute funding to the programming and reconfiguration of this park in order to maximize active uses.



Gene Friend Recreation Center. Photo by SF Planning.

Policy 5.1.3 Explore additional strategies to fund existing parks and recreation centers.

In addition to City money, there are often other sources available to fund existing parks and recreation centers. This includes federal and state funding, as well as other grants and potential partnerships. The City should explore ways to receive this money in support of the parks and recreation centers that serve Central SoMa.



Victoria Manalo Draves Park. Photo by SF Planning.

OBJECTIVE 5.2

CREATE NEW PUBLIC PARKS

New public parks in Central SoMa are needed to provide much needed green space, a respite from the busy streets, and opportunities for active recreation for children, adults, and even dogs.

Policy 5.2.1 Create a new public park in the highest growth portion of the Plan Area.

Most of the new development of jobs and housing proposed by the Plan is slated to occur in the southwest portion of the Plan Area, generally between the I-80 freeway and Townsend Street west of 3rd Street. Currently, this area does not have any public parks. The City has identified an opportunity for a park on the block bounded by 4th, 5th, Bryant, and Brannan Streets making use of the publicly-owned parcel at 639 Bryant Street, which is used by SFPUC as a storage lot. A park on the interior of this site could, like South Park, be accessed by numerous streets and alleys and activated by adjacent uses such as ground floor retail and PDR.

Policy 5.2.2 Create a new linear park along Bluxome Street between 4th and 5th Street.

Bluxome Street between 4th and 5th Streets offers an opportunity to repurpose underutilized street right-of-way as a new park. Bluxome Street is functionally an alley and does not serve major circulation purposes, but is extraordinarily wide (70') compared to other SoMa alleys (typically 35'-40'). The wide street is currently devoted primarily to angled parking. The City should rebalance the right-of-way allocation by



Daggett Plaza, under construction, is an example of a new park in San Francisco. Photo by [Google Street View](#).

expanding the pedestrian area on one side of the street and consolidating the vehicular area to two lanes of traffic and one parallel parking lane. This would allow nearly one-half acre of open space to be created on the block. Coordination with the adjacent development will provide a strong connection to this space and help make it successful.

Policy 5.2.3 Pursue the creation of a large new park within or near Central SoMa to serve the burgeoning greater SoMa area.

In many neighborhoods, a large multi-acre park serves as the common gathering and recreational center for the whole community and helps define the neighborhood (e.g., Washington Square for North Beach, Alamo Square for the Western Addition, Bernal Heights Park for Bernal, and Dolores Park for the Mission and Castro). These Parks provide relief from the urban environment that only a large space can. Yerba Buena Gardens and Victoria Manalo Draves currently play that role in SoMa, but as the neighborhood grows the need for a new large park will also grow. The City should pursue the creation of such a signature, neighborhood-defining park within the vicinity of Plan Area, such as on a portion of the Caltrain Railyards.

OBJECTIVE 5.3

CREATE NEW PUBLIC RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES

Public recreational facilities, such as spaces for athletics and cultural activities, are essential outlets for residents and workers to engage in fun, exercise and stimulating activity. Facilities for active recreation, such as basketball courts and skateparks, can be located in parks, but they can also be in buildings or other spaces not suitable for traditional neighborhood parks. As such, with forethought and creativity, there are more opportunities for incorporating recreational facilities into this highly urban area.

Policy 5.3.1 Increase the amount of public recreation center space, including the creation of a new public recreation center.

The Plan Area is presently served by the Gene Friend Recreation Center at 6th and Folsom just outside the Plan boundary. However, as the residential and worker population grows in the greater SoMa neighborhood, there will likely be demand for an additional Recreation Center. The City should pursue the creation of such a facility within or near the Plan Area to serve this expected demand and coordinate the amenities and offerings with those available at Gene Friend.



SoMa West Skatepark and Dog Run. Photo by Ethan Kaplan, SF Arts Commission.

Policy 5.3.2 Develop public recreational facilities under the I-80 freeway.

There is currently ample unutilized land under I-80 between 4th and 6th Streets. With such projects as the SoMa West Skatepark and Dog Run, the City has demonstrated that a public recreational facility under a freeway can simultaneously meet the community's recreational needs and create safer and more pleasant conditions for pedestrians. As such, the City should work with Caltrans to pursue the potential for providing similar facilities underneath I-80.

Policy 5.3.3 Do not require replacement of private recreational facilities.

Private recreational sources, such as clubs and gyms, offer important opportunities for physical activity. San Franciscans use indoor recreation spaces for activities like swimming, tennis, basketball, ping-pong, yoga, and general fitness. As such, the City should continue allowing these uses in the Plan Area. However, the need for such spaces in Central SoMa must be balanced with the need for space for housing and jobs, along with space and funding for affordable public recreation facilities. As such, the City should not require the preservation of existing private recreational facilities.

OBJECTIVE 5.4

UTILIZE THE STREET RIGHT-OF-WAY FOR ADDITIONAL GREEN SPACES, GATHERING AND RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES

In a dense neighborhood such as Central SoMa, it is important to utilize every opportunity to provide respites and gathering spaces. One opportunity to do so is by utilizing space on the narrow streets and alleys, including new mid-block connections.

Policy 5.4.1 Where appropriate, promote pedestrian-only or shared-street design concepts for narrow streets, alleys, and mid-block connections.

Central SoMa’s narrow-streets and alleys are important for pedestrian circulation, but often carry a low volume of cars. Even more of these public rights-of-way will be created as part of the development of large parcels in the Plan Area. Where appropriate, these areas should be designed to be pedestrian-only or “shared streets,” where vehicular use is minimized. On such streets, the City should increase green spaces and provide amenities for gathering, such as benches and tables. Where streets are fully pedestrian-only, the City could provide additional recreational amenities, such as playgrounds.

Privately-owned public open spaces (POPOS) have been a staple of the downtown for over 30 years, providing important gathering places and interesting public spaces.



POPOS in Downtown. Photo by Petar Iliev, SF Planning.

OBJECTIVE 5.5

AUGMENT THE PUBLIC OPEN SPACE AND RECREATION NETWORK WITH PRIVATELY-OWNED PUBLIC OPEN SPACES (POPOS)

Existing Planning Code requirements in the Eastern Neighborhoods require all non-residential development to provide open space, but unlike the Downtown, none of this space is currently required to be publicly accessible. By contrast, privately-owned public open spaces (POPOS) have been a staple of the downtown for over 30 years, providing important gathering places and interesting public spaces. However, by nature of their upper-floor location and limited hours, their primary function has been to serve the daytime needs of downtown office workers. The Recreation and Open Space Element, updated in 2014, specifically recommends expanding the POPOS requirements outside the Downtown to other mixed use areas, like Central SoMa, in order to augment the open space and recreation system.



POPOS in Downtown. Photo by Petar Iliev, SF Planning.

Policy 5.5.1 Require new non-residential development and encourage residential development to provide POPOS that address the needs of the community.

In Central SoMa these POPOS shall be designed to help meet the needs of the community through such strategies as being at street level, inviting, open extended hours, and featuring needed amenities like play areas, community gardens and dog runs. The City should require that these POPOS be open to the sky, unless they provide an active recreational amenity that will benefit from being indoors. POPOS can also contribute to the environmental sustainability goals by managing storm water and providing other environmental benefits.

OBJECTIVE 5.6

ENSURE THE NEIGHBORHOOD’S PARKS AND RECREATION OFFERINGS FUNCTION AS A NETWORK AND COMPLEMENT THE FACILITIES OF THE BROADER SOMA AREA

The implementation of the Objectives and Policies described above will result in a substantial increase in the amount of space dedicated to parks and recreational facilities within Central SoMa. To maximize their value to the community, it is important that these spaces function as a network that systematically addresses needs.

Policy 5.6.1 Design the parks and recreational opportunities in a systematic manner to serve the community’s needs.

There are many different needs that can be addressed by parks and recreation facilities. This includes playgrounds for children of varying age groups, fields and courts for playing sports, dog play areas, multi-purpose recreation buildings to serve a variety

The parks and recreational facilities currently serving Central SoMa should be programmed to address this diversity of needs that will continue to evolve with time, tastes, and population changes.

of activities, and passive spaces for multiple kinds of social gathering and personal time. The parks and recreational facilities currently serving Central SoMa should be programmed to address this diversity of needs that will continue to evolve with time, tastes, and population changes. This would entail developing and implementing a parks and recreation strategy for the Plan Area and/or larger South of Market area. This strategy could identify the neighborhood needs in the context of both existing and planned facilities and population, as well as identifying potential locations to meet these needs.



Yerba Buena Gardens. Photo by Neil Hrushowy, SF Planning.

Figure 5.1

PARKS AND RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES

The implementation of the Objectives and Policies above can offer an abundance of parks and recreational opportunities in Central SoMa.



Existing Parks, Recreation Centers, Plazas, and POPOS

Potential Parks

Potential development sites containing POPOS

High Priority Potential Shared Public Ways
Additional small streets and alleys may be candidates for shared public way design.



FULFILLING THE VISION

Offering an abundance of parks and recreational opportunities would help fulfill the Plan’s vision of creating a sustainable neighborhood by:



Supporting **social sustainability** by providing places to gather, to exercise, and to gain a respite from a busy neighborhood.



Supporting **economic sustainability** by facilitating healthy, and thus more productive, workers.



Supporting **environmental sustainability** by increasing greenery, habitat, and space to implement other environmentally positive measures.



Central SoMa is poised to become a truly sustainable (healthy, green, efficient), resilient, and regenerative neighborhood—an “Eco-District” where urban development gives more to the environment than it takes.

Create an Environmentally Sustainable and Resilient Neighborhood

CONTEXT

Central SoMa is poised to become a truly sustainable (healthy, green, efficient), resilient, and regenerative neighborhood—an “Eco-District” where urban development gives more to the environment than it takes. In such a community, buildings use 100 percent greenhouse gas-free energy (much of it generated within the neighborhood); carbon emissions and fossil fuels are completely eliminated; non-potable water is captured, treated, and re-used within the district to conserve potable water and eliminate waste; nature is a daily experience, with greening and biodiversity thriving on streets, buildings, and parks; and zero solid waste is sent to the landfill.

To achieve this bold vision, the Central SoMa “Eco-District” is committed to advancing livability and environmental performance through innovative and neighborhood-scale systems, projects, and programs. Creative partnerships between residents, organizations, businesses, and government entities help ensure sustainability targets are achieved and progress is tracked over time. The results will be palpable to the daily experiences of people living, working, and visiting the neighborhood, and will place Central SoMa at the forefront of action on global climate change.

All of this will require an intentional and substantial shift from today’s conditions and business-as-usual approaches. At a time of ever-increasing awareness of the threats of climate change, considerable greenhouse gas emissions are generated from inefficient and fossil-fuel based energy use in buildings and vehicle transportation. While the ongoing drought has heightened concerns about the City’s water supply, a substantial amount continues to be wasted every day through inefficient use and disposal. Reflective of its industrial and auto-dominated history, the neighborhood is severely lacking in quality pedestrian environments and nature, and experiences some of the poorest air quality in San Francisco, in large part due to its proximity to an elevated, regional freeway corridor. With substantial low-lying areas built on fill, the neighborhood is also at risk from earthquakes and flooding, which could be exacerbated by sea level rise in the long term. And while the City is a world leader in waste diversion from landfills, there is still work to be done at the very local level to achieve our goal of zero waste.

While the litany of environmental challenges is daunting, there is also tremendous opportunity in Central SoMa. Implementation of this Plan will result in a substantial number of new buildings, infrastructure



Bikes, permeable paving, and street trees on Gough Street. Photo by Bruce Damonte.

investment, and public benefits within the Plan Area, leading to dramatic opportunities for significant improvements to environmental quality. Given current State and City regulations, new buildings are required to be greener and more resilient than buildings from earlier eras. However, additional cost-effective regulations for new development, such as living roofs and the use of 100 percent greenhouse gas-free electricity can help ensure that individual projects are environmentally sustainable and resilient to a degree that provides restorative benefits to the larger neighborhood. Similarly, implementation of this Plan will result in a re-envisioning of the streets, sidewalks, and open spaces of the Plan Area—not only to be more vibrant and safer, but also to complement the neighborhood’s environmental health and resilience. Strategies include the incorporation of beneficial elements, such as trees, green infrastructure for stormwater management, and energy efficient street lights. Finally, the Plan establishes a framework for innovation, to enable the latest and greatest technologies and design approaches to be applied to the built environment, like passive design and district-scale utility systems that service multiple buildings to heighten efficiencies.

OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES TO FULFILL THIS GOAL

The Objectives and Policies below are intended to fulfill the Plan’s Goal of creating an environmentally sustainable and resilient neighborhood in Central SoMa.

OBJECTIVE 6.1

ESTABLISH AN ECO-DISTRICT IN CENTRAL SOMA

An environmentally sustainable and resilient neighborhood will necessitate a huge shift in existing practices.

An Eco-District is a neighborhood with a commitment and strategy to become sustainable and resilient, often guided by a specific entity tasked with its implementation. By focusing on the neighborhood scale, the strategy for the Eco-District can be more targeted and opportunistic than citywide strategies, while benefiting from economies of scale not available at the level of the individual buildings. Implementation of an Eco-District can also leverage neighborhood-scale resources and expertise, by providing a platform for community members, institutions, and businesses to engage with city leaders and utility providers to meet ambitious sustainability goals and tangible quality of life improvements.

Because of their scale, Eco-Districts can more efficiently and effectively achieve the City’s environmental targets, as established in such documents as the Climate Action Plan, Electricity Resource Plan, and Green Building Ordinance. Simultaneously, because they are nimble, Eco-Districts can be amenable to community-developed goals and innovative solutions. It is because of all of these advantages that the City should establish an Eco-District in Central SoMa.

Policy 6.1.1 Develop a comprehensive strategy for creating an environmentally sustainable and resilient neighborhood.

Moving from current conditions to an environmentally sustainable and resilient neighborhood will necessitate a huge shift in existing practices across a number of topic areas. Achieving this shift will require the establishment of a strategic framework that can serve as a blueprint over many years of implementation. The City should use the opportunity of the adoption of the Central SoMa Plan, and affiliated legislation, to set into motion many of the requirements and recommendations necessary to fulfill the Eco-District’s potential.

Additionally, effective implementation will require the ongoing participation of a number of public and private entities. To coordinate their actions, the City should create an Eco-District Guidebook, including the vision, objectives, policies, and implementation measures necessary to create the Eco-District, as well as technical resources, precedents, and guidelines. Such a document should aim to facilitate a comprehensive understanding of the issues and

the strategies proposed to address them, whereas such information is currently diffused across multiple documents and agencies.

Policy 6.1.2 Create an implementing entity within the City.

Currently, numerous City departments are involved in implementing disparate strategies aimed at meeting San Francisco’s myriad of environmental sustainability and resiliency goals. Neither the goals nor the strategies are typically neighborhood-specific or approached in relation to each other, so opportunities for efficiency and co-benefits are often missed. To ensure the effective implementation of the Central SoMa Eco-District, an implementing entity should be identified within the City’s government. This entity will be able to operate at the neighborhood level across all topic areas, and thus be able to identify possible synergies and unique opportunities that would not be apparent under the existing system. This team would work closely with all relevant agencies and community partners to facilitate the sharing of knowledge and to realize District-specific strategies.



Central SoMa before and after “Better Roofs” implementation [potential vision rendering, not planned]. Illustrative by Anne Brask, SF Planning.

Policy 6.1.3 Ensure that environmental sustainability and resiliency is considered holistically in public investment decisions.

The City has multiple bodies designed to guide investment in public areas, including street improvements and the creation and improvement of parks. The City should make sure that the goal of environmental sustainability and resiliency is factored into all of these decisions for Central SoMa by including the Eco-District team into relevant processes, such as the Interagency Plan Implementation Team (IPIC) and the Streets Design Advisory Team (SDAT).

Policy 6.1.4 Ensure that property owners, developers, and tenants have the opportunity to maximize environmental sustainability and resilience.

The City has an important role in shaping new residential and commercial development to ensure that it meets development and design standards. The City should leverage its involvement in this process to provide advice, direction, and encouragement to new development to maximize its environmental sustainability and resilience. The City should also work proactively with owners of existing buildings as to their role in the Eco-District, including opportunities to invest in efficiency upgrades through green technologies and techniques, and to engage residents, workers, and visitors on how individual actions cumulatively have major impacts.

Policy 6.1.5 Continue to evolve the requirements and recommendations of the Eco-District with changing needs and technologies.

Achieving true environmental sustainability and resiliency will require a major shift in the way we currently treat energy, water, refuse, landscaping, etc. In implementing this Eco-District, it may become apparent that certain necessary strategies are not

economically, physically, or technologically possible at a given time. However, there is rapid innovation occurring globally in the field of sustainability, as populations around the world struggle with similar issues as Central SoMa. As such, the City should continue to monitor changes in the field, educate partners, and upgrade requirements as necessary, to help fulfill the vision of the Eco-District.

OBJECTIVE 6.2

MINIMIZE GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Global climate change, caused by excess greenhouse gas emissions, may be the single largest environmental issue for the present century. It is already affecting weather patterns and ecosystems, causing sea level rise, and population migrations. No single entity is responsible for climate change, and no single entity can solve it—the collective action of billions of people across the planet is required.

About half of all greenhouse gas emissions in SF are produced by building systems and equipment.

Recognizing this concern, San Francisco has established aggressive goals for reduction of greenhouse gases. Compared to 1990 levels, the City already achieved its target of 20 percent reduction by 2012 and 25 percent reduction by 2017, and is seeking to reach 40 percent reduction by 2025 and 80 percent reduction by 2050. The City is aiming for all buildings to use 100 percent renewable electricity by 2030 and to reduce energy consumption in existing commercial buildings by 2.5 percent annually. The City also wants to shift transportation away from automobile usage, having already met its goal that 50 percent of all trips within San Francisco be taken by other means by 2017, and seeking to reach 80 percent by 2050.

To help meet these targets, the City has instituted a suite of requirements (discussed below). The City can build on these measures in Central SoMa through targeted strategies on buildings, utilities, and transportation. These additional measures are necessary to help San Francisco and the State meet its aggressive targets for reducing greenhouse gases. Increased greening (discussed below) in the Plan Area will also support the reduction of greenhouse gases.

Policy 6.2.1 Maximize energy efficiency in the built environment.

In San Francisco, about half of all greenhouse gas emissions are produced by building systems and equipment (e.g., heating, cooling, appliances, lighting, etc.). The easiest way to reduce building emissions is by increasing the efficiency of energy use. As such, the City should continue implementing current measures for new and existing buildings, such as 1) requiring all newly constructed buildings (and major renovations) to meet or exceed California’s Title-24 Energy Code by

up to 10 percent; 2) requiring all existing commercial buildings larger than 10,000 square feet of conditioned space to complete energy benchmarking, have an energy audit conducted by a qualified professional, and share key data about building performance with the City; and 3) requiring homes to be retrofit with energy efficiency measures at the time of sale. The City should also ensure that buildings have every opportunity to exceed existing requirements, and should seek new ways to further increase efficiency. The City should also ensure that street lighting is as efficient as possible.

Policy 6.2.2 Maximize onsite renewable energy generation.

Renewable energy harnesses the sun, wind, and movement of water without depleting the source. The field of local renewable energy generation is rapidly evolving, and solar energy is already an economically viable alternative to non-renewable energy sources such as fossil fuels. Recognizing this, the City



Photo by SF Planning.

recently passed legislation that requires most new development projects to include solar installations on 15 percent of their roof area (photo voltaic and/or solar thermal hot water). Because the first phase of this program does not maximize onsite renewable energy generation, and Central SoMa's buildings and climates are especially suited to solar power, the City should expand this potential to larger roof areas and building facades. To exemplify the maximization of onsite renewable energy generation, the City could undertake a demonstration project on a public building within the Plan Area.

Policy 6.2.3 Satisfy 100 percent of electricity demand using greenhouse gas-free power supplies.

After maximizing energy efficiency and onsite renewable energy generation, many buildings will still need to purchase electricity. Any purchase of electricity from greenhouse gas-emitting sources (coal, natural gas, etc.) will contribute to climate change, even if that electricity is generated far from San Francisco. As such, the City should require that buildings in Central SoMa purchase the remainder of their electricity from greenhouse gas-free power sources.

Policy 6.2.4 Explore strategies to reduce fossil fuel use in buildings.

In addition to electricity, buildings use fossil fuels such as natural gas and oil for heating, cooling, and cooking. The City should explore economically viable alternatives to these fossil fuels, and potentially develop requirements for all-electric systems and/or use of renewable energy sources in lieu of these fossil fuels.

Policy 6.2.5 Minimize transportation-based greenhouse gas emissions.

In San Francisco, moving people and goods generates about 40 percent of all greenhouse gas emissions. The City has already instituted numerous strategies to shift

travel mode away from private automobiles, such as investing in new transportation infrastructure (e.g., the Central Subway and new bicycle lanes) and requiring large development to provide shuttles, transit passes, and/or other strategies to reduce driving, while simultaneously constraining supply through the reduction of parking allowed in new development. The City should continue implementing these measures. In addition, the City should seek ways to further minimize transportation-based greenhouse gas emissions in Central SoMa, such as facilitating electric vehicle use through the provision of ample charging stations and other infrastructure, and exploring ways to curb emissions from idling trucks.



Planned improvements on 2nd Street. Rendering courtesy of SFMTA.

OBJECTIVE 6.3

MINIMIZE WATER WASTE

The recent multi-year severe drought conditions in California only exacerbate the need to address the extreme inefficiencies of our current patterns of water use and vulnerability of our potable water supplies. Recognizing this, the City and State have both developed targets around water usage. The State has established a goal of 20 percent reduction in per capita water use by 2020 from the per capita urban water use in 2010—a target that San Francisco has already achieved through strategies discussed in the policies below.

The Central SoMa Plan Area is well positioned to lead the City's effort towards a more sustainable water policy.

The Central SoMa Plan Area is well positioned to lead the City's effort towards a more sustainable water policy, due to factors such as:


- The large amount of new development that can utilize the best technologies and practices for water efficiency, as well as implement on-site infrastructure systems for non-potable water capture, storage, and re-use systems; both within individual buildings and ideally between multiple projects.
- The large number of streetscape projects will provide numerous opportunities to implement technologies and best practices for capturing, treating, and reusing stormwater as a non-potable water source for irrigation and street cleaning.

Policy 6.3.1 Efficiently use potable water.

Because there will always be a demand for potable water for drinking, bathing, and cooking, and because water is a precious resource, it is imperative that it is used in the most efficient way possible. The City already requires that all new buildings install efficient fixtures; that existing properties repair plumbing leaks and replace inefficient plumbing fixtures (toilets, urinals, faucets, and showerheads) with high-efficiency models by 2017 or upon major improvements; and that all projects with 1,000 square feet or more of new or modified landscape area design, install, and maintain efficient irrigation systems, utilize low water-use plantings, and calculate a water budget. The City should continue implementing these requirements, and should seek additional strategies to increase potable water efficiency and conservation in Central SoMa.

Policy 6.3.2 Increase non-potable water use in buildings.

Upwards of 75 percent of building functions do not require potable water, including toilet flushing, irrigation, and building cooling systems. Since 1991, the City has required new construction and major alterations in large parts of the city (including all of Central SoMa) to install dual plumbing ("purple pipes") for use with future recycled water sources. In 2015 the City started requiring the largest of these buildings (250,000 square feet and greater) to start capturing and treating non-potable water onsite and utilizing it via the dual plumbing system, and for buildings 40,000 square feet or more to study the potential to do so. The City should continue these requirements, and seek ways to make this requirement more efficient by linking multiple buildings into the same non-potable system, an opportunity which is particular to Central SoMa due to the large scale of future development and the concentration of major new development in a small geographic area. The City should also explore additional ways to shift from potable to non-potable water use in building.



Non-potable water sources in a typical San Francisco building. Image courtesy of SFPUC.



Street trees and green infrastructure on Linden Alley. Photo by Petar Iliev, SF Planning.



Living roof at One South Van Ness Avenue. Photo by Greenroofs.com.

Policy 6.3.3 Increase non-potable water use in parks, open spaces, sidewalks, and streets.

Landscaping and street cleaning are two water-intensive uses for which non-potable water could be substituted for potable water. In major public open spaces in Central SoMa, the City should capture and use stormwater for irrigation and toilet flushing. The City should also install sufficient non-potable water filling stations to satisfy all street cleaning needs in the neighborhood.

OBJECTIVE 6.4

SUPPORT BIODIVERSITY, ACCESS TO NATURE, AND A HEALTHY ECOSYSTEM

Reflecting its urbanized, industrial past, there is very little natural habitat or greening in Central SoMa. Nearly 90 percent of the neighborhood is covered in impervious surfaces, and there is substantially less tree coverage in SoMa than elsewhere in the city. Additionally, the existing plants in the Plan Area are generally not supportive of local wildlife, such as birds and butterflies. As a result, today’s residents, workers, and visitors have very little access to nature, which studies have shown is essential to mental and physical health and to human development.

The City has very few targets and programs regarding biodiversity and natural habitat. Present requirements of new development are limited to street tree planting and bird-safe building design. In Central SoMa, there is an opportunity to greatly surpass existing requirements, by maximizing the quantity and quality of greening in both public spaces and private property.

Policy 6.4.1 Maximize greening of parks, streets, and other publicly-accessible spaces.

The City’s Urban Forest Plan seeks to maximize street trees and sidewalk gardens. The City’s Better Streets Plan already requires that new development provide street trees every 20 feet. The City should continue this policy, while following the Urban Forest Plan by filling in the gaps along street frontages where new development is not occurring. The City should pay special attention to greening efforts around the freeway corridor, which could provide substantial benefits in terms of air quality, habitat creation, and beautification. The City should also require that open spaces are maximally greened, including within privately-owned public open spaces (POPOS) that are to be provided as part of new commercial development.



Drought-resistant living wall, on 14th Street. Photo courtesy of PlantedDesign.com.

Policy 6.4.2 Maximize greening of rooftops and walls.

Buildings cover well over half of the land in Central SoMa and typically have large flat roofs. Almost all the roofs and walls of these buildings are devoid of any plant life. This provides a tremendous opportunity for greening and biodiversity – particularly from new buildings, which can be designed appropriately to handle the logistics of watering and soil loads. The City should therefore require a substantial portion of the roofs of new buildings be “living,” including locally appropriate plants, open space, stormwater management, and urban agriculture. To demonstrate the feasibility and efficacy of such living roofs, the City should build a “demonstration” roof on a public building within the Plan Area. To maximize efficient use of space, the City should also encourage living walls on buildings wherever possible.

Nearly 90 percent of the neighborhood is covered in impervious surfaces, and there is substantially less tree coverage in SoMa than elsewhere in the city.

Policy 6.4.3 Ensure that greening supports habitat and biodiversity.

Supporting biodiversity and access to nature requires not only quantity of greening, but quality and location. As such, the City should ensure plantings in the neighborhood’s new buildings, open spaces, sidewalks, and streets are native, habitat supportive, and climate appropriate species. In addition, individual green areas should be planned with consideration of adjacent opportunities to create green connections and corridors. The City should also continue implementing its landmark bird-safe buildings standards.

OBJECTIVE 6.5

IMPROVE AIR QUALITY

San Francisco’s air quality has improved over the past decades, in part due to cleaner fuels and trends away from an industrial economy. Additionally, the State, region, and City have all developed regulations and implementation strategies to reduce impacts from a myriad of contaminants from a range of sources (such as vehicles, construction practices, and off-gassing materials). That being said, relative to other neighborhoods, Central SoMa has a high volume of emissions from car and truck traffic — both from its surface streets, which have been designed primarily for heavy vehicular traffic, and the elevated regional freeway that bisects it. There are also higher building emissions from diesel generators and fire pumps relative to less developed neighborhoods. Commensurately, the area has a higher incidence of air pollution-related hospitalization rates. Additionally, there is the potential for higher heat levels due to the high concentrations of constructed, non-reflective surfaces and lack of greenery in the neighborhood. These areas continue to be concerns that the Eco-District should seek to address.

Policy 6.5.1 Support a reduction in vehicle miles traveled.

As discussed thoroughly in Goal #4, a key priority is to shift travel demand in Central SoMa towards transit and non-polluting modes such as walking and bicycling. While such measures are important to the efficiency, safety, and attractiveness of the transportation network, they simultaneously have a tremendous benefit in improving local air quality. The City should make sure that the air quality benefits of such transportation improvements are prominently featured in any discussion of the merits of these policies.

Policy 6.5.2 Utilize greening to reduce pollution and heat.

In addition to beautification and biodiversity benefits, many trees and plants are natural filters for pollution and capable of absorbing heat. The City should therefore support substantial greening efforts in Central SoMa that maximize air quality improvements, as discussed under Objective 6.4 above.



I-80 Freeway underpass at 5th Street. Photo courtesy of Google Street View.

Policy 6.5.3 Improve air quality around the freeway.

Given the sheer volume of vehicles and its elevated nature, the area around the I-80 freeway continues to have the worst air quality in the Plan Area related to pollutants, including fine and ultra-fine particulate

matter. The City should work diligently to improve the air quality in this area, through such measures as reducing emission sources, intensive greening in and around the corridor, and technological solutions, such as air filtering systems and material surfaces.

Policy 6.5.4 Utilize healthier buildings materials and technologies that improve indoor and outdoor air quality.

Building materials and operations can off-gas toxins and pollutants that impact health. The City already has standards for building interiors that require the use of zero or low-emitting materials and requires enhanced filtration systems for areas of poor air quality, such as Central SoMa. The City should continue these policies, and should provide expertise to buildings in Central SoMa for regarding additional ways that buildings can support healthy indoor and outdoor air quality through filtration systems and other evolving technologies.

OBJECTIVE 6.6

ENSURE A FLOOD-RESILIENT NEIGHBORHOOD

Flood resistant design guidelines should meet City goals of vibrant sidewalks and active ground floors.

Portions of Central SoMa already experience frequent urban flooding during extreme storms. Climate change is expected to exacerbate flooding by increasing the severity of storms and by raising the overall sea level. Low-lying portions of Central SoMa (particularly the southwest portion of the Plan Area) are susceptible to both temporary flooding and permanent inundation. This area lies on the north shore of Mission Bay at the end of the historic Hayes Creek and marsh.

Simultaneously, the area is adjacent to Mission Creek, which is expected to rise (along with the Bay) several feet by the end of the century and potentially place parts of Central SoMa below future sea level.

In part to reduce flooding impacts and avoid combined sewage discharges into the Bay, the SFPUC has been undertaking a \$20 billion Sewer System Improvement Program. It will upgrade conventional piped systems (“grey infrastructure”) for reliability and regulatory compliance while implementing innovative “green infrastructure” projects (typically rain gardens and bioswales that use soil and plants to restore and mimic natural processes) to manage stormwater in a manner that creates healthier urban environments. In March 2016, the City also released a Sea Level Rise Action Plan to establish a baseline understanding of end-of-century vulnerability and outline immediate next steps for improving the capacity to adapt in areas near the Bay and ocean. Both efforts recognize the need to improve local flood-resilience in Central SoMa, while pursuing larger citywide strategies and measures. In general, Central SoMa’s infill nature, with a mix of new and existing buildings, makes adaptation more complicated than at some of the City’s wholesale redevelopment sites along the waterfront.

Policy 6.6.1 Develop a comprehensive sea level rise and flood management strategy for Central SoMa and adjacent at-risk areas.


To address risks to the neighborhood, the City should develop a comprehensive sea level rise and flooding strategy for Central SoMa and areas similarly affected by Mission Creek. This can be done as part of, or folded into, the City’s larger effort to create a citywide Adaption Plan for Sea Level Rise and Urban Flooding. It should include a hydrology study and a strategy for stormwater storage and conveyance, as well as design guidelines for flood-resistant buildings.

Policy 6.6.2 Reduce building vulnerability to sea level rise and extreme storms.

The City already requires buildings to manage a portion of their stormwater on site, and to comply with City’s Floodplain Management Ordinance and Building and Subdivision standards. The City should to continue to implement these requirements and efforts to reflect future sea level rise conditions in adopted 100-year flood levels. In the meantime, due to the rapid pace of development in Central SoMa, the City should create neighborhood-specific flood resistant design guidelines for buildings. These design guidelines should be reflective of other City goals, such as ensuring vibrant sidewalks and active ground floors.

Policy 6.6.3 Maximize stormwater and flood management using streets, sidewalks, and open spaces.

Major storms have shown that they can overwhelm the City’s combined sewage and stormwater system, forcing polluted water to stay on the surface and/or discharge into the Bay. Recognizing this, the city’s streets and sidewalks should be designed to effectively convey stormwater to centralized storage facilities. Simultaneously, landscaping in the sidewalks and in open spaces should be designed to include green infrastructure that slows flows and enhances water quality.



(A) street trees with flow through planters (B) rain gardens (C) upgraded sewer pipes (D) permeable pavement (E) cisterns (F) vegetated roofs

San Francisco’s green infrastructure tool kit. Image courtesy of SFPUC.

OBJECTIVE 6.7

MAXIMIZE EARTHQUAKE RESILIENCE

Earthquake preparedness has been a policy focus for over a hundred years. Given the opportunity provided by the large number of new buildings, Central SoMa should be at the forefront of earthquake resilience.

The issue of a major earthquake is not a question of if, but when.

Policy 6.7.1 Ensure the ability of new and existing buildings to withstand a major seismic event.

San Francisco’s Building Code includes strict measures to ensure seismic preparedness and safety. The City should continue implementing these measures. The City should also make property owners aware of ongoing City efforts towards seismic preparedness, such as the soft-story ordinance and comprehensive Resilient SF strategy.

Policy 6.7.2 Secure sufficient power and water supplies to withstand a 72-hour emergency.

The best place to house people after a major seismic event (or other disaster) is in their own homes, or at least in their own neighborhoods. Working populations also need the ability to temporarily reside in their office buildings for up to 72 hours, if needed. Doing so requires that these buildings not only withstand a disaster, but have sufficient power and water to weather the first few days after the event. The City should explore strategies for supporting such onsite capacity in Central SoMa, including district scale energy.

OBJECTIVE 6.8

HELP ACHIEVE ZERO SOLID WASTE

Through its recycling and composting programs, San Francisco met the State-mandated 50 percent landfill diversion by 2000 and achieved the locally mandated 75 percent landfill diversion by 2010. The City has a zero waste target by 2020 and should utilize the Central SoMa Eco-District as a model for how to achieve this goal.

Policy 6.8.1 Maximize recycling and composting of solid waste from all buildings.

Meeting a goal of zero solid waste requires that individuals sort and dispose of their refuse into recyclables, compostables, and trash. To overcome the behavioral challenges in achieving this goal, the City requires that buildings provide adequate and equally accessible space onsite for the collection, sorting, and storage of all three streams, and requires that all multi-family residential and commercial buildings have on-site staff to facilitate source separation and tenant education. The City should continue enforcing these requirements, and should further facilitate this process by developing refuse facilities design guidelines for new buildings.



Standard three-stream refuse bins. Photo courtesy of SF Environment.

Policy 6.8.2 Maximize recycling and reuse of construction and demolition materials.

All buildings that are required to comply with the Green Building Code and/or LEED must already recycle 75 percent of their construction and demolition debris. The City should continue to implement this requirement and seek ways to encourage all other buildings to improve diversion rates, in part through on-site sorting in advance of collection.

Policy 6.8.3 Reduce litter in streetscapes and parks.

In terms of volume, litter is a minimal part of the waste stream. However, it is the most visible form of solid waste, and therefore should be reduced to the

greatest degree possible in the Eco-District. To do so, the City should establish tamper-proof, durable, and well-designed refuse systems for sidewalks, parks, and open spaces in Central SoMa. All privately managed open spaces (e.g. POPOS / privately-owned public open spaces) should be required to provide three-stream collection systems.

FULFILLING THE VISION

Creating an environmentally sustainable and resilient neighborhood in Central SoMa would help fulfill the Plan’s vision of creating a sustainable neighborhood by:



Supporting **social sustainability** by providing a more inviting neighborhood that encourages people to spend time outdoors.



Supporting **economic sustainability** by maximizing resource efficiency, minimizing waste, and fostering innovation.



Supporting **environmental sustainability** by improving local ecological systems, as well as providing an example for neighborhoods around the city and beyond.



The Plan Area's cultural heritage is a valuable historical, social, and economic resource that requires thoughtful management to safeguard the City's unique identity and to ensure a high quality-of-life for its current and future inhabitants.

Performance of *She, Who Can See* by Kularts. Photo by Wilfred Galila.

Preserve and Celebrate the Neighborhood's Cultural Heritage

CONTEXT

SoMa was once the domain of longshoremen, warehousemen, merchant mariners, day laborers, immigrant farm workers, and other manual workers (most of whom were men) who contributed immeasurably to the prosperity and economic development of the West. Many were newcomers—beginning with the Irish, Germans, and Scandinavians in the nineteenth century. These groups were followed by waves of Greeks, Eastern European Jews, Ukrainians, and Japanese during the early twentieth century. Dustbowl refugees arrived during the Depression, and Central Americans, African-Americans, and Filipinos took up residence during the post-World War II era.

The industrialization of SoMa was the result of the neighborhood's proximity to the waterfront, in addition to its regional highway and rail links, and has been referred to as San Francisco's back porch – the place where the unglamorous service businesses and industrial enterprises could conveniently set up shop. The topography of South of Market allowed for flat and wide thoroughfares, making the transportation of

goods via wagon and eventually train and truck much easier.

During the Gold Rush era, SoMa served as the most productive industrial zone on the West Coast. In the years following the gold rush, the area evolved into a mixed-use neighborhood. This is in part attributed to the fact that residential uses were developed in conjunction with industrial facilities, to provide convenient access for industrial workers who could not yet afford public transit.

The 1906 Earthquake and Fire destroyed almost every building and structure in SoMa and dramatically changed the socio-economic characteristics of the entire area. Two important survivors of the conflagration were well-fortified public buildings: the U.S. Mint and the U.S. Post Office and Court of Appeals. The U.S. Mint was listed as a National Historic Landmark, the National Park Service's highest honor, on July 4, 1961. After the 1906 Earthquake, economic forces led to the reconstruction of the neighborhood as a predominantly light industrial district, which caused the residential population to plummet.



SoMa was once the domain of longshoremen, warehousemen, merchant mariners, day laborers, immigrant farm workers, and other manual workers who contributed immeasurably to the prosperity and economic development of the West.

SoMa has since developed an eclectic mix of commerce, industry, and increasingly, entertainment and residential living spaces. Within this diverse mix of land uses, there are historically and culturally significant properties and districts. SoMa is an important center for two culturally important communities: Filipinos and the lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (LGBTQ) community. SoMa is home to the largest concentration of Filipinos in San Francisco, and is the cultural center of the regional Filipino community. The Filipino community has deep roots in the neighborhood, beginning in the 1920s and becoming a predominant presence in the 1960s. The LGBTQ community also has a long-standing presence in SoMa. By 1956, the two most prominent national organizations dedicated to improving the social status of gays and lesbians were both headquartered within the Central SoMa. Beginning after World War II and to present day, various LGBTQ-oriented business establishments have located to SoMa's industrial areas.

SoMa is an important center for two culturally important communities: Filipinos and the lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (LGBTQ) community.

The Plan Area's cultural heritage is a valuable historical, social, and economic resource that requires thoughtful management to safeguard the City's unique identity and to ensure a high quality-of-life for its current and future inhabitants. Retaining the City's architectural heritage builds an inimitable sense of place and a tangible connection to its past. Sustaining the traditions, businesses, arts, and practices that compose San Francisco's social and economic fabric preserves experiences that can be shared across generations. And, protecting the City's archeological sites and artifacts provides increasing insight into the story of its past inhabitants. Conservation of our cultural heritage encourages a deeper awareness of our shared and multi-faceted history while facilitating sustainable economic development. As the area changes and develops, key elements of the historic built environment should not be lost or diminished through demolition or inappropriate alterations. The City supports preservation and sustainable rehabilitation of historic resources according to the



Photo by tobakhopper, "the crowd : folsom street fair, san francisco (2013)" September 29, 2013 via Flickr, Creative Commons Attribution

Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and encourages the introduction of new compatible uses, and allows for preservation incentives for qualifying projects. Moreover, new construction in identified historic districts should respect and relate to its architectural context. The City also supports stabilization, promotion, and increased visibility of the area’s living heritage, which includes businesses, organizations, traditions, and practices associated with the Filipino and LGBTQ communities.

OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES

The Objectives and Policies below are intended to fulfill the goal of preserving and celebrating the neighborhood’s history.

OBJECTIVE 7.1

ENSURE THAT THE HISTORY OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD IS ADEQUATELY DOCUMENTED

Understanding our future requires understanding our past.

This requires recording Central SoMa’s rich history via both a historic context statement and survey.

Policy 7.1.1 Complete and adopt a Central SoMa Historic Context Statement.

Historic Context Statements are documents that chronicle the historical development of a neighborhood. A Central SoMa Historic Context Statement has been completed and was adopted by the Historic Preservation Commission at its March 16, 2016 hearing, recording the important history of this neighborhood in one place.

Policy 7.1.2 Complete and adopt a Central SoMa Historic Resources Survey.

Assessing the value of a building, landscape, or feature requires survey, research and analysis to determine whether it is significant for local, state, or national historical registers. Such research and analysis is helpful to the Planning Department, community, property owners, and decision-makers. This documentation provides up-front information about a property’s historic status. Within the Plan Area, this analysis has occurred and was adopted by the Historic Preservation Commission at its March 16, 2016 hearing.

OBJECTIVE 7.2

SUPPORT THE PRESERVATION, RECOGNITION, AND WELLBEING OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD’S CULTURAL HERITAGE RESOURCES

The term “cultural heritage” is understood to mean tangible properties or intangible assets that express the ways of living developed by a community and passed on from generation to generation. These elements are rooted in the community’s history and are important in maintaining the continuing cultural identity of the community. Tangible cultural heritage includes objects, buildings, sites, structures, cultural landscapes, or districts that are significant in architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of San Francisco, the state of California, or the nation. Intangible cultural heritage includes the practices, representations, expressions, knowledge, or skills that communities, groups and, in some cases, individuals recognize as part of their cultural heritage. Intangible cultural heritage, transmitted from generation to generation, is constantly recreated

by communities and groups in response to their environment, their interaction with nature and their history, and provides them with a sense of identity and continuity, thus promoting respect for cultural diversity and human creativity. These two categories of cultural heritage resources – “tangible” or “intangible” – require different approaches for identification, protection, and management.



Maség Typhoon performance. Photo by Kularts.

Policy 7.2.1 Facilitate the creation and implementation of a SoMa Pilipinas – Filipino Cultural Heritage Strategy.

The South of Market is home to the largest concentration of Filipinos in San Francisco, and is the cultural center of the regional Filipino community. The Filipino community has deep roots in the neighborhood, beginning in the 1920s and becoming a predominant presence in the 1960s. The Filipino culture is a critical part of the neighborhood’s diversity, strength, and resilience. Having survived Redevelopment in the 1960s-1980s, the community is still subject to the threat of displacement given the current market forces that are driving up housing and commercial rents. To rectify this issue, in April 2016 the City created SoMa Pilipinas – Filipino Cultural Heritage District. This CHD includes all of Central SoMa north of Brannan Street, and extends into other parts of SoMa

as far west as 11th Street. Because of its substantial overlap with the Plan Area, the Planning Department should collaborate with the community to develop and implement a strategy to stabilize, promote, and increase the visibility of SoMa’s Filipino community.

Policy 7.2.2 Facilitate the creation and implementation of other social or cultural heritage strategies, such as for the LGBTQ community.

Through its long and tumultuous history, Central SoMa has been home to many important social and cultural communities. The City should continue exploring opportunities to recognize and support these communities, whether through neighborhood-specific programs or as part of citywide efforts. The Historic Preservation Commission adopted the Citywide LGBTQ Historic Context Statement at its November 15, 2015 hearing. The document can be used by community history advocates and the Planning Department to provide a foundation for the protection, identification, interpretation, and designation of historically and culturally significant LGBTQ-related sites and places, within SoMa and citywide.



Photo by tobakhopper, “sister risqué wearing the flag : folsom street fair, san francisco (2010)” September 29, 2010 via Flickr, Creative Commons Attribution



The San Francisco Flower Mart. Image by Flickr user dutchbaby (CC BY-NC-ND 2.0).

Maintaining PDR jobs helps support the preservation of intangible heritage assets, such as the practices, representations, expressions, knowledge, or skills represented within SoMa’s current and legacy industrial uses.

OBJECTIVE 7.3

ENSURE THE NEIGHBORHOOD’S TANGIBLE AND INTANGIBLE INDUSTRIAL AND ARTS LEGACY IS NOT LOST

Central SoMa has been an important industrial area since the Gold Rush. Much of the industrial jobs are now gone, due to the overall shift in the American economy towards services and the movement of many of those remaining industrial companies to the periphery of the city and region. Yet there is still an important blue-collar presence in Central SoMa reflected not only in its buildings but in the surprising diversity of practices, knowledge, and skills still extant, from the Flower Mart to auto repair shops to metal fabricators to artists’ studios.

Policy 7.3.1 Implement strategies that maintain PDR jobs in the neighborhood.

As Central SoMa continues to grow, there is potential for its PDR jobs to be priced out. The City should help maintain the neighborhood’s share of PDR jobs (as discussed in more detail in Objective 3 of Goal #3). Maintaining PDR jobs helps support the preservation of intangible heritage assets, such as the practices, representations, expressions, knowledge, or skills represented within SoMa’s current and legacy industrial uses.

Policy 7.3.2 Support the preservation of buildings and features that reflect the industrial and arts legacy of the neighborhood.

Protecting the neighborhood’s industrial legacy is not just about the people working there, but also the context of where the work and daily life occurred. As such, important historic industrial buildings and features should be preserved and maintained in conformance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and via the mechanisms described elsewhere in this Goal.


OBJECTIVE 7.4

PREVENT DEMOLITION OF OR INSENSITIVE ALTERATIONS TO CULTURAL HERITAGE RESOURCES IN THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT

San Francisco’s heritage is visible in its historic built environment, which includes objects, buildings, sites, structures, and landscapes. These resources provide visual and tangible continuity to the events, places, people, and architecture of San Francisco’s storied past. Culturally significant buildings contribute to the City’s diverse housing and commercial stock, and to

Figure 7.1

HISTORIC RESOURCES



EXISTING RESOURCES

- Designated Article 10 Landmark Building or Article 11 Significant or Contributory Building
- Listed on the National or California Register
- Existing Article 10 District

ELIGIBLE RESOURCES

- Resources Eligible for Article 10 or 11 Designation
- Other Resources Eligible for the National or California Register or Locally Significant
- Proposed Article 10 Landmark District or Article 11 Conservation District
- Other Eligible Historic District

the human scale and pedestrian orientation of its neighborhoods. These buildings are also important to quality-of-life in the City, and they help to make it attractive to residents, visitors, and businesses. Because of their importance, the Central SoMa Plan aims to prevent the demolition or insensitive alteration that would undermine the contributions that these cultural heritage resources make to the neighborhood and the City.

Policy 7.4.1 Protect Landmark-worthy cultural heritage properties through designation to Article 10 of the Planning Code.

Article 10 of the Planning Code contains a list of individual resources and districts that are protected City Landmarks. The Plan Area currently contains 29 such buildings, which are designated as either individual Landmarks or contributors to a Landmark District. As shown in Figure 7.1, the City has identified six buildings as eligible individual Landmarks and 11 additional buildings that are eligible contributors to a Landmark District, based upon review of the existing cultural resource surveys and community outreach efforts.

Policy 7.4.2 Protect “Significant” and “Contributory” cultural heritage properties through designation to Article 11 of the Planning Code.

Article 11 of the Planning Code contains lists of individual buildings and districts considered historically and architecturally significant and contributing buildings in the downtown area. The City should extend Article 11 zoning controls into the Plan Area, to afford qualifying buildings the benefits, such as the ability to participate in the City’s “Transfer of Development Rights” (TDR) program, once designated. As shown in Figure 7.1, the City has identified 27 buildings as eligible “Significant” or “Contributory” buildings, based upon review of the existing cultural resource surveys and community outreach efforts.

OBJECTIVE 7.5

SUPPORT MECHANISMS FOR THE REHABILITATION AND MAINTENANCE OF CULTURAL HERITAGE PROPERTIES

Preserving cultural resources requires more than just legal protections – it requires a plan, funding sources, and a supportive body of experts, community members, and decision-makers. Fortunately, there is a wide variety of local, state, and federal mechanisms that can facilitate and encourage the preservation and rehabilitation of cultural resources.

Policy 7.5.1 Support funding for the rehabilitation of the Old Mint.


The City-owned Old Mint at 5th and Mission is one of San Francisco’s most significant buildings. It is also in a state of significant disrepair and in need of substantial and immediate rehabilitation. Funding generated from the Central SoMa Plan should contribute, as part of a broader community partnership, to identify a program strategy, to fund a rehabilitation and restoration plan, and to ensure it remains a facility for public use.



The Old Mint. Image by Shawn Clover, Flickr (CC BY-NC 2.0)

Figure 7.2

PROHIBITION OF LOT MERGERS



Policy 7.5.2 Enable “Significant” and “Contributing” buildings underbuilt per applicable zoning to sell Transferable Development Rights.

Transfer of Development Rights is an effective method for creating economic benefit for buildings designated “Significant” or “Contributing” in Article 11 of the Planning Code. It creates economic value for buildings by enabling them to sell unused development rights where there is a difference between what is allowed and the actual size of the building. In San Francisco, this tool has primarily been utilized in the downtown (C-3) zoning districts and adjacent districts. The City should extend this tool into the Plan Area. Facilitating the TDR program would support the protection of these buildings by reducing development pressure and providing an economic incentive for the preservation and maintenance of designated cultural resources.

Policy 7.5.3 Require large new development projects to purchase Transferable Development Rights.

In addition to extending the right to sell TDR to Central SoMa, major new developments should be required to purchase TDR as well. As such, this would create a mechanism by which new developments in Central SoMa directly support the preservation and maintenance of the neighborhood’s historic buildings.

Policy 7.5.4 Support additions over wholesale demolition to preserve cultural heritage properties.

Regardless of historic designation status, the City should support new development and the preservation of cultural heritage properties through application of Standards 9 and 10 of the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards. Supporting sensitive, well-designed additions to historic buildings is one way to increase square footage and to benefit from

the preservation of cultural resources. As such, the City should support additions rather than wholesale demolition when such demolitions are physically feasible.

Policy 7.5.5 Encourage the use of existing strategies and incentives that facilitate the preservation and rehabilitation of designated cultural heritage properties.

Cultural heritage properties already benefit from a wide range of strategies and incentives to support preservation and maintenance. This includes measures to increase available revenue, including the Mills Act, Federal Historic Preservation Tax Incentives, and façade easements. This also includes additional flexibility from Planning Code and Building Code requirements through exemptions granted by the Zoning Administrator or via application of the California Historic Building Code. The City should continue encouraging the application of these strategies and incentives to Central SoMa’s cultural resources.

OBJECTIVE 7.6

SUPPORT RETENTION OF FINE-GRAINED DEVELOPED PATTERN AND CHARACTER-ENHANCING BUILDINGS



An example of a block with a fine-grained character. Photo by [Google Street View](#).



An example of a block with a fine-grained character. Photo by [Google Street View](#).

Buildings that have cultural heritage significance are not the only buildings of merit in Central SoMa. There are many buildings that exhibit high levels of visual cohesion and contextual architectural expression. Collectively, these buildings also form development patterns that are emblematic of the history of SoMa and that make the neighborhood visually interesting.

Policy 7.6.1 Restrict the consolidation of small- and medium-sized lots with character-enhancing buildings.

The Plan Area has myriad development patterns, ranging from “fine-grained” blocks where the lots are as little as 25 feet wide, to monumental blocks where individual lots are hundreds of feet in length. The most pleasant blocks to experience are presently those areas where the pattern of fine-grained parcels is combined with older buildings that enhance, individually and as a group, the character and activity of SoMa. As such, these historic development patterns should be preserved by restricting the consolidation of these lots into larger lots, as shown in Figure 7.2.

Policy 7.6.2 Incentivize retention of character-enhancing buildings.

Character-enhancing buildings received a “6L” California Historic Resources Status Code (CHRSC) in the historic survey. As such, these buildings were determined not to be eligible for the same level of protection as cultural resources. However, because they are character-enhancing, the City should consider strategies to incentivize their retention, such as allowing them to sell TDR to when they are part of a larger development project.

FULLFILLING THE VISION

Preserving and celebrating the neighborhood's history would help fulfill the Plan's vision of creating a sustainable neighborhood by:



Supporting **social sustainability** by retaining important existing communities as well as links to the neighborhood's past.



Supporting **economic sustainability** by providing a reservoir of older buildings that support important uses that may not be able to otherwise compete on rents.



Supporting **environmental sustainability** by reducing the need for new building materials.



The goal of the Central SoMa Plan is to ensure that each new building enhances the character of the neighborhood and the city as a whole.

Photo by Daniel Austin Hoherd, Flickr (CC BY-NC 2.0).

Ensure that New Buildings Enhance the Character of the Neighborhood and the City

CONTEXT

While many existing residential, historic, public, and large commercial buildings in Central SoMa are likely to remain in the foreseeable future, there is also a substantial amount of land on which new development is likely to occur.

New buildings and landscapes will change the neighborhood in many ways. The design of ground floors can control how interesting and safe a street will be for people walking. The size and massing of buildings as perceived from the street can be inviting if scaled appropriately, alienating if too small or too far removed, or intimidating if too large, looming or impervious. The collection of the buildings as viewed from the distance can either enhance or detract from the overall skyline and sense of the City's landscape. The architecture of a building can either engage people with intimate details and support a feeling of a cohesive and dynamic neighborhood or only coolly express its own internal interests without enriching its context.

Within the existing neighborhood, there are already numerous good and bad examples for each of these issues. The goal of the Central SoMa Plan is to ensure that each new building enhances the character of

the neighborhood and the city as a whole by having engaging ground floor, appropriate scale, great architecture and a beneficial contribution to the skyline.

OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES

The Objectives and Policies below are intended to fulfill the goal of ensuring that new buildings enhance the character of the neighborhood and the city.

OBJECTIVE 8.1

ENSURE THAT THE GROUND FLOORS OF BUILDINGS CONTRIBUTE TO THE ACTIVATION, SAFETY, AND DYNAMISM OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD

The most important part of a building is the ground floor, where it interfaces with the street and other public spaces. Most people never actually go inside or assess the vast majority of the buildings they encounter – but they are, often subconsciously, aware of how the ground floors shape their daily experience of the neighborhood. People will seek out streets that feel interesting and richly textured, enabling them to engage with friends, people-watch, view items in shop windows or activity inside businesses, and safely avoid undesired encounters.



An example of retail that engages the street.

Policy 8.1.1 Require that ground floor uses actively engage the street.

When ground floors are dominated by internally oriented or non-public uses like parking and offices, people walking by or in adjacent public spaces do not feel the ability to engage with their environment and feel socially disconnected and disinterested. Recognizing this, the City has already instituted requirements for ground floors, such as that they must be lined with active uses, and not with parking or storage. The City also requires a high amount of building transparency on the ground floor and supports frequent placement of doors. The City should consider additional measures to increase ground floor activity, such as requiring retail in certain locations (as discussed in Goal# 3), allowing production, distribution, and repair uses (PDR) if they properly activate the street, and banning additional uses on the ground floor that do not interface well with the street, such as offices.

Policy 8.1.2 Design building frontages and public open spaces with furnishings and amenities to engage a mixed-use neighborhood.

As discussed elsewhere in this document, Central SoMa is one of the most lively and diverse

neighborhoods in the City, containing residents, many different kinds of work activities, and visitors at all hours of the day. Buildings and open spaces should reflect and enhance this experience through the design and inclusion of amenities. Projects should include fixtures, furnishings, art, utilities, and programming at the ground floor or adjacent open space to invite and support more active and consistent use of public areas including alleys, open spaces, and sidewalks. These smaller elements help connect interior and exterior uses and support more impromptu and flexible activities on the ground floor that can evolve with the neighborhood.

Policy 8.1.3 Ensure buildings are built up to the sidewalk edge.

When buildings are set back from the sidewalk – such as in a suburban strip mall environment – people on foot feel exposed on both sides and detached from their surroundings, leaving adjacent street traffic as the defining experience. By contrast, most buildings in Central SoMa should be at the property line, or set back in instances where there is opportunity and desire to widen the sidewalk or create public space for active usage. In the case of purely residential buildings with walk-up units, the ground floors should be designed in accordance with the Ground Floor Residential Design Guidelines, such as incorporating setbacks to allow for livable interior spaces, stoops, landscaping, and appropriate public-private transition.

Policy 8.1.4 Minimize parking and loading entrances.

Frequent parking and loading entrances diminish the ability to have active, safe, and dynamic ground floors – particularly on retail-focused streets. Therefore, parking and loading entrances in buildings should be limited, and as necessary directed towards the narrow streets and alleys with fewer pedestrians and fewer retail uses.

OBJECTIVE 8.2

ENSURE THAT THE OVERALL DEVELOPMENT PATTERN IS COMPLEMENTARY TO THE SKYLINE

San Francisco is renowned for its physical beauty and unique sense of place. These qualities are defined by buildings and streets laid upon hills and valleys, the San Francisco Bay and Pacific Ocean, and signature landmarks poised at picturesque locations. The city’s urban form at this scale is an essential characteristic of San Francisco’s identity and should be enhanced by the Central SoMa Plan.

Policy 8.2.1 Set height limits, bulk controls, and architectural guidelines mindful of important views.

From other vantage points, the proposed heights in Central SoMa should be subservient to the dramatic hills around it – including the built “hill” of the downtown high-rise district. Changes proposed in the northwest and southeast part of the Plan Area should be in keeping with the buildings immediately adjacent and/or within a block. In the southwest part of the Plan Area, there is a potential to create a new development pattern that would become, for the first time, noticeable from a distance. However, this new pattern should consist of a small cluster of buildings spaced apart from each other and achieving heights half as high, at most, of buildings downtown. As such, this area would serve as more of a “foothill,” complementing rather than detracting from the overall skyline. The tallest of these buildings should demarcate the 4th and Townsend intersection, identifying the Caltrain station and intersection of multiple light rail lines as a key node of city importance, and serve to distinguish the area on the skyline through both height and distinctive architecture.

The diversity of buildings in Central SoMa is reflective of the many roles it has played in the city’s history.

OBJECTIVE 8.3

REINFORCE THE CHARACTER OF CENTRAL SOMA AS A MID-RISE DISTRICT WITH TANGIBLE “URBAN ROOMS”

The diversity of buildings in Central SoMa is reflective of the many roles it has played in the city’s history. One of the most common building forms is the “mid-rise” building of five to eight stories (65 to 85 feet), characteristic of its industrial and warehouse legacy. These mid-rise buildings have proven to have great longevity, because their large floors and high ceilings are attractive to a range of uses. This includes modern office uses, which desire flexibility with workspace arrangements that accommodate expansive collaborative and informal environments, while simultaneously discouraging the proliferation of individual offices.




Figure 8.1
URBAN ROOM

With the tower set back, buildings emphasize the clarity of the urban room.



Figure 8.2
VIEW OF DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL FROM DOLORES PARK

SF Digital Model by SOM




Figure 8.3
VIEW OF DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL FROM POTRERO HILL

SF Digital Model by SOM

- CENTRAL SOMA DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL
- ANTICIPATED PROJECTS OUTSIDE OF CENTRAL SOMA

These images are intended to visualize the overall development capacity of the Central SoMa Plan. They are not meant to be a precise assessment of potential at the individual parcel level. It is certain that eventual development at these locations will look differently than rendered in these images.

In SoMa, these mid-rise buildings create a comfortable “urban room” – which is when the perceived height of the building is approximately equivalent to the width of the street. In the Plan area, major streets are 82.5 feet wide and the narrow minor streets are typically 35 feet wide. This combination of mid-rise buildings whose heights are similar to the street width sets Central SoMa apart from adjacent high-rise districts.

Policy 8.3.1 Set height limits to enable mid-rise development.

Currently, height limits on major streets are too low to support mid-rise development. These height limits should be adjusted to enable mid-rise development, except where there is an important civic asset that lower heights would benefit.

Policy 8.3.2 Require new buildings to reinforce the urban room.

Buildings in Central SoMa should be designed to be mindful of creating and preserving the urban room. This predominantly requires that buildings have a strong presence along the street, rather than being set back off the property line – a condition which diminishes its boundary and thus its feeling as a “room.”

Policy 8.3.3 Require buildings whose height exceeds the street width to step back at the upper stories.

Buildings that exceed the height of the urban room will contribute to the neighborhood’s mid-rise character if the predominance of their mass and height is not visible or dominant from the street. Additionally, there should be sufficient light, air, and sense of openness between buildings. Therefore, the City should require massing and design strategies that reduce the apparent mass of buildings above a height of 85 feet and should require adequate spacing between towers.




Figure 8.4
DEVELOPMENT CAPACITY

Mid-rise buildings can provide comparable square footage but large floorplates.

Policy 8.3.4 Limit the distribution and bulk of new towers and focus them at important nodes.

By efficiently using land, new towers (i.e., buildings taller than 160 feet in height) are helpful to fulfilling the Plan’s goal to increase the capacity for jobs and housing (as discussed in Goal 1). However, as a mid-rise district, such towers should not be permitted to dominate the landscape. To do so, the number of towers should be limited. Additionally, these towers should be located at important nodes in the Plan Area, such as the intersection of the Central Subway and Caltrain and the intersection of 5th and Brannan.

Policy 8.3.5 Limit heights in areas with a high concentration of historic buildings and areas of unique character.

The southeastern portion of the Plan Area features two unique concentrations of historic resources – the South Park block and the western portion of the South End Historic District. In order to preserve the unique character and scale of these areas, the City should not increase height limits in either, including the area identified for expansion of the South End Historic District (as discussed in Goal # 7).



Yerba Buena Gardens. Photo by Petar Iliev, SF Planning.

Policy 8.3.6 Minimize the impact of shadows on public spaces to the extent feasible, balanced with other core objectives.

Sunlight is an important factor in people’s attraction to and enjoyment of public spaces. Planning Code Section 295, adopted pursuant to Proposition K in 1984, protects Recreation and Park Department parks from new shading that might be significant and adverse to the use of those parks. South Park is the only Recreation and Park Department property in the Plan Area. However, there are other important public open spaces that require attention as well, despite a lack of formal protection. The City should propose height districts to minimize shadow impacts on South Park, Yerba Buena Gardens, and the Bessie Carmichael School yard. On other public spaces, particularly new spaces either discussed in Goal #5 or those that may be created in the future, shadows should be minimized to the degree that such sculpting of the buildings does not sacrifice other important Plan objectives, especially those regarding optimizing land use. These future open spaces will be funded and activated by new development, without which they would not exist, and are being proposed in the context of the Plan’s overall urban form and land use parameters. Some shading from buildings enabled by this Plan is inherent in the creation of these open spaces. As such, new buildings should be sculpted

to maximize sunlight to these spaces without unduly impacting the development capacity of the sites intended by this Plan.

Policy 8.3.7 Utilize new buildings to diminish the dominant presence of the freeway in the neighborhood.

The elevated I-80 freeway slices through the Plan Area. While the freeway structure is relatively low (30-50 feet), it looms large above the low-slung buildings on either side and creates a physical and psychological divider of the neighborhood. Where the City is increasing development potential, it should allow buildings to be taller than the freeway. This will help diminish the presence of the freeway while integrating the areas on either side.

OBJECTIVE 8.4

ENSURE THAT NARROW STREETS AND ALLEYS MAINTAIN THEIR INTIMATENESS AND SENSE OF OPENNESS TO THE SKY

Every block in Central SoMa is blessed with one or more narrow streets and alleys, whose widths are typically 35 feet or less. The patterns and layouts of these streets changes from block to block, creating unique and distinguishing configurations.

Historically, the buildings along these narrow streets and alleys have been lower in height – reflecting their smaller scale “urban room.” The result is that the alleys have provided a sense of openness, intimacy, and reprieve in this dense neighborhood of wide streets and large buildings. The scale of these streets is an essential ingredient to the livability of the district.

Policy 8.4.1 Require new buildings facing alleys and narrow streets to step back at the upper stories.

While a central tenet of the Plan is support for increasing capacity for housing and jobs in the

neighborhood, the intent of this Plan is also to ensure that the narrow streets and alleys maintain their sense of openness to the sky and lower scale so that future generations can continue to enjoy their benefit. Therefore, the City should ensure that new buildings facing alleys and narrow streets step back at the upper stories. As well, in parts of the Plan area that contain high concentrations of older and small-scale residential uses along alleys (e.g., the northwest part of the Plan area), building height limits should be kept relatively lower than on the major streets surrounding them.

OBJECTIVE 8.5

ENSURE THAT LARGE DEVELOPMENT SITES ARE CAREFULLY DESIGNED TO MAXIMIZE PUBLIC BENEFIT

Central SoMa includes a number of large, underutilized sites (parcels or groups of adjacent parcels that are 30,000 to well over 100,000 square feet) that represent a substantial portion of the overall development in the Plan Area. Because of their size, these sites have the potential to deliver substantial public benefits if carefully designed.

Policy 8.5.1 Provide greater direction and flexibility for large development sites in return for improved design and additional public benefits.

The City should develop guidelines and requirements for large development sites where there is potential for additional public benefits and where alternative organization or massing on the site would better achieve the goals of the Plan. These guidelines and requirements should lay out how these specific sites could provide desirable community benefits, such as public open space and recreational facilities, dedicated sites for affordable housing development, and other benefits critical to achieving the goals of the Plan.

Policy 8.5.2 Limit the length of new buildings.

Development on large lots could lead to buildings that have very long street frontages. Such buildings can have a negative impact on the surrounding environment by feeling too imposing or creating a sensation of monotony or homogeneity to the street environment. The City already has controls to prevent such conditions by requiring mass reductions for buildings longer than 200 feet and mid-block alleys on lots longer than 300 feet. The City should continue to implement these controls in Central SoMa.



Photo by Daniel Austin Hoherd, Flickr (CC BY-NC 2.0).

Perhaps the most lasting aspect of a building is its architecture and the ways it engages people.

OBJECTIVE 8.6

PROMOTE HIGH QUALITY ARCHITECTURE THAT ENHANCES THE NEIGHBORHOOD

Perhaps the most lasting aspect of a building is its architecture – its form, materials, programming, and all the other ways it engages people. Achieving high quality architecture in Central SoMa is critical, given its central location, the substantial number of new buildings expected (some of which will be quite large), and the rich history and diversity of the buildings in the neighborhood.

Policy 8.6.1 Conform to the City’s Urban Design Guidelines.

The City is in the process of adopting Urban Design Guidelines that will apply to all new development within San Francisco. These Guidelines will give direction on a number of important design issues, including site design, massing, open space, fenestration and facade development, and ground floor design. To promote design excellence, at a minimum all projects in Central SoMa shall conform to the City’s Urban Design Guidelines.

Policy 8.6.2 Promote innovative and contextually-appropriate design.

Central SoMa is currently an organic collection of buildings built at different scales, in different times and for different purposes. It is also a neighborhood steeped in a history of invention and creativity, including in technology, industry and the arts. Given this eclectic and innovative environment, new development in Central SoMa should promote innovative design that also respects its context. This innovation can be evident in the choice or choices of materials, structure, sustainability features, form, landscape, and expression of uses or concept.

Policy 8.6.3 Design the upper floors to be deferential to the “urban room”.

As discussed above, the height limits and bulk controls in Central SoMa will support its character as a mid-rise district with a strong urban room. The architecture, including materials, facade patterns, and proportions, of new development should be designed to reinforce this character.

Policy 8.6.4 Design buildings to be mindful of wind.

Like much of San Francisco, Central SoMa is subject to strong winds, which generally emanate from the west. Tall buildings and exposed structures can strongly affect the wind environment for pedestrians. A building that stands alone or is much taller than the surrounding buildings can intercept and redirect winds that might otherwise flow overhead and bring them down the vertical face of the building. These winds and resulting turbulence may create conditions that are unpleasant on the neighborhoods sidewalks, streets, and open spaces. The City should require that buildings be designed to minimize new wind impacts at the ground level.

Policy 8.6.5 Ensure large projects integrate with existing urban fabric and provide a varied character.

Central SoMa has a number of large development sites due to the area’s industrial legacy. Many of these sites could feature multiple sizable buildings. Due to their scale, development on these sites has the potential to dominate and stand apart from their surroundings and form homogeneous and insular collections of buildings or campuses. Instead, projects proposed on these sites should be designed to integrate with the surrounding urban fabric, reflecting and enhancing the existing development patterns. Additionally, they should provide a varied character and avoid design cues that suggest a “campus” environment.

Central SoMa is a neighborhood steeped in a history of invention and creativity, including in technology, industry and the arts.

OBJECTIVE 8.7

ESTABLISH CLEAR RULES FOR DEVELOPMENT

In developing new buildings, there are instances in which a flexible process creates a lack of clarity for all parties – community, developers, and the City – as to what is possible. While in some cases this may lead to superior outcomes, in many cases the only result is distrust and uncertainty until a decision is made very far into the process, resulting in lost time and money. The Plan would not be considered successful if neither the community nor property owners have certainty about how development will proceed and have certain guarantees regarding physical, programmatic and public benefit parameters.

Policy 8.7.1

Whenever possible, delineate via the Planning Code what is allowed and not allowed in new development.

To maximize certainty for all parties, the rules for new development should be unambiguously established in the Planning Code. This can be accomplished by minimizing allowance for exceptions and exemptions from Planning Code controls, and by clearly laying out conditions and criteria for when exceptions to the basic controls may be warranted – particularly on large sites (as discussed above). Open-ended, subjective conditions allowing exceptions for “design excellence” or ill-defined “public benefits” should be avoided in favor of objective criteria and clear direction.

FULFILLING THE VISION

Ensuring that new buildings enhance the character of the neighborhood and the city would help fulfill the Plan’s vision of creating a sustainable neighborhood by:



Supporting **social sustainability**

by maintaining the traditional feel of SoMa while facilitating additional opportunities for social interactions and interesting streets.




Supporting **economic sustainability**

by promoting interesting buildings that have substantial size and thus the potential to attract companies to stay, grow, and/or come to the neighborhood.



Supporting **environmental sustainability**

emphasizing light and air at the street level.



**PART II:
CENTRAL SOMA
IMPLEMENTATION
STRATEGY**



PART II: **CENTRAL SOMA IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY**

IMPLEMENTATION MATRIX

CENTRAL SOMA PLAN IMPLEMENTATION MATRIX

This document conveys what measures will be taken to implement the Central SoMa Plan, as when as how, when, and by whom they will be implemented.

GOAL #1 – INCREASE THE CAPACITY FOR JOBS AND HOUSING

#	OBJECTIVE	#	POLICY	#	IMPLEMENTATION MEASURE	IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM	TIMELINE	LEAD AGENCY
1.1	Increase the area where space for jobs and housing can be built	1.1.1	Retain existing zoning that supports capacity for new jobs and housing	1.1.1.1	Maintain existing MUO, MUG, SoMA NCT, and South Park zoning (see Figures 1.3 and 1.4 in the Plan).	Ongoing implementation of existing Zoning Map	Complete	Planning
		1.1.2	Replace existing zoning that restricts capacity for development with zoning that supports capacity for development	1.1.2.1	Change SALI, SALI, WSMUO, and RED zoning to MUO zoning (see Figures 1.3 and 1.4 in the Plan).	Zoning Map amendment	Upon Plan adoption	Planning
				1.1.2.2	Change SALI zoning to WSMUO zoning along the south side of Bryant Street from just east of 5th Street to 6th Street (see Figures 1.3 and 1.4 in the Plan).	Zoning Map amendment	Upon Plan adoption	Planning
1.2	Increase how much space for jobs and housing can be built	1.2.1	Increase height limits on parcels, as appropriate	1.2.1.1	Increase height limits from existing to proposed (see Figures 1.7 and 1.8 in the Plan).	Zoning Map amendment	Upon Plan adoption	Planning
		1.2.2	Allow physical controls for height, bulk, setbacks, and open space to determine density	1.2.2.1	Remove Floor Area Ratio (FAR) limits on non-residential buildings above 85 feet in height.	Planning Code amendment	Upon Plan adoption	Planning

GOAL #2 – MAINTAIN THE DIVERSITY OF RESIDENTS

#	OBJECTIVE	#	POLICY	#	IMPLEMENTATION MEASURE	IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM	TIMELINE	LEAD AGENCY
2.1	Maintain the existing stock of housing	2.1.1	Continue implementing controls that maintain the existing supply of housing	2.1.1.1	Continue implementing unit merger and demolition controls.	Ongoing implementation of the Planning Code	Ongoing	Planning
				2.1.1.2	Continue enforcing restrictions on conversion of units to hotels rooms, including Short Term Rentals.	Ongoing implementation of the Planning and Administrative Codes	Ongoing	Office of Short Term Rentals
				2.1.1.3	Continue implementation strategies to ensure livability of units – particularly Single Room Occupancy housing (SROs).	Ongoing implementation of the Administrative Code	Ongoing	Department of Public Health
2.2	Maintain the affordability of the existing stock of housing	2.2.1	Continue implementing controls and strategies that help maintain the existing supply of affordable housing	2.2.1.1	Continue enforcing rent control and eviction protection regulations.	Ongoing implementation of the Administrative Code	Ongoing	Rent Board and Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD)

#	OBJECTIVE	#	POLICY	#	IMPLEMENTATION MEASURE	IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM	TIMELINE	LEAD AGENCY
				2.2.1.2	Continue implementing funding strategies such as the Rental Assistance Demonstration program and rehabilitation loans for affordable buildings.	Ongoing implementation of MOHCD programs	Ongoing	MOHCD
		2.2.2	Support the conversion of existing housing into permanently affordable housing	2.2.2.1	Continue implementing the City's Small Sites program.	Ongoing implementation of MOHCD programs	Ongoing	MOHCD
				2.2.2.2	Explore development of a program, whereby new development could satisfy their affordable housing requirements by converting existing housing into permanently affordable housing.	Assessment of feasibility of this measure	Within 12 months of Plan adoption	MOHCD
2.3	Ensure that at least 33 percent of new housing is affordable to very low, low, and moderate-income households	2.3.1	Set affordability requirements for new residential development at rates necessary to fulfill this objective	2.3.1.1	Increase the percentage of affordable housing by Central SoMa Public Benefits Tiers (for specific requirements, see the "Requirements for New Development" document). <i>Note: this measure is subject to change based on the analysis conducted to help implement June 2016's Proposition C.</i>	Planning Code amendment	Upon Plan adoption	Planning
		2.3.2	Require increased contribution to affordable housing from commercial uses on land where development capacity is substantially increased	2.3.2.1	Create a Central SoMa Impact Fee and apply to non-residential development (for specific requirements, see the "Requirements for New Development" document).	Planning Code amendment	Upon Plan adoption	Planning
		2.3.3	Ensure that affordable housing revenue generated in Central SoMa stays in the neighborhood	2.3.3.1	Require affordable housing revenue generated by the Central SoMa Plan to be expended within the boundaries of SoMa (Market, Embarcadero, South Van Ness, 13th St, Division St, China Basin).	Planning Code amendment	Upon Plan adoption	Planning
				2.3.3.2	Allow the application of the "land dedication" option for both residential and non-residential development. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For residential development, the land dedication requirement would be a parcel of sufficient square footage to accommodate a unit count 50% greater than the amount of units required by the off-site/in-lieu option shown in Implementation Measure 2.3.1.1 For non-residential development, the land dedication would be based on an appraisal of land value. For all sites, the requirements and rules for land dedication projects stipulated in Planning Code Section 419.5(2) would apply.	Planning Code amendment	Upon Plan adoption	Planning
		2.3.4	Allow affordable housing sites to sell any unused development rights	2.3.4.1	Add affordable housing sites to list of sites eligible for the Transfer of Development Rights program (as discussed in Implementation Measure 7.5.2.1).	Planning Code amendment	Upon Plan adoption	Planning

#	OBJECTIVE	#	POLICY	#	IMPLEMENTATION MEASURE	IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM	TIMELINE	LEAD AGENCY
2.4	Support housing for other households that cannot afford market rate housing	2.4.1	Continue implementing strategies that support the development of “gap” housing	2.4.1.1	Apply ongoing strategies for creating middle-income housing, such as funding created through 2015’s Proposition A, down payment assistance loan programs, and the middle-income housing requirements imposed by June 2016’s Proposition C and subsequent Board actions.	Ongoing application of funds and requirements	Ongoing	MOHCD, Planning
2.5	Support housing for a diversity of household sizes	2.5.1	Continue requiring a diversity of family sized units	2.5.1.1	Require that new development provide at least 40% two-bedroom or 30% three-bedroom units. <i>Note: this measure to be updated based on the outcome of Board File No. 160821.</i>	Planning Code amendment	Upon Plan adoption	Planning
2.6	Support the schools, child care, and community services that serve local residents	2.6.1	Help fund public schools	2.6.1.1	Continue implementing the Schools Impact Fee.	Ongoing implementation of existing Planning Code requirements	Ongoing	San Francisco Unified School District
		2.6.2	Help fund child care facilities	2.6.2.1	Continue implementing the Child Care Impact Fee and Eastern Neighborhoods Impact Fee.	Ongoing implementation of existing Planning Code requirements	Ongoing	Planning
		2.6.3	Help fund the creation of new community services	2.6.3.1	Create a new Community Services Impact Fee (for specific requirements, see the “Requirements for New Development” document). New development will be given the option to provide community facilities directly via an In-Kind Agreement with the City instead of paying the fees.	Planning Code amendment	Upon Plan adoption	Planning

GOAL #3 - FACILITATE AN ECONOMICALLY DIVERSIFIED AND LIVELY JOBS CENTER

#	OBJECTIVE	#	POLICY	#	IMPLEMENTATION MEASURE	IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM	TIMELINE	LEAD AGENCY
3.1	Favor non-residential development over other kinds of growth	3.1.1	Require non-residential development on large parcels	3.1.1.1	On parcels larger than 30,000 square feet south of Harrison Street require that two-thirds of new development below 160 feet in height be non-residential.	Planning Code amendment	Upon Plan adoption	Planning
		3.1.2	Reduce current restrictions on non-residential development	3.1.2.1	Change MUR zoning to be MUO zoning east of 5th Street, change MUR to MUG Zoning west of 5th Street, change WSMUG zoning to MUO zoning, and change RED to MUO zoning south of Harrison Street	Zoning Map amendment	Upon Plan adoption	Planning
3.2	Support the growth of office space	3.2.1	Facilitate the growth of office	3.2.1.1	See Implementation Measure 3.1.1.1.	Planning Code amendment	Upon Plan adoption	Planning

#	OBJECTIVE	#	POLICY	#	IMPLEMENTATION MEASURE	IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM	TIMELINE	LEAD AGENCY
3.3	Ensure the removal of protective zoning does not result in a loss of PDR in the Plan Area	3.3.1	Maintain existing zoning that restricts non-PDR development in certain locations	3.3.1.1	Maintain existing SALI zoning between 4th and 6th Streets and Harrison and Bryant Streets.	Ongoing implementation of existing Zoning Map	Upon Plan adoption	Planning
		3.3.2	Limit conversion of PDR space in formerly industrial districts	3.3.2.1	In buildings on parcels being rezoned from SLI to MUO, require retention of 50% of space permitted as PDR as of January 1, 2016.	Planning Code amendment	Upon Plan adoption	Planning
				3.3.2.2	In buildings on parcels being rezoned from SALI to MUO or WSMUO, require 100% retention of space permitted as PDR as of January 1, 2016.	Planning Code amendment	Upon Plan adoption	Planning
		3.3.3	Require PDR space as part of large commercial development	3.3.3.1	In new office developments of greater than 50,000 square feet, require new PDR, via the following options: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Build PDR on-site: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ On former SALI parcels, require 0.5 FAR or 100% replacement of PDR, whichever is greater, ▪ On former SLI parcels, require 0.5 FAR or 50% replacement of PDR, whichever is greater, and ▪ Elsewhere, require 0.5 FAR. ▪ Exempt from land area for purposes of calculating the FAR any land dedicated to affordable housing or publicly accessible open space fully open to the sky. • Build net new PDR off-site at 1.5 times the on-site requirement. This PDR can be built anywhere in SoMa (Market, Embarcadero, South Van Ness, 13th St, Division St, China Basin). • Preserve existing PDR space at 2.0 times the on-site requirement through deed restriction. This PDR can be preserved anywhere in SoMa not zoned SALI after Plan adoption (Market, Embarcadero, South Van Ness, 13th St, Division St, China Basin). 	Planning Code amendment	Upon Plan adoption	Planning
				3.3.3.2	Explore the potential for development to meet their PDR requirement through an in-lieu fee to the City to be used for the construction of new PDR and preservation/retention of existing PDR space.	Planning Code amendment	Ongoing	Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD)
		3.3.4	Provide incentives to fund, build, and/or protect PDR	3.3.4.1	Allow buildings to meet their Transferable Development Rights requirements (as discussed in Implementation Measure 7.5.3.1) through preservation (through deed restriction) of existing PDR buildings.	Planning Code amendment	Upon Plan adoption	Planning
				3.3.4.2	Continue technical support and strategic programs and agreements that support the growth of PDR businesses and the development of new PDR space.	Ongoing implementation of City programs	Ongoing	OEWD

#	OBJECTIVE	#	POLICY	#	IMPLEMENTATION MEASURE	IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM	TIMELINE	LEAD AGENCY
3.4	Facilitate a vibrant retail environment that serves the needs of the community			3.3.4.3	Continue implementing the 1% Art Program, including the option for development to participate in the Public Art Trust.	Ongoing implementation of City programs	Ongoing	Arts Commission
		3.4.1	Allow retail throughout the Plan Area	3.4.1.1	Continue allowing retail in all zoning districts.	Ongoing implementation of the existing Planning Code	Ongoing	Planning
		3.4.2	Require ground-floor retail along important streets	3.4.2.1	Maintain retail requirements along 4th Street between Townsend and Bryant.	Ongoing implementation of the existing Planning Code	Ongoing	Planning
				3.4.2.2	Require retail on following streets: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4th Street between Bryant St and Folsom St, and • Folsom Street between 4th and 6th. 	Planning Code amendment	Upon Plan adoption	Planning
		3.4.3	Support local, affordable, community-serving retail	3.4.3.1	Require formula retail uses to attain a Conditional Use Permit throughout the Plan Area.	Planning Code amendment	Upon Plan adoption	Planning
3.5	Support development of hotels			3.4.3.2	For development on lots greater than 20,000 square feet, require micro retail units (1,000 sqft or less) of one for every 20,000 square feet of lot area (rounding to the nearest unit).	Planning Code amendment	Upon Plan adoption	Planning
				3.4.3.3	Continue banning stand-alone big box retail.	Ongoing implementation of the existing Planning Code	Ongoing	Planning
		3.5.1	Allow hotels throughout the growth-oriented parts of the Plan Area	3.5.1.1	Permit hotels in the MUG, MUO, and WSMUO with a Conditional Use.	Planning Code amendment	Upon Plan adoption	Planning
3.6	Recognize the importance of nightlife uses in creating a complete neighborhood			3.5.1.2	Support the development of one or more large (>500 room) hotels in the vicinity of the Moscone Convention Center.	City engagement with private developers during entitlement process	Ongoing	OEWD
		3.6.1	Allow nightlife where appropriate	3.6.1.1	Continue allowing restaurants and bars throughout the Plan Area, as controlled by district.	Ongoing implementation of the existing Planning Code	Ongoing	Planning
				3.6.1.2	Continue permitting nighttime entertainment uses as-of-right in those areas being converted from SALL to MUO and WSMUO.	Planning Code amendment	Upon Plan adoption	Planning

GOAL #4 – PROVIDE SAFE AND CONVENIENT TRANSPORTATION THAT PRIORITIZES WALKING, BICYCLING, AND TRANSIT

#	OBJECTIVE	#	POLICY	#	IMPLEMENTATION MEASURES	IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM	TIMELINE	LEAD AGENCY
4.1	Provide people walking a safe, convenient, attractive environment on all the streets in the Plan Area	4.1.1	Widen sidewalks on major streets to meet Better Streets Plan standards	4.1.1.1	Undertake a comprehensive complete streets plan for all of the major streets in the Plan Area (i.e., 3rd, 4th, 5th, 6th, Howard, Folsom, Harrison, Bryant, Brannan, and Townsend Streets). This strategy should incorporate pedestrian, bicycle, and transit improvements. Designs should incorporate on- and off-street loading needs and emergency vehicle access. Dedicate funding towards the planning and construction of recommended improvements through the Transportation Sustainability Fee (TSF), Eastern Neighborhoods Impact (EN) Fee, and/or a Mello-Roos Community Facilities District (CFD). (See Figure 4.1 in the Plan for a map of existing sidewalk conditions).	Designed by the City with community input, adopted by legislation from San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) and San Francisco Department of Public Works (DPW), and implemented by a combination of the City and new development (through meeting the Better Streets Plan and/or In-Kind Agreements with the City)	Ongoing, as funding accrues, as prioritized through City and community processes	San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), San Francisco Department of Public Works (DPW), Planning
				4.1.1.2	Require a five-foot setback on all development on 4th Street south of Bryant Street. This setback must occur at the ground floor, and have minimum height of 25 feet.	Planning Code amendment	Upon Plan adoption	Planning
		4.1.2	Prohibit new curb cuts on key major streets and limit them elsewhere	4.1.2.1	Ban curb cuts within the Plan Area on all of Folsom, Brannan, Townsend, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, and 6th Streets, and any blocks of Howard Street that are one-way; require a Conditional Use permit for curb cuts for all other major streets in the Plan Area. (See Figure 4.2 in the Plan for a map of limitations on curb cuts).	Planning Code amendment	Upon Plan adoption	Planning
		4.1.3	Provide additional signalized crosswalks across major streets	4.1.3.1	See Implementation Measure 4.1.1.1. (See Figure 4.3 in the Plan for the locations of recommended crosswalks).	See Implementation Measure 4.1.1.1.	See Implementation Measure 4.1.1.1.	See Implementation Measure 4.1.1.1.
		4.1.4	Open currently closed crosswalks at signalized intersections	4.1.4.1	See Implementation Measure 4.1.1.1. (See Figure 4.3 in the Plan for the locations of currently closed crosswalks).	See Implementation Measure 4.1.1.1.	See Implementation Measure 4.1.1.1.	See Implementation Measure 4.1.1.1.
		4.1.5	Improve intersections at freeway ramps	4.1.5.1	Work with Caltrans to redesign or improve intersections at freeway ramps.	Intergovernmental coordination	Within 5 years of Plan adoption	SFMTA, San Francisco County Transportation Authority (SFCTA)
		4.1.6	Provide corner sidewalk extensions to enhance pedestrian safety at crosswalks, in keeping with the Better Streets Plan	4.1.6.1	Implement strategies identified through the City's Walk First and Vision Zero programs, as well as additional strategies identified in the complete streets plan discussed in Implementation Measure 4.1.1.1.	Walk First and Vision Zero programs; also Implementation Measure 4.1.1.1.	Ongoing	SFMTA

#	OBJECTIVE	#	POLICY	#	IMPLEMENTATION MEASURES	IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM	TIMELINE	LEAD AGENCY
		4.1.7	Improve the conditions on narrow streets and alleys for people walking	4.1.7.1	Undertake a follow-up Narrow Streets and Alleys Strategy, and implement recommendations adopted by that Strategy, as well as additional strategies identified in the complete streets plan discussed in Implementation Measure 4.1.1.1.	Community planning effort; also implementation Measure 4.1.1.1.	Start process within two years of Plan Adoption	Planning, DPW
		4.1.8	Add street trees and street furnishings to sidewalks wherever possible, in keeping with the Better Streets Plan	4.1.8.1	Ongoing implementation of street tree requirements in the Planning Code, as well as additional strategies identified in the complete streets plan discussed in Implementation Measure 4.1.1.1.	See Implementation Measure 4.1.1.1.	See Implementation Measure 4.1.1.1.	See Implementation Measure 4.1.1.1.
		4.1.9	Expand the pedestrian network wherever possible through creation of new narrow streets, alleys, and mid-block connections	4.1.9.1	Continue implementing the existing requirements for development on large lots.	Application of existing Planning Code requirements, with further guidance in the Central SoMa Key Site Guidelines	Ongoing	Planning
				4.1.9.2	Prioritize the creation of new connections wherever possible through acquisitions and/or easements on private lots (as part of Implementation Measure 4.1.7.1).	Community planning effort	Start process within 12 months of Plan Adoption	Planning
		4.1.10	Use public art, lighting, and other amenities to improve the pedestrian experience beneath elevated freeways	4.1.10.1	See Implementation Measure 4.1.1.1	See Implementation Measure 4.1.1.1.	See Implementation Measure 4.1.1.1.	See Implementation Measure 4.1.1.1.
				4.1.10.2	Continue working with Caltrans to facilitate these improvements on their property.	Intergovernmental coordination	Ongoing	Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD), Planning
				4.1.10.3	Encourage projects to dedicate their 1% for art requirements to the Arts Trust, and the City to dedicate this funding for art in this area.	City engagement with private developers during entitlement process	Ongoing	Planning, Arts Commission
4.2	Make cycling a safe and convenient transportation option throughout the Plan Area for all ages and abilities	4.2.1	Create a network of convenient and safe bicycle lanes	4.2.1.1	Implement the recommendations of the City's Bicycle Plan.	Implementation of the Bicycle Plan	Ongoing	SFMTA

#	OBJECTIVE	#	POLICY	#	IMPLEMENTATION MEASURES	IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM	TIMELINE	LEAD AGENCY
				4.2.1.2	See Implementation Measure 4.1.1.1. (See Figure 4.4 in the Plan for a map of streets recommended for bicycle route improvements in the Plan Area).	Community planning efforts	Ongoing, as funding accrues, as prioritized through City and community processes	SFMTA
		4.2.2	Provide additional bicycle infrastructure, such as bicycle parking, to support ridership	4.2.2.1	Continue implementing bicycle parking regulations in buildings.	Application of existing Planning Code requirements	Ongoing	Planning
				4.2.2.2	Support the implementation and expansion of Bay Area Bike Share.	Application of existing SFMTA process	Ongoing	SFMTA
				4.2.2.3	Support the creation of bicycle parking facilities on streets and sidewalks, as appropriate.	Application of existing SFMTA process	Ongoing	SFMTA, Planning
4.3	Ensure that transit serving the Plan Area is adequate, reliable and pleasant	4.3.1	Provide a robust network of lanes that are exclusively for transit	4.3.1.1	Implement transit lanes identified by the Muni Forward Program, as well as additional strategies identified in the complete streets plan discussed in Implementation Measure 4.1.1.1. (See Figure 4.5 in the Plan for a map of existing and potential transit-only lanes).	Implementation of the Muni Forward Program; also Implementation Measure 4.1.1.1.	Ongoing	SFMTA, DPW
		4.3.2	Support funding maintaining a state of good repair of the existing fleet and infrastructure	4.3.2.1	Dedicate funding towards maintaining a state of good repair of the existing fleet and infrastructure through the Transportation Sustainability Fee (TSF), Eastern Neighborhoods Impact (EN) Fee, and/or a Mello-Roos Community Facilities District (CFD).	The Transportation Sustainability Fee (TSF) and Eastern Neighborhoods Impact Fee (EN Fee) are existing. The Mello-Roos Community Facilities District (CFD) would need to be created upon adoption of the Central SoMa Plan	Ongoing	Planning, SFMTA
		4.3.3	Support funding to implement Muni Forward	4.3.3.1	Dedicate funding towards implementing the Muni Forward program through the TSF, EN Fee, and/or a CFD.	The TSF and EN Fee are existing. The CFD would need to be created upon adoption of the Central SoMa Plan	Ongoing	Planning, SFMTA
		4.3.4	Support funding to meet future needs for both local and regional transit service to the Plan Area	4.3.4.1	Dedicate funding towards the improvement and expansion of transit through the TSF, EN Fee, and/or a CFD.	The TSF and EN Fee are existing. The CFD would need to be created upon adoption of the Central SoMa Plan	Ongoing	Planning, SFCTA, SFMTA
		4.3.5	Study adjustment of transit service program to serve the demand from the increase in jobs and housing in the neighborhood	4.3.5.1	Study the need to revise transit service after a substantial amount of the expected development has occurred.	SFMTA study with community input	After 10 years of Plan adoption	SFMTA

#	OBJECTIVE	#	POLICY	#	IMPLEMENTATION MEASURES	IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM	TIMELINE	LEAD AGENCY
4.4	Encourage mode shift away from private automobile usage	4.4.1	Limit the amount of parking in new development	4.4.1.1	<p>Reduce the amount of parking allowed as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For residential development, set the as-of-right amount at 0.5 spaces per unit, with no potential more. For all non-residential development, set the maximum amount allowed as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Office: one space for every 3,500 square feet, Retail: one space for every 1,500 square feet, and All other uses as currently listed in Planning Code Section 151.1. 	Planning Code amendment	Upon Plan adoption	Planning
		4.4.2	Utilize Transportation Demand Management strategies to encourage use of alternatives to the private automobile	4.4.2.1	Continue implementing Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures required by the Planning Code.	Application of existing Planning Code requirements	Ongoing	Planning
4.5	Accommodate regional, through, and delivery traffic where necessary, but mitigate the impacts of such traffic on local livability and circulation	4.5.1	Maintain the ability of certain streets to accommodate through-traffic while ensuring they meet minimum needs for safety and comfort of all road users	4.5.1.1	Design and construct Bryant and Harrison Streets to accommodate more through traffic than other east-west streets in the Plan Area.	Community planning efforts	Ongoing, as funding accrues, as prioritized through City and community processes	SFMTA
		4.5.2	Design buildings to accommodate delivery of people and goods with a minimum of conflict	4.5.2.1	Require sponsors of development projects that provide more than 100,000 square feet to prepare a Driveaway and Loading Operations Plan (DLOP), and submit the plan for review and approval by the Planning Department and the SFMTA. The DLOP shall focus on reducing potential conflicts between driveway operations, including loading activities, and pedestrians, bicycles and vehicles, and to maximize reliance of on-site loading spaces to accommodate new loading demand. The DLOP shall include consider, at a minimum, loading dock management, large truck access, garage/loading dock attendants, and refuse collection. The DLOP shall also look at designs to separate loading from sensitive land uses as well as building design strategies to better support off-peak and unattended deliveries.	Planning Code amendment	Upon Plan adoption	Planning, SFMTA

GOAL #5 – OFFER AN ABUNDANCE OF PARKS AND RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES

#	OBJECTIVE	#	POLICY	#	IMPLEMENTATION MEASURE	IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM	TIMELINE	LEAD AGENCY
5.1	Maximize the benefit provided by existing parks and recreational facilities	5.1.1	Support funding for the rehabilitation of Gene Friend Recreation Center	5.1.1.1	Help fund the rehabilitation and/or rebuild of Gene Friend Recreation Center.	Funding from the Eastern Neighborhoods Impact Fee (EN Fee) and/or a Mello-Roos Community Facilities District (CFD) to supplement other funding processes	As funding accrues, as prioritized through City and community processes	Recreation and Parks Department (RPD)
		5.1.2	Support funding for the activation of Victoria Manalo Draves Park	5.1.2.1	Help fund activation of and/or capital upgrades to Victoria Manalo Draves Park.	Funding from CFD and/ or EN Fee to support ongoing RPD efforts	As funding accrues, as prioritized through City and community processes	RPD
		5.1.3	Explore additional strategies to fund existing parks	5.1.3.1	Ongoingly seek out grants, partnerships, etc.	Ongoing dedicated staff time	Ongoing	RPD
5.2	Create new public parks	5.2.1	Create a new public park in the highest growth portion of the Plan Area	5.2.1.1	Help fund, design, and construct a new public park on the block bounded by 4th Street, 5th Street, Bryant Street, and Brannan Street.	Funded by EN Fee, designed through community planning efforts, constructed by City and/or adjacent development	As funding accrues, as prioritized through City and community processes	Planning, RPD
		5.2.2	Create a new linear park along Bluxome Street between 4th Street and 5th Street	5.2.2.1	Help fund, design, and construct a new public park on Bluxome Street between 4th Street and 5th Street.	Funded from EN Fee, CFD, or off-site POPOS. Designed through community planning efforts. Implemented by the City.	As funding accrues, as prioritized through City and community processes	Planning
		5.2.3	Pursue the creation of a large new park within or near Central SoMa to serve the burgeoning greater SoMa area	5.2.3.1	Dedicate funding towards the creation of a large new park within or near Central SoMa, including site identification and design, and potentially site acquisition and construction pending costs and funding.	Funding from EN Fee or CFD. Designed through community planning efforts. Implemented by the City.	Ongoing, as funding accrues, as prioritized through City and community processes	Planning
5.3	Create new public recreational opportunities	5.3.1	Increase the amount of public recreation center space, including the creation of a new public recreation center	5.3.1.1	Work with developers of large new projects to explore the potential to locate a new recreational center in their development.	Public/private engagement	Ongoing until completed	Planning
				5.3.1.2	As appropriate, help fund, design, and construct a public recreation center.	Funding from EN Fee or CFD	Ongoing	RPD

#	OBJECTIVE	#	POLICY	#	IMPLEMENTATION MEASURE	IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM	TIMELINE	LEAD AGENCY
		5.3.2	Develop public recreational facilities under the I-80 freeway	5.3.2.1	Work with Caltrans to lease land at affordable rates for the purpose of building recreational facilities under the freeway.	Intergovernmental process	Upon Plan completion	Planning
				5.3.2.2	As appropriate, help fund, design, and construct public recreation facilities under the I-80 freeway.	Funding from EN Fee, CFD, or offsite POPOS. Designed through community planning efforts. Implemented by the City.	Ongoing	Planning
		5.3.3	Do not require replacement of private recreational facilities	5.3.3.1	Do not require the private recreational facilities to be rebuilt within the current Western SoMa Special Use District.	Planning Code amendment	Upon Plan Adoption	Planning
5.4	Utilize the street right-of-way for additional green spaces, gathering and recreational opportunities	5.4.1	Where appropriate, promote pedestrian-only or shared-street design concepts for narrow streets, alleys, and mid-block connections	5.4.1.1	Support pedestrian-only or shared streets in new developments required to provide mid-block connections.	Design and review of development projects	Ongoing, as development proposals occur	Planning
5.5	Augment the public open space and recreation network with privately-owned public open spaces (POPOS)	5.5.1	Require new non-residential development and encourage residential development to provide POPOS that address the needs of the community	5.5.1.1	Require new office and hotel development of 25,000 square feet or more to provide POPOS at a rate of one square foot for every 50 square feet of gross floor area. Require these POPOS to meet certain design standards, in consultation with staff of the Recreation and Parks Department, and incentivize them to provide community space as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • POPOS must be at grade and open to the sky, unless they provide an enclosed sports facility, • POPOS must be on-site or within 900 feet of the development, • POPOS must be open evening and weekends, • POPOS must be lined by active uses, and • Every square foot of the following amenities shall reduce required open space by 33%: a playground, community garden, sport court, and/or dog run. 	Planning Code amendment	Upon Plan adoption	Planning
				5.5.1.2	Continue enabling residential and non-residential development to have a reduced open space requirement where such open space is publicly accessible	Ongoing implementation of the existing Planning Code	Ongoing	Planning
				5.5.1.3	Review and approve design and operations strategy of proposed POPOS.	Design and review of development projects	Ongoing, as development proposals occur	Planning, RPD

#	OBJECTIVE	#	POLICY	#	IMPLEMENTATION MEASURE	IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM	TIMELINE	LEAD AGENCY
5.6	Ensure the neighborhood's parks and recreation offerings function as a network and complement the facilities of the broader SoMa area	5.6.1	Design the parks and recreational opportunities in a systematic manner to serve the community's needs	5.6.1.1	Develop and implement a parks and recreation strategy for the Plan Area and/or larger South of Market area. This strategy should identify the neighborhood needs in the context of both existing and planned facilities and population. It should also identify locations to meet these needs as new parks and recreational facilities are built and/or rehabilitated.	Community planning effort	Within two years of Plan adoption	Planning, RPD

GOAL #6 – CREATE AN ENVIRONMENTALLY SUSTAINABLE AND RESILIENT NEIGHBORHOOD

#	OBJECTIVE	#	POLICY	#	IMPLEMENTATION MEASURE	IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM	TIMELINE	LEAD AGENCY
6.1	Establish an Eco-District in Central SoMa	6.1.1	Develop a comprehensive strategy for creating an environmentally sustainable and resilient neighborhood	6.1.1.1	Adopt requirements and recommendations for new development and public investment related to energy, water, air quality, refuse, habitat and biodiversity, flooding, and seismic safety.	Planning Code amendment	Upon Plan adoption	Planning
				6.1.1.2	Produce a Central SoMa Eco-District Guidebook to support the Central SoMa Plan, containing the vision, goals, policies, and implementation measures for the Eco-District, as well as best-practice examples and technical resources.	Central SoMa Eco-District Team work program	By Plan adoption	Planning
		6.1.2	Create an implementing entity within the City	6.1.2.1	Formalize a Central SoMa Eco-District Team (CSEDT) with the Planning Department's Sustainable City Team, with support from key agencies like the San Francisco Department of the Environment (SFE) and the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC), as well as community engagement from developers of new buildings, owners and managers of existing buildings, residents, businesses, workers, visitors, other City agencies, utilities, potential funders, and other stakeholders.	Work program of the Planning Department	By Plan adoption	Planning
		6.1.3	Ensure that environmental sustainability and resiliency is considered holistically in public investment decisions	6.1.3.1	The CSEDT will participate in the City's capital planning processes, including the Interagency Plan Implementation Team (IPIC) and the Streets Design Advisory Team (SDAT). In these roles, the CSEDT will seek efficiencies and cross-cutting strategies that could fulfill multiple goals at once.	Central SoMa Eco-District Team work program	Ongoing	Planning
		6.1.4	Ensure that property owners, developers, and tenants have the opportunity to maximize environmental sustainability and resilience	6.1.4.1	The CSEDT will participate in the City's design and development review processes, including the Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) process and the Urban Design Advisory Team (UDAT). The CSEDT will offer solutions, help reduce barriers, and foster innovation to enable high-performing development.	Central SoMa Eco-District Team work program	Ongoing	Planning

#	OBJECTIVE	#	POLICY	#	IMPLEMENTATION MEASURE	IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM	TIMELINE	LEAD AGENCY
				6.1.4.2	The CSEDTE will undertake all relevant outreach and engagement to property owners to inform them about opportunities and encourage them to increase the environmental sustainability and resilience of their buildings and their occupants.	Central SoMa Eco-District Team work program	Ongoing	Planning
		6.1.5	Continue to evolve the requirements and recommendations of the Eco-District with changing needs and technologies	6.1.5.1	Monitor environmental conditions and trends, and evolving technologies and other strategies to fulfill the vision and goals of the Eco-District.	Central SoMa Eco-District Team work program	Ongoing	Planning
6.2	Minimize greenhouse gas emissions	6.2.1	Maximize energy efficiency in the built environment	6.2.1.1	For new and existing buildings, continue implementing the energy efficiency requirements of San Francisco's Green Building Code and the California Building Code Standards ("Title 24").	Ongoing implementation of the San Francisco Green Building Code and Title 24	Ongoing	Department of Building Inspection (DBI), San Francisco Department of the Environment (SFE)
				6.2.1.2	Provide information to new development proposals on how to increase energy efficiency beyond current requirements.	Inclusion in the Central SoMa Eco-District Guidebook	At PPA and subsequent project review	Planning, SFE
				6.2.1.3	Provide information to existing building owners about energy retrofit programs.	Inclusion in the Central SoMa Eco-District Guidebook	At annual benchmarking and 5-year audit requirements	SFE
				6.2.1.4	Explore requiring energy use intensity (EUI) estimates for new development.	Central SoMa Eco-District Team work program	Within two years of Plan adoption	Planning
				6.2.1.5	Support SFPU's ongoing LED upgrades of its streetlights throughout the District.	Ongoing SFPU work program	Upon Plan adoption	San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPU)
				6.2.1.6	Support the replacement and/or conversion of streetlights to LED as part of the Central SoMa complete streets plan (See Implementation Measure 4.1.1.1).	See Implementation Measure 4.1.1.	Ongoing, as funding accrues, as prioritized through City and community processes	San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), San Francisco Department of Public Works (DPW), DPW
				6.2.1.7	Explore upgrades to street lighting not planned for conversion through either SFPU's current LED program or the Central SoMa Plan complete streets upgrades.	Central SoMa Eco-District Team work program	Within two years of Plan adoption	DPW
		6.2.2	Maximize onsite renewable energy generation	6.2.2.1	Implement existing requirements on new development and major alterations for installation and operation of rooftop solar energy generation and/or solar thermal hot water systems.	Ongoing implementation of the existing Environment Code and Green Building Code	Required for development applications received after December 31, 2016	DBI

#	OBJECTIVE	#	POLICY	#	IMPLEMENTATION MEASURE	IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM	TIMELINE	LEAD AGENCY
				6.2.2.2	Expand current solar requirements to all new development up to 160 feet tall, regardless of number of occupied floors.	Green Building Code amendment	Upon Plan adoption	SFE
				6.2.2.3	Explore strategies to increase onsite renewable energy generation and/or solar thermal hot water systems beyond current minimums; including, increased roof-top productivity, building facades, and other innovations.	Central SoMa Eco-District Team work program and Guidebook	Within two years of Plan adoption	SFE
				6.2.2.4	Provide information to existing building owners about funding opportunities for solar energy generation systems, as well as opportunities to combine living roofs with solar systems to increase performance and co-benefits.	Inclusion in the Central SoMa Eco-District Guidebook	At annual benchmarking and 5-year audit requirements	SFE
				6.2.2.5	Design and implement solar projects on key public sites, in coordination with a better roof program.	Central SoMa Eco-District Team work program	Within two years of Plan adoption	SFPUC
		6.2.3	Satisfy 100 percent of electricity demand using greenhouse gas-free power supplies	6.2.3.1	After maximizing efficiency measures and/or on-site renewable energy generation, require all remaining electricity demand in new development (and major renovations) to come from 100% greenhouse gas-free electricity sources.	Green Building Code amendment	Upon Plan adoption	SFE
				6.2.3.2	Provide existing buildings with information on green power purchase options.	Inclusion in the Central SoMa Eco-District Guidebook	At annual benchmarking and 5-year audit requirements	SFE
		6.2.4	Explore strategies to reduce fossil fuel use in buildings	6.2.4.1	Conduct an interagency task force to explore fossil-free energy building standards and requirements for Central SoMa that either eliminate or greatly reduce fossil free use (e.g., natural gas). As feasible, develop zero-carbon (net zero) building guidelines and program.	Central SoMa Eco-District Team work program	Within two years of Plan adoption	Planning
				6.2.4.2	Conduct a district energy infrastructure feasibility study focusing on major development sites.	Central SoMa Eco-District Team work program	Within two years of Plan adoption	SFE
				6.2.4.3	Continue interagency and private sector initiative to identify appropriate locations and funding for district energy systems, as informed district energy feasibility study.	Central SoMa Eco-District Team work program	Ongoing	Planning
		6.2.5	Minimize transportation-based greenhouse gas emissions	6.2.5.1	Support the reduction of vehicle miles travelled through dense development patterns, robust transit service, and walkable and bikeable neighborhoods (see Implementation Measures in Goal 1 and Goal 4).	See Implementation Measures in Goal 1 and Goal 4	Upon Plan Adoption	Planning, SFMTA
				6.2.5.2	Meet citywide requirements for electrical distribution and service capacity standards that support electrical vehicle (EV) charging in off-street parking spaces, in new development and major renovations.	Ongoing implementation of the Green Building Code	Ongoing	SFE
				6.2.5.3	Explore requirement for installing EV plug-in stations at off-street loading docks in new and existing development that eliminates delivery trucks idling emissions.	Central SoMa Eco-District Team work program	Within two years of Plan adoption	SFE

#	OBJECTIVE	#	POLICY	#	IMPLEMENTATION MEASURE	IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM	TIMELINE	LEAD AGENCY
				6.2.5.4	Explore a program to plan and install EV charging stations in publicly accessible parking spaces (on-street and off-street) throughout Central SoMa.	Central SoMa Eco-District Team work program	Within two years of Plan adoption	Planning
				6.2.5.5	Explore the potential of vacuum systems for refuse materials management on multi-building/district-scale development sites, in part to significantly reduce refuse hauling noise and emissions impacts by minimizing material pick-up locations and frequency.	Central SoMa Eco-District Team work program	Within three years of Plan adoption	SFE
6.3	Eliminate water waste	6.3.1	Efficiently use potable water	6.3.1.1	Continue implementing existing City requirements for water efficiency and conservation in new development.	Green Building Code	Ongoing	SFPUC
				6.3.1.2	Continue to explore opportunities to increase water use efficiency and conservation in new and existing development and open spaces in the context of the Central SoMa Eco-District.	Inclusion in the Central SoMa Eco-District Guidebook	Upon Plan Adoption	SFPUC
		6.3.2	Increase non-potable water use in buildings	6.3.2.1	Implement the Non-Potable Ordinance: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Require non-potable treatment systems in new developments 250k square feet or larger, leveraging all available non-potable water sources (rainwater, graywater: showers and laundry, and foundation drainage) for maximum reuse for irrigation and toilet flushing, and Continue implementing existing City requirement that all new development 40,000 square feet and larger conduct a Water Balance Study considering non-potable water capture and use. 	Ongoing implementation of the Health Code	Ongoing	SFPUC
				6.3.2.2	Explore opportunities for maximizing non-potable water use in building cooling systems.	Inclusion in the Central SoMa Eco-District Guidebook	Upon Plan adoption	SFPUC
				6.3.2.3	Encourage and facilitate the development of district, multi-project scale non-potable water systems: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue to increase awareness and reduce barriers to district-scale systems, Continue to provide technical guidance to interested project sponsors, and Consider augmenting the currently required Water Balance Study to consider potential synergies between properties; i.e., projects 250,000 square feet and greater consider expanding systems to support neighboring projects, and projects of less than 250,000 square consider if adjacent projects are developing non-potable systems to which they might connect. 	Inclusion in the Central SoMa Eco-District Guidebook	Upon Plan adoption	SFPUC

#	OBJECTIVE	#	POLICY	#	IMPLEMENTATION MEASURE	IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM	TIMELINE	LEAD AGENCY
		6.3.3	Increase non-potable water use in parks, open spaces, sidewalks, and streets	6.3.3.1	Fund the planning, design, and construction of non-potable water collection, treatment, and storage systems as part of Central SoMa's major public park and open space projects that eliminate their use of potable water for irrigation, while supporting neighborhood flood resilience.	Planned as part of the Central SoMa Sea Level Rise and Flood Management Strategy (see Implementation Measures 6.6.1.1)	Within 10 years of Plan adoption	SFPUC
				6.3.3.2	Fund the planning, design, and construction of sufficient non-potable water filling stations to satisfy all street cleaning needs in the District.	Central SoMa Eco-District Team work program	Within two years of Plan adoption	Planning
6.4	Support biodiversity, access to nature, and a healthy ecosystem	6.4.1	Maximize greening of parks, streets, and other publicly-accessible spaces	6.4.1.1	Continue implementing the Urban Forest Master Plan, Green Connections, and other efforts to maximize street trees and sidewalk gardens.	Ongoing implementation of the Public Works Codes and the Urban Forest Master Plan	Ongoing	DPW
				6.4.1.2	As part of a comprehensive "Freeway Corridor Transformation Strategy," increase greening and provide habitat areas in and around the freeway.	Central SoMa Eco-District Team work program	Concept Plan within one year of Plan Adoption, implementation phased over 10 years	Planning
				6.4.1.3	Require all privately-owned public open spaces (POPOS) to contain greening on at least 50% of each site area.	Planning Code amendment	Upon Plan adoption	Planning
		6.4.2	Maximize greening of rooftops and walls	6.4.2.1	Require new development (sites 5,000 square feet and larger, with building heights 160 feet and less) to construct at least 50% of roof area as a living roof to be designed in a manner that meets applicable non-potable water and stormwater management requirements.	Planning Code Amendment and Central SoMa Eco-District Guidebook	Upon Plan adoption	Planning, SFPUC
				6.4.2.2	Fund the planning, design, and construction of at least one "Better Roofs" demonstration project on a highly visible public building, focused on greening and urban agriculture.	Central SoMa Eco-District Team work program	0-5 years from Plan adoption	Planning
				6.4.2.3	Encourage "living" walls indoors and outdoors, as part of comprehensive greening strategies and projects that also coordinate with applicable stormwater and non-potable water requirements.	Inclusion in the Central SoMa Eco-District Guidebook	Upon Plan adoption	Planning
		6.4.3	Ensure that greening supports habitat and biodiversity	6.4.3.1	For all greening on streets and public open spaces, encourage the use of climate appropriate, habitat supportive, pollution filtering, and non-invasive plants, as well as integrated pest management that meets City standards.	DPW review of streets, sidewalks, and open space plans	Ongoing	SFE
				6.4.3.2	For all greening on private roofs and privately-owned public open spaces, require the use of climate appropriate, habitat supportive, pollution filtering, non-invasive plants (as identified in the SF Plant Finder, Bay Friendly Guidelines, or similar tool), and meet the City's Integrated Pest Management Ordinance.	SFPUC review as part of living roof and/or stormwater management approvals	Ongoing	SFPUC

#	OBJECTIVE	#	POLICY	#	IMPLEMENTATION MEASURE	IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM	TIMELINE	LEAD AGENCY
				6.4.3.3	Continue implementing Bird Safe Buildings Standards in new development.	Ongoing implementation of the Planning Code	Ongoing	Planning
				6.4.3.4	Encourage the inclusion of interpretive elements and other public information dissemination on biodiversity, habitat, and nature in POPOS and other publicly accessible open spaces.	Inclusion in the Central SoMa Eco-District Guidebook	Upon Plan adoption	SFE
6.5	Improve air quality	6.5.1	Support a reduction in vehicle miles travelled	6.5.1.1	See Implementation Measures in Goal 4.	See Implementation Measures in Goal 4	See Implementation Measures in Goal 4	See Implementation Measures in Goal 4
		6.5.2	Utilize greening to reduce pollution and heat	6.5.2.1	See Implementation Measures associated with Policies 6.4.1 through 6.4.3.	See Implementation Measures associated with Policies 6.4.1 through 6.4.3	See Implementation Measures associated with Policies 6.4.1 through 6.4.3	See Implementation Measures associated with Policies 6.4.1 through 6.4.3
		6.5.3	Improve the air quality around the freeway	6.5.3.1	As part of a comprehensive "Freeway Corridor Transformation Strategy," develop and implement air quality improvement measures along the freeway corridor, such as greening, use of air filtration materials technologies, and other innovations.	Central SoMa Eco-District Team work program	Strategy within one year of Plan adoption, ongoing implementation as funding permits	Planning
		6.5.4	Utilize healthier building materials and technologies that improve indoor and outdoor air quality	6.5.4.1	All new development must meet the highest current City standards for Low Emitting Materials in building interiors.	Green Building Code to be updated January 1, 2017	Ongoing	SFE
				6.5.4.2	Require enhanced filtration systems for areas of poor air quality, in accordance with Article 38 of the Health Code.	Ongoing implementation of the Health Code	Ongoing	Planning
				6.5.4.3	Provide examples, resources, and standards, such as the use of pollution filtering building skins and other exterior materials that promote healthier outdoor air.	Inclusion in the Central SoMa Eco-District Guidebook	Upon Plan adoption	Planning
				6.5.4.4	Promote the best available control technologies for diesel generators and fire pumps.	Inclusion in the Central SoMa Eco-District Guidebook	Upon Plan adoption	Planning

#	OBJECTIVE	#	POLICY	#	IMPLEMENTATION MEASURE	IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM	TIMELINE	LEAD AGENCY
6.6	Maximize flood resilience	6.6.1	Develop a comprehensive sea level rise and flood management strategy for Central SoMa and adjacent at-risk areas	6.6.1.1	Develop the <i>Central SoMa Sea Level Rise and Flood Management Strategy</i> , including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> District-wide hydrology study (extreme storm and 100-year flood flows, considering sea level rise impacts), Comprehensive plan of optimally sized, located, and prioritized flood management infrastructure, including potential green infrastructure systems in streets and sidewalks, street grade adjustments, floodways, detention basins, and stormwater systems, and Targeted policies and programs to reduce flood risk. 	Central SoMa Eco-District Team work program	Within one year of Plan adoption	Sea Level Rise Committee
		6.6.2	Reduce building vulnerability to sea level rise and extreme storms	6.6.2.1	All new development and substantial modifications to existing development should meet the flood resistant building standards of the City's Floodplain Management Ordinance and Building Code, especially as flood hazard maps are updated to reflect precipitation-driven flooding and sea level rise.	Floodplain Management Ordinance and Building Code	Ongoing	City Administrator's Office
				6.6.2.2	Develop and implement <i>Flood Resistant Design Guidelines</i> for representative building typologies in Central SoMa that help protect structures while ensuring vibrant/livable sidewalks and streets.	Central SoMa Eco-District Team work program, in collaboration with Sea Level Rise Action Plan implementation	Within one year of Plan adoption	Planning, Sea Level Rise Committee
		6.6.3	Maximize stormwater and flood management using streets, sidewalks, and open spaces	6.6.3.1	Integrate stormwater and flood management tools into all "complete streets" improvements through both functional landscape elements and street design, according to the <i>Central SoMa Sea Level Rise and Flood Management Strategy</i> and <i>Flood Resistant Design Guidelines</i> .	Integrated into complete streets design and construction (see Implementation Measure 4.1.1.1)	Ongoing (see Implementation Measure 4.1.1.1)	Planning, Sea Level Rise Committee (see Implementation Measure 4.1.1.1)
				6.6.3.2	Integrate stormwater and flood management tools into existing and new open spaces, according to the Central SoMa Sea Level Rise and Flood Management Strategy and Flood Resistant Design Guidelines.	Integrated in park design processes (see Implementation Measures 5.2.1.1 through 5.2.4.1)	Ongoing (see Implementation Measures 5.2.1.1 through 5.2.4.1)	Recreation and Parks Department (RPD), Sea Level Rise Committee
6.7	Maximize earthquake resilience	6.7.1	Ensure the ability of new and existing buildings to withstand a major seismic event	6.7.1.1	Continue implementing Building Code requirements for seismic safety.	Ongoing implementation of the Building Code	Ongoing	Planning
				6.7.1.2	Provide project sponsors with information on latest citywide resilience efforts, such as Resilient SF, the Solar Storage initiative, etc.	Engagement through the PPA and entitlement process	Ongoing	Planning
		6.7.2	Secure sufficient power and water supplies to withstand a 72-hour emergency	6.7.2.1	Consider developing a Central SoMa program for securing emergency on-site power and water capacity, in new private developments, existing buildings, public sites, neighborhood emergency center, etc.	Central SoMa Eco-District Team work program	Ongoing implementation of the Green Building Code	DBI

#	OBJECTIVE	#	POLICY	#	IMPLEMENTATION MEASURE	IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM	TIMELINE	LEAD AGENCY
6.8	Help achieve zero solid waste	6.8.1	Maximize recycling and composting of solid waste from all buildings	6.8.1.1	Ensure adequate refuse sorting and storage facilities and operations in all buildings to support achieving a target of zero waste, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enforce current requirements to provide adequate and equally convenient collection, sorting, and storage space for recyclables, compostables, and trash streams, in order to allow the recovery of 100% of a facility's refuse materials, and Enforce requirements that all multi-family residential and commercial buildings have on-site staff to facilitate source separation and tenant education. 	Ongoing implementation of the Building Code and Environment Code	Ongoing	SFE
				6.8.1.2	Develop refuse collection and storage design guidelines for the District's common residential and commercial building typologies.	Inclusion in Central SoMa Eco-District Guidebook	Upon Plan adoption	SFE
		6.8.2	Maximize recycling and reuse of construction and demolition materials	6.8.2.1	Encourage all new development to pursue onsite source separation that facilitates higher recycling rates for construction and demolition debris.	Inclusion in Central SoMa Eco-District Guidebook	Upon Plan adoption	SFE
		6.8.3	Reduce litter in streetscapes and parks	6.8.3.1	Require 3-stream collection systems in privately managed open spaces (POPOS).	Planning Code amendment	Upon Plan adoption	SFE
				6.8.3.2	Explore development of a Central SoMa Litter Waste Abatement Strategy, including public education, facilities, and signage.	Central SoMa Eco-District Team work program	Within three years of Plan adoption	Planning

GOAL #7 – PRESERVE AND CELEBRATE THE NEIGHBORHOOD'S CULTURAL HERITAGE

#	OBJECTIVE	#	POLICY	#	IMPLEMENTATION MEASURE	IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM	TIMELINE	LEAD AGENCY
7.1	Ensure that the history of the neighborhood is adequately documented	7.1.1	Complete and adopt the historic context statement	7.1.1.1	Not applicable – already adopted.	Motion #0277 of the Historic Preservation Commission	Completed March 2016	Planning
		7.1.2	Complete and adopt the historic resources survey	7.1.2.1	Not applicable – already adopted.	Motion #0277 of the Historic Preservation Commission	Completed March 2016	Planning
7.2	Support the preservation, recognition, and wellbeing of the neighborhood's cultural heritage resources	7.2.1	Facilitate the creation and implementation of a SoMa Pilipinas Cultural Heritage Strategy	7.2.1.1	Staff community process of developing the SoMa Pilipinas Cultural Heritage Strategy.	Ongoing community process culminating in presentations to the Planning Commission, Historic Preservation Commission, and Board of Supervisors	Expected Fall of 2016	Planning
				7.2.1.2	To be determined, based on results of Strategy.	TBD based on results of Strategy	Upon adoption of Strategy	To be determined

#	OBJECTIVE	#	POLICY	#	IMPLEMENTATION MEASURE	IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM	TIMELINE	LEAD AGENCY
		7.2.2	Facilitate the creation and implementation of other social or cultural heritage strategies, such as for the LGBTQ community	7.2.2.1	Support efforts to implement the recommendations of the LGBTQ Historic Context Statement.	Ongoing community and City conversation	Ongoing	Planning
				7.2.2.2	As appropriate, undertake community process of developing a cultural heritage strategy for groups important to the living history of Central SoMa.	Ongoing community and City conversation	Ongoing	Planning
7.3	Ensure the neighborhood's tangible and intangible industrial and arts legacy is not lost	7.3.1	Implement strategies that maintain PDR jobs in the neighborhood	7.3.1.1	See implementation measures related to Objective 3.3.	Planning Code amendment	Upon Plan Adoption	Planning
		7.3.2	Support the preservation of buildings and features that reflect the industrial and arts legacy of the neighborhood	7.3.2.1	See implementation measures related to Objectives 7.4, 7.5, and 7.6.	Planning Code amendment	Upon Plan adoption	Planning
7.4	Prevent demolition of or insensitive alterations to cultural heritage resources in the built environment	7.4.1	Protect Landmark-worthy cultural heritage properties through designation to Article 10 of the Planning Code	7.4.1.1	Maintain and safeguard properties already designated to Articles 10 and 11 of the Planning Code within the Plan Area.	Ongoing implementation of existing Planning Code requirements	Ongoing	Planning
				7.4.1.2	Designate properties and districts to Article 10 of the Planning Code (see Figure 7.1 in the Plan).	Planning Code amendment	Upon Plan adoption and ongoing until complete, with the sequence of additions based on prioritization of the Historic Preservation Commission	Planning
		7.4.2	Protect "Significant" and "Contributory" cultural heritage properties through designation to Article 11 of the Planning Code	7.4.2.1	Expand Article 11 of the Planning Code to include Central SoMa.	Planning Code amendment	Upon Plan adoption	Planning
				7.4.2.2	Reclassify properties and districts to Article 11 of the Planning Code (see Figure 7.1 in the Plan).	Planning Code amendment	Upon Plan adoption	Planning

#	OBJECTIVE	#	POLICY	#	IMPLEMENTATION MEASURE	IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM	TIMELINE	LEAD AGENCY
7.5	Support mechanisms for the rehabilitation and maintenance of cultural heritage properties	7.5.1	Support funding for the rehabilitation of the Old Mint	7.5.1.1	Dedicate funding through a Community Facilities District to support the restoration of the Old Mint.	Requirement of the Community Facilities District	Ongoing, as funding accrues	Planning
7.5.2		Enable “Significant” and “Contributing” buildings underbuilt per applicable zoning to sell Transferable Development Rights	7.5.2.1	Revise the Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) program to extend to Central SoMa.	Planning Code amendment	Upon Plan adoption	Planning	
7.5.3		Require large new development projects to purchase Transferable Development Rights	7.5.3.1	Require projects to buy TDR (for specific requirements, see the “Requirements for New Development” document). TDR must be purchased from buildings within Central SoMa.	Planning Code amendment	Upon Plan adoption	Planning	
7.5.4		Support additions over wholesale demolition to preserve cultural heritage properties	7.5.4.1	For historic buildings not included in Article 10 or 11, require buildings to explore additions as an alternative to demolition. Only support demolition upon demonstrative proof of the infeasibility of additions. Projects informed through the City’s Urban Design Guidelines and the Historic Design Guidelines documents.	Planning Code amendment	Upon Plan adoption	Planning	
7.5.5		Encourage the use of existing strategies and incentives that facilitate the preservation and rehabilitation of designated cultural heritage properties	7.5.5.1	Continue implementing existing programs where appropriate. Such programs include the Mills Act, Federal Rehabilitation Tax Incentives, façade easements, Planning Code exemptions and the use of the California Historic Building Code.	Ongoing promotion and technical support provided by Planning Department’s Preservation Planning team.	Ongoing	Planning, Department of Building Inspection (DBI)	
7.6	Support retention of fine-grained developed pattern and character-enhancing buildings	7.6.1	Restrict the consolidation of small- and medium-sized lots with character-enhancing buildings	7.6.1.1	Ban the consolidation of lots containing buildings with historic or neighborhood-character buildings (California Historic Resources Status Codes 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6L) where the frontage that could be merged is under 200 feet in length (excepting the frontage along the north side of Perry Street) (See Figure 7.2 in the Plan).	Planning Code amendment	Upon Plan adoption	Planning
7.6.2		Incentivize retention of character-enhancing buildings	7.6.2.1	Allow developments that preserve existing historic and neighborhood character buildings (California Historic Resources Status Codes 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6L) to count the square footage maintained against the development’s TDR requirement – whether as whole buildings or additions.	Planning Code amendment	Upon Plan adoption	Planning	

GOAL #8 - ENSURE THAT NEW BUILDINGS ENHANCE THE CHARACTER OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD AND THE CITY

#	OBJECTIVE	#	POLICY	#	IMPLEMENTATION MEASURE	IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM	TIMELINE	LEAD AGENCY
8.1	Ensure that the ground floors of buildings contribute to the activation, safety, and dynamism of the neighborhood	8.1.1	Require that ground floors actively engage the street	8.1.1.1	Continue implementing the existing requirements that buildings be lined with active uses. Revise the definition of "active" to remove offices and to allow PDR on the ground floor if it meets the transparency and fenestration requirements of non-PDR-uses. Expand the definition of frontages to POPOS and mid-block connections.	Planning Code amendment	Upon Plan adoption	Planning
		8.1.2	Design building frontages and public open spaces with furnishings and amenities to engage a mixed-use neighborhood	8.1.2.1	Comply with the City's Urban Design Guidelines (pending adoption in Fall 2016) with regards to design of ground floors.	Design review of individual projects	Ongoing	Planning
		8.1.3	Ensure buildings are built up to the sidewalk edge	8.1.3.1	Review and support building designs where fixtures, furnishings, art, utilities, and programming at the ground floor or adjacent open space invite and support more active and consistent use of public areas including alleys, open spaces, and sidewalks.	Design review of individual projects	Ongoing	Planning
		8.1.4	Minimize parking and loading entrances	8.1.4.1	Require that new buildings to be built along the street-facing property line up to the top of the podium, which can be between 65 and 85 feet, with an exception for residential buildings with walk-up units (which should have setbacks in accordance with the Ground Floor Residential Guidelines).	Planning Code amendment	Upon Plan adoption	Planning
8.2	Ensure that the overall development pattern is complementary to the skyline	8.2.1	Set height limits, bulk controls, and architectural guidelines mindful of important views	8.2.1.1	Implement the curb cut controls from Policy 4.1.2.	Planning Code amendment	Upon Plan adoption	Planning
				8.2.1.2	Set height limits and bulk controls to be complementary to the overall city skyline pattern (see Figure 1.8 in the Plan).	Zoning Map amendment	Upon Plan adoption	Planning
8.3	Reinforce the character of Central SoMa as a mid-rise district with tangible "urban rooms"	8.3.1	Set height limits to enable mid-rise development	8.3.1.1	Utilize design and architecture techniques to Central SoMa's tallest buildings to demarcate the 4th and Townsend intersection and to be able to distinguish the area on the skyline.	Design review of individual projects	Ongoing	Planning
				8.3.2.1	Set height limits along the major streets to facilitate podiums of 65 to 85 feet (see Figure 1.8 in the Plan).	Zoning Map amendment	Upon Plan adoption	Planning
		8.3.2	Require new buildings to reinforce the "urban room"	8.3.2.1	See Implementation Measure 8.1.3.1.	Planning Code amendment	Upon Plan adoption	Planning

#	OBJECTIVE	#	POLICY	#	IMPLEMENTATION MEASURE	IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM	TIMELINE	LEAD AGENCY
		8.3.3	Require buildings whose height exceeds the width of the major streets to step back at the upper stories	8.3.3.1	<p>For buildings 160 feet or less in height, apply “skyplane” to the portion of the building between 85-160 feet, as follows (and as visually conveyed in the “Guide to Urban Design” document):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At 85 feet in height, require a 15 foot setback for at least 60% of each frontage. • On the north side of the street: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Height district of 130 feet: Require apparent mass reduction of 50%. ▪ Height district of 160 feet: Require apparent mass reduction of 70%. • On the south side of the street: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Height district of 130 feet: Require apparent mass reduction of 67%. ▪ Height district of 160 feet: Require apparent mass reduction of 80%. 	Planning Code amendment	Upon Plan adoption	Planning
				8.3.3.2	Require setbacks of 15-feet above a height of 85 feet on all sides of the building not facing a public right-of-way.	Planning Code amendment	Upon Plan adoption	Planning
				8.3.3.3	Do not allow any bridges between buildings to be above 130 feet in height.	Planning Code amendment	Upon Plan adoption	Planning
				8.3.3.4	<p>Require the following additional controls to apply when there is a proposed tower (i.e., building over 160 feet) (as visually conveyed in the “Guide to Urban Design” document):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When there is an existing tower, the second tower should be at least 115 feet. The distance between towers may be reduced to a minimum of 85 feet if <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The difference in the height of the two towers is at least 50 feet, ▪ The bulk of the second tower is reduced relative to the reduction in tower separation, such that at 85 feet, the maximum tower bulk shall be 10,000 square feet. • Any tower seeking reduced tower separation will be required to be designed contextually to the other tower, and to maximize apparent distance and architectural differentiation, • When a tower is adjacent to a building that is between 85 to 160 feet, at least 30 feet separation is required, and • On lots large enough to contain a building with a tower portion (taller than 160’) and a portion between 85 to 160 feet along a street frontage, in addition to these masses needing to be separated by at least 30 feet, these portions should be designed to look like different buildings from the frontage(s). 	Planning Code amendment	Upon Plan adoption	Planning

#	OBJECTIVE	#	POLICY	#	IMPLEMENTATION MEASURE	IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM	TIMELINE	LEAD AGENCY
		8.3.4	Limit the distribution and bulk of new towers and focus them at important nodes	8.3.4.1	Limit new buildings greater than 160 feet (i.e., towers) to important nodes, including along the new Central Subway, 5th and Howard, 2nd and Harrison, and 5th and Howard, and 5th and Brannan (see Figure 1.8 in the Plan).	Zoning Map amendment	Upon Plan adoption	Planning
				8.3.4.2	Require the following bulk controls for buildings taller than 160 feet (as visually conveyed in the "Guide to Urban Design" document): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tower bulk controls apply starting at a podium height 85 feet, • Above 85 feet, a 15-foot setback will be required along all property lines, • No residential or hotel use allowed to have a floor exceed 12,000 gross square feet, • The average floor for commercial uses cannot exceed 15,000 gross square feet and no single floor may exceed 17,000 gross square feet, • For towers 250 feet or more, the upper 1/3 of the tower portion must feature minimum bulk reductions of 15% of the floorplate and the maximum diagonal of 7.5%. The upper tower bulk reduction shall not be required for any tower for which the overall tower is reduced from the maximum bulk allowance by an equal or greater volume (above a height of 85 feet), • The maximum horizontal ("plan") dimension of 150 feet, and • The maximum diagonal dimension of 190 feet. 	Planning Code amendment	Upon Plan adoption	Planning
		8.3.5	Limit heights in areas with a high concentration of historic buildings and areas of unique character	8.3.5.1	Keep height limits as is at South Park, the South End Historic District and the South End Historic District Extension (see Figure 1.8 in the Plan).	Zoning Map amendment	Upon Plan adoption	Planning
				8.3.5.2	Create lower heights on 4th and near Bessie Carmichael Annex (see Figure 1.8 in the Plan).	Zoning Map amendment	Upon Plan adoption	Planning
		8.3.6	Minimize the impact of shadows on public spaces to the extent feasible, balanced with other core objectives	8.3.6.1	Set height limits districts to minimize shadow impacts on South Park, Yerba Buena Gardens, and Bessie Carmichael School's 6th-8th grade campus.	Zoning Map amendment	Upon Plan adoption	Planning
				8.3.6.2	Sculpt new development to the degree possible to minimize shadows on public spaces without unduly impacting development capacity.	Design review of individual projects	Ongoing	Planning
		8.3.7	Utilize new buildings to diminish the dominant presence of the freeway in the neighborhood	8.3.7.1	Raise height limits above the existing 30 feet limits between 4th and 6th Streets (see Figure 1.8 in the Plan).	Zoning Map amendment	Upon Plan adoption	Planning
8.4	Ensure that narrow streets and alleys maintain their intimacy and sense of openness to the sky	8.4.1	Require new buildings facing alleys and narrow streets to step back at the upper stories	8.4.1.1	Maintain existing sun-angle requirements on the south side of east-west narrow streets (35-foot wide or less).	Ongoing implementation of existing Planning Code requirements	Ongoing	Planning

#	OBJECTIVE	#	POLICY	#	IMPLEMENTATION MEASURE	IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM	TIMELINE	LEAD AGENCY
				8.4.1.2	Extend the sun-angle requirement on the south side of east-west narrow streets (35 feet wide or less) to the south side of north-south narrow streets.	Planning Code amendment	Upon Plan adoption	Planning
				8.4.1.3	Apply skyplane to north side narrow streets (35 feet wide or less) at heights above 35 feet as follows (and as visually conveyed in the "Guide to Urban Design" document): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Height districts of 55 feet and under: require upper stories set back at least 10 feet at the property line above a height equivalent to 1.25 times the width of the abutting alley, • Height district of 65 feet: Require apparent mass reduction of 50%, • Height district of 85 feet: Require apparent mass reduction of 70%, • Height district of 130 feet: Require apparent mass reduction of 85%, • For towers, the skyplane controls do not apply, and • For buildings along Perry Street, require upper stories set back at least 10 feet at the property line above a height equivalent to 1.25 times the width of the street. 	Planning Code amendment	Upon Plan adoption	Planning
				8.4.1.4	On streets between 36 and 80 feet in width, apply the skyplane requirements of major streets as described in Implementation Measure 8.3.2.1, but begin the apparent mass reduction requirements at a height equivalent to the width of the street.	Planning Code amendment	Upon Plan adoption	Planning
8.5	Ensure that large development sites are carefully designed to maximize public benefit	8.5.1	Provide greater direction and flexibility for large development sites in return for improved design and additional public benefits	8.5.1.1	Develop "Key Development Site Guidelines" that lay out more detailed design guidance and convey specific exceptions allowed and specific public benefits received in return (see "Draft Key Development Site Guidelines" document).	Planning Code amendment	Upon Plan adoption	Planning
				8.5.1.2	An additional 25 feet of height may be permitted on sites where such flexibility in height would facilitate the provision of affordable housing and/or public parks and recreational facilities beyond what would otherwise be required by the Plan, as long as that additional height did not increase the overall amount of development otherwise enabled by the Plan or cause new significant impacts related to wind and shadow.			
		8.5.2	Limit the length of new buildings	8.5.2.1	Continue implementing the existing requirements for horizontal mass reductions.	Ongoing implementation of existing Planning Code requirements	Ongoing	Planning
				8.5.2.2	Limit the length of any new building to 300 feet.	Planning Code amendment	Upon Plan adoption	Planning
8.6	Promote high quality architecture that enhances the neighborhood	8.6.1	Conform to the City's Urban Design Guidelines	8.6.1.1	Comply with the City's Urban Design Guidelines (pending adoption in Fall 2016).	Design review of individual projects	Ongoing	Planning
		8.6.2	Promote innovative and contextually-appropriate design	8.6.2.1	Utilize application of "skyplane" as a device to create interestingly shaped buildings (as detailed in the "Guide to Urban Design" document).	Design review of individual projects	Ongoing	Planning

#	OBJECTIVE	#	POLICY	#	IMPLEMENTATION MEASURE	IMPLEMENTATION MECHANISM	TIMELINE	LEAD AGENCY
				8.6.2.2	Harmonize new building designs with existing neighborhood materials but in a contemporary or reinterpreted way (as detailed in the "Guide to Urban Design" document).	Design review of individual projects	Ongoing	Planning
				8.6.2.3	Recognize and enhance existing local form material and geometry variations to support neighborhood-specific architecture (as detailed in the "Guide to Urban Design" document).	Design review of individual projects	Ongoing	Planning
				8.6.2.4	Employ innovative architectural ideas for larger projects that provide a clear organizing principle for design (as detailed in the "Guide to Urban Design" document).	Design review of individual projects	Ongoing	Planning
		8.6.3	Design the upper floors to be deferential to the "urban room"	8.6.3.1	Require buildings to comply with skyplane controls discussed under Policy 8.3.3 and 8.4.1.	Planning Code amendment	Upon Plan adoption	Planning
				8.6.3.2	Utilize material systems that visually diminish upper facades.	Design review of individual projects	Ongoing	Planning
		8.6.4	Design buildings to be mindful of wind	8.6.4.1	For buildings over 85 feet, set the following wind requirements: Do not allow an increase in the number of hours during which wind exceeds the "comfort criterion" defined in Planning Code Section 148, Do not allow an increase in the total exceedances of the "hazard criterion" defined in Section 148, and Apply the same exceptions included in Section 148.	Planning Code amendment	Upon Plan adoption	Planning
		8.6.5	Ensure large projects integrate with existing urban fabric and provide a varied character	8.6.5.1	Modulate larger projects vertically or horizontally, whichever is more appropriate, to reflect surrounding lots and massing patterns.	Design review of individual projects	Ongoing	Planning
				8.6.5.2	Provide fixtures, furnishings, and art at interior and exterior ground floor openings to invite and support use of adjacent public areas.	Design review of individual projects	Ongoing	Planning
				8.6.5.3	Vary the roofs of buildings for projects with long facades.	Design review of individual projects	Ongoing	Planning
				8.6.5.4	Require projects on site that are larger than two acres to have multiple architects.	Planning Code amendment	Upon Plan adoption	Planning
8.7	Establish clear rules for development	8.7.1	Wherever possible, delineate via the Planning Code what is allowed and not allowed in new development	8.7.1.1	Utilize the Community Plan Exemption process for complying projects.	Ongoing implementation of CEQA	Ongoing	Planning
				8.7.1.2	Minimize potential exceptions and exemptions within the Planning Code.	Planning Code amendment	Upon Plan adoption	Planning



PART II: **CENTRAL SOMA IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY**

PUBLIC BENEFITS PACKAGE

CENTRAL SOMA PUBLIC BENEFITS PACKAGE

“Public benefits” are goods and services that 1) support the community’s wellbeing, 2) are not typically provided voluntarily by the private sector (or at least not in sufficient quantity or quality) and that 3) require public funding or subsidy (such as by development) to create and maintain. Common types of public benefits include affordable housing, parks, and transit service.

The Central SoMa Plan is expected to generate up to \$2 billion in public benefits to serve the neighborhood over the life of the Plan.¹ Without it, the neighborhood could receive approximately \$300 million in public benefits. The Plan therefore provides the potential for a 667 percent increase in public benefits for Central SoMa.

This \$2 billion would be derived exclusively from new development allowing for approximately 5,000 market-rate housing units and approximately 40,000 new jobs. The benefits would be delivered through one or more of the following three mechanisms: 1) direct provision of the benefit (such as “on-site” affordable housing), 2) one-time impact fees (such as the Transit Sustainability Fee), and 3) through on-going taxation (through a Mello-Roos Community Facilities District).

Table 1 describes the expected sources of funding for public benefits from new development. The amount of benefits required from new development is located in the Requirements for New Development document.

¹ The life of the Plan is assumed to be 25 years, but subject to local economic conditions and other social and environmental factors.

Table 1

SOURCES OF PUBLIC BENEFITS FUNDING

SOURCE	AMOUNT	PERCENT OF TOTAL	PUBLIC BENEFIT CATEGORY	MECHANISM
Below-Market Rate Housing Program ¹	\$600M	29%	Affordable Housing	Direct provision or one-time fee
Mello-Roos Community Facilities District Tax ²	\$350M	17%	Transit, Complete Streets, Parks and Recreation Environmental Sustainability, and Cultural Preservation	Annual tax
Eastern Neighborhoods Infrastructure Impact Fee ³	\$250M	12%	Transit, Complete Streets, Parks and Recreation, and Schools and Child Care	One-time fee
Jobs-Housing Linkage Fee ⁴	\$210M	10%	Affordable Housing	One-time fee
Transportation Sustainability Fee ⁵	\$210M	10%	Transit and Complete Streets	One-time fee
PDR Requirement	\$180M	9%	PDR	Direct provision
Central SoMa Fee ⁶	\$90M	4%	Affordable Housing	One-time fee
POPOS Requirement	\$80M	4%	Parks and Recreation	Direct provision
School Fee ⁷	\$20M	1%	Schools and Childcare	One-time fee
Community Services Fee ⁸	\$20M	1%	Community Services	One-time fee
Transferable Development Rights ⁹	\$20M	1%	Cultural Preservation	One-time transaction
Childcare Fee ¹⁰	\$10M	1%	Schools and Child care	One-time fee
Sustainability Requirements	\$10M	1%	Environmental Sustainability and Resilience	Direct provision
Total	\$2,050M	100%		

- 1 The Below-Market Rate (BMR) Housing Program is an existing program requiring market rate housing development to provide affordable housing (see Planning Code Section 415). The existing requirements established by 2016's Proposition C are proposed to be adjusted based on the increase in development capacity derived from the Central SoMa Plan. Any fees collected will be directed to the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development. Note that the current rates are subject to change by the Board of Supervisors based on the analysis conducted to help implement Proposition C.
- 2 A CFD is a taxing mechanism to fund public benefits. The Central SoMa CFD would be a new tax that would need to be approved by vote by the owners of the affected properties. The amount reflected here presumes the City issues bonds against the revenue stream that would carry out at least 55 years.
- 3 The Eastern Neighborhoods Infrastructure Impact Fee is an existing fee on both residential and non-residential development (see Planning Code Section 423). It only applies to projects within the Eastern Neighborhoods, and can only be spent within the Eastern Neighborhoods. The fee is disseminated between different types of public benefits, based on its source: fees from residential development are apportioned 47.5% to parks and recreation, 31% to complete streets, 10% to transit, 6.5% to child care, and 5% to administering the fees; fees from non-residential development are apportioned 53% to transit, 34% to complete streets, 6% to parks and recreation, 2% to child care, and 5% to administering the fees.
- 4 The Jobs-Housing Linkage Fee is an existing fee on non-residential development that is dedicated to affordable housing (see Planning Code Section 413).
- 5 The Transportation Sustainability Fee (TSF) is an existing fee on both residential and non-residential development (see Planning Code Section 411A). Ninety five percent of this fee is dedicated to transit, and three percent to complete streets, with the remainder to administration.
- 6 The Central SoMa Fee is a new impact fee proposed for new development in Central SoMa. It is proposed to be dedicated to affordable housing.
- 7 The School Impact Fee is an existing fee that supports capital investment in new and existing schools (see State Education Code Section 17620).
- 8 The Community Services Fee is a new impact fee proposed by for new development in Central SoMa. It is proposed to be dedicated to building community services.
- 9 Transferable Development Rights is an existing concept that enables certain historically important buildings to sell their unused development rights to other development (see Planning Code Section 128).
- 10 The Child Care Fee is an existing impact fee on both residential and non-residential development (see Planning Code Section 414).

Note that the \$2 billion does not include many existing requirements whose benefits to community are not quantifiable or which may not have net cost impacts to developers, such as most green building and urban design requirements to achieve goals of maintaining light and air and improving the experience for pedestrians. Also note that while all dollar amounts are expressed here are in current year 2016 dollars, the amount of revenue collected each year will be higher. This is because all City fees index annually with the cost of constructing infrastructure, and the Mello-Roos Community Facilities District also escalates annually (at a rate determined at the establishment of the CFD).

In addition to this \$2 billion of direct development benefits, taxes from new development in the Plan Area are expected to generate up to \$1 billion for the City’s General Fund within the same time period. These taxes could be directed toward the neighborhood,

other citywide needs, or a combination of the two. Additionally, the City could choose to fund public benefits in the neighborhood via the General Fund or other mechanisms such as bonds (such as the Parks Bond, Transit Bond, and Affordable Housing Bond) or general taxes. The overall economic impact of the Central SoMa Plan to the City is required to be analyzed in a separate report by the City Economist.

There are nine categories of public benefits that would be funded by the Central SoMa Plan in support of its Goals, Objectives, and Policies. Table 2 provides a summary of how the Plan proposes to fund these benefits, accompanied by a detailed discussion of each benefit type, including sources of funding and the resulting benefits expected.

Table 2
SUMMARY OF PUBLIC BENEFITS FUNDING BY BENEFIT CATEGORY

BENEFIT	AMOUNT	PERCENT OF TOTAL
Affordable Housing	\$900 million	44%
Transit	\$500 million	24%
Production, Distribution, and Repair	\$180 million	9%
Parks and Recreation	\$160 million	8%
Complete Streets	\$130 million	6%
Environmental Sustainability	\$70 million	3%
Schools and Childcare	\$50 million	2%
Cultural Preservation	\$40 million	2%
Community Services	\$20 million	1%
Total	\$2,050 million	100%

Note that the information below is intended to be concise and user-friendly. To ensure that the program is memorialized and implemented upon adoption of the Central SoMa Plan, a Central SoMa Implementation Plan describing this program in detail will be provided by the Planning Department for approval by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors, as well as updates to the Eastern Neighborhoods Memorandum of Understanding between City agencies.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Objective

Ensure that at least 33% of new and rehabilitated housing is affordable to very low, low, and moderate-income households (see Plan Objective 2.3 and accompanying policies). Given that approximately 5,200 market rate units could be built within the Plan Area, the City would need to ensure the provision of approximately 2,600 units of housing that is affordable (i.e., requires 30% or less of annual income) to very low, low, and moderate-income households (up to a maximum of 55% of the City's median income for rental units and 100% for units for sale).

Estimated Contribution from Development in Central SoMa

\$900 million

Funding Source(s)

- *Below-Market Rate (BMR) Housing Program* (\$600 million), through direct provision of affordable units built on-site or off-site as part of market-rate housing projects or payment of an in-lieu fee to the City;
- *Jobs-Housing Linkage Fee* (\$210 million), through payment of the fee to the City; and
- *The Central SoMa Fee* (\$90 million), through payment of the fee to the City.

Result and Timing

The three programs above are expected to result in approximately 2,600 affordable housing units. This includes approximately 700 “on-site” units via the Below Market Rate Housing Program, as well as 1,900 off-site and/or units funded through in-lieu fees (including 870 from the BMR Housing Program, 690 from the Jobs-Housing Linkage Fee, and 340 from the

Central SoMa Fee).² Estimating the cost of on-site units at \$500,000 each, and the off-site and in-lieu units at \$300,000 each, yields the overall total of \$880 million towards affordable housing.³

On-site and off-site units would be built at the same time as the market rate units of the affiliated project. In-lieu fees would accrue as development occurs. The funds are directed to the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD). MOHCD utilizes the money to identify and purchase sites and construct new affordable housing, typically in conjunction with non-profit housing developers. The development of these affordable units could fall behind the market rate development that provided the fees or land, in some instances by several years, assuming that additional funding is not directed to the Plan area.

TRANSIT

Objective

Ensure that transit is a safe and convenient option for people moving within and through the Plan Area (see Objective 4.3 and accompanying policies). This includes improvements to both local and regional transit systems.

Estimated Contribution from Development in Central SoMa

\$500 million

Funding Source(s)

² The Plan will provide additional mechanisms to fulfill affordability requirements, such as providing land and making existing housing permanently affordable. The value of these alternatives will be set to be equivalent to the value of the in-lieu fee.

³ The \$300,000 estimate of value for in-lieu units is a general rounding of the in-lieu fee (which itself is subject to unit size etc.). The \$500,000 estimate of value for on-site units is a conservative estimate. By setting the requirements for on-site units below the off-site and in-lieu options, the City has signaled that on-site units have higher value. The \$500,000 is based on an assumption that the value of on-site is 60% more than off-site/in-lieu, based on the recently amended affordability requirements of 12% on-site and 20% off-site/in-lieu. Alternatively, the value of on-site could be measured in the cost to the developer to subsidize the units. Given the average value of units exceeds \$1 million and the amount recouped from affordable units is approximately \$300,000, an alternative estimate would be that each on-site unit is worth the value of the subsidy, which is around \$700,000. No matter the estimate, the number of affordable units associated with the Plan is the same.

- *Central SoMa Mello-Roos Community Facilities District (CFD)* (\$210 million), through annual collection of the tax;
- *Transportation Sustainability Fee* (\$205 million), through payment of the fee to the City; and
- *Eastern Neighborhoods Infrastructure Impact Fee* (\$85 million), through payment of the fee to the City.

Results and Timing

Of the \$500 million, two-thirds (\$333 million) will go to the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) to support a state of good repair on the existing Muni fleet and infrastructure, as well as enhancement and expansion of services. The portion of this funding from the Transportation Sustainability Fee (TSF) and Eastern Neighborhoods Infrastructure Impact Fee will accrue as development projects receive their building permits. The portion from the CFD would accumulate over the life span of the Plan and beyond – though it could substantially accrue earlier if the City issues bonds against this revenue stream.

The remaining one-third (\$167 million) will go towards regional transit capacity enhancement and expansion. Of this amount, about one-third would be set aside to pursue near term “core capacity” Transbay corridor enhancements (such as station capacity, operational and fleet improvements to BART stations, or augmentation of Transbay bus service), about one-third to pursue long-term “core capacity” projects (such as study a second Transbay rail crossing), and about one-third for the Caltrain corridor (e.g., DTX, alignment undergrounding). The preponderance of this money will come from the CFD and thus would accumulate over the life span of the Plan and beyond – though it could accrue earlier if the City bonds against it.

PRODUCTION, DISTRIBUTION, AND REPAIR (PDR)

Objective

Ensure that the removal of protective zoning does not result in a net loss of PDR in the Plan Area, as well as provide incentives to fund, build, and/or protect PDR (see Objective 3.3 and accompanying policies). The amount of PDR space sought is approximately 500,000 square feet.⁴

Estimated Contribution from Development in Central SoMa

\$180 million

Funding Source(s)

Direct provision of PDR space by new development (\$180 million)⁵

Results and Timing

The direct provision of PDR space will come from land use controls and conditions for allowing new office development, in the form of requirements to replace existing spaces and to include new space in large projects. As a direct provision, no transfer of funds or payment of fees will occur.⁶ The PDR space will be provided at the same time the office space becomes occupiable.

PARKS AND RECREATION

Objective

Provide an abundance of parks and recreational opportunities in the neighborhood (see Objectives 5.1 through 5.5 and accompanying policies).

⁴ The strategies discussed herein will complement other Plan strategies that will protect approximately 400,000 square feet of PDR space.

⁵ Additional funding could occur if developers choose to apply their 1% Art Program requirement to the City's Public Arts Trust. The Arts Commission presides over the funding in the Trust, and has substantial discretionary powers over the benefits provided, which could include programming and funding for arts space.

⁶ The Plan endorses the pursuit and analysis of an in-lieu fee for PDR, but the fee itself is not proposed as part of the Plan.

Estimated Contribution from Development in Central SoMa

\$160 million

Funding Source(s)

Direct provision of privately-owned public open space (POPOS) (\$80 million);

- *Eastern Neighborhoods Infrastructure Impact Fee* (\$70 million), through payment of the fee to the City; and
- *Central SoMa Mello-Roos Community Facilities District (CFD)* (\$10 million), through annual collection of the tax.

Results and Timing

The funding would be allocated to the following benefits, as it accrues:⁷

- Reconstruction/expansion of Gene Friend Recreation Center in SoMa: up to \$25 million;
- A new one-acre park in the southwest part of the Plan area, (identified in the Plan as between 4th, 5th, Bryant, and Brannan Streets): up to \$30 million. There is potential for this to be provided as an In-Kind Agreement with surrounding development, which could potentially create the park within five years of Plan adoption;
- A new public recreation center: up to \$15 million. There is also potential for this to be provided as part of surrounding development, which could create the recreation center sooner than if constructed by the City;
- Programming of Victoria Manalo Draves Park: up to \$5 million from the CFD;
- Large (2+ acres) new SoMa park: up to \$10 million

⁷ The cost of parks and recreational benefits is highly subject to design decisions and identification of complementary funding sources. If the benefits listed all cost the City the maximum foreseeable, then the sum of these benefits will exceed the amount allocated. Recognizing this, the list is sorted in general order of priority.

for identification of potential site(s) and initial design and coordination;

- A new Bluxome linear park: up to \$5 million. There is also potential for this to be developed as a “privately-owned public open space” (POPOS) from nearby development; and
- New under-freeway public recreation area: up to \$10 million. There is also potential for this to be developed as a “privately-owned public open space” (POPOS) from nearby development.
- The POPOS requirement in the Plan would also result in up to four acres (in aggregate) of net new publicly-accessible space across the Plan area. These would be provided at the same time as the new development that constructs it.

COMPLETE STREETS

Objective

Redesign all major streets in the Plan Area to be safe and comfortable for all people walking, biking, and on transit (see Plan Objectives 4.1 and 4.2 and accompanying policies). There are approximately 25,000 linear feet of major streets within the Plan Area, including portions of 3rd, 4th, 5th, 6th, Howard, Folsom, Harrison, Bryant, Brannan, and Townsend Streets.⁸ Depending on the street and the proposed improvements, costs are estimated at between \$4,400 and \$5,400 per linear foot.⁹

Estimated Contribution from Development in Central SoMa

\$130 million

⁸ This number accounts for improvements on both sides of the street. Within the Plan Area, 2nd Street is already funded and approved for construction, and the southern half of 4th Street is currently being improved as part of the Central Subway project. The costs discussed here exclude improvements to the south side of Townsend Street and the west side of 6th Street.

⁹ Cost estimates are based on budgets for the completed plans for 2nd Street.

Funding Source(s)

- *Eastern Neighborhoods Infrastructure Impact Fee* (\$80 million), through payment of the fee to the City;
- *Central SoMa Mello-Roos Community Facilities District (CFD)* (\$40 million), through annual collection of the tax;
- *Transportation Sustainability Fee* (\$10 million), through payment of the fee to the City; and
- *Better Streets Plan Requirements*¹⁰ (\$0-\$15 million), through direct provision of benefits by new development.

Results and Timing

All funding dedicated to complete streets (including other sources discussed in this section) would be used by the City for planning, design, and construction. The result will be sufficient funding to redesign all of the major streets in the Plan Area. The improvements funded by fees and the CFD could occur as money accrues: for fees this occurs when projects receive their building permits; for the CFD funding accrues each year with the property tax, although it is likely that the City will seek to bond against this income in five-year increments. Improvements made directly by development per the Better Streets Plan would be completed at the same time as the affiliated development project.

ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY

Objective

Support strategies to address a range of objectives, including minimizing greenhouse gas emissions, minimizing water waste, supporting biodiversity,

access to nature, and a healthy ecosystem, improving air quality, ensuring a flood-resilient neighborhood, maximizing earthquake resilience, and helping achieve zero solid waste (see Plan Objectives 6.1 through 6.8 and accompanying policies).

Estimated Contribution from Development in Central SoMa

\$70 million

Funding Source(s)

- *Central SoMa Mello-Roos Community Facilities District (CFD)* (\$60 million), through annual collection of the tax; and
- Direct provision of benefits by new development (\$10 million).

Results and Timing

Funding for environmental sustainability will support strategies to address a range of issues discussed under the “Objective” above. Specific strategies are as follows:¹¹

- Fund enhanced stormwater management in complete street projects (\$32 million)
- Fund freeway corridor air quality and greening improvements (\$20 million)
- Require 50% “living roofs” on all new development 160 feet and less in height (\$6 million)
- Fund 100% non-potable (recycled) water for street cleaning (\$3 million)
- Fund 100% non-potable (recycled) water for public park irrigation (\$1 million)
- Fund 100% energy-efficiency street lights (\$1 million)

¹⁰ The Better Streets Plan is an adopted City policy codified in Section 138.1 of the Planning Code. This Section requires that large new development improve the sidewalks and streets in front of their property (up to the entire block face) to meet adopted standards. In instances where such development occurs before the City re-builds the street, the development would make the proposed complete streets improvements. In instances where the development occurs after the City re-builds the street, the development would not. Because of the uncertainty in timing for both scenarios, this number is shown as a range, with \$15 million being the maximum contribution. Any such contribution would reduce the City's cost to build complete streets.

¹¹ In addition to these strategies, there are other new requirements being proposed that are expected to be cost neutral or even beneficial to new development, such as expanding the City's existing solar energy requirement to more buildings and requiring the purchase of 100% greenhouse-gas free electricity in all new buildings.

- Build a “Better Roofs” “living roof” demonstration project (\$1 million)
- Build a “Better Roofs” solar demonstration project (\$0.5 million)
- Fund 100% “green” stormwater management in parks (\$0.5 million)
- Study district utility for energy and water (\$0.5 million)
- Develop a *Central SoMa Sea Level Rise and Flood Management Strategy* (\$0.4 million)
- Develop *Fossil Fuel Free Buildings Study & Guidelines* (\$0.3 million)
- Develop *Flood Resilient Design Guidelines* for new development (\$0.3 million)

In terms of timing, the development requirements listed above would be delivered by new development upon its completion. Benefits funded through the CFD could be delivered upon accrual of the revenue. The Studies, Strategies, and Guidelines discussed above are proposed to be delivered within two years after adoption of the Central SoMa Plan. These themselves may lead to new requirements or benefits.

SCHOOLS AND CHILD CARE

Objective

Help fund public schools and childcare centers serving the needs of children aged 0-18 (see Plan Objective 2.6 and Policies 2.6.1 and 2.6.2).

Estimated Contribution from Development in Central SoMa

\$50 million

Funding Source(s)

- *School Impact Fee* (\$25 million), through payment of the fee to the City;

- *Eastern Neighborhoods Infrastructure Impact Fee* (\$15 million), through payment of the fee to the City; and
- *Child Care Fee* (\$10 million) through payment of the fee to the City.

Results and Timing

The \$25 million in funds from the School Impact Fee will be allocated to the San Francisco Unified School District for use throughout the city, at their discretion. The \$25 million in funds from the Child Care Fee and Eastern Neighborhoods Infrastructure Impact Fee will go to the Human Services Agency. The Child Care Fee money can be spent throughout the city, while the Eastern Neighborhoods Infrastructure Impact Fee money must be spent within the Eastern Neighborhoods. For child care, new development has the option to provide directly via an In-Kind Agreement with the City instead of paying the fees, which would result in faster delivery of the public benefit. For all these fees, the amount required for new development in Central SoMa is the maximum allowed under the City’s nexus studies related to schools and child care.

The timing of delivery of these public benefits is uncertain. New school facilities will cost significantly more than the contribution expected from Central SoMa, and therefore will rely on additional revenues, including those collected by the School Impact Fee over the previous and future years. New child care facilities could be constructed in the near term, based on previously collected fees, or not until later in the lifespan of the project, as revenue accrues.

CULTURAL PRESERVATION

Objective

Support mechanisms that fund the preservation, rehabilitation, and maintenance of historically significant buildings and other cultural resources (see Plan Objective 6.5 and accompanying policies).

Estimated Contribution from Development in Central SoMa

\$40 million

Funding Source(s)

- *Central SoMa Mello-Roos Community Facilities District (CFD)* (\$20 million), through annual collection of the tax; and
- Requirement on new development to purchase Transferable Development Rights (\$20 million).

Results and Timing

The \$20 million from the CFD would be allocated to preservation and rehabilitation of the Old Mint. The CFD is a tax tied to new development that typically lasts for 30 years. As such, it would accumulate over the life span of the Plan and beyond. It could accrue earlier if the City bonds against it.

Transferable Development Rights (TDR) is a development requirement for new large development to acquire unused development rights from historic buildings with unused zoning potential (and thus funding their preservation). While the transfer of these rights is recorded and monitored by the City, the transactions themselves are private and the cost fluctuates with market conditions. The Plan proposes to enact this program in the Plan area where it does not currently apply. The \$20 million is based on the cost to new development of purchasing 800,000 square feet of TDR at an average of \$25 per square foot.¹² The 800,000 square feet purchased represents about 50% of the approximately 1.6 million square feet of TDR potentially eligible for sale from buildings in Central SoMa.

COMMUNITY SERVICES

Objective

Provide space for community services (such as health care and job training) to meet the needs generated by new development in the neighborhood (see Plan Objective 2.6 and Policy 2.6.3). The demand is estimated at approximately 60,000 square feet of space, based on the City's recent nexus study.

Estimated Contribution from Development in Central SoMa

\$20 million

Funding Source(s)

Central SoMa Community Services Fee (\$20 million), through direct payment of the fee to the City.

Results and Timing

All of the fee revenue would be directed to funding the development of space for community services in the neighborhood. The amount of funding is intended to facilitate the construction of approximately 60,000 square feet of space, thereby meeting the demand. As an impact fee, the funding would accrue with development over the lifespan of the Plan. The fee would be directed to the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development, potentially to support co-location of community services in new affordable housing developments. Because the development of these affordable units would fall behind the market rate development that provided the fees or land, the development of community facilities is likely to fall behind as well. New development will be given the option to provide community facilities directly via an In-Kind Agreement with the City instead of paying the fees, which would result in faster delivery of the public benefit.

¹² \$25 represents the average price for the sale of TDR over the 30 year history of the program. See http://onesanfrancisco.org/wp-content/uploads/R_TDR_Market_Study_062113.pdf



PART II: **CENTRAL SOMA IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY**

REQUIREMENTS FOR NEW DEVELOPMENT

REQUIREMENTS FOR NEW DEVELOPMENT

Context

Goal #1 of the Central SoMa Plan is to increase the capacity for jobs and housing in the neighborhood, so as to help address social, economic, and environmental concerns. However, increasing the population of the neighborhood requires significant investments in infrastructure. As such, the City places requirements on new development to help ameliorate and mitigate its impacts. As well, various land use controls are also put in place to ensure that new development in Central SoMa reflects the characteristics of SoMa and achieves of the ideals put forward by the Plan.

The purpose of this document is to provide a comprehensive catalogue of the new development requirements proposed by the Central SoMa Plan. These new requirements are in addition to all current ones, including financial contributions from the Transportation Sustainability Fee, Jobs-Housing Linkage Fee, Child Care Fee, Schools Fee, and Eastern Neighborhoods Impact Fee.^{1,2}

Approach

The new requirements have been calibrated such that development projects are financially feasible while maximizing the City's ability to ameliorate impacts.

This calibration is an essential part of meeting the Plan's vision for a sustainable neighborhood. Were the

requirements set too low, the City would get needed development, but not be able to address its impacts. Were requirements set too high, development would not occur because it would be financially infeasible, and thus the City would get neither the development nor the public benefits.

The financial feasibility is based on models commissioned by the Planning Department and undertaken by Seifel Consulting. These models examined a range of development types and sizes. That being said, every development project in San Francisco has its own unique set of circumstances which cannot be accounted for by this model. As such, the City recognizes that these requirements may make some particularly challenging development projects financially infeasible.

Methodology

The increase in development is calculated as follows:

- For parcels being rezoned from SALI or SLI to MUO or WSMUO, the increase in development capacity is the new height limit.
- For other parcels, the increase in development capacity is the difference between the new height limit and the old height limit.

After determining the increased development capacity, parcels in the Plan Area were divided into five categories. If the Plan does not propose to increase development capacity on the site, then no new requirements would apply.³ If the Plan does propose to increase development capacity, then a parcel has been assigned one Tier for any residential development that occurs, and one Tier for any non-residential development that occurs, as shown in Table 1 and in Figures C.1 and C.2.

¹ For the Eastern Neighborhoods Impact Fee, parcels currently fall into one of three Fee Tiers (Per Planning Code Section 423.2, established in 2008 for parcels in East SoMa and 2013 for parcels in Western SoMa): 1) Tier 1 are parcels which received no increase in their height limit by the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan, 2) Tier 2 are parcels which received a 9 to 28 foot increase in their height limit, and 3) Tier 3 are parcels which received an increase in their height limits greater than 28 feet. These Fee Tiers will be readjusted based on the change in height limits proposed by the Central SoMa Plan, as follows: 1) parcels that do not receive an increase in height will remain at their current Eastern Neighborhoods Fee Tier; 2) parcels in Tier 1 which receive a height limit increase of 9 to 28 feet will move to Tier 2; 3) parcels in Tier 1 which receive a height limit increase greater than 28 feet will move to Tier 3; and 4) parcels in Tier 2 which receive a height limit increase greater than 9 feet will move up to Tier 3. These adjustments are independent of the assignment of Central SoMa Tiers, discussed below.

² The amount of these existing fees can be found here (note that these numbers are updated annually): http://default.sfpplanning.org/administration/Master_Impact_Fee_Schedule_2016_DBI_Register-040416.pdf

³ Note that this discussion does not include design and/or sustainability requirements discussed in the Implementation Matrix, which would apply to all projects in the Plan Area.

Table 1

CENTRAL SOMA DEVELOPMENT TIERS

INCREASED DEVELOPMENT CAPACITY	RESIDENTIAL	NON-RESIDENTIAL
15-45 feet	Tier A	Tier A
50-85 feet	Tier B	
90-165 feet	Tier C	Tier B
170 feet or more	Tier D	

The requirements for each Tier are discussed below.

Residential Development

The following requirements are proposed for the residential portion of any new development.

Note that the Below Market Rate (BMR) housing requirements proposed here are different than (i.e., less than) those adopted by the City through June 2016’s Proposition C, which are 25% for the on-site option and 33% for the off-site and in-lieu options. The proposed Central SoMa BMR requirements were based on analysis completed many months before the recent passage of Prop C and were considered in tandem with the comprehensive set of other new proposed development requirements proposed under the Plan. Prop C permits the Board of Supervisors to adjust its

initial percentages of 25% and 33%; to inform any such change Prop C directed the City to conduct a financial feasibility assessment, underway by the Controller’s Office as of publication of this document in early August 2016. The final Central SoMa Plan will be considered in light of the citywide BMR requirements that exist at the time of Plan approval in 2017; as such the Plan’s proposals may need to adjust based on the overall changes to the citywide BMR program requirements. However, the Plan rates proposed in this document, combined with other measures (such as the new Central SoMa Fee and existing Jobs-Housing Linkage Fee), are sufficient for the City to achieve its target of 33% housing affordability in all new development in the Plan Area while still providing other necessary public benefits.

Also note that impact fees are paid once at initiation of construction, while a Mello-Roos Community Facilities District (CFD) is paid annually for at least 30 years.⁴ As such, overall the requirements for Tier C are greater overall than those for Tier B (because it contributes to the CFD), even though some of the individual requirements are lower.

⁴ Though the actual length of the tax could be longer. This will be determined at the establishment of the Community Facilities District upon Plan adoption.

Table 2

REQUIREMENTS FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

REQUIREMENT	TIER A	TIER B	TIER C	TIER D
Below Market Rate Housing: On-Site Option	16%	20%	18%	18%
Below Market Rate Housing: Off-Site and In-Lieu Options	28%	33%	30%	33%
Central SoMa Fee	N/A	\$20	N/A	\$20
Mello-Roos Community Facilities District	N/A	N/A	Condo: <u>\$6.44/nsf/yr</u> Rental: <u>\$2.59/nsf/yr</u>	Condo: <u>\$6.44/nsf/yr</u> Rental: <u>\$2.59/nsf/yr</u>
Community Facilities Fee	<u>\$1.30/gsf</u>	<u>\$1.30/gsf</u>	<u>\$1.30/gsf</u>	<u>\$1.30/gsf</u>
Transferable Development Rights	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Production, Distribution, and Repair (PDR)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

N/A = Not applicable

Non-Residential Development

The following requirements are proposed for the non-residential portion of any new development.

Note that the proposed PDR requirements are slightly different than those introduced by the Board of Supervisors on August 2, 2016 as a proposed November 2016 ballot measure. If the proposed ballot measure is approved by the voters in November, the final Central SoMa Plan may need to adjust these requirements. However, the rates proposed currently by the Plan are sufficient to meet the Plan target of no net loss of PDR due to the rezoning of industrial areas by the Plan.

See above for a discussion of the relative financial impact of fees versus the CFD.


Table 3

REQUIREMENTS FOR NON-RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

REQUIREMENT	TIER A	TIER B
Central SoMa Fee		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ for projects seeking an Office Allocation 	\$13.75	\$2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ for projects not seeking an Office Allocation 	\$33.75	\$22.75
Mello-Roos Community Facilities District	N/A	\$4.48/gsf/yr
Community Facilities Fee	\$1.75	\$1.75
Transferable Development Rights	N/A	1.25 FAR
Production, Distribution, and Repair (PDR)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ for projects seeking an Office Allocation in areas formerly zoned SALI 	0.5FAR or 100% replacement, whichever is higher	0.5FAR or 100% replacement, whichever is higher
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ for projects seeking an Office Allocation in areas formerly zoned SLI 	0.5FAR or 50% replacement, whichever is higher	0.5FAR or 50% replacement, whichever is higher
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ for projects not seeking an Office Allocation 	N/A	N/A

N/A = Not applicable

Figure C.1




Residential Fee Tiers
CENTRAL SOMA

- Tier A (15'-45' increased development capacity)
- Tier B (50'-85' increased development capacity)
- Tier C (90'-165' increased development capacity)
- Tier D (170' or more increased development capacity)

1,000 Feet



Figure C.2




Non-residential Fee Tiers

CENTRAL SOMA

- Tier A (15'-85' increased development capacity)
- Tier B (Over 90' increased development capacity)

1,000 Feet





PART II: **CENTRAL SOMA IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY**

GUIDE TO URBAN DESIGN

PURPOSE

- To convey design guidance that is specific to Central SoMa in a way that complements and supplements the requirements of the Planning Code and pending citywide Urban Design Guidelines; and
- To visually demonstrate Central SoMa Plan bulk controls.

CONTENTS

- 1. Additional Architectural Guidance** This section contains additional guidance for implementing the architectural vision for the Plan Area beyond what was written under Objective 8.6 of the Plan;
- 2. Calculating Skyplane** This section contains a graphical explanation of how to calculate the apparent mass reduction requirements contained in Implementation Measures 8.3.3.1, 8.4.1.3, and 8.4.1.4;
- 3. Visualizing Bulk Controls** This section contains a graphical representation of the implementation of the skyplane, mid-rise, and tower controls contained in Implementation Measures 8.3.3.1, 8.3.3.2, 8.3.3.4, 8.3.4.1, and 8.3.4.2; and
- 4. Neighborhood Renderings** This section contains renderings of how the Plan Area might look from street level after development of a substantial number of its anticipated buildings.



855 Folsom. Photo by Natoma Architects
 178 Townsend. Photo by Blake Marvin, HKS, Inc.

Folsom and Dore. Photo by Brian Rose
 Historic building. Photo by SF Planning
 South Park Cafe. Photo by Julia Spiess and Frank Schott

PART 1: ADDITIONAL ARCHITECTURAL GUIDANCE

This section contains additional guidance for implementing the architectural vision for the Plan Area conveyed by Plan Objective 8.6: “Promote high quality architecture that enhances the neighborhood.” Specifically, it includes guidance around the following Implementation Measures:

- 8.1.2.1** Provide fixtures, furnishings, and art at interior and exterior ground floor openings to invite and support use of adjacent public areas
- 8.6.2.1** Utilize application of “skyplane” as a device to create interestingly shaped buildings
- 8.6.2.2** Harmonize new building designs with existing neighborhood materials but in a contemporary or reinterpreted way
- 8.6.2.3** Recognize and enhance existing local form and geometry variations to support neighborhood-specific architecture
- 8.6.2.4** Employ innovative architectural ideas for larger projects that provide a clear organizing principle for design
- 8.6.3.2** Utilize material systems that visually diminish upper facades
- 8.6.5.1** Modulate larger projects vertically or horizontally, whichever is more appropriate, to reflect surrounding lots and massing patterns
- 8.6.5.2** For projects with more than one building, recognize and respond to the existing pattern of long blocks, open spaces, and large and small streets
- 8.6.5.3** Vary the roofs of buildings for projects with long facades.

Developing Site Concepts and Massing

Unlike downtown, the South of Market long blocks, low-rise buildings, and wide streets provide a more open experience of sun and sky. Central SoMa alleys contrast this “bigness” with more human-scaled environments.

Below are suggested, not prescribed, means that meet the intention of the implementation measure.

Support Lots of Sky

Employ the flexibility of skyplane to creatively shape upper mass away from large streets and alleys. When employing skyplane, consider the building base to be the prominent and durable architecture and the upper building portion above the urban room as a more recessive, sculptural or even ethereal component. Consider volumetrically sculpting the tops of buildings to reflect the human scale, for example: contemporary versions of the mansard roof, indentions for smaller-scale balconies, clock towers, or light boxes that express interior use.

Enhance Horizontality

While vertical articulations are common in most of San Francisco, designers working in the southern portion of Central SoMa should consider how horizontal geometry reads more strongly. The long blocks of Central SoMa offer opportunities for large floorplate

buildings but long undifferentiated facades, however, are not ideal for a positive street experience. Consider developing a modulated horizontality to express the existing environment, but with other articulations and fine-grained texture to create a visually compelling urban room.

Precinct-Specific Form

Central SoMa has several distinct building clusters that require more nuanced site design considerations, for example: 5th and Brannan, South Park, 5th and Howard, smaller residential enclaves, and parcels close to the freeway. Note and respond to urban form types and scales within these areas including nearby proposed projects.

Enhance a Scale-shift


Recognize the scale changes from the large street environments to the small scale alleys by relating facade textures and modulation to equivalent heights



Bryant Street elevation. Photo by Google Maps



Brannan Street. Photo by SF Planning



Taber Alley. Photo by SF Planning

and proportions. Consider how building or landscape corners turn between these two environments and how the pedestrian experience can transition. Examine building openings that lead to alleys or open spaces for opportunities as gateways. Include neighborhood landmark features such as clock towers, special geometry, refined materials, coloration or other demarcating devices.

Engage Wide Streets

The existing wide streets of Central SoMa will remain and be reinforced as the streetwall heights are designed to match their widths. Alternating big and small gaps are a familiar pattern in the pedestrian experience of Central SoMa. Designers should consider the cadence, proportions, and widths of alleys and wide streets in developing mid-block passages, entries to POPOS and courtyard spaces.

Selecting Contextual Materials

Central SoMa has rich and varied histories that have left material patterns and scales. Contemporary architecture and construction techniques should express their time, but thoughtfully within the lineage of the neighborhood.

Below are suggested, not prescribed, means that meet the intention of the implementation measure.

Express Industrial Legacy

Consider re-introducing familiar elements from historic building elements, for example: sawtooth light portals, longer spans for open floorplates, corrugation for texture and articulation, roll up doors to support active street frontages, and small wall openings to highlight the human scale. These elements should not be considered an industrial aesthetic but rather a reinterpretation of their benefits for contemporary programs and uses.



Neighborhood buildings. Photo by SF Planning

Support Historic Character

Adaptively re-use existing fabric in innovative ways. This includes developing very contemporary language or “hyphenations” with older low-rise buildings.

Provide masonry buildings

Designers should consider using materials that offer textures or geometries at the scale of brick. While brick is not endemic to all of Central SoMa, its scale of texture, however, is a familiar pattern demonstrated in earlier eras, such as corrugated metal, plate steel, industrial sash windows, larger window spans, frame buildings, and load-bearing masonry buildings with large spans. Consider contemporary materials that employ similar logics for scale, texture and access but avoid mimicry or appropriation.

Offer Gritty Architecture

Repeatedly noted by residents as both a benefit and detriment, the “grit” of Central SoMa can be positively interpreted as environments that are “eclectic,” “surprising,” or “hardy.” Provide durable materials at the ground floor that are more rugged and resilient. Consider using facade systems that allow for small-scale flexible or modular insertions that would be easy to repair or swap for a change in technology, artistic exploration, or other future adaptation. Offer pedestrian scale indentions at the ground floor that could host seating or outdoor work areas. Support production activities being visible from or extending into the alley network.

Programming Architecture to Support Public Space

Central SoMa's history of industrial and art production have fostered it as a place of innovation and experimentation. Consider how furnishings and programming will help Central SoMa support this character and evolve over time.

Below are suggested, not prescribed, means that meet the intention of the implementation measure.

Support the Alley Experience

Alleys in Central SoMa foster both quiet residential neighborhoods and industrial overflow. Rather than being just utilitarian, they can sponsor art, outdoor workspace or places to hang out. The Department recommends thoughtfully inventing alley way uses that can support full and safe pedestrian use while still facilitating loading and the other rougher functional uses needed by PDR users at the ground level.

Offer Mid-Block Surprises

To animate alleys and public open space, offer and program small spaces that are flexible for different activities, for example, fold out galleries, flexible kiosks, micro-retail, art or lighting installations, playful street furnishings, or places for outdoor workshops or maker activities. Create stewardship programs that



Taber Alley. Photo by Street Arts SF

support or host curated events or activities. Where panels, solid surfaces, or other less pedestrian-friendly elements are required for utilitarian purposes, consider those as opportunities for art, special materials, or display.

Provide Maker Spaces


As a place of production, Central SoMa favored interior uses that were rough, eclectic, and supported invention and less pristine or tightly honed activities. Consider PDR as an active ground floor use where making or distributing material goods can be a recognized human endeavour through the use of transparency, openings, lighting, and doorways. Consider inventing ways for this use to invite pedestrian views or engagement through affiliated retail or more organized cultural events.



Loading dock near Little Skillet. Photo credit: Kendra Aronson.

PART 2: CALCULATING SKYPLANE

This section contains a graphical explanation of how to calculate the “skyplane” requirements contained in Implementation Measures 8.3.3.1, 8.4.1.3, and 8.4.1.4.



PART 3: VISUALIZING BULK CONTROLS

This section contains a graphical representation of the implementation of the skyplane and tower controls contained in Implementation Measures 8.3.3.1, 8.3.3.2, 8.3.3.4, 8.3.4.1, and 8.3.4.2. It includes images for three kinds of buildings:

Buildings taller than 160 feet subject to tower controls


Buildings above 85 feet but not taller than 160 feet subject to skyplane controls

Buildings 85 feet and less subject to skyplane controls when fronting on narrow streets and alleys

Bulk Controls for Buildings Taller than 160'

Central SoMa will allow a handful of buildings taller than 160 feet, to punctuate important intersections (such as at the Caltrain station). To support height at these locations while still supporting light, air, and sun access to the streets, the Plan includes:

Below is a majority but not complete depiction of Implementation Measures (referenced by number that may affect the building envelope).



TOWER BULK CONTROLS

TOWER SEPARATION



IMPLEMENTATION MEASURE 8.3.3.4

When there is an existing tower, the second tower should be at least 115'. The distance between towers may be reduced to a minimum of 85' if the difference in the height of the two towers is at least 50' and the bulk of the second tower is reduced relative to the reduction in tower separation, such that at 85', the maximum tower bulk shall be 10,000 sf.

TOWER REDUCTION



IMPLEMENTATION MEASURE 8.3.4.2

For towers 250' or more, the upper 1/3 of any tower must feature minimum bulk reductions of 15% of the floorplate and the maximum diagonal of 7.5%. The upper tower bulk reduction shall not be required for any tower for which the overall tower is reduced from the maximum bulk allowance by an equal or greater volume (above a height of 85').

TOWER BULK



IMPLEMENTATION MEASURE 8.4.1.3

No residential or hotel use would be allowed to have a floor exceed 12,000 gsf. The average floor for commercial uses cannot exceed 15,000 gsf and no single floor may exceed 17,000 gsf. The maximum horizontal dimension would be 150'. The maximum diagonal dimension would be 190'.




Photo by Daniel Austin Hoherd, Flickr (CC BY-NC 2.0).

Bulk Controls for 130' or 160' Tall Buildings


Central SoMa is primarily designed to be a mid-rise district, with buildings of 85 feet to 160 feet. To support this density while still supporting light, air, and sun access to the streets, the Plan includes:

Below is a majority but not complete depiction of Implementation Measures (referenced by number that may affect the building envelope).



SKYPLANE APPARENT MASS REDUCTION %


Height:	Building Face is on:	South elevation %:	North elevation %:	At height:
160'	35' wide street 82.5' wide street	70% 70%	100% 80%	above 35' above 85'
130'	35' wide street 82.5' wide street	85% 50%	100% 67%	above 35' above 85'



Bulk Controls for Buildings 85' or Shorter


Small streets and alleys in Central SoMa offer special neighborhood character. To maintain this character by supporting light, air, and sun access to these streets, the Plan includes:

Below is a majority but not complete depiction of Implementation Measures (referenced by number that may affect the building envelope).



SKYPLANE APPARENT MASS REDUCTION %


Height:	Building Face is on:	South elevation %:	North elevation %:	At height:
85'	35' wide street	70%	100%	above 35'
65'	35' wide street	50%	100%	above 35'
< 65'	35' wide street	10' at 1.25x St width	100%	above 35'



PART 4: NEIGHBORHOOD RENDERINGS

This section contains simple renderings of how the Plan Area might look from street level after development of a substantial number of its anticipated buildings. It is intended to depict the scale and definition of the urban room and not specific building or street design. It includes views from the following vantages:

- A **Fifth and Brannan** looking northwest
- B **Fourth and Townsend** looking northwest
- C **Fourth and Bryant** looking southeast
- D **Third and Brannan** looking southwest



View key locations of renderings found on the following pages.

SF Digital Model by SOM;
Diagram by SF Planning



A.1 View from Fifth and Brannan looking northwest (existing).

San Francisco Digital Model by Skidmore, Owings & Merrill, LLP



A.2 View from Fifth and Brannan looking northwest (potential). This view, looking towards Market Street, depicts both tower and mid-rise projects that will better frame the urban room, complemented by wider sidewalks and more greening.

San Francisco Digital Model by Skidmore, Owings & Merrill, LLP; Entourage by SF Planning



B.1 View from Fourth and Townsend looking northwest (existing).

San Francisco Digital Model by Skidmore, Owings & Merrill, LLP



B.2 View from Fourth and Townsend looking northwest (potential). looking northwest of development potential. This view looking towards Market Street is next to the highest tower height in the plan area. The visual experience of the tower is more from a distance (see view on opposite page) than from the street.

San Francisco Digital Model by Skidmore, Owings & Merrill, LLP; Entourage by SF Planning



C.1 View from Fourth and Bryant looking southeast (existing).

San Francisco Digital Model by Skidmore, Owings & Merrill, LLP



C.2 View from Fourth and Bryant looking southeast (potential). This view, looking towards the Caltrain station, again shows how new and old can co-exist and maintain the neighborhood’s diversity of building types and architecture.

San Francisco Digital Model by Skidmore, Owings & Merrill, LLP; Entourage by SF Planning



D.1 View from Third and Brannan looking southwest (existing)

San Francisco Digital Model by Skidmore, Owings & Merrill, LLP



D.2 View from Third and Brannan looking southwest (potential). This view, looking towards the Flower Mart, depicts the potential to add a substantial amount of development potential while maintaining many of the existing buildings and openness to the sky.

San Francisco Digital Model by Skidmore, Owings & Merrill, LLP; Entourage by SF Planning



PART II: **CENTRAL SOMA IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY**

DRAFT KEY DEVELOPMENT SITE GUIDELINES

DRAFT KEY DEVELOPMENT SITE GUIDELINES

PURPOSE

The Central SoMa Plan Area contains a number of “key development sites” - large, underutilized development opportunities with lot areas ranging from 30,000 square feet to well over 100,000 square feet (see Figure 1). By providing greater direction to the development of these sites, the City has an opportunity to maximize public benefits and to ensure that their development directly delivers critical public benefits, such as:

- **Affordable housing**, per Plan Policy 2.3.1: “Set affordability requirements for new residential development at rates necessary to fulfill this objective;”
- **Protections and incentives for production, distribution, and repair space**, per Plan Policy 3.3.4: “Provide incentives to fund, build, and/or protect PDR;”
- **A large hotel serving the Convention Center**, per Plan Policy 3.5.1: “Allow hotels throughout the growth-oriented parts of the Plan Area;”
- **Pedestrian access**, per Plan Policy 4.1.9: “Expand the pedestrian network wherever possible through creation of new narrow streets, alleys, and mid-block connections;”
- **New public parks**, per Plan Policy 5.2.1: “Create a new public park in the highest growth portion of the Plan Area” and Plan Policy 5.2.2: “Create a new linear park along Bluxome Street between 4th and 5th Streets;”
- **A new public recreation center**, per Plan Policy 5.3.1: “Increase the amount of public recreation center space, including the creation of a new public recreation center;” and
- **Public plazas**, per Plan Policy 5.5.1: “Require new non-residential development and encourage

residential development to provide POPOS that address the needs of the community.”

Finding space on which to locate these kinds of public assets is tremendously difficult in a highly developed neighborhood like SoMa. But on these key development sites, the City can partner with the developer to address the unique design challenges that could constrain the creation of these amenities in exchange for their provision.

The draft Key Development Site Guidelines contained in this document are intended to help fulfill the opportunities for public benefits and address these design challenges. In doing so, these Guidelines are intended to help implement Objective 8.5 and Policy 8.5.1 of the Central SoMa Plan. Objective 8.5 states, “Ensure that large development sites are carefully designed to maximize public benefit,” whereas Policy 8.5.1 states, “Provide greater direction and flexibility for large development sites in return for improved design and additional public benefits.” The intent is for these guidelines to be further refined and codified with the adoption of the Central SoMa Plan, with additional refinement to occur as these projects seek entitlement from the City.

Figure 1

KEY DEVELOPMENT SITES




Figure 2
EXISTING ZONING




Figure 3

PROPOSED ZONING




Figure 4

EXISTING HEIGHT LIMITS





Figure 5

PROPOSED HEIGHT LIMITS



CONTENTS

The following information is contained for each key development site:

- The existing conditions on the site (as of August 2016);
- Its development potential, based on proposed zoning and height limit;
- The “Potential Public Benefits,” which, as the name implies, describes the public benefits that could be provided on the site that are not otherwise required by the Plan, tailored to the unique potential of the site;
- The “Potential Flexibility,” which describes the potential exceptions from the Plan’s Implementation Measures that may be necessary to achieve the increased public benefits, tailored to the unique circumstances of each site and of provision of the potential public benefits; and
- The “Design Guidelines,” which describe site-specific strategies to best implement the Plan’s policies where such explicit direction is not already given by the Plan.

SITE 1: “5TH AND HOWARD”

Existing Conditions

The 31,000 square foot site currently contains a large surface parking lot covering most of its area. It also includes two small two-story commercial buildings, one fronting Howard Street with parking in the rear and one extending from Howard Street to Tehama Street.

Development Potential

Based on the proposed height, bulk and zoning parameters, there is potential for approximately four to five hundred thousand square feet of total development at this site across all uses, including any office, residential, retail, hotel, and PDR on the site. This site is currently under the ownership of a non-profit housing development organization, and the expected development on the site would consist of a residential project with a very high percentage of affordable housing.

Potential Public Benefits

This site has the potential to provide a substantial amount of affordable housing, approximately 400 housing units, at least 2/3 of which would be affordable to very low, low, and moderate income San Franciscans. This would greatly exceed the percentage of below market rate housing otherwise required for the site (as contained in Part C of the Central SoMa Implementation Strategy, “Requirements for New Development”).

Potential Flexibility

Height

The site could contain two buildings – one of 300 feet and one of 180 feet. To maximize affordable housing units, the Plan could allow the 180-foot building to utilize the height to be treated as a mid-rise building rather than a tower (per Implementation Measure 8.5.1.2), in which case it would be allowed to have floor plates larger than 12,000 square feet and be within 30 feet of the adjacent tower.

Massing

Where buildings are taller than 160 feet, the Plan requires a 15-foot setback along all property lines at a height of 85 feet (per Implementation Measure 8.3.4.2). To maximize affordable housing units, the Plan could allow a partial reduction this setback requirement. However, at that height, design techniques including articulation (and not simply materiality and surface treatments) must be used to distinguish the streetwall podium from the tower. The Plan could also modify the apparent mass reduction requirement (per Implementation Measure 8.3.3.1) along Howard Street for the 180-foot building.

Design Guidelines

Parking and Loading Access

To minimize conflicts on Howard and 5th Streets, any parking and loading for provided on this site shall be accessed off of Tehama Street.

SITE 2: “4TH AND HARRISON”

Existing Conditions

The 102,000 square foot site currently contains four single-story buildings, including automobile parking for commuters and other non-residential uses.

Development Potential

Based on the proposed height, bulk and zoning parameters, including requirements for mid-block alleys, there is potential for approximately one million square feet of total development at this site across all uses, including any office, residential, retail, hotel, and PDR on the site.

Potential Public Benefits

Because of its large size, the site has the potential to provide space for one or more of the following as described further below: 1) an affordable housing site, 2) affordable space for production, distribution, and repair, 3) a public recreation center.

Affordable Housing Site

This site contains the potential for dedicating a portion of the site for a 100% affordable housing development while still including a large footprint for a substantial commercial development. Should this site yield an affordable housing site, the preferred location would be interior to the block facing Harrison Street, with a size of between 15,000 – 30,000 square feet (which is the Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development’s preferred size for affordable housing developments).

Production, Distribution, and Repair

Any proposed office building on this site would be required to provide PDR space (per Implementation Measure 3.3.3.1). While the City cannot require that this

space be subsidized as part of the Plan, the project sponsor could provide affordable rents to through a development agreement or other mechanism.

Public Recreation Center

Because of its large size and development potential, this site contains the potential to include the new public recreation center being sought by the City. Such a recreation center could be stand-alone, or for purposes of site efficiency, incorporated into the affordable housing site or a proposed office development. Any proposed recreation center should coordinate the amenities and offerings with those available at the Gene Friend Recreation Center located at 6th and Folsom Streets.

Potential Flexibility

Height

If providing on-site affordable housing and/or a recreation center, the Plan could allow up to 25 feet of additional height on the buildings on the site (per Implementation Measure 8.5.1.2).

Massing

The Plan’s “skyplane” requirements mandate mass reduction from 50-80% along street-facing property lines (per Implementation Measure 8.3.3.1). If required to provide on-site affordable housing and/or a recreation center without diminishing overall project development potential, the Plan could allow a reduction of the “skyplane” requirements along some combination of Harrison Street and 4th Street. This reduction would be designed to shift the building mass in a manner that emphasizes the corner of 4th and Harrison.

Design Guidelines

Mid-Block Connections

Per Planning Code Section 270.2, the site will be required to provide a mid-block connection between Harrison and Perry Streets. The mid-block connection should be located in the middle-third of the block.

Pedestrian Experience under I-80

Current pedestrian conditions along 4th Street under I-80 along could be improved in a number of ways to create a safer, more engaging environment. The project could provide or contribute to public art, lighting and other improvements in coordination with the City.

Parking and Loading Access

Any parking and loading provided shall be accessed off of Perry Street and/or the new mid-block alley.

Privately-owned public open space (POPOS)

New development is required to provide POPOS, on-site or within 900 feet of the project. A good location for this project's POPOS is off-site under the I-80 freeway, on the west side of 4th Street, where it could serve to activate the street (in keeping with Implementation Measures 4.1.10.1 and 5.3.2.1). If provided on-site, the project's POPOS should be oriented towards Harrison Street or a courtyard that is well connected to the surrounding streets.

SITE 3: “2ND AND HARRISON”

Existing Conditions

The site currently contains five buildings. There is a four story, 65,000 square foot commercial building on Harrison Street between 2nd Street and Vassar Place. To the west of Vassar Place, covering the full lot from Harrison Street to Perry Street, is a five story, 150,000 square foot historically significant commercial building. West of that building are three two-story commercial buildings fronting Harrison Street with parking lots fronting Perry Street.

Development Potential

Based on the proposed height, bulk and zoning parameters, there is potential for approximately one million square feet of total development at this site across all uses, including any office, residential, retail, hotel, and PDR on the site.

Potential Public Benefits

As a large site, the site has the potential to deliver one or more of the following as described further below: 1) increased affordable housing, 2) affordable space for production, distribution, and repair, 3) a large hotel.

Affordable Housing Site

The collection of parcels west of the site’s historic building has been proposed for a residential tower. With additional development potential, the site could potentially exceed the affordability levels required by the Plan (as contained in Part C of the Implementation Strategy, “Requirements for New Development”).

Production, Distribution, and Repair

Any proposed office building on this site would be required to provide PDR space (per Implementation Measure 3.3.3.1). While the City cannot require that this

space be subsidized as part of the Plan, the project sponsor could provide affordable rents to through a development agreement or other mechanism.

Large Hotel

The City is seeking large hotels (500 rooms or more) in the proximity of the Moscone Convention Center (as discussed in Implementation Measure 3.5.1.1). This site could accommodate such a hotel.

Potential Flexibility

Height

The Plan contains two potential height limits for this key development site – a lower height and a higher height that could only be achieved through provision of the affordable housing and large hotel described above. This would include up to 200 feet on the Lot 105 and 350 feet on the collection of parcels to its west.

Massing

The Plan’s tower controls establish a maximum floorplate of 12,000 square feet for hotels (per Implementation Measure 8.3.4.2) and a minimum distance of 115 feet between any two towers (per Implementation Measure 8.3.3.4). Achieving the City’s desired minimum number of hotel rooms on-site could require the hotel tower to exceed the Plan’s proposed maximum floor size and dimensions, as well as its minimum tower separation. However, such a tower would be required to be set back on the site such that it is no more visible from the north side of Harrison Street than would be otherwise allowed a building of 160 feet.

Privately-owned public open space (POPOS)

The Plan's POPOS requirements state that the development's POPOS should be open to the sky (per Implementation Measure 5.5.1.1). However, the location of the site adjacent to the freeway is not highly conducive to an outdoor POPOS. Simultaneously, a use that activates 2nd Street for pedestrians is very important along that busy street. As such, the Plan could allow an exception to the requirement that the POPOS be open to the sky, and instead provide an enclosed POPOS, as long as it is at sidewalk grade and has a clear ceiling height of at least 25 feet and meets other standards for design and performance.

Lot Consolidation

To maintain historic neighborhood character, the Plan bans consolidation of lots containing buildings with historic or neighborhood-character buildings (per Implementation Measure 7.6.1.1). As shown in Plan Figure 7.2, several parcels fronting Harrison and 2nd Streets would not be allowed to consolidate with other parcels under this provision. However, on this large site, this requirement may impact the ability to achieve both public benefits and superior design and potential for public benefits. Therefore, the Plan could allow the project to consolidate these lots.

Design Guidelines

Mid-Block Connections

The development site has the potential to add a portion of Lot 112. If this occurs, the development should connect Vassar Place all the way from Harrison Street to Perry Street. However, a second mid-block connection in addition to Vassar Place is unlikely to provide an important pedestrian route, given the

availability of Vassar Street and the lack of a mid-block connection south of Perry Street, and could diminish from the street wall along Harrison Street. Therefore, the project may not be required to develop a second mid-block connection.

Pedestrian Experience under I-80

Current pedestrian conditions along 2nd and 3rd Streets under I-80 along could be improved in a number of ways to create a safer, more engaging environment. The project could provide or contribute to public art, lighting and other improvements in coordination with the City.

Parking and Loading Access

Parking and loading should be provided off of Perry Street or Vassar Place, but not 2nd Street or Harrison Street.

SITE 4: “FLOWER MART”

Existing Conditions

The site currently contains a large wholesale flower mart consisting of single-story warehouses, smaller shops, parking, and ancillary facilities. Additionally, there is a surface parking lot at the corner of 5th and Brannan that has been used to store utility vehicles.

Development Potential

Based on the proposed height, bulk and zoning parameters, including requirements for mid-block alleys, there is potential for at least two million square feet of total development at this site across all uses, including any office, residential, retail, hotel, and PDR on the site.

Potential Public Benefits

As a large collection of parcels, the site has the potential to deliver one or more of the following as described further below: 1) a replacement Flower Mart at subsidized rents, 2) an affordable housing site.

Flower Mart

Any proposed office building on this site would be required to provide PDR space (per Implementation Measure 3.3.3.1). It is important that such space be provided for current Flower Mart tenants as well as future operators, and that the facility is provided at affordable rents to ensure their longevity and financial success. The City and the project sponsor are considering a development agreement to ensure that this occurs.

Affordable Housing Site

Current plans for the site do not contemplate the inclusion of housing, due to potential conflicts with operations of the Flower Mart. However, if

such conflicts were mitigatable, and housing were contemplated on the site, such housing could also provide space for on-site affordability. The large size of the site could enable the potential for a 100% affordable housing development of 15,000 – 30,000 square feet, potentially at the corner of 6th and Brannan, while still including a substantial commercial development.

Potential Flexibility

Massing

The site design is driven by the Flower Mart’s need for a continuous ground floor operation of almost three acres. Given this consideration, the City could allow the following exceptions to skyplane (per Implementation Measure 8.3.3.1), tower separation (per Implementation Measure 8.3.3.4), tower bulk (per Implementation Measure 8.3.4.2), setback requirements (per Implementation Measure 8.3.4.2), and building length (per Implementation Measure 8.5.2.2):

- The potential for the building at the corner of 5th and Brannan to have its 15-foot setback would occur up to a height of 100 feet rather than 85 feet;
- The “mid-rise” portion of the Flower Mart building to go to 200 feet rather than 160 feet, provided this increase is only located internally to the block along the mid-block connection created by the project;
- A reduced setback at 85 feet along 5th Street for a small percentage of the building;
- A waiver of the reduction in the bulk reduction in the top 1/3 of the tower;
- An ability to exceed the maximum building length of 300 feet if the project still contains architectural

mass breaks (as required in Planning Code Section 270.1) and is largely permeable and open to the elements at the ground floor

PDR Space

To ensure no net loss of PDR due to the Plan, the Plan proposes 100 percent replacement of PDR space in areas being rezoned from SALI to PDR (per Implementation Measure 3.3.3.1). However, by increasing the efficiency of the current Flower Mart, it is possible to have the same amount of businesses and workers on a smaller footprint. As such, the Plan could allow an exception to the 100 percent replacement requirement.

Lot Consolidation

To maintain historic neighborhood character, the Plan bans consolidation of lots containing buildings with historic or neighborhood-character buildings (per Implementation Measure 7.6.1.1). As shown in Plan Figure 7.2, the site parcels fronting both 5th and 6th Streets that would not be allowed to consolidate with other parcels. On this large site, this requirement runs counter to the ability to achieve superior design and potential for public benefits. Therefore, the Plan could allow the project to consolidate these lots.

Design Guidelines

Mid-Block Connections

Per Planning Code Section 270.2, the site will be required to provide multiple mid-block connections. These should be utilized to create an alley network on this block – one of the few in SoMa without one. This should include an east-west connection through the entire block, potentially as an extension of Freelon Street. This should also include a north-south

connection from Brannan Street to the east-west connection.

Pedestrian Experience under I-80

Current pedestrian conditions along 5th Street under I-80 along could be improved in a number of ways to create a safer, more engaging environment. The project could provide or contribute to public art, lighting or other improvements in coordination with the City.

Parking and Loading Access

Parking and loading should be provided off of an existing or new alley. Given the size and industrial nature of this site, it may require multiple parking access points.

Privately-owned public open space (POPOS)

Due to the site's size, there are multiple ways to meet the intent of the POPOS requirement. This could include pedestrianizing a large portion of the required mid-block connections. This could also include a large centralized public space on the site. Any such space should be oriented to maximize sunshine.

Ground Floor Activation

Presuming the replacement Flower Mart is at the ground floor, it will be important to ensure that the facility is designed to support activation at this level during the afternoon and evening hours when the Flower Mart typically has no to low activity. The portion of the building fronting POPOS should be lined with active commercial and/or community uses that serve the local population into the evenings and weekends.

SITE 5: “PARK BLOCK”

Existing Conditions

The site includes a nearly 100,000 square foot parcel (Lot 045) fronting Brannan and 5th Streets that includes a two-story building of approximately 40,000 square feet that formerly was a San Francisco Chronicle printing plant (now partially used for animal care), as well as a large parking lot. The site includes three parcels fronting Brannan Street, including a 60,000 square foot “L” shaped parcel (Lot 052) currently owned by the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) and used primarily for open air storage of light poles. The other two lots are each about 19,000 square feet and contain low-rise industrial structures; one (Lot 051) contains a one-story auto body shop and the other (Lot 050) is used for additional storage by the SFPUC.

Development Potential

Based on the proposed height, bulk and zoning parameters, including requirements for mid-block alleys, there is potential for approximately one million square feet of total development at this site across all uses, including any office, residential, retail, hotel, and PDR on the site.

Potential Public Benefits

As a large collection of parcels, the site has the potential to deliver one or more of the following as described further below: 1) a public park, 2) an affordable housing site, 3) affordable space for production, distribution, and repair.

Public Park

The Central SoMa Plan has identified this site as the preferred location for a new public park (as discussed in Implementation Measure 5.2.2.1). The potential

park on this site could be up to an acre in size (~43,000 square feet), with a minimum desirable size of approximately three-quarters of an acre (~32,000 square feet). If located on the interior to this typical large SoMa block, it would be protected from noise and traffic by its location and could be accessed by up to six public streets based on implementation of the design recommendations discussed below. Given the limited opportunities to identify a site for a park of this size, the creation of this park is a very high priority of the Plan.

Affordable Housing Site

This site contains the potential for dedicating a portion of the site (between 15,000 – 30,000 square feet) for a 100% affordable housing development while still including a large footprint for a substantial commercial development. Should this site yield an affordable housing site, the preferred location would include a significant frontage facing the proposed park, which would directly benefit the residents and help provide “eyes” on the park around the clock throughout the week, in addition to that provided by the new adjacent commercial buildings, as well as ensuring a diversity of uses fronting the park.

Production, Distribution, and Repair

Any proposed office building on this site would be required to provide PDR space (per Implementation Measure 3.3.3.1). While the City cannot require that this space be subsidized as part of the Plan, the project sponsor could provide affordable rents to through a development agreement or other mechanism.

Potential Flexibility

Height

If providing a public park and/or on-site affordable housing, the Plan could allow up to 25 feet of additional height on the buildings on the site (per Implementation Measure 8.5.1.2).

Massing

The Plan's "skyplane" requirements mandate mass reduction from 50-80% along street-facing property lines (per Implementation Measure 8.3.3.1). Recognizing that the proposed park substantially reduces the site's development potential, the Plan could allow the "skyplane" requirements to be reduced on this site, as viewed from Brannan, 5th, Bryant, and Welsh Streets. This reduction would shift the building mass in a manner that increases sun access to the park by moving it towards the corner of 5th and Brannan, towards Welsh Street, and towards Bryant. The buildings would still need to establish a strong streetwall of 65 feet to 85 feet along the major streets, step back substantially above that height, and use architectural techniques to render the upper portion deferential to the lower portion.

Design Guidelines

Mid-Block Connections

The new mid-block connections required on this site should connect and extend the existing dead end alleys directly to the public open space, and increase the pedestrian permeability through the interior of this block, as follows:

1. *Connect the two ends of Welsh Street:* This alley would provide east-west access through the block and remove two dead-end conditions. This alley

should follow the current alignment of Welsh Street alignment.

2. *Connect Freelon Street to 5th Street:* This alley would provide east-west access through the block and remove a dead-end condition.
3. *Connect Freelon Street to Brannan Street:* This connection should provide direct access to the proposed park (discussed above) from Brannan Street. The intersection of this mid-block connection with Brannan Street should be located as far to the east as possible, in order to effectively reduce the block length, provide most direct alignment to the park, and most closely align with both a proposed mid-block pedestrian crossing on Brannan Street and with a required mid-block connection on block 3786 ("88 Bluxome/Tennis Club" site).
4. *Connect Bryant Street to Welsh Street:* This connection should provide direct access to the proposed park from Bryant Street.

Pedestrian Experience under I-80

Current pedestrian conditions along 5th Street under I-80 along could be improved in a number of ways to create a safer, more engaging environment. The project could contribute to this improvement in coordination with the City.

Parking and Loading Access

Any parking and loading provided shall be designed to minimize conflicts with the use of and access to the public park.

Privately-owned public open space (POPOS)

As required by the Plan, the site will provide a significant amount of POPOS. This space should be located adjacent to the proposed public park to expand its size, and/or designed to enhance access to the park (via making the new mid-block connections pedestrian-only).

Ground Floor Activation

Activation of the park is critical. As required by the Plan, the park shall be lined with active uses, particularly retail, community uses (e.g., childcare), and PDR. To maximize activation, the ground floor uses should be diversified, in terms of users and time of use. Residential uses should be located facing to the park to provide additional eyes on it round the clock.

Light and Wind in the Public Park

The park and the development must be designed cooperatively to ensure that the project remains feasible and that the park does not reduce the site's development potential. That being said, the massing and design of the buildings should afford the park a substantial amount of sunshine and a minimum amount of wind to ensure its use and enjoyment.

SITE 6: “WELLS FARGO”

Existing Conditions

The site includes a 6,000 square foot single-story building containing a Wells Fargo bank branch and a chain coffee shop, as well as a large parking lot.

Development Potential

Based on the proposed height, bulk and zoning parameters, there is potential for approximately three- to four-hundred thousand square feet of total development at this site across all uses, including any office, residential, retail, hotel, and PDR on the site.

Potential Public Benefits

As a single, relatively modest sized parcel the site has the potential to deliver one or more of the following as described further below: 1) affordable space for production, distribution, and repair, 2) a public recreation center.

Production, Distribution, and Repair

Any proposed office building on this site would be required to provide PDR space (per Implementation Measure 3.3.3.1). While the City cannot require that this space be subsidized as part of the Plan, the project sponsor could provide affordable rents to through a development agreement or other mechanism.

Public Recreation Center

This site contains the potential to include the new public recreation center being sought by the City. Any proposed recreation center should coordinate the amenities and offerings with those available at the Gene Friend Recreation Center located at 6th and Folsom Streets.

Potential Flexibility

Massing

Since the site is proposed to be zoned at 200 feet, it could choose to develop as a tower, subject to the rules discussed in Implementation Measure 8.3.3.4, and the exceptions discussed here would not be necessary. However, if the site chooses to develop subject to the controls of a mid-rise building, with a maximum height of 160 feet, it could provide significantly more light and air onto Freelon Alley than the tower scenario. To support this outcome, the Plan could allow 1) an alteration of the skyplane requirements so that there is still significantly more light and air on Freelon Street than under the tower scenario, though less than otherwise required by Implementation Measure 8.4.1.1, and 2) a minor reduction in apparent mass reduction on Brannan Street. Such a gesture could help emphasize the importance of the corner of 4th and Brannan Streets.

Privately-owned public open space (POPOS)

To maximize development potential on the site, and in return for the public benefits described above, the City could allow the POPOS not open to the sky, as long as it has a clearance of at least 25 feet and meets other standards for design and performance included in Implementation Measure 5.5.1.1.

Design Guidelines

Mid-Block Connections

Per Planning Code Section 270.2, the site may be required to provide a new mid-block connection connecting 225-foot long lot frontages on Brannan and Freelon. However, given the existing permeability of the block (via such alleys as Freelon, Welsh, Zoe, and Ritch), such an alley is not necessary. If provided,

it should serve as a POPOS and be activated by uses within the development.

Pedestrian Experience under I-80

Current pedestrian conditions along 4th Street under I-80 along could be improved in a number of ways to create a safer, more engaging environment. The project could provide or contribute to improvements in coordination with the City.

Parking and Loading Access

Any parking and loading provided shall be accessed off of Freelon Street, rather than 4th Street or Brannan Street.

Privately-owned public open space (POPOS)

Part of the POPOS requirement on this site can be met through the required five foot setback along 4th Street, which is necessary to provide adequate sidewalk widths (see Implementation Measure 4.1.1.2). As per the remaining POPOS requirement, notwithstanding the potential exception discussed above, a good location for this project's POPOS is off-site under the I-80 freeway, where it could serve to activate the street (in keeping with Implementation Measures 4.1.10.1 and 5.3.2.1). If such a POPOS is infeasible, the site should consider a pedestrianized mid-block connection on the eastern end of the property (as discussed above) or through a setback along Freelon Street. The POPOS should not be provided as a "carve out" along 4th or Brannan Streets that diminishes from the streetwall provided by the building (per Implementation Measure 8.1.3.1).

SITE 7: “88 BLUXOME/TENNIS CLUB”

Existing Conditions

The site is currently utilized as a private recreational facility, most prominently featuring the city’s only indoor tennis courts.

Development Potential

Based on the proposed height, bulk and zoning parameters, including requirements for mid-block alleys, there is potential for approximately one million square feet of total development at this site across all uses, including any office, residential, recreational, retail, hotel, and PDR on the site.

Potential Public Benefits

This large site has the potential to deliver one or more of the following as described further below: 1) an affordable housing site, 2) public recreation center, 3) Bluxome Linear Park.

Affordable Housing Site

This site contains the potential for dedicating a portion of the site (between 15,000 – 30,000 square feet) for a 100% affordable housing development while still including a large footprint for a substantial commercial development. Should this site yield an affordable housing site, the preferred location would be interior to the block.

Public Recreation Center

This site contains the potential to include the new public recreation center being sought by the City. For purposes of site efficiency, such a recreation center could be incorporated into the affordable housing site or a proposed office development. Any proposed recreation center should coordinate the amenities and offerings with those available at the Gene Friend Recreation Center located at 6th and Folsom Streets.

Bluxome Linear Park

The site contains the potential to create the new linear park along Bluxome Street between 4th and 5th Streets. While part of this requirement could meet the Plan’s POPOS requirements (per Implementation Measure 5.5.1.1), construction of the entire park would likely exceed the amount of required POPOS.

Potential Flexibility

Height

If providing an on-site affordable housing and/or a public recreation center, the Plan could allow up to 25 feet of additional height on the buildings on the site (per Implementation Measure 8.5.1.2).

Massing

The Plan’s “skyplane” requirements mandate mass reduction from 50-80% along street-facing property lines (per Implementation Measure 8.3.3.1). In return for the public benefits discussed above, the City could allow a reduction of the “skyplane” requirements along some combination of Bluxome, Brannan, and 5th Streets. This reduction would be designed to shift the building mass in a manner that emphasizes the corner of 5th and Brannan Streets. For the potential tower on the western portion of the site, the design should explore ways to increase floorplates and dimensions in a fashion that is minimally visible from the street, given the depth of the development lot. For the potential mid-rise building in the eastern portion of the site, it may be necessary to add mass on the upper floors to account for development capacity lost in providing the additional public benefits. These potential exceptions should be mindful of potential shadow impacts on the proposed park on the north side of Brannan Street (see “Park Block” site).

Production, Distribution, and Repair

The Plan requires that any proposed office building on the site would be required to provide PDR space (per Implementation Measure 3.3.3.1). The City could allow this PDR requirement to be waived in return for providing more than one of the public benefits discussed above.

Design Guidelines

Mid-Block Connections

Per Planning Code Section 270.2, the site will be required to provide a mid-block connection between Brannan and Bluxome Streets. The mid-block connection between Brannan and Bluxome Streets should be located in the middle-third of the block. While a new mid-block connection could be required east from 5th Street, it is unlikely that such a connection would benefit the circulation pattern in the area, and is therefore not a priority.

Parking and Loading Access

Any parking and loading provided shall be accessed off of Freelon Street, rather than 4th Street or Brannan Street. To minimize disruption of the proposed linear park along Freelon, this loading should occur as far east on the site as possible.

Light and Wind in the Public Park

The development on the site should consider its effects on shadows and wind on the proposed Bluxome Street linear park, balancing this issue against other massing considerations on the site.

SITE 8: “4TH AND TOWNSEND”

Existing Conditions

The site currently has several uses. On the triangular lot fronting 4th Street is a single-story building hosting two retail uses – a restaurant and a coffee shop. On the triangular lot fronting Townsend Street is a single story furniture store. In the northeast corner of the site are two residential condominiums and a commercial condominium. These are connected via a driveway to a curb cut at the intersection of 4th and Townsend.

Development Potential

Based on the proposed height, bulk and zoning parameters, including requirements for mid-block alleys, there is potential for approximately one million square feet of total development at this site across all uses, including any office, residential, retail, hotel, and PDR on the site.

Potential Public Benefits

As a large collection of parcels, the site has the potential to deliver one or more of the following as described further below: 1) an architectural identifier for the Plan Area, 2) pedestrian access to transit.

Architecture

The corner of 4th and Townsend is the intersection of two rail lines – Caltrain and the Central Subway. The Plan seeks to emphasize the importance of this location by establishing the Plan Area’s highest height limits. Additionally, the Plan seeks to use distinctive architecture to demarcate the importance of this site and serve as an identifier of Central SoMa on the skyline.

Pedestrian Access to Transit

The ongoing upgrades to Caltrain and the completion of the Central Subway are both going to bring a lot of new people to the intersection of 4th and Townsend Streets. To facilitate the movement of these pedestrians across this busy intersection, this development site should consider incorporation, in the plaza or in a ground floor space adjacent to the plaza, underground pedestrian access to the Caltrain station.

Potential Flexibility

Land Use

The Plan requires parcels larger than 30,000 square feet south of Harrison Street to be primarily non-residential (per Implementation Measure 3.1.1.1). The Plan could allow this site to be a primarily residential development, with potential for ground floor retail. This exception would be tied to the provision of non-residential development beyond otherwise required at an affiliated site (i.e., the Park Block site, currently proposed for development by the same sponsor).

Massing

The site has the potential for two towers designed in an architecturally superior way. Given this consideration, the City could allow the following exceptions to tower separation (per Implementation Measure 8.3.3.4), tower bulk (per Implementation Measure 8.3.4.2), setback requirements (per Implementation Measure 8.3.4.2):

- A reduced tower separation between the two buildings, to a minimum of 65 feet on the lower half of the building and a minimum of 85 feet on upper half of the building;

- An increase in the bulk such that one of the towers may have an individual floorplate of more than 12,000 square feet on any given floor, but between the two towers, on any given floor the sum would not exceed 24,000 square feet;
- A waiver of the reduction in the bulk reduction in the top 1/3 of the tower, provided that there is distinctive variation in floorplate sizes throughout the tower;
- An increase in the plan dimension of the towers up to 170 feet, and a diagonal of up to 230 feet;
- A reduced setback at 85 feet along Townsend Street, though this setback could be no less than 10 feet; and
- In the northeastern corner of the site, an increase in the height at which the 15-foot setback would occur up to a height of 100 feet.

Design Guidelines

Parking and Loading Access

To minimize impacts to transit vehicles traversing the intersection of 4th and Townsend Streets, all vehicle access to the site must be from an alley connecting to Townsend Street at the eastern edge of the site. New curb cuts are not permitted along 4th Street.

Public Plaza

The City requires residential projects to provide open space, and provides an incentive to make such open space publicly accessible. This site would be a good location for such a public open space, provided in the form of a substantial public plaza at the corner of 4th and Townsend that could be a hub for this busy intersection.



MAYOR

Edwin M. Lee

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

London Breed, *President*

Eric Mar

Mark Farrell

Aaron Peskin

Katy Tang

Jane Kim

Norman Yee

Scott Wiener

David Campos

Malia Cohen

John Avalos

PLANNING COMMISSION

Rodney Fong, *President*

Dennis Richards, *Vice President*

Michael Antonini

Rich Hillis

Christine D. Johnson

Kathrin Moore

Cindy Wu

San Francisco Planning

John Rahaim, *Director of Planning*

Gil Kelley, *Director of Citywide Planning*

Joshua Switzky, *Senior Planner*

Steve Wertheim, *Project Manager*

Amnon Ben-Pazi, *Policy Analysis*

Lisa Chen, *Policy Analysis*

Lisa Fisher, *Policy Analysis*

Susan Parks, *Policy Analysis*

Maia Small, *Policy Analysis*

Jon Swae, *Policy Analysis*

Tim Frye, *Policy Analysis*

Justin Horner, *Environmental Planning*

Michael Jacinto, *Environmental Planning*

Elizabeth Purl, *Environmental Planning*

Jessica Range, *Environmental Planning*

Kansai Uchida, *Environmental Planning*

Gary Chen, *Graphic Design*

Adrienne Hyder, *Graphic Design*

Michael Webster, *Cartography*

Special thanks for the contributions by staff from the:

Mayor's Office of Housing and Department of Public Health (DPH)

Community Development (MOHCD)

Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD)

Recreation and Parks Department (RPD)

Department of the Environment (SFE)

San Francisco County Transportation Authority (SFCTA)

San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA)

San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC)



San Francisco Planning

SAN FRANCISCO
PLANNING DEPARTMENT
1650 MISSION STREET
SUITE 400
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94103

sfplanning.org

    /sfplanning