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**Glen Park Community Plan**

**BACKGROUND**

- Draft Plan completed in 2003
- Workshop & Open House (2009)
- Glen Park Festival 2009 & 10
- EIR Meeting (July ’09)
- Glen Park Assoc. presentations
- Plan area mailings
- Transportation Workshop (Nov. 2009)
- Parking Meeting (June 2010)
- Working draft Plan release (Sep 2010)
- Draft Plan comments (Oct 2010)
- Moving towards Plan finalization in 2011
Why a Plan?
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WHY A PLAN?

- Tool to benefit community
- Enshrines neighborhood vision
- Identifies what’s unique & needs care
- Sets policy for the area
- Directs City investment
- Helps attract public funding
Vibrant walkable “Village” core
WHAT MAKES A VILLAGE?

Human Scale
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WHAT MAKES A VILLAGE?

Natural environment
WHAT MAKES A VILLAGE?

Transportation options
Community
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KEY ISSUES

Transportation & Circulation
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KEY ISSUES

Transportation & Circulation

Mega Infrastructure

Development Uncertainty

BART?

Parking?
What is the Plan?
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What is a Plan?

- Policy Framework
- Zoning
- Implementation Program
Draft Plan
Public Comments
Comments

- 60 people!
- Variety of opinions
- Great care for neighborhood
- Not agreement on everything
- Generally support a Plan
- Considering changes
General

“I strongly support this effort and hope very much to see it carried through to realization.”

“I am very supportive of the document and think it paints a lovely vision for what Glen Park can become.”

“We support many of the Plan’s objectives in principle. However, certain aspects of the Plan are cause for great concern.”
“Pedestrian calming initiatives are definitely a move in the right direction.”

“This goal of encouraging walking/public transit is unrealistic and discriminatory.”

“Policies that support the integration of features to promote public safety will make streets more walkable.”

“I really like the idea of keeping the ‘feel’ of the village and maintaining store fronts and making sidewalks and crosswalks more pedestrian friendly.”
Pedestrians

- Much support for pedestrian improvements
- Benches, widened sidewalks, lighting
- Bosworth intersections
- Public safety
- Plan in good place
Transportation

“I also LOVE the idea of a roundabout at Bosworth & Arlington. It is a terrible intersection and I think you have come up with a good solution.”

“I am concerned about the decidedly anti-car tone of the report.”

“The impact of the mega buses (Google, Genentech, Apple) that roam through the n’hood...should be considered.”
Transportation

- Interest in traffic calming projects
- Impact of employee shuttles & freeway traffic
- Left-turn pockets on Diamond Street
- Bicycle projects
- Car sharing
- Refine with SFMTA & community
Parking

“I am concerned about taking away parking spots... since it may result in more shoppers parking in residential areas.”

“I am opposed to the elimination of more parking in Glen Park. Many people...drive because of lack of reliable public transportation or a physical problem.”

“Unlike most residents, I have no support for parking requirements and fully support the lessening of parking requirements.”
Parking

- Parking is already difficult. Reducing parking will make it more difficult.
- Don’t remove parking without adding new parking
- Opportunities to increase on-street parking?
“... we strongly oppose any plan that would facilitate the development of that parking lot.”

“I would support a building on...the BART parking lot...in order to provide densities that respond to the transit rich node of the BART station.”
BART Parking Lot

- Plan sets framework for area
- BART lot should stay
- Family housing?
- Confusion (City & BART, heights)
- Plan continues to stay open
Open Space

“I am in favor of greening and beautifying the BART plaza and surrounding area to make it a more viable, safer, public communal space.”

“Parklets are not needed in the busy, noisy downtown area. Just walk a few blocks and you have 66 acres in Glen Canyon Park.”

“I am a huge fan of daylighting of the creek.”

“I have little faith that the City can maintain Islais Creek if it ever brings its water above ground.”
Open Space

- Interest in creating additional public space
- Mixed reaction to ‘parklet’
- Support for redesign of BART Plaza
- Support for greenway path
- For/against creek daylighting
- Plan states opportunities
San Jose Avenue

“The volume and speed of vehicular traffic on San Jose Ave needs to be addressed.”

“We support adding a wide bike lane and more trees along San Jose Ave. so it does not look so ‘freeway’ like.”

“The plan’s consideration of returning San Jose Ave to a street... is completely unrealistic.”
San Jose Avenue

- Traffic calming improvements
- Increase / reduce congestion?
- Public safety, maintenance, homeless
- Restored neighborhood connections
- Will be determined post-Plan
Impact on Surrounding N’hoods

- Miraloma Park: hilly, infrequent transit service - makes walking difficult.
- Oppose reduction of on-street parking, curb cut restrictions, development of BART lot.
- Neighbors nearby in Bernal Heights support San Jose Avenue redesign.
“I am very opposed to the rezoning discussed. This neighborhood is already dense and cannot take a zoning that has unlimited height restrictions and parking.”

“I feel that there is a missed opportunity to enlarge and encourage more commercial development.”

“Updating the existing zoning is clearly an effort to help BART develop their property.”
How will new zoning affect the Village?
Updating zoning is way to help BART develop their property.
Possible to expand neighborhood commercial zoning?
Chain stores?
Plan is NOT rezoning BART lot
Points of Clarification

- Plan is policy document ➔ Implementation later
- BART is NOT EXEMPT from local planning and zoning
- 65’ height is only for EIR
- Eminent domain WILL NOT be used
- Bike projects approved through separate process
Changes to Plan?

- Language on BART lot
- Short-term projects / “early wins”
- Explore opportunities to add on-street parking
- Car sharing
- Further address shuttles (SFMTA?)
Questions?
Zoning
What is Zoning?

- Every lot in San Francisco zoned
- Sets rules for land usage + development
- Direct and manage growth and development
- How tall can buildings be?
- How many parking spaces?
- What’s allowed inside (i.e. a store, home, auto repair shop, etc)?
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EXISTING ZONING

LAND USE DISTRICTS
- RH-1: Residential, one unit per lot
- RH-2: Residential, two units per lot
- RH-3: Residential, three units per lot
- RM-1: Low Density Residential, 1 unit per 800 sf
- NC-2: Neighborhood Commercial, small scale 2 commercial stories
- NC-T: Neighborhood Commercial Transit
- P: Public

40' height limit
RESIDENTIAL

¬ Homes
¬ Apartment buildings
RESIDENTIAL

- Homes
- Apartment buildings

PUBLIC

- Elementary School
- Bosworth green space
- BART station + lot
**RESIDENTIAL**

- Homes
- Apartment buildings

**PUBLIC**

- Elementary School
- Bosworth green space
- BART station + lot

**NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL**

- Retail buildings
- Diamond St.
- Chenery St.
About 50 properties
Roughly 120 housing units
Half of buildings have parking
Neighborhood Commercial Districts
Walkable

Active

Transit

Storefronts
Glen Park Neighborhood Commercial Transit District

Support walkability and transit-orientation

Reflect historic building pattern

Changes to existing zoning

Consistent with other n’hoods
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Highlights

1. Establish a specific Glen Park district
2. Customized use controls (i.e. chain stores)
3. Flexible density + parking in district ONLY
4. Pedestrian street requirements
5. Height bump (5’) for ground floors
6. Legalize pre-existing commercial use (Osha Thai)
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GLEN PARK NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL TRANSIT (NCT) ZONING

- Develop customized controls (Ocean Ave, Union Street, North Beach, others)
- Support walkability, transit, and business
- Allow flexibility in commercial core (parking & housing)
- Control type of uses (chains, hours of operation, etc.)
- 5 ft. height bump for groundfloor stores
Off-Street Parking

- Off-street parking – non required, up to 1 space per unit
- Traditional n’hood pattern
- More flexible use of building
- Consistent w/ character
- Still an option
Ground Floor Heights

- 5’ height increase for ground floors
- More inviting streetfronts
- Support pedestrian environment
- Does NOT allow for additional floor of development.
**Street Frontage**

- Ground floor commercial required
- Strengthen commercial district
- Pedestrian experience
- Limit curb cuts/driveway access (Diamond St., Chenery St.)
- Parking set back from street
Density

- Density – no density by lot area, 40% 2 bedroom units?
- Allows flexibility
Questions?

- Expand commercial district?
- Limit types of uses or hours of operation (bars, institutions, etc.)?
- Restrict chain stores?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Plan</th>
<th>Environmental Impact Report (EIR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning Commission Informational Briefing (Jan/Feb 2011)</td>
<td>Draft EIR – Feb 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan refinement continues</td>
<td>45 day public comment period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Plan Package &amp; Workshops (March - June 2011)</td>
<td>Hearing at Planning Commission during public review period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible Planning Commission Hearings (June/July 2011?)</td>
<td>Comments and Responses document and EIR certification in summer 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thank you!

Questions?