



SOUTH OF MARKET PROJECT AREA COMMITTEE
1035 FOLSOM STREET SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94103
415.487.2166 Fax 415. 487.2169 website: <http://www.sompac.com>
Advisory Body to the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency

SPECIAL ZONING COMMITTEE
Tuesday October 16, 2007
5:00 Noon

Presiding Chair (5:03 PM)
Chris Durazo

Chair's Report (5:03 PM)

Ms. Durazo announced that she would like to begin the meeting with introductions. Members and guests introduced themselves.

Roll Call (5:04 PM)

Present: Chris Durazo/SOMCAN, Ingrid Aquino (16:00 PM), Raymon Smith (16:00 PM) and Antoinetta Stadlman (15:11 PM)

Absent: John Melone/SAN and Charles Range/SOM Health Center

PAC Staff: Marcia Ban and Karen Nolan

Agency Staff:

Guests: Joshua Morgan/SOMPAC member, Claudia Flores and Andres Power/Planning Department

Review of Minutes (5:05 PM)

Minutes were reviewed

Agenda Order (5:06 PM)

It was agreed to follow the agenda as is.

Announcement of next Special Zoning Committee meeting

The next meeting will be announced at a future date.

Agenda Item 6. Review and Discussion of Draft EIR on East SOMA by Chris Durazo (5:07 PM)

Ms. Durazo referred to the document regarding concerns raised by the Zoning Committee and stated that the purpose of this group is to determine the impact of the Eastern Neighborhoods zoning on SOMPAC. She referred to the list of concerns and stated that these are the noted concerns of the group from the last meeting and this does not reflect in any way the position of the full PAC.

Ms. Flores handed out maps of the proposed zoning and height changes for the Eastern Neighborhoods and stated that we can review and discuss the key changes. Referring to the map, **Ms. Flores** stated that the light yellow areas would remain the same, as the residential enclaves districts (RED), the red areas would be neighborhood/commercial/transit (NC-T) zones, the dark yellow would be mixed-use residential (MUR) and the dark orange areas would be mixed-use general (MU) zones where most types of uses are allowed within the South of Market Project Area – refer to the back of the map handed out for specific allowed uses.

The open space requirements would be raised for all areas, but mostly in the mixed-use, NCT and residential enclaves. The current requirement of 33 square feet of open space per dwelling unit would be changed to 80 square feet and 50 percent can be publicly accessible, or the developer can pay into the open space impact fee.

Ms. Flores referred to parking and stated that all districts would have no parking required, but it would be allowed at roughly one parking space for every four units depending on unit size and type. In the mixed-use areas if a developer wants more parking than is minimally allowed it would be as a conditional use for units with one-bedroom or larger. With regard to light industrial uses, they will no longer be permitted in the NC-T, but they would be in the other new zones. What is already there in terms of light industrial businesses in the NC-T may remain, but no new light industrial will be allowed.

Ms. Flores referred back to the parking requirements and stated that housing can be made more affordable by offering some units without parking for those who don't need the space – it is called unbundling parking from housing – and if the community wants more affordable housing, they must be willing to balance those choices and look at the trade-offs.. SOMA is near many transit hubs and public garages are allowed to be built in these areas. **Ms. Stadlman** wanted to know if there would be restrictions on the size of these parking garages. She stated that a couple of stories would be okay, but not five or six. **Ms. Flores** agreed to check on the requirements and restrictions on parking garages. **Mr. Smith** stated that there are many people that live here, but they do not work here and they must have transportation to work. **Mr. Morgan** stated that he lives here and is able to walk to work downtown, but he must have his car for business outside of the city and his appointments are not always conducive to public transportation. **Mr. Smith** stated that the assumption is that people will purchase affordable units and get rid of their cars. The reality is that you have more cars parked on the street. **Ms. Flores** agreed that parking is a very contentious issue – some people want more, some people want no more and the Department's strategy is to balance that along with all other community and city needs. There was a discussion with regard to parking versus no parking.

Mr. Powers referred to the Eastern Neighborhood Plan and reminded everyone that this plan has been in the process for over five years. He stated that there would be stronger affordability requirements and higher inclusionary housing fees, but the exact numbers have not been determined yet. **Mr. Powers** reminded everyone that the final plan would be presented to the Planning Commission in late December or early January.

Ms. Durazo referred back to the terms of parking and the assumption of affordable housing having no parking. She stated that she does not like the position of parking impacting the cost of affordable housing. **Ms. Durazo** wanted to know if there were any

suggestions of how to curb commuters in this area such as working with the state to close some of the freeway ramps. **Mr. Smith** stated that all groups regardless of whether they are city or state should be working together on this plan. It is important for all groups involved to know what the others are doing. **Ms. Flores** stated that there has been a directive from the Board of Supervisors mandating that all groups work together to ensure that everyone knows what each other is doing. The Planning Department is working with the Mayor's Office of Housing, the Metropolitan Transportation Authority, etc.

Ms. Stadlman mentioned the parking and how it affects the quality of life for those of us who are already here. She is not concerned about others that want to come here in the future. **Mr. Morgan** stated that **Ms. Stadlman** makes a good point. He would not want to react, but instead prepare for the future. He stated that San Francisco will continue to grow and we want it to grow as a community with a good quality of life for the future. People that are buying here feel that this will be a key area as they can walk downtown to work and walk to Union Square to shop. **Mr. Morgan** stated that this group needs to accommodate all groups because without an infusion of cash this area will become strictly a low-income area with a police officer on every corner. **Ms. Stadlman** stated that if you do not build, people will not come here and this is what she would prefer. **Ms. Durazo** expressed concern over the impact on the infrastructure with more people coming to this area.

Ms. Flores referred back to the maps and stated that the service light industrial (SLI) area would remain an area where no market rate housing would be allowed by itself. The Department is working on an affordable housing strategy in that and other areas of the Eastern Neighborhoods. The larger sites would have the option of a "land dedication" model which would allow low and very low-income housing on the dedicated portion of the site. Smaller lots would have a requirement of somewhere along 70%-80% moderate-income housing with the rest being market-rate. You must allow a certain number of market rate units to be able to finance the project. If you require 80% affordable in every project, you run into the question of whether or not anyone would build here. In the case of inclusionary fees, they generally go towards low-income housing, not moderate housing. If parcels end up with height and density increases as a result of the rezoning, basically there would be higher affordability requirements. There are also requirements in this plan for larger units and more open space. The Mayor's Office of Housing is currently working on the increased inclusionary numbers.

Ms. Durazo reiterated her concerns of higher density and the impact on the neighborhood. **Mr. Powers** explained that the highest residential density in the city is in the Mission and even with these changes the South of Market would not even come close to the density of the Mission. He stated that they are looking at the impact fees and are considering higher inclusionary fees. **Ms. Flores** stated that they are looking at a greater density in transit areas and new categories for impact fees.

Mr. Smith stated that he has concerns of bringing in more families and seniors and not having enough open green space for the neighborhood. **Ms. Flores** gave everyone a map reflecting the open space concept. She pointed out that the yellow circles refer to areas that are deficient in open space per capita for San Francisco. This is according to the general plan of the Recreation & Parks Department where this information was obtained.

Mr. Powers referred to the heights and stated that some areas are being proposed for 85 feet height limits requiring inclusionary housing. The heights are currently at 40-85 feet, which means you can build to 40 feet, but could build as high as 85 feet if you build inclusionary housing with a conditional use. They will be removing the conditional use and allowing developers to go to 85 feet with additional increment housing where applicable. They are looking at specific height controls for the alleys by reducing massing height limits. Currently you can build to 85 feet in the alleys and the new plan would only allow you to build up to 40 feet in the alleys. This would help in creating livable spaces in the alleys with strict design controls regarding the height of the ground floor and where garage entrance and exits could be located.

Mr. Smith wanted to know how many affordable units would be required under the new height limits of 85 feet. **Mr. Powers** stated that this has not been determined yet, but it would be somewhere between 20-35 % inclusionary. This is the most aggressive housing requirement in the country.

Ms. Durazo stated that she would like for the SOMPAC to be an advisory body to the Planning Commission as well as the Redevelopment Commission. She would like for it to be necessary to have a neighborhood review process for buildings that go up in this project area. **Ms. Durazo** stated that as a representative of SOMCAN she is not prepared to support this plan without more details. **Ms. Flores** stated that the Planning Department is in the process of writing out the zoning controls and will be releasing new area plans at the end of the month. **Ms. Durazo** would like to set up meetings for discussions on each element of the plan such as transportation, affordability, etc.

Everyone agreed to meet again when there is more detailed information available. **Ms. Flores** will be in touch with **Ms. Durazo** to determine when this would take place.

Public Comment (6:30 PM)

Meeting Ends (6:30 PM)

**Chris Durazo
Chair**