

## **Section Three Appendices**

---

### **Appendix A: Community Comments**

### **Appendix B: Forecast and Growth Allocation 2000-2025: Housing and Jobs**

### **Appendix C: Methodology of Zoning Options Assessment**

## Appendix A: Community Comments

The following tables contain community comments from public workshops where land use maps were discussed or from meetings held at the request of groups or individuals. The tables provide a brief assessment of whether or not a particular rezoning option addresses the comment or how the issue will be handled by the rezoning project.

The comments are grouped by topic. Mostly, the comments are written verbatim as stated. The Rezoning Options A, B, and C correspond to the Low, Moderate, and Maximum Housing development scenarios, respectively, discussed in the public workshops. An assessment of “Yes” indicates the comment’s topic is part of the rezoning option. An assessment of “No” indicates that the subject of the comment has not been incorporated into the land use option developed to date. Subsequent dialogue through the Planning Commission hearings could address such comments. “NA” means the comment is not applicable to the rezoning option (the comment may apply to a topic, such as high density residential housing, not present in one option). “Beyond Rezoning” means that the comment cannot be addressed through rezoning. Some responses, such as partially, under consideration, etc., provide an indication of the current status of an issue not fully addressed by the rezoning options presented in the Workbook.

Some issues have not yet been addressed by the rezoning project because they are part of a secondary group of topics that are dependent on preliminary steps. For instance, developing urban design guidelines should follow decisions about basic land use. However, other comments raise issues such as transportation planning and open space development that may require separate, subsequent efforts.

**COMMUNITY COMMENTS**  
**Bayview Hunters Point**

TOPIC / COMMUNITY COMMENTS (Bayview Hunters Point)	ADDRESSED IN REZONING OPTIONS?		
	A	B	C
<b>Land Use and Character</b>			
Retain the existing industrial areas for PDR uses	Yes	Yes	Partially
Rezone some industrial land for housing and retail uses	No	Yes	Yes
Provide a buffer zone between industrial and residential uses	Yes	Yes	Yes
Zone for a small big-box zone for large retail uses	No	Yes	Yes
Zone for retail and public amenities around health center	Yes	Yes	Yes
Zone for cultural activities in the town center	Yes	Yes	Yes
Zone for retail activities in town center	Yes	Yes	Yes
Provide public amenities such as theaters in town center	Yes	Yes	Yes
No more liquor stores on Third Street	Partially (Restricted use)	Partially (Restricted use)	Partially (Restricted use)
Appropriate zoning to define a gateway along northern entry	Yes	Yes	Yes
Zone for retail and housing along Oakdale street	No	Yes	Yes
Zone for entertainment activities in northern gateway area	No	No	No
Develop special zoning controls for India basin area	Under Consideration	Under consideration	Under consideration
Zone for locally owned businesses and jobs in the town center	Beyond Rezoning	Beyond Rezoning	Beyond Rezoning
Zone for office and commercial uses in northern gateway area	Yes	Yes	Yes
Need a better definition of industrial districts and uses	See Zoning Table in Chapter 2	See Zoning Table in Chapter 2	See Zoning Table in Chapter 2
<b>Housing</b>			
Affordable housing along Third Street	See Workbook Chapter 2.		
Provide housing of varying density for different households	Yes	Yes	Yes
No new housing near heavy industrial	Yes	Partially	Yes
Increase housing density on Hunters Point hill	Beyond Rezoning	Beyond Rezoning	Beyond Rezoning
No higher density housing except on Third street	Not proposed	Moderate Density	Moderate Density

TOPIC / COMMUNITY COMMENTS (Bayview Hunters Point)	ADDRESSED IN REZONING OPTIONS?		
	A	B	C
<b>Parking</b>			
Public parking in garages or surface lots close to town center	May be possible	Under Consideration	Restricted
<b>Open Space</b>			
Recreation facilities such as a park close to town center	Beyond Rezoning	Beyond Rezoning	Beyond Rezoning
Preserve existing vacant lots with native plants as open space	Beyond Rezoning	Beyond Rezoning	Beyond Rezoning
Provide open space near Hunters Point hill	Beyond Rezoning	Beyond Rezoning	Beyond Rezoning
Provide open space near India Basin Shoreline	Beyond Rezoning	Beyond Rezoning	Beyond Rezoning
<b>Transportation</b>			
Re-route truck traffic from Third Street	Beyond Rezoning	Beyond Rezoning	Beyond Rezoning
<b>Height &amp; Bulk</b>			
Heights in India basin should be low at a neighborhood scale	NA	Under Consideration	Under Consideration
Heights should step down from Third Street to other areas	NA	Yes	Under Consideration
Need special standards for bulk control	Not applicable	By design controls	By design controls
<b>Infrastructure and Services</b>			
Address new infrastructure needs and impacts from proposals	Beyond zoning	Beyond zoning	Beyond zoning
<b>Design Guidelines</b>			
Need design guidelines for desired quality of development	Under Consideration	Under Consideration	Under Consideration
<i>Notes:</i> NA = not applicable.			

**COMMUNITY COMMENTS**  
**Showplace Square -- Potrero Hill**

TOPIC / COMMUNITY COMMENTS (Showplace-Potrero)	ADDRESSED IN REZONING OPTIONS?		
	A	B	C
<b>Land Use and Character</b>			
Preserve character of Henry Adams	Yes	Yes	Yes
Think Mission, Van Ness, Lombard, Geary for 16th St. [Each option includes 16th Street as an emergin future transit corridor, but not on the scale of Van Ness Etc.	No	No	No
Identify cultural and neighborhood amenities? [Such uses are permitted in most of the different zoning districts]	Yes	Yes	Yes
For Dagget Triangle area, change Residential/Commercial to a new "cultural and open space" zoning district, e.g., CIE & Open Space (no residential, no office except small nonprofit, reserve some for public open space, develop as gateway).	No	No	No
Concerns about cumulative impacts from Mission Bay, UCSF, Pac Bell Park, and in preserving integrity of existing residential on Potrero Hill. [Part of land use assessment].	Yes	Yes	Yes
On the two blocks abutting 7th St. between Berry and Townsend, change PDR to housing only IF change Dagget to CIE/Open Space.	No	No	No
Discussion supported idea of adding housing in general.	Yes	Yes	Yes
Concerned about housing located near freeways in terms of air quality and health issues.	Yes	Yes	Yes
Development exactions (including transit fee, open space fee, affordable housing fee), should apply to future development and be dedicated to the neighborhood.	Could be developed	Could be developed	Could be developed
Change Anchor Steam "Ind" zoning to Ind/Res (minor comment)	No	No	Yes
Don't require replacement of vacant PDR in Ind/Res district. [Will require ground floor PDR or some replacement].	Yes	Yes	Yes
Define no net loss in the Ind/Res district in terms of jobs.	No	No	No
Create a separate Showroom District within the Ind/Res district.	Yes	Yes	Yes
In the northeast corner, from King St. to Bryant, generally, change Res/Comm to Ind/Res or to spot zoning for existing Office (SEGA, Baker Hamilton) or residential (under const. Project on King).	Yes	Yes	Yes
Allow retail as a permitted use in the Ind/Res zoning district	Yes	Yes	Yes

TOPIC / COMMUNITY COMMENTS (Showplace-Potrero)	ADDRESSED IN REZONING OPTIONS?		
	A	B	C
<b>Land Use and Character</b>			
Concern in implementing no net loss of PDR in the Ind/Res district. Maybe limit to a simple percentage. [Will require ground floor PDR]	No	No	No
Define mix of appropriate PDR uses for the Ind/Res District. Encourage retail on ground floor, preservation of historical structures, retain building characteristics related to PDR use, loading docks etc.	Yes	Yes	Yes
In the southeastern corner of the plan area, change Ind/Res to Res/Comm because it should be housing with mixed use neighborhood commercial.	No	No	Yes
Mandate "Design-Related" PDR for future uses in the design district subarea of the Ind/Res zoning district.	Yes	Yes	Yes
In the Ind/Res zoning district, keep PDR on the ground floor and allow flexibility on where the housing goes.	Yes	Yes	Yes
More commercial activity would require some more housing.	Yes	Yes	Yes
Support design-related PDR in the Ind/Res district. Infill housing is OK, but require NSRs for noise. Permit uses for architects, trade shops.	Yes	Yes	Yes
Liked the flexibility in the Res/Comm zoning district.	Yes	Yes	Yes
Between 7th-8th, Hooper-Bryant, change Res/Comm to HD Res (High Density Residential) to encourage affordable housing.	No	No	Yes
Should be housing above neighborhood commercial in the 16th and 17th St. corridor.	Yes	Yes	Yes
Retain concourse and block to west as IND only.	No	No	No
Allow retail in HD (High Density) Residential.	NA	NA	Yes
Expand housing west one block on eastern edge of residential, to DeHaro.	No	No	No
For the new neighborhood area, emphasize more mixed, nonresidential uses, with some housing VS current emphasis on housing.	Yes	Yes	Yes
Permit night clubs away from housing	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>Density</b>			
Reduce density south of 17th St. from proposed Res/Comm & NC to RH-2	Yes	No	No
Reduce density along the 16th St.-17th St. corridor from the proposed Res/Comm & NC to RH-3 (reduced Heights for PDR emphasis option)	No	No	No
Total housing development not to exceed 2,500 units	Yes	No	No
How to set housing densities in relationship to development of Mission Bay/UCSF? [To be addressed in Land Use Assessment, Forecast, and EIR.	To be addressed	To be addressed	To be addressed

TOPIC / COMMUNITY COMMENTS (Showplace-Potrero)	ADDRESSED IN REZONING OPTIONS?		
	A	B	C
<b>Heights and Bulk</b>			
50' OK along 16th St., limit to 40' along 17th St.	Yes	Yes	Yes
Step Heights down North to South along 7th St. edge from Townsend to 16th St. on blocks abutting 7th St.	Yes	Yes	No???
In Design District area, allow 65' heights west of 8th St. all the way to Bryant	No	No	No
On the block with the Bay Guardian (17th, Mississippi, Pennsylvania, Mariposa), the height map says 40'. Existing height district is 50' (both district and buildings). Need clarification.	Yes	Yes	Yes
The bulk designation should be X for the blocks abutting 7th St. (Dagget/16th to Townsend).	To be addressed	To be addressed	To be addressed
<b>Housing</b>			
Increase affordable housing requirement as heights increase.	No. See Workbook Chapter 2		
5,100-9,000 units?	No	Yes	Yes
Encourage affordable housing thru higher density and concentrate high density housing in the north-most block.	No. See Workbook Chapter 2.		
What type of housing?	NA	NA	NA
Investigate increasing affordable housing with increased height allowances.	No. See Workbook Chapter 2		
<b>Design Guidelines</b>			
Infill projects must follow design guidelines (residential)	To be addressed	To be addressed	To be addressed
Investigate other mechanisms than "rear yards" and other setback that should/could be used to produce open space.	To be addressed	To be addressed	To be addressed
<b>Parking</b>			
Allow parking on the ground floor behind and masked by retail. Need retail depth of 40-50'.	Yes	Yes	Yes
Throughout planning area, use maximum parking requirement plus CU for more parking.	Yes	Yes	Yes
Designate shared parking as a use.	No	No	No
<b>Open Space</b>			
On the area from Berry to Channel Sts., open space or existing uses (storage, warehouse).	No. Could be considered	No. Could be considered	No. Could be considered
Indicate proposed park as part of larger open space system.	No. Could be considered	No. Could be considered	No. Could be considered
Provide more publicly accessible open space, 15% of development in the blocks from 16th to 7th. Arkansas-Hubbel/Wisconsin/Irwin, connection to Mission Bay.	No. Could be considered	No. Could be considered	No. Could be considered
Identify open space early on before these sites get up-zoned (work with Recreation/Parks).	No. Could be considered	No. Could be considered	No. Could be considered
Require public open space in major projects over 50'	No. Could be considered	No. Could be considered	No. Could be considered

TOPIC / COMMUNITY COMMENTS (Showplace-Potrero)	ADDRESSED IN REZONING OPTIONS?		
	A	B	C
<b>Block Pattern -- Street System</b>			
Rethink street system for large blocks (Division, King, Berry, Carolina), block-building pattern, pedestrian walkways, alleys, etc. for large blocks, particularly those abutting 7th St. Establish smaller pedestrian-scale blocks in new residential neighborhoods with convenient broad sidewalks. Create a pedestrian thru-walkway connecting Channel to Berry (essentially a northern extension of 8th).	Could be developed in Design Guidelines.	Could be developed in Design Guidelines.	Could be developed in Design Guidelines.
Encourage the use of alleyways for vehicle access for large blocks along 7th St. through design guidelines.	Could be in Design Guidelines	Could be in Design Guidelines	Could be in Design Guidelines
<b>Transportation</b>			
Encourage bike paths throughout the planning area	No. Could be considered	No. Could be considered	No. Could be considered
Make Henry Adams a pedestrian street from Division to 16th.	Beyond Rezoning	Beyond Rezoning	Beyond Rezoning
Consider traffic circles @ intersections and other traffic calming measures.	Beyond Rezoning	Beyond Rezoning	Beyond Rezoning
Link public transit improvement to development so it occurs with development as opposed to possibly occurring after development.	Beyond Rezoning	Beyond Rezoning	Beyond Rezoning
Need more transit to mitigate traffic impacts.	Beyond Rezoning	Beyond Rezoning	Beyond Rezoning
Leave 17th St. as Residential due to traffic concerns. Direct traffic along 16th and Townsend.	No	No	No
<i>Notes:</i> NA = not applicable.			

<b>COMMUNITY COMMENTS</b>			
<b>Mission</b>			
<b>TOPIC / COMMUNITY COMMENTS (Mission)</b>	<b>ADDRESSED IN REZONING OPTIONS?</b>		
	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>
<b>HOUSING</b>			
Affordable housing emphasis.	See Work Book Chapter 2 (discussion on affordable housing)		
Density bonus for affordable housing.	See Work Book Chapter 2 (discussion on affordable housing)		
Increase inclusionary requirement.	See Work Book Chapter 2 (discussion on affordable housing)		
Affordable and/or senior housing in NEMIZ tail.	See Work Book Chapter 2 (discussion on affordable housing)		
Density/ height bonus for affordable housing.	See Work Book Chapter 2 (discussion on affordable housing)		
Affordable housing only south of MUNI yard.	See Work Book Chapter 2 (discussion on affordable housing)		
Include in zoning ordinance quotas/priorities for affordable housing.	See Work Book Chapter 2 (discussion on affordable housing)		
Incentive affordable housing.	See Work Book Chapter 2 (discussion on affordable housing)		
Ensure enough housing for seniors and families.	See Work Book Chapter 2 (discussion on affordable housing)		
Larger family units.	See Work Book Chapter 2 (discussion on affordable housing)		
Affordable housing overlay zone critical in former NEMIZ.	See Work Book Chapter 2 (discussion on affordable housing)		
Encourage a mix of housing prices and styles.	See Work Book Chapter 2 (discussion on affordable housing)		
Nemiz "tail" and western edge should go residential or mixed use/residential.	No	Yes	Yes
In-law units in residential areas.	No	No	No
Housing for singles on commercial corridors where parking need is less.	Partially	YES	Partially
Orange r/c should be ground floor comm with high density housing above.	NA	Yes	Yes
Housing over big box parking lots along freeway from Potrero to Folsom and between 18th/20th and Harrison/York.	No	No	No
Support for ground fl commercial w/ housing above.	No	Yes	Yes
Refine industrial/ housing border - 18th to 20th might be ind/res mix (blue).	No	Yes	Partially

TOPIC / COMMUNITY COMMENTS (Mission)	ADDRESSED IN REZONING OPTIONS?		
	A	B	C
<b>HOUSING</b>			
The NEMIZ should support a mix of uses including housing, arts, entertainment, office, and industrial. No one use should dominate the neighborhood.	No	Yes	Yes
Encourage housing in Non-IPZ areas.	Partially	Partially	Yes
Encourage neighborhood serving retail in the NEMIZ.	Partially	Yes	Yes
Restrict condo's in NC-T.	Beyond Rezoning. Condo developments are controlled by Department of Public Works' lottery.		
<b>BUFFER ZONES</b>			
Ind/res buffer zone between 19th/20th.	No	Partially	Partially
Increase buffer around IPZ.	No	Partially	Partially
Allow PDR uses which are less Noxious (medium and light) to buffer other uses (retail and residential) from core PDR, and generally allow these uses to integrate into the mixed use areas of the NEMIZ.	No	Yes	Yes
<b>PDR</b>			
Increase flexibility in industrial area.	No	Yes	Yes
Industrial areas PDR only.	No	No	No
Allow restaurants as accessory to PDR.	Yes	Yes	Yes
Better PDR definition - healthy mix but keep office and "biz service" out.	Yes	Yes	Yes
Extend blue (ind/res) 1 block between Harrison and S. Van Ness.	No	No	No
No size limits for PDR uses.	No	No	No
Core industry along freeway, North of 16th street, in NE corner of NEMIZ.	Partially	Yes	Yes
Establish an IPZ for Core PDR uses in the NE corner of the NEMIZ.	Partially	Yes	Yes
Develop a use strategy for multi-story PDR building.	NA	NA	NA
Retain all PDR but add NC-T to this alternative.	Yes	Partially	No
Convert industrial to residential around John O'Connell.	NA	Partially	Partially
Mix PDR, less commercial.	Yes	Partially	No
Encourage ind/res mix (blue) between 18th/20th and Harrison/Folsom.	No	No	No
Retain all PDR but add NC-T to this alternative.	YES	Partially	No
16th ind/res mix (blue).	No	Yes (to the East only)	Yes (to the East only)

TOPIC / COMMUNITY COMMENTS (Mission)	ADDRESSED IN REZONING OPTIONS?		
	A	B	C
<b>PDR</b>			
No office in PDR areas	Yes	Yes	Yes
Define industrial area by Noise, traffic, smell, Not use which changes over time.	No (defined by use)	No (defined by use)	No (defined by use)
No more PDR job loss.	NA	NA	NA
VERY CONCERNED about Non-conforming uses (i.e. what will happen to my loft if it's rezoned for PDR?).	See discussion in Zoning Designations and Options		
Keep existing M1-zoning in place, allowing market forces to determine the future of the neighborhood. /2/	No	No	No
<b>JOBS</b>			
Retain PDR jobs in the NEMIZ.	Yes	Partially	Partially
Create a NEMIZ mixed use district that includes a list of uses tied to clearly defined objectives for jobs and housing.	No	Partially	Partially
The NEMIZ should generate jobs.	Beyond Rezoning	Beyond Rezoning	Beyond Rezoning
Establish short and long range economic development incentives for desired uses including permits, taxes, job training programs, impact fees, and or parking requirements in the NEMIZ.	Beyond Rezoning	Beyond Rezoning	Beyond Rezoning
<b>TRANSIT CORRIDORS</b>			
Agree with NC-T concept and reduced parking along corridors.	Partially	Yes	Partially
Corner stores in residential areas; allow in-laws; 24th 2-3 stories; Mission/Valencia 3-4 stories.	Partially	Partially	Partially
NC-T on 16th.	Yes (to the west only)	Yes (to the west only)	Yes (to the west only)
Better public transportation.	Beyond Rezoning	Beyond Rezoning	Beyond Rezoning
16th street transit corridor overlay.	Partially (to the west only), No overlay	Partially (to the west only), No overlay	Partially (to the west only), No overlay
South of 16th street Mixed Use/Residential.	Partially	Partially	Partially
<b>HEIGHT</b>			
Heights Not a concern.	No	No	No
Lower height and off-street parking around Safeway.	No	No	No
Sensitive to existing building heights.	Yes	Yes	Yes

TOPIC / COMMUNITY COMMENTS (Mission)	ADDRESSED IN REZONING OPTIONS?		
	A	B	C
<b>PARKING</b>			
No parking, res; neighborhood parking garages at fringes.	No	Partially	Partially
Allow developers to build parking away from commercial corridors.	No	No	No
Reduce parking requirements near transit.	Partially	Yes	Partially
Shared parking.	No	No	No
More parking.	No	No	No
<b>OPEN SPACE</b>			
Surround parks with mixed use or residential.	Partially	Partially	Partially
Need parks.	Beyond Rezoning	Beyond Rezoning	Beyond Rezoning
Encourage physical improvements such as planting trees and installing other amenities along streets, especially 16th, 17th, and 20th.	Beyond Rezoning. Could be addressed through urban design guidelines. Refer to tree planting by DPW and beautifications projects by Redevelopment Agency.		
<b>MISCELLANEOUS</b>			
Displacement concerns upzoning 24th.	No	No	No
Armory as youth facility.	No	No	No
Consider establishing air rights for large parcels which could be developed by building on top of existing low intensity uses (for example, PG&E at 19th and Folsom).	No	No	No
Mixed use along 16th with increased heights.	Yes, to the west only	Yes, to the west only	Yes, to the west only
Map A boundaries with Map B spirit.	No	Partially	Partially
New Commercial Corridors S. Van Ness/Folsom 5 stories.	No	No	No
More services.	No	Partially	Partially
Encourage neighborhood serving retail and discourage destination retail.	Partially	Yes	Partially
Buffer zones are preferred in the NEMIZ between incompatible uses, but are Not always realistic or needed given current mix of land uses and the actual external impacts of many PDR businesses.	No	Yes	Partially
Create and maintain clear parking standards for new development in the NEMIZ.	Yes	Yes	Yes

TOPIC / COMMUNITY COMMENTS (Mission)	ADDRESSED IN REZONING OPTIONS?		
	A	B	C
<b>MISCELLANEOUS</b>			
Public facilities which are unlikely to relocate (MUNI) should Not be included in this protection scheme (zone P for public?).	Public will remain P because it is land that belongs to various city agencies		
Develop a transportation plan in the NEMIZ that includes the Mission Creek Bike, pedestrian access and street improvements, truck access, and bike lanes.	Zoning can not develop a transportation plan per se, but this option addresses transit corridors		
Limit bars and restaurants that sell liquor.	Already regulated. No changes proposed in rezoning.		
More true artist l/w.	Live-Work uses are no longer permitted citywide.		
No demolitions.	Beyond Rezoning	Beyond Rezoning	Beyond Rezoning
"Sensitive" renovations.	Beyond Rezoning	Beyond Rezoning	Beyond Rezoning
Increase community safety.	Beyond Rezoning	Beyond Rezoning	Beyond Rezoning
Enhance art spaces in the NEMIZ.	Beyond Rezoning	Beyond Rezoning	Beyond Rezoning
<i>Notes:</i> NA = Not applicable.			

**COMMUNITY COMMENTS  
South of Market (SOMA)**

TOPIC / COMMUNITY COMMENTS (SOMA)	ADDRESSED IN REZONING OPTIONS?		
	A	B	C
<b>Zoning Districts</b>			
Allow everything in industrial area, including large office, except for housing	No	No	No
Lots of truck traffic in areas south of Bryant between 7 <sup>th</sup> and 5 <sup>th</sup> , but the alleys and streets can't accommodate trucks, so it's not a good area for industrial	No	No	No
Wondering if size of IPZ is appropriate. Is it too big?	No	No	No
Parcels north of freeway between 5 <sup>th</sup> and 6 <sup>th</sup> and on both side of freeway between 4 <sup>th</sup> and 5 <sup>th</sup> should be PDR buffer	Yes	No	No
Fine tune zoning on the IPZ for existing office, residential uses	See Zoning Table in Chapter 2	See Zoning Table in Chapter 2	See Zoning Table in Chapter 2
There is more housing between 6 <sup>th</sup> and 7 <sup>th</sup> and Townsend and Bryant	No	No	No
More housing and live/work exists between 5 <sup>th</sup> and 6 <sup>th</sup> and Folsom and Harrison	No	Yes	Yes
Big box favored in industrial area	No	No	No
Some alleys more appropriate for industrial versus residential/commercial	Yes	Yes	Yes
Wanted to apply the zoning that was used in the moderate option to the area east of 4 <sup>th</sup> St.	Partially	NA	NA
More fine grained and appropriate classification of PDR businesses west of 8 <sup>th</sup> .	Yes	Yes	Yes
The IPZ, south of Brannan between 5 <sup>th</sup> through 7 <sup>th</sup> (being closer to Cal Train) should be housing.	No	No	No
In the IPZ area, present industrial uses are not compatible with existing uses (lots of offices in the area). Area is not conducive to truck traffic (Bluxome Street).	No	No	Partially
Preserve existing buildings and retain existing industrial uses south of Brannan between 4 <sup>th</sup> and 5 <sup>th</sup> .	Yes	Partially	No
Extend Ind/Res to entire block from Folsom to Harrison, 12 <sup>th</sup> to Freeway??	No	No	Yes

TOPIC / COMMUNITY COMMENTS (SOMA)	ADDRESSED IN REZONING OPTIONS?		
	A	B	C
<b>Zoning Districts</b>			
Ind/Res concept not realisticó arbitrary why not everywhere? Ok if do more rationally	NA	NA	NA
Wanted Industrial/Residential south of South Park	Yes	No	No
Areas facing Bryant should be Industrial/Residential	No	No	No
Wanted entire industrial area west of 7 <sup>th</sup> street to be Ind/Res	No	No	Yes
Change south of Brannan between 4 <sup>th</sup> and 5 <sup>th</sup> to Industrial /Residential due to nature of existing businesses.	No	Yes	Yes
Include south of Clementia in Industrial/Residential.	No	No	Yes
Make south of Folsom between 5 <sup>th</sup> and 6 <sup>th</sup> , Industrial/Residential.	No	Yes	No
Make south of Folsom between 7 <sup>th</sup> and 8 <sup>th</sup> , Industrial/Residential.	No	Partially	Partially
Expand Industrial/Residential, with a better understanding of how it works.	No	Yes	Yes
Increase the Industrial/Residential at the expense of Industrial, along Folsom & Harrison Corridor, and west of 8 <sup>th</sup> .	No	No	Yes
Industrial/Residential proposed between Bryant/Brannan and 4 <sup>th</sup> /5 <sup>th</sup> block. (Industrial in moderate option)	No	No	No
Allow PDR core with trucking as a conditional use in Industrial/Residential areas only.	PDR core with trucking will not be permitted in PDR/Res district		
In Industrial/Residential areas, provide density bonus for developers to develop PDR in the ground floor.	PDR will be required at 1.0 FAR	PDR will be required at 1.0 FAR	PDR will be required at 1.0 FAR
Add NC-T on 2 <sup>nd</sup> and 3 <sup>rd</sup> to the PDR emphasis alternative	Yes	NA	NA
What about east-west transit corridors? Folsom? Howard? Other NC-T?	NC-T is a limited district, see Zoning Table in Chapter 2 for a description		
require ground floor commercial on frontage to main corridors create excess supply incubators	NC-T is a limited district, see Zoning Table in Chapter 2 for a description		
non-resident/non-parking uses should front the street on the ground floor along Folsom from 2 <sup>nd</sup> to 11 <sup>th</sup> . Residential permitted above 1 <sup>st</sup> floor	No	No	Yes
NC-T on Folsom	No	Yes	Yes

TOPIC / COMMUNITY COMMENTS (SOMA)	ADDRESSED IN REZONING OPTIONS?		
	A	B	C
<b>Zoning Districts</b>			
Extend NC down Folsom St. as opposed to Res/Comm	No	Yes	Yes
Add retail with housing above	Yes	Yes	Yes
Folsom street corridor	No	Yes	Yes
Consider NC-T along 7 <sup>th</sup> between Mission and Folsom.	No	No	No
Extension of NC-T along Folsom until 8 <sup>th</sup> /9 <sup>th</sup>	No	Yes	Yes
More NC-T in Residential High Density Mixed Use areas	No	No	No
Suggests NC-T along 4 <sup>th</sup> street corridor, south of Bryant.	No	No	No
Throughout Folsom, from 4 <sup>th</sup> through 8 <sup>th</sup> , encourage ground floor retail activity.	No	Yes	Yes
Wanted Res/Comm. Along Folsom St. between 7 <sup>th</sup> and 9 <sup>th</sup>	No	No	No
Res/Com between 10 <sup>th</sup> and 11 <sup>th</sup> on Folsom	No	No	No
Res/Com between Folsom and Harrison and between 5 <sup>th</sup> and 6 <sup>th</sup>	No	Yes	Yes
Block north & south of Folsom on 7 <sup>th</sup> as Residential/Commercial.	No	No	Yes
RED on Dore, between Harrison and Bryant	Yes	Yes	Yes
RED important	Yes	Yes	Yes
Protect alleys, expand RED Districts with some features of moderate development (redeeming architectural features, community feeling)	Yes	Yes	Yes
Wanted RED on Kissling between 10 <sup>th</sup> and 11 <sup>th</sup> , Howard and Folsom	Yes	Yes	Yes
Wanted RED on Sheridan, between 9 <sup>th</sup> and 10 <sup>th</sup> , Folsom and Harrison	Yes	Yes	Yes
Preserve existing Residential Enclave Districts	Yes	Yes	Yes
Designate more RED (especially where the actual housing exists).	Yes	Yes	Yes

TOPIC / COMMUNITY COMMENTS (SOMA)	ADDRESSED IN REZONING OPTIONS?		
	A	B	C
<b>Nighttime Entertainment</b>			
Nighttime Entertainmentó permit smaller (by sq. feet) places outright and CU for larger uses, don't use max occupancy, not accurate	Yes	Yes	Yes
Retain entertainment along 12 <sup>th</sup>	Yes	Yes	Yes
Entertainment: P-Neighborhood, low-impact, acoustic; CU-medium-size, amplified, etc., NP-larger, try to find a place but not in neighborhoods	See Zoning Table in Chapter 2	See Zoning Table in Chapter 2	See Zoning Table in Chapter 2
Consider larger entertainment use in the industrial areas, no conflict of use	Yes	Yes	Yes
Allow nighttime entertainment in the industrial district	Yes	Yes	Yes
Does not prefer Nighttime Entertainment near Residential areas.	See Zoning Table in Chapter 2	See Zoning Table in Chapter 2	See Zoning Table in Chapter 2
Inclusion of Nighttime Entertainment (in Maximum option), between 10 <sup>th</sup> and 12 <sup>th</sup> along Folsom.	Yes	Yes	Yes
Nighttime Entertainment permitted as Conditional Use only. Allow it elsewhere other than the 11 <sup>th</sup> corridor, sound proof them, and make neighborhood serving places with easy public transportation access.	See Zoning Table in Chapter 2	See Zoning Table in Chapter 2	See Zoning Table in Chapter 2
Encourages Nighttime Entertainment in Industrial Zone that acts as a buffer.	Yes	Yes	Yes
Pro Nighttime Entertainment!	Yes	Yes	Yes
Nighttime Entertainment proposed along Folsom and Howard Corridor from 5 <sup>th</sup> through 11 <sup>th</sup> , through conditional use.	See Zoning Table in Chapter 2	See Zoning Table in Chapter 2	See Zoning Table in Chapter 2
<b>Heights</b>			
Want alleys to be 40 and arterials to be higher, although a few people thought alleys could be higher as well	Yes	Yes	Yes
40 feet wood, safety concerns	NA	NA	NA
Increase heights	Yes	Yes	Yes
Minimum of 50í throughout, All supported increased heights, except in RED	No	No	No
Industrial should be 65í or higher	Yes	Yes	Yes
Concerned with higher limits at all along Folsom between 7 <sup>th</sup> and 8 <sup>th</sup>	No change proposed. See height map.		

TOPIC / COMMUNITY COMMENTS (SOMA)	ADDRESSED IN REZONING OPTIONS?		
	A	B	C
<b>Heights</b>			
Allow very high heights in Rincon hill	Yes	Yes	Yes
Minimum heights in industrial areas?	No	No	No
Height allowances for all housing	No	No	No
Review heights between 7 <sup>th</sup> and 5 <sup>th</sup> and Townsend and Bryant relative to the existing heights	Yes	Yes	Yes
Review 55 foot height limit along 4 <sup>th</sup> street	Yes	Yes	Yes
Midblock=45', corridors and corner =65'	Yes	Yes	Yes
Midblocks-drop from high corridors	Yes	Yes	Yes
65í east of 4 <sup>th</sup>	Partially	Partially	Partially
85í along 4 <sup>th</sup>	No	No	No
mission bay is 160í, so need a transition	Yes	Yes	Yes
Some discussion of heights, wanted to increase them	Yes	Yes	Yes
Up to 45 feet in RED to preserve character, not a group consensus on this idea	Yes	Yes	Yes
Need higher heights, concentrate the development for the future	Yes	Yes	Yes
No problem with heights, very brief discussion	Yes	Yes	Yes
Height is now use driven Ò should be location driven/overlay with use	Yes	Yes	Yes
Small enclaves should be preserved more (height wise)	Yes	Yes	Yes
40í height limit on Varney Place, south of South park and Labor alley north of South Park	Yes	Yes	Yes
55í on both sides of freeway and extending west of 3 <sup>rd</sup> to Zoe, between Bryant and Brannan	No	No	No
What to do w/ 6 <sup>th</sup> St.: SROs, Neighborhood Commercial, and vibrant pedestrian Mixed Use District	Yes	Yes	Yes

TOPIC / COMMUNITY COMMENTS (SOMA)	ADDRESSED IN REZONING OPTIONS?		
	A	B	C
<b>Affordable Housing</b>			
Arterials: allow density bonuses for affordable housing 40-65i=15%, 65-90=20%	See discussion in Chapter XX regarding affordable housing.		
Allow affordable in industrial area, but needs higher than 40f	No	No	No
Increase amount of inclusionary housing	In Redevelopment Area, inclusionary requirement will be higher.		
Distribute low income homes in area versus in a cluster	Beyond Zoning, see Chapter 2 discussion on affordable housing.		
Create more affordable housing in the Residential High Density/MU.	Beyond Zoning, see Chapter 2 discussion on affordable housing.		
Mandate more Affordable Housing like SLI.	Beyond Zoning, see Chapter 2 discussion on affordable housing.		
Concerns: Housing being displaced, affordability, seniors being displaced due to high rent, retain less expensive housing when/where compatible with PDR.	Yes	Yes	Yes
Wants maximum amount of affordable housing, Inclusionary Housing greater than 12%.	In Redevelopment Area, inclusionary requirement will be higher		
<b>Open Space</b>			
Recreate rear yard requirement to create an open space fund	See discussion in Chapter 2, a. Zoning Designations, regarding Open Space.		
More open space on Folsom	See discussion in Chapter 2, a. Zoning Designations, regarding Open Space.		
Add more parks/community gardens like Howard & Ross St.	See discussion in Chapter 2, a. Zoning Designations, regarding Open Space.		
Demand for green space throughout SoMa,	See discussion in Chapter 2, a. Zoning Designations, regarding Open Space.		
Application of "South Park" concept in Residential /Commercial Areas.	See discussion in Chapter 2, a. Zoning Designations, regarding Open Space.		
Demand adequate open spaces and parks, community facilities and schools.	See discussion in Chapter 2, a. Zoning Designations, regarding Open Space.		
Creation of more small pocket parks in residential areas.	See discussion in Chapter 2, a. Zoning Designations, regarding Open Space.		
Allow open spaces in the industrial spaces in the Industrial/Residential zone when Industry goes away.	See discussion in Chapter 2, a. Zoning Designations, regarding Open Space.		

TOPIC / COMMUNITY COMMENTS (SOMA)	ADDRESSED IN REZONING OPTIONS?		
	A	B	C
<b>Big Box</b>			
Target/Big Box possibly preferable for low wage jobs and to serve lower income residents and families and provide a use the community might enjoy close at hand	No	No	No
Allow Big Box between 10 <sup>th</sup> /11 <sup>th</sup> and south of Harrison, (maintain the Big Box cluster)	No	No	No
Allow Big Box but do a traffic impact study.	No	No	No
<b>Grocery Stores</b>			
SoMa needs supermarkets and neighborhood supporting businesses.	Yes	Yes	Yes
Allow super markets in all zoning categories.	Yes	Yes	Yes
Grocery store required in the block north of Bryant between 8 <sup>th</sup> and 9 <sup>th</sup> .	No	No	No
<b>Cultural and Institutional</b>			
Preserve the existing Historical/Cultural resources of SoMa.	Yes	Yes	Yes
Designate a separate CIE zone.	No	No	No
Build a middle school.	Beyond Rezoning		
Build community center on Howard between 7 <sup>th</sup> /8 <sup>th</sup>	Beyond Rezoning		
Protect Philipino cultural institutions.	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>Mix of Uses</b>			
Like SoMa as it is (very mixed) just more dense, and with more housing.	Yes	Yes	No
Mix of uses	Yes	Yes	Yes
Ground floor retail-w/ residential above	Yes	Yes	Yes
Preserve Diversity of Uses, do not want to lose them	Yes	Yes, to lesser extent	Yes, to lesser extent

TOPIC / COMMUNITY COMMENTS (SOMA)	ADDRESSED IN REZONING OPTIONS?		
	A	B	C
<b>Uses</b>			
Like Soma the way it is, but want the housing emphasis because want maximum flexibility	No	No	No
Highest and best use for everything	No	No	No
Existing Land use designations should be more accurate	Yes	Yes	Yes
More intense uses on major corridors, e.g. along the freeway	Yes	Partially	No
Worked from PDR emphasis because wanted to preserve jobs and increase number of jobs; some thought that retail jobs would serve just as well as PDR jobs	Yes	Partially	No
PDR-keeps character/services in SF	Yes	Lesser extent	Least extent
In favor of more housing	Yes	Yes	Yes
Focus retail on commercial streets	Yes	Yes	Yes
Light industrial on ground floor (not trucking dependent)	Yes	Yes	Yes
Encourage retail along south park	Yes	Yes	Yes
Maintain parking garage for retail center	NA	NA	NA
<b>Non-Zoning Related Issues</b>			
Like to increase bike lanes and pedestrian amenities	Beyond Rezoning	Beyond Rezoning	Beyond Rezoning
turn housing with development impact fees, i.e. fire services, road conditions consistent with growth	Beyond Rezoning	Beyond Rezoning	Beyond Rezoning
Concerned about truck traffic south of freeway	Beyond Rezoning	Beyond Rezoning	Beyond Rezoning
Hire people who work in soma first (develop training programs, etc.)	Beyond Rezoning	Beyond Rezoning	Beyond Rezoning
Community jobs	Beyond Rezoning	Beyond Rezoning	Beyond Rezoning
Pedestrian crossing encourage along 2 <sup>nd</sup> and 3 <sup>rd</sup>	Beyond Rezoning	Beyond Rezoning	Beyond Rezoning
Improve transit service with residential development	Beyond Rezoning	Beyond Rezoning	Beyond Rezoning
Notes:			
NA = Not Applicable			

## Appendix B: Land Use Forecast and Allocation Methodology 2000-2025: Housing and Jobs

The following is an overview of the main steps used to estimate the future use of land in San Francisco. The forecast is based the Association of Bay Area Governments' (ABAG's) projections of San Francisco's housing and job growth through 2025. Examining San Francisco's role in the regional economy, ABAG projected the net addition of about 135,000 jobs and 19,000 households in the City by 2025.<sup>1</sup> The Planning Department projected where in the City new jobs and housing units are likely to be located. This consisted of several steps: 1.) examination of existing (2000) conditions and of forecasts from ABAG; 2.) assessment of available space for future housing and jobs; 3.) distribution of this forecast growth throughout the city by neighborhoods.

### Existing Conditions 2000, 2025 Forecast

To calculate the existing housing and jobs throughout the city, by neighborhood, year 2000 was used as a base year. Data from ABAG, the 2000 U.S. Census, the San Francisco Assessor and the Planning Department were used.

*Housing units.* The total ABAG number for San Francisco households in 2000 was used to determine the number of units in San Francisco. There were 329,700. Assuming a 5% vacancy rate, there were 347,000 housing units. This total was distributed by neighborhoods based on the Planning Department's land use database, which locates units by parcel. This gives a reasonable estimation of the distribution of units through the City, while assuring that the total is consistent with number estimated by ABAG's methodology.

*Housing Unit Growth Forecasts 2000-2025.* According to ABAG's Projections 2002, San Francisco households will grow by about 19,000 households between 2000 and 2025. For the

<b>Existing Housing Distribution by Neighborhoods</b>	
<b>Neighborhoods</b>	<b>Housing Units</b>
<b>Eastern Neighborhood</b>	<b>42,000</b>
Mission	16,800
SOMA	7,400
Showplace Square	5,300
Bayview	9,300
VisVal	3,200
<b>Better Neighborhoods</b>	<b>12,400</b>
Balboa	1,600
Market -Octavia	10,300
Central Water Front	500
<b>Downtown</b>	<b>5,380</b>
Mission Bay	20
Rincon Hill	1,150
TransBay	10
Mid-Market	1,300
C-3	2,900
<b>Transit Corridor</b>	<b>65,200</b>
<b>Rest of the city</b>	<b>222,000</b>
Port	20
Presidio	1,000
Candlestick Point	10
Hunters Point	160
Everywhere else	220,200
<b>Total</b>	<b>347,000</b>

<sup>1</sup> Association of Bay Area Governments, Projections 2002.

purposes of this analysis, we are assuming that the San Francisco housing stock will grow more than that -- by about 30,000 households. This larger assumption is based on the annual average housing production of 1,200 units over the last 20 years, on the various community plans and rezoning initiatives that are likely to expand housing potential capacity throughout the City.

*Jobs.* ABAG divides its job projections by broad industry type using Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) codes. These ABAG estimates for year 2000 and the forecast for 2025 are shown in the following table. These categories describe the business of the firm, but not the type of space that the employee uses.

In order to understand the space needed for employees, the Planning Department converts the jobs from the broad industry categories into "land use categories" describing the type of space they occupy. This conversion is done using a standardized methodology based on surveying actual patterns of land use activity and their correspondence with industrial classifications (see the Planning Department's annual Commerce and Industry Inventories for details). This methodology is updated periodically to adjust for changes in land use activity over time. (These land use categories are described in the table below.)

For example, in the manufacturing sector, production functions fall under PDR and headquarter functions fall under MIPS. All mining jobs in San Francisco are considered MIPS -- they are headquarters and administrative office jobs rather than direct work with minerals. This translation of sectors used by

PDR	Production, distribution, and repair activities
MIPS	Management, information, and professional services (office)
RET/Visitor	Retail establishments and hotels
CIE	Cultural, institutional, and educational facilities, including medical

ABAG into these San Francisco-specific land use activities for this study is augmented by information about firms in the Dunn and Bradstreet business database, surveys conducted by the Planning Department; these conversion factors are shown in the table below. This conversion concludes that of the net new jobs forecast for 2025, two thirds of the growth will be concentrated in the office/institutional activities, 22 percent in retail, and 13 percent in PDR.

Future PDR Jobs 2000-2025. There were 89,000 jobs in PDR firms in 2000, 47,000 of which were Core PDR jobs. ABAG forecasts a net addition of about 19,000 jobs in PDR activities in San Francisco by 2025. If we retain the current distribution of 'Core PDR' jobs to other PDR jobs in San Francisco, slightly more than 10,000 of these net new 2025 jobs will be in 'Core PDR' activities. ABAG assumed that there would be space available to accommodate this growth.

ABAG Categories	PDR	Office	Retail/ Visitor	Cultural/ Institutional	Total
Agriculture & Mining	65%	21%	0%	14%	100%
Construction	86%	14%	0%	0%	100%
Manufacturing	65%	35%	0%	0%	100%
Transportation & Public Utilities	52%	48%	0%	0%	100%
Wholesale Trade	68%	32%	0%	0%	100%
Retail Trade	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%
F.I.R.E.	0%	100%	0%	0%	100%
Services	3%	46%	12%	39%	100%
Government/Public Administration	0%	100%	0%	0%	100%

<i>Year 2000 &amp; 2025 Total Employment Distribution by ABAG Category</i>		
ABAG Categories	Year 2000	Year 2025
Agriculture & Mining	2,700	3,300
Construction	17,000	21,000
Manufacturing	35,500	43,000
Transportation & Public Utilities	47,000	57,000
Wholesale Trade	22,700	28,000
Retail Trade	92,000	112,200
F.I.R.E.	68,500	83,000
Services	324,000	393,000
Government/Public Administration	25,000	30,000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>634,400</b>	<b>770,500</b>

<b>Forecasted Increase of Employment by Sector</b>			
SECTOR	Existing Jobs for 2000	Jobs Forecasted for 2025	Net Jobs increase from 2000-2025
Production/Distribution/Repair	85,000	103,000	18,000
Mgmt/Information/Prof. Services	285,400	347,400	62,000
Retail/Visitor	133,000	161,500	28,500
Cultural/Institutional/Educational/Medical	127,000	154,000	27,000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>630,400</b>	<b>765,900</b>	<b>135,500</b>

### **Space Available for Future Development Citywide**

The first step in allocating these citywide housing and job projections by neighborhood was to investigate the space available for new jobs and housing in different areas of the City. This was done in two steps. First, current projects being permitted or built (projects in the Building Department "pipeline") were tracked. This shows where, under current and very recent policies and market conditions, developers are choosing to build. Next came an examination of vacant or underutilized parcels throughout the city, or "soft sites." The sites are likely locations of future development.

Data were also collected on development potential from the City's various Area Plans. Certain areas of the city, such as the Port, the Presidio, the Transbay area, the Mission Bay neighborhood, and the Mid-Market neighborhood, have been targeted for development by the City's Redevelopment Agency or their own staff. These areas each have their own plans for development and often work with outside partners to make the plans take shape. These plans were assumed.

*Development Pipeline* A major component of future growth allocation among neighborhoods, the "pipeline" database tracks the status of building permits within the Planning Department and the Department of Building Inspection. Included are projects for which permits have been applied, which are under review, or have been approved for construction, as of the date specified, in this case 2000. It does not include projects that are completed and have received a Certificate of Occupancy, which are already counted in the 2000 database.

The result is shown in the following table, *Distribution of Pipeline Housing and Employment*. There are over 7,000 housing units in the pipeline database. There is commercial space that could provide space for almost 30,000 jobs.

*Soft Site Analysis.* Few lots in the City are truly vacant. Parcels that are used, but not to the extent that is allowed by current zoning, can be identified as likely points of future development. These may include parking lots, open storage, and one-story buildings. In the 400-foot height limit area downtown, even three-story buildings might be considered soft sites. It is assumed that the greater the current development on a lot, the less likelihood it has of developing further over our 25-year period; for example, a parking lot has a greater chance for development than a one-story building. In general, soft sites include parcels that are built up to 30% of what zoning allows, and this rule of thumb informed much of the analysis of available space. In the Eastern Neighborhoods, however, a detailed survey of soft sites was conducted to refine the inventory of space available for future development.

Because the Eastern Neighborhoods are currently undergoing a rezoning process, three sets of soft site build out potentials were calculated, one for each alternative. Since rezoning in the Eastern Neighborhoods does not affect the zoning potential of the rest of the City, potential elsewhere is held constant. Thus, only the Eastern Neighborhood future development potential figures differ in the table below.

<b>Distribution of Pipeline Housing and Employment</b>						
<b>NEIGHBORHOOD</b>	<b>Pipeline Housing Distribution</b>	<b>Pipeline PDR Jobs</b>	<b>Pipeline Office Jobs</b>	<b>Pipeline Retail Jobs</b>	<b>Pipeline CIE Jobs</b>	<b>Total Jobs</b>
<b>Eastern Neigh.:</b>	<b>1,646</b>	<b>1,406</b>	<b>4,911</b>	<b>908</b>	<b>254</b>	<b>7,479</b>
Bayview	547	1,135	724	535	151	
Mission	404	86	66	56	38	
Showplace Square	404	0	1,565	224		
SoMa	1,516	0	2,556	93		
Visitation Valley	5	185			65	
<b>Better Neigh.:</b>	<b>573</b>	<b>965</b>	<b>365</b>	<b>127</b>	<b>556</b>	<b>2,013</b>
Balboa Park	18	0	0	0	0	
Central Waterfront	211	965	365	0	0	
Market-Octavia	487	0	0	127	556	
<b>Downtown:</b>	<b>3,573</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>11,053</b>	<b>1,256</b>	<b>310</b>	<b>12,619</b>
Mission Bay	437	0	2,283	0	0	
Transbay	1,179	0	5,358	73	0	
Mid-Market	512	0	130	426	0	
Rincon Hill	1,218	0	0	0	0	
Other C-3	1,879	0	3,282	757	310	
<b>Transit Corridors:</b>	<b>458</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>974</b>	<b>986</b>
<b>Rest of City:</b>	<b>1,101</b>	<b>446</b>	<b>835</b>	<b>2,947</b>	<b>2,192</b>	<b>6,420</b>
Candlestick Mills		0	0	0	0	0
Hunter's Point		0	0	0	0	0
PORT	300	223	203	451	0	877
Presidio		0	0	0	0	0
Everywhere Else	1,445	223	632	2,496	2,192	5,543
<b>CITYWIDE TOTAL</b>	<b>7,351</b>	<b>2,817</b>	<b>17,164</b>	<b>5,250</b>	<b>4,286</b>	<b>29,517</b>

The total amount of possible built space on a soft-site was then divided by a job-area factor (300 sq ft/job for non-PDR, 521 sq ft/job for PDR, 2070 sq ft/job for Port industrial). Here are the results, along with the total potential housing units for each neighborhood:

*Space Available for Current and Future PDR Activities.* The following table shows land that would be likely to be available for use by Core PDR firms in the future under the three scenarios. Section I of the following table identifies all land within the three proposed zoning options where Core PDR is permitted. It does not include land zoned for Heavy or Maritime Industrial activities. The four Eastern Neighborhoods of Bayview, Mission, Showplace Square/Potrero, and SoMa have different numbers for each of the three different zoning scenarios. Figures for the other districts are from the ongoing planning and environmental review processes for these areas.

Section II of the following table shows how much of the land in Section I is currently in other uses, such as office, retail, or housing. Section III assumes that the land identified in Section II would continue to be occupied by other uses; it is subtracted from the totals calculated in Section I for each alternative. The remaining acreage is that land zoned for Core PDR that is likely to be available for new Core PDR activities.

Section Three :: Appendices :: Appendix B: Land Use Forecast and Allocation Methodology  
2000-2025: Housing and Jobs

Neighborhood	Housing Units	Total Jobs	PDR Jobs	MIPS & CIE Jobs	RET Jobs	Housing Units	Total Jobs	PDR Jobs	MIPS & CIE Jobs	RET Jobs	Housing Units	Total Jobs	PDR Jobs	MIPS & CIE Jobs	RET Jobs
<b>Eastern Neighborhoods</b>	<b>17,000</b>	<b>14,900</b>	<b>-1,000</b>	<b>11,700</b>	<b>4,200</b>	<b>23,400</b>	<b>17,400</b>	<b>-5,600</b>	<b>17,100</b>	<b>5,800</b>	<b>29,300</b>	<b>13,500</b>	<b>-12,400</b>	<b>19,100</b>	<b>6,800</b>
Bayview	1,800	4,900	1,900	2,000	1,000	2,300	5,500	1,700	2,500	1,200	3,600	6,500	1,700	3,300	1,600
Mission	4,600	2,900	-880	2,000	1,800	5,400	3,600	-1,300	2,500	2,300	6,600	1,700	-4,000	3,000	2,700
Showplace Square	3,800	3,700	100	3,000	620	6,000	2,800	-2,100	4,000	900	6,900	1,400	-2,300	3,000	640
SoMa	6,000	2,870	-2,300	4,600	530	8,900	5,000	-4,200	8,000	1,200	11,400	3,400	-7,900	9,700	1,600
Visitation Valley	750	550	185	115	250	750	550	185	115	250	750	550	185	115	250
<b>Better Neighborhoods</b>	<b>10,900</b>	<b>8,840</b>	<b>1,520</b>	<b>3,560</b>	<b>3,710</b>	<b>10,900</b>	<b>8,840</b>	<b>1,520</b>	<b>3,560</b>	<b>3,710</b>	<b>10,900</b>	<b>8,840</b>	<b>1,520</b>	<b>3,560</b>	<b>3,710</b>
Balboa Park	2,300	330	0	60	270	2,300	330	0	60	270	2,300	330	0	60	270
Central Waterfront	1,100	1,310	1,120	0	190	1,100	1,310	1,120	0	190	1,100	1,310	1,120	0	190
Market-Octavia	7,500	7,200	400	3,500	3,250	7,500	7,200	400	3,500	3,250	7,500	7,200	400	3,500	3,250
<b>Downtown and Mission Bay</b>	<b>22,200</b>	<b>75,400</b>	<b>1,880</b>	<b>64,730</b>	<b>8,640</b>	<b>22,200</b>	<b>75,400</b>	<b>1,880</b>	<b>64,730</b>	<b>8,650</b>	<b>22,200</b>	<b>75,400</b>	<b>1,880</b>	<b>64,730</b>	<b>8,650</b>
Mission Bay	6,000	32,600	810	28,100	3,600	6,000	32,600	810	28,100	3,600	6,000	32,600	810	28,100	3,600
Transbay	4,700	6,700	170	3,800	2,700	4,700	6,700	170	3,800	2,700	4,700	6,700	170	3,800	2,700
Mid-Market	2,500	4,900	120	3,200	1,600	2,500	4,900	120	3,200	1,610	2,500	4,900	120	3,200	1,610
Rincon Hill	4,500	1,700	40	1,630	0	4,500	1,700	40	1,630	0	4,500	1,700	40	1,630	0
Other C-3	4,500	29,500	740	28,000	740	4,500	29,500	740	28,000	740	4,500	29,500	740	28,000	740
<b>Transit Corridors</b>	<b>5,100</b>	<b>7,800</b>	<b>1,050</b>	<b>4,300</b>	<b>2,400</b>	<b>5,100</b>	<b>7,800</b>	<b>1,050</b>	<b>4,300</b>	<b>2,400</b>	<b>5,100</b>	<b>7,800</b>	<b>1,050</b>	<b>4,300</b>	<b>2,400</b>
<b>Rest of City</b>	<b>10,390</b>	<b>48,600</b>	<b>3,580</b>	<b>29,900</b>	<b>15,090</b>	<b>10,390</b>	<b>48,600</b>	<b>3,580</b>	<b>29,900</b>	<b>15,090</b>	<b>10,390</b>	<b>48,600</b>	<b>3,580</b>	<b>29,900</b>	<b>15,090</b>
Hunter's Point	1,800	9,800	1,310	6,400	2,100	1,800	9,800	1,310	6,400	2,100	1,800	9,800	1,310	6,400	2,100
PORT	350	8,800	1,450	3,400	3,900	350	8,800	1,450	3,400	3,900	350	8,800	1,450	3,400	3,900
Presidio	640	4,500	-100	4,500	90	640	4,500	-100	4,500	90	640	4,500	-100	4,500	90
Everywhere Else	7,600	25,500	920	15,600	9,000	7,600	25,500	920	15,600	9,000	7,600	25,500	920	15,600	9,000
<b>CITYWIDE TOTAL</b>	<b>65,590</b>	<b>155,540</b>	<b>7,030</b>	<b>114,190</b>	<b>34,040</b>	<b>71,990</b>	<b>158,040</b>	<b>2,430</b>	<b>119,590</b>	<b>35,650</b>	<b>77,890</b>	<b>154,140</b>	<b>-4,370</b>	<b>121,590</b>	<b>36,650</b>

Land/Job Density. In order to understand the capacity and need for future 'Core PDR' jobs, we must first assess how much land, on average, a typical 'Core PDR' employee uses. We developed the current Core PDR employment density by dividing the amount of land on parcels exclusively occupied by these businesses by their number of employees.

In order to calculate the job capacity, the acreage available for Core PDR firms was broken down into sites where there are PDR firms currently operating, where a job density identical to that which exists currently was assumed to continue, and sites where a new PDR is assumed. The new sites for PDR use are expected to be used more efficiently.

Section I	<b>Acres in Core PDR and PDR/Large Commercial Zoning Districts</b>				
		<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>Blue IPZ</b>
	Bayview	593	531	505	664
	Mission	152	97	0	112
	Showplace Sq.	101	14	14	176
	SoMa	172	109	55	149
	Vis Valley	0	0	0	50
	Central Waterfront	119	119	119	123
	Hunters Point	16	16	16	0
	Mbay	0	0	0	0
	Port	36	36	36	0
	Rest of City	0	0	0	0
		1,189	923	745	1,274
Section II	<b>Land Occupied by other uses in Core PDR and PDR/Large Commercial Zoning Districts</b>				
	Bayview	168	154	144	218
	Mission	84	44	0	63
	Showplace Sq.	24	10	10	86
	SoMa	75	39	21	65
	Vis Valley				
	Central Waterfront	39	39	39	1
	Hunters Point				
	Mbay				
	Port				
	Rest of City				
		390	286	214	433
Section III	<b>What remains available for Core PDR in Core PDR and PDR/Large Commercial Zoning Districts</b>				
	Bayview	425	377	361	446
	Mission	68	54	-	49
	Showplace Sq.	77	4	4	91
	SoMa	97	71	34	84
	Vis Valley	-	-	-	50
	Central Waterfront	80	80	80	122
	Hunters Point	16	16	16	0
	Mbay	-	-	-	-
	Port	36	36	36	0
	Rest of City	-	-	-	-
	Total Acres	799	637	531	840
<b>Jobs Possible</b>					
<b>On this Acreage    40,388    32,262    26,947</b>					

### Housing and Job Allocation by Neighborhood

As a result of the soft site and pipeline analysis, the total capacity for new housing construction was found to be 60,000 to 79,000 housing units, depending on the rezoning results in the Eastern Neighborhoods, and space for 158,000 to 161,000 jobs. Since the forecasts, which are based on larger economic trends, assume that San Francisco will produce only 30,000 new housing units and 135,000 jobs by 2025, the crux of the Land Use Forecast becomes the allocation of development, which can be supported. Because of the differences among the three Eastern Neighborhoods zoning scenarios, the land use future of the City could develop in three very distinct ways. (See table below.) The Option A alternatives in the Eastern Neighborhoods leave more housing units to allocate to richly transit-served areas like the Better Neighborhoods, Downtown, and designated Transit Corridors. Option A would also result in less replacement of PDR jobs by office and retail jobs in the Eastern Neighborhoods. The Option C alternatives would result in more housing growth in the Eastern Neighborhoods, with less housing left over for heavily transit-served areas, and a relatively high PDR job loss. Option B is a compromise between the two. The numbers allocated for other parts of the city vary as a result of policy changes in the Eastern Neighborhoods.

### Housing and Job Growth Allocation – 2025

Region of City	Option A (Existing Neighborhoods)				Option B (Expanding Neighborhoods)				Option C (New Neighborhoods)			
	Housing Units	PDR Jobs	Non-PDR Jobs	Total Jobs	Housing Units	PDR Jobs	Non-PDR Jobs	Total Jobs	Housing Units	PDR Jobs	Non-PDR Jobs	Total Jobs
Eastern Neighborhoods	4,250	-350	13,000	12,650	8,250	-2,800	15,000	12,200	12,000	-11,700	17,000	5,300
Better Neighborhoods/ Transit Corridors	9,300	2,600	13,000	15,600	7,300	2,600	11,000	13,600	5,250	2,600	10,000	12,600
Downtown/Mission Bay	12,000	1,900	63,000	64,900	10,000	1,900	63,000	64,900	8,250	1,900	62,000	63,900
Rest of City	4,280	3,600	30,000	33,600	4,450	3,600	30,000	33,600	4,500	3,600	30,000	33,600
<b>Total</b>	<b>29,830</b>	<b>7,750</b>	<b>119,000</b>	<b>126,750</b>	<b>30,000</b>	<b>5,300</b>	<b>119,000</b>	<b>124,300</b>	<b>30,000</b>	<b>-3,600</b>	<b>119,000</b>	<b>115,400</b>

## Appendix C: Methodology of Zoning Options Assessment

This section describes the main steps used to estimate potential maximum land use change over time. This change would be reflected in residential and employment development potential that each rezoning option would enable. The results of the assessment are summarized in the Assessment Tables of Chapter II, Section V. The method estimates two types of change. The first is an estimate of potential new development from new development that would occur on existing vacant or underutilized parcels, or soft sites. The second is an estimate of changes in land use within existing buildings, or hard sites. The analysis of soft sites requires identifying existing vacant or underutilized parcels. The hard site analysis requires identifying existing buildings where changes from existing uses would be expected over time. The main steps and assumptions are described below.

### 1. Estimate Soft Site Development Potential

- a. Identify parcels with a high development potential. Criteria included the following existing site characteristics: the parcel is vacant, the existing structure is condemned, the parcel is used as a parking lot, the parcel is used as a parking lot and includes a small structure, the structure on the parcel is only one-story.
- b. Calculate the gross lot area for parcels within each soft site category.
- c. Estimate the proportion of gross lot area most likely to develop over the next 25 years for each soft site category in each zoning district under each rezoning option. For instance, it would make sense to assume that 100% of the few vacant parcels would be developed, while assuming some lesser amount of one-story structures. Variation by zoning district would make sense in some cases. For instance, one-story structures would be more likely to develop in an option and zoning district where housing was permitted than in a PDR only district.
- d. Calculate raw soft site development potential by applying the proportion of soft sites to be developed (in step 1.c. above) to the gross lot area of soft sites to yield the gross lot area of soft site development potential by zoning district and option.

### 2. Determine Housing Unit Densities by Zoning District and Rezoning Option

To develop housing densities, a model was developed to estimate dwelling units per acre.

- a. Net developable acreage ranges from 50-60 percent after accounting for non-buildable areas, such as set backs, open space, and roads.
- b. Average unit size assumptions varied from 1,000 gross square feet (gsf) per unit to 1,400 gsf based on the expected nature of future development within the zoning district and planning area.

- c. Ground floor height was set at 15 feet presuming design guidelines will require a higher ground floor to create a more gracious and inviting space for residential or commercial uses, or needed functional space for PDR uses.
  - d. Floor heights for the second floor and above were assumed to be 10 feet floor-to-floor.
  - e. Assumptions of use mixes (commercial, residential, etc.) varied by zoning district and planning area based on the anticipated requirements of the proposed new zoning districts. Space for nonresidential uses was subtracted from housing potential accordingly.
  - f. Expected future heights were then used as the constraint from which to determine housing unit densities which were then used to estimate future housing development potential.
- 3. Estimate Residential Soft Site Development Potential**
- a. Apply the residential gross acre densities by zoning district and option to the soft site gross acre development potential estimated in Step 1 for districts permitting housing.
- 4. Estimate PDR Job Displacement (both hard and soft sites) From Existing Employment**
- a. Count existing PDR employment for all zoning districts for each alternative.
  - b. Assume 100% maximum displacement over time in all non PDR districts, since direct and indirect market forces of housing permitted by right would either redevelop the soft sites or change uses in existing buildings that remained (hard sites).
- 5. Estimate Land Use Changes on Hard Sites (Employment and Housing)**
- a. Calculate the PDR use square footage on non-soft sites by zoning district and rezoning option, in all but the PDR-related zoning Districts.
  - b. Assume the PDR use square footage on hard sites would change use on average as follows:
    - i. 25% of the space would change to commercial uses
    - ii. 75% of the space would change to residential uses.
  - c. For the residential uses, calculate the residential development potential based on average unit size.
- 6. Calculate Total Housing Development Potential**
- a. Add soft site and hard site residential development potential from preceding steps.

**7. Calculate New Retail/Office Space and Employment**

- a. Add retail/office space estimated for hard sites to the commercial potential estimated for the soft sites.
- b. Divide the sum resulting from the previous step by 300 gross square feet per employee (a standard merged retail/office employment density factor) to yield the potential employment capacity that the rezoning would enable.

**8. Calculate New PDR Space and Employment**

- a. For the Core PDR, PDR/Medium Commercial, and Light PDR zoning districts, the Department expects future PDR land use to intensify. This intensification is modeled as a future average FAR that varies by planning areas and zoning district from 0.5 FAR in the Mission to 1.5 FAR in Showplace-Potrero. These FAR assumptions are applied to the soft sites located in the applicable districts.
- b. For the Residential/PDR zoning districts, where 1 FAR of PDR is required for new development, new PDR space calculated at the intensified land uses discussed in the previous step was estimated for vacant parcels only.
- c. Future employment capacity is estimated by dividing the gross square footage of future PDR space calculated in the previous steps by 521 gsf per employee, the existing San Francisco PDR employment density. However, due to a concentration of heavy and core PDR activities in Bayview Hunters Point, an employment density factor of 1,200 gsf per employee that is more suited to this type of PDR activity is used. Although the Department also expects future PDR activity to intensify its use of built space in addition to its use of land (see previous step), the City's existing sectoral average PDR employment density was used for the estimate to produce a conservative estimate of future employment capacity.

The data for this analysis comes from two main sources: (1) Dunn and Bradstreet Business Data, and (2) the Planning Department's Land Use Database. The land use database is a collection of data from varied City sources -- from Assessor's data to the Department's own Case-Tracking database. The Dunn and Bradstreet data used is current as of March 2002 and Dunn and Bradstreet states that their business count is 90 percent accurate.

# Acknowledgements

---

**Mayor Willie L. Brown**

## **Board of Supervisors**

Tom Ammiano

Chris Daly

Bevan Dufty

Matt Gonzalez

Tony Hall

Fiona Ma

Sophie Maxwell

Jake McGoldrick

Gavin Newsom

Aaron Peskin

Gerardo Sandoval, Board President

## **Planning Commission**

Shelley Bradford Bell, President

Michael Antonini, Vice President

Rev. Edgar Boyd

Lisa Feldstein

Kevin Hughes

Sue Lee

William L. Lee

## **Planning Department**

Gerald G. Green, Director of Planning

Amit K. Ghosh, Chief of Comprehensive Planning

## **Project Manager**

Miriam Chion

## **Neighborhood Coordinators**

Scott Edmondson

Susan Exline

Johnny Jaramillo

Jonathan Lau

Paul Lord

Chitra Moitra

Rachna

Jill Slater

Sandra Soto-Grondona

## **Project Team**

Catherine Bauman

Teresa Ojeda

Sharon Young

## **Urban Design Team**

David Alumbaugh

John Billovitz

AnMarie Rodgers

Marshall Foster

Joshua Switzky

## **Intern**

Karla Solheim

## **Graphics**

Rocio Reyes

## San Francisco Planning Department

1660 Mission Street, Suite 500

San Francisco, California 94103-2414

Phone: 415.558.6378

Fax: 415.558.6426

<http://www.sfgov.org/planning/communityplanning>

### South of Market:

Jill Slater

415.558.6473

[jill.slater@sfgov.org](mailto:jill.slater@sfgov.org)

Sue Exline

415.558.6332

[susan.exline@sfgov.org](mailto:susan.exline@sfgov.org)

Chitra Moitra

415.558.6370

[chitra.moitra@sfgov.org](mailto:chitra.moitra@sfgov.org)

### Mission:

Jill Slater

415.558.6473

[jill.slater@sfgov.org](mailto:jill.slater@sfgov.org)

Johnny Jaramillo

415.575.6818

[johnny.jaramillo@sfgov.org](mailto:johnny.jaramillo@sfgov.org)

Sandra Soto-Grondona

415.575.6810

[sandra.soto@sfgov.org](mailto:sandra.soto@sfgov.org)

### Showplace Square/Potrero Hill:

Scott Edmondson

415.558.6384

[scott.edmondson@sfgov.org](mailto:scott.edmondson@sfgov.org)

Paul Lord

415.558.6311

[paul.lord@sfgov.org](mailto:paul.lord@sfgov.org)

### Bayview:

Jon Lau

415.558.6383

[jon.lau@sfgov.org](mailto:jon.lau@sfgov.org)

Sue Exline

415.558.6332

[susan.exline@sfgov.org](mailto:susan.exline@sfgov.org)

Rachna

415.575.6806

[rachna.rachna@sfgov.org](mailto:rachna.rachna@sfgov.org)