Comments from large session

- Traffic doesn’t move now at the intersection of Arleta and Bayshore, with more units where will traffic move?
  - We need to do more transit analysis – intersection does need improvement.
- With regards to contamination if you are not getting anywhere with property owner shouldn’t they pay to clean it up?
  - The property won’t be developed until cleaned; state has ordered them to clean the site up – we are waiting to see how they respond. They will probably try to sell the site.
  - Even if City does get involved with clean up – we could recoup money from prop owner.
- I worked for Shlage lock for 44 years; when doing shipping I saw that Southern Pacific caused some of the contamination as well – Southern Pacific should help pay for clean up of site as well.
- Why are we tampering with the toxic site; should there not be a waiting period?
  - We want to clean it up to re-use it – it is possible to clean it up. There will be additional sampling after initial remediation especially in red zone area where it’s the ground water that is contaminated. At the moment exposure is very little – concrete buildings are capping the vapor. But we are continuing to monitor it. The Department of Toxics has a web site with more information.
- Are the costs for green roofs higher?
  - Yes it is more costly but it is more beneficial for owner and occupier and maintenance costs are less for City. They also increase the value of property upward which could offset some of the higher costs.
- Can the City require such interventions?
  - Some parts are required by the state but could also encourage them through design guidelines.

Written comments

Traffic, Parking and Street Connection
- No Trader Joe’s because of traffic and parking misery.
- Should have a pedestrian over-crossing at Bayshore and Leland.
- Need a larger parking area at Caltrain – Southern access.
- What are the plans for Tunnel Avenue.
- Make the contaminated area parking for light rail users and neighborhood residents.
- Create a vehicular access from the Schlage lot to Blanken Street so that there is an opportunity to alleviate some traffic from Bayshore/Arleta intersection.

Contamination Issues
- Overall, it was a great presentation but I don’t feel you talked about the existing dangers from inhaling toxic chemicals, etc. We as residents need to know everything there is to know re: toxic soil, etc. especially with it in our midst.
Other

- Don’t forget the arts
- We need a supermarket!
- I think this process is very cumbersome, different people show up at different meetings. Nothing is cohesive. Usually one or two outliers dominate the table and re-design the plan from scratch. They say they represent the community. It is very frustrating. The facilitators already have the bases and they should guide us – that doesn’t seem to happen. No focus and we waste a lot of time. I don’t know how else to do it but if you are going to do this type of meeting please keep people moving forward by focusing – this is what we have already focused on doing xyz with it. Thanks.
- Needed narrative (power point) on variations between the four schemes, for comparison.
- Please put a bulletin board on the website so that dialogue can continue daily between community and development committee and developers.
- The PUC presentation about watershed was not necessary that evening. I do not feel that any of the comments said by the people at my table (or the ones presented at the end) were influenced by the presentation. More time could have been given to the breakout sessions instead.
- Green the sides of Bayshore with trees also.
- When it is windy, the area is quite windy. Please perform a wind study to help us make better decisions about placement of things.

Comments from break out groups

Connections / Street Network

- It seems as though connections over rail yard into Little Hollywood are not being given proper consideration.
- Using a ‘retail spine’ as a connector between the site and Leland Avenue is a good thing.
- Aligning the North-South street/pedestrian system with the community facility at the northern edge would be nice both aesthetically and symbolically.
- Concern about traffic generated and the ability of the internal circulation system to handle and diffuse the traffic onto Bayshore. Specifically, by creating a strong connection to the CalTrain station, the internal street system would no longer serve primarily local landuse, but would instead become a regional connector.
- Strong desire to avoid placing a street connection to Bayshore at the Northern end of the site. Doing so would make traffic ‘disaster’ that much worse.
- A question was raised regarding the connections to Little Hollywood and Executive Park. A group expressed that if at all possible provide strong connectivity from the “Little Hollywood” residential district to the project site. Some felt that “little Hollywood” was not incorporated well enough into the proposed project site.
- Provide strong connectivity between the Leland Commercial Street District and the project site
- Some at the table viewed the varied proposed maps and felt that “little Hollywood” was not incorporated well enough into the proposed project site.
- A group is very concerned about traffic and traffic flows.
- A question was raised about opening up Geneva Ave and a connection to the freeway.
- The connection up to the old building (the green strip or a street) may be too steep for people. Most of us avoid going on that side and prefer to walk on Bayshore. It’s a smoother side.
- The MUNI connections are more important than the Caltrain for people in the community. The intersections of Bayshore with Leland and Sunnydale are most important.
- Many people wait for MUNI at Bayshore and Arleta.
- Some people (at one of the tables) dislike the street network in scheme 1, most preferred schemes 2 & 4.
- Crossing Bayshore Blvd. at Blanken Street, Leland Avenue and other streets is very dangerous, recently there have been 3 pedestrian accidents. Consider an elevated pedestrian crossing or keep the pedestrian crossing where it is but lower Bayshore Blvd. In the same manner that Geary blvd. is where it crosses Fillmore and Masonic Street – a sunken driveway of sorts. If considering a pedestrian bridge over Bayshore Blvd. it must be one where that activates the street connection to it. It should be a street bridge that is designed well (attractive), that can handle high amounts of people, (not a skinny unattractive pedestrian bridge that has chain link fences to hold people in).
- Narrow the streets leading to and surrounding the project site to calm the intensity of traffic making the vicinity of Bayshore Blvd. a more pedestrian atmosphere. As is the wide three-laned Bayshore Blvd. is not pedestrian friendly and will continue to provide an atmosphere where accidents are common occurrences.
- A group expressed the desire of exploring the proposed project site as one that is strictly a pedestrian or partly a pedestrian Zone or car free Zone. Examples are Mexico public Plaza Types, European Plaza.
- A group suggested designated off-street parking lot on the project site, possibly the heavily contaminated site on the southwest region.
- If parking is allowed on site it should be adequately screened from the publics view possibly locate parking on rooftops.
- Another group had concerns about parking
- Is there any designated parking for the light rail?
- Could we get over the train tracks with a building flyover?
- Traffic from Bayshore to freeway is a concern
- Multilevel parking with retail above (is it possible?)
- A group asked why MUNI turns around where it does. -- Why not continue to Geneva to Cal Train station at that location?

**Open Space**
- Park-fronting retail would be a great addition to the VisValley community.
- People seemed to like the formality of the open space in Scheme 4.
- The park in Scheme 2, because it is placed at the lowest topographical point, could be used as receptacle for winter storm water runoff.
- Landscaping and open space design are important considerations and should allow for multiple, concurrent users. It’s important to refrain from allowing only active uses of the open space.
- A question was raised on how the sustainability schemes presented at the workshop can be incorporated into the plan.
- A table group stated a strong preference for a large, central park at the end of Leland Street.
- Landscaping must be part of it.
- Connecting to larger open space important, if doable – bike/trail connections to Brisbane, to other larger open space, to candlestick point trails, etc…
- Knuckle park preference at one table.
- The development should be integrated.
- Open space should have multiple uses: We want open space where kids can play (playground) and where seniors can exercise – having a space with exercise stations and area for seniors as well as benches. Maybe a playground and other themes throughout the park.
- A table liked schemes 2 & 4
- Space must be big enough and dog friendly. The long continuous strip could nice for people with dogs.
- But dogs should be on a leash and have their area so it’s not dominated by people with dogs and it’s dirty
- A table didn’t particularly care for the smaller strips of green since they felt those would only be used by the people who’ll live in the buildings that face them.
- One group preferred large grocery store with semi-circular Leland Park at the end of Leland Street.
- A group expressed they would like to see integrating existing neighborhoods to redeveloped site by introducing parks intermixed with mixed-use areas so they are in close proximity to each other.

Retail / Land Use
- A table expressed they would prefer a larger grocery store, but one the size of TJ’s would be fine.
- Question about the different models for retail/grocery stores – might be useful to look at these as they relate to needs in a more logical, rational manner.
- Perhaps a store such as Ranch99 could be attracted to the site.
- Relating to the point above, most Chinese residents take the bus into Chinatown each day to purchase produce and other Asian food staples. It would be great to capture that purchasing power in the neighborhood, on top of the fact that a large Asian store would provide a desperately needed amenity for local residents.
- Strong desire to allow for flexible uses as the configuration and design of the parking areas are being considered – Specifically, allowing for a farmer’s market, or other such informal use, would be a great addition to the neighborhood community.
- What is the feasibility of platformed retail over parking, or conversely, platformed parking over retail, such as the Whole Foods in SoMa.
- In any thought about the ‘proper’ retail use for the site, including the type, size, and placement of a grocery, it is essential to consider the contextual relationships of the site as they relate to attracting people from outside the VisValley community. How will parking be handled, and how will traffic change as a result of a Safeway vs. Trader Joes vs. Asian market.
- Any surface parking should be mitigated visually, using landscaping, building placement, etc.
- Strong desire to use retail siting, such as a large grocery, as a destination anchor that would then have the effect of ‘spilling-over’ customers along any retail extension into the site as well as along Leland Avenue.
- What is the feasibility of having a mid-size retail store, such as Trader Joes, in the Southwest corner of the site, in addition to a smaller grocery up near the Leland extension?
- Concern that a large super-grocery is not compatible with the urban character of San Francisco and Visitation Valley. Instead, a series of smaller, more specialized stores would promote an increased urban character as well as provide for the needs of residents.
- Concerns about the proposed smaller grocery led to enquiries about examples of 15-20K sq ft store; facilitator cited Ranch 99 or Trader Joe’s.
- Almost all cited preference for a full-size store like a Safeway; a number stated that this has been the community preference for a long-time and have regularly been brought up in community meetings/workshops. One participant was willing to compromise with a mid-sized grocery, like a Bell’s, so long as it’s convenient and well stocked. A community member inquired about the possibility of having the Safeway sized grocery store over the contaminated site over podium parking and a cap on the contaminated site.
- A few voiced concerns about traffic and parking. Parking and traffic flows need to be addressed before planning work could begin, especially with Executive Park and the ballpark coming online.
- One participant wanted to know what kind of smaller retail would be coming in.
- A question was raised regarding the older building on Blanken: a city college satellite or a Randall Museum-type facility would be preferable.
- Someone noted that a three- to five-year time lag for a large grocery store to be built is not that long in the larger scheme of things.
- Another group emphasized their strong preference for a large grocery store.
- A community member mentioned that affordable housing is the most important aspect.
- A question was raised regarding infrastructure and support services such as a police and fire protection, etc. which need to be discussed especially when new residents come in.
- The group also stated a preference to keep the site largely residential, with the grocery store, and not have more offices or light industrial uses.
- A question was raised regarding how motivated Ingersoll Rand is to sell the site; what would motivate the company to sell?
- The group reiterated the need for more community discussion on the other components of the plan such as parking and traffic.
- The larger store is desired in another group.
- Concerned about density – traffic and congestion
- What is the impact with retail on Leland St?
- The smaller the store the higher the price (it should be affordable)
- Parking is an issue with any size store.
- Make a parking lot on the contaminated site.
- The grocery store should be smaller like a Trader Joe’s but with parking on the contaminated space and a greenway like the knuckle park.
- Another group agreed that they prefer a large, full-service grocery store with meat, poultry, and food on the southern portion of the site.
- Seniors would go to this large grocery store so make sure it is accessible to them.
- Small retail on the Leland extension.
- Would like retail on Bayshore too.
- Look at parking issues, where you put grocery will depend on parking and traffic on Bayshore.
- We don’t want a Safeway as a grocery store but we do want something affordable like a Foods Co. We should be able to buy the food and walk to it.
- A community member expressed that Leland needs more diversity of shops: “there’s nothing of use other than the Bank and the nail salon.”
- Introduce an array of different uses that will make this community vibrant during the entire day not just a morning and evening community.
- Small-scale office uses that will address the immediate needs of the surrounding community such as doctor’s offices, consulting office, etc. – anything that will bring people into the immediate area and in turn, those people will support other smaller scale retail uses already existing on Leland Street.
- Pedestrian-friendly storefronts.
- A group wishes to have a Grocery Store like Trader Joe’s or Nugget found in Sacramento that will be the business Anchor and attract other supporting retail establishments. An anchor Grocery store will allow the existing storefronts at Leland Avenue to thrive once again.
- The redeveloped site should not detract activity from Leland Avenue but allow it to become more vibrant. The Schlage Lock site should be supporting the existing neighborhood.
- Please no large office uses like those that were built out at Executive Park.
- Full size retail is preferred.
- Grocery at the end of Leland preferred by one group.
- Another group questioned the logic of proposed grocery store at southern portion of the site (where the large one is proposed) – there had been a grocery store just south of the City line and is was not successful. They expressed their desire for grocery store though questioned its feasibility at this site. Some thought grocery store at Leland was better and liked the idea of extending Leland – expressed desire for other neighborhood serving retail such as hardware store. Other uses that could be for the “large grocery store” site included medical uses.
- A group suggested that the historic Schlage office building be used for Police sub station

Other
- How will site contamination, and the conditional land use controls be applied to the most contaminated areas, affect building/parking/open space design and placement?
- Questions about level of contamination in most problematic areas, and what that will mean in terms of the development timeline.
- Questions about contaminants were important for people – should development even happen etc? Need clarity about remediation process. Make sure there is a separation from the contaminants.
- Would it be safer to do parking on bottom and to have some private open space be balconies? – What open space would there be that is private? i.e. back yards, etc. If private open space is limited you need a space big enough to exercise.
- Why is emphasis on Leland?
- We basically want a supermarket and things that will be beneficial for the neighborhood we are not as concerned about the fancy details.
- Why aren’t the 3rd street light rail stops closer together? They are too far apart.
- Members from a group commented that any design of buildings and configuration of buildings relative to parks and open space consider wind effects on such open space.