

1 [General Plan - Amendments to the Market and Octavia Area Plan]

2

3 **Ordinance amending the General Plan to amend the Market and Octavia Area Plan;**
4 **making conforming amendments to the Arts Element and the Housing Element; and**
5 **making environmental findings, including adopting a statement of overriding**
6 **considerations, and findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight**
7 **priority policies of Planning Code, Section, 101.1, and findings of public necessity,**
8 **convenience, and welfare under Planning Code, Section 302.**

9 NOTE: **Unchanged Code text and uncodified text** are in plain Arial font.
10 **Additions to Codes** are in *single-underline italics Times New Roman font*.
11 **Deletions to Codes** are in ~~*italics Times New Roman font*~~.
12 **Board amendment additions** are in Arial font.
13 **Board amendment deletions** are in ~~Arial font~~.
14 **Asterisks (* * * *)** indicate the omission of unchanged Code
15 subsections or parts of tables.

16 Be it ordained by the People of the City and County of San Francisco:

17

18 Section 1. Environmental and Planning Code Findings.

19 (a) Section 4.105 of the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco provides that
20 the Planning Commission shall periodically recommend to the Board of Supervisors, for
21 approval or rejection, proposed amendments to the General Plan.

22 (b) On May 29, 2020, the Board of Supervisors received from the Planning
23 Department the proposed General Plan amendments, including the amendments to the
24 Market and Octavia Area Plan. These amendments are on file with the Clerk of the Board of
25 Supervisors in File No. 200557 and are incorporated herein by reference.

///

///

1 (c) Section 4.105 of the City Charter further provides that if the Board of Supervisors
2 fails to Act within 90 days of receipt of the proposed General Plan amendments, then the
3 proposed amendments shall be deemed approved.

4 (d) San Francisco Planning Code Section 340 provides that the Planning Commission
5 may initiate an amendment to the General Plan by a resolution of intention, which refers to,
6 and incorporates by reference, the proposed General Plan amendments. Section 340 further
7 provides that Planning Commission shall adopt the proposed General Plan amendments after
8 a public hearing if it finds from the facts presented that the public necessity, convenience and
9 general welfare require the proposed amendment or any part thereof. If adopted by the
10 Commission in whole or in part, the proposed amendments shall be presented to the Board of
11 Supervisors, which may approve or reject the amendments by a majority vote.

12 (e) After a duly noticed public hearing on May 21, 2020, by Resolution No. 20709, the
13 Planning Commission initiated amendments to the proposed General Plan. Said motion is on
14 file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in Board File No. 200557 and incorporated
15 herein by reference.

16 (f) On May 21, 2020, after a duly noticed public hearing, the Planning Commission
17 certified the Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the proposed Hub Plan, 30 Van
18 Ness Avenue Project, 98 Franklin Street Project, and Hub Housing Sustainability District (the
19 Project) by Motion No. 20707, finding the Final EIR reflects the independent judgment and
20 analysis of the City and County of San Francisco, is adequate, accurate and objective,
21 contains no significant revisions to the Draft EIR, and the content of the report and the
22 procedures through which the Final EIR was prepared, publicized, and reviewed comply with
23 the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (California Public Resources Code
24 Sections 21000 et seq.), the CEQA Guidelines (14 Cal. Code Regs. Section 15000 et seq.),
25 and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code. Copies of the Planning

1 Commission Motion and Final EIR are on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File
2 No. 200556 and is incorporated herein by reference. The Board affirms this determination.

3 (g) The Project evaluated in the Final EIR includes the proposed amendments to the
4 General Plan as well as Planning Code and Zoning Map amendments related to the
5 amendments to the Market and Octavia Area Plan. The proposed General Plan amendments
6 are within the scope of the Project evaluated in the Final EIR.

7 (h) At the same hearing during which the Planning Commission certified the Final EIR,
8 the Planning Commission adopted findings under CEQA regarding the Project's
9 environmental impacts, the disposition of mitigation measures, and project alternatives, as
10 well as a statement of overriding considerations (CEQA Findings) and adopted a mitigation
11 monitoring reporting program (MMRP), by Motion No. 20708.

12 (i) The Planning Commission then adopted the proposed General Plan amendments
13 by Resolution No. 20709, finding in accordance with Planning Code Section 340 that the
14 public necessity, convenience, and general welfare required the proposed amendments.

15 (j) The letter from the Planning Department transmitting the proposed General Plan
16 amendments to the Board of Supervisors, the Final EIR, the CEQA Findings, the MMRP, the
17 General Plan amendments, and the Planning Commission's Resolution approving the
18 proposed General Plan Amendments are on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in
19 File No. 200556. These and any and all other documents referenced in this Ordinance have
20 been made available to the Board of Supervisors and may be found in either the files of the
21 Planning Department, as the custodian of records, at 1650 Mission Street in San Francisco, or
22 in File No. 200556 with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors at 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett
23 Place, San Francisco, and are incorporated herein by reference.

24 (k) The Board of Supervisors has reviewed and considered the Final EIR and the
25 environmental documents on file referred to herein. The Board of Supervisors has reviewed

1 and considered the CEQA Findings, and hereby adopts them as its own and incorporates
2 them by reference as though such findings were fully set forth in this Ordinance.

3 (l) The Board of Supervisors adopts the MMRP as a condition of this approval, and
4 endorses those mitigation measures that are under the jurisdiction of other City Departments,
5 and recommends for adoption those mitigation measures that are enforceable by agencies
6 other than City agencies, all as set forth in the CEQA Findings and MMRP.

7 (m) The Board of Supervisors finds that no substantial changes have occurred in the
8 proposed Project that would require revisions in the Final EIR due to the involvement of new
9 significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously
10 identified significant effects, no substantial changes have occurred with respect to the
11 circumstances under which the proposed Project is to be undertaken that would require major
12 revisions to the Final EIR due to the involvement of new environmental effects or a substantial
13 increase in the severity of effects identified in the Final EIR, and no new information of
14 substantial importance to the proposed Project has become available which indicates that (1)
15 the Project will have significant effects not discussed in the Final EIR, (2) significant
16 environmental effects will be substantially more severe, (3) mitigation measure or alternatives
17 found not feasible that would reduce one or more significant effects have become feasible or
18 (4) mitigation measures or alternatives that are considerably different from those in the Final
19 EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment.

20 (n) The Board of Supervisors finds, pursuant to Planning Code Section 340, that the
21 proposed General Plan amendments will serve the public necessity, convenience and general
22 welfare for the reasons set forth in Planning Commission Resolution No. 20709 and
23 incorporates those reasons herein by reference.

24 (o) The Board of Supervisors finds that the proposed General Plan amendments are,
25 on balance, in conformity with the General Plan, as amended by this Ordinance, and the

1 priority policies of Planning Code Section 101.1 for the reasons set forth in Planning
2 Commission Resolution No. 20709, and the Board hereby adopts those findings as its own.

3
4 Section 2. The General Plan is hereby amended by revising the Market and Octavia
5 Area Plan, as follows:

6 (a) Figure 3, “Zoning District Table” is hereby removed from the Market and Octavia
7 Area Plan.

8 (b) Figure 11, “South Van Ness Avenue from Market to Howard Streets” is hereby
9 removed from the Market and Octavia Area Plan.

10 (c) Figure 12, “A New Street System for SoMa Neighborhood” is hereby removed from
11 the Market and Octavia Area Plan.

12 (d) Figure 4, “Bulk and Separation Controls for Towers” is hereby renumbered as
13 Figure 3.

14 (e) Figure 5, “A Living Alley” is hereby renumbered as Figure 4.

15 (f) Figure 6, “Linden Alley: Before and After “Living Alley” Improvements” is hereby
16 renumbered as Figure 5 in accordance with the figure found on file with the Clerk of the Board
17 in File No. 200556.

18 (g) Figure 7, “Hayes at Gough Intersections: Existing and Proposed” is hereby
19 renumbered as Figure 6 in accordance with the figure found on file with the Clerk of the Board
20 in File No. 200556.

21 (h) Figure 8, “Market Street at Dolores Street: Existing and Proposed” is hereby
22 renumbered as Figure 7 in accordance with the map figure on file with the Clerk of the Board
23 in File No. 200556. The reference to “Figure 8 - Market Street at Dolores Street: Existing and
24 Proposed” in the text following Policy 4.3.3 is hereby renumbered by revising it as “Figure 7 -
25 Market Street at Dolores Street: Existing and Proposed”.

1 (i) Figure 9, "Market Street at Church Street: Existing and Proposed" is hereby
2 renumbered as Figure 8 in accordance with the figure found on file with the Clerk of the Board
3 in File No. 200556. The reference to "Figure 9. Market Street at Church Street: Existing and
4 Proposed" in the text following Policy 4.3.4 is hereby renumbered by revising it as "Figure 9.
5 Market Street at Dolores Street: Existing and Proposed".

6 (j) Figure 10, "Page Street at Buchanan Street: Existing and Proposed" is hereby
7 renumbered as Figure 9 in accordance with the figure found on file with the Clerk of the Board
8 in File No. 200556. The reference to "Figure 10 - Page Street at Buchanan Street: Existing
9 and Proposed" in the text following Policy 4.3.4 is hereby renumbered by revising it as "Figure
10 9 - Page Street at Buchanan Street: Existing and Proposed".

11 (k) Map 1, "Land Use Districts" is hereby amended by renaming it "Generalized Land
12 Use Districts" in accordance with the map found on file with the Clerk of the Board in File No.
13 200556. The reference to "Map 01. Land Use Districts" in the Table of Contents is hereby
14 amended by revising it as "Map 01. Generalized Land Use Districts".

15 (l) Map 2, "Frontages Where Ground Floor Retail Is Required" is hereby amended by
16 renaming it "Frontages Where Active Ground Floor Commercial Is Required" in accordance
17 with the map found on file with the Clerk of the Board in File No. 200556. The reference to
18 "Map 2. Frontages Where Ground Floor Retail Is Required" in the Table of Contents is hereby
19 amended by revising it as "Map 2. Frontages Where Active Ground Floor Commercial Is
20 Required".

21 (m) Map 3, "Height Districts" is hereby amended by renaming it "Generalized Height
22 Districts" in accordance with the map found on file with the Clerk of the Board in File No.
23 200556. The reference to "Map 03. Height Districts" in the Table of Contents is hereby
24 amended by revising it as "Map 03. Generalized Height Districts".
25

1 (n) Map 4a, "Interim Scrutiny Areas" is hereby amended by revising it in accordance
2 with the map found on file with the Clerk of the Board in File No. 200556.

3 (o) Maps 1, 2, 3, 4, 4a, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12 are hereby amended by making
4 minor corrections to the study area boundary line, in accordance with the maps found on file
5 with the Clerk of the Board in File No. 200557.

6 (p) The Market and Octavia Area Plan is further revised, as follows:

7
8 **Market and Octavia Area Plan**

9 * * * *

10 **INTRODUCTION**

11 The Market and Octavia Area Plan (The Plan) grew out of the Market and Octavia
12 Neighborhood Plan (Neighborhood Plan) that in turn was the first plan to emerge from the
13 City's Better Neighborhoods Program. This Area Plan is a summary of the topics covered in
14 the neighborhood plan. The neighborhood plan was also adopted by the Planning
15 Commission and should be referred to for further details and illustrations.

16
17 As one of three neighborhoods in the Better Neighborhoods Program, the Market and Octavia
18 neighborhood offers a distinct set of opportunities for change sensitive to existing patterns,
19 given its unique place in the city and the region. At the center of the city, it sits at a remarkable
20 confluence of city and regional transportation. It is accessible from the entire Bay Area by
21 BART, bus, and the regional freeway system. More than a dozen transit lines cross the Market
22 and Octavia neighborhood, including all of the City's core streetcar lines, which enter the
23 downtown here. It is just west of the Civic Center, where City Hall and state and federal office
24
25

1 buildings, Herbst Theatre, and other governmental and cultural institutions attract a wide
2 range of people both day and night.

3
4 The Market and Octavia neighborhood sits at the junction of three of the city's grid systems.
5 The north of Market, south of Market, and Mission grids meet at Market Street, creating a
6 distinct pattern of irregular blocks and intersections, and bringing traffic from these grids to
7 Market Street. The surrounding topography of the Western Addition, Nob Hill, Cathedral Hill,
8 and Twin Peaks flattens out in this area, creating a geography that makes the Market and
9 Octavia neighborhood a natural point of entry to the downtown from the rest of the city. As a
10 result of its central location, it has long been both a crossroads—a place that people pass
11 through—as well as a distinctive part of the city in its own right.

12 The Market and Octavia neighborhood is a truly urban place, with a diversity of character and
13 quality in its various parts. Local residents will tell you that the area is an “in-between” place—
14 a place that supports a variety of lifestyles, ages, and incomes. Its varied but close-knit
15 pattern of streets and alleys, along with relatively gentle topography, make it very walkable
16 and bikeable. It has excellent access to city and regional public transit and offers a good
17 variety of commercial streets that provide access to daily needs. It has a rich pattern of land
18 uses that integrates a diversity of housing types, commercial activities, institutions, and open
19 spaces within a close-knit physical fabric.

20
21 The Market and Octavia neighborhood's strengths as an urban place, an exciting “in-between”
22 place, are fragile. Its role as a crossroads poses enormous challenges. Over the past 100
23 years, the imposition of large infrastructure and redevelopment projects have deeply scarred
24 the area's physical fabric. Whole city blocks were assembled for large redevelopment projects
25

1 in the 1960's and 1970's. Large flows of automobile traffic are channeled through to the
2 Central Freeway via major arteries such as Fell/Oak, Gough/Franklin, and Van Ness Avenue.

3 Street management practices meant to expedite these traffic flows have degraded the quality
4 of its public spaces and conflicts between cars and pedestrians have made streets hostile to
5 public life. Because large flows of automobile traffic and core transit lines converge here,
6 there are competing needs for a limited amount of street space. Transit vehicles are often
7 stuck in traffic, impacting transit service and reliability citywide and adding to traffic
8 congestion. Parking requirements have led to buildings in recent years with long, dead, and
9 undifferentiated facades that diminish the quality of the streets.

10
11 At the same time, there are tremendous opportunities for positive change in the Market and
12 Octavia neighborhood—opportunities to build on its strengths as an urban place and to create
13 a better future.

14
15 The Market and Octavia neighborhood is undergoing dramatic renewal since the Central
16 Freeway was removed north of Market Street. With the passage of Proposition E in 1998,
17 construction of a graceful and functional surface boulevard has replaced the structure and has
18 freed-up over 7 acres of land for infill development that will help repair the divisions created by
19 the Central Freeway. As part of this effort, there is an opportunity to rationalize regional traffic
20 flows and minimize their negative effects on the quality of life of the area, as well as to plan for
21 the reuse of several other large sites.

22 The Market and Octavia neighborhood can grow supported by its access to public transit. In
23 addition to repairing its physical fabric, new development can take advantage of the area's
24 rich transit access to provide new housing and public amenities, and reduce new traffic and
25

1 parking problems typically associated with ~~too many cars in the area growth~~. Because the Market
2 and Octavia neighborhood's location supports a lifestyle that doesn't have to rely on
3 automobiles, space devoted to moving and storing them can be dramatically reduced—
4 allowing more housing and services to be provided more efficiently and affordably. Market and
5 Octavia can capture the benefits of new development while minimizing the negative effects of
6 more automobiles.

7
8 If planned well, new development will strengthen and enhance the Market and Octavia
9 neighborhood. With the removal of the Central Freeway and construction of the new Octavia
10 Boulevard, there is a strong desire here to repair damage done in past decades and realize its
11 full potential as a vibrant urban place. There is potential for new mixed-use development,
12 including a significant amount of new housing. With the added vitality that new housing and
13 other uses will bring, the area's established character as an urban place can be strengthened
14 and enhanced.

15 The Market and Octavia neighborhood is at a critical juncture. Over the last 40 years, an
16 imbalance in how we plan for the interrelated needs of housing, transportation, and land use
17 has undermined our ability to provide housing and services efficiently, to provide streets that
18 are the setting for public life, and to build on transit, bicycling, and walking as safe and
19 convenient means of getting around our city. Nowhere is this imbalance clearer than here,
20 where an elevated freeway, land assembly projects, and other well-meaning interventions
21 have degraded the overall quality of the place.

22
23 As we look forward, there is much that can be done. The Plan aims, above all, to restore San
24 Francisco's long-standing practice of building good urban places—providing housing that
25 responds to human needs, offering people choice in how they get around, and building

1 “whole” neighborhoods that provide a full range of services and amenities close to where
2 people live and work. To succeed, The Plan need only learn from the established urban
3 structure that has enabled the Market and Octavia neighborhood, like other urban places, to
4 work so well for people over time.

5
6 If the Market and Octavia neighborhood’s tradition of public activism on these issues is any
7 indication, this Area Plan will succeed by building on these strengths: enriching its critical
8 mass of people and activities, enhancing the area’s close-knit physical pattern, and investing
9 in a transportation program that restores balance between travel modes. The Plan addresses
10 these issues holistically, as success with any one aspect depends on addressing the overall
11 dynamic between them. To diminish any one aspect of The Plan is to diminish the opportunity
12 presented by the whole.

13
14 Market Octavia is centered around three neighborhoods with high concentrations of Communities of
15 Concern. Communities of Concern are defined as census tracts that have a concentration of both
16 minority and low-income residents, or that have a concentration of low-income residents and any three
17 or more of the following six disadvantage factors: persons with limited English proficiency, zero-
18 vehicle households, seniors aged 75 years and over, persons with one or more disability, single-parent
19 families, and renters paying more than 50 percent of their household income on housing. The
20 Communities of Concern adjacent to the Market and Octavia Plan Area include the Western Addition
21 to the north, SoMa to the east, and the Mission to the south. Thus the positive and negative impacts of
22 new development on these neighborhoods should be taken into consideration. Given the legacies of
23 land use decisions, development patterns, and investments from past eras, such as elevated freeways
24 and redevelopment, Planning should carefully consider the needs of these adjacent neighborhoods to
25 advance the goals of sustainability, resiliency, equity, and economic diversity. It is particularly

1 important that historically marginalized communities can benefit from investment and that burdens be
2 avoided or mitigated to ensure more equitable outcomes and access to opportunity and investment.
3 In addition, the City has made a commitment to racial and social equity a core tenet of our values,
4 culture, and institutional practices. While the City has made inroads in advancing a more diverse and
5 inclusive city over the last several years, much remains to be done to redress the systematic racial and
6 social inequities that have long been part of our local and national history. Given this history, the City
7 has a responsibility to work towards the reversal of such outcomes and plays a key role in changing
8 structures and policies in achieving racially and socially equitable outcomes.

9
10 * * * *

11 **1. LAND USE AND URBAN FORM**

12 Strengthening the Market and Octavia area requires a comprehensive approach to planning
13 for all aspects of what makes the place work well for people. Housing alone does not make a
14 place, although new housing, and the people it brings, will add life to the area. Providing
15 adequate and appropriate space for a range of land uses that contribute to the function,
16 convenience, and vitality of the place are encouraged as part of an integrated land use and
17 urban design vision for the area.

18
19 **Land Use**

20 To reinforce and improve on the existing land use pattern, this plan establishes the following
21 principles:

- 22 • Require infill development to enhance the area’s established land use pattern and
23 character. While the area’s physical fabric is well established, there are ‘holes,’ both large
24 and small, where infill development can dramatically repair the fabric and provide new
25 housing opportunities and neighborhood services. This kind of development should be

1 actively encouraged and integrated into the prevailing pattern of uses, taking cues from
2 existing development in the area.

- 3 • Concentrate new uses where access to transit and services best enables people to be less
4 reliant on automobiles. New development will be most successful where it minimizes the
5 negative effects of additional automobiles, by building on the area’s superior accessibility
6 on foot and by transit. To this end, the most intense new development should be linked
7 directly to existing and proposed transit services, and concentrated where the area’s mix
8 of uses supports a lifestyle less dependent on cars.

9
10 Significant change is envisioned for the “~~SoMa West~~”Hub area, which lies between Market
11 Street, South Van Ness Avenue, Mission Street and the Central Freeway. For more than three
12 decades the city’s General Plan has proposed that this area become a mixed-use residential
13 neighborhood adjacent to the downtown. This element of the plan carries this policy forward
14 by encouraging relatively high-density mixed-use residential development in the ~~SoMa~~
15 ~~West~~Hub area. Element 7, “A New Neighborhood in ~~SoMa West~~the Hub” proposes a bold
16 program of capital improvement to create a public realm of streets and open spaces
17 appropriate for the evolution of the public life of the area, and to serve as the catalyst for the
18 development of a new mixed-use residential neighborhood.

19 * * * *

20
21 **OBJECTIVE 1.1**
22 **CREATE A LAND USE PLAN THAT EMBRACES THE MARKET AND OCTAVIA**
23 **NEIGHBORHOOD’S POTENTIAL AS A SUSTAINABLE MIXED-USE URBAN**
24 **NEIGHBORHOOD.**

1 The new land use and special use districts, along with revisions to several existing districts,
2 implement this concept. These land use districts provide a flexible framework that encourages
3 new housing and neighborhood services that build on and enhance the area's urban
4 character. Several planning controls are introduced, including carefully prescribed building
5 envelopes and the elimination of housing density limits, as well as the replacement of parking
6 requirements with parking maximums, based on accessibility to transit.

7 • The *Van Ness and Market ~~Downtown~~ Residential Special Use District* (VNMØR-SUD) will
8 encourage the development of a walkable, transit-oriented, high-density, mixed-use
9 neighborhood around the intersection of Van Ness Avenue and Market Street, adjacent to
10 downtown. This district will still have the area's most intensive ~~commercial~~ residential uses,
11 ~~including some offices uses and neighborhood serving retail, but balances those with a new~~
12 ~~residential presence~~. Residential towers will be permitted along the Market / Mission Street
13 corridor, provided they meet urban design standards. Residential towers, if built, would be
14 clustered around the intersection of Market Street and Van Ness Avenue, with heights
15 ranging from ~~160~~140 – ~~400~~650 feet.

16
17 • A *Transit-Oriented Neighborhood Commercial District* (NCT) will encourage transit-
18 oriented, mixed-use development of a moderate scale to a height of 85 feet concentrated
19 near transit services in ~~SoMa West~~ the Hub, areas immediately adjacent to the downtown,
20 and along the Market Street corridor. Retail use is actively encouraged on the ground floor
21 with housing above to enliven commercial streets. Along Market Street and in ~~SoMa~~
22 ~~West~~ the Hub, a limited amount of office will be permitted. Complimenting a rich mix of
23 neighborhood-serving retail and services with a dense residential populations in these
24 districts, walking and transit will be the primary means of transportation and car-free
25 housing will be common and encouraged.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

In named NCT and NC-1 (T) districts, revised parking requirements and housing density controls will encourage housing above ground-floor retail uses. These districts otherwise remain unchanged. They include current Neighborhood Commercial Districts (Hayes-Gough, portions of the Upper Market, Valencia) and several parcels currently zoned NC-1.

- A *Transit-Oriented Residential District* (RTO) will encourage moderate-density, multi-family, residential infill, in scale with existing development. The high availability of transit service, proximity of retail and services within walking distance, and limitation on permitted parking will encourage construction of housing without accessory parking. Small-scale retail activities serving the immediate area will be permitted at intersections.

See Map 01: Generalized Land Use Districts ~~and Figure 3. Zoning District Table~~

* * * *

POLICY 1.1.1

Repair the damage caused by the Central Freeway by encouraging mixed-use infill on the former freeway lands.

With the removal of the Central Freeway and construction of Octavia Boulevard, approximately 7 acres of land has been made available for new development. Appropriate use and careful design of development on the former freeway lands will repair the urban fabric of Hayes Valley and adjacent areas. New development should conform with the neighborhood’s existing urban scale and character and should maintain a strong connection to streets and public spaces.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

POLICY 1.1.2

Concentrate more intense uses and activities in those areas best served by transit and most accessible on foot or by bicycle.

In keeping with the plan’s goal of prioritizing the safe and effective movement of people, the most intense uses and activities are focused where transit and walking are most convenient and attractive—along the Market Street / Mission Street corridor and at the intersection of Market Street and Van Ness Avenue. Concentrating transit-oriented uses in these locations will reduce automobile traffic on city streets and support the expansion of transit service in the area’s core urban center.

POLICY 1.1.3

Encourage housing and retail infill to support the vitality of the Hayes-Gough, Upper Market and Valencia Neighborhood Commercial Districts.

There are significant opportunities for new mixed-use infill along neighborhood commercial streets in the plan area. In conjunction with proposals to encourage flexible housing types and to reduce parking requirements, new development along commercial streets should create new retail uses and services oriented to the street, with as much housing as possible on upper floors. New uses should maintain the overall pedestrian orientation of these streets.

POLICY 1.1.4

1 ***As ~~SoMa West~~ the Hub evolves into a high-density mixed-use neighborhood, encourage***
2 ***the concurrent development of neighborhood-serving uses to support an increasing***
3 ***residential population.***

4

5 There is a demonstrated need for neighborhood-serving uses in the ~~SoMa West~~ Hub area. As
6 its residential population increases, adequate space for retail activities and other services are
7 encouraged as part of the overall mix of uses in the area. While some amount of office uses
8 will be permitted, it will not be allowed to dominate the ground floor in areas where significant
9 new housing is proposed.

10 * * * *

11

12 ***POLICY 1.1.6***

13 ***Preserve and enhance the role of cultural~~and~~, educational institutionsand arts***
14 ***organizations in the plan area.***

15

16 Major cultural institutions such as City Hall, the Opera House, Herbst Theatre, and the
17 SFLGBT Community Center are vital assets adjacent to the neighborhood and will retain their
18 role as major regional destinations. In addition, consider how community-based art organizations
19 can be incorporated into the ground floor of new development to serve neighborhood residents and
20 support the broader civic center arts district.

21 * * * *

22 ***POLICY 1.1.8***

23 ***Reinforce continuous retail activities on Market, Church, and Hayes Streets, as well as***
24 ***on Van Ness Avenue.***

25

1 On the frontages indicated above, maximize neighborhood-serving retail activities on the
2 ground floor for new development and substantial alterations, providing retail uses for at least
3 75 percent of the frontage on the ground floor.

4
5 See Map 2 Frontages Where ~~Retail~~Active Ground Floor Commercial is Required

6 * * * *

7

8 **POLICY 1.1.11**

9 **Apply a racial and social equity lens to the community planning process.**

10

11 Understanding why equity is important and incorporating practices of equity in all facets of planning is
12 essential for equitable planning. The Planning Department has developed a Racial and Social Equity
13 Tool to assess the impacts of development, who benefits and who is burdened, and mitigation
14 strategies. This tool is a resource that can be used at various decision-making points to evaluate how a
15 land use and urban design proposal may increase or decrease racial and social equity, understand the
16 unintended consequences, and help to identify opportunities to advance racial and social equity.

17

18 * * * *

19

20 **POLICY 1.2.4**

21 **Encourage ~~buildings~~ podium buildings of the same similar height along each side of major**
22 **streets.**

23

24 Streets ~~work well~~feel comfortable as public spaces when they are clearly defined by buildings of
25 a similar podium height on both sides of the street.

1 * * * *

2

3 **POLICY 1.2.8**

4 ***Encourage the development of slender residential towers above the base height in the***
5 ***~~SoMa West~~ Hub area along South Van Ness Avenue between Market and Mission Streets,***
6 ***and along the Market Street corridor.***

7 * * * *

8

9 **2. HOUSING**

10 Housing is an essential human need. No single issue is of more importance than how we
11 provide shelter for ourselves. Housing is in chronically short supply in San Francisco,
12 particularly for those with low and moderate incomes. The Market and Octavia neighborhood
13 presents a unique opportunity, because new housing can build upon and even enhance its
14 vitality and sense of place. This plan encourages housing as a beneficial form of infill
15 development—new buildings at traditional scales and densities, reflecting the fine-grained
16 fabric of the place.

17

18 In many respects, this plan does not diverge from established and continually evolving
19 citywide policies and programs of housing affordability. It does not establish new inclusionary
20 standards, new funding mechanisms, nor create its own solutions to homelessness in the city.
21 On these matters, which cannot be affected on an area-by-area basis, The Plan defers to
22 larger citywide solutions.

23

24

25

1 Existing sound housing stock is a precious resource and should be preserved and supported.
2 No demolitions, removals, nor wholesale clearings as in redevelopment projects of old are
3 proposed. Dwelling unit mergers are strongly discouraged.

4

5 The fundamental principles are:

- 6 • *Provide ample and diverse housing opportunities to add to the vitality of the place.*

7 Maximize the amount and types of housing opportunities in the neighborhood to serve a wide
8 variety of people, including a range of incomes, ages, and household and family compositions.

9 The Plan does so by looking to the prevailing built form of the area and carefully
10 prescribing controls for building envelopes to emulate that form. Controls that limit building
11 area by restricting housing are eliminated in favor of well-defined height and bulk controls
12 and urban design guidelines, encouraging building types more in keeping with the area's
13 established development pattern, and allowing greater flexibility in the type and
14 configuration of new housing. In addition, residential buildings are also encouraged to include a
15 mix of amenities that support the needs of families with children and sustainable transportation
16 choices, such as social and play spaces and easily accessible storage for strollers, car seats,
17 grocery carts, and bicycles.

18 * * * *

19

20 **POLICY 2.2.5**

21 ***Encourage additional housing units in existing buildings.***

22

23 New housing can be provided incrementally without significant changes to the physical form of
24 the area by adding accessory units to existing buildings. Because these units are typically
25 smaller and directly attached to existing units, they are an ideal way to provide housing for

1 seniors, students, and people with low-income or special needs. Additions to existing
2 buildings and conversions of ground floor spaces that create new housing units are allowed
3 and encouraged. Encourage the addition of units to existing residential buildings throughout
4 the area. Encourage the conversion of garage spaces to housing units and the restoration of
5 on-street parking spaces. Where such a conversion would remove off-street parking, require
6 the removal of the curb cut and the planting of at least one new street tree.

7 * * * *

8
9 **OBJECTIVE 2.3**

10 **~~PRESERVE AND ENHANCE~~ THE AFFORDABILITY OF EXISTING ~~SOUND~~ HOUSING**
11 **~~STOCK~~ AND STRENGTHEN TENANT PROTECTION PROGRAMS.**

12 *~~The Market and Octavia neighborhood has approximately 10,500 housing units today, providing homes~~*
13 *~~to more than 23,000 people. In contrast to new housing, existing housing tends to be more affordable.~~*
14 *~~The area’s existing housing stock should be preserved as much as possible.~~ Preservation of existing*
15 *housing affordable to vulnerable populations and tenant protections are two effective strategies to*
16 *reduce displacement and mitigate its impacts on vulnerable populations.*

17 **POLICY 2.3.1**

18 **Support citywide efforts to strengthen tenant protection and eviction prevention programs.**
19 **Existing tenant protection programs provide a variety of tools including tenants’ rights education,**
20 **counseling, mediation, and most recently a new Tenants Right to Counsel to provide legal**
21 **representation to tenants facing eviction. The programs include eviction protection and relocation**
22 **assistance as well. Citywide efforts to strengthen those programs through additional funding and**
23 **better monitoring should be supported at neighborhood level.**

24 * * * *

1 ***POLICY 2.3.12***

2 ***Prohibit residential demolitions unless they would result in sufficient replacement of***
3 ***existing housing units. Even when replacement housing is provided, demolitions***
4 ***should further be restricted to ensure that affordable housing and historic resources***
5 ***are maintained.***

6
7 The City's *General Plan* discourages residential demolitions, except where it would result in
8 replacement housing equal to or exceeding that which is to be demolished. This policy will be
9 applied in the Market & Octavia area in such a way that new housing would at least offset the
10 loss of existing units, and the City's affordable housing, and historic resources would be
11 protected. The plan maintains a strong prejudice against the demolition of sound housing,
12 particularly affordable housing.

13
14 Even when replacement housing is provided, demolitions would be permitted only through
15 conditional use in the event the project serves the public interest by giving consideration to
16 each of the following: (1) affordability, (2) soundness, (3) maintenance history, (4) historic
17 resource assessment, (5) number of units, (6) superb architectural and urban design, (7)
18 rental housing opportunities, (8) number of family-sized units, (9) supportive housing or serves
19 a special or underserved population, and (10) a public interest or public use that cannot be
20 met without the proposed demolition.

21
22 ***POLICY 2.3.23***

23 ***Discourage dwelling-unit mergers.***
24
25

1 Dwelling-unit mergers reduce the number of housing units available in an area. If widespread,
2 over time, dwelling unit mergers can drastically reduce the available housing opportunities,
3 especially for single- and low-income households. This plan maintains a strong prejudice
4 against dwelling unit mergers with the goal of maintaining the neighborhood housing stock
5 and an appropriately balanced distribution of unit sizes.

6 * * * *

7
8 **3. BUILDING WITH A SENSE OF PLACE AND SUSTAINABILITY**

9 *Today, a neighborhood’s positive sense of place and sustainability is dependent on its physical*
10 *character, diversity of people and uses, and a resilient built environment. Buildings provide spaces to*
11 *live, work, and play—they also define and frame a neighborhood’s public streets, sidewalks, plazas,*
12 *and open spaces where people meet, gather, and interact intentionally or informally define the public*
13 *realm in addition to providing space for a myriad of private activities. They provide the setting for*
14 *people to meet and interact informally and shape the neighborhood’s range of social experiences and*
15 *offerings. Building height, setback, massing, and materiality impacts the quality and use of adjacent*
16 *public spaces-spacing define the streets, sidewalks, plazas, and open space that comprise the*
17 *community’s public realm. Buildings These design elements also shape views and create “urban*
18 *rooms” where public life can thrive, and affect the amount of sunlight and air that reaches the*
19 *people on the ground-street. The uses of buildings and their relationships to one another also*
20 *affect the variety, activity, and liveliness, and diversity of a place. Buildings with a mix of uses*
21 *and human-scaled, and interesting design contribute to attractive and inviting neighborhoods in*
22 *their own right, and are vital to the creation of lively and friendly streets and public spaces. ~~In~~*
23 *the best cases, the defining qualities of buildings along the street create a kind of “urban room” where*
24 *the public life of the neighborhood can thrive. Finally, ecologically sustainable designs, including*
25

1 operating systems (e.g., heating, stormwater management), resource uses (e.g., renewable energy,
2 water), and material selections (e.g., concrete, wood, plants) contribute to a healthy and climate
3 resilient neighborhood for everyone.

4 **OBJECTIVE 3.1**

5 **ENCOURAGE NEW BUILDINGS THAT CONTRIBUTE TO THE BEAUTY OF THE BUILT**
6 **ENVIRONMENT AND THE QUALITY OF STREETS AS PUBLIC SPACE.**
7

8 For all new buildings and major additions, ensure that fundamentals of good urban design are
9 followed, while allowing for freedom of architectural expression. A variety of architectural
10 styles (e.g. Victorian, Edwardian, Modern) can perform equally well. Proposed buildings
11 should relate well to the street and to other buildings, regardless of style. In its architectural
12 design and siting, new construction should reflect and improve on the scale, character, and
13 pedestrian friendliness of the street and the neighborhood. Design should be consistent with
14 the accompanying design guidelines; the guidelines do not address architectural style. The
15 intent is to encourage buildings with a human scale that contribute to the establishment of
16 inviting and visually interesting public places, consistent with the area’s traditional pattern of
17 development.
18

19 ***Policy 3.1.1***

20 ***Ensure that new development adheres to principles of good urban design.***
21

22 New development will take place over time. Modest structures will fill in small gaps in the
23 urban fabric, some owners will upgrade building facades, and large underutilized land areas,
24
25

1 such as the former Central Freeway parcels, will see dramatic revitalization in the years
2 ahead.

3
4 The following Fundamental Design Principles apply to all new development in the Market and
5 Octavia area. They are intended to supplement existing design guidelines, Fundamental
6 Principles in the Urban Design Element of the General Plan and the Planning Department's
7 Residential Design Guidelines, which apply to residential districts, and the Urban Design
8 Guidelines, which apply to commercial, downtown, and mixed-use districts. They address the
9 following areas: (1) Building Massing and Articulation; (2) Tower Design Elements; (3)
10 Ground Floor Treatment, further distinguished by street typology, including (a) Neighborhood
11 Commercial Streets, (b) Special Streets - Market Street, and (c) Alleys; and (4) Open Space.

12 * * * *

13
14 **OBJECTIVE 3.2**

15 **ENHANCE ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY THROUGH BUILDING DESIGN.**

16
17 Everything built or renovated in San Francisco has the opportunity to enhance its own sustainability
18 and resilience while contributing to neighborhood quality and health. The policies listed below and
19 integrated throughout this Plan are intended to achieve healthy air, renewable energy, clean water,
20 robust ecosystems, and zero waste throughout the community. They also support San Francisco's
21 citywide climate resilience and biodiversity goals: a net-zero emission city that is climate adapted to
22 protect people from extreme heat, flooding, and poor air quality; where local plants and wildlife thrive;
23 and people are connected to nature every day.

1 **Policy 3.2.1**

2 **Support healthy indoor and outdoor air quality.**

3
4 Local carbon emissions create public health and environmental impacts. Often associated with outdoor
5 pollution from roadway congestion, indoor air is increasingly toxic due to insufficient filtering, natural
6 gas appliances, and chemicals found in building materials and furnishings. Therefore, development
7 should be air-tight with high-quality filtration systems that can be upgraded during spare-the-air days.
8 Interiors should be constructed with zero-VOC (volatile organic compounds) materials and finishes.
9 Building managers should provide occupants with information on healthy furnishings and non-toxic
10 cleaning products, and model said recommendations on site. Construction practices and back-up
11 power systems should avoid diesel generators.

12
13 Healthier outdoor air quality is achieved through zero-emission buildings, sustainable transportation,
14 and greening. After prioritizing walking, biking, and transit, remaining car and truck trips should use
15 zero-emission vehicles. To support this fuel switch, electric vehicle charging is needed throughout on-
16 and off-street parking.

17
18 **Policy 3.2.2**

19 **Support biodiversity and connect people to nature.**

20
21 Urban greening, such as trees, low plantings, living roofs, and community gardens enhance
22 neighborhood quality with beauty, shade from extreme heat, pollution reduction and carbon
23 sequestration, stormwater management, and the mental health benefits of connecting to nature daily.
24 Climate appropriate plants are essential for supporting water conservation needs, and prioritizing
25 local native species supports biodiversity by providing critical habitat for birds, the insects that feed

1 them, pollinators, and other wildlife. As a guide, projects are encouraged to develop landscaped spaces
2 equivalent to at least half of the site area, integrated in open spaces.

3
4 **Policy 3.2.3**

5 **Maximize energy efficiency and use of renewable sources.**

6
7 To help stabilize the global climate crisis, cities need to pursue zero-emission buildings and
8 transportation powered by renewable energy. To minimize the resource needs of renewable energy
9 generation, buildings should pursue maximum energy efficiency through orientation and massing, all-
10 electric mechanical systems and appliances; and smart technologies that optimize power supplies and
11 uses. Buildings should also maximize on-site renewable energy generation and solar water heating on
12 rooftops and facades, and install sufficient battery storage to maintain critical loads during
13 emergencies and power shut-offs. Any remaining energy demand should be met through the purchase of
14 100% greenhouse-gas free electricity.

15
16 **Policy 3.2.4**

17 **Maximize water conservation, protect from flooding, and support local watershed health.**

18
19 Given the increasing pressures on water resources from growth and the climate crisis, buildings should
20 maximize water-conservation beyond efficient fixtures through smart technologies, such as irrigation
21 and leak sensors, and on-site water recovery and reuse. Required in certain-sized projects, these non-
22 potable/recycled water systems collect graywater (rain, foundation drainage, showers/baths and
23 laundry) and sometimes blackwater (sewer), conduct tertiary treatment, and reuse it for flushing,
24 irrigation, and cooling. District-scale systems with adjacent properties may be considered to increase
25 efficiency and effectiveness.

1
2 To enhance flood protection and watershed health, projects are encouraged to maximize on-site
3 stormwater management and prioritize green infrastructure solutions, such as bioswales and rain
4 gardens. Leveraging these ecosystem-based methods benefits the San Francisco Bay’s water quality
5 during rain events, as well as neighborhood beautification, biodiversity, and air quality. Minimizing
6 impermeable surfaces through landscaping and block pavers also helps recharge groundwater.

7
8 **Policy 3.2.5**

9 Support the City’s zero waste goal in building design and operation by prioritizing responsible
10 materials, reduced consumption, and material recovery and reuse.

11
12 Prioritizing materials for construction and operations that are sustainably grown, harvested, and
13 produced—and regionally sourced—protects environmental and worker health, minimizes waste,
14 creates healthier interiors, and reduces emissions. Although San Francisco achieved the world’s
15 highest rates of recycling and composting, a growing population, construction boom, and consumption
16 culture have doubled the amount of refuse generated. Reducing waste is not only essential for
17 mitigating human health and air/water quality impacts from garbage truck trips and landfills, it is also
18 key to reducing climate changing emissions, because methane from decomposing trash is 80 times more
19 potent than carbon dioxide. Buildings and the spaces between them should be designed and operated
20 for occupants to maximize recycling and composting. And construction and demolition activities should
21 include deconstruction practices that salvage reusable materials for reuse or resale, such as old-
22 growth redwood and concrete aggregate.

23
24 **OBJECTIVE 3.23**

25 **PROMOTE THE PRESERVATION OF NOTABLE HISTORIC LANDMARKS, INDIVIDUAL**

1 **HISTORIC BUILDINGS, AND FEATURES THAT HELP TO PROVIDE CONTINUITY WITH**
2 **THE PAST.**

3
4 There are currently a number of known historically significant resources in the plan area.
5 ~~Locally designated landmarks are specified in Article 10 of the Planning Code. Resources are also~~
6 ~~listed in the California Register of Historical Resources, the National Register of Historic Places, and~~
7 ~~in certified historic resource surveys. This includes the locally designated landmarks that are specified~~
8 ~~in Articles 10 and 11 of the Planning Code. Properties that have been listed or determined eligible for~~
9 ~~listing in the California Register of Historical Resources or the National Register of Historic Places,~~
10 ~~most commonly through the CEQA review process or adopted historic resource surveys, are also~~
11 ~~considered historic resources.~~ Map 4 shows these known resources.

12 * * * *

13
14 **POLICY 3.23.1**

15 **Preserve landmark and other buildings of historic value as invaluable neighborhood**
16 **assets.**

17 * * * *

18
19 **POLICY 3.23.2**

20 **Encourage rehabilitation and adaptive reuse of historic buildings and resources.**

21 * * * *

22
23 **POLICY 3.23.3**

24 **The addition of garages to historic buildings should be strongly discouraged.**

25 * * * *

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

POLICY 3.23.4

Protect and preserve groupings of cultural resources that have integrity, convey a period of significance, and are given recognition as groupings through the creation of historic or conservation districts.

* * * *

POLICY 3.23.5

Preserve resources in identified historic districts.

* * * *

POLICY 3.23.6

Pursue future preservation efforts, including the designation of historic landmarks and districts, should they exist, throughout the plan area.

A 1995/96 historic resources survey identified an historic district in the Hayes Valley area and the Inner Mission North Survey of 2004 identified three smaller eligible districts in the north Mission area. The Market and Octavia Historic Preservation Survey expanded one existing district and identified an additional 7 districts. The boundaries of these historic districts can be found on Map 4. The 2018/19 Hub Historic Resource Survey identified five new individual historic resources. Future survey findings should be incorporated as appropriate. In addition to the protection provided to these resources through planning and environmental review procedures, official designation should also be pursued when appropriate. Designation serves to more widely and publicly recognize important historic resources in the plan area.

1 **POLICY 3.23.7**

2 ***Ensure that changes in the built environment respect the historic character and***
3 ***cultural heritage of the area, and that resource sustainability is supported.***

4 * * * *

5
6 **POLICY 3.23.8**

7 ***Encourage new building design that respects the character of nearby older***
8 ***development.***

9 * * * *

10
11 **Policy 3.23.9**

12 ***Promote preservation incentives that encourage reusing older buildings.***

13
14 Preservation incentives are intended to encourage property owners to repair, restore, or
15 rehabilitate historic resources in lieu of demolition. San Francisco offers local preservation
16 incentive programs, and other incentives are offered through federal and state agencies.
17 These include federal tax credits for rehabilitation of qualified historical resources, property tax
18 abatement programs (the Mills Act), alternative building codes, and tax reductions for
19 preservation easements. Preservation incentives can result in tangible benefits to property
20 owners. Material deconstruction and re-use also supports the City's air quality and climate-related
21 emission reduction goals.

22
23 **POLICY 3.23.10**

1 **Apply the “Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic**
2 **Properties” for all projects that affect individually designated buildings at the local,**
3 **state, or national level.**

4 * * * *

5
6 **POLICY 3.23.11**

7 **Apply the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties**
8 **for infill construction in Historic Districts and Conservation Districts (designated at the**
9 **local, state, or national level) to assure compatibility with the character of districts.**

10 * * * *

11
12 **POLICY 3.23.12**

13 **Preserve the cultural and socio-economic diversity of the plan area through**
14 **preservation of historic resources.**

15 * * * *

16
17 **POLICY 3.23.13**

18 **To maintain the City’s supply of affordable housing, historic rehabilitation projects may**
19 **need to accommodate other considerations in determining the level of restoration.**

20 * * * *

21
22 **4. STREETS AND OPEN SPACES**

23 **The System of Public Streets and Alleys**
24
25

1 The Public Realm is the space between the buildings. A vibrant and successful public realm is
2 comprised of well-designed public streets, sidewalks, parks, plazas, and open spaces. It includes the
3 public places we walk, travel, sit, play, visit with friends, gather for events, experience nature and art,
4 meet new neighbors, and build community. In San Francisco as a whole, and in denser
5 neighborhoods like ~~the~~ Market and Octavia ~~neighborhood~~, streets are an important part of the
6 public realm. We travel along public ways, to get from place to place, and to gain access to
7 where we live, work, and shop. Public services—police, fire, deliveries of all sorts—depend on
8 them. We locate our municipal hardware and utilities—water, sewage and electric lines,
9 cables, and more—on them, above them, and mostly under them. But the public way system
10 is much more than a utilitarian system of connections. It is where people walk, where they
11 meet each other, where they socialize, where they take in the views, where they see what
12 merchants have to offer, where people (or deliveries) load in and out of vehicles, where they get to
13 know ~~first hand, their city,~~ their neighborhood, and their fellow ~~citizens~~ neighbors first hand.
14 ~~Streets, then,~~ and sidewalks connect us socially and functionally, and can be categorized as
15 safe or dangerous, places to behold or to stay away from. It is from this dual nature of streets
16 and sidewalks as places of function (utility, transportation) and places of socializing and
17 leisure that one of the main ~~dilemmas~~ challenges of planning arises—how ~~to do we~~ allocate this
18 most ~~scarce~~ precious public resource ~~characterized by both~~ to best meet functional requirements
19 and aesthetic sensibilities.

20
21 The Market and Octavia neighborhood is within walking distance of Downtown, adjacent to
22 Civic Center, the home of San Francisco's most important main street (Market Street), and
23 located where three of the oldest ~~of the~~ street grids come together. It is reasonably level (for
24 San Francisco), which makes it great for walking and biking. Given its central location, it is
25 one of those urban areas that most San Franciscans ~~are compelled to~~ pass through in order to

1 reach their destination. Whether by streetcar, bus, trolley, rapid transit, auto, bicycle, or on
2 foot, many of the City's movement systems ~~pass through the area. They do it~~rely on the
3 neighborhood's system of public ways. The challenge in Market and Octavia is no different
4 than for planning in general: How do we accommodate the legitimate travel needs of the
5 people using the many modes of movement through the area, while at the same time
6 respecting and achieving the neighborhood's legitimate desires for and expectations of safe,
7 moderate-paced, attractive streets on which to move, socialize, walk, and lead an urban, face-
8 to-face lifestyle, at least the equal to any in San Francisco. As in most urban neighborhoods, the
9 goals in Market and Octavia are to accommodate a wide variety of travel needs on safe, attractive
10 streets and sidewalks, and to encourage sustainable modes that help reduce the climate crisis.

11

12 A first step to meeting ~~that challenge~~those goals is to restore a balance between the movement
13 needs of competing travel modes, and to ensure that there is a balanced mix of travel modes
14 with special attention to pedestrians and street life.

15

16 The plan recognizes that road capacity in San Francisco is a highly constrained resource, with
17 decision-makers required to balance the requirements of cars, transit vehicles, freight,
18 cyclists, and pedestrians. A common fear is that reducing the capacity available for cars will
19 result in major increases in congestion. Much research rejects this logic and shows that
20 people's transportation choices are dynamic and respond to capacity, relative cost, time,
21 convenience, and other factors. Crucially, we learn that movement of people is more than just
22 movement of cars. This plan prioritizes the safe and effective movement of people. What
23 follows are specific proposals for a myriad of improvements to streets.

24

25 See Map 5. System of Civic Streets and Open Space

1 * * * *

2
3 ***Principle:*** *Streets that support and invite multiple uses, including safe and ample space for*
4 *pedestrians, bicycles, ~~and~~ public transit, and nature, are a more conducive setting for the public*
5 *life of an urban neighborhood than streets designed primarily to move vehicles.*

6
7 The past 20 years have seen advances in ways to improve the livability of streets, be they
8 major traffic carriers or local public ways. Closely planted street trees, sidewalk gardens and
9 green infrastructure for stormwater management, pedestrian-scaled lights, well- marked
10 crosswalks, widened sidewalks at corners, and creative parking arrangements are but a few
11 of the methods used with success to achieve the kind of neighborhood that residents say they
12 want. They are all addressed in the objectives and policies that follow.

13
14 **Parks, Plazas and Open Spaces**

15 Provision of public open space is necessary to sustain a vital urban neighborhood, especially
16 one where new housing is to be added to an already dense urban fabric. This is especially so
17 given the reality that there are few public parks or plazas in the Market and Octavia
18 neighborhood. To be sure, there are public spaces nearby: Jefferson Square between Gough
19 Street and Laguna Street, at Turk Street; Civic Center Plaza (with its children’s play areas)
20 east of Polk Street; Dolores Park some blocks south of Market Street; Duboce Park, west of
21 Steiner Street; and Koshland Park, which perhaps comes closest to what one thinks of as a
22 local park, up on the hill, at Buchanan Street and Page Street. But all of these spaces are
23 either “nearby,” close but not a part of, or are city-oriented rather than neighborhood-oriented.
24 There is no central public square, park, or plaza that marks and helps give identity to this
25 neighborhood.

1

2 At the same time that the neighborhood lacks community-focused open space, it is also
3 largely built out, without significant or appropriate undeveloped land, except for that laid bare
4 by the demolition of the Central Freeway. Most of this property is earmarked for much-needed
5 housing.

6

7 In the Market and Octavia neighborhood, the streets afford the greatest opportunity to create
8 new public parks and plazas. That is why streets are included in the discussion of public open
9 spaces. This plan takes advantage of opportunities within public rights-of-way. Most
10 noteworthy, Octavia Boulevard itself is conceived in part as a linear open space, as with all
11 great boulevards, that will draw walkers, sitters, and cyclists. In addition, modest but gracious
12 public open spaces are designated within former street rights-of-way that are availed through
13 major infrastructure changes, along with a series of smaller open spaces, for the most part
14 occurring within widened sidewalks areas. As well, housing development along the former
15 freeway lands will create open spaces within private developments, contributing to the
16 neighborhood as a whole.

17

18 ***Principle:*** *A successful open space system is carefully woven into the overall fabric of a*
19 *neighborhood's public streets, taking advantage of large and small opportunities, ~~large and~~*
20 *~~small,~~ to create spaces both formal and informal spaces for respite, gathering, and recreation.*

21

22 While almost all of the Market and Octavia neighborhood is built out, there are a few
23 opportunities to integrate new neighborhood open spaces into its existing physical fabric.
24 There are several significant sites for potential new open spaces. Widened sidewalk areas,
25 when provided with benches, nature, and shade that encourage lingering ~~and trees that provide~~

1 ~~shade~~, can be effective small public spaces. This plan includes proposals for both kinds of
2 open space.

- 3
- 4 • A new public park, Patricia’s Green in Hayes Valley, has been created at the northern end
5 of the new Octavia Boulevard, using the street right-of-way provided as the boulevard
6 transitions to local traffic.
- 7 • A widened sidewalk in the commercial section of Hayes Street should be studied as a
8 linear open space for strolling under trees and for lingering, linked to the pedestrian
9 promenade along Octavia Boulevard.
- 10 • Street intersections along Market Street—at Dolores Street and at the freeway
11 “touchdown,” for example—provide the opportunity to create small public plazas, and this
12 plan proposes to take advantage of them. Likewise, traffic-calming initiatives on local
13 streets provide opportunities for corner plazas, similar to those in the Duboce Triangle
14 area to the west.
- 15 • An intimate public square can be created in the new ~~SoMa West~~Hub neighborhood, along
16 Brady Street, on land associated with a small BART utility structure and adjacent surface
17 parking lot. This is an area of small streets that calls out for new, modestly-scaled housing
18 that can be part of a mixed-use neighborhood. A new public square can serve as a focal
19 point for this area.
- 20 • There is an opportunity for a new open space in the McCoppin Street right-of-way, where
21 the street no longer carries significant traffic flows and can be reclaimed as neighborhood
22 open space. The triangular parcel immediately south of the McCoppin Street right-of-way,
23 currently serving as a truck-rental office, could be part of a larger open space at this
24 location, should it become available. Future open space opportunities should be considered in
25

1 coordination with future development to activate the open space and enhance stewardship of the
2 space.

- 3 • Every new and enhanced public open space can help achieve the City's policy goal to amplify
4 nature in order to support biodiversity, climate resilience (reduce extreme heat, air quality, and
5 flood impacts), and happiness. This includes trees, planted areas, green infrastructure solutions for
6 stormwater management, and living roofs and walls. To best support local biodiversity and other
7 sustainability goals, it is important to use drought tolerant and native plant species.

9 **Areawide Improvements**

10 Local streets like Laguna, Hermann, Octavia north of Hayes, Buchanan, and others should be
11 reconfigured and enhanced where necessary to encourage walking and slow traffic
12 movement. They are envisioned as gathering places that enhance neighborhood identity as
13 well as public streets. The neighborhood's alleys are major assets to be protected and, in
14 places, enhanced.

16 **OBJECTIVE 4.1**

17 **PROVIDE SAFE, ~~AND COMFORTABLE,~~ AND GREEN PUBLIC RIGHTS-OF-WAY FOR**
18 **PEDESTRIAN USE AND IMPROVE THE PUBLIC LIFE OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD.**

20 **POLICY 4.1.1**

21 ***Widen sidewalks and shorten pedestrian crossings with corner plazas and boldly***
22 ***marked crosswalks where possible without affecting traffic lanes. Where such***
23 ***improvements may reduce lanes, the improvements should first be studied.***

1 On streets throughout the plan area, there is a limited amount of space on the street to serve
2 a variety of competing users. Many streets have more vehicular capacity than is needed to
3 carry peak vehicle loads. In accordance with the city's Transit-First Policy, street rights-of-way
4 should be allocated to make safe and attractive places for people and to prioritize reliable and
5 effective transit service—even if it means reducing the street's car-carrying capacity. Where
6 there is excessive vehicular capacity, traffic lanes should be reclaimed as civic space for
7 widened sidewalks, plazas, and the like.

8

9 Though it may not be possible to widen sidewalks along major traffic streets such as Market,
10 Franklin, Gough, Oak, and Fell Streets, it is both possible and desirable to widen sidewalks by
11 providing widened 'sidewalk bulbs' at corners. In addition, boldly marked crosswalks alert
12 drivers that they are entering intersections where pedestrians are likely to be crossing.

13 Sidewalk widening and improved pedestrian crossings should be implemented throughout the
14 plan area as the most important means of improving pedestrian safety and comfort on the
15 street.

16

17 See Map 6. Priority Intersections for Pedestrian Improvements

18

19 **POLICY 4.1.2**

20 ***Enhance the pedestrian environment by ~~maximizing planting~~ trees and gardens along***
21 ***sidewalks that connect people to nature, closely planted between pedestrians and vehicles.***

22

23 Closely spaced and sizeable trees parallel and close to curbs, progressing along the streets to
24 intersections, create a visual and psychological barrier between sidewalks and vehicular
25 traffic, like a tall but transparent picket fence. More than any other single element, healthy

1 street trees can do more to humanize a street, even a major traffic street. On many streets
2 within the Market and Octavia neighborhood, successful environments can be created through
3 consistent tree infill. For example, this can take place on Otis, Mission, Franklin, and Gough
4 Streets north of Market Street. On other streets, such as Gough Street south of Market, Fell,
5 and Oak Streets, and Duboce Avenue, it will require a major new tree planting program.

6
7 ~~Consistent~~Robust tree plantings also make an important contribution to neighborhood identity,
8 microclimate, and biodiversity. Different tree species can be used on different streets, or even
9 different blocks of the same street, thereby achieving diversity on a broader basis; habitat
10 supportive and low-water use species are preferred. ~~Rather than removing~~If existing trees need to be
11 removed for maintenance reasons, replacement tree species should be informed by observing the most
12 successful species on the immediate and adjacent blocks~~from any given street, the dominant tree~~
13 ~~species—or preferred tree species—on each block should be identified and future tree planting should~~
14 ~~be of that tree type.~~

15 See Map 7 Priorities for Street Tree Plantings

16 * * * *

17 **POLICY 4.1.3**

18 ***Establish and maintain a seamless pedestrian right-of-way throughout the plan area.***

19
20 Transit-oriented neighborhoods and pedestrian-friendly environments depend on good
21 pedestrian access and ease of movement. Some intersections in the plan area do not permit
22 pedestrian crossings, for example Fell and Gough, Hayes and Gough, and Gough and Otis.
23 The signal cycles at these intersections should be adjusted to accommodate pedestrians. The
24 City should also eliminate pedestrian “do not cross” signs as the sole means to resolve
25

1 problems at high-traffic intersections where it may be done safely. Prohibitions on pedestrian
2 crossings should be removed wherever these bans exist throughout the plan area.

3
4 **POLICY 4.1.4**

5 ***Encourage the inclusion of public art projects and programs in the design of streets,***
6 ***and public spaces, and building facades fronting the public realm.***

7
8 Public art plays an essential role in the civic life of our city. In urban places like the Market and
9 Octavia neighborhood, where streets, parks, and plazas are where civic life unfolds, public art
10 takes on a broad range of meanings that enriches the overall quality of public space. Funding
11 and space for public art should be integrated into all proposals for the physical improvement
12 of streets and open spaces.

13
14 **POLICY 4.1.5**

15 ***Prohibit the vacation of public rights-of-way, especially alleys; where new development***
16 ***creates the opportunity, extend the area’s alley network.***

17
18 There are many existing alleys within the plan area, many of which are concentrated in Hayes
19 Valley and in the larger blocks in the South of Market areas. In addition to being the location
20 of considerable neighborhood housing, most of the alleys, by reason of their intimate scale,
21 the diversity of buildings along them, in some cases their trees, and certainly their contrast
22 with surrounding streets, are delightful, valuable urbane places. These alleys are an
23 invaluable part of the neighborhood’s system of public ways and, like any public resource,
24 should be protected against proposals to privatize them.

1 **POLICY 4.1.6**

2 ***Pursue the extension of alleys where it would enhance the existing network.***

3

4 A number of alleys which were previously through streets have been truncated and are now
5 dead-end alleys. As part of the effort to extend pedestrian connections, the City should
6 purchase of the easternmost portion of Plum Alley that is in private ownership and further
7 study the extension of Stevenson Alley from Gough Street to McCoppin Street as part of any
8 proposal for demolition and new construction on Assessor's Block 3504/030.

9

10 **POLICY 4.1.7**

11 ***Introduce traffic-calming measures on residential alleys and consider making***
12 ***improvements to alleys with a residential character to create shared, multipurpose***
13 ***public space for the use of residents.***

14

15 Parking should be concentrated along the curbside with the fewest curb cuts (driveway
16 breaks). New pedestrian-scaled lighting can be added, ~~along with Sstreet trees and sidewalk~~
17 ~~gardens should be planted (if residents desire trees). Seek to reach agreement on a single tree species~~
18 ~~by street (or at minimum, per block) in order to have a unified planting pattern.~~ Because alleys carry
19 relatively little traffic, they can be re-designed to provide more public space for ~~local~~
20 ~~residents people~~—as a living alley with corner plazas to calm traffic, seating and play areas for
21 children, community gardens, and the like—~~where people and cars share space.~~ By ~~calming traffic~~
22 ~~and creating more space for public use~~ prioritizing use by people over cars, the alley can become a
23 common front yard for public use and enjoyment.

24

25

1 Working closely all City agencies should develop design prototypes for more extensive
2 improvements to residential alleys. The City should establish a process for local residents to
3 propose living-street improvements and participate actively in the design for their alley.

- 4 • Develop prototypes for residential alley improvements, to be used as part of the “Livable
5 Streets” traffic-calming initiative.
- 6 • Develop a process whereby local residents can propose living- alley improvements and
7 participate in the design and implementation of improvements to their alley.

8
9 See Map 8. Alleys for “Living Alley” Improvements, Figure 54. A Living Alley, and Figure 65
10 Linden Alley: Before and After

11 * * * *

12
13 **POLICY 4.1.8**

14 ***Consider making improvements to non-residential alleys that foster the creation of a***
15 ***dynamic, mixed-use place.***

16
17 Certain alleys support non-residential uses. Coordinated approaches to the design of these
18 alleys should protect the intimate scale of these alleys and yet create public space that
19 contributes to and supports the varied uses along them.

- 20 • Enliven the ground floor space with active uses where possible. Loading spaces can be
21 accommodated in ways that add to the character of the alley.
- 22 • Non-residential alleys can benefit from “living alleys” improvements that provide public
23 open spaces, that enhance the commercial uses.
- 24 • Encourage coordination throughout the alley by using similar or complementary details
25 throughout.

- 1 • Create spaces that allow for the growth and evolution of uses.
- 2 • Non-residential alleys may provide for a number of different and often conflicting uses.
- 3 Reduce the conflict of uses by providing an uncluttered environment. Consider placing
- 4 furnishings such as trash and recycling cans in a recessed area.

5

6 **Octavia Boulevard and Hayes Valley**

7

8 **OBJECTIVE 4.2**

9 **ACCOMMODATE REGIONAL THROUGH TRAFFIC ON SURFACE STREETS THAT ALSO**
10 **SERVE LOCAL NEEDS, THEREBY REPAIRING AREAS DISRUPTED BY LARGE**
11 **INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS OF THE PAST.**

12

13 ***POLICY 4.2.1***

14 ***Create new public open spaces around the freeway touchdown, including a plaza on***
15 ***Market Street and a plaza in the McCoppin Street right-of-way, west of Valencia Street.***

16

17 Bringing the elevated freeway down to street surface at Market Street provides the opportunity
18 to create two new small public open spaces: a plaza along Market Street west of the freeway
19 touchdown, and a plaza or other form of small open space within the last block of McCoppin
20 Street, as it comes to its terminus west of Valencia Street. The plaza on Market Street
21 enhances the pedestrian experience of the street and facilitates safer pedestrian crossings.
22 Because of its prominent location at the end of the freeway and beginning of Octavia
23 Boulevard, it has been designed to signal the end of the freeway and an entry to the city. The
24 plaza should include seating, trees and other pedestrian amenities. The leftover space on
25 McCoppin Street is an appropriate place to provide a community-serving open space,

1 integrated into the overall “green street” treatments proposed for McCoppin Street east of
2 Valencia Street, as well as the proposed bike path on the east side of the touchdown. The
3 triangular parcel immediately south of the McCoppin Street right-of-way could be incorporated
4 with it to provide a larger open space at this location. These new spaces should be designed in
5 coordination with future development to ensure that the spaces are active, programmed, and
6 maintained.

7 ~~• The Planning Department should work with DPW, MTA, the Recreation and Park Department, and~~
8 ~~Caltrans to facilitate a public design process for a new plaza in the McCoppin Street right-of-way,~~
9 ~~and to explore possibilities for the adjacent Assessor’s Block 3502/113 west of Valencia Street. (See~~
10 ~~the larger diagram of the new SoMa West Street System, Figure 12)~~

11
12 **POLICY 4.2.2**

13 **Improve the pedestrian character of Hayes Street, between Franklin and Laguna**
14 **Streets, by creating an unobstructed, linear pedestrian thoroughfare linking**
15 **commercial activities along Hayes Street to the new Octavia Boulevard.**

16
17 Hayes Street is a special commercial street within the neighborhood. It is at once locally-
18 focused, with small cafes and restaurants, and oriented citywide, with numerous galleries and
19 close proximity to cultural institutions in the Civic Center. It is often alive with pedestrian
20 activity. Between Franklin and Laguna Streets, where traffic rerouting policies allow converting
21 the street back to two-way traffic, the roadway is wider than it needs to be for vehicular traffic.
22 In this area, the City should undertake a future study which would consider factors such as
23 widening the sidewalk on the north side of the street, planting new trees, and installing new
24 pedestrian-scaled light fixtures and benches to create a much-needed public open space.

1 Café seating should be allowed to spill out onto widened sidewalks. The sidewalk widening
2 should not adversely affect turning movements for Muni buses.

3
4 See Figure 76. Hayes at Gough Intersections: Existing and Proposed

5 * * * *

6
7 **POLICY 4.2.3**

8 ***Re-introduce a public right-of-way along the former line of Octavia Street, between***
9 ***Fulton Street and Golden Gate Avenue for use by pedestrians and bicycles.***

10
11 Damage done to the San Francisco grid by land-assembly projects of the 1960's and 1970's
12 can be partially repaired through the reestablishment of Octavia Street as a public right-of-way
13 from Fulton Street to Golden Gate Avenue, providing improved pedestrian access to existing
14 housing developments, helping to knit them back into the areas south of Fulton Street, and
15 providing a "green connection" between the new Octavia Boulevard, Jefferson Park and
16 Hayward Playground. Bicycle movement in a north-south direction would also be improved by
17 this policy.

18
19 **POLICY 4.2.4**

20 ***Study further dismantling of the Central Freeway, similar to removal of the freeway***
21 ***ramps between Market and Hayes Streets.***

22
23 In the long-term, the City should evaluate removing the Central Freeway west of Bryant
24 Street, and to rebuilding Division Street as an extension of Octavia Boulevard. The success of
25

1 Octavia Boulevard should be analyzed periodically in conjunction with a study of further
2 dismantling of the Central Freeway.

3

4 Just as the north-of-Market Street Central Freeway ramps bisected the Market and Octavia
5 neighborhood, the new Central Freeway ramp does the same thing to the south. The area
6 under the freeway is dark and dank and Division Street and its surrounds are unpleasant at
7 best. While pulling the Central Freeway back to Market Street allows the repair of Hayes
8 Valley with minimal negative impacts to cross-town automobile traffic, it does nothing to
9 address the damage done to the Mission District or ~~SoMa West~~ the Hub. As important, it
10 disgorges a large volume of high-speed automobile traffic onto Market Street, the most
11 constrained street in the plan area. Market Street is the City's signature street, its most
12 important civic street and the most important for transit, bicycles, and pedestrians. The
13 considerable damage the freeway touchdown has done to the City's most important street is
14 obvious, and the City should purposefully work to repair this damage.

15

16 South of Market Street, the Mission Street, and South Van Ness Avenue freeway ramps are
17 poorly placed, requiring motorists to make left turns through highly congested intersections to
18 get to and from the Van Ness/Franklin/Gough corridor. These turning movements add delay in
19 already constrained locations, particularly at the Mission/Otis/Duboce/13th intersection.
20 To take better advantage of the SoMa and Mission street grids – and particularly the extra
21 capacity on Brannan, 11th, 12th, and northeast Mission streets, the City should study
22 removing the elevated Central Freeway to the fullest extent feasible and rebuilding Division
23 Street as a surface-level extension of Octavia Boulevard.

24

25 **Market Street**

1 Market Street, the City’s “Grand Diagonal,” will continue to be honored and protected as San
2 Francisco’s visual and functional spine. Market Street has been reconfigured twice in major
3 ways since a 1967 bond issue was approved by San Franciscans to improve it from the
4 Central Freeway to the Ferry Building. This plan confines itself to a series of enhancements to
5 make the street more pleasant to walk along, cross, and cycle upon in the plan area.
6 Improvements to the overall street configuration should be made as part of a comprehensive
7 redesign of the street, from The Embarcadero to Castro Street. Ultimately, the damage done
8 to Market Street and the neighborhood by the poorly conceived freeway touchdown should be
9 addressed and repaired.

10
11 **OBJECTIVE 4.3**

12 **REINFORCE THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE MARKET STREET STREETScape AND**
13 **CELEBRATE ITS PROMINENCE AS SAN FRANCISCO’S SYMBOLIC “MAIN STREET.”**

14
15 ***POLICY 4.3.1***

16 ***Recognize the importance of the entire Market Street corridor in any improvements to***
17 ***Market Street proposed for the plan area.***

18
19 Market Street is unquestionably the City’s most memorable street. It is our primary ceremonial
20 space, the heart of our downtown, and our most important transportation corridor. There are
21 more demands placed on Market Street than any other street in the City: it accommodates
22 streetcars, buses, trolleys, automobiles, bicycles, and pedestrians who use it as a major route
23 to destinations and as a strolling street. With these heavy demands, it is in the impossible role of
24 trying to be all things for all modes of travel.

1 A bold move on Market Street is needed. The City's Better Market Street project makes this bold move.
2 The project would prioritize transit, paratransit, taxis, and people walking and riding bicycles. It would
3 create dedicated, safe spaces for bicyclists, create safe crossings for pedestrians, widen sidewalks,
4 integrate boarding islands for seamless transit connectivity, improve transit speeds, and significantly
5 enliven the street. Access would be restricted for private vehicles and trucks.

6
7 **POLICY 4.3.2**

8 **Improve the visual appearance and integrity of Market Street within the plan area**
9 **through more and better maintained trees and ecological features~~consistent tree planting, better~~**
10 **~~tree maintenance~~, de-cluttering sidewalks, and installing new pedestrian amenities.**

11
12 While an appropriate redesign of the whole of Market Street is outside of the scope of this
13 plan, significant improvements of moderate cost are possible and desirable to enhance the
14 street within the neighborhood. The magnificent palm trees that march down the center of the
15 street are spotty and noncontiguous in their spacing, and their impact is lost where they are
16 experienced: on the street. There are many opportunities to both infill these trees and add~~with~~
17 new ones that provide shade and habitat value to connect people to nature.~~Similarly, there are many~~
18 ~~opportunities for additional trees along the street,;~~ at times in double rows. Sidewalk gardens of low
19 plantings also enhance neighborhood aesthetics and biodiversity, and as needed can be designed to
20 manage stormwater. All plantings~~Both existing and new trees~~ should receive the highest level of
21 on-going care. Sidewalks infrastructure and amenities such as~~along the street are cluttered with a~~
22 ~~disarray of~~ newspaper boxes, signs, refuse cans, and utility boxes, ~~which~~ could be clustered
23 more attractively. Benches, bicycle racks, and pedestrian-scaled lighting fixtures should be
24 provided on the street, particularly at corner plazas.

1 **POLICY 4.3.3**

2 **Mark the intersections of Market Street with Van Ness Avenue, Octavia Boulevard, and**
3 **Dolores Street with streetscape elements that celebrate their particular significance.**

4
5 The designs for these principal intersections should include streetscape elements—such as
6 special light fixtures, gateways, and public art pieces—that emphasize and celebrate the
7 special significance of each intersection.

8
9 **Market Street and Van Ness Avenue**

10 ~~The Van Ness Avenue intersection will be provided with pedestrian-oriented additions on the north side~~
11 ~~and major improvements on the south, associated with the introduction of the Van Ness Avenue~~
12 ~~Transitway, described in this plan. The intersection at the heart of the Hub neighborhood is primarily a~~
13 ~~crossroads, with little to draw people and even less to make them stay. Few buildings activate the~~
14 ~~street, conflicts between different users are constant, space is highly contested, and there is nothing to~~
15 ~~define or identify the space.~~ The intersection should be designed with prominent streetscape
16 elements that signify the crossing of two important streets. This will break up the width of the
17 street into three separate sections, thereby humanizing it and providing pedestrian refuges for
18 people crossing Van Ness Avenue. ~~Widened sidewalks can do the same at the corners, as can extended~~
19 ~~streetcar platforms on Market Street. Widening, visually defining, and specially marking the crosswalks~~
20 ~~to more logically follow pedestrian desire lines will enhance the space for pedestrians. Additional~~
21 ~~greening will improve the pedestrian experience and pedestrian comfort, along with added wind~~
22 ~~canopies, street trees, and espaliers (green planted screens). Living alleys and pedestrian passageways~~
23 ~~should be integrated to help make the intersection feel more intimate. High-quality design should be~~
24 ~~leveraged to mark this location and create a sense of place. Buildings should be pulled back from the~~

1 corner, and new entrances to the Van Ness Muni~~UNI~~ Metro Station should be integrated within
2 buildings when possible.

3 * * * *

5. BALANCING TRANSPORTATION CHOICES

6 Historically, the Market and Octavia neighborhood has been an imminently walkable place
7 with good access to public transit. Its dense fabric of streets and alleys, relatively gentle
8 topography, and role as the gateway to downtown from neighborhoods to the west have made
9 it an essential crossroads, supporting the development of strong residential districts
10 interspersed by active commercial streets with good transit service.

11
12 Since the 1950's, these qualities have become increasingly fragile. With the proliferation of
13 private cars in San Francisco and the region, the Market and Octavia neighborhood's role as
14 a crossroads has led to the imposition of a major regional freeway and the channeling of large
15 flows of auto traffic on Fell, Oak, Gough, and Franklin Streets. Because space in the area's
16 dense physical fabric is limited, increasing auto ownership has meant more space dedicated
17 to the movement and ~~storage~~parking of automobiles.

18
19 This has resulted in less space for housing and civic life~~more space devoted to parking~~—
20 resulting in ~~dead~~inactive ground-floor spaces, overly-trafficked streets, and less room for safe
21 sidewalks, bicycles and transit. Minimum parking requirements for new development, adapted
22 from suburban jurisdictions and introduced in San Francisco in 1957, resulted in more space
23 used for parking in the neighborhood, where driving has the most negative impact, and other
24 ways of getting around are attractive and viable.

1 Today, the Market and Octavia neighborhood, and the city as a whole, is at a critical juncture.
2 Over the last 40 years, this imbalance has created increased conflicts between cars and
3 people, ~~undermining the ability to provide housing and services efficiently~~, degrading the value of
4 streets as the setting for public life, and crippling the potential of the sustainable modes needed to
5 reduce emissions and the related climate crisis: transit, bicycling, and walking to provide safe and
6 convenient means of getting around. Ultimately, we can provide adequate, affordable housing
7 and vital, healthy neighborhoods only as we restore a balance between the transportation
8 choices available to people. How we allocate space on city streets and ~~how much parking we~~
9 ~~provide~~ along our curbs amidst today's growth demands, air quality issues, and climate emergency
10 become ~~basically~~ not just a matters of geometry, ~~not ideology~~; but of civic values and priorities. ~~Where~~
11 travel demand is greatest, the allocation of street space must prioritize transit and other
12 modes that move people more efficiently, even if it means reducing space for private autos.
13 While autos will continue to have a place, keeping our streets running means giving priority to
14 ways of getting around that make more efficient use of increasingly limited street space, and
15 limiting the traffic-generating effects of parking where it is most harmful. At base, what this
16 means is going back to a model of city building that strengthens neighborhoods like Market
17 and Octavia, in keeping with its best traditions as an urban place.

18
19 To this end, this plan proposes policies to strengthen the area's accessibility by foot, bicycle,
20 and transit, and to prioritize these modes as the long-term vision for how the area will grow.
21 The plan discourages new parking facilities, recognizing that they generate traffic, consume
22 space that could be devoted to housing, and have a negative effect overall on the
23 neighborhood.

24
25

1 ***Principle:*** *Prioritize the efficient movement of people and goods and minimize the negative*
2 *effects of cars on neighborhood streets.*

3

4 Responding to the “Transit-First” Policy means fundamentally changing the way we classify
5 and plan for streets. This plan aims to make this change in the Market and Octavia
6 neighborhood. In keeping with the “Transit-First” Policy, this plan aims to improve the
7 reliability, frequency, and overall dignity of transit, bicycle, and pedestrian service and
8 amenities in the area while managing the parking supply to provide efficient and equitable
9 access to a variety of users.

10

11 ***Principle:*** *Better management of existing resources is more effective in improving service*
12 *than simply increasing capacity.*

13

14 The easiest way to improve transit speed and reliability, for example, is to move existing
15 transit vehicles faster by getting them out of traffic. A perceived lack of customer parking can
16 be remedied by metering on-street spaces for short-term use. Management can effectively
17 influence people’s choice of travel mode, as the region has demonstrated with tolls on the
18 Golden Gate and Bay Bridges that support regional transit service. Management can also be
19 used to balance parking supply and demand, as the city has shown with short-term pricing at
20 the 5th and Mission Garage and other city garages, which discourage all-day commuter
21 parking and encourage short-term customer parking.

22

23 **Making Public Transit Work**

24 Transit riders, like all travelers, are rational decision makers. They are transportation
25 consumers, and they are looking at what is the best value for their needs. Any given traveler

1 will not select a travel mode if it is more time consuming, less convenient, less reliable, and
2 equally costly. The primary factors that influence mode choice are:

- 3 • time and cost,
- 4 • convenience, reliability, and flexibility, and
- 5 • availability of information.

6

7 To this end, the plan prioritizes the frequent and reliable operation of transit on the city's core
8 transit streets. The plan also calls for improving the function and design of essential transit
9 facilities and nodes. As more people come to the neighborhood, we have to give them good
10 reasons to come without a car.

11

12 **OBJECTIVE 5.1**

13 **IMPROVE PUBLIC TRANSIT TO MAKE IT MORE RELIABLE, ATTRACTIVE,**
14 **CONVENIENT, AND RESPONSIVE TO INCREASING DEMAND.**

15

16 For transit to meet the needs of San Francisco's population, it must offer travel times and
17 reliability that compete well against the private automobile. Unfortunately, congestion has a
18 disproportionate impact on transit relative to cars, given transit's fixed routes and passenger
19 boarding needs. Moreover, traffic-light systems that are timed to benefit autos often force
20 transit vehicles to "bunch" together, decreasing reliability for passengers. These problems can
21 be overcome by providing transit-preferential treatments, from traffic signal prioritization to
22 creating dedicated transit rights of way, where buses and streetcars are removed from the
23 traffic around them. If the goal of the transportation system is to maximize the movement of
24 people, street improvements that give transit a clear priority over private vehicles are

25

1 essential. In some cases, this may require reallocating street space from automobiles to
2 transit.

3 See Map 9. Proposed Transit Improvements

4 * * * *

5

6 **POLICY 5.1.1**

7 **Implement transit improvements on streets designated as “Transit Preferential Streets”**
8 **in this plan.**

9

10 **Market Street**

11 At the confluence of San Francisco’s three main grids, a significant share of all Muni lines
12 converge on Market Street. At Market Street at Van Ness Avenue, five lines come together
13 and run on average every two minutes in each direction, not counting subway service. Closer
14 to downtown, thirteen Muni lines are scheduled every 40 seconds in each direction. With so
15 many lines in one place, seemingly insignificant delays can quickly compound through the
16 system. For example, a continuous one-minute delay for all Muni vehicles on Market Street at
17 O’Farrell Street results in a cumulative 2,300-minute daily delay, significantly reducing
18 reliability system-wide. That is equal to 38 hours of service, which ~~o~~Over the course of a year,
19 ~~the extra is a significant~~ cost to the city ~~would exceed \$1 million~~. Market Street’s importance to the
20 success of the whole transportation system cannot be overstated.

21

22 In addition to urban design improvements to make Market Street more friendly to pedestrians,
23 it is critically important that the operations of Market Street be improved to eliminate Muni
24 delays. Two important ways of achieving this are by refining signal timing and creating
25 enforceable transit-only lanes.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

In order for signal timing to work without creating unnecessary red time for the cross streets, it is critical that other vehicles not impede Muni’s progress. Currently, so many cars use Market Street in the downtown that it ~~may often~~ takes several light cycles (excess of 10-minute delays) for ~~the~~ buses and streetcars to move to the next block—~~delays occasionally in excess of 10 minutes~~. ~~As t~~The existing “bus only” lanes are not clearly marked, ~~are~~ nor generally ~~not~~ enforced, ~~and~~ they are thus ignored by motorists.

The City should consider the following means to improve transit speed and reliability:

- Changes to traffic signal timing.
- Transit lane delineation.
- Increased enforcement of existing rules against driving in the transit only lanes or raising fines and post them prominently.
- Designation of other routes for private automobiles.

Van Ness Avenue

Along with Market, Mission, Geary, and Stockton Streets, Van Ness Avenue is one of the most critical links in the City and regional transit system. Besides the core Muni lines that run the length of it, it is also served by seven Golden Gate Transit lines, connecting San Francisco to points throughout Marin and Sonoma counties. It is also U.S. 101, a state highway and major auto route. As a result, it experiences severe peak period congestion, which in turn creates equally severe reliability problems and travel time impacts for the transit routes that serve it.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Van Ness should be thought of as part of the core Muni Metro system. While it is not a candidate for light rail at this time because of its lack of connectivity to the rest of the system, the high number of buses in this transit corridor suggest that it would be better developed with “bus rapid transit” (BRT): an at-grade, rubber-tire version of a subway line. Such systems have been highly successful all over the world. In North America, Ottawa has a network of high-quality buses that operate as subways, Los Angeles has implemented Phase 1 of such a program on the Wilshire/Whittier corridor, and AC Transit has recently decided to implement such a system on the Telegraph/Broadway/International Boulevard corridor in Berkeley and Oakland.

San Francisco is now in the process of investigating the feasibility of bus rapid transit on Van Ness Avenue. The illustration at right shows a possible solution, however the specifics of the project are yet to be determined and would require further study.

See Figure 11. South Van Ness Avenue from Market to Howard Streets

* * * *

POLICY 5.1.4
Support innovative transit solutions that improve service, reliability, and overall quality of the transit rider’s experience.

In addition to improvements to individual Muni~~UNI~~ lines, system-wide improvements could improve transit service and should be considered. Improvements that increase transit running

1 speeds, real-time passenger information systems, “proof-of-payment” policies that expedite
2 ticketing and boarding, and other innovations should be explored and applied in the plan area.

3
4 Ideas for future study to improve transit service include but are not limited to the following:

- 5
6 • dedicated bus lanes, including the possibility of bus rapid transit, on *Van Ness Avenue* major
7 transit corridors. (SFMTA, ~~Muni~~, Caltrans)
- 8 • transit preferential treatments, such as stop sign removal and signal
9 preemption/prioritization, on bus route streets. (SFMTA, ~~Muni~~)
- 10 • enforceable transit-only lanes on transit preferential streets. (SFMTA)
- 11 • transit preferential treatments outside the neighborhood along corridors outside the Plan
12 Area to improve frequency and capacity within it. (SFMTA)
- 13 • new transit services outside the neighborhood that will reduce the need to drive from the
14 west side of the city into downtown. (SFMTA)
- 15 • establishment of a ~~transit impact development fee (TIDE)~~ Transportation Sustainability Fee to
16 assist in funding the proposed transit improvements. The ~~Planning Department~~ SFMTA shall
17 be the implementing agency for this fee.
- 18 • prohibition of new curb cuts on traffic-preferential streets and reduction or elimination of
19 existing curb cuts where opportunities arise. The Planning Department shall be the
20 implementing agency for this fee.
- 21 • establishment of an impact fee for residential development that funds a range of transit,
22 pedestrian, and bicycle improvements, and extend impact fees on commercial fees from
23 the downtown to include the Market and Octavia neighborhood. Proceeds should go to an
24 “Alternative Transportation Improvements Fund” for the Market and Octavia area. Funds
25 should be used exclusively to implement the transit, pedestrian, and bicycle improvements

1 outlined in this plan. The Planning Department shall be the implementing agency for this
2 fee.

3
4 * * * *

5
6 **OBJECTIVE 5.2**

7 **DEVELOP AND IMPLEMENT PARKING POLICIES FOR AREAS WELL SERVED BY**
8 **PUBLIC TRANSIT THAT ENCOURAGE TRAVEL BY PUBLIC TRANSIT AND**
9 **ALTERNATIVE TRANSPORTATION MODES AND REDUCE TRAFFIC CONGESTION.**

10
11 San Francisco’s Downtown Area Plan successfully implemented parking management
12 strategies that discouraged auto dependence by limiting parking development, enabling the
13 development of 14 million square feet of commercial space to be built and thrive on public
14 transit and very little parking. Market and Octavia parking management strategies allow some
15 neighborhood residents to choose a “car-free” or “car-reduced” lifestyle. In a center-city
16 neighborhood such lifestyles reduce expensive transportation costs and encourage healthy
17 modes of transportation such as walking and bicycling. Because the Market and Octavia
18 neighborhood is one of the city’s best transit-served areas, it naturally supports transit-
19 oriented living. In keeping with the “Transit First” Policy (City Charter, Section 16.102), every
20 effort should be made to manage parking supply and pricing to encourage the use of public
21 transportation and alternative ways of moving about.

22
23 ***POLICY 5.2.1***

24 ***Eliminate minimum off-street parking requirements and establish parking caps for***
25 ***residential and commercial parking.***

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Eliminating parking requirements will support the creation of housing and increase the affordability of housing, as well as encourage new space for small-scale commercial uses and services, in keeping with the scale of existing commercial streets. Parking maximums should allow varying amounts of parking depending on a site's proximity to transit and services and the overall intensity of use expected in the future.

POLICY 5.2.2

Encourage the efficient use of space designated for parking and amenities that support sustainable trips.

Often, space used for parking represents a lost opportunity to provide space for housing ~~and~~, commercial uses, or community benefits. Where it is provided, space dedicated to parking should be used as efficiently as possible, ~~thereby minimizing this lost opportunity and integrate conveniences for residents that do not own cars~~. Through the use of reduced parking minimums, tandem parking, valet services, car-share parking, and new parking technologies, the amount of space needed to park a car can be reduced dramatically. Every effort should be made to encourage efficient use of space and increase amenities.

- Encourage innovative means of increasing the efficiency of space devoted to parking (parking lifts, valet parking, etc.).
- Do not require individual parking and loading spaces to be independently accessible. Expand the planning code definition of a parking space to include tandem spaces, spaces in parking lifts, and valet parking spaces.

- 1 • Do not permit the minimum dimensions for a parking space to be exceeded by more than
2 15 percent.
- 3 • Include community storage spaces in parking areas for car seats and other equipment that supports
4 residents not owning their own vehicles.

5 6 **POLICY 5.2.3**

7 **Minimize the negative impacts of off-street parking on neighborhood quality.**

8
9 Off-street parking, where it is above ground, detracts from the character and quality of
10 neighborhood streets. Parking garages typically bring with them large expanses of blank walls
11 with nothing of interest to the passerby, creating dead spaces that are almost always avoided
12 and contribute little to the life of the neighborhood. By ensuring that parking is located below
13 grade, or at the least lined with more active uses and activities, the negative effects of parking
14 on the neighborhood can be kept to a minimum.

- 15 • In districts with large lots and where more intensive residential development is possible,
16 limit the use of above-ground space for parking to minimize large frontages devoted to
17 parking and to maximize opportunities for housing and community-serving uses.
- 18 • Where above-ground parking is permitted, require it to be setback from building facades
19 that face public rights-of-way.
- 20 • Maximize parking spaces outfitted with electric vehicle charging and reserved for zero-emission
21 car share.

22 23 **POLICY 5.2.4**

24 **Support the choice to live without a car.**

25

1 More than 40 percent of the households in the Market & Octavia neighborhood live without a
2 car. The area’s access to transit, ~~to~~ local shopping, and ~~to the~~ downtown make it an ideal
3 place to live with less dependency on ~~the~~ private automobiles. In addition to retiring the
4 minimum parking requirement, ~~every effort should be made to support this possibility by~~ and
5 ensuring that parking-free housing ~~without parking~~ is available in the neighborhood, ~~and that~~
6 supportive services ~~such as carsharing and taxis are for sustainable trips (walking, biking, transit,~~
7 carpool) should also be readily available, including sufficient amounts and types of bike parking,
8 carshare, and transit shelters. The City should investigate the full costs to the public of parking in
9 new developments; and should consider recovering these costs and using the proceeds to
10 fund transit improvements and to increase the quality of streets for pedestrians.

11
12 **POLICY 5.2.5**

13 ~~**Retire minimum off-street loading requirements for residential uses and establish maximums based**~~
14 ~~**on the existing minimums.**~~

15
16 ~~The city currently requires most new residential development to provide one off-street loading space~~
17 ~~for every 100,000 sf. of development. While space for loading is important, this requirement is geared~~
18 ~~toward meeting the building’s one-time needs on “move-in day” and results in more loading spaces~~
19 ~~than are needed for its day-to-day operation. It also is geared to street designs where every use is given~~
20 ~~its own space, when flexible management of uses might work as well or better while at the same time~~
21 ~~creating better street designs. Large areas of the ground floor that could otherwise be used for housing,~~
22 ~~retail and other community-serving uses are thus given over permanently to loading spaces that are~~
23 ~~rarely, if ever, used. Rather than prescribe a requirement that responds to a one-time need or lack of~~
24 ~~street management, new development should provide the amount of loading space necessary to operate~~

1 ~~the building, and arrangements made to provide on-street space for loading to take place on move-in~~
2 ~~days.~~

3
4 **Balance the pedestrian experience with individual loading needs.**

5
6 When developments are required to have off-street loading, consider the evolving needs of loading and
7 building design. Minimize frontages devoted to services and parking access and integrate loading with
8 the overall articulation and fenestration of the façade. Combine loading with vehicular access to
9 minimize curb cuts.

10
11 * * * *

12
13 **OBJECTIVE 5.4**

14 **MANAGE EXISTING PARKING RESOURCES TO MAXIMIZE SERVICE AND**
15 **ACCESSIBILITY TO ALL.**

16
17 Existing parking resources should be optimized before considering any substantial increase in
18 parking supply. Increasing supply is just one way, arguably the most costly and time-
19 consuming, to increase the availability of parking. More effective pricing, more efficient
20 management of supply, and better information can all result in dramatically improved parking
21 availability in an area without adding a single parking space.

22
23 **POLICY 5.4.1**

24 ~~Consider revisions to the~~ **Continuously refine the Residential Parking Permit (RPP) program**
25

1 ~~that~~ **to make more efficient use of the on-street parking supply and support the City's**
2 **Transit First Policy.**

3
4 Many San Franciscans live in older neighborhoods where parking for existing residences and
5 businesses is scarce and they rely on a limited amount of on-street parking. While requiring
6 off-street parking spaces gives the appearance of a solution in the short-term, over time it only
7 exacerbates the problem, which would be more directly addressed by limiting the issuance of
8 parking permits based on the availability of parking spaces, ~~and through increasing fees for on-~~
9 ~~street permits to more closely reflect their true market value.~~

10
11 ~~The MTA and other relevant policy bodies should consider the following revisions to the Residential~~
12 ~~Parking Permit (RPP) program for the Market & Octavia neighborhood:~~

- 13 ~~• Grandfather existing residents with one RPP per household at the current rate, indexed annually,~~
14 ~~for as long as they live at their current address.~~
- 15 ~~• Restrict the issuance of RPPs to new residents based on available on-street parking supply.~~
- 16 ~~• Price new RPPs at market rate, allowing for only a short waiting list, if any. Revenue in excess of~~
17 ~~the administrative fee could go into the alternative transportation fund, described in Policy 5.2.1~~
- 18 ~~• Extend the hours of RPP zones beyond the current 9 AM to 6 PM, if residents desire.~~
- 19 ~~• Allow RPP residents to sell excess daytime parking capacity to businesses, but do not permit the~~
20 ~~sale or purchase of daytime capacity for commuter parking. Revenue generated should be used for~~
21 ~~neighborhood improvements, especially alternative transportation related improvements such as~~
22 ~~pedestrian improvements, bicycle parking, or transit facility enhancements.~~
- 23 ~~• Consider automatically establishing or extending an RPP zone when on-street parking occupancy~~
24 ~~exceeds a pre-determined benchmark, upon residents request, or to prevent spillover effect.~~

1 **POLICY 5.4.2**

2 ***Prioritize access to available publicly-owned parking (on- and off-street) based on user***
3 ***needs.***

4

5 Access to public parking should be allocated based on need and should maximize
6 accessibility to the most appropriate users. There is a clear, demonstrated need, for instance,
7 for dedicated parking space for those with physical disabilities, for required deliveries, and for
8 short-term users. A commuter parking space, by contrast, encourages peak-period driving
9 trips, which negatively impact the street system when it is the most congested, and which
10 could be most easily accommodated by transit.

11

12 The following priorities should be used to allocate on-street and public garage spaces, in this
13 order:

- 14 1. Adequate parking space should be reserved at all times for ~~the handicapped and the~~
15 ~~disabled~~ *people with disabilities and elderly people.*
- 16 2. Sufficient high-turnover spaces for short-term shopping and errand-running trips should
17 be made available at all times through the provision of time-limited, metered parking,
18 and pricing policies that discourage all-day parking and support turnover.
- 19 3. Sufficient parking should be maintained for the major arts and educational institutions
20 in the area, but these spaces should be priced at rates comparable to those in the
21 Downtown, and these prices should be made visible to individual users. Access and
22 personal safety improvements should be made to the Civic Center Garage to serve
23 patrons of area cultural institutions.

24

25

- 1 4. Residential parking should generally be provided along the curb, and curbside parking
2 should be managed by limiting the number of curbside parking permits ~~and allocating~~
3 ~~these permits by market pricing.~~
- 4 5. Commuter parking should generally be discouraged and should only be provided to the
5 extent that other goals are met. In any case, all commuter parking spaces should be
6 priced according to the prevailing downtown rates, and these prices should be made
7 visible to users.

8 **POLICY 5.4.3**

9 ***Permit off-street parking only where loss of on-street parking is adequately offset and***
10 ***pursue recovering the full costs of new curb cuts to the city.***
11

12 While the provision of new off-street parking may relieve some limited, private demand for on-
13 street parking in the short term, the curb cuts required to access it usually require removing
14 on-street parking spaces. The giving over of public parking for private parking should be
15 carefully considered in every instance and permitted only where the new off-street parking
16 spaces offsets the loss of public on-street parking.
17

18 A fee should be considered for all curb cuts. The curb cut fee should be sufficient to account
19 for the long-term value of the street area no longer available for public use. The supporting fee
20 study should consider delays to street traffic (auto, transit, bicycles), safety and aesthetic
21 impacts on the pedestrian realm, loss of on-street publicly accessible parking, and program
22 administration (costs and structure). This fee should be re-evaluated every five years, to
23 capture increased costs and impacts. In general, new curb cuts should not be allowed where
24
25

1 they would result in the removal of on-street parking and create fewer than two fully enclosed
2 off-street spaces.

3

4 **POLICY 5.4.4**

5 ***Consider recovering the full costs of new parking to the neighborhood and using the***
6 ***proceeds to improve transit, bicycle infrastructure, and equity-focused transportation programs.***

7

8 In keeping with the goal of moving more people through the overall transportation system, the
9 costs of encouraging other users to shift to alternatives to driving should be borne by new
10 parking facilities built in the plan area.

- 11 • Consider establishing an impact fee for new residential and commercial off-street parking.
12 Use the fund proceeds to improve transit access and pedestrian safety as part of the
13 alternative transportation fund.
- 14 • Consider pursuing parking benefits districts, in coordination with the *Municipal*
15 *Transportation Agency (SFMTA)* and the San Francisco County Transportation Authority
16 (SFCTA).
- 17 • Consider supporting transit subsidies for Muni including the Lifeline Pass for Muni rides.

18

19 **POLICY 5.4.5**

20 ***Improve the safety and accessibility of City-owned parking structures.***

21

22 An extensive analysis of parking supply, demand, and management was undertaken in
23 Spring 2001 to help develop the parking program for the Market and Octavia area. The study
24 identified 1,040 off-street surface parking spaces in the initial study area, including 537
25 spaces on the parcels formerly covered by the Central Freeway. One of the primary findings

1 of the study is that there is excess capacity in the Civic Center Garage during the evening—
2 even when the Opera, Ballet and Symphony have simultaneous performances—and that the
3 needs of the performing arts institutions can be accommodated even with the removal of
4 parking and development of new housing on the Central Freeway parcels. There is also
5 excess capacity in the Performing Arts Garage during the daytime, which could be better
6 managed to address the parking needs of the neighborhood, shoppers, arts providers and
7 commuters.

- 8 • Offset parking demand by implementing bicycle, pedestrian, and transit improvements
9 recommended elsewhere in this plan.
- 10 • Improve personal security for evening parkers at the Civic Center Garage
11 through significant urban design changes at Civic Center Plaza, and with
12 security personnel stationed there during evening events.
- 13 • In keeping with the city's downtown parking policies, eliminate discounts offered
14 at the Civic Center Garage.
- 15 • Adjust pricing structures at the Civic Center and Performing Arts Garages in line
16 with those at the 5th/Mission Garage, including the elimination of the early-bird
17 rate offered at the Performing Arts Garage.
- 18 • Optimize use of the City vehicle fleet more efficiently to decrease space needed
19 for City vehicles and increase space available for public use.
- 20 • ~~Offset parking demand by implementing bicycle, pedestrian, and transit improvements~~
21 ~~recommended elsewhere in this plan.~~
- 22 • Encourage the provision of parking cash-outs for all employees in the plan area,
23 in lieu of parking subsidies.
- 24 • Relocate and reduce reserved on-street parking around City Hall.

- 1 • Implement real-time information regarding parking availability in area parking
- 2 garages.
- 3 • Introduce evening valet parking at the Civic Center Garage as appropriate.
- 4 • Provide a parking shuttle to and from the Civic Center Garage and perhaps the
- 5 5th and Mission Streets Garage for events at cultural institutions in the area.
- 6 • These actions should be considered before the City allows new parking in the
- 7 area.

8 * * * *

9
10 **POLICY 5.4.8**

11 **Monitor parking supply in Time Series Monitoring reports.**

12 * * * *

13 **Improving the Area’s Bicycle Network**

14 Bicycling offers a simple, inexpensive, and space-efficient means of getting from place to place, and

15 requires nothing more than ~~the most~~ simple equipment, ~~no licenses, or~~ and basic ~~special~~ training.

16 People have been bicycling for centuries. Human settlements developed compact, urban

17 forms in order to facilitate fast and easy access to daily needs on foot. Like walking, biking

18 harnesses our own muscle power to allow us to travel larger distances within this same

19 compact urban form. Only relatively recently have motorized transportation technologies been

20 developed, encouraging people to move around far more quickly, cover far greater distances,

21 and in turn encouraging cities to spread out.

22

23 The ~~close knit~~ urban fabric of the Market and Octavia neighborhood is well suited to bicycling,

24 ~~along with~~ due to its central location ~~and,~~ relatively level topography, and connections to the larger

25 city bicycle network ~~is well suited to bicycling, and bicycling offers a simple, inexpensive, and space-~~

1 ~~efficient means of getting from place to place.~~ As part of a comprehensive approach to
2 transportation, this plan promotes bicycling as a safe, equitable, and convenient form of
3 transportation that increases the neighborhood’s livability, enhances public life, and improves
4 public and environmental health.

5
6 To this end, the plan calls for creating a network of safe and convenient bike lanes, bike
7 routes, and calmed traffic streets. It proposes several new bike facilities that would connect
8 established bike lanes into a more complete bike system. The plan also proposes
9 improvements to several extremely dangerous conflict points between bicycles and vehicular
10 traffic.

11
12 See Map 11 Bicycle Network

13 * * * *

14
15 **OBJECTIVE 5.5**
16 **ESTABLISH A BICYCLE NETWORK THAT PROVIDES A SAFE AND ATTRACTIVE**
17 **ALTERNATIVE TO DRIVING FOR BOTH LOCAL AND CITYWIDE TRAVEL NEEDS.**

18 * * * *

19 **POLICY 5.5.2**
20 ***Provide sufficient, secure, and convenient bicycle parking throughout the area.***

21
22 Providing ample and convenient~~secure~~ bicycle parking is important to make cycling an attractive
23 alternative to driving. In urban areas like San Francisco, ~~secure and convenient bicycle parking,~~
24 ~~placed in appropriate locations, is an essential amenity for everyday cyclists. Such~~ bicycle parking
25 must also be secure to reduces theft and provide a needed sense of security.

- 1 • Building on SFMTA's bicycle parking program, ensure that adequate bicycle parking is
2 provided in centers of activity such as Hayes Street, Market Street, and the new Octavia
3 Boulevard.
- 4 • Require a minimum amount of easy-to-use bicycle parking on-site for all new development,
5 considering unit size and number of bedrooms.
- 6 • Include sufficient bicycle racks that are sized to accommodate larger cargo bicycles and adequate
7 number of electric charging facilities.

8

9 **POLICY 5.5.3**

10 ***Support and expand opportunities for bicycle commuting throughout the city and the***
11 ***region.***

12

13 In cities where bicycling is promoted and where a complete and safe network of bikeways is
14 provided, such as Davis and Palo Alto, bicycling has been shown to have a measurable effect
15 on reducing congestion. From a citywide and regional perspective, every effort should be
16 made to support peoples' commute by bicycle. The largest obstacle to bicycle commuting,
17 aside from unsafe streets, is the difficulty in taking bicycles on regional transit and the lack of
18 secure bicycle parking at transit facilities. To support bicycle commuting, bicycles need to be
19 permitted on all city and regional transit operators at peak commute times and secure bicycle
20 parking needs to be provided at transit stations.

- 21 • Encourage SamTrans, Golden Gate Transit, and other regional bus transit operators to
22 provide bicycle racks on their buses.
- 23 • Study the feasibility of allowing bicycles on light rail vehicles, and of providing racks on all
24 other Muni vehicles.

25

- 1 • Encourage BART to study the possibilities of allowing bicycles at peak periods, including a
2 “bike car” on peak-period trains and programs to encourage the use of folding bicycles.
3 Develop the means to allow bicyclists to use the BART system without conflicting with
4 other riders (e.g. dedicated locations for bicycle storage on trains or dedicated “bike cars”.)
- 5 • Encourage provision of secure, convenient, and supervised bicycle storage facilities at
6 regional transit stations.

7

8 * * * *

9

10 **7. A NEW NEIGHBORHOOD IN ~~SOMA WEST~~ THE HUB**

11 Immediately south of Market Street between 10th ~~14th~~ Street and Duboce Avenue~~Valencia Street~~
12 lies an area that relatively few San Franciscans know well. It is where the South of Market
13 Street grid bumps awkwardly into and connects with the Mission grid. The area is currently
14 characterized with an overhead freeway structure and a dank Division Street beneath, with
15 freeway entrance and exit ramps, and with a wide variety of uses, considerable housing, and
16 a handful of new residential developments.

17

18 There are tremendous opportunities for positive change in this area - what has come to be
19 called “~~SoMa West~~ the Hub,” a name given to the neighborhood for its prominence at the intersection
20 of four street car lines. The city’s General Plan envisions this area’s transformation into a
21 vibrant, new, sustainable, and resilient mixed-use residential neighborhood, providing much-
22 needed housing, a full range of neighborhood serving uses~~new services~~ and vibrant streets and
23 public spaces. This plan carries forward this vision and articulates it further, proposing new
24 zoning that encourages substantial new mixed-use housing development, as well as a
25 dramatic program for recreating the public realm of streets and open spaces to serve a new

1 residential population. This is the one part of the Market and Octavia area where creating a
2 new, truly high-density mixed-use neighborhood can be achieved and would bring
3 tremendous benefit to the city as a whole.

4
5 Realizing this vision will be no small task. Creating a neighborhood here will take more than
6 changing the zoning. A great deal of vehicular traffic, much of it freeway-bound, pushes
7 through the area's busy streets: South Van Ness, Mission, Duboce, and Division. As public
8 spaces, these streets suffer from large unwelcoming areas of asphalt, awkward pedestrian
9 islands, and high accident rates. Most are "no man's lands" without the most basic comforts
10 for pedestrians. There are major, problematic intersections, for cars and pedestrians alike,
11 including intersections at Market Street and Van Ness Avenue, Market Street and Gough Street,
12 and at South Van Ness Avenue and Mission Street. Most streets within the area are on the Vision
13 Zero high-injury network, among the City's most dangerous streets for all users. ~~While injuries have~~
14 ~~steadily declined during the past decade following investments in safety from Department of Parking~~
15 ~~and Traffic, there is room for improvement. Of the more busy intersections in the area, the Gough and~~
16 ~~Market Street intersection has the dubious distinction of being among the three highest intersections in~~
17 ~~terms of injury according to MTA's 2004 Collision Report. While the South Van Ness Avenue and~~
18 ~~Mission Street intersection proves less treacherous, it is nonetheless characterized by an unappealing~~
19 ~~pedestrian environment due to its scale, the many possible directions of traffic, and the confusing~~
20 ~~geometry owing to the nature of the underlying street grids.~~

21
22 New residential developments in the area attest to what this area could become. Major transit
23 investments, planned for Van Ness Avenue and the Market / Mission Street corridors, add to
24 the area's potential for a dramatic new future. Ultimately, it can happen only if the city takes
25 an active role in undertaking the improvements proposed here. It will be a large project, with

1 the needed public realm improvements costing roughly \$20–30/20 million in all. If the
2 investment were made, it would set the stage for the creation of ~~more than 2,000 new~~several
3 thousand housing units as part of ~~at~~this new, high-density mixed-use neighborhood in an area
4 that otherwise shows little promise or hope of realizing its position ~~at~~in the center of the city.
5 ~~More than in any other part of San Francisco, it is up to the city to seize the~~There is an opportunity
6 here, to encourage housing, and ~~to~~ invest in its streets and public spaces, thereby setting the
7 stage for a real neighborhood to emerge in ~~SoMa West~~the Hub.

8
9 **OBJECTIVE 7.1**

10 **CREATE A VIBRANT NEW MIXED-USE NEIGHBORHOOD IN ~~SOMA WEST~~THE HUB.**

11
12 While a small scattering of new housing is being built in ~~SoMa West~~the Hub, the area has a
13 tremendous untapped potential for substantial new residential development, supported by a
14 full range of neighborhood-serving shops and services. To realize this potential, the area's
15 existing zoning, which encourages large-scale commercial uses, will be changed to
16 encourage a gradual transition to high-density residential uses with retail, services, and a
17 limited amount of office uses on lower floors. Every effort should be made to encourage
18 mixed-use housing development as part of a gradual conversion of the area with high-density
19 residential uses above retail and commercial activities. Because the coarser, large-scale
20 physical fabric of the area supports tall buildings in selected areas, residential towers should
21 be encouraged as one part of the overall urban form vision for the plan area.

22
23 **POLICY 7.1.1**

24 ***Maintain a strong preference for housing as a desired use.***

1 ~~SoMa West~~The Hub is unlike the smaller-scale residential areas of the rest of the plan area.
2 Buildings here typically house commercial uses, are typically taller and more bulky, and sit on
3 larger parcels. Where there are opportunities for new development, housing is a priority above
4 all other uses to create a stronger residential presence in the area. To this end, the overall
5 land use plan takes advantage of the unique scale of ~~the SoMa West~~the Hub area to
6 accommodate higher-density housing where there are opportunity sites close to transit and
7 services. Retail and other uses that support new housing are encouraged on the ground floor
8 as part of new development.

9

10 **POLICY 7.1.2**

11 ***Encourage residential towers on selected sites.***

12

13 ~~In limited areas, slender r~~Residential towers should be permitted around the Market Street and Van
14 Ness Avenue and Mission Street and South Van Ness Avenue intersections~~to extend above the streetwall~~
15 ~~height.~~ Housing should be the ~~only permitted~~primary use in these towers. Carefully control the
16 tower form and bulk so they are not overly imposing on the skyline and do not produce
17 excessive wind or shadows on public spaces.

18

- 19 • Make housing the primary~~a~~ required use for all new construction and major additions~~building~~
20 ~~area above the streetwall height.~~
- 21 • Adopt special controls for residential towers to ensure a slender profile on the skyline, as
22 described in Element Objective 3 of this plan.

23

24 **OBJECTIVE 7.2**

25 **ESTABLISH A FUNCTIONAL, ATTRACTIVE, GREEN, AND WELL-INTEGRATED SYSTEM**

1 **OF PUBLIC STREETS AND OPEN SPACES IN THE ~~SOMA WESTHUB~~ AREA TO**
2 **IMPROVE THE PUBLIC REALM.**

3
4 ~~A great deal of vehicular traffic, much of it freeway bound from areas north of Market Street and from~~
5 ~~the west, pushes through SoMa West: South Van Ness Avenue and Mission, Duboce, and Division~~
6 ~~Streets. SoMa West is also lacking in public open space; what spaces do exist are negatively affected by~~
7 ~~traffic that makes them noisy and less than desirable. Public transit moves through this area, as do~~
8 ~~increasing numbers of cyclists. Most of its streets are not comfortable for pedestrians; many are~~
9 ~~dangerous. There are major, problematic intersections. Some of the worst are at Market Street / Van~~
10 ~~Ness Avenue, and at South Van Ness Avenue / Mission Street, Mission Street / Otis / Division Streets,~~
11 ~~and South Van Ness Avenue / Division Street.~~

12 High volumes of vehicular through traffic, much of it freeway-bound from areas north of Market Street
13 and from the west, push through the Hub, creating congestion, air quality, and safety issues.

14 Particularly Van Ness and South Van Ness Avenues, and Mission, Otis, Gough, Duboce, and Division
15 Streets, are impacted by this traffic, and identified as Vision Zero high-injury corridors due to known
16 injuries or deaths to pedestrians, cyclist, and motorists. Public transit moving through this area is often
17 delayed and the area lacks protected bicycle facilities. Most of the neighborhood's streets are
18 uncomfortable and unsafe for pedestrians, in part because of the numerous large, complicated
19 intersections that are difficult to cross.

20
21 As the residential population of the area expands, every opportunity should be taken to
22 ~~improve pedestrian safety and calm traffic through the area~~reduce and calm vehicle traffic and
23 improve safety for people that walk and bicycle. New neighborhood open spaces should be
24 provided through the creation of new parks and plazas, ~~as well as through reclaiming street~~
25 ~~spaces to widen sidewalks and improve~~and by widening sidewalks; in part through reclaimed street

1 spaces dedicated to pedestrian use. The following policies describe specific strategies to
2 make these improvements.

3
4 See Map 12. Major Routes for Vehicular Circulation and the Hub Public Realm Plan~~Figure 12. A~~
5 ~~New Street System for SoMa Neighborhood.~~

6 * * * *

7
8 ***POLICY 7.2.1***

9 ~~***Study a redesign of South Van Ness Avenue from Mission Street to Division Street as a surface***~~
10 ~~***boulevard serving regional as well as local traffic.***~~

11 ~~*Currently a no-man’s land of wide expanses of asphalt and rather frantic traffic, South Van Ness*~~
12 ~~*Avenue, a state highway, could be a gracious, tree-lined boulevard with wonderful views to the south,*~~
13 ~~*comfortable for autos, buses, pedestrians, and cyclists alike. Moreover, it can and should be a street,*~~
14 ~~*like Van Ness Avenue north of Market Street, that new uses, particularly housing, seek out rather than*~~
15 ~~*shun.*~~

- 16 ~~● *Study creating a dedicated transitway (bus rapid transit) on Van Ness Avenue. The transitway*~~
17 ~~*should include landscaping and pedestrian amenities, as described in this plan.*~~
- 18 ~~● *From Mission Street to Howard Street and Division Street, South Van Ness Avenue carries*~~
19 ~~*considerable vehicular traffic to the freeway. South Van Ness Avenue should be studied with the*~~
20 ~~*goal of supporting all the functions of a great street, moving traffic, facilitating transit and creating*~~
21 ~~*a pleasant and safe environment for bicycles and pedestrians.*~~

22
23 ***POLICY 7.2.2***

24 ~~***Embark on a study to redesign Mission and Otis Streets from South Van Ness Avenue to Duboce***~~
25 ~~***Avenue.***~~

1
2 ~~These two streets act as a one-way couplet making the transition from downtown to the Mission District~~
3 ~~and carrying freeway-bound traffic from Gough Street via Otis Street. Mission district buses use this~~
4 ~~pair as well. Otis Street, particularly, is rather unpleasant for pedestrians. A redesign of these streets~~
5 ~~should be studied to see if it would make the streets comfortable and efficient for buses, autos,~~
6 ~~pedestrians, and bicyclists. The scale of these streets can become more intimate and inviting for all~~
7 ~~users. As part of the study ideas for widening sidewalks and installing other new transit preferential~~
8 ~~improvements should be considered. While other ideas should be studied, the following ideas were~~
9 ~~discussed (but not yet studied) during the community planning process.~~

10 • ~~The Otis Street right-of-way is wide enough to separate local-serving traffic from through traffic~~
11 ~~between Van Ness Avenue and Gough Street via a tree-planted median. A bus-only lane gives~~
12 ~~public transit the priority it needs. Between Gough and Duboce Avenues, the freeway-bound traffic~~
13 ~~can be separated from the buses and the Mission district traffic, again by a planted median that will~~
14 ~~give the street a more human scale.~~

15 • ~~Mission Street traffic, in this area, can be accommodated on fewer lanes, allowing for enhanced~~
16 ~~sidewalks consistent with the new residential development along it. A separate bus lane and a long~~
17 ~~and comfortable boarding platform at the Duboce / Division intersection will serve transit riders.~~
18 ~~This street can have parking lanes on both sides for most of its length. Where the Central Freeway~~
19 ~~off-ramp meets Mission Street, remove the unrestricted right turn onto Mission Street.~~

20 **POLICY 7.2.1**

21 **Street furnishings and landscaping provide important amenities for pedestrians by adding**
22 **functionality and vitality to the pedestrian realm.**

23
24 Throughout all new or redeveloped streets, sidewalks, and open spaces, increase public amenities such
25 as street trees, sidewalk gardens, benches, bicycle racks, and multi-stream waste systems. Plantings

1 should be climate appropriate species with a focus on natives to increase habitat value and support the
2 City's biodiversity policy.

3
4 **POLICY 7.2.2**

5 **Advance a redesign of South Van Ness Avenue from Mission Street to Division Street as a surface**
6 **boulevard welcoming to pedestrians and serving regional as well as local traffic.**

7
8 A no-human's land of wide expanses of asphalt and congested traffic, South Van Ness Avenue is a state
9 highway partially under the control of Caltrans that is burdened by the considerable vehicular traffic
10 it carries to the freeway. South Van Ness Avenue should be redesigned with the goal of supporting all
11 the functions of a great street, prioritizing safety and transit, and creating a pleasant and safe
12 environment for bicycles and pedestrians, while calmly and safely moving vehicular traffic. Support
13 the Van Ness Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) system on South Van Ness and consider long-term improvements
14 to South Van Ness Avenue that support and build on this significant public transit investment. A
15 gracious, tree-lined boulevard with housing and wonderful views to the south, comfortable for autos,
16 buses, pedestrians, and cyclists alike. Separating out local from regional travel lanes with green
17 medians will calm traffic, enhance safety, make the neighborhood a better place to live, and
18 significantly improve the public realm. From Mission Street to Howard Street and Division Street,
19 redesign this long block with a boulevard design, similar to that found on Octavia Boulevard.

20
21 **POLICY 7.2.3**

22 **Redesign Mission and Otis Streets from South Van Ness Avenue to Duboce Avenue.**

23
24 Mission Street and Otis Street act as a one-way couplet making the transition from downtown to the
25 Mission District and carrying freeway-bound traffic from Gough Street via Otis Street. Mission Street

1 buses use this pair of streets as well. Otis Street is particularly unpleasant for pedestrians. Transit-
2 priority improvements will improve the streets and make them more efficient for buses, but there is still
3 a need to improve conditions for people walking. On Otis Street between Duboce Avenue and Gough
4 Street, a single northbound lane could be added to enhance more direct vehicular access from the
5 freeway. This would require additional study. This removal of the u-turn movement at Mission Street/Otis
6 Street and South Van Ness Avenue would improve pedestrian safety at this intersection. Otis Street
7 between Gough Street and South Van Ness Avenue carries far less vehicular traffic and there is more
8 opportunity for improvement. A parking-protected bikeway and transit lane should replace two vehicular
9 travel lanes, and the south sidewalk should be significantly widened for much of this block.

10
11 **POLICY 7.2.34**

12 **Redesign the southern end of Gough Street between Otis Street and Market Streets with**
13 **widened sidewalks and a community gathering space or garden at the northeastern side of the**
14 **Gough, Otis and McCoppin Streets intersection.**

15
16 Presently a wide street with no compelling attractions except for traffic, the wide right-of-way has
17 space for three southbound moving lanes, a tree-lined median, and a northbound lane, with parking to
18 provide a pedestrian realm that borders the small scaled “Brady Block” to the east.

19 A new corner bulb-out should be built on the southwestern corner of the intersection of Gough, Otis, and
20 McCoppin Streets to provide a buffer from vehicles and additional open space. This bulb-out should be
21 built in coordination with the development of the adjacent property at 33 Gough Street. The east sidewalk
22 of the local lane on Gough Street does not meet minimum Better Streets Plan standards and should be
23 widened to at least 12 feet.

1 Stevenson Street between Gough Street and Brady Street should be converted into a two-way street, to
2 accommodate vehicles travelling between Gough Street and Brady Street. Raised crosswalks should be
3 added at the intersection of Gough and Stevenson Streets, 12th and Stevenson Streets, Brady and Otis
4 Streets, and Brady and Market Streets, to calm traffic at the main vehicular entrances to this new
5 neighborhood. A raised intersection at Brady and Colton Streets should be considered to highlight this
6 key intersection and transition from different street spaces on all sides.

7

8 **POLICY 7.2.45**

9 ***Redesign McCoppin Street ~~as a linear green street~~ with additional plantings and a new open***
10 ***space west of Valencia Street in conjunction with the redevelopment of adjacent parcels.***

11

12 With the new freeway touchdown, traffic accessing the freeway, McCoppin Street no longer
13 has the need to be used as a cut-through. As a result, the street carries only a fraction of the
14 traffic that it did before. There is the opportunity to reconfigure McCoppin Street from Otis to
15 Valencia Streets ~~as a linear green street~~, with a substantial portion of the vehicular right-of-way
16 reclaimed as open space on the north side (the sunny side) of the street, and a calmed right-
17 of-way for local traffic. The portion of McCoppin Street west of Valencia Street is no longer
18 needed for vehicular traffic, providing the opportunity to convert it to a small open space. The
19 space, ~~approximately 80 feet by 100 feet~~, should be converted into a small plaza or other form of
20 community space for the use of local residents, activated by adjacent development.

21

22 **POLICY 7.2.56**

23 ***Make pedestrian improvements within the block bounded by Market, Twelfth, Otis, and***
24 ***Gough Streets and redesign Twelfth Street between Market and Mission Streets,***
25 ***creating a new park and street spaces for public use, and new housing opportunities.***

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

The block bounded by Market, Gough, Otis and 12th Streets, known as the “Brady Block” is a unique place; its interior is divided and made publicly-accessible by four alleys bisecting it in different directions. At its core, the block shows the signs of many years of neglect; surface parking lots and a large ventilation shaft for the BART system create a large swath of indefensible space.

The block has tremendous potential despite its present conditions. It is an intimate space of small buildings fronting on narrow alleys. It *isn'tis not* hard to envision a small neighborhood here-on the scale of South Park: small residential infill and existing buildings framing a new public park at the core of the block’s network of alleys. The addition of new housing and the development of a small-scaled living area with a narrow but connected street pattern can make this an enviable mini-neighborhood. Existing uses can stay, but new uses can, by public and private cooperation, create a residential mixed-use enclave.

~~A small new open space can be developed in the center of the Brady Block, taking advantage of a small (approximately 80-foot-square BART-owned parcel that provides access to its tunnel below), and through purchase of an adjacent 100-foot by 80-foot parcel, currently surface parking. By creating a small open space here and connecting the existing alley network, the city would have created a magnificent centerpiece for this intimate mini-neighborhood. The park will be surrounded by several housing opportunity sites and would be accessed via a network of mid-block alleys designed as “living street” spaces. The BART vent shaft rather than a hindrance could be the site of a central wind-driven kinetic sculpture.~~

~~In addition to the land use, height and bulk controls outlined in Element 1, the following actions are necessary to realize this change for the Brady Block, in order of importance:~~

- 1 • ~~An agreement will be necessary with BART to allow the reuse of the land where its ventilation~~
2 ~~shafts comes to the surface as a public park.~~
- 3 • ~~Parcels 3505031 and 3505031A, which are currently used as surface parking lots, will have to be~~
4 ~~purchased and dedicated to the Recreation and Parks Department as public open space.~~
- 5 • ~~Parcel 3505029, which is currently vacant, will have to be purchased and dedicated to DPW as a~~
6 ~~public right-of-way connecting Stevenson Alley with Colton and Colusa Alleys.~~
- 7 • ~~Approximately 4,000 sf. of parcel 3505035, which is currently a surface parking lot, will have to be~~
8 ~~purchased and dedicated to DPW as a public right-of-way connecting the two disconnected halves~~
9 ~~of Stevenson Alley.~~

10 Several small alleys within this block should be designed to prioritize pedestrians. These include Colton
11 Street from Brady Street to Colusa Street, Colusa Place, Chase Court, and Stevenson Street from 12th
12 Street to the new open space. Colton Street east of Brady Street should be redesigned as a shared street
13 with special paving, in conjunction with new development.

14
15 Colton Street from Brady Street to Stevenson Street is an unusually narrow right-of-way and could be
16 converted to pedestrian-only. Private access to the garage for 36-38 Gough Street should be
17 maintained on Colton Street. If there is an opportunity in the future to consolidate driveway access on
18 Gough Street, then vehicle access on Colton Street could be eliminated.

19
20 **POLICY 7.2.67**

21 **Redesign 12th Street between Market Street and South Van Ness Avenue as a calm, residential street**
22 **with significant linear open space.** ~~Embark on a study to redesign 12th Street between Market and~~
23 ~~Mission to recapture space for pedestrian use.~~

1 Twelfth Street is a wide street with far more space devoted to autos and parking than is necessary,
2 especially given low traffic volumes. At least three new developments will line 12th Street with active
3 ground floor uses and residential uses above. Twelfth Street should be repurposed to create wider
4 sidewalks with street trees and sidewalk gardens, as well as a long linear open space along the street's
5 eastern edge, with one travel lane in each direction and parking lanes. This would create an active and
6 green pedestrian environment.

7 ~~Twelfth Street, like McCoppin Street, has more space devoted to autos and parking than is necessary.~~
8 ~~During the community planning process the following idea was discussed but not yet studied: Twelfth~~
9 ~~Street could be reconfigured to provide only one travel lane in each direction, plus parking lanes, and~~
10 ~~concentrating a widened pedestrian realm on one side of the street for pedestrians, providing space for~~
11 ~~public seating, recreation and gardens, can turn it into positive, useful spaces for those who live and~~
12 ~~work along it.~~

13
14 **POLICY 7.2.8**

15 **Redesign Oak Street between Market Street and Van Ness Avenue with a new public plaza at the**
16 **corner of Market Street and Van Ness Avenue.**

17
18 The block of Oak Street between Franklin Street and Market Street has a much different character from
19 the rest of Oak Street. While still relatively wide, it is a one-lane, one-way street in the opposite
20 direction as the rest of Oak Street. San Francisco Fire Department Station 36 is one block away, and
21 Oak Street is used in a contra-flow direction for fire trucks traveling towards SoMa. Three new
22 developments will front Oak Street with active ground floor uses and residential uses above. Some of
23 the roadway should be repurposed to create a high-quality civic street, while maintaining parking on
24 the north side of the street and providing space for passenger loading and deliveries.

1 **POLICY 7.2.9**

2 **Redesign 13th Street between Valencia Street and Folsom Street to minimize the impact of freeway**
3 **traffic and improve safety and comfort for people walking and riding bicycles.**

4
5 Thirteenth Street is a heavily-trafficked and auto-dominated street associated with the entry and exit to
6 the Central Freeway. Though it runs beneath the freeway, 13th Street is also used by people walking
7 and riding bicycles because it is flat and provides a direct connection from SoMa to the Mission.
8 Excess roadway should be repurposed to create new protected bicycle lanes in both directions, with
9 intersections redesigned to improve safety for all users.

10
11 For people on bicycles, protected bicycle lanes should be added from Valencia Street to Folsom Street,
12 connecting to the parking-protected bikeways on 13th Street east of Folsom Street. A safe new crossing
13 for bicycles across Mission Street should be created, either with a new split signal phase near South
14 Van Ness Avenue, or another redesign. Under the off-ramp, Caltrans parking should be reorganized
15 with pedestrian space and a protected bicycle lane.

16
17 For people walking, the sidewalk connection between Mission Street and Howard Street on the
18 northern side of 13th Street should be improved, and bulb-outs should be added at all corners for the
19 safety of all users. A raised crosswalk should be added at Woodward Street for pedestrian safety. Infill
20 tree planting should be added wherever possible, and new pedestrian lighting should be added on the
21 extended sidewalk on the northern side of 13th Street. Opportunities for expanding public art on the
22 freeway columns should be explored, building on the successful public art on freeway columns at the
23 SoMa skatepark.

24
25 **POLICY 7.2.10**

1 **Redesign Valencia Street between Market Street and 15th Street to prioritize safety and comfort for**
2 **people walking and riding bicycles.**

3
4 Valencia is a neighborhood commercial street and an important north-south connection for pedestrians
5 and people riding bicycles. Public realm improvements were implemented south of 15th Street in 2010.
6 These improvements should be extended to Market Street.

7
8 Valencia Street should be redesigned with parking-protected bikeways to provide full protection for
9 people riding bicycles. Corner bulb-outs should be added at all intersections to improve the safety of
10 all users. Raised crosswalks should be added at all alleys, including Clinton Park, Brosnan, and Rosa
11 Parks. Infill street trees, plantings, pedestrian-scale lighting, and seating or other street furnishings
12 should be added to improve pedestrian comfort.

13
14 **POLICY 7.2.11**

15 **Redesign 11th Street between Market Street and Bryant Street to prioritize transit and improve safety**
16 **and comfort for people walking and riding bicycles.**

17
18 Eleventh Street is an important street for transit and bicycles connecting SoMa to Market Street.
19 Currently, the street has three lanes of traffic, including a center turn lane, bicycle lanes, and curb-side
20 parking lanes. The center turning lane should be repurposed to create a parking-protected bicycle lane
21 in both directions.

22
23 Eleventh Street should be redesigned with a one-way, parking-protected bikeway along both curb edges
24 of the street, to enhance safety for people riding bicycles. Transit boarding islands and corner bulb-
25 outs should be added at intersections to improve the safety of all users. Raised crosswalks should be

1 added at all alleys. Infill street trees, sidewalk plantings, pedestrian-scale lighting, and seating or other
2 street furnishings should be added to improve pedestrian comfort.

3
4 **POLICY 7.2.712**

5 ***Embark on a study to reconfigure major intersections to make them safer for vehicles***
6 ***and pedestrians alike, to facilitate traffic movement, and to take advantage of***
7 ***opportunities to create public spaces.***

8
9 ***South Van Ness Avenue and Mission/Otis Streets***

10 ~~*Six streets come together at this intersection. There is a vast paved area that is without relief and is*~~
11 ~~*daunting for pedestrians, transit riders, and drivers alike.*~~

12
13 ~~*During the community planning process the following idea was discussed but not yet studied: the 12th*~~
14 ~~*Street intersection could be reconfigured with South Van Ness Avenue to create space for a new, corner*~~
15 ~~*plaza. Reorganizing vehicular travel lanes and the creation of the transitway north of the intersection*~~
16 ~~*could permit much wider sidewalks at all the corners, as well as refuges for pedestrians crossing the*~~
17 ~~*street. In all, this could be a much safer, less daunting intersection than is the case currently.*~~

18 *The Mission Street and South Van Ness Avenue intersection is a convergence of six different streets*
19 *with varying widths and unusual angles. Long crossings and signal wait times combined with high*
20 *volumes and speeds of traffic leaves the large numbers of pedestrians crossing it consistently*
21 *uncomfortable and unsafe; this Vision Zero intersection has unfortunately high rates of injury for all*
22 *users (pedestrians, cyclists, and vehicle drivers and passengers). While the intersection is heavily used*
23 *by people walking, it also plays an important role for State Route 101 and, as a result, there are some*
24 *limitations for major transformation. The proposal includes realigning 12th Street to create a new 12th*
25 *Street plaza in coordination with the Van Ness BRT project. Other changes to the intersection would*

1 aim to calm traffic and simplify turning movements to improve safety for all users and enhance the
2 pedestrian experience.

3
4 **Division Street at Mission Street and at South Van Ness Avenue**

5 Large volumes of freeway-bound traffic move through these two intersections to access the
6 freeway on-ramp. Pedestrian crossings are daunting, if not impossible, and cyclists find these
7 intersections particularly difficult, mostly because of the freeway-bound traffic. The area's
8 small traffic islands, weaving traffic lanes, and discontinuous sidewalks leave pedestrians and
9 bicyclists lost in a sea of traffic.

10
11 ~~During the community planning process the following idea was discussed but not yet studied: The city~~
12 ~~could establish new lane configurations to make the transition from Mission Street and South Van Ness~~
13 ~~Avenue to the freeway ramp more direct and minimize conflicts with pedestrians. Pedestrian spaces~~
14 ~~could be expanded and auto turning movements regularized. In addition, the city could extend the~~
15 ~~sidewalk along South Van Ness Avenue south of Division Street. This could provide better pedestrian~~
16 ~~connections and separate freeway from local traffic, possibly creating an easier and safer transition for~~
17 ~~cyclists traveling south.~~

18 * * * *

19
20 Section 3. The General Plan is hereby amended by revising the Housing Element, as
21 follows:

22
23 * * * *

24 **I. SUMMARY OF OBJECTIVES & POLICIES**

25 * * * *

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Issue 3:

EQUAL HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES

Objective 4

FOSTER A HOUSING STOCK THAT MEETS THE NEEDS OF ALL RESIDENTS ACROSS LIFECYCLES.

POLICY 4.1

Promote housing for families with children in new development by locating multi-bedroom units near common open space and amenities or with easy access to the street; and by incorporating child-friendly amenities into common open and indoor spaces.

POLICY 4.2

Develop new housing, and encourage the remodeling of existing housing, for families with children.

POLICY 4.3

Provide a range of housing options for residents with special needs for housing support and services.

POLICY 4.4

Create housing for people with disabilities and aging adults by including universal design principles in new and rehabilitated housing units.

1 POLICY 4.45

2 Encourage sufficient and suitable rental housing opportunities, emphasizing permanently
3 affordable rental units wherever possible.

4

5 POLICY 4.56

6 Ensure that new permanently affordable housing is located in all of the city's neighborhoods,
7 and encourage integrated neighborhoods, with a diversity of unit types provided at a range of
8 income levels.

9

10 POLICY 4.67

11 Encourage an equitable distribution of growth according to infrastructure and site capacity.

12

13 POLICY 4.78

14 Consider environmental justice issues when planning for new housing, especially affordable
15 housing.

16

17 * * * *

18

19 **PART II. OBJECTIVES & POLICIES**

20 * * * *

21

22 **ISSUE 3:**

23 **EQUAL HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES**

24

25 **OBJECTIVE 4**

1 **FOSTER A HOUSING STOCK THAT MEETS THE NEEDS OF ALL RESIDENTS ACROSS**
2 **LIFECYCLES.**

3
4 Population diversity is one of San Francisco’s most important assets; San Francisco’s
5 residents span ethnicities, income levels, household types and sizes. Supporting household
6 diversity requires the City support a variety of housing opportunities, so that everyone has the
7 opportunity to live in a suitable home that they can afford.

8 * * * *

9
10 **POLICY 4.1**

11 **Promote housing for families with children in new development by locating multi-bedroom units**
12 **near common open space and amenities or with easy access to the street; and by incorporating**
13 **child-friendly amenities into common open and indoor spaces.**

14
15 *Since 1990 the number of households with children in San Francisco declined slightly, while the region*
16 *continued to gain these households. While the Bay Area has gained both households with one child and*
17 *households with two or more children, San Francisco lost households with two or more children,*
18 *perhaps indicating the difficulty of securing housing that is large enough to accommodate the needs of*
19 *these households.*

20
21 *Citywide, development projects of a certain size are required to provide a minimum of two and/or three*
22 *bedroom units. Additional design features could help make these larger units more appealing to*
23 *families with children. Locating these large units adjacent to each other would encourage socializing*
24 *and community. Providing easy access to common open areas from those units, either directly where*
25 *possible, or accessible by stairs up to three stories, would provide children easy access to play space.*

1 Creating overlooks from those units to the common open space would provide parents better
2 opportunities for informal supervision. Designing open spaces and indoor spaces, such as community
3 rooms or lobby space, with child-friendly features and programing those spaces with children-oriented
4 activities and amenities would provide engaging opportunities for children and further appeal to
5 families with children.

6

7 **POLICY 4.42**

8 ~~Develop new housing, and e~~**Encourage the remodeling of existing housing, for families**
9 **with children.**

10 * * * *

11

12 **POLICY 4.23**

13 **Provide a range of housing options for residents with special needs for housing**
14 **support and services.**

15 * * * *

16

17 **POLICY 4.34**

18 **Create housing for people with disabilities and aging adults by including universal**
19 **design principles in new and rehabilitated housing units.**

20 * * * *

21

22 **POLICY 4.45**

23 **Encourage sufficient and suitable rental housing opportunities, emphasizing**
24 **permanently affordable rental units wherever possible.**

25 * * * *

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

POLICY 4.56

Ensure that new permanently affordable housing is located in all of the city’s neighborhoods, and encourage integrated neighborhoods, with a diversity of unit types provided at a range of income levels.

* * * *

POLICY 4.67

Encourage an equitable distribution of growth according to infrastructure and site capacity

* * * *

POLICY 4.78

Consider environmental justice issues when planning for new housing, especially affordable housing.

* * * *

Section 4. The General Plan is hereby amended by revising the Arts Element, as follows:

(a) The Table of Contents of the Arts Element is hereby amended by inserting a reference to “ART.IND.2.5 Encourage arts on the ground floor as avenues to the creative life and vitality of San Francisco,” in accordance with the amendments described below.

(b) The Arts Element is further revised, as follows:

* * * *

1 **OBJECTIVE III-2**
2 **STRENGTHEN THE CONTRIBUTION OF ARTS ORGANIZATIONS TO THE CREATIVE**
3 **LIFE AND VITALITY OF SAN FRANCISCO.**

4
5 * * * *

6
7 **POLICY III-2.5**

8 **Encourage arts on the ground floor as avenues to the creative life and vitality of San Francisco.**

9
10 **Background**

11 Community-serving arts organizations are critical to strengthening neighborhoods, building
12 community infrastructure, and fostering positive social change. In order for these organizations to
13 continue to operate and remain accessible to residents and visitors, the City should support policies
14 that encourage ground floor space to be made available for community-serving arts organizations.
15 These organizations are integral to making San Francisco a city that provides cultural equity and
16 access to high quality arts experiences.

17 * * * *

18
19 Section 5. Effective Date. This ordinance shall become effective 30 days after
20 enactment. Enactment occurs when the Mayor signs the ordinance, the Mayor returns the
21 ordinance unsigned or does not sign the ordinance within ten days of receiving it, or the Board
22 of Supervisors overrides the Mayor's veto of the ordinance.

23
24 Section 6. Scope of Ordinance. Except as described in sections 2, 3, and 4 of this
25 ordinance, in enacting this ordinance, the Board of Supervisors intends to amend only those

1 words, phrases, paragraphs, subsections, sections, articles, numbers, punctuation marks,
2 charts, diagrams, or any other constituent parts of the General Plan that are explicitly shown
3 in this ordinance as additions, deletions, Board amendment additions, and Board amendment
4 deletions in accordance with the “Note” that appears under the official title of the ordinance.

5

6 APPROVED AS TO FORM:
7 DENNIS J. HERRERA, City Attorney

8 By: /s/ Peter R. Miljanich
9 PETER R. MILJANICH
Deputy City Attorney

10 n:\legana\as2020\1700197\01449409.docx

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25



City and County of San Francisco
Tails
Ordinance

City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

File Number: 200557

Date Passed: July 28, 2020

Ordinance amending the General Plan to amend the Market and Octavia Area Plan; making conforming amendments to the Arts Element and the Housing Element; and making environmental findings, including adopting a statement of overriding considerations, and findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight priority policies of Planning Code, Section, 101.1, and findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare under Planning Code, Section 302.

July 13, 2020 Land Use and Transportation Committee - CONTINUED

July 20, 2020 Land Use and Transportation Committee - RECOMMENDED AS COMMITTEE REPORT

July 21, 2020 Board of Supervisors - PASSED ON FIRST READING

Ayes: 11 - Fewer, Haney, Mandelman, Mar, Peskin, Preston, Ronen, Safai, Stefani, Walton and Yee

July 28, 2020 Board of Supervisors - FINALLY PASSED

Ayes: 11 - Fewer, Haney, Mandelman, Mar, Peskin, Preston, Ronen, Safai, Stefani, Walton and Yee

File No. 200557

I hereby certify that the foregoing Ordinance was FINALLY PASSED on 7/28/2020 by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco.

Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board

London N. Breed
Mayor

7/31/20

Date Approved