

File No. 230501 Committee Item No. 2
Board Item No. _____

COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

Committee: Land Use and Transportation Committee Date July 10, 2023

Board of Supervisors Meeting Date _____

Cmte Board

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Motion |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Resolution |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Ordinance |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Legislative Digest |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Budget and Legislative Analyst Report |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Youth Commission Report |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Introduction Form |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Department/Agency Cover Letter and/or Report |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | MOU |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Grant Information Form |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Grant Budget |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Subcontract Budget |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Contract/Agreement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Form 126 – Ethics Commission |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Award Letter |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Application |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Public Correspondence |

OTHER (Use back side if additional space is needed)

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <u>PLN Transmittal 042823</u> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <u>PLN Executive Summary</u> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <u>PC Reso No. 21303 042023</u> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <u>PC Reso No. 21304 042023</u> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <u>PC Reso No. 21305 042023</u> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <u>PC Motion No. 21277</u> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <u>Port Reso No. 23-15</u> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <u>Referral CEQA PC 051223</u> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <u>CEQA Determination 051723</u> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <u>Hearing Notice 071023</u> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |

Completed by: Erica Major Date July 6, 2023

Completed by: Erica Major Date _____

1 [Zoning Map - Port of San Francisco Waterfront Plan Update; Waterfront Zoning Correction]

2

3 **Ordinance amending the Zoning Map of the Planning Code to rezone certain waterfront**
4 **parcels from P (Public) to M-1 (Light Industrial), and to add Waterfront Special Use**
5 **District No. 4 covering areas east of the Mission Bay and Southern Waterfront areas;**
6 **and making environmental findings, including adopting a statement of overriding**
7 **considerations, and findings of consistency with the General Plan, and the eight**
8 **priority policies of Planning Code, Section 101.1, and findings of public necessity,**
9 **convenience, and welfare under Planning Code, Section 302.**

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

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

18 Section 1. Environmental and Planning Code Findings.

19 (a) On March 16, 2023, after a duly noticed public hearing, the Planning Commission,
20 by Motion No. 21277, certified the Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Port of
21 San Francisco's Waterfront Plan (the Project), which updates and amends the Port's 1997
22 Waterfront Land Use Plan and sets long term goals and policies to guide the use,
23 management, and improvement of properties owned and managed by the Port. The Planning
24 Commission motion finds that the Final EIR reflects the independent judgment and analysis of
25 the City and County of San Francisco, is adequate, accurate and objective, contains no
significant revisions to the Draft EIR, and the content of the report and the procedures through

1 which the Final EIR was prepared, publicized, and reviewed comply with the provisions of the
2 California Environmental Quality Act (California Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et
3 seq.), the CEQA Guidelines (14 Cal. Code Regs. Section 15000 et seq.), and Chapter 31 of
4 the San Francisco Administrative Code. Copies of the Planning Commission Motion and Final
5 EIR are on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. 230501 and are
6 incorporated herein by reference. The Board affirms this determination.

7 (b) With the exception of the rezoning of certain waterfront parcels from P (Public) to
8 M-1 (Light Industrial) set forth in this ordinance, the Project evaluated in the Final EIR includes
9 the proposed amendments to the Zoning Map set forth in this ordinance as well as
10 amendments to the General Plan and the Planning Code.

11 (c) Although not part of the Project, the Port also seeks rezoning of certain waterfront
12 parcels constituting a portion of Assessor’s Block 3941 from P (Public) to M-1 (Light Industrial)
13 to correct an earlier rezoning error. This site is located between the Mission Bay and Central
14 Waterfront neighborhoods. On January 12, 2023, the Planning Department determined that
15 this corrected rezoning of certain waterfront parcels from P to M-1 is exempt from CEQA. The
16 Board affirms this determination. A copy of said determination is on file with the Clerk of the
17 Board of Supervisors in File No. 230501, and is incorporated herein by reference.

18 (d) On April 11, 2023, the Port Commission, in Resolution No. 23-15, adopted findings
19 under CEQA regarding the Project’s environmental impacts, the disposition of mitigation
20 measures, and project alternatives, as well as a statement of overriding considerations
21 (CEQA Findings), and adopted a mitigation monitoring reporting program (MMRP). On
22 _____, the Port Commission, in Resolution No. _____, also affirmed the Planning
23 Department’s determination that the rezoning of certain waterfront parcels from P (Public) to
24 M-1 (Light Industrial) set forth in this ordinance is exempt from CEQA. Copies of said
25

1 Resolutions are on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. _____, and
2 are incorporated herein by reference.

3 (e) On _____, the Planning Commission, in Motion No. _____, adopted
4 findings under CEQA regarding the Project's environmental impacts, the disposition of
5 mitigation measures, and project alternatives, as well as a statement of overriding
6 considerations (CEQA Findings), and adopted a mitigation monitoring reporting program
7 (MMRP). On April 20, 2023, the Planning Commission, in Resolution No. 21305, also
8 affirmed the Planning Department's determination that the rezoning of certain waterfront
9 parcels from P (Public) to M-1 (Light Industrial) set forth in this ordinance is exempt from
10 CEQA. Copies of said Motions are on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File
11 No. 230501, and are incorporated herein by reference.

12 (f) On April 20, 2023, the Planning Commission, in Resolution No. 21305,
13 recommended the proposed Zoning Map amendments for approval and adopted findings that
14 the actions contemplated in this ordinance are consistent, on balance, with the City's General
15 Plan and eight priority policies of Planning Code Section 101.1. The Board adopts these
16 findings as its own. A copy of said Resolution is on file with the Clerk of the Board of
17 Supervisors in File No. 230501, and is incorporated herein by reference.

18 (g) On April 20, 2023, the Planning Commission, in Resolution No. 21305, adopted
19 findings under Planning Code section 302 that the actions contemplated in this ordinance will
20 serve the public necessity, convenience, and welfare. The Board adopts these findings as its
21 own. A copy of said Resolution is on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No.
22 230501, and is incorporated herein by reference.

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

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

21
22 Section 2. The Planning Code is hereby amended by revising Zoning Use District Map
23 ZN08 and Special Use District Maps SU08 and SU09, as follows:

24 (a) The San Francisco Planning Code is hereby amended by amending Zoning Use
25 District Map ZN08 of the Zoning Map of the City and County of San Francisco, as follows:

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

<u>Description of Property</u>		<u>Use Districts to be Superseded</u>	<u>Use Districts Hereby Approved</u>
<u>Assessor's Block</u>	<u>Lot</u>		
3941	031	P (Public)	M-1 (Light Industrial)

(b) The San Francisco Planning Code is hereby amended by amending Special Use District Maps SU08 and SU09 of the Zoning Map of the City and County of San Francisco, as follows:

<u>Description of Property</u>		<u>Special Use District Map</u>	<u>Special Use District Hereby Approved</u>
<u>Assessor's Block</u>	<u>Lot(s)</u>		
3941	021, 028, 031, 041	SU08	Waterfront SUD No. 4
4111	008	SU08	Waterfront SUD No. 4
4301	001	SU08	Waterfront SUD No. 4
4302	001	SU08	Waterfront SUD No. 4
4303	001	SU08	Waterfront SUD No. 4

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

4304	002 [and all portions of Pier 80 within and outside the boundaries of this parcel]	SU08	Waterfront SUD No. 4
4307	006	SU08	Waterfront SUD No. 4
4308	005, 007	SU08	Waterfront SUD No. 4
4379	001	SU08	Waterfront SUD No. 4
4380	010	SU08	Waterfront SUD No. 4
4502A	002 [and all portions of Piers 90 through 96 within and outside the boundaries of this parcel]	SU08 and SU09	Waterfront SUD No. 4
4827	001, 002	SU09	Waterfront SUD No. 4
4845	002	SU09	Waterfront SUD No. 4
9900	050, 050H, 052, 054, 064, 064H, 068, 070	SU08	Waterfront SUD No. 4
9900	098 [and all portions of Heron's Head Park within and outside the boundaries of this parcel]	SU09	Waterfront SUD No. 4

1 Section 3. Effective Date. This ordinance shall become effective 30 days after
2 enactment. Enactment occurs when the Mayor signs the ordinance, the Mayor returns the
3 ordinance unsigned or does not sign the ordinance within ten days of receiving it, or the Board
4 of Supervisors overrides the Mayor’s veto of the ordinance.

5
6 Section 4. Scope of Ordinance. In enacting this ordinance, the Board of Supervisors
7 intends to amend only those words, phrases, paragraphs, subsections, sections, articles,
8 numbers, punctuation marks, charts, diagrams, or any other constituent parts of the Municipal
9 Code that are explicitly shown in this ordinance as additions, deletions, Board amendment
10 additions, and Board amendment deletions in accordance with the “Note” that appears under
11 the official title of the ordinance.

12
13
14 APPROVED AS TO FORM:
15 DAVID CHIU, City Attorney

16 By: /s/ Peter R. Miljanich
17 PETER R. MILJANICH
18 Deputy City Attorney

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
n:\legana\as2023\2300067\01658039.docx

LEGISLATIVE DIGEST

[Zoning Map - Port of San Francisco Waterfront Plan Update; Waterfront Zoning Correction]

Ordinance amending the Zoning Map of the Planning Code to rezone certain waterfront parcels from P (Public) to M-1 (Light Industrial), and to add Waterfront Special Use District No. 4 covering areas east of the Mission Bay and Southern Waterfront areas; 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.

Existing Law

The Planning Code and Zoning Map regulate development in the City, including setting forth requirements for height and bulk, density, and other controls. Sections 235 through 249.93 of the Planning Code establish various Special Use Districts. Sections 240 through 240.3 of the Planning Code establish three Waterfront Special Use Districts that provide development controls and design review procedures for portions of the City's waterfront area. The Zoning Map sets forth the boundaries of these Waterfront Special Use Districts.

Amendments to Current Law

The ordinance would amend Zoning Use District Map ZN08 to rezone a portion of Assessor's Block 3941, lot 031 from P (Public) to M-1 (Light Manufacturing) to correct an earlier, inadvertent rezoning action. This ordinance would also amend Zoning Use District Maps SU08 and SU09 to create new Waterfront Special Use District No. 4.

Background Information

The Port conducted a thorough public planning process for the updated Waterfront Plan, which included the creation of a Waterfront Plan Working Group that presented extensive policy recommendations to the Port Commission, and the adoption of a draft updated Waterfront Plan in 2019. The Planning Commission initiated this ordinance, pursuant to Planning Code section 302, on March 9, 2023. This ordinance is a companion to other legislative amendments to the General Plan and Planning Code that would give effect to the updated Waterfront Plan.

n:\legana\as2023\2300067\01674028.docx


BOARD of SUPERVISORS



City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689
Tel. No. (415) 554-5184
Fax No. (415) 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. (415) 554-5227

MEMORANDUM

Date: May 12, 2023
To: Planning Department / Commission
From: Erica Major, Clerk of the Land Use and Transportation Committee
Subject: Board of Supervisors Legislation Referral - File Nos. 230501, 230502, 230503
Zoning Map - Port of San Francisco Waterfront Plan Update; Waterfront Zoning
Correction; General Plan - Port of San Francisco Waterfront Plan Update; Planning Code
- Port of San Francisco Waterfront Plan Update

- California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Determination CEQA clearance under Port of San Francisco
(*California Public Resources Code, Sections 21000 et seq.*) Waterfront Plan Project EIR certified March 16,
 Ordinance / Resolution 2023, (Planning Dept. Case No. 2019-023037ENV.
 Ballot Measure 05/17/23 
- Amendment to the Planning Code, including the following Findings:
(*Planning Code, Section 302(b): 90 days for Planning Commission review*)
 General Plan Planning Code, Section 101.1 Planning Code, Section 302
- Amendment to the Administrative Code, involving Land Use/Planning
(*Board Rule 3.23: 30 days for possible Planning Department review*)
- General Plan Referral for Non-Planning Code Amendments
(*Charter, Section 4.105, and Administrative Code, Section 2A.53*)
(Required for legislation concerning the acquisition, vacation, sale, or change in use of City
property; subdivision of land; construction, improvement, extension, widening, narrowing, removal,
or relocation of public ways, transportation routes, ground, open space, buildings, or structures;
plans for public housing and publicly-assisted private housing; redevelopment plans; development
agreements; the annual capital expenditure plan and six-year capital improvement program; and
any capital improvement project or long-term financing proposal such as general obligation or
revenue bonds.)
- Historic Preservation Commission
 - Landmark (*Planning Code, Section 1004.3*)
 - Cultural Districts (*Charter, Section 4.135 & Board Rule 3.23*)
 - Mills Act Contract (*Government Code, Section 50280*)
 - Designation for Significant/Contributory Buildings (*Planning Code, Article 11*)

Please send the Planning Department/Commission recommendation/determination to Erica Major at Erica.Major@sfgov.org.



April 28, 2023

Ms. Angela Calvillo, Clerk
Board of Supervisors
City and County of San Francisco
City Hall, Room 244
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: Transmittal of Planning Department Case Number 2019-023037GPAPCAMAP:
Waterfront Plan Related Legislation
[Board File Unassigned]

Planning Commission Recommendation: Approval

Dear Ms. Calvillo:

On April 20, 2023, the Planning Commission conducted a duly noticed public hearing at a regularly scheduled meeting to consider the proposed General Plan, Planning Code, and Zoning Map Ordinances, that were initiated by the Planning Commission. The amendments would do the following:

- **General Plan Amendments:** Amend the Northeastern Waterfront Plan, the Central Waterfront Plan, and the Recreation and Open Space Element
- **Planning Code Text Amendments:** Amend Planning Code Section 240, the Waterfront Special Use District
- **Planning Code Zoning Map:** Amend Planning Code Zoning Map Nos. ZN-08, SU-08, and SU-09

These amendments are being proposed to assure alignment with the recently adopted updated Waterfront Plan by the Port Commission and the respective Planning documents, among other goals.

The proposed General Plan and Planning Code amendments were studied per the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in association with the Waterfront Plan Update; the Final Environmental Report was certified by the Planning Commission at their March 13, 2023, hearing.

The rezoning of Lot 031 of Assessor's Block 3941 received separate environmental review under a Common Sense Exemption on January 12, 2023 (Case No. 2023-000337PRJ).

Please find attached documents relating to the Commission's actions in addition electronic copies of the signed-to-form ordinances. If you have any questions or require further information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,



Aaron D. Starr
Manager of Legislative Affairs

cc: Drafting Attorney, Deputy City Attorney Peter Miljanich
Mat Snyder, Senior Planner
Erica Major, Office of the Clerk of the Board

Attachments :

Planning Commission Resolutions

Planning Department Executive Summary

Signed-to-Form Ordinance: General Plan – Port of San Francisco Waterfront Plan Update

Signed-to-Form Ordinance: Planning Code – Port of San Francisco Waterfront Plan Update

Signed-to-Form Ordinance: Zoning Map – Port of San Francisco Waterfront Plan Update; Waterfront Zoning Correction



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

GENERAL PLAN PLANNING CODE AND ZONING MAP AMENDMENT

HEARING DATE: April 20, 2023

Project Name: General Plan, Planning Code, and Zoning Map Amendments associated with the Port of San Francisco Waterfront Plan Update

Case Number: 2019-023037GPA MAP PCT

Initiated by: Planning Commission

Staff Contact: Mat Snyder, Citywide Planning
Mathew.snyder@sfgov.org, (628) 652-7460

Reviewed by: Lily Langlois, Principal Planner, Citywide Planning
Lily.Langlois@sfgov.org, (628) 652-7472

Recommendation: Recommend Approval to the Board of Supervisors the Amendments to the General Plan, the Planning Code, and Zoning Maps

General Plan Amendment

The proposed Ordinance would amend the Recreation and Open Space Element (“ROSE”), the Northeastern Waterfront Area Plan and the Central Waterfront Area Plan.

The Way It Is Now

- The Northeastern Waterfront Area Plan was last updated in 1997 with the adoption of the Waterfront Land Use Plan. It contains out-of-date references to developments that have occurred since 1997. Other pieces of legislation and Planning processes, most notably, the Waterfront Plan update, have superseded discussions in this plan.
- The Central Waterfront Plan was adopted in 2008 and has not received a major update since. It contains similar material ripe for updating.
- The Recreation and Open Space Element was adopted in 2014 and has not received a major update

since. Simple changes proposed here reflect the City's most recent park and open space work.

The Way it Would Be

The Northeastern Waterfront Area Plan

- The Plan provides updated descriptions of private and public developments that have occurred since 1997 (e.g., Ferry Building, Ball Park, Rincon Point Park, South Beach Park, etc.).
- Terminology has been updated to be consistent with the update Waterfront Plan, including those describing diversity of populations using the Waterfront.
- The Area Plan contains new objectives and policies addressing resilience.
- Objectives and policies for Rincon Point and South Beach east of the Embarcadero have been removed since those areas are now incorporated into the East SoMa Area Plan.

Central Waterfront Area Plan

- Objectives and Policies that have been implemented (e.g., rezoning industrial lands) have been reworded to indicate ongoing commitment to such conditions.
- Objectives and Policies that had encouraged life science office in the northern portion of the Plan Area have been removed to reflect recent legislation.
- The Area Plan includes updated descriptions of the Pier 70 and Potrero Power Station Development Agreement projects which have been approved since the Area Plan was last adopted.
- The Area Plan includes updated descriptions of transportation planning including bus and bike routing to reflect current MTA programs and planning efforts.

Recreation and Open Space Element

- The ROSE includes updated reference to other City policy documents (e.g., the Climate Action Plan rather the Sustainability Plan).
- The ROSE includes updated descriptions of planned open spaces along the Bay Waterfront (e.g., open spaces associated with Pier 70, Potrero Power Station, 900 Innes, and India Basin).
- The ROSE includes updated descriptions of the Bay Trail and the Blue Greenway.

Note: since the Commission initiated the General Plan Amendments, minor refinements are proposed to the Northeastern Waterfront Plan and ROSE that reflect changes made to the Waterfront Plan and related CEQA documents prior to their approval and certification. These changes add additional emphasis to water recreation. A list of these amendments are attached to this Executive Summary.

Planning Code Amendment

The proposed Ordinance would amend the Planning Code to revise certain Waterfront Special Use District controls and add Waterfront Special Use District No. 4 covering portions east of Mission Bay and the Southern Waterfront.

The Way It Is Now

- Planning Code Section 240, “The Waterfront Special Use District”, establishes three Special Use Districts (“SUDs”) along the northeastern waterfront and establishes the Waterfront Design Advisory Committee (WDAC) and design review procedures thereto. Currently the WDAC is charged with advising the Planning Commission and the Port Commission on design issues for certain development projects within Waterfront Special Use Districts No. 1, which generally include Port properties north and east the Embarcadero and north of the Ballpark; and Waterfront Special Use District No. 3, which generally include Port owned properties west of the Embarcadero and north of the Ballpark. There is not a Special Use District for Port properties east and south of the Mission Rock.
- The WDAC membership includes one appointment by the Mayor, two by the Planning Director, and one by the Executive Director of the Port of San Francisco. Membership may include Port staff. There is no specific appointment of a preservation professional.
- Some WDAC procedures for notification and transmittal requirements are outdated, in that they require transmittal of WDAC decisions to the Planning and Port Commissions within five days, require notification of meetings by mail, and are unclear on who is responsible for maintaining contact information on those requesting information on hearings.
- In Waterfront Special Use District No. 3, Conditional Use is required for any use that is not screened from view from adjacent streets or other public areas.
- Section 240 refers to the “Waterfront Land Use Plan” and the “Waterfront Design and Access goals”, terms that are being superseded.

The Way It Would Be

- An additional Special Use District would be created for Port owned properties east and south of Mission Rock. Properties within the SUD would be subject to the design review requirements of the WDAC.
- The WDAC membership would no longer include a Mayoral appointment, and instead would include an additional appointment from the Executive Director of the Port; this new appointment would be required to be a preservation professional. Port staff would no longer be permitted to serve on the WDAC.
- Notification and transmittal requirements would be updated by requiring transmittal of WDAC decision to the Commissions within two weeks, requiring electronic notification of WDAC meetings, and clarifying the Port staff would be responsible for keeping records of those requesting information on WDAC
- Conditional use authorization would no longer be required for uses that are not screened from view from adjacent streets or other public areas in Waterfront Special Use District Nos. 2 and 3. (Note that the

version of the Ordinance that the Planning Commission initiated inadvertently only included SUD No. 3, which has been changed in the draft Ordinance (Exhibit D) to include SUD No. 2 and No. 3.)

- Terminology would be updated to align with the Waterfront Plan.

Zoning Map Amendment

The proposed Ordinance would amend Zoning Map of the Planning Code to rezone certain waterfront parcels from P (Public) to M-1 (Light Industrial), and to add Waterfront Special Use District No. 4 covering portions east of Mission Bay and the Southern Waterfront.

The Way It Is Now

- Lot 031 in Assessor's Block 3941 is Port owned property and currently includes private businesses including Mission Rock Restaurant, The Ramp Restaurant, San Francisco Boatworks, and Kneass Building. The Lot was inadvertently rezoned to P (Public), a zoning designation that generally restricts uses which are owned by private entities.

The Way It Would Be

- Assessor's Block 3941 would be rezoned to M-1 (Light Manufacturing), for which the existing uses are principally permitted. This change would make the zoning for this parcel consistent with the zoning for other Port owned properties that include private entities, which are also zoned M-1.

Background

Port of San Francisco Waterfront Plan Update

Legislative amendments are proposed to accompany the Port of San Francisco's Waterfront Plan Update.

On April 11, 2023, the San Francisco Port Commission adopted the Waterfront Plan. This plan was first adopted in June 1997 as "The Waterfront Land Use Plan" and the companion plan, "The Waterfront Design and Access," was adopted thereafter in 2001. The Waterfront Land Use Plan was prepared pursuant to Proposition H, an initiative approved by San Francisco voters in 1990. Both the original Waterfront Land Use Plan and the updated Waterfront Plan prioritize maritime uses along the Port's 7 ½ mile waterfront and includes policies that also call for complementary non-maritime uses for properties under the Port's jurisdiction. In 2020, following a lengthy public process, the Port produced a comprehensive update called the "Waterfront Plan". This new draft updated the long-term goals and policies for Port properties. It addressed the topics in the "Waterfront Design & Access" element as it expanded the topics addressed in the Plan to include transportation, sustainability, resilience, and community participation.

The Waterfront Plan can be found here: <https://sfport.com/projects-programs/waterfront-plan>

General Plan Amendments

The Planning Department and the Port have been working together to ensure that the Waterfront Plan is consistent with the General Plan. Planning staff have inventoried all relevant area plans and elements, noting

where updates to the General Plan were necessary to reflect the same City policy changes now reflected in the Waterfront Plan.

Planning and Port staff identified needed amendments to the **Recreation and Open Space Element (“ROSE”)**, the **Northeastern Waterfront Area Plan** and the **Central Waterfront Area Plan**. Planning staff reviewed the General Plan for accuracy beyond what is needed for alignment with the new ideas emerging from Port’s Waterfront Plan efforts. The intention of these updates is to update policies where the ideas have changed through other planning processes or official City actions. For example, descriptions of public and private developments have been updated.

Port staff worked with Planning staff to keep the Waterfront Plan consistent with the recently approved Housing Element, Safety and Resilience Element and the Environmental Justice Framework. Planning staff and Port staff are collaborating on future General Plan efforts including but not limited to the Transportation Element. Notably, amendments to the Bayview Hunters Point Area Plan(BVHP) are not currently proposed. While the BVHP area plan is substantially out of date, these communities are currently subscribed in the work of completing the African American Cultural District and CHESS. Once this process has been completed, more may be known about how to best reflect the community vision.

Issues and Considerations

- The Waterfront Plan has been written to reflect developments along the waterfront and to capture the ongoing vision more fully for the Port of San Francisco. The updated Plan addresses land use, urban design, open space and water access, as the previous version did. New policy proposed in the updated Plan also include transportation, sustainability, resilience, equity, and inclusive community engagement.
- These General Plan that the ROSE, Northeastern Waterfront Area Plan, and the Central Waterfront Area Plan are similarly updated and align with the same City policies that are now described in the Waterfront Plan. Other proposed updates to the General Plan are similarly reflective of other policy changes, development projects, and planning processes that have occurred since these elements were last updated.
- As part of this package Planning is not proposing changes to other Elements that are underway or have been identified to be updated. The Port is committed to working with Planning to ensure that the Waterfront Plan will be consistent with future General Plan updates..
- Assessor’s Block 3941 would be rezoned to M-1(Light Manufacturing), which is a more appropriate zoning designation given its current ownership and existing land uses.
- By creating a new Waterfront Special Use District (WSUD No. 4), development projects on Port properties south of Mission Rock would be subject to the Waterfront Design Advisory Committee review, which

would help assure better quality and transparent review of such projects.

Racial and Social Equity Analysis

Understanding the benefits, burdens, and opportunities to advance racial and social equity that the proposed General Plan, Planning Code and Zoning Map amendments provide is part of the Department's Racial and Social Equity Initiative. This is also consistent with the Mayor's Citywide Strategic Initiatives for equity and accountability and with the forthcoming Office of Racial Equity, which will require all Departments to conduct this analysis.

The Amendments align the updated Waterfront Plan with the General Plan and Planning Code. The Waterfront Plan now includes more specific policies to address equity through recreational and open space access, access to good paying jobs, and targeted community engagement to equity communities. The amendments to the Northeastern Waterfront Area Plan include new language to more accurately reflect the Ohlone people, not western settlers, as the original people of San Francisco. The amendments also broaden references to the users of the Northeastern Waterfront, specifically including vulnerable communities, where the current text largely suggests Northeastern Waterfront users are principally local residents and tourists. Amendments to the Central Waterfront Plan and ROSE include updated descriptions of open space and infrastructure projects in equity communities, including but not limited to Islais Creek, India Basin, and Civic Center.

Recommendation

The Department recommends that the Planning Commission recommend approval of the General Plan, Planning Code, and Zoning Map amendments.

Basis for Recommendation

The Department recommends that the Planning Commission approve the proposed General Plan Amendments because it will bring the Recreation and Open Space Element, the Northeastern Waterfront Area Plan, and the Central Waterfront Area Plan up to date and ensure the Waterfront Plan is consistent with the General Plan. The Department recommends that the Commission approve the Planning Code Amendments because it will enable more thorough and transparent design review of Port development projects along the Southern Waterfront. The Department recommends that the Commission approve the Zoning Map Amendment because it will redesignate Lot 031 of Assessor's Block 3941 as M-1 (Light Manufacturing) from P (Public), a more appropriate designation given Port ownership of the property and existing land uses.

Required Commission Action

The proposed Ordinance is before the Commission so that it may approve it, reject it, or approve it with modifications.

Environmental Review

General Plan and Planning Code Amendments

The proposed General Plan and Planning Code amendments have been studied per the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in association with the Waterfront Plan Update; the Final Environmental Report was certified by the Planning Commission at their March 13, 2023 hearing.

On April 5, 2023, the Planning Department published Addendum No. 1 to the FEIR (the “Addendum”), [link]. The Addendum provides additional language to clarify that CEQA review would be required for subsequent projects (not otherwise exempt from CEQA) for potentially significant environmental impacts to the extent not expressly reviewed in the subject FIER, among other clarifications.

Note on April 11, 2023, the San Francisco Port Commission (“Port Commission”) approved the Waterfront Plan by Resolution No. 23-15, which incorporated the adoption of CEQA Findings and a statement of overriding considerations [link];

Zoning Map Amendment for Lot 031 in Assessor’s Block 39441

This zoning reclassification has received separate environmental review under a Common Sense Exemption on January 12, 2023 (Case No. 2023-000337PRJ).

Public Comment

As of the date of this report, the Planning Department has not received any public comment regarding the proposed general plan, planning code or zoning map amendments.

RECOMMENDATION: Recommend Approval to the Board of Supervisors the Amendments to the General Plan, the Planning Code, and Zoning Maps

Attachments:

General Plan Amendments

- Draft Planning Commission Resolution for the General Plan Amendments
- Proposed Ordinance for the General Plan Amendments
- Maps of Northeastern Waterfront Plan, Central Waterfront Plan (for reference only)
- ROSE Maps 3, 11, and 12 (proposed to be amended – for reference only)
- List of proposed amendments since initiation

Planning Code Text Amendments

- Draft Planning Commission Resolution for the Planning Code Amendments
- Proposed Ordinance for the Planning Code Amendments

Zoning Map Amendments

- Draft Planning Commission Resolution for the Zoning Map Amendments
- : Proposed Ordinance for the Zoning Map Amendments
- Maps of Waterfront SUD (as is and as proposed - for reference only)



PLANNING COMMISSION RESOLUTION NO. 21303

HEARING DATE: APRIL 20, 2023

Project Name: General Plan Amendments associated with the Port of San Francisco Waterfront Plan Update
Case Number: 2019-023037GPA MAP PCA
Initiated by: Planning Commission
Staff Contact: Mat Snyder, Citywide Planning
Mathew.snyder@sfgov.org, (628) 652-7460
Reviewed by: Lily Langlois, Principal Planner, Citywide Planning
Lily.Langlois@sfgov.org, (628) 652-7472

RESOLUTION RECOMMENDING THAT THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVE AMENDMENTS TO THE NORTHEASTERN WATERFRONT AREA PLAN, THE CENTRAL WATERFRONT AREA PLAN AND THE RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE ELEMENT TO PROVIDE FACTUAL UPDATES AND MINOR CHANGES TO CERTAIN OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES SO THAT THEY ALIGN WITH REVISED CITY POLICY REFLECTIVE OF THE RECENTLY UPDATED WATERFRONT PLAN AND OTHER POLICY DOCUMENTS; ADOPTING FINDINGS, INCLUDING ENVIRONMENTAL FINDINGS, PLANNING CODE SECTION 340 FINDINGS, AND FINDINGS OF CONSISTENCY WITH THE GENERAL PLAN AND PLANNING CODE SECTION 101.1.

WHEREAS, Section 4.105 of the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco provides to the Planning Commission the opportunity to periodically recommend General Plan Amendments to the Board of Supervisors; and

WHEREAS, Pursuant to Planning Code Section 340(C), the Planning Commission (“Commission”) initiated a General Plan Amendment to amend the Northeastern Waterfront Area Plan, the Central Waterfront Area Plan, and the Recreation and Open Space Element, by Planning Commission Resolution No. 21271, on March 9, 2023; and

WHEREAS, The Proposed Amendments would amend the Northeastern Waterfront Plan, the Central Waterfront Plan, and the Recreation and Open Space Element by providing factual updates of developments that have occurred within the Plan Areas and Element since each was last updated, and make minor changes to objectives, policies, and text of each respective area plan and element so that the Waterfront Plan and other various policy documents aligns with the General Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Waterfront Plan (previously the Waterfront Land Use Plan) is the long-range plan that sets forth policies for the use and improvement of properties owned and managed by the Port of San Francisco, developed pursuant to requirements in Proposition H approved by San Francisco voters in 1990, which was adopted by the

Port Commission in 1997, with occasional subsequent amendments that were approved by the Port Commission; and

WHEREAS, the Port Commission directed the creation of a Waterfront Plan Working Group to lead a public planning process and public discussions about existing waterfront activities, regulations, challenges, and public desires and needs to incorporate diverse viewpoints and perspectives to develop policy recommendations to update the Waterfront Land Use Plan; and

WHEREAS, The Working Group recommendations updated or added new goals and policies in nine categories to expand the breadth of content and policy direction, such that the Port has renamed the document to, simply, the Waterfront Plan, which addresses: Maritime & Water-dependent Uses; Diverse Non-Maritime Uses; Public Access & Open Space; Urban Design & Historic Preservation; A Financially Strong Port; Transportation and Mobility; Environmental Sustainability; A Resilient Port; Community Engagement and Partnering; and updated objectives for five waterfront subareas that flow from the new goals and policies: Fisherman's Wharf, Northeastern Waterfront, South Beach, Mission Bay, and Southern Waterfront; and

WHEREAS, Planning staff, in partnership with Port staff, reviewed all elements and Area Plans of the General Plan to see where amendments would be necessary to ensure that the updated Waterfront Plan aligned with the General Plan. Planning staff concluded that amendments to the Northeastern Waterfront Area Plan, the Central Waterfront Area Plan, and the Recreation and Open Space Element were necessary. At the same time, Planning considered other policy developments and other relevant physical developments that had occurred since the two area plans and element were last updated, and also drafted relevant amendments to ensure alignment with all such changes; and

WHEREAS, amendments to Planning Code Section 240, and Zoning Maps ZN08, SU08 and SU09, were also considered by the Commission in association with the Waterfront Plan update. The Commission recommended approval to the Board of Supervisors of these amendments by Resolution R-21304 and R-21305, respectively; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Department is the Lead Agency responsible for the implementation of CEQA, California Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq., the Guidelines for Implementation of CEQA, 14 California Code of Regulations Section 15000 et seq. ("CEQA Guidelines"), and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code, and undertook an environmental review process for the proposed Waterfront Plan Project and related General Plan, Planning Code, and Zoning Map amendments, and provided appropriate public hearings before the Planning Commission; and

WHEREAS, on February 23, 2022, the Planning Department published the Waterfront Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report ("DEIR") for the Waterfront Plan Project (Case No. 2019-023037ENV), which included the December 2019 Draft Waterfront Plan, and amendments to the San Francisco General Plan, San Francisco Planning Code and Zoning Map, and BCDC Special Area Plan, and provided public notice in a newspaper of general circulation of the availability of the DEIR for public review and comment and of the date and time of the Planning Commission public hearing on the DEIR; this notice was mailed to the Department's list of persons requesting such notice. Notices of availability of the DEIR and the date and time of the public hearing were posted near the project site by the Department beginning on February 23, 2022. The DEIR contains analysis at a "program level" pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15168 for the adoption and implementation of the Waterfront Plan; and

WHEREAS, on March 24, 2022, the Planning Commission held a duly advertised public hearing on the DEIR, at which an opportunity for public comment was given, and public comment was received on the DEIR. The period for commenting on the DEIR ended on April 25, 2022. The Department prepared responses to comments on environmental issues received during the 60-day public review period for the DEIR, prepared revisions to the text of the DEIR in response to comments received or based on additional information that became available during the public review period, and corrected clerical errors in the DEIR; and

WHEREAS, between September and December 2022, Port staff produced further proposed revisions to the Waterfront Plan to incorporate information updates, technical edits, and policy refinements, which underwent public review and comment and were presented to the Port Commission at its September 13, 2022 and January 24, 2023 meetings, and which revisions were reviewed by the Planning Department staff and determined to not result in any required changes to the information or conclusions in the FEIR; and on January 19, 2023, the Planning Department published a Responses to Comments document. A Final Environmental Impact Report (“FEIR”) has been prepared by the Department, consisting of the DEIR, any consultations and comments received during the review process, any additional information that became available, and the Responses to Comments document, all as required by law; and

WHEREAS, on March 10, 2020, the Planning Department published an Errata to the FEIR, and on March 16, 2020, the Planning Commission reviewed and considered the FEIR (including the Errata) and found that the contents of said report and the procedures through which the FEIR was prepared, publicized, and reviewed comply with the provisions of CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code. The FEIR was certified by the Planning Commission on March 19, 2023; and

WHEREAS, on April 5, 2023, the Planning Department published Addendum No. 1 to the FEIR (the “Addendum”), and determined that the additional information in Addendum No. 1 does not change the analyses and conclusions presented in the FEIR. The Addendum provides additional language to clarify the CEQA review process for subsequent projects; and

WHEREAS, on April 11, 2023, the San Francisco Port Commission (“Port Commission”) approved the Waterfront Plan by Resolution No. 23-15, which incorporated the adoption of CEQA Findings and a statement of overriding considerations [\[link\]](#); and

WHEREAS, the Commission has heard and considered the testimony presented to it at the public hearing and has further considered written materials and oral testimony presented on behalf of Department staff and other interested parties; and

WHEREAS, all pertinent documents may be found in the files of the Department, as the custodian of records, at 49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco; and

A draft ordinance, attached hereto as Exhibit A, pursuant to Planning Code Section 340, would amend the Northeastern Waterfront Area Plan, the Central Waterfront Area Plan, and the Recreation and Open Space Element;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Commission hereby finds that the Planning General Plan Amendments promote the public welfare, convenience and necessity for the following reasons:

- The Waterfront Plan has been written to reflect developments along the waterfront and to capture the ongoing vision more fully for the Port of San Francisco. The updated Plan addresses land use, urban design, open space and water access, as the previous version did. New policy proposed in the updated Plan also include transportation, sustainability, resilience, equity, and inclusive community engagement.
- These General Plan that the ROSE, Northeastern Waterfront Area Plan, and the Central Waterfront Area Plan are similarly updated and align with the same City policies that are now described in the Waterfront Plan. Other proposed updates to the General Plan are similarly reflective of other policy changes, development projects, and planning processes that have occurred since these elements were last updated.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Commission hereby finds that the proposed General Plan, and Planning Code and Zoning Map amendments, are consistent with the General Plan and Planning Code Section 101.1. Consistency findings are follows:

GENERAL PLAN CONSISTENCY FINDINGS

Commerce and Industry Element

OBJECTIVE 5

REALIZE SAN FRANCISCO'S FULL MARITIME POTENTIAL.

POLICY 5.1

Develop and implement a comprehensive long-range maritime development program for the port.

POLICY 5.6

Foster the relation of maritime activity to other segments of San Francisco economy.

POLICY 5.8

Encourage maritime activity which complements visitor activity and resident recreation.

POLICY 5.11

Pursue permitted non-maritime development on port properties.

The updated Waterfront Plan and General Plan, Planning Code and Zoning Map amendments thereto would clarify policies that balance desired maritime uses for City commerce - including transportation and recreational maritime uses - with other uses that attract residents, workers, and visitors to the Waterfront and maximize waterfront access to all users.

Safety and Resilience Element

OBJECTIVE 2.2.

MULTI-HAZARD RESILIENCE AND CO-BENEFITS. IN ADAPTATION AND MITIGATION INVESTMENTS TO MULTIPLE AND SIMULTANEOUS HAZARDS, MAXIMIZE RISK REDUCTION STRATEGIES AND THE RELATED COMMUNITY BENEFITS.

POLICY 2.2.2.

Examine the risk of flooding and evaluate adaptation actions that will protect people and the built and natural environments to help inform land use, capital investment, and other policies.

POLICY 2.2.4.

Adapt the City's bay and ocean shorelines to current and future climate flood hazards, including coastal flooding, sea level rise, groundwater rise, and extreme storms.

Amendments to the Northeastern Waterfront and Central Waterfront Area Plans clarify that private and public development going forward must take into consideration hazard risks, particularly regarding sea level rise, and must engage the community at large in planning to assure ongoing resilience.

Transportation Element

OBJECTIVE 5

SUPPORT AND ENHANCE THE ROLE OF SAN FRANCISCO AS A MAJOR DESTINATION AND DEPARTURE POINT FOR TRAVELERS MAKING INTERSTATE, NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL TRIPS.

The revised updated Waterfront Plan and related amendments to the Northeastern Waterfront Plan more specifically call out the significance of water transportation -- including ferries and water taxis -- as an integral part of the City's transportation network.

OBJECTIVE 8

MAINTAIN AND ENHANCE REGIONAL PEDESTRIAN, HIKING AND BIKING ACCESS TO THE COAST, THE BAY AND RIDGE TRAILS.

POLICY 8.1

Ensure that the Coast Trail, the Bay Trail and the Ridge Trail remain uninterrupted and unobstructed where they pass through San Francisco.

The revised Waterfront Plan and related amendments to the Northeastern Waterfront Plan, the Central Waterfront Plan, and the Recreation and Open Space Element explicitly describe the importance of pedestrian and bicycle access to and along the waterfront and the significance of the Blue Greenway as an essential element of Bay access. Descriptions of development in all these Area Plans and Element are updated to more appropriately describe the current context in which policy decisions are to be made.

Urban Design Element

OBJECTIVE 2

CONSERVATION OF RESOURCES WHICH PROVIDE A SENSE OF NATURE, CONTINUITY WITH THE PAST, AND FREEDOM FROM OVERCROWDING.

POLICY 2.2

Limit improvements in other open spaces having an established sense of nature to those that are necessary, and unlikely to detract from the primary values of the open space.

POLICY 2.3

Avoid encroachments on San Francisco Bay that would be inconsistent with the Bay Plan or the needs of the city's residents.

The Waterfront Plan, General Plan, and Planning Code, and Zoning Maps amendments thereto update descriptions of development along the waterfront on Port property and elsewhere, to provide an updated description of the current context in which land use and other decisions are to be made.

The Planning Code Text Amendments update procedures for the Waterfront Design Advisory Committee, to, in part, ensure that developments in the Southern Waterfront are afforded the same design consideration and public transparency that have been afforded to projects elsewhere along the Bay Waterfront.

Recreation and Open Space Element

OBJECTIVE 1

ENSURE A WELL-MAINTAINED, HIGHLY UTILIZED, AND INTEGRATED OPEN SPACE SYSTEM

POLICY 1.4

Prioritize the better utilization of McLaren Park, Ocean Beach, the Southeastern Waterfront and other underutilized significant open spaces.

The Waterfront Plan and amendments to the Central Waterfront Area Plan and Recreational and Open Space element include up to date descriptions of proposed open space plans for the Central Waterfront (Pier 70, Potrero Power Station, and Islais Creek) and Bayview Hunters Point (India Basin) that more accurately set the context for land use and policy decision for these areas.

The updates also include updated descriptions of the Port's Blue Greenway, which is an essential component to ensuring equitable access to San Francisco Bay for pedestrians, bicyclists, and those seeking water access and recreation.

PLANNING CODE SECTION 101.1 CONSISTENCY FINDINGS

1. That existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced and future opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of such businesses enhanced;

The proposed amendments to the General Plan, Planning Code, and Zoning Map will not negatively impact the ability for neighborhood-serving uses to be preserved and enhanced and will not negatively affect the future opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of such businesses.

2. That existing housing and neighborhood character be conserved and protected in order to preserve the

cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhoods;

The proposed amendments to the General Plan, Planning Code, and Zoning Map will not negatively impact the ability of existing housing and neighborhood character to be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhoods.

3. That the City's supply of affordable housing be preserved and enhanced;

The City's supply of affordable housing and its ability to be preserved and enhanced will not be negatively impacted by the subject General Plan, Planning Code and Zoning Map amendments.

4. That commuter traffic not impede MUNI transit service or overburden our streets or neighborhood parking;

The updated Waterfront Plan and related General Plan amendments to the Northeastern Waterfront Area Plan and Central Waterfront Area Plan describe up-to-date policies regarding prioritizing travel by transit, bicycle, and by foot over single-occupancy private vehicle consistent with Citywide policy, thereby ensuring maximum efficiency of MUNI transit.

5. That a diverse economic base be maintained by protecting our industrial and service sectors from displacement due to commercial office development, and that future opportunities for resident employment and ownership in these sectors be enhanced;

The diverse economic base will not be negatively impacted by the proposed amendments.

6. That the City achieve the greatest possible preparedness to protect against injury and loss of life in an earthquake;

The proposed amendments include new objectives and policies in the Northeastern Waterfront Area Plan and Central Waterfront Area Plan include new objectives and policies and address resilience particularly in regard to Sea Level Rise, and the need to engage the community-at-large to plan for all hazards that face San Francisco and its Waterfront.

7. That the landmarks and historic buildings be preserved;

Amendments to the Northeastern Waterfront Plan more specifically call out The Embarcadero National Historic District and the requirement to for projects within the District to adhere to the Secretary of Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties.

8. That our parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas be protected from development;

The General Plan, Planning Code and Zoning Map amendments do not enable additional building height beyond what is otherwise permitted and therefore will not cause potential additional shadow on existing open spaces, compared to what is currently permitted. The amendments update descriptions of new and

newly planned open spaces in the City.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Commission has reviewed and considered the CEQA Findings, including the statement of overriding considerations, that the Port Commission adopted, and hereby adopts these CEQA Findings as its own; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Commission has reviewed the Addendum and hereby agrees with its analysis and findings, including the determination that the additional information in Addendum #1 does not change the analyses and conclusions presented in the FEIR, and has considered the Addendum as part of the decisions described in this Resolution; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that pursuant to Planning Code Section 340(c), the Commission adopts a Resolution to recommend to the Board of Supervisors approval of the Ordinance.

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was adopted by the Commission at its meeting on April 20, 2023.

Laura Lynch

Laura Lynch
Acting Commission Secretary

AYES: Braun, Diamond, Imperial, Koppel, Moore, Tanner

NOES: None

ABSENT: Ruiz

ADOPTED: April 20, 2023

1 [General Plan - Port of San Francisco Waterfront Plan Update]

2

3 **Ordinance amending the Recreation and Open Space Element, Central Waterfront Area**
4 **Plan, and Northeastern Waterfront Area Plan of the General Plan to maintain**
5 **consistency with the Port of San Francisco’s Waterfront Plan update; and making**
6 **environmental findings, including adopting a statement of overriding considerations,**
7 **and findings of consistency with the General Plan and the eight priority policies of**
8 **Planning Code, Section 101.1, and findings of public necessity, convenience, and**
9 **welfare under Planning Code, Section 340.**

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

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

18

19 Section 1. Environmental and Planning Code Findings.

20 (a) On _____, after a duly noticed public hearing, the Planning Commission, by
21 Motion No. _____, certified the Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Port of
22 San Francisco’s Waterfront Plan (the Project), which updates and amends the Port’s 1997
23 Waterfront Land Use Plan and sets long term goals and policies to guide the use,
24 management, and improvement of properties owned and managed by the Port. The Planning
25 Commission motion finds that the Final EIR reflects the independent judgment and analysis of
the City and County of San Francisco, is adequate, accurate and objective, contains no
significant revisions to the Draft EIR, and the content of the report and the procedures through

1 which the Final EIR was prepared, publicized, and reviewed comply with the provisions of the
2 California Environmental Quality Act (California Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et
3 seq.), the CEQA Guidelines (14 Cal. Code Regs. Section 15000 et seq.), and Chapter 31 of
4 the San Francisco Administrative Code. Copies of the Planning Commission Motion and Final
5 EIR are on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. ___ and is incorporated
6 herein by reference. The Board affirms this determination.

7 (b) The Project evaluated in the Final EIR includes the proposed amendments to the
8 General Plan set forth in this ordinance as well as amendments to the Planning Code and
9 Zoning Map.

10 (c) On _____, the Port Commission, in Motion No. _____, adopted
11 findings under CEQA regarding the Project's environmental impacts, the disposition of
12 mitigation measures, and project alternatives, as well as a statement of overriding
13 considerations (CEQA Findings), and adopted a mitigation monitoring reporting program
14 (MMRP). A copy of said Motion is on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No.
15 _____, and is incorporated herein by reference.

16 (d) On _____, the Planning Commission, in Motion No. _____, adopted
17 findings under CEQA regarding the Project's environmental impacts, the disposition of
18 mitigation measures, and project alternatives, as well as a statement of overriding
19 considerations (CEQA Findings), and adopted a mitigation monitoring reporting program
20 (MMRP). A copy of said Motion is on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No.
21 _____, and is incorporated herein by reference.

22 (e) On _____, the Planning Commission, in Resolution No. _____,
23 recommended the proposed General Plan amendments for approval and adopted findings
24 that the actions contemplated in this ordinance are consistent, on balance, with the City's
25 General Plan and eight priority policies of Planning Code Section 101.1. The Board adopts

1 these findings as its own. A copy of said Resolution is on file with the Clerk of the Board of
2 Supervisors in File No. _____, and is incorporated herein by reference.

3 (f) On _____, the Planning Commission, in Resolution No. _____,
4 adopted findings under Planning Code Section 340 that the actions contemplated in this
5 ordinance will serve the public necessity, convenience, and welfare. The Board adopts these
6 findings as its own. A copy of said Resolution is on file with the Clerk of the Board of
7 Supervisors in File No. _____, and is incorporated herein by reference.

8 (g) The Board of Supervisors has reviewed and considered the Final EIR and the
9 environmental documents on file referred to herein. The Board of Supervisors has reviewed
10 and considered the CEQA Findings, and hereby adopts them as its own and incorporates
11 them by reference as though such findings were fully set forth in this ordinance.

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

16 (i) The Board of Supervisors finds that since certification of the Final EIR no
17 substantial changes have occurred in the proposed Project that would require revisions in the
18 Final EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial
19 increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects, no substantial changes have
20 occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the proposed Project is to be
21 undertaken that would require major revisions to the Final EIR due to the involvement of new
22 environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of effects identified in the Final
23 EIR, and no new information of substantial importance to the proposed Project has become
24 available which indicates that (1) the Project will have significant effects not discussed in the
25 Final EIR, (2) significant environmental effects will be substantially more severe, (3) mitigation

1 measure or alternatives found not feasible that would reduce one or more significant effects
2 have become feasible, or (4) mitigation measures or alternatives that are considerably
3 different from those in the Final EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects
4 on the environment.

5

6 Section 2. The Central Waterfront Area Plan of the San Francisco General Plan is
7 hereby amended as follows:

8

9 **CENTRAL WATERFRONT AREA PLAN**

10 * * * *

11 **1. LAND USE**

12 **OBJECTIVE 1.1**

13 **ENCOURAGE THE TRANSITION OF PORTIONS OF THE CENTRAL**
14 **WATERFRONT TO A MORE MIXED-USE CHARACTER, WHILE PROTECTING THE**
15 **NEIGHBORHOOD'S CORE OF PDR USES AS WELL AS THE HISTORIC DOGPATCH**
16 **NEIGHBORHOOD**

17

18 Portions of the Central Waterfront have been transitioning from PDR to a more mixed-
19 use character. This has been particularly the case in the northern portion of the neighborhood,
20 with new residential development and a small amount of new retail occurring along Third
21 Street. In addition, life science and medical related uses are expected to desire locations
22 close to Mission Bay in the northern portion of this neighborhood. This mix of uses in the
23 northern portion of the neighborhood should be maintained and promoted, while the core PDR
24 areas south of 23rd Street and east of Third Street should be protected.

25

1 Because of its proximity to Mission Bay and the UCSF research and hospital facilities
2 there, ~~the northern portion of the~~ Central Waterfront is a logical place to encourage
3 development of life-science related research institutions ~~as well as medical offices and clinics.~~
4 ~~Encouraging these uses to cluster in the northern portion of the neighborhood should help to prevent~~
5 ~~unnecessary displacement of PDR businesses further to the south.~~

6
7 The existing Dogpatch residential neighborhood and its small adjacent neighborhood
8 commercial district constitute a unique enclave within the larger Central Waterfront area. The
9 historic homes in this area, along Tennessee and Minnesota Streets, were built around the
10 turn of the twentieth century and earlier. Land use controls in this area should ensure its future
11 as a small-scale residential enclave.

12
13 Controls should also maintain and protect tThe unique character of the Central
14 Waterfront's existing neighborhood commercial area ~~should also be maintained and protected.~~
15 Twenty-Second Street is already the focus of retail activity for the neighborhood and connects
16 the CalTrain Station to Third Street. Continuing to encourage retail on the ground floor
17 between Third and Minnesota Streets builds on the existing character of the street,
18 concentrates activity, and helps to create a "neighborhood heart." To ensure compatibility with
19 the existing scale of these areas, large lot development and lot mergers should be restricted
20 and business sizes carefully controlled.

21
22 The ~~Pier 70 area plays a significant role in defining the Central Waterfront. Future historic~~
23 ~~preservation efforts and new infill development will have a significant effect on the ultimate character~~
24 ~~of the entire neighborhood. (The Pier 70 area is generally defined as the area east of Illinois Street~~
25 ~~between Mariposa Street and 22nd Street.) While the Port has adopted the Waterfront Land Use Plan~~

1 ~~that specifically calls for a mixed use development opportunity site within a portion of Pier 70,~~
2 ~~previous development proposals for the opportunity site alone were unsuccessful, due largely to the~~
3 ~~unknown ultimate disposition of the remainder of the Pier 70 area. Therefore the Port has initiated~~
4 conducted a community based planning process ~~that will ultimately lead to the development of a~~
5 ~~Master Plan, including a preservation strategy for the historic resources for the Pier 70 area. This~~
6 ~~effort began in late 2006 with completion of a preferred Master Plan anticipated by mid 2008. Because~~
7 ~~the Port's Pier 70 planning process for Pier 70 is ongoing, this Plan leaves zoning and height controls~~
8 ~~for the area as is, in recognition that the Plan may need to be amended, and zoning modified, to reflect~~
9 ~~the outcome of the Port's Pier 70 area planning process.~~ to develop a comprehensive strategy for Pier
10 70, including the shipyard area, and created the Pier 70 Union Iron Works Historic District, which is
11 listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The Pier 70 area is generally defined as the area
12 east of Illinois Street between Mariposa Street and 22nd Street.

13
14 The Pier 70 ~~Mixed Use Opportunity Site may be an opportunity to encourage larger, non-~~
15 ~~maritime and non-PDR activities such as commercial as well as research and development uses. These~~
16 ~~must be carefully integrated into the larger Pier 70 area and the adjacent neighborhood so that they~~
17 ~~are not disruptive to surrounding uses.~~ community planning collaborations built support for developer
18 partnerships and the creation of the Pier 70 Special Use District. The Port and City are working in
19 coordination with the developers to implement improvements consistent with, and incorporated by
20 reference in, the Port's Waterfront Plan. The Pier 70 Special Use District will: 1) rehabilitate and
21 adaptably reuse Pier 70 Historic Resources; 2) support maritime industry; 3) provide new Blue
22 Greenway open spaces including shoreline access; 4) conduct as-needed environmental remediation;
23 5) provide for new infill development that is adaptively designed to address sea level rise; 6) develop
24 new infrastructure required to support the development; and 7) provide a funding stream to implement
25

1 the variety of goals defined for the site. Adjacent to Pier 70, the site of the former Potrero Power
2 Station is now proposed for mixed-use development, as further described in Policy 1.1.8.

3
4 ~~Adjacent to the Pier 70 area, the Potrero power plant is expected to cease operations sometime~~
5 ~~in the future. While contamination of the soil here will preclude housing development on the site, it will~~
6 ~~be an opportunity, similar to Pier 70, for mixed use development in the future that could include larger~~
7 ~~activities such as commercial as well as research and development uses. A future community planning~~
8 ~~process for this site will help determine exactly what should occur on the site.~~

9
10 This Plan's approach to land use controls in the Central Waterfront neighborhood
11 consists of the following key elements:

- 12
13 • In the northern part of the Central Waterfront (generally north of 23rd Street and
14 west of Illinois Street) establish new controls that allow mixed-income residential
15 development, while limiting new office and retail development.
- 16
17 • ~~Unlike in most other parts of the Eastern Neighborhoods where mixed use districts~~
18 ~~generally limit all large office development, make an exception here for life science and~~
19 ~~medical related office and clinical facilities, due to the proximity to Mission Bay.~~
- 20
21 • Provide a buffer around the Dogpatch neighborhood, where larger office and life
22 clinical facilities would not be permitted.

- In the core PDR area, generally south of 23rd Street, establish new controls that protect PDR businesses by prohibiting new residential development and limiting new office and retail development.
- In areas controlled by the Port as well as the Potrero Power ~~Plant~~ Station site, guide improvements according to the Pier 70 Special Use District and Potrero Power Station Special Use District Development Agreements' planning policies, zoning controls, and design standards, and maintain existing industrial zoning of Port property outside of the Pier 70 area ~~pending the outcome of separate planning processes for these areas.~~
- Address Seal Level Rise as an integral goal when planning and designing new buildings and developments along the waterfront.

The policies to address the needs highlighted ~~above are as~~ include the followings:

POLICY 1.1.1

~~Revise land use controls in~~In the core PDR area generally south of 23rd Street, ~~to~~ protect and promote PDR activities, as well as the arts, by prohibiting construction of new housing and limiting the amount of new office and retail uses ~~that can be introduced.~~

POLICY 1.1.2

Maintain the revised~~Revise~~ land use controls in formerly industrial areas outside the core Central Waterfront industrial area, ~~to~~which creates new mixed use areas, and ~~allowing~~ mixed-income housing as a principal use, as well as limited amounts of retail,

1 office, and research and development, while protecting against the wholesale
2 displacement of PDR uses.

3
4 **POLICY 1.1.3**

5 Permit and encourage life science and medical related uses at the most appropriate
6 locations in the northern portion of the Central Waterfront, close to Mission Bay by eliminating
7 restrictions on life science and medical related office and clinical uses that might otherwise apply.

8
9 **POLICY 1.1.4**

10 Maintain the integrity of the historic Dogpatch neighborhood.

11
12 **POLICY 1.1.5**

13 Create a buffer around the Dogpatch neighborhood to protect against
14 encroachment of larger office and life science research uses.

15
16 **POLICY 1.1.6**

17 Permit and encourage small and moderate size retail establishments in
18 neighborhood commercial areas of Central Waterfront, while allowing larger retail in
19 the new Urban Mixed Use districts only when part of a mixed-use development.

20
21 **POLICY 1.1.7**

22 Ensure that ~~future~~ development at of the Port's Pier 70 Mixed Use Opportunity Site
23 supports the Port's and City land use and planning policies and design standards set forth in the
24 Pier 70 Special Use District, and revenue raising goals while remaining complementary to
25 maritime and industrial nature of the area.

1
2 **POLICY 1.1.8**

3 ~~Consider the Potrero power plant site as an opportunity for reuse for larger scale commercial~~
4 ~~and research establishments.~~Ensure the development of the Potrero Power Station Mixed-Use
5 Development Project, a multi-phase 29 acre master development that was approved in 2019; the
6 Potrero Power Station Mixed-Use Development Project includes a wide mix of residential, non-
7 residential, and community facility uses along with a wide variety of recreational and open space
8 facilities that, among other goals, provide a continuous sequence of park and recreational
9 opportunities along and to the Bay waterfront. Integral to the Power Station Development are
10 strategies that assure the development is sustainable and resilient, particularly to Sea Level Rise.

11
12 * * * *

13
14 **OBJECTIVE 1.4**

15 **SUPPORT A ROLE FOR “KNOWLEDGE SECTOR” BUSINESSES IN**
16 **APPROPRIATE PORTIONS OF THE CENTRAL WATERFRONT**

17
18 The “Knowledge Sector” consists of businesses that create economic value through the
19 knowledge they generate and provide for their customers. These include businesses involved
20 in financial services, professional services, information technology, publishing, digital media,
21 multimedia, life sciences (including biotechnology), and environmental products and
22 technologies. The Knowledge Sector contributes to the city’s economy through the high
23 wages these industries generally pay, creating multiplier effects for local-serving businesses
24 in San Francisco, and generating payroll taxes for the city. Although these industries generally
25 require greater levels of training and education than PDR workers typically possess, they may

1 in the future be able to provide a greater number of quality jobs for some San Franciscans
2 without a four-year college degree, provided appropriate workforce development programs
3 are put in place.

4
5 From a land use perspective, the Knowledge Sector utilizes a variety of types of space.
6 Depending on the particular needs of a company, this may include buildings for offices,
7 research and development (R&D), and manufacturing. Mixed-use and industrial land in the
8 Central Waterfront benefits from lower rents and less-intensive development than other parts
9 of the city. These characteristics may allow for the location of manufacturing and R&D
10 components of the Knowledge Sector, as well as provide some Class B office space suitable
11 for Knowledge Sector companies who cannot afford or would prefer not to be located
12 downtown. Additionally, the proximity of the Central Waterfront to the life science research
13 and medical uses of Mission Bay support a concentration of life science uses in parts of the
14 Central Waterfront. These uses could be supported in the following manner:

- 15
16 • The PDR component of the Knowledge Sector could locate throughout the
17 Mixed Use and PDR districts of the Central Waterfront.
- 18
19 • The office component of the Knowledge Sector should be directed towards
20 space above the ground floor in buildings in the Central Waterfront's Mixed Use
21 and PDR-1 districts. The amount of office in these buildings should be restricted
22 to support PDR uses above the ground floor.
- 23
24 • R&D uses range from being office-only to a mixture of office and production and
25 testing. To the degree that uses are office-only, they will face the same controls

1 as office uses. The more ~~industrially oriented~~ R&D uses could be located
2 throughout the Mixed Use and PDR districts ~~of the Mission~~, though the office
3 component would be subject to office controls.

4
5 ● ~~To capitalize on proximity to Mission Bay, life science and medical office buildings~~
6 ~~should be directed towards the northern portions of the Central Waterfront.~~

7 * * * *

8
9 OBJECTIVE 1.8

10 **PROTECT MARITIME AND MARITIME-RELATED ACTIVITIES IN THE CENTRAL**
11 **WATERFRONT**

12
13 The Central Waterfront has long been home to maritime activities, including the
14 existing Pier 70 ~~shipyard~~dry dock. As a response to the advent of containerization in the 1960s,
15 the Port of San Francisco began to focus its cargo operations at Pier 80, and south of Islais
16 Creek at Piers 94-96. Maintaining and supporting these activities, including ship repair,
17 maritime support, warehousing and storage, and shipping, is important to both the Port's
18 mission and more generally to San Francisco's economy. The various industrial activities
19 occurring on and near Port land need to be able to carry out their operations without the
20 impediments caused by the presence of sensitive land uses such as housing or
21 neighborhood-related activities.

22
23 Shipbuilding and ship repair ~~have had~~have had been carried out at the Pier 70 dry dock since the
24 late 1880s. In fact, Pier 70 ~~is~~hosted the longest continually operating, non-military dry dock on
25 the West Coast. While the Port's ship repair operator terminated operations in 2017, the Pier 70

1 shipyard will continue to serve various maritime and industrial uses. Any development adjacent to
2 the ~~shipyard~~~~dry dock~~ facility should not impinge on its maritime and industrial use. ~~In particular,~~
3 ~~to avoid conflict, uses sensitive to a 24 hour, industrial operation should not be located nearby.~~
4

5 The Port's terminal at the 69-acre Pier 80 is in active use, providing the Port and city
6 with ~~modern container and~~ non-container-cargo handling facilities. The businesses at and
7 related to Pier 80 are well integrated with the city's economy; they employ a substantial
8 number of people, generate income for the Port, and taxes for the city. Continued, efficient
9 access by freight rail and truck from the peninsula, freeways, and via city streets is
10 fundamental to the viability of the pier and the industries related to it. Therefore, transportation
11 infrastructure in the vicinity of Pier 80 should not be changed in ways that would interfere with
12 its continued efficient operation.

13
14 * * * *

15 **POLICY 3.3.4**

16 **Compliance with strict environmental efficiency standards for new buildings is**
17 **strongly encouraged.**

18
19 The positive relationship between building sustainability, urban form, and the public
20 realm has become increasingly understood as these buildings become more commonplace in
21 cities around the world. Instead of turning inwards and creating a distinct and disconnected
22 internal environment, sustainable buildings look outward at their surroundings as they allow in
23 natural light and air. In so doing, they relate to the public domain through architectural
24 creativity and visual interest, as open, visible windows provide a communicative interchange
25 between those inside and outside the building. In an area where creative solutions to open

1 space, public amenity, and visual interest are of special need, sustainable building strategies
2 that enhance the public realm and enhance ecological sustainability are to be encouraged.

3
4 OBJECTIVE 3.4

5 ENSURE FUTURE PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ADDRESS THE NEED TO
6 MITIGATE AND RESPOND TO FUTURE HAZARDS, PARTICULARLY THOSE CAUSED BY
7 SEA LEVEL RISE AND CLIMATE CHANGE.

8
9 Policy 3.4.1

10 Engage the community on an ongoing basis when adapting land use and development
11 policies to mitigate and reduce hazard risks associated with Sea Level Rise.

12 In August 2021, the City and the Port published the Islais Creek Southeast Mobility Adaptation
13 Strategy (ICSMAS), which examined the Creek and its surrounding neighborhood’s flood hazard risks
14 and identified a comprehensive suite of possible adaptation pathways to protect the area and its key
15 public assets from flooding and permanent inundation. The ICSMAS describes community
16 engagement, methodology, and recommendations that could be used as a template and starting point
17 for future ongoing planning and community engagement to address SLR-related hazard risk around
18 Islais Creek.

19
20 **4. Transportation**

21
22 NOTE: The following Transportation objectives and policies relate specifically to the
23 transportation system. Objectives and policies related to physical street design can be found
24 in the Streets and Open Space chapter.

1 The gritty, industrial character of the Central Waterfront extends to the transportation
2 system serving it. The challenge is to preserve the essential character of the neighborhood
3 while supporting a full, equitable range of choices for the movement of people and goods to,
4 within, and from the Central Waterfront. Access to transportation, particularly alternatives to
5 the private automobile, must be knitted into the fabric of the neighborhood and everyday
6 services promoted to reduce the need to travel.

7
8 Ongoing improvements to the operation of the new Third Street Light Rail line will
9 continue to improve the accessibility of the area by transit. New commercial and residential
10 development will support basic services and reduce the need to travel outside the
11 neighborhood. The Central Waterfront's transportation infrastructure must continue to cater to
12 industrial uses while also reducing conflicts that heavy freight traffic creates with other road
13 users such as bicyclists and pedestrians.

14
15 **OBJECTIVE 4.1**

16 **IMPROVE PUBLIC TRANSIT TO BETTER SERVE EXISTING AND NEW**
17 **DEVELOPMENT IN CENTRAL WATERFRONT**

18
19 The Central Waterfront is well served by both local and regional transit. In early 2007,
20 Muni's Third Street Light Rail entered revenue service, providing a direct link north to
21 downtown and south to Bayview/Hunters Point and Visitacion Valley. The 22nd Street Caltrain
22 Station provides regional connections south to the South Bay and Silicon Valley. While the
23 majority of transit service and ridership in the Central Waterfront is along north-south
24 corridors, the need remains to improve cross-town routes. ~~At present, crosstown bus service is~~
25 ~~provided by the #22 Fillmore and #48 Quintara. Service on the #48 Quintara in particular needs to be~~

1 ~~strengthened. Streamlining the circuitous routing over Potrero Hill could improve travel times. As~~
2 the number of workers and residents in the neighborhood increases, ~~there will be greater~~
3 ~~demand for transit access from all parts of the city. The~~ the cross-town routes also play an
4 important role as feeder routes to the Third Street Light Rail.

5
6 ~~Beginning in 2008, In 2011,~~ the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency
7 (SFMTA), Planning Department and the San Francisco County Transportation Authority
8 (SFCTA) ~~will commence~~ completed a comprehensive Eastern Neighborhoods Transportation
9 Implementation Planning Study (EN TRIPS) ~~to that further~~ explored the feasibility of the
10 options described above, determine which projects are needed, how they should be designed
11 and how they can be funded. A key input to this ~~will be~~ was SFMTA's Muni Forward
12 Project ~~“Transit Effectiveness Project” (TEP), which was~~ the first comprehensive study of the Muni
13 system since the late 1970s. ~~The TEP Muni Forward aims to~~ promoted overall performance and
14 long-term financial stability through faster, more reliable transportation choices and cost-
15 effective operating practices. In 2021, the multiagency transportation planning collaboration
16 ConnectSF produced a Transit Strategy, which describes the major capital projects and programs that
17 will help San Francisco’s transit system meet the existing and future travel needs of residents, workers,
18 and visitors. The TEP recommendations focus on improving transit service, speed and reliability and
19 should be implemented as soon as possible within the Central Waterfront.

20
21 * * * *

22
23 **POLICY 4.1.3**

1 Continue to support ~~Implement~~ the service recommendations of the *Transit*
2 *Effectiveness Project (TEP)* Muni Forward program and the recommendations of the *ConnectSF*
3 *Transit Strategy*.

4
5 **POLICY 4.1.4**

6 **Reduce existing curb cuts where possible and restrict new curb cuts to prevent**
7 **vehicular conflicts with transit on important transit and neighborhood commercial**
8 **streets.**

9
10 Curb cuts should be reduced on key neighborhood commercial, pedestrian, and transit
11 streets, where it is important to maintain continuous active ground floor activity, protect
12 pedestrian movement and retail viability, and reduce transit delay and variability. This is a
13 critical measure to reduce congestion and conflicts with pedestrians and transit movement
14 along Transit Preferential Streets, particularly where transit vehicles do not run in protected
15 dedicated rights-of-way and are vulnerable to disruption and delay. Curb cuts are currently
16 restricted along Third Street.

17
18 **POLICY 4.1.5**

19 **Ensure Muni's storage and maintenance facility needs are met to serve**
20 **increased transit demand and provide enhanced service.**

21
22 Additional transit vehicles will be needed to serve new development in the Eastern
23 Neighborhoods. The capacity of existing storage and maintenance facilities should be
24 expanded and new facilities constructed to support growth in the Eastern Neighborhoods.

1 Address the need to mitigate and respond to possible future hazards, particularly related to SLR, in
2 Muni's ongoing planning for, and maintenance and future rehabilitation of, such facilities

3
4 * * * *

5 **OBJECTIVE 4.6**

6 **SUPPORT WALKING AS A KEY TRANSPORTATION MODE BY IMPROVING**
7 **PEDESTRIAN CIRCULATION WITHIN CENTRAL WATERFRONT AND TO OTHER PARTS**
8 **OF THE CITY**

9
10 * * * *

11 **POLICY 4.6.6**

12 **Explore opportunities to identify and expand waterfront recreational trails and**
13 **opportunities including the Bay Trail.**

14
15 The Association of Bay Area Governments' (ABAG) Bay Trail project is a planned
16 recreational corridor that, when complete, will encircle San Francisco and San Pablo Bays
17 with a continuous 400-mile network of bicycling and hiking trails. At present, much of the Bay
18 Trail extends along Third Street and Illinois Street ~~provide the link in the Bay Trail through the~~
19 ~~Central Waterfront. Created in 2012, the Blue Greenway open space guidelines and network through~~
20 the Central Waterfront promote parks and public access that extends to and along the waterfront,
21 integrated in new mixed use developments while respecting space needs of ~~Currently, the Bay Trail~~
22 ~~crosses Islais Creek on Third Street and jogs over to Illinois Street at 23rd Street. Ideally, the trail~~
23 ~~would run closer to the water, though heavy~~ industrial and maritime uses, ~~along with a lack of~~
24 ~~continuous public rights of way, preclude such a continuous shoreline path. The city should take~~
25 ~~advantage of opportunities to move it eastwards if and when Port lands are redeveloped.~~ Signs for

1 spur trails to new and improved public open spaces and shoreline access at Islais Creek,
2 Warm Water Cove, Irish Hill, and Pier 70 should be placed and included in the Bay Trail maps
3 and literature. ~~Other proposals to further evaluate include the “Blue Greenway,” a proposed 13-mile~~
4 ~~greenway network along the San Francisco’s Central and Southern Waterfront.~~

5
6 **OBJECTIVE 4.7**

7 **IMPROVE AND EXPAND INFRASTRUCTURE FOR BICYCLING AS AN**
8 **IMPORTANT MODE OF TRANSPORTATION**

9
10 The Central Waterfront plays a critical role in creating a continuous, safe, comfortable
11 bicycle connection between downtown and the Bayview/Hunters Point. It is flat and provides
12 direct routes between the two areas. Given the Mission Bay development to the north, the
13 best bike corridors through the Central Waterfront are Indiana and Illinois Streets. Indiana
14 Street provides direct access to the 22nd Street Caltrain Station, Esprit Park, and Islais Creek
15 open space. Illinois Street improvements would connect to downtown via Terry Francois
16 Boulevard, and to Bayview/Hunters Point via the Illinois Street bridge over Islais Creek.

17
18 The SFMTA is studying these corridors, as well as Minnesota Street, for bicycle
19 improvements that will facilitate safer north-south connections ~~including bike lanes on Illinois Street~~
20 ~~and shared lane markings (“sharrows”) on Indiana Street.~~ Potential east-west bicycle
21 improvements include, but are not limited to, changes on Cesar Chavez Street and ~~to~~ Mariposa
22 Street ~~are being studied under the UCSF Mission Bay’s new hospital planning and design process.~~
23 Additional bicycle connections ~~should be pursued to~~ have been created in Pier 70 to connect ~~with~~
24 ~~the Port’s future redevelopment of the site. The proposed Blue Greenway offers the opportunity to~~
25 ~~extend the Bay Trail through the Central Waterfront. Future planning and design should explore how~~

1 ~~to safely integrate bicycles into the new recreational pathway along the waterfront.~~ new development
2 and Blue Greenway open spaces to the city street grid and public realm. Bicycle access and
3 improvements should be carefully designed with respect to Central Waterfront industrial and truck
4 operations as addressed in Objective 4.4.

5
6 The policies to address the objective outlined above are as follows:

7
8 **POLICY 4.7.1**

9 **Provide a continuous network of safe, convenient and attractive bicycle facilities**
10 **connecting Central Waterfront to the citywide bicycle network ~~and~~ that conforms**
11 **with conforming to the San Francisco ~~Bicycle Plan.~~ bicycle policies and is designed for safety on**
12 **streets that serve industrial business and vehicular traffic.**

13
14 **POLICY 4.7.2**

15 **Provide secure, accessible and abundant bicycle parking, particularly at transit**
16 **stations, within shopping areas and at concentrations of employment.**

17
18 **POLICY 4.7.3**

19 **Support the establishment of the Blue-Greenway by including safe, quality**
20 **pedestrian and bicycle connections from Central Waterfront.**

21
22 The vision for the “Blue Greenway” is to create a 13-mile greenway network along San
23 Francisco’s Southern Waterfront, completing San Francisco’s portion of the Bay Trail,
24 increasing public enjoyment of this historic, working waterfront, and providing much-needed
25

1 open space, water access, and a walking/biking route to San Francisco's eastern
2 neighborhoods.

3

4 OBJECTIVE 4.8

5 ENCOURAGE ALTERNATIVES TO CAR OWNERSHIP AND THE REDUCTION OF
6 PRIVATE VEHICLE TRIPS

7

8 * * * *

9

10 POLICY 4.8.3

11 ~~Develop a~~ Implement the Citywide Transportation Demand Management (TDM)
12 program for the Eastern Neighborhoods that provides information and incentives for
13 employees, visitors and residents to use alternative transportation modes and travel
14 times.

15

16 * * * *

17

18 Central Waterfront has had a deficiency of open spaces serving the neighborhood. ~~As~~
19 ~~an industrial area many parts~~ Given that much of Central Waterfront is transitioning from industrial to
20 mixed-use, notable portions of Central Waterfront are not within walking distance to an existing
21 park and many areas lack adequate places to recreate and relax. With the addition of new
22 workers and residents, this deficiency will only be exacerbated. Thus, one of the primary
23 objectives of this Plan is to provide more open space to serve both existing and new
24 residents, workers and visitors. ~~Analysis reveals that a total of about 1.9 acres of new space should~~
25 ~~be provided in this area to accommodate expected growth.~~ Outside of Pier 70 and Potrero Power

1 Station, which together propose roughly nine acres of new open space, This Plan proposes to
2 provide this new open space by creating at least one substantial new park site (or more than
3 one smaller open spaces commensurate to one substantial new park) in Central Waterfront. In
4 addition, the Plan proposes to encourage some of the private open space that will be required
5 as part of development to be provided as public open space and to utilize our existing rights-
6 of-way to provide pocket parks.

7
8 OBJECTIVE 5.1

9 **PROVIDE PUBLIC PARKS AND OPEN SPACES THAT MEET THE NEEDS OF**
10 **RESIDENTS, WORKERS AND VISITORS**

11
12 In a built-out neighborhood such as this, finding sites for sizeable new parks is difficult.
13 However, it is critical that at least one new substantial open space be provided as part of this
14 Plan. This Plan identifies a number of potential park sites: the area behind the IM Scott School
15 site, which is currently used for parking, expansion of Warm Water Cove and the development
16 of Crane Cove Park ~~on north of~~ Pier 70. Additionally, as part of a ~~long term planning process of~~
17 ~~new development at the former~~ Potrero Power Plant ~~site~~ and the Pier 70 Special Use District
18 sites ~~Planning process~~, the Bay shoreline will be improved with bayfront parks, pathways, and public
19 access connecting the Bay Trail through these areas. The area surrounding Irish Hill is also
20 identified as a potential park site. ~~Finally, an improved waterfront at the end of 22nd Street would~~
21 ~~provide a much needed bayfront park site and should be considered as part of any long term plans for~~
22 ~~Pier 70.~~

23
24 The City is working with the San Francisco Unified School District on the IM Scott
25 School site and with the Port of San Francisco ~~on the to~~ development of Crane Cove Park ~~as~~

1 ~~well as,~~ and the City supports the renovation and expansion of Warm Water Cove. The Port
2 sites ~~would~~ greatly expand public access to the waterfront and provide large areas of public
3 open space. ~~As part of the Pier 70 planning process,~~ Crane Cove Park, located at 19th and
4 Illinois Street, ~~is being considered for~~ includes over 1,200 feet of Bay edge access, two cranes,
5 and a ~~possible~~ small boat/aquatic center. This major new waterfront park adjacent to the Pier
6 70 shipyard ~~would be~~ is integrated with the restoration of the historic maritime structures. Also
7 envisioned is the renovation and future expansion of Warm Water Cove, a small landscaped
8 picnic area at the end of 24th Street adjacent to the Bay. ~~Expansions to the south are planned and~~
9 ~~future expansions to the south should be considered.~~ The new master planned development at Pier 70
10 and the Potrero Power Station will provide multiple acres of open space along the waterfront and
11 internal to the two sites. ~~The Planning Department will continue working with the Recreation and Parks~~
12 ~~Department and the Port to pursue these public park sites in the Central Waterfront.~~

13
14 ~~With the closure of the Potrero Power Plant site and the Pier 70 planning process,~~ As a result of
15 the Pier 70 planning processes, the remnant of Irish Hill ~~should be evaluated for its potential to be a~~
16 ~~successful open space~~ will be incorporated into the open space network. Irish Hill was once a
17 prominent feature of the Central Waterfront, serving as the home for workers in the nearby
18 mills from the 1880s until World War I, when the hill was mostly leveled to make way for
19 expansion of the shipyards. While little of the original bluff remains, it is an unusual reminder
20 of the area's history.

21
22 In order to provide a public park, significant funding will need to be identified to acquire,
23 develop, and maintain the spaces. One source of funds would be impact fees or direct
24 contributions from new development. New residential development directly impacts the
25 existing park sites with its influx of new residents, therefore new residential development will

1 be required to either pay directly into a fund to acquire new open space or provide publicly
2 accessible space on or off-site. Funding for the planned Port open spaces is also needed. The
3 Port, with the Recreation and Parks Department, ~~has proposed~~ will propose ~~an~~ future open space
4 bonds, which ~~will~~ could partially cover the cost of improvements to Warm Water Cove and ~~to~~
5 an expanded Crane Cove Park, but additional funding sources will need to be found to ensure
6 the development of these open spaces.

7

8 Commercial development also directly impacts existing park sites, with workers,
9 shoppers and others needing places to eat lunch and take a break outside. This Plan also
10 proposes to charge an impact fee for commercial development to cover the impact of
11 proposed commercial development.

12

13 The policies to address the objective outlined above are as follows:

14

15 * * * *

16 OBJECTIVE 5.3

17 **CREATE A NETWORK OF GREEN STREETS THAT CONNECTS OPEN SPACES**
18 **AND IMPROVES THE WALKABILITY, AESTHETICS, AND ECOLOGICAL**
19 **SUSTAINABILITY OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD**

20

21 In a built out neighborhood such as Central Waterfront, acquiring sites for new large
22 parks can be difficult. For this reason, in addition to the acquisition of at least one park site in
23 the neighborhood, the Central Waterfront Area Plan proposes an open space network of
24 “Green Connector” streets, with wider sidewalks, places to sit and enjoy, significant
25 landscaping, and gracious street trees that would provide linkages between larger open

1 spaces and diffuse the recreational and aesthetic benefits of these spaces into the
2 neighborhood. Specifically, this Plan proposes to create a greenway along 24th Street that will
3 connect Warm Water Cove to the rest of the neighborhood. At 100 feet, the 24th Street right-
4 of-way between the water and Michigan Street is wider than a typical street width, offering the
5 opportunity for landscaping and greening elements to connect the park more strongly to Third
6 Street and to attract more users from Third Street. Additional green Connector streets are
7 proposed along Minnesota Street to connect Esprit Park, to Muni Park and passing the
8 proposed IM Scott school site park. Third Street also represents an important street with the
9 light rail and pedestrian activity on this street. Additionally, 22nd Street connecting the Central
10 Waterfront neighborhood to new neighborhood and waterfront public access in the proposed Pier
11 70 Special Use District redevelopment provides an opportunity for greening. Proposed
12 landscaping and greening improvements would enhance this streetscape.

13
14 Public access to Islais Creek is also in need of improvement. Currently, there are two
15 access points: the north side of Tennessee Street is a hardscaped area that covers a sewage
16 outfall facility and the south side of the creek is a handicap-accessible put-in for non-
17 motorized watercraft. On the east side of the Third Street Bridge is Tulare pocket park. None
18 of these spaces are well used (except by skateboarders, who use the outfall cover) because
19 they are not easily reached, are small, and feel isolated and disconnected. As much as
20 possible, future development should be required to contribute to the creation of a continuous
21 loop of publicly accessible open space, and should themselves help to activate it. The loop
22 should run from Illinois Street west along the northern edge of the creek, turning at the end of
23 the creek to run east along the southern edge, ending at the 3rd Street Bridge. Future
24 improvements to Islais Creek and its adjacent open spaces and infrastructure should include features

25

1 and programs that address possible future flooding and inundation caused by Sea Level Rise and
2 climate change.

3
4 ~~This Plan also proposes to develop~~ The area marking the historic alignment of the Tubbs
5 Cordage Factory *has been developed* into a public pedestrian passage ~~or open space~~ that
6 connects Tennessee and Third Streets. Now constructed, ~~This will improve~~s the connection
7 between the Caltrain station and the ~~planned~~ 23rd Street light rail stop. (See Map 5 – Eastern
8 Neighborhoods Streets and Open Space Concept Map)

9
10 Streets can and should provide important and valued additions to the open space
11 network and aesthetic quality of the area. The design and maintenance of all other streets
12 throughout the Plan area should be guided by the Pier 70 Plan and ~~forthcoming~~ the Better
13 Streets Plan, which will provide direction on how to improve the overall urban design quality,
14 aesthetic character, and ecological function of the city’s streets while maintaining safe and
15 efficient use for all modes of transportation. The Better Streets Plan will provide guidance for
16 both public and private improvements to the streetscape. The Central Waterfront Area Plan, in
17 addition to the Better Streets Plan, will generate amendments to the planning code to make
18 more explicit the requirements of private developers to construct and maintain a more
19 enjoyable, more beautiful pedestrian environment.

20
21 In addition to these general streetscape improvements along streets, specific design
22 interventions should also be considered for major intersections. As evidenced throughout the
23 Plan Area, where major intersections are often two streets of speeding through traffic framed
24 on four corners by single-story buildings, these places are unfriendly to the walker and cyclist.
25 To better foster a sense of place and to improve the pedestrian experience, significant public

1 space improvements – such as bulb-outs and landscaping treatments – should be focused at
2 these intersections. Additionally, as described in the Built Form chapter of this Plan, specific
3 effort should be paid to improving the quality, design, massing, and scale of corner buildings
4 to better reflect the civic importance of major street intersections.

5
6 The Central Waterfront Area Plan calls for the development of the Blue Greenway, as
7 discussed further in the Transportation Chapter. The Blue Greenway is a 13 mile recreational
8 corridor that would run along the Bay – perhaps Central Waterfront’s greatest natural asset –
9 providing a connection between ~~the~~ The Embarcadero and China Basin all the way to
10 Candlestick Point, as a necklace of small waterfront parks, pathways, and promenades.

11
12 An important consideration for Central Waterfront is the visual and functional
13 dominance of the elevated freeway and at-grade railway infrastructure. To soften this
14 dominance and to improve connections through the infrastructure, the City is working with
15 Caltrans to provide landscaping along the freeway-, as well as architectural lighting. This
16 lighting should be both energy efficient and designed to minimize light spill into abutting
17 neighborhoods.

18
19 The Plan also proposes to utilize the existing rail rights-of way by pursuing acquisition
20 or conversion of the curved alignment between the Caltrain Station and 20th Street.
21 Comprised of two lots, both were former railroad rights-of-ways. They are currently privately
22 owned and are used as parking lots. Incorporating these into the system of green connector
23 streets would help create a functional, attractive pedestrian route between Caltrain, future
24 development at Pier 70, and other neighborhood destinations.

1 The policies to address the objective outlined above are as follows:

2 * * * *

3
4 **POLICY 5.3.8**

5 ~~*Pursue acquisition or conversion of*~~ **Maintain public access to the Tubbs Cordage**
6 **Factory alignment** ~~*to public access. Should it be infeasible to purchase the necessary property,*~~
7 ~~*future development should include the following improvements:*~~

8
9 ~~*— Good night time lighting for pedestrian safety and comfort.*~~

10 ~~*— Limit ground cover to 24” to maximize visibility.*~~

11 ~~*— If benches are provided, they should be placed only at the street.*~~

12 * * * *

13
14 **OBJECTIVE 8.2**

15 **PROTECT, PRESERVE, AND REUSE HISTORIC RESOURCES WITHIN THE**
16 **CENTRAL WATERFRONT AREA PLAN, INCLUDING THE UNION IRON WORKS**
17 **NATIONAL REGISTER HISTORIC DISTRICT AT PIER 70.**

18
19 A substantial portion of the Central Waterfront area plan’s rich history is represented in
20 the unique and largely intact collection of historic and cultural resources found on Port-owned
21 property, in particular, within the Pier 70 area. The Pier 70 Union Iron Works Historic District was
22 listed on the ~~*The Planning Department will participate in the Port’s master planning activities for Pier*~~
23 ~~*70. This planning effort includes research and documentation necessary to list the area as a*~~ National
24 Register ~~*Historic District.*~~ Other significant historic and cultural resources located in the
25 Central Waterfront area plan include individual properties, districts, and engineering

1 achievements such as bridges and tunnels that are listed on or eligible for the National or
2 California Register, or that are designated as Landmarks or Districts under Article 10 of the
3 Planning Code. These historic and cultural resources cannot be replaced if lost to demolition
4 or altered in such manner that their historic significance is diminished.

5 * * * *

6
7
8 Section 3. The Northeastern Waterfront Area Plan of the San Francisco General Plan
9 is hereby amended as follows:

10
11 **INTRODUCTION**

12 **Background**

13
14 San Francisco is a compact city, surrounded on three sides by the Pacific Ocean and
15 San Francisco Bay. From the beginning, the waterfront has played an intimate role in the
16 City's industrial, commercial, and recreational life.

17
18 San Francisco has long served as a gateway to newcomers venturing to North America for the
19 first time due to its protected harbor. Originally home to the Ohlone, San Francisco attracted people
20 of European ancestry and other non-natives looking for a new life and a new place to call home.
21 Europeans – specifically Spaniards – first settled in ~~Although~~ San Francisco Bay ~~was discovered by~~
22 ~~the Spaniards in 1775, 1776; however,~~ it was not until the 1849 gold rush that the region had its
23 first wave of ~~population growth~~ significant settlement and population growth by Europeans. As with
24 all of the Americas, prior to western settlement, this land had been the home of indigenous peoples who
25 had maintained harmony with the Bay's ecology for millennia. When Juan Bautista de Anza arrived,

1 this was the home of the Yelamu, a subgroup of the Ramaytush-speaking group of the Ohlone people.
2 ~~The focus of the growth was in the area adjacent to the Bay where deep and protected waters provided~~
3 ~~a natural harbor.~~ Settlement of people of European ancestry in San Francisco generally followed
4 settlement patterns of the Ohlone. For example, Spanish colonists did not lay their plans on a blank
5 canvas, as the natural landscape dictated the placement of both the Presidio and the Mission. Both
6 were situated near sources of drinking water, and both avoided the vast fields of sand dunes. Because it
7 was meant to protect the Bay, the Presidio overlooked the Golden Gate. Because it was supposed to
8 produce food, the Mission overlooked sunny grasslands. Spanish colonists also built on the settlement
9 patters of those they sought to colonize. Through the lens of settler colonialism, these echoes of
10 indigenous patterns on the land are still visible in today's City. In the Northeastern Waterfront,
11 European settlement growth was in the area adjacent to the Bay where deep and protected waters
12 provided a natural harbor.

13 This area is now the Northeastern Waterfront and includes Fisherman's Wharf to China
14 Basin. Much of this area was developed on Bay fill as the original shoreline skirted the base of
15 what are known as Telegraph, Rincon, and Potrero Hill.

16
17 During these early days of settlement by people of European ancestry, the waterfront was a
18 lively part of town, busy with sailors and those hoping to earn their fortunes in the gold fields.
19 City dwellers would stroll along the waterfront and enjoy the marvelous view of the Port and
20 the Bay. The nearby hillsides were the sites of the earliest settlements and later became
21 fashionable neighborhoods.

22
23 Through World War II, the waterfront retained its image of as a thriving port and center
24 of the City's economic vitality. The Ferry Building, located at the foot of Market Street, became
25 a landmark structure symbolic of the City's ties with the Bay Area and the World. The western

1 half of San Francisco's waterfront, from Aquatic Park, west to the Presidio and south along
2 Ocean Beach to the County line was developed for military and recreational use and in recent
3 years has become part of the magnificent Golden Gate National Recreational Area.

4
5 With the passage of time, however, the Northeastern Waterfront became increasingly
6 separated from the rest of the city and began to decline in activity. The completion of the Bay
7 Bridge in the 1930's foreshadowed the decline of the Trans-Bay ferry service and diminished
8 the role of the Ferry Building. The construction of the Embarcadero Freeway and parking lots
9 beneath it created visual and physical barriers to the Bay, impeding the revitalization of this
10 part of the City.

11
12 Changes in transportation technology related to the movement of goods by water also
13 contributed to the decline of the waterfront. The placement of cargo in standardized
14 containers resulted in dramatic shifts in maritime transportation patterns. Container shipping
15 shifted the emphasis from the traditional breakbulk method of cargo handling, for which the
16 Port's finger piers were designed, and created the need for large modern facilities requiring
17 considerable capital investment and backland support areas. In response, new container
18 shipping facilities were developed in the central and southern waterfront near India Basin in
19 the 1970's.

20
21 Although the Port of San Francisco was, at the end of World War II, the largest port in
22 the region, the Port of Oakland was first to develop container shipping facilities. Oakland has
23 the advantage of large, undeveloped flat land necessary for the storage of containers as well
24 as better rail and highway connections to eastern markets than San Francisco. ~~Today, portions~~
25 ~~of Some piers along San Francisco's Northeastern Waterfront continue to be used for break bulk~~

1 cargo handling through the 1990's. Other piers continue to be used in whole or part for commercial
2 fishing, maritime support, cruises, excursions, ferries, and other commercial and recreational maritime
3 operations, which will maintain a working waterfront presence. However, many of the underutilized
4 piers and adjacent Port land which was no longer needed or suitable exclusively for industrial
5 maritime operations have created opportunity for new maritime mixed use developments, recreation,
6 public access, and open space. ~~and related activities; however some of the piers are vacant and~~
7 ~~dilapidated and much of the Port's property in this area is underutilized. The Port expects that, over~~
8 ~~time, cargo shipping, ship repair operations and related support services will continue to consolidate~~
9 ~~south of China Basin, maximizing efficient use of the Port's container terminals, industrial land and~~
10 ~~freight rail service. In the meantime, the Port intends to maintain existing non-container newsprint~~
11 ~~shipping and cargo warehouses in the Northeastern Waterfront, for as long they remain viable in this~~
12 ~~location.~~

13
14 ~~Other piers in the Northeastern Waterfront will continue to be used in whole or part for~~
15 ~~commercial fishing, maritime support, cruise, excursions, ferries and other commercial and~~
16 ~~recreational maritime operations, which will maintain a working waterfront presence. However,~~
17 ~~because many of the piers and adjacent Port land are no longer needed or suitable exclusively for~~
18 ~~industrial maritime operations, there are opportunities for new commercial development and public~~
19 ~~access and open space.~~

20
21 In the 1960's, the gradual decline of as cargo shipping and other industry changes led to the
22 decline in the Port's breakbulk operations in the Northeastern Waterfront, other economic and
23 technological shifts led to economic and planning changes for upland properties west of The
24 Embarcadero. the departure of many non-maritime industry Industrial and manufacturing
25 businesses, and warehouses that extended from Fisherman's Wharf, and south along the Sansome-

1 Battery corridor ~~into and the~~ South of Market ~~became the focus of~~ areas. ~~As the number of vacant~~
2 ~~warehouses and underutilized properties increased,~~ City planning efforts ~~focused on to~~ transforming
3 these areas to commercial and residential uses to complement the growing financial and
4 business services center in downtown San Francisco ~~(e.g. the Icehouse office conversion,~~
5 ~~Ghirardelli Square specialty retail center)~~. In addition, the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency
6 established two redevelopment areas: 1) Golden Gateway, generally bounded by Front and
7 Battery Streets on the west, Sacramento Street to the south next to downtown, Broadway to
8 the north and The Embarcadero to the east; and 2) Rincon Point-South Beach, a two-part
9 redevelopment area which includes an approximately three to four block area near the
10 waterfront from Mission to Folsom Streets, and a larger nine block area on the waterfront from
11 Bryant to Berry Streets which includes South Beach Harbor and Pier 40. These two
12 redevelopment project areas sunset in 2021, after which land use authority was transferred to the
13 Planning Department. The two areas were incorporated into the East SoMa Area Plan adopted in
14 2009. In 1985, the San Francisco Planning Commission adopted the Rincon Hill Plan for the
15 area adjacent to the waterfront between Folsom and Bryant Streets, extending inland to
16 Second Street.; the Rincon Hill Plan was further updated in 2006. These three planned areas
17 have been, or will be, redeveloped with a mix of activities, but predominantly of residential use
18 with supporting commercial and business services.

19
20 Although plans for all three areas were developed when the Embarcadero Freeway
21 was still in place, their proximity to the waterfront was regarded as a major amenity that could
22 only be fully realized if the Freeway was removed. The General Plan therefore included
23 policies calling for the removal of the overhead Embarcadero Freeway, to allow the City to be
24 reunited with its waterfront. However, after the defeat in 1986 of a ballot proposition for the
25 freeway removal, public efforts turned to defining transportation improvements that would

1 transform the surface Embarcadero roadway from a largely industrial arterial to a grand urban
2 boulevard.

3

4 Guided by policies contained in the Northeastern Waterfront Plan, in 1985 the City
5 approved the blueprint for the \$80 million Waterfront Transportation Projects, a series of
6 improvements that together would improve The Embarcadero roadway from Fisherman's
7 Wharf to China Basin, with widened sidewalks, public art, landscaping and other pedestrian
8 amenities, a new F historic street car line from Market Street to Fisherman's Wharf, and a
9 MUNI Metro light rail service extension from Market Street into the Mission Bay area.

10

11 The phased construction of these transportation enhancements was underway before
12 the Loma Prieta Earthquake in 1989. In light of the extent of earthquake damage sustained by
13 the Embarcadero Freeway and its extremely high repair cost, the City decided to demolish the
14 double-decked structure and its connecting ramp system, which opened the City to the
15 waterfront. ~~City efforts now are underway to develop transportation improvements for the mid section~~
16 ~~of the Embarcadero between Howard Street and Broadway which had laid beneath the freeway.~~

17

18 In the aftermath of the freeway removal, new unobstructed waterfront views from
19 Downtown San Francisco and adjacent areas combined with the landscaping, lighting, public
20 art and other pedestrian improvements underway along The Embarcadero ~~have~~ reinvigorated
21 public interest in revitalizing the waterfront. While there is substantial demand for a variety of
22 uses on the Northeastern Waterfront, the type and magnitude of new uses should reflect what
23 is desirable from the broadest public interest point of view. Although there is a desire to
24 maintain and attract new blue collar jobs, this has become increasingly difficult in light of
25 technological advances which have replaced manufacturing jobs, the moving of

1 manufacturing functions overseas, the increased costs of land in the City, and traffic
2 congestion on major travel corridors. In addition to office, industrial, services and shipping
3 activities, a substantial portion of the City's economy is related to tourism. Hotel, restaurant
4 and retail uses are large employers, particularly of ~~minority groups~~ people of color. There is a
5 demand for additional commercial and tourist-related development, however it must be
6 carefully balanced against the need for maritime uses, recreation and open space, the needs
7 of new resident populations in the Northeastern Waterfront and the community desire not to
8 replicate or compete with other tourist areas in the City.

9
10 Property under the jurisdiction of the Port of San Francisco, including all piers and
11 certain inland sites in the Northeastern Waterfront, is subject to use limitations under the
12 public trust and the Burton Act. The Port, as trustee, is required to promote maritime
13 commerce, navigation, and fisheries, as well as to protect natural resources and develop
14 recreational facilities and activities to promote for public use and enjoyment on these public lands.

15
16 In June 1997, the Port Commission adopted the Waterfront Land Use Plan, which was
17 prepared pursuant to Proposition H, an initiative approved by San Francisco voters in 1990 ~~with the~~
18 ~~assistance of a broad based Waterfront Plan Advisory Board.~~ Under Proposition H, the Waterfront
19 Plan prioritizes maritime and water-dependent uses along the Port's 7.5-mile waterfront, and ~~The~~
20 ~~Waterfront Plan~~ sets forth land use policies that allow complementary non-maritime uses for all
21 ~~property under the jurisdiction of the Port of San Francisco, for properties under the Port's~~
22 jurisdiction, which are consistent with the Port's public trust responsibilities and the Burton Act
23 and the City's Northeastern Waterfront Plan. In 2023, following a lengthy public process, the Port
24 produced a comprehensive update of the Waterfront Plan. The Waterfront Plan goals describe the
25

1 public values and set the policy foundation for the plan, including: ~~of the Waterfront Land Use Plan~~
2 ~~are~~ 1) to maintain and improve the working maritime waterfront; 2) to provide a revitalized Port,
3 ~~&~~ diversity of activities that provide equitable benefits to ~~and~~ people and communities that
4 ~~historically have been marginalized and not included in public discussions about the waterfront;~~ 3) to
5 ~~maintain and improve a connected network of parks and public;~~ access to and along the
6 waterfront; 4) to respect and enhance ~~an evolving waterfront mindful of its past and future,~~ unique
7 ~~maritime historic resources and~~ urban design worthy of the waterfront setting; 5) to promote ~~and~~
8 economic and recreational access that ~~reflects~~ includes people of all races, ages, and social
9 ~~backgrounds~~ the diversity of San Francisco; and 6) to partner with the community, sponsors, and
10 ~~public agencies to advance environmental sustainability and adaptation of the waterfront to climate~~
11 ~~change and sea level rise.~~ The Waterfront Plan includes general land use policies for maritime
12 uses, open space and public access, residential and commercial uses, other uses and interim
13 uses, and identifies unacceptable non-maritime land uses. It includes five subarea plans, of
14 which three ~~and one half~~ are entirely within the area covered by the Northeastern Waterfront
15 Plan. ~~The Waterfront Land Use Plan's related Waterfront Design & Access policies include goals,~~
16 ~~policies and criteria which address urban design, public access, city pattern and historic preservation~~
17 ~~which will be achieved in future waterfront improvement projects.~~

18
19 The San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) has
20 jurisdiction over San Francisco Bay and upland areas within 100 feet of the shoreline under
21 the McAteer-Petris Act. BCDC adopted the San Francisco Bay Plan as called for under that
22 legislation, which establishes BCDC policies for San Francisco Bay. To provide more dedicated
23 policy focus for piers and properties along the San Francisco Waterfront, BCDC worked ~~in 1975,~~
24 ~~acting~~ in concert with the Planning Department and Port, to ~~adopted~~ the San Francisco
25 Waterfront Special Area Plan in 1975. The Special Area Plan, together with the McAteer-

1 Petris Act and the Bay Plan ~~and subsequent amendments to all three documents,~~ prescribes a set
2 forth of rules BCDC policies and conditions for water-dependent uses, and for non-maritime uses on
3 piers and shoreline properties development along the San Francisco Waterfront. The Port works
4 with BCDC and the City on periodic amendments to City and BCDC plans to update and maintain
5 alignment between the policies of all three agencies.

6
7 Within the context of this regulatory framework and the strong caring interest that San
8 Francisco's residents and workers have for the City, the Port's Waterfront ~~Land Use~~ Plan sets
9 forth goals and policies that have guided many waterfront improvements to complement the
10 transformation of The Embarcadero. New waterfront parks and an expanded public access system
11 have been created. The iconic finger piers and arched bulkhead buildings, together with the Ferry
12 Building and Agriculture Building, are included in the Embarcadero Historic District, which was listed
13 on the National Register of Historic Places in 2006. The historic rehabilitation of the Ferry Building
14 and several historic piers and development of a ballpark for the San Francisco Giants have created
15 new attractions and activities that make the waterfront a worldwide destination. The investments
16 include major new maritime facilities, including the James R. Herman Cruise Terminal at Pier 27, and
17 the development of the Downtown Ferry Terminal, which provides a new major regional public transit
18 service in the Bay Area. The Waterfront Plan also includes an implementation process for major
19 development projects which ~~involves~~ ~~includes~~ soliciting early community input on conceptual
20 development programs for specific sites before the Port issues requests for major new
21 development proposals. Further, an interagency design review committee including Planning
22 Department, Port and San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission
23 representatives ~~would~~ review projects to ensure that early in the process the interests of
24 respective agencies are addressed and resolved satisfactorily, ~~consistent with the Port's~~

1 ~~Waterfront Design & Access policies,~~ thereby improving predictability and minimizing delays in
2 the regulatory process.

3 4 **The Future of the Northeastern Waterfront**

5
6 The Northeastern Waterfront Plan recommends objectives and policies designed to
7 contribute to the waterfront's environmental quality, enhance the economic vitality of the Port
8 and the City, preserve the unique maritime character, and provide for the maximum feasible
9 visual and physical access to and along the Bay.

10
11 In the Northeastern Waterfront, in areas where piers are sound, ~~shipping and related~~
12 ~~maritime uses will be maintained for as long as they remain viable in these locations.~~ Commercial
13 and recreational uses, maritime operations (e.g. cruise, excursions, ferries, historic ships,
14 recreational boating), and fishing industry facilities at Fisherman's Wharf will be maintained
15 and expanded. ~~On lands no longer needed exclusively for maritime purposes,~~ New projects will
16 emerge, primarily as maritime mixed-use developments, which will provide improved and
17 expanded commercial and recreational maritime facilities, open spaces and public access –
18 including access to and from the waters of San Francisco Bay – combined with revenue-generating,
19 water-oriented activities and attractions to increase public enjoyment of the waterfront. On
20 inland areas, the predominant uses will be residential and commercial uses, such as offices,
21 neighborhood-oriented retail and service businesses, and community and cultural facilities.
22 ~~Now that the Embarcadero Freeway has been removed,~~ The waterfront will be re-integrated with
23 the fabric of the City and reestablished as the eastern edge of the City, linked by the
24 transportation improvements along The Embarcadero. New developments also offer opportunities to
25 capture private investment in adapting the waterfront to sea level rise and seismically strengthening the

1 Embarcadero Seawall, as a coordinated element of Port and City resilience and climate change
2 programs and projects. ~~roadway improvements, when completed, will link the Northeastern Waterfront~~
3 ~~with other portions of the shoreline via a rail transit system which will reduce the need for auto travel~~
4 ~~and on site parking; and pedestrian and bicycle ways which will connect recreational areas with~~
5 ~~community facilities, historic and architecturally significant buildings, residential areas, and~~
6 ~~employment centers.~~ An authentic maritime character and strong sense of historic continuity
7 combined with increased visibility of the natural attributes of the Bay will reinforce the special
8 identity of the area.

9
10 To achieve these goals, the Plan recommends general objectives and policies for Land
11 Use, Transportation, and Urban Design and recommends specific objectives and policies
12 which apply to four geographic subareas as well as the Embarcadero Corridor which links
13 them: Fisherman's Wharf Subarea (which extends from the Municipal Pier at Van Ness
14 Avenue through Pier 39); the Base of Telegraph Hill Subarea (Pier 35 through Pier 7); the
15 Ferry Building Subarea (Pier 5 through Rincon Park); and the South Beach Subarea (Pier 22
16 through Pier 46B).

18 **Goals**

19 The overall goal of the Plan is to create a physical and economic environment in the
20 Northeastern Waterfront area which will use the area's resources and potential in the manner
21 which will best serve the needs of ~~the San Francisco,~~ the Bay Area, and visitors ~~community.~~ In
22 order to accomplish this goal, the dominant planning principles of this Plan are:

23
24 1. provide for those uses which positively contribute to the environmental quality of
25 the area and contribute to the economic health of the Port and the City,

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

2. preserve and enhance the unique character of the area, and take advantage of the unique economic opportunity provided by San Francisco Bay, and

3. provide the maximum possible visual and physical access to San Francisco Bay while minimizing the adverse environmental impacts of existing and new activity.

MAP 1 - Northeastern Waterfront Planning Area

OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES

Land Use

General

OBJECTIVE 2

TO DIVERSIFY USES IN THE NORTHEASTERN WATERFRONT, TO EXPAND THE PERIOD OF USE OF EACH SUBAREA AND TO PROMOTE MAXIMUM PUBLIC USE OF THE WATERFRONT WHILE ENHANCING ITS ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY.

POLICY 2.1

Develop uses which generate activity during a variety of time periods rather than concentrating activity during the same peak periods.

1 **POLICY 2.2**

2 **Diversify activities to encourage the use of the Northeastern Waterfront by a**
3 **broad spectrum of the population, particularly vulnerable communities who have not**
4 **traditionally taken advantage of the Waterfront.**

5
6 **POLICY 2.3**

7 **Encourage land uses having different peak periods of activity within each**
8 **subarea of the Northeastern Waterfront to contribute to the area's diversity, to expand**
9 **the period of use, to decrease peak period traffic congestion, to facilitate efficient use**
10 **of the transit system and to preserve and enhance the environmental quality of the**
11 **waterfront.**

12
13 **POLICY 2.4**

14 **Promote ~~the development of new~~ maritime activities, public ~~open space and public~~**
15 **access, improvements and stewardship of Embarcadero Historic District piers as part of major**
16 **new development on piers.**

17
18 **POLICY 2.5**

19 **Promote public-oriented uses including~~Emphasize water-related recreation,~~ Bay-oriented**
20 **commercial recreation and ~~Bay-oriented~~ public assembly uses in non-maritime pier**
21 **development adjacent to, or over, the water.**

22
23 **Maritime and Industrial**

24 *** * * ***

25 **OBJECTIVE 3**

1 TO RETAIN AND ENHANCE MARITIME ACTIVITIES, RESERVING AS MUCH OF
2 THE NORTHEASTERN WATERFRONT AS IS REALISTICALLY REQUIRED FOR FUTURE
3 MARITIME USES, AND PROVIDING FOR EFFICIENT OPERATION OF PORT ACTIVITIES.
4

5 POLICY 3.1

6 Give priority to maritime activities recognizing that the waterfront available for
7 such activities is a limited resource and that maritime activities are vital to the City's
8 economy. Based on a realistic assessment of the maritime needs of the Port, reserve
9 the necessary waterfront area by prohibiting activities which would preclude possible
10 future maritime development, identify where waterfront area should be reserved for maritime
11 development, and develop locations and strategies to improve or create new maritime uses with
12 complementary non-maritime activities. Consider opportunities for other water-dependent activities,
13 including access for water recreation uses, including swimmers, rowers, and human-powered
14 vessels.

15 * * * *

16
17 OBJECTIVE 4

18 TO RETAIN ECONOMICALLY VIABLE INDUSTRIAL ACTIVITY IN THE
19 NORTHEASTERN WATERFRONT FOR AS LONG AS POSSIBLE.
20

21 POLICY 4.1

22 Encourage the retention of industries and businesses which support the Port's
23 maritime operations, either through providing services or through using the Port's
24 facilities ~~for~~ to meet light industrial ~~its shipping~~ needs in San Francisco.
25

1 **POLICY 4.2**

2 **Encourage the retention of viable industries which provide significant revenues,**
3 **job opportunities or services to the City.**

4
5 **POLICY 4.3**

6 **Assist in the relocation within San Francisco of industries which are forced to**
7 **move by market conditions or public action.**

8
9 **Commercial**

10
11 **OBJECTIVE 5**

12 **TO DEVELOP LIMITED ADDITIONAL OFFICE AND COMMERCIAL SPACE IN**
13 **ORDER TO SERVE THE CITY'S ECONOMIC NEEDS AND TO ENCOURAGE A MIXTURE**
14 **OF USES AND ACTIVITIES ALONG THE NORTHEASTERN WATERFRONT.**

15
16 **POLICY 5.1**

17 **Permit additional general office and commercial development on sites inland of**
18 **the seawall adjacent to the Downtown Office District, which complements the**
19 **downtown but which is of a lesser intensity and which reflects the transition between**
20 **the City and the water. Include ground floor retail and commercial uses that provide public-**
21 **oriented activities to enliven the pedestrian experience and attract diverse populations to the**
22 **waterfront**

23
24 **POLICY 5.2**

25 **Encourage service retail uses in combination with other uses.**

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 5.3

Allow general and specialty retail uses in combination with other uses which will not significantly detract from the Downtown Retail District.

POLICY 5.4

Except on piers, permit additional hotel space in locations which would enhance the mixture of uses. In areas where hotels are already concentrated, additional such facilities should be limited and should only be provided if they complement adjacent uses.

POLICY 5.5

Promote maritime mixed use development on piers that are not needed exclusively for maritime use to expand public access over the water, provide public-oriented activities and uses that complement pier maritime activities, and finance pier repair, seismic retrofit, and sea level rise adaptation.~~Encourage Bay-oriented commercial recreation and public assembly uses on piers, which include public access and complementary maritime activities (e.g. cruises, excursions, ferries, historic ships), and maritime support services.~~

POLICY 5.6

Continue to celebrate and promote the ballpark for the San Francisco Giants as a major civic landmark that also hosts other events, supports local businesses and activities, and provides an anchor for the South Beach neighborhood and City as a whole.~~Permit an open-air ballpark with a maximum of 45,000 seats and related commercial uses at Pier 46B.~~

1 **Residential**

2
3 **OBJECTIVE 6**

4 **TO DEVELOP AND MAINTAIN RESIDENTIAL USES ALONG THE**
5 **NORTHEASTERN WATERFRONT IN ORDER TO ASSIST IN SATISFYING THE CITY'S**
6 **HOUSING NEEDS AND CAPITALIZE ON THE AREA'S POTENTIAL AS A DESIRABLE**
7 **LIVING ENVIRONMENT.**

8
9 **POLICY 6.1**

10 **Strengthen, preserve and protect existing residential uses.**

11
12 **POLICY 6.2**

13 **Encourage the development of additional housing wherever feasible (except on**
14 **new or replacement fill).**

15
16 **POLICY 6.3**

17 **Preserve and expand the supply of ~~low and moderate income~~affordable housing**
18 **servicing low- and moderate-income households and encourage the economic integration of**
19 **housing.**

20
21 **POLICY 6.4**

22 **Encourage the development of a variety of unit types for households of all sizes**
23 **where practical.**

24
25 **Recreation and Open Space**

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

OBJECTIVE 7

TO STRENGTHEN AND EXPAND THE RECREATION CHARACTER OF THE NORTHEASTERN WATERFRONT AND TO DEVELOP A SYSTEM OF PUBLIC OPEN SPACES AND RECREATION FACILITIES THAT RECOGNIZES ITS RECREATIONAL POTENTIAL, PROVIDES UNITY AND IDENTITY TO THE URBAN AREA, AND ESTABLISHES AN OVERALL WATERFRONT CHARACTER OF OPENNESS OF VIEWS, WATER AND SKY AND PUBLIC ACCESSIBILITY TO THE WATER'S EDGE.

POLICY 7.1

Develop recreation facilities attractive to residents, workers, and visitors of all ages and ~~income~~ racial and social groups.

POLICY 7.2

Provide a continuous system of parks, urban plazas, water-related public recreation, shoreline pedestrian promenades, pedestrian walkways and street greenways throughout the entire Northeastern Waterfront.

POLICY 7.3

Connect the recreation and open space facilities of the Northeastern Waterfront with those of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

POLICY 7.4

1 Encourage and provide open space and public recreation facilities as part of any
2 development, to provide facilities for people residing and working in the Northeastern
3 Waterfront and in adjoining neighborhoods.

4
5 **POLICY 7.5**

6 Provide overlooks and public viewing areas with convenient pedestrian access
7 wherever possible. Every attempt should be made to provide such viewing facilities in
8 areas of maritime and fish processing activities without interfering with the operation
9 of those activities, consistent with the Port's Waterfront *Design & Access Plan* policies.
10 ~~Remove or create openings in buildings between piers wherever feasible, consistent with their~~
11 ~~historic character and use, in order to construct such overlooks and to create a balanced rhythm of~~
12 ~~buildings and views.~~

13
14 **POLICY 7.6**

15 With new development, create new views between buildings and/or physical
16 access to (1) the Bay, (2) water-dependent maritime activities or (3) open space or other
17 public attractions that invite the public onto pier areas and provide access to the Bay.

18
19 **POLICY 7.7**

20 Where desirable and feasible, provide amenities which enhance public
21 enjoyment of open spaces and public access areas by providing public restrooms,
22 drinking fountains, information kiosks, sales of refreshments from push carts and
23 other services.

24
25 **POLICY 7.8**

1 Require the inclusion of a substantial amount of public open space and
2 peripheral public access to the water's edge when major new mixed-use developments
3 occur. Provide connections between these waterfront open spaces and public access
4 areas to create a 'PortWalk' ~~which is integrated with sidewalk and pedestrian improvements~~
5 ~~along that complements~~ The Embarcadero Promenade (Herb Caen Way/~~Embarcadero~~
6 ~~Promenade~~) ~~which, between King and Jefferson Streets, coincides with the~~ and regional Bay Trail.
7 Public access should be located at ground or pier deck platform-level, but minor
8 variations in elevation intended to enhance design of open space may be permitted,
9 while encouraging access for persons with disabilities. Public access should also be open to
10 the sky, although some covering may be allowed if it serves the public areas and does
11 not support structures. Particular attention should be given to the provision of
12 perimeter public access on piers along the platform edge. Other uses may extend to the
13 ~~pier platform~~ edge subject to the following conditions: (a) Such uses should enhance the
14 total design of the project, and should serve to make the public access more interesting,
15 ~~and should not divert the public way along more than twenty percent (20%) of the total platform~~
16 ~~edge.~~ (b) Deviations of the public way from the ~~platform pier~~ edge should be limited to
17 short distances.

18
19 **POLICY 7.9**

20 Provide as much public open space and peripheral access as is feasible in areas
21 of maritime activity without interfering with the operation of this activity.
22

23 **POLICY 7.10**

24 Continue operation of the small boat marinas at Pier 39 and at South Beach
25 Harbor, and encourage additional locations for transient mooring to expand waterside

1 access to the Northeastern Waterfront. Encourage the development of new water taxis, ferries,
2 and excursion boats, to establish an accessible water transit network.

3
4 **POLICY 7.11**

5 Develop a continuous bicycle path along the Northeastern Waterfront that is
6 linked with the city-wide bicycle route system.

7
8 **POLICY 7.12**

9 Support improvements in parks and open spaces (including launches, changing areas, and
10 restrooms), where feasible, to serve swimming, kayaking, and water recreation in the Bay.

11
12 **Transportation**

13
14 **OBJECTIVE 8**

15 **TO FACILITATE THE MOVEMENT OF PEOPLE AND GOODS WITHIN THE**
16 **NORTHEASTERN WATERFRONT IN SUCH A WAY AS TO MINIMIZE THE ADVERSE**
17 **IMPACT OF THIS MOVEMENT.**

18
19 **POLICY 8.1**

20 Prioritize safe, comfortable, and enjoyable travel by foot, bike, public transit, and other non-
21 vehicular modes of transportation over travel by private vehicle. Ensure waterfront development
22 includes features and transportation demand management programs that promote transportation
23 mode alternatives to private vehicles. ~~Intercept and divert as much automobile traffic as feasible~~
24 ~~away from the water's edge and areas of intense pedestrian activity in order to make conditions more~~

1 ~~pleasurable, safe, and interesting for the pedestrian, and in order to facilitate the commercial and~~
2 ~~recreational development of the area.~~

3
4 **POLICY 8.2**

5 ~~Limit additional parking facilities in the Northeastern Waterfront and minimize the impact of~~
6 ~~this parking.~~ Discourage long-term commute parking for work trips and promote
7 transportation mode shifts to public ~~which could be accommodated by~~ transit and non-vehicle
8 alternatives. Manage existing parking facilities to promote shared use, and dedicated spaces for
9 electric vehicle charging, rideshare vehicles, and secure bicycle parking. Restrict additional
10 parking to: (a) Short-term (less than four hour) parking facilities to meet needs of
11 visitors frequenting ~~additional~~ business, retail, restaurant, marina, and entertainment
12 activities; (b) Long-term parking facilities for maritime activities, hotel and residential
13 uses. To the extent possible, locate parking away from areas of intense pedestrian
14 activity. Encourage shared parking at adjacent or nearby facilities.

15
16 **POLICY 8.3**

17 ~~Discourage vehicle~~ ~~Allow~~ parking over or near the water ~~for public and commercial~~
18 ~~recreation uses only if: (a) no alternative location is feasible; (b) the parking is located within a~~
19 ~~structure devoted to a permitted use and is necessary to such use or to other permitted uses in the~~
20 ~~same project area; and (c) it is the minimum amount necessary.~~ and promote public transit, bicycles,
21 and walking access to the waterfront, and transportation safety for all modes of travel. When
22 allocating available parking at the waterfront, give priority to essential maritime and Port tenant
23 operations.

24
25 **POLICY 8.4**

1 ~~*Prohibit*~~*Manage paid on-street* parking ~~*over the water for marinas in the Fisherman's*~~
2 ~~*Wharf through Ferry Building areas. In other areas, allow parking for marinas over water only if:*~~
3 ~~*(a) no alternative upland location is feasible; (b) the total fill for a marina does not exceed a land-*~~
4 ~~*water ratio of 1/2:1; and (c) it is the minimum necessary. Encourage loading and unloading areas*~~
5 ~~*adjacent to marinas to minimize the need for parking over the water.*~~*encourage parking turnover,*
6 *provide disabled accessible spaces, and serve customer and visitor access to the area.*
7

8 **POLICY 8.5**

9 *Work with the SFMTA to achieve mode-shift goals and transportation demand management*
10 *plans to promote alternatives to private vehicles, in order to support existing and new development*
11 *along the waterfront, based on City and Port transportation goals, public transit service levels, and*
12 *roadway capacity.*~~*Base the determination of the amount of parking allowed for permitted uses on the*~~
13 ~~*desirability of reducing automobiles along the waterfront and, to the maximum extent feasible,*~~
14 ~~*consider the use of existing public transit and inland parking, as well as public transit and inland*~~
15 ~~*parking which could reasonably be provided in the future.*~~
16

17 **POLICY 8.6**

18 ~~*Remove or relocate inland those existing parking facilities on or near the water's edge or*~~
19 ~~*within areas of intense pedestrian activity.*~~
20

21 **POLICY 8.76**

22 ~~*Facilitate*~~*Prioritize* pedestrian access to the shoreline, including access for the
23 ~~*handicapped*~~*disabled*, through the provision of convenient, safe pedestrian crossings
24 along The Embarcadero. Provide promenades and walkways of sufficient width to
25

1 accommodate comfortably and safely the movement of pedestrians throughout the
2 Northeastern Waterfront.

3
4 **POLICY 8.7**

5 **Support SFMTA efforts to improve safety for all transportation modes in the development of**
6 **the Embarcadero Enhancement Program to add a protected bikeway along The Embarcadero from**
7 **King Street to Fisherman’s Wharf, while ensuring safe pedestrian crossing of The Embarcadero,**
8 **and safe vehicle access to Port tenant and maritime operations on piers.**

9
10 **POLICY 8.8**

11 **Coordinate with SFMTA and the Port to develop and maintain sustainable and**
12 **reliable**~~Facilitate the~~ **movement of goods into and out of the maritime piers along The**
13 **Embarcadero, and manage use of curb zones designated for loading and deliveries**~~where possible in~~
14 ~~the design of the road system.~~

15
16 **OBJECTIVE 9**

17 **TO ACCOMMODATE THE REGIONAL MOVEMENT OF PEOPLE AND GOODS,**
18 **PERMITTING THE THROUGH MOVEMENT OF TRAFFIC, ACCESS TO THE REGIONAL**
19 **SYSTEM FROM THE MARITIME AND OTHER INDUSTRIAL AREAS OF THE CITY, AND**
20 **FACILITATING THE MOVEMENT OF REGIONAL TRANSIT WHILE MINIMIZING THE**
21 **ADVERSE IMPACT OF THIS SYSTEM ON THE NORTHEASTERN WATERFRONT AREA.**

22
23 **POLICY 9.1**

24 **To the extent feasible, accommodate regional traffic movement inland from the**
25 **Northeastern Waterfront area.**

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 9.2

Prohibit any increase to the capacity of the roadway system along the shoreline to accommodate automobiles between the Bay Bridge-downtown area and the Golden Gate Bridge. Improve transit service in this corridor to encourage the reduction of automobile traffic.

POLICY 9.3

Minimize the impact of regional transportation movement along the Northeastern Waterfront by encouraging transit use through the addition and improvement of service and through the use, wherever possible, of exclusive rights-of-way and other types of transit preferential treatment.

POLICY 9.4

~~To the extent feasible, f~~Facilitate and expand the operation of passenger ferry systems to minimize traffic impacts.

POLICY 9.5

Improve transit service to, and along, the Northeastern Waterfront. ~~Provide~~ ~~Continue to provide and improve~~ ~~connection between the F line and the MUNI Metro Extension to~~ ~~allow for~~ continuous transit rail service in an exclusive right-of-way along ~~the~~ Embarcadero between Fisherman's Wharf and China Basin, which also connects with or provides easy transfers to numerous other transit lines.

POLICY 9.6

1 **Make transfers among transit systems as easy, safe and pleasant as possible,**
2 **and clearly identify loading areas and routes. In particular in the Ferry Building**
3 **Subarea, design the relationship between the ferries, BART, MUNI surface and**
4 **subsurface lines, and the Transbay Terminal to facilitate connections among the**
5 **systems.**

6
7 **POLICY 9.7**

8 **Maintain The Embarcadero between Beach Street and Broadway as an attractive landscaped**
9 **roadway having two moving lanes in each direction, an exclusive transit right-of-way, and improved**
10 **pedestrian and bicycle access.**

11
12 **Urban Design**

13
14 **OBJECTIVE 10**

15 **TO DEVELOP THE FULL POTENTIAL OF THE NORTHEASTERN WATERFRONT**
16 **IN ACCORD WITH THE ~~UNUSUAL~~ UNIQUE OPPORTUNITIES PRESENTED BY ITS**
17 **RELATION TO THE BAY, TO THE OPERATING PORT, FISHING INDUSTRY, AND**
18 **DOWNTOWN; AND TO ENHANCE ITS UNIQUE AESTHETIC QUALITIES OFFERED BY**
19 **WATER, TOPOGRAPHY, VIEWS OF THE CITY AND BAY, AND ITS HISTORIC MARITIME**
20 **CHARACTER.**

21
22 **MAP 2 - Height and Bulk Plan**

23
24 **POLICY 10.1**

1 **Preserve the physical form of the waterfront and reinforce San Francisco's**
2 **distinctive hill form by maintaining low structures near the water, with an increase in**
3 **vertical development near hills or the downtown core area. Promote preservation and**
4 **historic rehabilitation of finger piers, bulkhead buildings, and structures in the Embarcadero**
5 **National Register Historic District. Larger buildings and structures with civic importance**
6 **may be appropriate at important locations.**

7
8 **POLICY 10.2**

9 **Preserve and create view corridors which can link the City and the Bay.**

10
11 **POLICY 10.3**

12 **Use continuous planting and other ground surface treatment to physically and**
13 **visually link the waterfront with adjacent inland areas.**

14
15 **POLICY 10.4**

16 **In major pedestrian areas (such as the Fisherman's Wharf and Ferry Building**
17 **Subareas), develop generally continuous ground floor active public-oriented uses, such as**
18 **retail, restaurants, and entertainment activities ~~or other pedestrian-oriented uses.~~**

19
20 **POLICY 10.5**

21 Consistent with land use policies in the Port Waterfront Plan, ~~P~~**ermit non-maritime**
22 **development bayward of the sea wall only if the following qualifications are met:**

- 23
24 **a. Maximum feasible public access is provided to the water's edge.**

1 **b. Important Bay and waterfront views along The Embarcadero and level inland**
2 **streets are preserved and improved. Minor encroachment into the view corridors from**
3 **level inland streets may be permitted: (1) Where the encroaching element has a distinct**
4 **maritime character and adds variety to the views along the waterfront; (2) Where minor**
5 **structures (such as kiosks) are desirable to provide public amenities contributing to a**
6 **continuity of interest and activity along the waterfront; (3) Where essential maritime**
7 **facilities cannot reasonably be located and designed to avoid view blockage; and (4)**
8 **Where the public enjoyment of the Bay will be enhanced by providing a place of public**
9 **assembly and recreation which allows unique vistas and overviews that include**
10 **portions that are publicly accessible during daytime and evenings consistent with**
11 **ensuring public safety.**

12
13 **POLICY 10.6**

14 **Retain older buildings of architectural ~~merit~~ or historical significance, including in**
15 **the Northeast Waterfront Historic District and Embarcadero Historic District, to preserve the**
16 **architectural and historical character of the waterfront and ensure the compatibility of**
17 **new development.**

18
19 **POLICY 10.7**

20 **Enhance and maintain the physical prominence of the Ferry Building.**

21
22 **POLICY 10.8**

23 **Prohibit new, and remove existing, general advertising signs, except those on**
24 **transit boarding platforms and transit shelters designed in a manner as to minimize**
25 **obstruction of public views from pedestrian walkways and public open space, and**

1 those on public service kiosks constructed in conjunction with the public toilet
2 program. Assure that public and private signing contributes to the aesthetic
3 appearance of the waterfront.

4
5 **POLICY 10.9**

6 Encourage the provision of street furniture which is of appropriate design to the
7 historic maritime character of the Northeastern Waterfront.

8
9 **POLICY 10.10**

10 ~~Retain and reuse those~~ Preserve and rehabilitate the arched bulkhead and pier ~~building~~
11 structures ~~identified in the Port's Waterfront Design & Access policies which exist at the main~~
12 ~~entrance to most piers and~~ in the Embarcadero Historic District which ~~established~~ an important
13 character ~~to~~ for The Embarcadero. They should be retained so long as maritime uses
14 exist behind them or when new development occurs which could incorporate these
15 structures without disadvantage.

16
17 **Specific Policies For Open Space, Public Recreation, and Public Access**

18
19 * * * *

20
21 ~~**POLICY 10.23**~~

22 ~~Cover pier decks and public access areas with wood planking to the extent feasible to provide~~
23 ~~an attractive maritime character and a reasonably inexpensive material for pedestrian movement.~~

24
25 **POLICY 10.24₃**

1 **Permit fishing along public access areas on piers and promenades consistent**
2 **with public health standards.**

3
4 **POLICY 10.254**

5 ~~*Establish a*~~ ***Support the continuance of the*** joint interagency design review process for
6 **non-maritime projects on piers involving new development or substantial exterior**
7 **alterations, to be conducted by the Planning Department, Port of San Francisco and**
8 **Bay Conservation and Development Commission, consistent with the Port's Waterfront**
9 ~~*Land Use Plan and Waterfront Design & Access policies.*~~

10
11 **Specific Policies for Buildings**

12
13 **POLICY 10.265**

14 **Restrict development south of Broadway to the Height and Bulk Districts shown**
15 **on Map 2.**

16
17 **POLICY 10.276**

18 **Locate buildings to minimize shadows and wind on public open spaces.**

19
20 **POLICY 10.287**

21 **Prohibit the use of reflective glass. Use flat glass skylights and discourage the**
22 **use of dark tinted glass to increase transparency in highly visible areas.**

23
24 **POLICY 10.298**

1 Prohibit general advertising signs in any public spaces or attached to any
2 buildings, except those on transit boarding platforms and transit shelters designed in a
3 manner as to minimize obstruction of public views from pedestrian walkways and
4 public open space, and those on public service kiosks constructed in conjunction with
5 the public toilet program. Allow only attractively designed business identification,
6 directional, regulatory or information signs and general advertising signs, as described
7 above. Permit illuminated signs but prohibit flashing or animated signs.

8
9 **POLICY 10.~~30~~29**

10 Employ a uniform system of attractively designed public signs that conform to
11 strict criteria for size, scale, style, and color as part of the Embarcadero roadway
12 improvements from Bay to King Streets and as part of the promenades from Piers 7
13 through 1 and from the Agriculture Building to Pier 24. Design signs in keeping with
14 the concept of ~~the~~ Embarcadero as a scenic boulevard rather than as a high speed
15 artery. Coordinate signs with those to be used in the Ferry Building complex.

16
17 **POLICY 10.~~31~~0**

18 Conceal or otherwise limit views of any mechanical equipment, pipes, ducts and
19 antennas, on roof surfaces. Avoid shiny or highly polished materials on roof surfaces
20 and facades.

21
22 **POLICY 10.~~32~~1**

23 Enclose all servicing facilities and store all waste within structures so as to be
24 shielded from public view. Prohibit any permanent exterior non-maritime storage.

1 **POLICY 10.3~~3~~2**

2 **Assure that historic ships moored in the area meet the following criteria for**
3 **approving the restoration of the ships: high quality of rehabilitation, historical**
4 **accuracy, appropriate scale, silhouette quality, detail quality, color scheme and**
5 **guarantee of continued maintenance. Use night lighting on ships to accent**
6 **surroundings but not to overpower or commercialize the waterfront. Base mooring**
7 **locations on concerns for visibility from ~~the~~The Embarcadero and inland areas, the ability**
8 **to provide visitor drop-off and service access, and the availability of nearby parking for**
9 **on-board commercial recreation uses.**

10
11 **POLICY 10.3~~4~~3**

12 **Assure that new buildings use the most cost-effective energy efficient measures**
13 **feasible.**

14
15 **SUBAREAS**

16
17 **Fisherman's Wharf Subarea**

18
19 **(Municipal Pier through Pier 39)**

20
21 Fisherman's Wharf contains portions of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area at
22 Aquatic Park, hotels, restaurants and specialty shops, the reuse of historic buildings for major
23 commercial centers at Ghirardelli Square and the Cannery, Fish Alley and the berthing basin
24 for the commercial fishing fleet, the Pier 39 development, two swim clubs, sea scouts and a
25 senior center. There are also several multi-unit housing complexes as well as interspersed

1 smaller residential buildings in the area. Policies for Fisherman's Wharf include ~~developing a~~
2 ~~new fishing harbor in the vicinity of Hyde Street to help the fishing fleet;~~ maintaining modernized
3 fishing harbor and fish handling facilities; creating a central open space; maintaining and
4 creating opportunities for new water-oriented commercial recreational development; providing
5 pedestrian, transit and parking improvements to upgrade circulation and reduce congestion;
6 preserving significant historic structures; and ensure that the community recreational needs in
7 Aquatic Park are recognized.

8
9 OBJECTIVE 11

10 TO MAINTAIN AND ENHANCE THE MARITIME CHARACTER OF THE
11 FISHERMAN'S WHARF AREA, AND ENHANCE THE AREA AS A CENTER FOR THE
12 COMMERCIAL FISHING INDUSTRY.

13
14 MAP 3 - Fisherman's Wharf Subarea Generalized Land Use Map

15
16 POLICY 11.1

17 Encourage the retention and expansion of the commercial fishing and fish
18 handling industry and businesses and which provide services to the fishing fleet operations at
19 the through construction of a new fishing harbor in the general area east of the Hyde Street
20 pier Fishing Boat Harbor.

21
22 * * * *

23
24 OBJECTIVE 12

1 TO STRENGTHEN THE AREA'S ATTRACTION AS A WATER-ORIENTED
2 COMMERCIAL RECREATION AND PUBLIC ASSEMBLY CENTER BY ATTRACTING NEW
3 REVENUE-GENERATING USES TO HELP SUPPORT AND SUBSIDIZE MARITIME AND
4 PUBLIC ACTIVITIES AND DEVELOPING USES WHICH WOULD GENERATE ACTIVITY
5 AT TIMES OTHER THAN THE EXISTING PEAK PERIODS.

6
7 **POLICY 12.1**

8 Employ measures to mitigate the impacts of any commercial recreation and
9 public assembly development such as restaurants, entertainment and specialty shops
10 in the Fisherman's Wharf area to minimize or reduce peak period congestion during
11 evenings and weekends.

12
13 **POLICY 12.2**

14 ~~*New development in the area bounded by Taylor and Jefferson Streets and The Embarcadero*~~
15 ~~*(the 'Triangle' site) should be limited to 30% of the surface area and be designed to finance and help*~~
16 ~~*activate public open space. Work with the community to relocate surface parking from the Triangle*~~
17 ~~*site.*~~ **Seek to reduce the amount of parking between The Embarcadero and the water's**
18 **edge, and to improve pedestrian movement and access to the Bay and Pier 43 Bay Trail**
19 **Promenade open spaces. Any new development in the area bounded by Taylor and Jefferson Streets**
20 **and The Embarcadero (the "Triangle" site) should be designed to finance and manage public open**
21 **spaces to promote public enjoyment of activities in Fisherman's Wharf.**

22
23 **POLICY 12.3**

24 **Balance existing commercial recreation and public assembly uses which**
25 **generate the most activity in summer, on weekends and during the evening, with uses,**

1 such as offices and residences, that would generate activity during other periods,
2 thereby promoting the vitality and use of the area without substantially contributing to
3 congestion. In particular, promote the development of housing on inland sites
4 wherever possible.

5
6 OBJECTIVE 13

7 TO ENCOURAGE USES WHICH WILL DIVERSIFY THE ACTIVITIES IN THE
8 WHARF AND WHICH WILL APPEAL TO LOCAL RESIDENTS AND WORKERS AS WELL
9 AS VISITORS.

10
11 POLICY 13.1

12 Encourage new Wharf activities such as arts, educational, historical,
13 recreational, non-tourist commercial and cultural facilities and places of public
14 assembly (such as festival halls, meeting halls or conference centers) to increase the
15 appeal of Fisherman's Wharf to local residents and workers.

16
17 POLICY 13.2

18 Encourage additional office and other workplace uses, particularly above ground
19 level, to provide Wharf activities oriented to local residents and workers and increase off-
20 season patronage of Wharf shops and restaurants.

21
22 OBJECTIVE 14

23 TO DEVELOP A TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM WHICH IMPROVES ACCESS FOR
24 PEOPLE AND GOODS TO AND AROUND THE FISHERMAN'S WHARF AREA WHILE
25

1 **MINIMIZING CONGESTION AND SAFETY CONFLICTS**~~THE ADVERSE ENVIRONMENTAL~~
2 ~~IMPACTS ON THE AREA.~~

3
4 * * * *

5
6 **POLICY 14.5**

7 Improve pedestrian and bicycle access~~Facilitate access into~~ and within ~~the~~ Fisherman's
8 Wharf by providing public realm improvements along Jefferson and Taylor Streets, and along Little
9 Embarcadero, that complement SFMTA light rail public transit area by transit through the provision
10 of exclusive rights of way and other preferential treatment, through the extension of additional
11 transit lines, improving Improve the frequency, speed and, hours of operation of public transit
12 to reduce automobile use along The Embarcadero and to Fisherman's Wharf, ~~and providing~~
13 Provide clearly identified loading areas and routes. ~~Establish~~ Maintain a rail/bus transit
14 line on Jefferson and Beach Streets, providing access to the Ferry Building and the
15 South of Market area. Further improve transit access to Fisherman's Wharf by implementing the
16 major transit investments recommended by the Transit Strategy. ~~Extend the Powell and Mason Cable~~
17 ~~Car line on Taylor Street to a location north of Jefferson Street.~~ Allow truck access in Fish
18 Alley.

19
20 **POLICY 14.6**

21 Establish water taxi service from Fisherman's Wharf to other points along the
22 waterfront.

23
24 **OBJECTIVE 15**

1 TO PROVIDE MAXIMUM OPPORTUNITIES FOR ENJOYING THE BAY AND ITS
2 RELATED ACTIVITIES BY ENHANCING AND INCREASING PUBLIC OPEN SPACE AND
3 ACCESS AREAS WHICH SAFELY AND COMFORTABLY ACCOMMODATE THE
4 MOVEMENT OF PEDESTRIANS.

5
6 POLICY 15.1

7 Develop generally continuous public pedestrian access to the water's edge,
8 excepting areas where such access would interfere with maritime activities. In those
9 areas, provide ~~that~~ public viewing and access ~~which~~that will not substantially interfere
10 with these activities.

11
12 POLICY 15.2

13 ~~Remove of existing~~ Prohibit new parking over the water or near the water's edge to
14 minimize conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians ~~and enhance perimeter access which~~
15 ~~would require resolving long term Port lease issues.~~

16
17 POLICY 15.3

18 Promote public enjoyment of public access, maritime activities and water recreation, and Bay
19 views of Alcatraz Island from the Pier 43 Bay trail Promenade and plazas along the northern edge of
20 ~~Develop new public open space areas in~~ Fisherman's Wharf to provide a relief from the
21 intense level of activity in this area. ~~Work with the community to develop the design of a major~~
22 ~~new open space on approximately 70% of the surface area of the 'Triangle' lot bounded by Taylor~~
23 ~~and Jefferson Streets and The Embarcadero and relocate the existing surface parking. Address~~
24 ~~interim parking and construction related issues during the design process. Rationalize and improve~~
25 Improve pedestrian, bicycle, and transit movement at the center of Fisherman's Wharf

1 along the Jefferson Street public realm and Little Embarcadero in a manner which also meets
2 the parking needs of existing businesses that depend on adjacent parking. Extend
3 open space from the Triangle lot to the Bay on Pier 43 if further funding sources
4 become available and long-term lease issues can be resolved. Maintain the East Wharf
5 Waterfront Park at Pier 39. Maintain and enhance the Joseph Conrad Park at the foot of
6 Columbus Avenue, bounded by Leavenworth and Beach Streets, which provides a
7 visual and functional termination of Columbus Avenue. Create exterior service or
8 pedestrian walkways to allow views or access to water where compatible with fishing
9 industry operations.

10
11 **Base of Telegraph Hill Subarea**
12 **(Piers 35 through 7)**

13
14 This subarea contains a mix of uses that reflect the area's maritime history and its
15 transformation into a vital urban residential and commercial district. ~~Cargo shipping,~~
16 ~~warehousing and other~~ Cruise Terminal and maritime operations ~~still~~ occupy some of the finger
17 piers, ~~although long term trends indicate that cargo shipping can be operated most efficiently through~~
18 ~~consolidation in the central and southern waterfront.~~ Most of the inland properties have been
19 redeveloped with offices for the design and communications industries, retail and residential
20 uses, many of which occupy preserved and rehabilitated historic warehouses. The Pier 7 has
21 ~~been redeveloped into a~~ public open space and fishing pier, Cruise Terminal Plaza at Pier 27 James
22 R. Herman Cruise Terminal, and Levi's Plaza ~~extending 900 feet into the bay, which provides a major~~
23 recreational amenityies in the subarea. ~~Policies call for maintaining cargo shipping facilities and~~
24 ~~cargo related support services for as long as needed. If the piers no longer are suitable as cargo~~
25 ~~facilities,~~ Plan policies encourage the expansion of commercial and recreational maritime

1 activities (e.g. ~~cruise terminal~~, ferries, water taxis, excursions, recreational boating) as part of
2 major new mixed use developments on piers which provide daytime and nighttime commercial
3 recreation venues and new public access improvements.

4
5 ~~The Port of San Francisco will conduct a Special Planning Study for Piers 15-29 to resolve the~~
6 ~~following issues before the Port approves any major new development on these piers: (1) the location~~
7 ~~and size of a major new 'Northeast Wharf' open space within potential new maritime mixed use~~
8 ~~development in the Special Study Area; and (2) the location and configuration of piers, including~~
9 ~~removal of pier area to create open water.~~

10
11 On inland sites, a variety of land uses are appropriate, including hotel, residential,
12 office and other commercial activities. These new developments will be designed to preserve
13 and enhance the rich historic character of the subarea and, as appropriate, highlight access
14 points to the nearby North Beach, Chinatown and Fisherman's Wharf districts.

15
16 OBJECTIVE 16

17 **TO RETAIN ~~EXISTING CARGO SHIPPING AND RELATED SERVICES AND TO~~**
18 **PROMOTE HARBOR SERVICE OPERATIONS, MARITIME, AND WATER-DEPENDENT**
19 **ACTIVITIES. ~~COMMERCIAL AND RECREATIONAL MARITIME ACTIVITIES.~~**

20
21 **MAP 4 - Base of Telegraph Hill Subarea Generalized Land Use Map**

22
23 **POLICY 16.1**

24 **Continue to encourage maritime use on Piers 35 through 9.**

1 POLICY 16.2

2 Promote ~~commercial and recreational~~ maritime and water dependent activities (e.g. a
3 cruise terminal, excursion boats, historic ships, recreational boat mooring, human-
4 powered water recreation uses) which may be complemented with water-oriented
5 commercial recreation and public assembly uses and public access improvements on
6 piers no longer needed or suitable for cargo shipping facilities.

7
8 POLICY 16.3

9 Improve existing Pier 35 cruise facilities. If feasible, renovate the facility to
10 provide a modern, functional passenger terminal with associated commercial
11 recreation and public assembly uses. ~~If Pier 35 is determined to be an infeasible location,~~
12 ~~allow the development of a new cruise terminal on another pier in the Northeastern~~
13 ~~Waterfront.~~ Maintain operation of the modern cruise terminal at Piers 27–29 and the adjacent public
14 open space. Continue to evaluate alternative locations for the creation of another cruise berth.

15
16 OBJECTIVE 17

17 TO PRESERVE THE HISTORIC MARITIME CHARACTER OF THE AREA.

18
19 POLICY 17.1

20 Retain architecturally interesting and historically significant buildings or
21 buildings which contribute substantially to the overall architectural character of the
22 area. In particular, every effort should be made to preserve the Italian Swiss Colony
23 Building, the Pelican Paper Company Warehouse, the Trinidad Bean and Elevator
24 Company Warehouse, and the Beltline Roundhouse. Historic bulkheads, ~~and connector~~
25 buildings piers, and structures within the Embarcadero National Register Historic District should

1 be retained and ~~reused as set forth in the Waterfront Design & Access policies~~ rehabilitated
2 consistent with the U.S. Secretary of Interior Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties,
3 consistent with the Port of San Francisco's Waterfront ~~Land Use~~ Plan.

4
5 **POLICY 17.2**

6 Ensure the compatibility of new development with the historic and architectural
7 maritime character of the Northeast Waterfront Historic District and Embarcadero Historic
8 District in terms of scale, materials and design.

9
10 **OBJECTIVE 18**

11 **TO DEVELOP A DIVERSITY OF ADDITIONAL ACTIVITIES WHICH WOULD**
12 **STRENGTHEN THE EXISTING PREDOMINANT USES IN THE BASE OF TELEGRAPH**
13 **HILL SUBAREA AND ACTIVITIES WHICH WOULD EXPAND THE PERIOD OF USE, BUT**
14 **OF AN INTENSITY WHICH WOULD PROVIDE A RELIEF FROM THE ADJACENT**
15 **DOWNTOWN AND FISHERMAN'S WHARF AREAS.**

16 * * * *

17
18 **POLICY 18.4**

19 Design new development on undeveloped seawall lots ~~Seawall Lots 323 and 324~~ as an
20 orientation point and transition from ~~for~~ the waterfront to the Chinatown, North Beach, Barbary
21 Coast, and Telegraph Hill neighborhoods ~~which also highlights the intersection of Broadway and~~
22 ~~The Embarcadero.~~

23
24 **POLICY 18.5**

1 Plan and design new developments on inland sites and adjacent piers in a
2 manner which complements and enhances the surrounding area, and which unites the
3 waterfront with the rest of the City.

4
5 **POLICY 18.6**

6 Minimize the intensity of automobile activity by promoting mass transit and other
7 non-vehicular modes of transportation through the implementation of transportation management
8 plans and other means ~~as a primary transportation mode~~. Maximize efficient use of existing
9 parking facilities in order to limit the amount of new parking necessary as part of new
10 development.

11
12 **POLICY 18.7**

13 Encourage the provision of landscaping and publicly accessible open space in
14 new development in the Base of Telegraph Hill area.

15
16 **POLICY 18.8**

17 Maintain permanent public open space on Pier 7. Allow limited improvements
18 such as convenience food and beverage sales from pushcart vendors, which increase
19 active use and enjoyment of the open space, and nearby public information kiosks and
20 public restrooms, provided that they maintain an uncluttered appearance in the area.
21 Take advantage of views of Pier 7 from new development on adjacent piers or inland
22 sites to Pier 7 and maintain city views from Pier 7.

23
24 **OBJECTIVE 19**

1 TO DEVELOP A BALANCED TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM WHICH
2 ACCOMMODATES REGIONAL AND LOCAL MOVEMENT WHILE CAUSING MINIMUM
3 ADVERSE IMPACT TO THE ENVIRONMENT.

4
5 ***POLICY 19.1***

6 ~~***Maintain The Embarcadero between Beach Street and Broadway as an attractive landscaped***~~
7 ~~***roadway having two moving lanes in each direction, an exclusive transit right of way, and improved***~~
8 ~~***pedestrian and bicycle access.***~~

9
10 **POLICY 19.2¹**

11 Discourage through traffic except in those limited areas designated for this
12 movement.

13
14 **POLICY 19.3²**

15 Design transportation access to new developments on seawall lots to minimize
16 congestion on Bay Street, Broadway and The Embarcadero.

17
18 **POLICY 19.4³**

19 Encourage a portion of the surface regional transit to use inland routes to the
20 downtown to minimize the impact on the waterfront.

21
22 * * * *

23
24 **Ferry Building Subarea**

25 **(Piers 5 through north of Pier 22)**

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

Previous iterations of this~~The Plan~~ included policies to ~~promotes the restoration of~~ rehabilitate
the historic Ferry Building, a city and national landmark structure which stands as the
centerpiece of the Northeastern Waterfront. Other earlier policies~~In addition, the Plan~~ called ~~ed~~ for
creating open water between the Agriculture Building and Pier 22 and converting a portion of The
Embarcadero into the creation of Rincon Park, an iconic urban open space and restaurants area.
These improvements were planned as an integral part of transforming The Embarcadero into an urban
boulevard following the removal of the Embarcadero Freeway. These were the City's first investments
to establish a public realm along the waterfront as a relief to the intensely developed downtown,
which preserved~~and to ensure~~ the continued prominence of the Ferry Building and its tower. The
Ferry Building ~~will be~~ has been preserved, rehabilitated consistent with the Secretary of the
Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, along with development of the Downtown Ferry Terminal
~~to~~ and re-established this area as a major regional transit center ~~and~~ at the eastern terminus of
Market Street. It ~~also will~~ provides a major entryway to the City from the water, with increased
ferry, excursion boat and water taxi service, and other modes of water transport, and a place
to moor historic ships and pleasure boats. Inside, the Ferry Building ~~will provide~~ s public
spaces to support ~~its~~ transit functions ~~and a variety of~~ along with complementary ~~commercial~~
~~recreation~~ public market, food and beverage activities, offices, ~~institutional,~~ and cultural ~~and/or~~
~~community facilities which will help finance the building restoration while also~~ activities that ~~fostering~~
public enjoyment of the waterfront. The waterside features ~~will be~~ are linked by a simple,
elegant promenade which runs along the entire length of The Embarcadero, creating a visual
corridor along the water's edge that complements a variety of water edge experiences. The
centerpiece of this promenade will be a grand new plaza ~~at the landside entrance to~~ on the bay
side of the Ferry Building. The subarea includes the Golden Gateway development north of the

1 Ferry Building, which was successfully redeveloped into an urban residential mixed use
2 neighborhood, including Sidney Walton Park.

3
4 South of the Ferry Building, the historic Agriculture Building will be preserved. ~~A planned~~
5 Rincon Park ~~will be~~ has been created, a major water-related soft surface public park with a
6 'Tavern-on-the-Green' type of restaurant, south of Folsom Street.

7
8 OBJECTIVE 21

9 **TO ~~DEVELOP~~ MAINTAIN AND PROMOTE A MAJOR RESOURCE OF OPEN SPACE**
10 **AND PUBLIC ACCESS CONNECTIONS PROVIDING MAXIMUM ACCESS TO AND**
11 **ALONG THE WATERFRONT FOR THE LARGE NUMBER OF PEOPLE WHO LIVE IN,**
12 **WORK IN AND USE THE ADJACENT DOWNTOWN AREA, PROVIDING RELIEF FROM**
13 **THE INTENSELY DEVELOPED DOWNTOWN.**

14 * * * *

15
16 OBJECTIVE 24

17 **TO RESTORE AND REHABILITATE THE FERRY BUILDING AND AGRICULTURE**
18 **BUILDING IN A MANNER CONSISTENT WITH THE SECRETARY OF INTERIOR**
19 **STANDARDS TO PRESERVE THE HISTORIC MARITIME CHARACTER OF THE AREA.**

20
21 OBJECTIVE 25

22 **TO MAXIMIZE VIEWS OF THE WATER AND OF WATERFRONT ACTIVITY.**

23
24 OBJECTIVE 26

1 TO FURTHER DEVELOP THE FERRY BUILDING AND DOWNTOWN FERRY
2 TERMINAL AREA AS A MAJOR TRANSIT CENTER, IMPROVING AND EXPANDING
3 TRANSIT ACCESS BY, AND TRANSFERS AMONG, LANDSIDE AND WATERSIDE
4 TRANSIT SYSTEMS.

5 * * * *

6
7 POLICY 26.6

8 Preserve and rehabilitate the historic bulkhead ~~building structures~~, allowing for the
9 enhancement or creation of waterfront or Bay views through existing openings or new
10 openings which do not adversely affect the building's historic architectural character.
11 Permit ~~an extension~~ construction of a pier shed that extends from the Pier 3 of the bulkhead
12 building onto the pier if consistent with ~~historic preservation criteria~~ Secretary of Interior
13 Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties, and provideing a pedestrian walkway around
14 ~~the shed and building.~~

15
16 POLICY 26.7

17 Promote new maritime attractions and waterside access, such as water taxi and
18 excursion boat stops, historic ships and temporary mooring areas as part of new
19 development.

20
21 Pier 1 - 1/2

22 POLICY 26.8

23 Preserve and rehabilitate the bulkhead building for museum, commercial
24 recreation and public assembly, community facilities, artist/designer studios and
25 galleries and/or office uses.

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

Pier 1

POLICY 26.9

Preserve and rehabilitate the bulkhead and pier building as headquarter location for the Port of San Francisco. ~~Continue to allow general parking until developed for permanent uses, as well as permanent support parking for Pier 1 excursion boat operations inside the pier shed. Permit replacement of the existing shed with a three floor structure but retain bulkhead building.~~ Provide continuous peripheral public access around the water sides of the pier, unless limited by public safety considerations or maritime operational needs.

POLICY 26.10

Permit ground floor retail uses, and public meeting space in Port offices, at Pier 1 to support community engagement and space for public events and activities, ~~commercial recreation and public assembly uses, artist/designer studios and galleries, community facilities and/or transportation services on Pier 1~~ which complement activities in the downtown and take advantage of transportation improvements planned for the Ferry Building Subarea. Encourage maritime activities, and provide for vessel berthing, ~~including excursion boat operations and associated passenger waiting areas and support uses in the pier shed and bulkhead building~~ emergency response capabilities.

Promenade/PortWalk

POLICY 26.11

Improve Herb Caen Way/The Embarcadero Promenade and PortWalk from Pier 5 to Pier 22-1/2 south of the Agriculture Building. Design the promenade to be a simple, elegant statement of movement along the water's edge which maintains visual

1 continuity and creates a variety of water-edge experiences. Provide appropriate street
2 furniture including wind protected seating areas and pedestrian scale lighting.

3
4 **POLICY 26.12**

5 Develop public access improvements on Piers 3 and 1 which contribute to
6 creation of the PortWalk, integrating open spaces and public access into major new
7 development on piers and connecting with Herb Caen Way/The Embarcadero
8 Promenade.

9
10 **POLICY 26.13**

11 ~~Restore and adaptively reuse the Ferry Building in general accord with the "Design~~
12 ~~Guidelines for the Restoration and Adaptive Reuse of the Ferry Building," dated July 1978. Maintain~~
13 ~~and enhance public use and enjoyment of the rehabilitated Ferry Building. Ensure that any future~~
14 ~~changes and construction at the Ferry Building follow the requirements of the Secretary of~~
15 ~~Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation.~~

16
17 **POLICY 26.14**

18 ~~Reuse~~ Maintain the rehabilitated ~~the~~ Ferry Building as a civic gathering place that includes
19 ground floor as follows: predominantly commercial recreation (shops and restaurants), public
20 spaces (e.g. exhibit, civic displays, passenger waiting areas, community facilities) and
21 transportation services on the ground floor, and office, commercial recreation and/or
22 public assembly activities on the second and third floors. ~~Permit an additional partial~~
23 ~~fourth floor east of the existing nave for office use; limit its height to the height of the peak of the~~
24 ~~existing nave monitors.~~

1 **POLICY 26.15**

2 ~~Replace or remove the dilapidated portions of the Pier 1/2 bulkhead wharf between Pier 1 and~~
3 ~~the Ferry Building. Maintain and enhance public access and passenger areas serving the ferry and~~
4 ~~excursion boat operations at Pier 1/2.~~

5
6 **POLICY 26.165**

7 ~~Maintain the plaza in front of the Ferry Building as Design a grand civic plaza, which~~
8 ~~creates to create a forecourt for the Ferry Building and a symbolic terminus to Market~~
9 ~~Street by removing parking in the middle of The Embarcadero roadway. This plaza should be~~
10 ~~designed to serve a multitude of activities, to re-establish physical and visual connections between the~~
11 ~~City and the waterfront, and to tie together existing and future open spaces along The Embarcadero,~~
12 ~~including Justin Herman Plaza. Provide complementary, smaller plazas at the front of the Ferry~~
13 ~~Building, replacing short term parking. If found to be feasible after further analysis, extend the~~
14 ~~California Street cable car down Market Street to the plaza and create a MUNI bus stop adjacent to~~
15 ~~the east west axis of the plaza along the Embarcadero. Use street furniture that provides weather~~
16 ~~protection and install additional ornamental double light fixtures like those presently used along the~~
17 ~~Embarcadero.~~

18
19 **POLICY 26.176**

20 ~~Continue to support and promote the Establish a Downtown Ferry Terminal at the Ferry~~
21 ~~Building as a primary destination point for all ferry and excursion boat riders on San~~
22 ~~Francisco Bay. The Downtown Ferry Terminal should continue to provide a range of~~
23 ~~public landing facilities accessible to the disabled community to accommodate all~~
24 ~~vessel types requiring access to San Francisco. Any landing facilities should allow~~
25 ~~multiple operators access to the facilities.~~

1
2 **POLICY 26.1~~7~~**

3 **Ensure ongoing~~Improve~~ pedestrian access through the Ferry Building to the**
4 **Downtown Ferry Terminal and~~including~~ the Golden Gate Ferry Terminal. Maintain~~Create~~ a**
5 **continuous walkway along the eastern side of the Ferry Building that is separate from**
6 **service vehicle access, to improve public access and to provide expanded space for**
7 **ferry, excursion boat, water taxi and other waterborne transit riders.**

8
9 **POLICY 26.1~~8~~**

10 **Improve~~Allow on~~ the Ferry Plaza, immediately east of ~~and related to~~ the Ferry**
11 **Building to create a civic outdoor gathering space for farmers markets and events, allowing, minor**
12 **amounts of outdoor commercial recreation uses which are consistent with the open**
13 **space use of the Plaza, ~~as open space~~ and a regional ferry transportation center (e.g. a**
14 **cafe, outdoor dining, flower vendors and other convenience retail services for**
15 **commuters and visitors). Design Ferry Plaza improvements to integrate and enhance**
16 **surrounding the Ferry Building, Golden Gate and Downtown Ferry Terminals, and restaurant uses**
17 **and operational requirements, including access and maintenance of BART infrastructure facilities**
18 **located on the pier. ~~Retain the existing restaurant, plaza, and ferry terminal.~~**

19
20 **POLICY 26.2~~0~~19**

21 **Rehabilitate and adaptively reuse the Agriculture Building, consistent with the**
22 **Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, for the following types of**
23 **potential activities: museum, community facilities, commercial recreation and public**
24 **assembly, artist/designer studios and galleries, and general office. Design improvements**
25 **that integrate with and enhance the Downtown Ferry Terminal and Plaza, and improve the public**

1 ~~*realm along The Embarcadero Promenade. In addition, allow for the creation of a passenger waiting*~~
2 ~~*area for possible future airport and Treasure Island ferry shuttle service. Extend a continuous*~~
3 ~~*walkway from the Ferry Building to the eastern side of the Agriculture Building which connects with*~~
4 ~~*The Embarcadero Promenade south of the Agriculture Building.*~~

5
6 ***POLICY 26.21***

7 ~~*Limit parking on the platform adjacent to the existing restaurant to restaurant service only.*~~
8 ~~*Allow vehicular pick-up and drop-off usage if associated with ferry service expansion. Retain the*~~
9 ~~*existing restaurant. Consider architectural improvements to enhance the restaurant's waterfront*~~
10 ~~*identity, improve views from The Embarcadero and provide perimeter public access.*~~

11
12 **POLICY 26.220**

13 **Maintain and enhance the portion of Herb Caen Way/The Embarcadero**
14 **Promenade between the Agriculture Building and the Pier 22-1/2 Fireboat House.**
15 **Maintain visual continuity along the water and create a variety of water edge**
16 **experiences.**

17
18 ***POLICY 26.231***

19 **Maintain open water between ~~*where dilapidated*~~ **Piers 14 Public Access and ~~*through*~~ Pier**
20 **22-1/2 Fireboat House ~~*have been removed*~~ as a visual relief to the intensely developed**
21 **Downtown. ~~*Allow transient mooring at minimum cost for approximately 50 boats and include a*~~**
22 **~~*boat shuttle service. Locate these facilities to avoid operational conflict with other waterborne*~~**
23 **~~*transportation services in the area.*~~****

24
25 **Block 3741**

1
2 ***POLICY 26.24***

3 ~~*Develop a 500,000 to 600,000 square foot commercial office building which may feature*~~
4 ~~*ground floor commercial space and meeting rooms and an auditorium.*~~

5
6 **Rincon Park**

7
8 **POLICY 26.25~~2~~**

9 ~~*Reroute The Embarcadero roadway onto Steuart Street between Howard and Harrison*~~
10 ~~*Streets. Maintain Rincon Park in the strip vacated by the Embarcadero and on Blocks*~~
11 ~~*3742 and 3743, build a public park*~~ adjacent to and inland of the Herb Caen
12 Way/Embarcadero Promenade. Orient the park to the Bay and relate the park to the
13 recreational preferences of residents and workers in the City and Bay Area, rather than
14 tourists. Maintain the restaurants within Rincon Park that provide opportunities for indoor and
15 outdoor dining and special events, and extend seasonal and nighttime activities that complement and
16 enhance public use of the park.~~*Provide large grassy open areas, a range of recreational equipment*~~
17 ~~*including a play structure, a tot lot, benches, game tables under shelter, and restrooms.*~~

18
19 ***POLICY 26.26***

20 ~~*Allow up to 12,000 square feet of indoor building area and up to 8000 square feet of outdoor*~~
21 ~~*area south of Folsom Street to be used for a 'Tavern on the Green' type restaurant(s) and plaza.*~~
22 ~~*Design the restaurants to include opportunities for indoor and outdoor dancing and dining and for*~~
23 ~~*special events. Develop hard surface plaza areas and terraces which can vary in elevation adjacent to*~~
24 ~~*the restaurant(s) to create a variety of spaces and viewing experiences. Use landscaping and glass*~~
25 ~~*screens to protect from winds. If feasible, provide outdoor heating in selected areas to extend the*~~

1 ~~seasonal and night time comfortable usage of plazas. Encourage the restaurant(s) to expand their~~
2 ~~seating into portions of the plazas but ensure that the plazas do not become the sole territory of~~
3 ~~private establishments. Provide seating which does not exclusively require patronage to adjacent~~
4 ~~restaurants. While a restaurant is a preferred use on the site, allow consideration of minor amounts~~
5 ~~of other retail opportunities which similarly complement park activities and provide financial~~
6 ~~support to the Port.~~

7
8 **POLICY 26.273**

9 **Change the Height and Bulk District on Block 3743 from 84-E to 40-X. Change the**
10 **Height and Bulk District on the rest of the Rincon Park Site to open space.**

11
12 **South Beach Subarea**

13 **(Piers 22-1/2 through 46 B)**

14
15 The South Beach Subarea extends from the Pier 22-1/2 Fireboat House, adjacent to ~~the~~
16 ~~planned~~ Rincon Park, to China Basin Channel and inland for a depth of one or two blocks.

17 Since the 1980's, this subarea has been transforming into a new residential and commercial
18 mixed use neighborhood, which still retains some of its industrial and maritime past. Because

19 the piers originally built for breakbulk shipping are now obsolete, ~~they are mostly vacant or~~
20 ~~underutilized,~~ and no longer serve a primary maritime function. ~~As a result, two are in an~~

21 ~~advanced state of deterioration and have been condemned~~ Piers 24, 34, and 36 became deteriorated
22 and were removed, increasing the expanse of Bay waters and making way for construction of the

23 Brannan Street Wharf public plaza. The single pierside improvement is South Beach Harbor, a full-
24 service marina and small boat harbor, was completed in 1986 adjacent to Pier 40, which

25 entailed the removal of former Piers 42-46A. In 2000, the San Francisco Giants completed

1 development of a new ballpark along the north side of China Basin Channel, which attracts many
2 visitors to the waterfront. The ballpark, South Beach Harbor, and waterfront parks, together with the
3 transportation improvements installed along the Embarcadero, provide key waterfront amenities and a
4 connected open space network for the public and residents in the new inland Rincon Hill and South
5 Beach neighborhoods. The South Beach Harbor, together with the transportation improvements
6 installed along The Embarcadero, provide key waterfront amenities, including boating and water
7 recreation, for residents in the new inland Rincon Hill and South Beach neighborhoods. ~~Inland~~
8 ~~of the harbor, the first phase (four acres) of South Beach Park has been developed.~~

9
10 ~~In March 1996, the San Francisco voters approved the development of a ballpark with a~~
11 ~~maximum seating capacity of 45,000 seats and related commercial uses for Pier 46B. This new facility~~
12 ~~will attract many visitors to the area and stimulate restaurants and night entertainment in the~~
13 ~~surrounding area. The redevelopment of Pier 46B will allow the continuation of the PortWalk alongside~~
14 ~~China Basin and the connection with the Lefty O'Doul Bridge and trails south of China Basin.~~

15
16 Plan policies encourage redevelopment on other piers to provide opportunities for
17 improved excursion boat, ferry and historic ship berthing and other maritime facilities,
18 maritime support operations, and public oriented uses to provide a variety of activities to attract
19 public use and enjoyment of the waterfront~~commercial recreation and assembly and entertainment~~
20 ~~activities.~~ Public access improvements also are proposed which will make the waterfront
21 inviting and safe for nearby residents as well as visitors from downtown and beyond. The
22 remaining inland sites which are vacant or underutilized may be developed with residential or
23 commercial uses which complement the redeveloped areas in South Beach and Rincon Hill
24 and new pierside activities, as well as accommodate accessory parking associated with new
25 uses in the vicinity.

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

On non-Port owned inland areas, a mixed-income residential community with open spaces and ~~commercial support services~~ other residential-serving uses is being have been developed on previously vacant or underutilized property. ~~The new community is interspersed with a few historic warehouses which have been adaptively reused. The historic~~ , including the adaptive reuse development of the Oriental Warehouse ~~has been rehabilitated to accommodate~~ as live/work studios. Walkways and bicycle paths combined with small plazas ~~would~~ connect the new residences to waterfront activities and other portions of the City. The new community is characterized by high density, low to mid-rise structures, recreating the fine-grained fabric of San Francisco neighborhoods and takes advantage of proximity to the Downtown, a desirable microclimate, amenity value of the Bay, and helps meet San Francisco's need for new housing. Originally a part of the South Beach Redevelopment Project Area, much of this area has now been incorporated into the East SoMa Area Plan, a part of the Eastern Neighborhoods.

* * * *

Pier 22-1/2

POLICY 30.1

Preserve and restore ~~and, if no longer needed in its current use, adaptively reuse~~ the historic Fireboat House at Pier 22-1/2 and construct a new fireboat station facility that supports modern fire and emergency services, equipment, and operations.

POLICY 30.2

1 Design new development which takes advantage of sweeping views of the
2 downtown, and which preserves and enhances views of the Bay Bridge and water from
3 Harrison Street.

4
5 ***POLICY 30.3***

6 ~~*Improve shoreline appearance, provide public access and open space, and expand views of*~~
7 ~~*open water by removing condemned Pier 24.*~~

8
9 **POLICY 30.43**

10 Allow the development at Pier 26 and 28 of commercial recreation, some
11 community facility, artist and designers studios and galleries, public assembly and/or
12 maritime uses, but exclude, hotel and boater uses. Permit such uses in the existing
13 sheds or new replacement structures, and incorporate new public access areas onto
14 the piers which connect with and complement The Embarcadero Promenade and
15 adjacent planned Rincon Park. Orient this development towards Bay Area residents
16 and workers rather than tourists. ~~*Permit the minimum amount of short term parking necessary*~~
17 ~~*to serve uses in the pier sheds until inland parking sites are available.*~~ *Ensure development maintains*
18 *the integrity of the Embarcadero Historic District's nationally recognized historic maritime*
19 *structures.*

20
21 **Pier 30-32**

22
23 **POLICY 30.54**

24 Promote new development on Pier 30-32 which provides commercial recreation
25 and public assembly activities, and maritime operations such as an excursion boat or

1 cruise terminal. New development should provide a multi-faceted mix of activities
2 oriented around a common theme rather than a singular commercial attraction. Allow
3 accessory parking on the pier to serve these activities.

4
5 **POLICY 30.~~65~~**

6 Include public access improvements – including water recreation activities in the Bay –
7 as a key component of major new development on the pier to further the creation of a
8 PortWalk which guides circulation on the pier, takes maximum advantage of views of
9 the City and the water, and which connects to the pedestrian improvements along The
10 Embarcadero.

11
12 **POLICY 30.~~76~~**

13 Encourage activities that do not generate peak traffic volumes during commute
14 periods in order to minimize congestion on roadway and transit systems.

15
16 **POLICY 30.~~87~~**

17 Require a high standard of architectural design appropriate to the prominence of
18 the site, which also establishes a new architectural identity and standard for waterside
19 development in the South Beach area.

20
21 **POLICY 30.~~98~~**

22 Develop uses which support and enhance the mix of maritime and commercial
23 recreation uses developed on Pier 30-32, as well as provide a transition between
24 residential uses on inland blocks and public-oriented activities on the waterfront. Block
25 3771 would be a desirable location for a mixed commercial and residential

1 development or a hotel, depending on the combination of uses developed on Pier 30-
2 **32. Development design should complement the neighborhood setting and contribute to the public**
3 **realm on the west side of ~~the~~ Embarcadero.** Incorporate off-street parking into the
4 development program for Block 3771 to serve a significant amount of the parking
5 demand associated with the Pier 30-32 development, if necessary.

6
7 Piers ~~34~~30 - 40, and South Beach Harbor

8
9 **POLICY 30.109**

10 **Continue to ensure public access to the Brannan Street Wharf open space and the expansive**
11 **views of the water that it enables** ~~Improve shoreline appearance, provide public access and open~~
12 ~~space, that was created by the removal of~~ **and expand views of open water by removing deteriorating**
13 **Piers 34 and 36 and extending the PortWalk out over the water to create a Brannan Street Wharf**
14 **public open space. Develop the layout, design, improvements, and any allowances for accessory uses**
15 **to promote the use of this open space in coordination with the community.**

16
17 **POLICY 30.110**

18 **Maintain South Beach Harbor as a small boat marina of approximately 700 slips**
19 **for public pleasure craft and the public access and fishing pier on top of the**
20 **breakwater.**

21
22 **POLICY 30.121**

23 **On Pier 40, provide a full range of services for recreational boating and water**
24 **uses, including boat building and repair facilities, day dock storage, sail maker, boat**
25 **sales and rental, ship chandlery and other uses related to the marina.**

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 30.1~~3~~2

Design any new or rehabilitated buildings on Pier 40 to reflect the bold, simple lines of traditional pier sheds. Ensure the integrity of the Embarcadero Historic District through historic preservation of the pier, while providing diverse maritime and public-oriented uses. Provide continuous peripheral public access along the water sides of the pier including sitting and fishing areas, except for portions of the pier which may remain in maritime-related activities, where such public access might conflict. Locate a prominent sitting area at the eastern end of the pier. Ensure that pier railings and other design elements be compatible with the promenade and breakwater design.

POLICY 30.14~~3~~

Preserve the Pier 38 bulkhead building consistent with standards of the Embarcadero Historic District, and promote uses in the bulkhead and on the pier which support and enhance the recreational boating and water uses located at Pier 40, including accessory parking and commercial recreation amenities. Pier 38 offers an opportunity to expand recreational boating facilities and services in the future, if feasible, and a location for maritime support services.

South Beach Park

POLICY 30.1~~5~~4

Continue to support and potentially improve ~~Develop~~ South Beach Park, between King and Second Streets and the Seawall, predominantly as a soft-surface park for public recreational use.

1 **POLICY 30.165**

2 South Beach Park has been developed to include areas for active sports such as
3 volleyball and separate areas for passive activities such as sitting, game tables under
4 shelter, and a tot lot. Include toilet and drinking facilities. The park has been designed to
5 ~~b~~Buffer the park from The Embarcadero with ~~devices such as~~ landscaping, berms, and
6 changes in elevation. The park provides~~Provide~~ for drop-off parking to serve the South
7 Beach Harbor marina and water recreation community~~Dolphin P. Rempp Restaurant. Provide~~
8 ~~appropriate transitions towards the proposed ballpark with its overlooks.~~ The design of the park
9 ~~maintains~~Maintain a hard-surface pedestrian promenade along the water's edge with
10 opportunities for sitting and viewing. It connects~~Connect~~ the promenade to the peripheral
11 public access areas on Pier 40 and to the South Beach Harbor breakwater, and
12 continues the promenade to Third Street and Lefty O'Doul Bridge. Permit pedestrian
13 access to the marina only from the pier and breakwater and not directly from the park.
14 The park and harbor design include a ~~Give special care to the~~ location of a boat dock for water
15 taxies and transient boat stops~~ramp. Prohibit commercial activities in the park but~~ Operations of
16 the park should allow a limited amount of commercial recreation use incidental to and
17 supportive of the open space. ~~Provide promenade railings and other elements of a design~~
18 ~~compatible with the pier and breakwater.~~ Maintain the complementary~~Coordinate the~~ designs of
19 South Beach Park and the Harbormaster and community facility, and ~~the creation of~~ connect
20 public access ~~to with the~~ Giants Bballpark ~~development on Pier 46B~~ along China Basin/Mission
21 Creek.

22
23 **Residential Neighborhood**

24
25 **POLICY 30.17**

1 ~~Develop and maintain mixed-income housing, with appropriate open space and~~
2 ~~neighborhood support uses on Blocks 3773, 3792, 3793 and portions of Blocks 3774 and 3789.~~

3
4 ***POLICY 30.18***

5 ~~Develop housing in small clusters of 100 to 200 units. Provide a range of building heights~~
6 ~~with no more than 40 feet in height along the Embarcadero and stepping up in height on the more~~
7 ~~inland portions to the maximum of 160 feet. In buildings fronting on Brannan Street in the 160-foot~~
8 ~~height area, create a strong base which maintains the street wall created by the residential complex~~
9 ~~to the east and the warehouse buildings to the west. Orient the mix of unit types to one and two~~
10 ~~bedrooms and include some three and four bedroom units. Pursue as the income and tenure goals, a~~
11 ~~mix of 20 percent low, 30 percent moderate and 50 percent middle and upper income, and a mix of~~
12 ~~rental, cooperative, and condominium units.~~

13
14 ***POLICY 30.19***

15 ~~Organize the housing clusters to maximize views to the water and downtown as well as sun~~
16 ~~exposure while minimizing shading of open space and blocking of views from adjacent areas. To the~~
17 ~~extent feasible, locate family units on ground floor levels adjacent to open space and recreational~~
18 ~~areas. Provide personalized entryways and private open space to all units. Orient the buildings to~~
19 ~~provide privacy and security.~~

20
21 ***POLICY 30.2016***

22 ~~Promote new development on Pier 30-32 which provides commercial recreation and public~~
23 ~~assembly activities, and maritime operations such as an excursion boat or cruise terminal. New~~
24 ~~development should provide a destination to complement the character and integrity of the~~
25 ~~Embarcadero Historic District and preserve the valuable deep-water berth at this location. Design the~~

1 ~~structures and dwelling units to express character and diversity. Incorporate high standards of~~
2 ~~indoor and outdoor private space design and convenience and use high quality materials. Express a~~
3 ~~human scale in surfaces and materials with articulated facades, bay windows, cornice lines,~~
4 ~~roofscapes, overhangs, towers and chimneys. Use varied light colors to break up building mass and~~
5 ~~liven surfaces. Design the housing complex to be energy efficient, and consider the use of passive~~
6 ~~solar systems.~~

7
8 ***POLICY 30.21***

9 ~~Incorporate most parking as part of the building within housing clusters. Because garages~~
10 ~~may be only a half level below grade due to the high water table, landscape or buffer exposed garage~~
11 ~~edges. Locate residences above parking structures to stabilize them and minimize differential~~
12 ~~settlement. To the extent feasible, improve the portions of the garage roof not covered by structures~~
13 ~~for walkways and recreation areas. Use tree wells to allow large trees to grow within residential~~
14 ~~clusters. Design parking structures to have controlled vehicular access points and direct access to~~
15 ~~residential units for increased security. Provide additional guest and service parking for the~~
16 ~~residential units in street rights of way or adjacent to the clusters.~~

17
18 ***POLICY 30.22***

19 ~~Do not permit buildings to exceed 65 percent coverage of land or parking podium. To the~~
20 ~~maximum extent feasible, provide open space at ground level and provide planting in the ground.~~
21 ~~Ensure that any open space on top of a podium provides easy pedestrian and visual transition from~~
22 ~~the sidewalk.~~

23
24 ***POLICY 30.23***

1 ~~Design structures to protect views of the water down street corridors from the residential~~
2 ~~areas. Carefully consider roof design and conceal roof equipment because of its visibility from~~
3 ~~adjacent residences. Landscape flat roofs and finish sloped roofs in attractive materials. Allow~~
4 ~~exposed parking only if the parking areas are extensively landscaped. Consider the use of turf block~~
5 ~~instead of asphalt paving.~~

6
7 ***Historic Preservation***

8
9 ***POLICY 30.24***

10 ~~Retain and historically restore for adaptive reuse the Cape Horn and Japan Street~~
11 ~~warehouses and allow small scale offices, neighborhood commercial and warehousing uses. Keep in~~
12 ~~industrial use that portion of Block 3774, Lot 24 which is needed to expand the manufacturing~~
13 ~~operation of the abutting industrial activity. If Lot 24 remains in industrial use, the structure on Lot~~
14 ~~18 may remain and be used for warehousing. As an alternate use, develop the sites of the Cape Horn~~
15 ~~and Japan Street warehouses with housing provided that, to the maximum extent feasible, the street-~~
16 ~~facing facades of the existing structures are incorporated in the new development.~~

17
18 ***POLICY 30.25***

19 ~~Historically restore the Oriental Warehouse as the focal point of the residential community;~~
20 ~~include a combination of such uses as live work, day care, recreation, and neighborhood services,~~
21 ~~professional offices and shopping. Remove the building to the north along the line of Brannan Street~~
22 ~~to enhance the form and visibility of the warehouse. Maintain the exterior facade and remove those~~
23 ~~windows that have been added without regard to the general exterior. Preserve portions of the~~
24 ~~existing paving as a public plaza and setting for the warehouse and remove unused spur tracks.~~

1 ~~*Streets, Walkways and Open Space*~~

2
3 ~~**POLICY 30.26**~~

4 ~~*Close the following streets completely: Berry east of Third Street, and Second south of King*~~
5 ~~*Street. Close the following streets to through traffic, improve them as walkways and allow only*~~
6 ~~*limited local and service vehicle access: Townsend between Second and the Embarcadero, Colin P.*~~
7 ~~*Kelly Jr. between Townsend and Brannan, First between Brannan and the Embarcadero, and Beale*~~
8 ~~*between Bryant and Brannan.*~~

9
10 ~~**POLICY 30.27**~~

11 ~~*Develop a plaza next to the Oriental Warehouse which is centrally located, and connect it to*~~
12 ~~*smaller open spaces within the proposed neighborhood. Have walkways open onto small plazas to*~~
13 ~~*create intimacy and spatial definition and orient them to be protected from winds. Enhance the*~~
14 ~~*feeling of outdoor security through use of lighting, walkways design, ingress and egress points and*~~
15 ~~*good surveillance by building orientation.*~~

16 **Pier 46B**

17
18 **POLICY 30.28**

19 *Continue to support and promote the Giant's Ballpark and its accessory uses and activities,*
20 *which include but are* **Develop an open air ballpark with a maximum of 45,000 seats with related**
21 **commercial uses including, but not limited to, office, retail, restaurants, live music**
22 **performances and other forms of live entertainment, in a setting of waterfront public**
23 **spaces.**

24
25 **POLICY 30.29**

1 ~~Maintain~~**Encourage** waterside public access improvements alongside the ballpark
2 ~~on Pier 46B~~ which connect with the South Beach Harbor and South Beach Park and
3 provide a link to the Lefty O'Doul Bridge, thereby extending public access over China
4 Basin Channel to the Blue Greenway open space network ~~planned for~~in Mission Bay.

5
6 **Embarcadero Corridor**

7
8 The removal of the Embarcadero Freeway and construction of the Waterfront
9 Transportation Projects has dramatically changed the character of the Embarcadero
10 Corridor. Policies for The Embarcadero are intended to continue to facilitate the
11 movement of people and goods, maintain environmental quality, enhance physical and
12 visual access to the shoreline and contribute to the continued vitality of the waterfront.
13 Much of this has been achieved by the reconstruction of the roadway as a major
14 waterfront boulevard, with public transit, bicycle, pedestrian promenade, sidewalk, and
15 landscaping improvements, and a public art program. ~~These improvements have been~~
16 ~~constructed along the north and south extensions of The Embarcadero, and should be completed by~~
17 ~~improvements to the mid-section of The Embarcadero between Broadway and Howard Streets, and~~
18 ~~the design and construction of a grand civic plaza at the foot of Market Street, in front of the Ferry~~
19 ~~Building.~~

20
21 * * * *

22 **POLICY 31.7**

23 **Prohibit heliports or STOL ports, but continue to allow for emergency landings.**

24
25 Resilience

1 OBJECTIVE 32

2
3 ENSURE LAND USE AND DEVELOPMENT DECISION MAKING INCORPORATES
4 THE NEED TO ADDRESS RESILIENCY FROM POSSIBLE FUTURE HAZARDS,
5 PARTICULARLY FUTURE FLOODING CAUSED BY SEA LEVEL RISE AND CLIMATE
6 CHANGE.

7
8 Policy 32.1

9 Engage the community in planning for the potential impacts of Sea Level Rise and other
10 potential hazards on an ongoing basis.

11
12 Policy 32.2

13 Ensure that members of the vulnerable communities previously left out of Waterfront-related
14 planning are engaged in planning for Sea Level Rise and other potential hazards.

15
16 Policy 32.3

17 Ensure that recreational users of the waterfront, including swimmers, rowers, kayakers, and
18 human powered vessel users, are engaged in planning for Sea Level Rise and other potential
19 hazards.

20
21 OBJECTIVE 33

22 PROTECT AND ENHANCE THE EXISTING WATERFRONT, CRITICAL PORT AND
23 CITY UTILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE, AND COMMUNITY, HISTORIC, AND
24 ECONOMIC ASSETS FOR AS LONG AS POSSIBLE; INCORPORATE ADAPTION CHANGES

1 **IN LINE WITH OVERALL CITY RESILIENCE AND ADAPTION PRINCIPLES AND**
2 **STRATEGIES.**

3
4 **Policy 33.1**

5 **Encourage and design resilience projects that achieve multiple Waterfront Plan urban**
6 **design, historic preservation, recreation, public access and open space, transportation, maritime and**
7 **environmental goals and benefits.**

8 **The Port and the City have engaged the local community, planners, engineers, and other stake**
9 **holders in planning for future flood and other risks through the Waterfront Resilience Program. The**
10 **Resilience Program looks to implement adaptation strategies that protect public and private assets and**
11 **the community at large, while anticipating a changing climate. Such efforts should be ongoing, but**
12 **flexible as environmental conditions of the Northeastern Waterfront change over time.**

13
14 **Glossary of Terms**

15 * * * *

16
17
18 Section 4. The Recreation and Open Space Element of the San Francisco General
19 Plan is hereby amended as follows:

20
21 **Recreation and Open Space Element**

22 * * * *

23
24 **Related Plans and Agency Programs**

1 The Recreation and Open Space Element, along with its related components that make
2 up the City’s overall Open Space Framework, aims to provide the elements needed to strive
3 towards San Francisco’s goal of a comprehensive open space network: a broad vision, a
4 policy context, and a tangible task list for moving forward. The City also maintains several
5 policy documents, plans and programs that provide direction about specific open space and
6 recreational components, or to certain parts of the City. These include:

7 * * * *

8
9 **Waterfront ~~Land Use Plan and Design and Access Element~~**

10
11 The Port of San Francisco’s Waterfront Plan (originally referred to as the Waterfront Land
12 Use Plan) was initially adopted by the Port Commission in 1997, with an updated version adopted
13 in 2023, defining acceptable uses, policies and land use information applicable to all properties
14 under the Commission’s jurisdiction. The Waterfront Plan defines locations for new public-
15 private partnership projects coordinated with major public open space, park and recreation
16 areas, maritime, and historic preservation improvements along the waterfront. ~~The Design and~~
17 ~~Access Element of this Plan sets forth policies and site specific design criteria to direct the location~~
18 ~~and types of public access and open spaces, public view corridors and urban design along San~~
19 ~~Francisco’s waterfront.~~

20
21 **Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, (Former Redevelopment**
22 **Agency), Open Space Planning**

23
24 The Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, which is the successor agency
25 to the Redevelopment Agency, created a significant amount of open space in its project

1 areas, with more in the planning stages. New parks have been developed at Golden Gateway,
2 in the Western Addition, Yerba Buena Center, Bayview Hunter’s Point, Rincon Point - South
3 Beach, ~~and Mission Bay, and Transbay~~ *(with additional parks to be developed in Mission Bay) and*
4 ~~are a part of recent plans in Hunter’s Point Shipyard and in the Transbay area.~~ These spaces are
5 currently being managed by the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure and a
6 number of different city agencies.

7
8 **Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) Planning Efforts**

9
10 The GGNRA encompasses a number of open space and parklands throughout Marin,
11 San Mateo and San Francisco, including Alcatraz Island, Crissy Field, the Presidio and the
12 majority of the City’s public beaches. A major planning process was ~~recently~~ completed by the
13 SPUR for Ocean Beach to examine ways to manage coastal processes that drive erosion,
14 ensure the future of critical infrastructure, protect natural resources, and activate and enhance
15 the beach to best serve the local and regional populations.

16 * * * *

17
18 **~~San Francisco’s Sustainability Plan~~**

19
20 ~~In 1996, a collaboration of multiple city agencies, including the Commission on the~~
21 ~~Environment, the Planning Department, the Bureau of Energy Conservation, the Recreation and Park~~
22 ~~Department, and the Solid Waste Management Program; as well as a number of businesses;~~
23 ~~environmental organizations; elected officials; and concerned individuals, developed a plan for how~~
24 ~~the City might reach a sustainable development future. While the plan intended to lay out objectives for~~
25 ~~a five year timeframe, its intent, particularly with regards to “Parks, Open Spaces and Streetscapes”~~

1 ~~and their vital ecological, social and economic function in the City, is still applicable. The Plan's~~
2 ~~strategies for how to retain those functions—through increased provision, constant maintenance,~~
3 ~~additional funding, expanded community participation, and civic commitment—are reflected in the~~
4 ~~strategies presented in this Element.~~

5 6 **The Climate Action Plan (CAP)**

7 The 2021 San Francisco Climate Action Plan sets forth a set of actionable and measurable
8 strategies that not only charts a pathway to achieve net-zero greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, but also
9 works toward addressing racial and social equity, public health, economic recovery, resilience, and the
10 provision of safe and affordable housing to all. Integral to these strategies is improving San
11 Francisco's parks, natural open spaces, and rights-of-way. The Plan includes several strategies
12 addressing Healthy Ecosystems, including: restore and enhance parks, natural lands, and open spaces;
13 maximize trees throughout the public realm; and increase greening and integration of local
14 biodiversity into the built environment. The CAP provides specific targets and milestone, calls for
15 ongoing monitoring to ensure critical measurement of progress, and allows for adjustments based on
16 changing conditions.

17 18 **Sustainability Plan for Public Parks**

19
20 ~~Using the 2011 SFRPD Departmental Climate Action Plan as a baseline, the Recreation and~~
21 ~~Park Department's Sustainability Plan sets forth guidelines for sustainable park practices. These~~
22 ~~practices offset municipal greenhouse gas emissions through landscape management and operations~~
23 ~~standards within the SFRPD parks and open spaces system to better manage natural resources,~~
24 ~~including soils, vegetation, and water. The Sustainability Plan expands the function of SFRPD parks~~
25 ~~beyond from providing recreational opportunities to mitigation of and adaptation to the effects of~~

1 ~~global climate change through environmental stewardship, resource conservation, and ecological~~
2 ~~responsibility.~~

3 * * * *

4 OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES

5
6 OBJECTIVE 1

7 **ENSURE A WELL-MAINTAINED, HIGHLY UTILIZED, AND INTEGRATED OPEN**
8 **SPACE SYSTEM**

9
10 The City’s goal is to make the very most of the open space assets that San Francisco’s
11 robust system already provides. Well-maintained, highly utilized, and integrated open spaces
12 are hallmarks of a unified and connected open space system with diverse programming,
13 numerous amenities, and regular maintenance. Offering a diverse range of active and passive
14 recreational opportunities in the City’s current recreation and open spaces would help better
15 utilize existing resources and encourage access for diverse users and activities.

16 * * * *

17
18 **POLICY 1.4**

19 ~~*Prioritize the better utilization of McLaren Park, Ocean Beach, the Southeastern Waterfront*~~
20 ~~*and other underutilized significant open spaces*~~ *Maintain and repair recreational facilities and open*
21 *spaces to modern maintenance standards.*

22
23 Maintaining open spaces and recreational facilities at a high level of quality will help
24 ensure that they are well-utilized and enjoyed. In order to maintain this goal, the City should

1 continue to employ well-trained staff, such as gardeners, arborists, electricians, plumbers and
2 other tradespeople to maintain our open space system and recreational facilities.

3
4 However, maintaining the City's existing recreation and open space system in a good
5 condition continues to be a challenge due to intensive use, facility age, and a high number of
6 sites. The City has diminishing resources devoted to general maintenance and upkeep. The
7 city, especially for private and supplemental spaces, should continue to explore creative
8 partnerships to meet maintenance goals of parks and open spaces, including those within the
9 jurisdiction of other agencies, such as the Port or National Park Service. Where feasible and in
10 keeping with the City's goal of providing well-maintained spaces the City should continue to
11 seek alternative maintenance methods, such as working with non-profit stewards, or
12 developing alternative maintenance agreements. Similarly, where open space is maintained by
13 entities other than the City, such as the National Park Service, the City should advocate for ongoing
14 maintenance of such facilities, particularly when such facilities fall into disrepair and become
15 unusable.

16
17 The Recreation and Parks Department owns a significant portion of the City's open
18 space system. With over 220 parks and 3000 acres of parkland, RPD requires significant
19 resources to keep the system in good to excellent condition. However, even as RPD
20 continues to seek additional funding sources to address these needs, maintenance continues
21 to be a problem due to rising costs and limitations on staffing and equipment.

22
23 RPD now evaluates parks on a quarterly basis and in addition the City Controller's
24 Office provides an annual report on the state of the City's parks. Further, RPD uses a facility
25 lifecycle management database to prioritize the RPD's deferred maintenance needs. The reports

1 have helped direct RPD management and City resources to address maintenance needs. The
2 City should continue to analyze maintenance needs by using these reports and other sources
3 as data from users throughout the recreation and open space system to ensure the
4 maintenance standards are met and funding is adequate.

5
6 **POLICY 1.5**

7 *Prioritize the better utilization of McLaren Park, Ocean Beach, the Southeastern Waterfront*
8 *and other underutilized significant open spaces*~~*Maintain and repair recreational facilities and open*~~
9 ~~*spaces to modern maintenance standards.*~~

10
11 Some of the City’s large signature spaces offer a special opportunity to provide
12 multifunctional open spaces that serve a diverse set of users. In particular:

13
14 **McLaren Park**

15
16 McLaren Park is a citywide resource due to its large size, varied landscape, and the
17 specialized activities and programs located within the park. At the same time, it is located in
18 an area of the City with one of the highest concentration of children, youth, seniors, and low-
19 income households. McLaren Park should offer uses which satisfy the recreation needs of
20 adjacent neighborhoods as well as meeting the needs of the city. The McLaren Park Master
21 Plan was originally written in 1983, updated in 1996, and most recently updated with
22 recommendations in the 2010 McLaren Park Needs Assessment *and published the McLaren*
23 *Park Vision Plan in 2018.* The City should ensure that the objectives and priorities of the Master
24 Plan provide effective guidance for the needs of the park today.

1 Development of the park should capitalize on the site's natural conditions, including
2 topography, existing native vegetation, and views, in compliance with RPD guidelines. New
3 plantings should be added to provide habitats and windbreaks, to define sub-areas of the
4 park, and to provide colorful and attractive visual accents. Plant species should be hardy,
5 wind- and fire-resistant, and provide for and enhance wildlife habitats.

6
7 In an effort to increase park use, the City should continue promoting events that attract
8 visitors to the Park. For example, Jerry Garcia Day, an annual festival held in honor of the
9 local musician, draws thousands of visitors to the park. Revenues generated from such events
10 could fund maintenance of and improvements to recreation facilities and open space.

11
12 The City should consider a number of improvements to McLaren Park. Existing traffic
13 conditions should be examined to reduce conflicts between vehicles and park users. The City
14 should investigate the feasibility of improving the existing right of way in the park to allow for
15 safe pedestrian, vehicular and bike access where appropriate and converting those areas to
16 recreational use. The existing trail system should be retained and improved by completing
17 missing linkages. Any new development should build on the existing infrastructure including
18 roads and parking areas, the irrigation system and drainage structures, and lighting and
19 electrical installations. Infrastructure that is damaged should be replaced within the existing
20 network, channel or path. New recreation areas should serve active, as well as passive, non-
21 organized recreation needs, that respond to a wide spectrum of park users.

22
23 **Ocean Beach**
24
25

1 Ocean Beach offers a vast, unbroken expanse of natural open space that is one of the
2 longest urban beaches in the country. The area historically served the growing San Francisco
3 population with the Sutro Baths, the Cliff House, the Fleishhaker Pool, and an amusement
4 park, but now suffers from erosion and a lack of amenities. At the same time, Ocean Beach is
5 annually visited by as many as three million people for activities such as walking, picnicking,
6 sunbathing, jogging, dog walking, surfing, fishing, and simply enjoying the natural beauty.
7

8 Ocean Beach faces significant obstacles to fulfilling its potential as a great public space
9 at the city's edge. First, critical components of the wastewater infrastructure are located near
10 the beach, with some elements that are threatened by erosion. Coastal management to
11 protect infrastructure, ecological resources, and public access is a complex challenge. The
12 erosion is likely to worsen as climate-related sea level rise accelerates. In addition, Ocean
13 Beach is administered by a host of Federal, State, and Local agencies, including the National
14 Park Service¹, the SF Recreation and Park Department, the San Francisco Public Utilities
15 Commission, and the State Coastal Commission.
16

17 A non-binding Master Plan for Ocean Beach has been developed by a project team led
18 by San Francisco Planning and Urban Research (SPUR) and incorporating input from an
19 interagency Steering Committee, Planning Advisory Committee (PAC), Technical Advisors
20 and the general public. The plan addresses the complex challenges faced at the coastline,
21 including severe erosion, jurisdictional issues, a diverse array of beach users and points of
22 view, and the looming challenge of climate-induced sea level rise. It presents
23 recommendations for the coastline and how it should be managed and protected for the
24 stretch from the Cliff House to Fort Funston, spanning roadway changes, bike and pedestrian
25 connectivity, technical interventions, and ecological restoration.

1 To help address the issues described above, the SFPUC, in partnership with other agencies, is
2 implementing the Ocean Beach Climate Change Adaptation Project for the southernmost portion of the
3 beach and surroundings. The Adaptation Project builds upon several previous efforts including the
4 Coastal Protection Measures and Management Strategy for South Ocean Beach (2015) and the Ocean
5 Beach Open Space Landscape Design (2017). Project elements include, but are not limited to,
6 managed retreat, structural protection, access and recreation improvements, and beach nourishment.

7
8 * * * *

9
10 **MAP 3 - Existing and Proposed Open Space [shall be replaced with an updated**
11 **MAP 3 showing new parks established since the Recreation and Open Space Element**
12 **was originally published]**

13
14 * * * *

15
16 **OBJECTIVE 2**

17 **INCREASE RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE TO MEET THE LONG-TERM NEEDS**
18 **OF THE CITY AND BAY REGION**

19 * * * *

20
21 **POLICY 2.4**

22 **Support the development of signature public open spaces along the shoreline.**

23 * * * *

24
25 **Northeastern Shoreline**

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

Significant progress has been made in opening and improving the city’s northern shorelines. With the opening of Crissy Field in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area and the retention of much of the open space in the Presidio as publicly-accessible open space, this area has transformed itself into a regional destination. Long-term, maximizing the recreational opportunities of other shoreline areas should be considered and inter-governmental and other partnerships should be pursued to further develop these opportunities. At the same time, existing facilities should be maintained at a level good repair to assure their ongoing usefulness.

In addition, a major opportunity exists to create an expanded, multi-park open space at the juncture of Market Street and ~~the~~ The Embarcadero. The existing open spaces of Embarcadero Promenade, Justin Herman Plaza, and Sue Bierman (formerly Ferry) Park provide a wealth of untapped opportunity, which can be connected to function as a coherent link from downtown to the Ferry Building and the waterfront, holding several linked yet distinct activity and recreation spaces. Additionally, the Port has opened ~~is planning to open~~ the Northeast Wharf at Pier 27, which ~~would be~~ includes a three acre plaza in front of a new Cruise Terminal at the base of Telegraph Hill, and a series of linked open spaces in the heart of Fisherman’s Wharf.

Western Shoreline

The western shoreline has the advantage that it is already a long-stretch of natural and publicly-accessible open space. Ocean Beach is a national treasure and should be improved to acknowledge the significance of vast, unbroken expanse of beach in the City.

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

A non-binding Ocean Beach Master Plan has been developed by SPUR (a San Francisco non-profit supporting planning and good government in the Bay Area) in close coordination with responsible agencies. The Plan includes recommendations to improve and restore conditions at Ocean Beach by adapting proactively to the changing coastline. The western shoreline also connects to Lake Merced, providing opportunities for enhanced access to the waterfront and recreational opportunities. The SFPUC is ~~currently exploring ways to~~ undertaking several efforts, including implementing the Ocean Beach Climate Change Adaptation Project, to improve access to the watershed lands in this area. If additional space becomes available, this space should provide improved connections from the neighborhood to the waterfront.

Southeastern Waterfront

The continued development of Mission Bay, the passage of the Eastern Neighborhoods plans (Mission, East SoMa, Showplace Square/Potrero Hill, and Central Waterfront Area Plans), the approved developments at Mission Rock, Pier 70, the Potrero Power Station, India Basin, and the proposed Candlestick Point and Hunters Point Shipyard developments will bring growth, which will require increased access and open spaces throughout the Southeast. Most of these plans are accompanied by specific open space strategies for parkland along the waterfront, where active water-oriented uses such as shoreline fishing, swimming, and boating should be promoted. The 2018 Central Waterfront: Dogpatch Public Realm Plan includes additional, more specific recommendations for the Central Waterfront-Dogpatch Public Realm Plan area.

BLUE GREENWAY

1 The Blue Greenway is a project to improve and expand the public open space network
2 along the City's central and southern waterfront, from the China Basin Channel to the San
3 Francisco County Line (see Map 8: Blue Greenway). It provides a new vision of how parks
4 and public spaces can be created to complement and connect with existing open spaces in
5 this industrial mixed-use area along the Bay waterfront. The Blue Greenway seeks to both
6 provide opportunities for much-needed open space that is easily accessible for exercise and
7 recreation, including bicycle and pedestrian access, recreational uses in the water (e.g.
8 kayaking *and swimming*), access to historical resources, and enjoyment of art, as well as
9 improve waterfront public access from nearby neighborhoods. These goals realize objectives
10 set forth in the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) San Francisco Bay Trail Plan
11 and Bay Area Water Trail for southeast San Francisco.

12
13 The following Blue Greenway projects should be given high priority as the
14 neighborhoods along the Bay waterfront – which are already deficient in open space –
15 continue to grow in population. These projects correspond with identified high needs areas.
16 Some are longer-term, large-scale projects that will require public funding:

- 17
18 • **China Basin Shoreline Park:** This existing approximately two-acre park will be
19 expanded as a part of the development of the Port's Sea Wall Lot 337 project
20 and will be the northern gateway of the Blue Greenway.
- 21
22 • **Mission Bay Park System:** This 41-acre park system will include a large scale,
23 bayfront park between the China Basin Shoreline Park and Pier 70, with an
24 important Blue Greenway segment. These open space opportunities and
25

1 projects are incorporated into the Office of Community Investment and
2 Infrastructure's Mission Bay Redevelopment project.

3
4 ● ~~Pier 70 Open Space System: the Port's Pier 70 Plan proposes the following open spaces
5 along the Blue Greenway:~~

6
7 ○ ~~Crane Cove Park: Plans for this approximately nine-acre shoreline park
8 within the Port's Pier 70 development area include construction of an aquatic
9 center and opportunities for park designs and interpretative materials that
10 provide educational information on the City's deeply rooted maritime history. In
11 addition to Crane Cove Park, the Pier 70 site presents opportunities for a variety
12 of other open spaces, all of which must be consistent with the industrial maritime
13 character and setting of the site.~~

14
15 ○ ~~Waterfront Development Site / Slipways Park: The waterfront development
16 site is an approximately 28-acre site that is slated for mixed use development.
17 The site includes Slipways Park, an approximately four-acre park along the
18 southeastern shoreline that will incorporate historic shipbuilding infrastructure.
19 The park will eventually connect with new shoreline open spaces once the former
20 Potrero Power Plant site is redeveloped. Adjacent to the waterfront development
21 site is the Irish Hill / Hoe Down Yard property at Illinois and 22nd Street, which
22 is jointly owned by the Port and PG&E. This area is also being evaluated for
23 development and open space potential as part of the waterfront development site
24 planning process.~~

- 1 • **Crane Cove Park:** This approximately seven-acre shoreline park within the Port's Pier
2 70 development area include construction of an aquatic center and interpretive
3 educational information regarding the City's deeply rooted maritime history. In addition
4 to Crane Cove Park, the Pier 70 site presents opportunities for a variety of other open
5 spaces, all of which must be consistent with the industrial maritime character and
6 setting of the site.

- 7
- 8 • **Pier 70 Development Project:** The waterfront development site is approximately 28
9 acres, which includes approximately nine acres of open space, including approximately
10 four acres of open spaces along the waterfront that will incorporate historic
11 shipbuilding infrastructure.

- 12
- 13 • **Potrero Power Station Development Project:** This approximately 23-acre parcel is the
14 former site of the Potrero Power Plant, which is now planned for a major multi-phase
15 mixed use development that will include significant amount of residential, office,
16 laboratory, and other supportive uses. A major feature of the development is its 6.9
17 acres of waterfront and inland open space that will be coordinated with the adjacent
18 Pier 70 multi-phase mixed-use development, as it provides an opportunity to extend
19 waterfront access through the pier to Warm Water Cove.

- 20
- 21 • **Warm Water Cove:** This isolated park has the opportunity to be improved and
22 expanded by up to three acres to provide access to the City's Eastern shoreline
23 and to provide recreational opportunities to the growing population. The 2018
24 Central Waterfront-Dogpatch Public Realm Plan includes concept designs for
25 this site to guide future expansion and enhancements.

- 1
- 2 • **Islais Creek Improvements:** This project may consist of shoreline
- 3 improvements, including rebuilding dilapidated wharves, removing ghost piles,
- 4 and providing for open space system linkages to expand public access and
- 5 recreational water use of Islais Creek. In August 2021, the City and the Port
- 6 published the Islais Creek Southeast Mobility Adaptation Strategy (ICSMAS), which
- 7 examined the Creek and its surrounding neighborhood’s flood hazard risks and
- 8 identified a comprehensive suite of possible adaptation pathways to protect the area and
- 9 its key public assets from flooding and permanent inundation.
- 10
- 11 • **India Basin:** The recently closed Hunters Point Power Plant and adjacent
- 12 shoreline properties offers the opportunity to bring much-needed recreational
- 13 space to the center of the City’s southeast neighborhoods, helping address the
- 14 health and environmental impacts of the plant’s operations. Relatedly, RPD in
- 15 embarking on a major redesign and enlargement of the India Basin Shoreline Park and
- 16 India Basin Open Space that will, among other aspects, expand the area of the parks by
- 17 incorporating new property at 900 Innes Avenue. The proposed India Basin multi-phase
- 18 development, approved in 2018, will also contribute significant new open space area.
- 19 Taken together, the new and improved open spaces from the Power Plant Site through
- 20 India Basin and into the Shipyard are expected to create a network of diverse open
- 21 spaces for the Bayview community and the City at large.

22 * * * *

23

24 **POLICY 2.6**

25 **Support the development of civic-serving open 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

San Francisco is a civic city— celebrations, rallies, gatherings and protests take place almost weekly; political speeches, music, performances in the open air are also common occurrences. Our identity is defined as much by expressions of our social and cultural goals as it is by our physical landscape. These regular events in San Francisco emphasize the role of our City as a regional stage where like minds can gather and deliberate.

* * * *

- **Civic Center:** Our existing Civic Center, surrounded by City Hall, the Main Library, the Asian Art Museum, and other civic spaces, hosts many of the activities described above. The Civic Center is part of the Civic Center Historic District with National, State, and Local designations. Civic Center’s design, however, limits its capacity and functionality, with activities often spilling into less optimal public spaces such as nearby streets. The nearby UN Plaza provides additional activity space that is used for weekly farmers and craft markets, but the two spaces are generally underused outside of scheduled activities and are separated by a virtual parking lot along Fulton Street between Hyde and Larkin Streets. A series of connected open spaces, along a “Civic Center axis” from Market Street to City Hall, could be created with the development of a pedestrian mall along Fulton Street between the Main Library and Asian Art Museum, and with corresponding activity improvements to increase the usability of the Civic Center and UN Plazas. ~~Some components that should be included in the revamping of these public spaces include an event lawn or amphitheater for performances, a gathering plaza, and~~

1 ~~pavilions for special events.~~ The Civic Center Public Realm Plan provides a blueprint
2 for realizing these goals.

3 * * * *

4
5 **POLICY 2.7**

6 **Expand partnerships among open space agencies, transit agencies, private**
7 **sector and nonprofit institutions to acquire, and develop new open space, ~~and/or~~ and**
8 **maintain, improve, and manage existing open spaces.**

9 * * * *

10
11 **OBJECTIVE 3**

12 **IMPROVE ACCESS AND CONNECTIVITY TO OPEN SPACE**

13
14 San Francisco is a dense, built-out city, where it may be difficult and expensive to
15 acquire new land for parks and open spaces. Even though acquisition remains an important
16 means to improve open space access, San Francisco's street network provides an untapped
17 opportunity to supplement the city's open space system and link the network of open spaces.
18 The street network, which makes up 25% percent of the City's total land area, is a valuable
19 public space asset that can incorporate many types of open spaces, such as pocket parks,
20 play streets, trails, and walkable streets and bike routes. These systems can connect
21 residents to larger parks and open spaces and serve as restorative green spaces in their own
22 right, places where residents can interact with urban nature on their doorstep. This system
23 should be clearly legible, and include signage to guide pedestrians to and through the larger
24 open space system.

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 3.3

Develop and enhance the City’s recreational trail system, linking to the regional hiking and biking trail system and considering restoring historic water courses to improve stormwater management.

San Francisco currently has an extensive network of trails that provide local opportunities for walking and biking and link to regional trails and open spaces throughout the Bay Area. These trails surround the Bay, parallel the ocean, extend through parks and neighborhoods and connect existing open spaces. Many of these trails have gaps and lack adequate signage. The City should prioritize filling these gaps and increasing awareness of the trails through updated signage. New trails are also envisioned to provide additional hiking and biking opportunities and important wildlife corridors. The City should also work with Daly City and San Mateo County to encourage better links to San Bruno Mountain and trails to the south.

New trails throughout the city could consider historic water courses to incorporate stormwater management, provide trail connections, or restore aquatic and riparian habitats or wildlife corridors.- These trails should provide better ways to move people through increased hiking and biking opportunities. Some adopted Area Plans, such as the Glen Park Area Plan, have identified such opportunities.

MAP 11 - San Francisco Bay Trail [shall be replaced with an updated MAP 11 showing segments of the Bay Trail currently shown as gaps as completed Bay Trail segments]

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

Continuous Waterfront Trail

The trails along the waterfront are administered by many different jurisdictions including regional, city, and federal agencies. However, visitors do not necessarily distinguish between these jurisdictions, and want a continuous, usable trail system along the waterfront. The City should improve trail signage to ensure users are provided clear routes and destinations and work to fill any gaps in the proposed trails and in the connections between them where it does not impede on water dependent commerce.

* * * *

Bay Area Water Trail

The State Coastal Conservancy is leading the implementation of the San Francisco Bay Area Water Trail Plan (Water Trail Plan), a new regional access project. The Water Trail ~~will be~~ is a network of access sites (or “trailheads”) that will enable people using non-motorized, small boats or other beachable sailcraft—such as kayaks, canoes, dragon boats, stand-up paddle and windsurf boards—to safely enjoy single and multiple-day trips around San Francisco Bay. This regional trail ~~has the potential to enhance~~ enhances Bay Area communities’ connections to the Bay for water recreation activities, and create new linkages to existing shoreline open space and other regional trails, such as the Bay Trail. The Water Trail will include educational, stewardship, and outreach components.

* * * *

MAP 12 - Regional Trails [shall be replaced with an updated MAP 12 showing segments of the Bay Trail currently shown as gaps as completed Bay Trail segments]

* * * *

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 5.1

Engage communities in the design, programming and improvement of their local open spaces, and in the development of recreational programs.

The most successful public spaces are those that respond to the needs of their users. Statistics, maps and figures can only go so far in determining a community’s need – they can explain proximity to open space, they can describe type of open spaces that are missing (hiking trails, sports fields, playgrounds, access to and from open water, etc.), but they cannot identify the components of open space design which will most reflect their user community.

* * * *

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

Section 6. Scope of Ordinance. In enacting this ordinance, the Board of Supervisors intends to amend only those words, phrases, paragraphs, subsections, sections, articles, numbers, punctuation marks, charts, diagrams, or any other constituent parts of the Municipal Code that are explicitly shown in this ordinance as additions, deletions, Board amendment additions, and Board amendment deletions in accordance with the “Note” that appears under the official title of the ordinance.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

1 DAVID CHIU, City Attorney

2 By: /s/ Peter R. Miljanich
3 PETER R. MILJANICH
4 Deputy City Attorney

5 n:\legana\as2023\2300067\01669871.docx

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



PLANNING COMMISSION RESOLUTION NO. 21304

HEARING DATE: APRIL 20, 2023

Project Name: General Plan Amendments associated with the Port of San Francisco Waterfront Plan Update
Case Number: 2019-023037GPA MAP PCA
Initiated by: Planning Commission
Staff Contact: Mat Snyder, Citywide Planning
Mathew.snyder@sfgov.org, (628) 652-7460
Reviewed by: Lily Langlois, Principal Planner, Citywide Planning
Lily.Langlois@sfgov.org, (628) 652-7472

INITIATING AMENDMENTS TO PLANNING CODE SECTION 240, THE WATERFRONT SPECIAL USE DISTRICT TO (1) MAKE MINOR CHANGES REGARDING THE COMPOSITION AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES OF THE WATERFRONT DESIGN ADVISORY COMMITTEE (WDAC); (2) ADD A NEW SPECIAL USE DISTRICT (WATERFRONT SPECIAL USE DISTRICT NO. 4) FOR THE PROPERTIES UNDER PORT JURISDICTION SOUTH OF MISSION ROCK AND WOULD SUBJECT DEVELOPMENTS WITHIN THE NEW SUD TO THE PROCEDURES OF THE WDAC; AND (3) REMOVE CONDITIONAL USE REQUIREMENTS FOR USES NOT SCREENED FROM PUBLIC VIEW; ADOPTING FINDINGS, INCLUDING ENVIRONMENTAL FINDINGS, PLANNING CODE SECTION 302 FINDINGS, AND FINDINGS OF CONSISTENCY WITH THE GENERAL PLAN AND PLANNING CODE SECTION 101.1.

WHEREAS, Section 4.105 of the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco provides to the Planning Commission the opportunity to periodically recommend Planning Code Amendments to the Board of Supervisors; and

WHEREAS, Pursuant to Planning Code Section 302 the Planning Commission (“Commission”) initiated a Planning Code amendment to change Planning Code Section 240, per Planning Commission Resolution No. 21272, on March 9, 2023.

WHEREAS, The Proposed Amendments would amend Planning Code Section 240, the “Waterfront Special Use District” (SUD) by (1) making minor changes to the composition and administrative procedures of the Waterfront Design Advisory Committee (WDAC); (2) adding a new Special Use District, Waterfront Special Use District No. 4 (“WSUD 4”), that would include properties owned and managed by the Port of San Francisco generally east and south of Mission Rock (excluding Pier 70) and would subject developments within the new WSUD 4 to the procedures of WDAC; (3) removing the conditional use requirement for uses not screened from public view; and

(4) other minor changes such as updating reference to the Waterfront Plan (as opposed to the Waterfront Land Use Plan); and

WHEREAS, Provisions in Planning Code Section 240 implement, in part, policies of the Port of San Francisco's Waterfront Plan. The Waterfront Plan (previously the Waterfront Land Use Plan) is the long-range plan that set forth policies for the use and improvement of properties owned and managed by the Port of San Francisco, developed pursuant to requirements in Proposition H approved by San Francisco voters in 1990, which was adopted by the Port Commission in 1997, with occasional subsequent amendments that were approved by the Port Commission; and

WHEREAS, the San Francisco Port Commission ("Port Commission") directed the creation of a Waterfront Plan Working Group to lead a public planning process and public discussions about existing waterfront activities, regulations, challenges, public desires and needs to incorporate diverse viewpoints and perspectives to develop policy recommendations to update the Waterfront Land Use Plan; and

WHEREAS, The Working Group recommendations updated or added new goals and policies in nine categories to expand the breadth of content and policy direction, such that the Port has renamed the document to, simply, the Waterfront Plan which addresses: Maritime & Water-dependent Uses; Diverse Non-Maritime Uses; Public Access & Open Space; Urban Design & Historic Preservation; A Financially Strong Port; Transportation and Mobility; Environmental Sustainability; A Resilient Port; Community Engagement and Partnering; and updated objectives for five waterfront subareas that flow from the new goals and policies: Fisherman's Wharf, Northeastern Waterfront, South Beach, Mission Bay and Southern Waterfront;

WHEREAS, In conjunction with the updates to the Waterfront Plan, Port staff recommends several amendments to Planning Code Section 240. A key provision of Section 240 is the establishment of the WDAC which provides advise to the Planning and Port Commission on the design of certain projects under owned and managed by the Port of San Francisco, within two of three of the Waterfront SUD sub-Special Use Districts (Waterfront SUD No. 1 and No. 3). There is not a special use district for Port properties in the Southern Waterfront, specifically east and south of Mission Rock. These amendments, among other provisions, create a new Special Use District No. 4 to extend the established design review process for properties under Port jurisdiction east and south of Mission Rock, thereby assuring equitable and transparent review of projects in the Southern Waterfront; and

WHEREAS, Planning staff reviewed other provisions of Planning Code Section 240 to see if other aspects of SUD required updating. Planning staff discovered that the provision that requires Conditional Use authorization for projects that were "*not screened from view from adjacent streets and other public areas*" was confusing and unnecessary and subject small projects to burdensome review and therefore is recommending removal of the requirement; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Department as the Lead Agency responsible for the implementation of CEQA, California Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq., the Guidelines for Implementation of CEQA, 14 California Code of Regulations Section 15000 et seq. ("CEQA Guidelines"), and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code, and undertook an environmental review process for the proposed Waterfront Plan Project and related General Plan, Planning Code, and Zoning Map amendments and provide appropriate public hearings before the Planning Commission; and

WHEREAS, on February 23, 2022, the Planning Department published the Waterfront Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report (“DEIR”) for the Waterfront Plan Project (Case No. 2019-023037ENV), which included the December 2019 Draft Waterfront Plan, and amendments to the San Francisco General Plan, San Francisco Planning Code and Zoning Map, and BCDC Special Area Plan, and provided public notice in a newspaper of general circulation of the availability of the DEIR for public review and comment and of the date and time of the Planning Commission public hearing on the DEIR; this notice was mailed to the Department’s list of persons requesting such notice. Notices of availability of the DEIR and the date and time of the public hearing were posted near the project site by the Department beginning on February 23, 2022. The DEIR contains analysis at a “program level” pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15168 for the adoption and implementation of the Waterfront Plan; and

WHEREAS, on March 24, 2022, the Planning Commission held a duly advertised public hearing on the DEIR, at which an opportunity for public comment was given, and public comment was received on the DEIR. The period for commenting on the DEIR ended on April 25, 2022. The Department prepared responses to comments on environmental issues received during the 60-day public review period for the DEIR, prepared revisions to the text of the DEIR in response to comments received or based on additional information that became available during the public review period, and corrected clerical errors in the DEIR; and

WHEREAS, between September and December 2022, Port staff produced further proposed revisions to the Waterfront Plan to incorporate information updates, technical edits, and policy refinements, which underwent public review and comment and were presented to the Port Commission at its September 13, 2022 and January 24, 2023 meetings, and which revisions were reviewed by the Planning Department staff and determined to not result in any required changes to the information or conclusions in the FEIR; and on January 19, 2023, the Planning Department published a Responses to Comments document. A Final Environmental Impact Report (hereinafter “FEIR”) has been prepared by the Department, consisting of the DEIR, any consultations and comments received during the review process, any additional information that became available, and the Responses to Comments document, all as required by law; and

WHEREAS, on March 10, 2020, the Planning Department published an Errata to the FEIR, and on March 16, 2020, the Planning Commission reviewed and considered the FEIR (including the Errata) and found that the contents of said report and the procedures through which the FEIR was prepared, publicized, and reviewed comply with the provisions of CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code. The FEIR was certified by the Planning Commission on March 19, 2023. On April 5, 2023, the Planning Department issued Addendum #1 to the FEIR and determined that the additional information in Addendum #1 does not change the analyses and conclusions presented in the FEIR; now, therefore, be it

WHEREAS, on April 5, 2023, the Planning Department published Addendum No. 1 to the FEIR (the “Addendum”), [link]. The Addendum provides additional language to clarify that CEQA review would be required for subsequent projects (not otherwise exempt from CEQA) for potentially significant environmental impacts to the extent not expressly reviewed in the subject FIER, among other clarifications; and

WHEREAS, on April 11, 2023, the San Francisco Port Commission (“Port Commission”) approved the Waterfront Plan by Resolution No. 23-15, which incorporated the adoption of CEQA Findings and a statement of overriding considerations [link]; and

WHEREAS, the Commission has heard and considered the testimony presented to it at the public hearing and has further considered written materials and oral testimony presented on behalf of Department staff and other interested parties; and

WHEREAS, all pertinent documents may be found in the files of the Department, as the custodian of records, at 49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco; and

A draft ordinance, attached hereto as Exhibit A, would amend Planning Code Section 240 pursuant to Planning Code Section 302.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Commission hereby finds that the Planning Code Text Amendments promote the public welfare, convenience and necessity for the following reasons:

- Other proposed amendments to Waterfront SUD would assure alignment with the recently updated Waterfront Plan and make other changes to improve procedures described therein; and
- By creating a new Waterfront Special Use District No. 4 under Planning Code Section 240, development projects on Port properties in the Southern Waterfront would be subject to the Waterfront Design Advisory Committee review, which would help assure better quality and transparent review of such projects.
- Removing the Conditional Use requirement for projects “*not screened from view from adjacent streets and other public areas*” removes a confusing, unnecessary and burdensome requirement for smaller projects.
- The proposed amendments are in general conformity with the General Plan, as amended, and Planning Code Section 101.1 as described in Planning Commission Resolution No. 21303.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Commission has reviewed and considered the CEQA Findings and statement of overriding considerations for that Waterfront Plan update, which addressed the related General Plan and Planning Code amendments, which the Port Commission adopted on April 11, 2023 per Port Commission Resolution no. 23-15, and hereby adopts these CEQA Findings as its own.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Commission has reviewed the Addendum and hereby agrees with its analysis and findings, including the determination that the additional information in Addendum #1 does not change the analyses and conclusions presented in the FEIR, and has considered the Addendum as part of the decisions described in this Resolution; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that pursuant to Planning Code Section 302 the Commission adopts a Resolution to recommend to the Board of Supervisors amendments to the General Plan;

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was adopted by the Commission at its meeting on April 20, 2023.

Laura Lynch

Laura Lynch
Acting Commission Secretary

AYES: Braun, Diamond, Imperial, Koppel, Moore, Tanner
NOES: None
ABSENT: Ruiz
ADOPTED: April 20, 2023

1 [Planning Code - Port of San Francisco Waterfront Plan Update]

2

3 **Ordinance amending the Planning Code to revise certain Waterfront Special Use**
4 **District controls and to add Waterfront Special Use District No. 4 covering areas east of**
5 **the Mission Bay and Southern Waterfront areas; and making environmental findings,**
6 **including adopting a statement of overriding considerations, and findings of**
7 **consistency with the General Plan and the eight priority policies of Planning Code,**
8 **Section 101.1, and findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare under**
9 **Planning Code, Section 302.**

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

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

18

19 Section 1. Environmental and Planning Code Findings.

20 (a) On _____, after a duly noticed public hearing, the Planning Commission, by
21 Motion No. _____, certified the Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Port of
22 San Francisco's Waterfront Plan (the Project), which updates and amends the Port's 1997
23 Waterfront Land Use Plan and sets long term goals and policies to guide the use,
24 management, and improvement of properties owned and managed by the Port. The Planning
25 Commission motion finds that the Final EIR reflects the independent judgment and analysis of
the City and County of San Francisco, is adequate, accurate and objective, contains no
significant revisions to the Draft EIR, and the content of the report and the procedures through

1 which the Final EIR was prepared, publicized, and reviewed comply with the provisions of the
2 California Environmental Quality Act (California Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et
3 seq.), the CEQA Guidelines (14 Cal. Code Regs. Section 15000 et seq.), and Chapter 31 of
4 the San Francisco Administrative Code. Copies of the Planning Commission Motion and Final
5 EIR are on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. ___ and are incorporated
6 herein by reference. The Board affirms this determination.

7 (b) The Project evaluated in the Final EIR includes the proposed amendments to the
8 Planning Code set forth in this ordinance as well as amendments to the General Plan and the
9 Zoning Map. The proposed Planning Code amendments set forth in this ordinance are within
10 the scope of the Project evaluated in the Final EIR.

11 (c) On _____, the Port Commission, in Motion No. _____, adopted
12 findings under CEQA regarding the Project's environmental impacts, the disposition of
13 mitigation measures, and project alternatives, as well as a statement of overriding
14 considerations (CEQA Findings), and adopted a mitigation monitoring reporting program
15 (MMRP). A copy of said Motion is on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No.
16 _____, and is incorporated herein by reference.

17 (d) On _____, the Planning Commission, in Motion No. _____, adopted
18 findings under CEQA regarding the Project's environmental impacts, the disposition of
19 mitigation measures, and project alternatives, as well as a statement of overriding
20 considerations (CEQA Findings) and adopted a mitigation monitoring reporting program
21 (MMRP). A copy of said Motion is on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No.
22 _____, and is incorporated herein by reference.

23 (e) On _____, the Planning Commission, in Resolution No. _____,
24 recommended the proposed Planning Code amendments for approval and adopted findings
25 that the actions contemplated in this ordinance are consistent, on balance, with the City's

1 General Plan and eight priority policies of Planning Code Section 101.1. The Board adopts
2 these findings as its own. A copy of said Resolution is on file with the Clerk of the Board of
3 Supervisors in File No. _____, and is incorporated herein by reference.

4 (f) On _____, the Planning Commission, in Resolution No. _____,
5 adopted findings under Planning Code section 302 that the actions contemplated in this
6 ordinance will serve the public necessity, convenience, and welfare. The Board adopts these
7 findings as its own. A copy of said Resolution is on file with the Clerk of the Board of
8 Supervisors in File No. _____, and is incorporated herein by reference.

9 (g) The Board of Supervisors has reviewed and considered the Final EIR and the
10 environmental documents on file referred to herein. The Board of Supervisors has reviewed
11 and considered the CEQA Findings, and hereby adopts them as its own and incorporates
12 them by reference as though such findings were fully set forth in this ordinance.

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

17 (i) The Board of Supervisors finds that since certification of the Final EIR no
18 substantial changes have occurred in the proposed Project that would require revisions in the
19 Final EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial
20 increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects, no substantial changes have
21 occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the proposed Project is to be
22 undertaken that would require major revisions to the Final EIR due to the involvement of new
23 environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of effects identified in the Final
24 EIR, and no new information of substantial importance to the proposed Project has become
25 available which indicates that (1) the Project will have significant effects not discussed in the

1 Final EIR, (2) significant environmental effects will be substantially more severe, (3) mitigation
2 measure or alternatives found not feasible that would reduce one or more significant effects
3 have become feasible, or (4) mitigation measures or alternatives that are considerably
4 different from those in the Final EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects
5 on the environment.

6
7 Section 2. Article 2 of the Planning Code is hereby amended by revising Sections 240,
8 240.1, 240.2, and 240.3, and adding Section 240.4, as follows:

9 **SEC. 240. WATERFRONT SPECIAL USE DISTRICT.**

10 (a) **Purpose.** In order to provide for certain areas with unique natural and man-
11 made physical characteristics, distinct historic and maritime character, special traffic, parking,
12 and use considerations, recognized development potential, and proximity to residential,
13 public, and commercial areas of regional, national, and international significance which should
14 be protected from adverse adjacent development, there shall be ~~three~~four Waterfront Special
15 Use Districts, Numbers 1, 2, ~~and 3,~~ and 4, as designated on Sectional Maps No. 1 SU, 8 SU,
16 and 9 SU* of the Zoning Map. The original copy of said Sectional Maps with these Special Use
17 Districts indicated thereon is on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors under File No.
18 171-70-4, pursuant to Ordinance No. 131-70 and subsequent amendments ~~thereunder~~ File No.
19 _____. The provisions set forth in Sections 240.1 through ~~240.3~~240.4 shall apply, respectively,
20 within these Special Use Districts, and shall be applicable to all property, whether public or
21 private, including property under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Port Commission.

22 (b) **State and Regional Land Use Controls.** Much of the property within Waterfront
23 Special Use District Numbers 1, ~~and 3,~~ and 4 is subject to land use controls in addition to those
24 set forth in this Code. Most of the land under the jurisdiction of the Port Commission is public
25 trust land and is subject to use limitations as provided in California Statutes of 1968, Chapter

1 1333, as amended (the "Burton Act") and the San Francisco Charter. In the event of a conflict
2 between the provisions of the Burton Act and this Code, the State legislation prevails. A
3 portion of the property under the Port Commission's jurisdiction is further subject to use
4 limitations as provided in the California Government Code, Sections 66600 et seq. (the
5 "McAteer-Petris Act"). The San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission is
6 responsible for implementing the provisions of the McAteer-Petris Act. Other property within
7 ~~this~~these Waterfront Special Use Districts is subject to redevelopment plans adopted by the
8 Board of Supervisors.

9 (c) **Waterfront Design Review Process.**

10 (1) In order to best achieve the public objectives that have been established in law
11 and policy for the property under the jurisdiction of the Port Commission, a waterfront design
12 review process is hereby established to review the urban design of new development on
13 certain land under the Port Commission's jurisdiction within ~~the~~ Waterfront Special Use
14 Districts Numbers 1, 3, and 4, consistent with applicable provisions of the Port's Waterfront ~~Land~~
15 ~~Use Plan and its Waterfront Design and Access goals, objectives and criteria, urban design, historic~~
16 ~~preservation, and public access goals, policies, and objectives,~~ as provided below. The purpose of
17 the waterfront design review process is to identify and integrate the State, regional, and local
18 objectives pertaining to the urban design of major, non-maritime development projects and
19 proposed uses in order to optimize the public enjoyment and beneficial use of this public trust
20 resource.

21 (2) The waterfront design review process shall be conducted by the Waterfront
22 Design Advisory Committee ("Committee"), which shall consist of five members. ~~a Design Advisory~~
23 ~~Committee. The Mayor shall appoint a qualified professional urban planner or architect (general,~~
24 ~~historic or landscape) who resides or works in San Francisco as one member.~~ The Director of
25 Planning and the Director of the Port of San Francisco shall each appoint two members who

1 ~~are, consisting of (1) a senior member from their respective staffs and (2) a~~ qualified professional
2 urban planner_s or architect_s (general, historic, or landscape) who resides or works in San
3 Francisco, and are not employed within their agency. In addition to these members, the Director of
4 the Port shall also appoint one member who is a historic preservation professional who meets the
5 Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standard. Port of San Francisco staff shall
6 maintain Committee records and administrative procedures reflecting the roster, qualifications, and
7 terms for each Committee member. ~~Of the original appointments, the Mayor's appointment shall serve~~
8 ~~for a four year term and the Planning Director and Port Director shall each appoint one member for a~~
9 ~~two year term and one member for a four year term. After expiration of the original terms, all~~
10 ~~appointments shall be for four year terms.~~ The Port Commission may ~~is granted the authority to~~
11 increase the number of Committee members by adding representatives appointed by the
12 Director of the Bay Conservation and Development Commission, if needed. The
13 ~~Committee~~ Design Advisory Committee shall select a chairperson from among its voting
14 members, and shall establish rules and regulations for its own organization and procedure.
15 The ~~Committee~~ Committee may establish subcommittees to which it may assign Committee
16 design review responsibilities. The Committee shall act by vote of a majority of those present
17 at a meeting with a quorum of Committee members.

18 (3) The ~~Design Advisory~~ Committee shall review proposed projects to be developed
19 on property of the Port of San Francisco, as set forth in Sections 240.1, 240.3, and ~~240.34~~
20 of this Code.

21 (4) The ~~Design Advisory~~ Committee shall be advisory to the Planning Department
22 and Port of San Francisco, and shall provide its design recommendations to the Bay
23 Conservation and Development Commission for proposed projects within its jurisdiction. The
24 Port shall convene and provide staff assistance to the Committee and consult with the
25

1 Committee on non-maritime development projects as set forth in this Code and at such other
2 times as the Port deems appropriate.

3 ~~(5) The Planning Commission and the Port Commission shall hold a joint hearing within~~
4 ~~two years from the date of adoption of this ordinance to evaluate the design review process and make~~
5 ~~recommendations to the Board of Supervisors for its improvement.~~

6 (65) The Committee shall hold a public hearing on a proposed project and make
7 design recommendations to ensure that the urban design of the proposed project is consistent
8 with applicable provisions of the Waterfront ~~Land Use Plan's Waterfront Design and Access goals,~~
9 ~~objectives and criteria~~ urban design, historic preservation, and public access goals, policies, and
10 objectives. In addition to any other notice required by law, the Committee shall provide public
11 notice for this hearing by electronic mail to the applicant or other person or agency initiating
12 the action and other parties who have requested ~~mailed notice of such hearing on the project in~~
13 ~~writing~~ notice of such hearing on the project and submitted their contact information to the Port of San
14 Francisco.

15 (76) The Committee, as an advisory board, must review and consider any final
16 environmental documents, or draft documents if final documents are not yet available,
17 prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act, before it makes its final
18 recommendations.

19 (87) The determination of the Committee on urban design issues related to the
20 proposed project shall be final as to those design issues, except as provided below. The
21 Committee shall transmit the design recommendations to the Planning Department and Port,
22 and to the Bay Conservation and Development Commission for proposed projects within
23 BCDC's jurisdiction, ~~within five days~~ two weeks following the Committee action for
24 consideration by those agencies prior to any action on the project.

1 (A) For a project that is permitted as a Principal Use, the Planning Commission
2 ~~may~~, by majority vote within 14 days of receipt of the design recommendations of the
3 Committee, make a determination to review the design recommendations. If the item cannot
4 be calendared for Planning Commission consideration within that period due to a canceled
5 meeting, the Commission may consider whether to review the design recommendations at its
6 next available meeting. If the Planning Commission requests review, it shall conduct a public
7 hearing on the matter within 14 days following its determination to review the design
8 recommendations, if legally adequate environmental documents have been completed, or at
9 its first public meeting after such documents have been completed, unless the Port Director
10 agrees to a different date. At the request of the Port Director, the meeting shall be conducted
11 as a joint public hearing of the Planning Commission and the Port Commission. The Planning
12 Commission, by majority vote, may adopt, amend, or reject the design recommendations of
13 the Committee, subject to the same standards and criteria that govern Committee decisions
14 as provided in subsection (c)(~~5~~) above.

15 If the Port Commission accepts the design recommendations of the Committee
16 or of the Planning Commission, the Port Commission shall incorporate the design
17 recommendations into the Port action on the project.

18 If the Port Commission objects to or seeks to modify the design
19 recommendations of the Committee, the Port Commission may request Planning Commission
20 review of the design recommendations of the Committee. The Planning Commission shall
21 schedule a public hearing and review the design recommendations of the Committee within
22 20 days following receipt of the request, if legally adequate environmental documents have
23 been completed, or at its first public meeting after such documents have been completed,
24 unless the Port Director agrees to a different date. At the request of the Port Director, the
25

1 meeting shall be conducted as a joint public hearing of the Planning Commission and the Port
2 Commission.

3 If the Port Commission objects to or seeks to substantially modify design
4 recommendations that have been approved by the Planning Commission as set forth above,
5 the Port Commission may appeal the design recommendations to the Board of Supervisors
6 pursuant to the procedures set forth in Section 308.1 of this Code and in Charter Section
7 4.105 for appeals of Conditional Uses. The Board of Supervisors may disapprove the decision
8 of the Commission by a vote of not less than two-thirds of the members of the Board.

9 (B) For a project that requires a conditional use authorization, the Director of
10 Planning shall incorporate the design recommendations of the Committee on urban design
11 issues related to the proposed project into the recommendation to the Planning Commission.
12 The Director of Planning may recommend specific modifications to the Committee's design
13 recommendations, in which case the Director's recommendation shall specify why the
14 Committee's design recommendations should not be considered final. The Director of
15 Planning shall schedule a public hearing before the Planning Commission within 30 days
16 following receipt of the Committee's design recommendations, if legally adequate
17 environmental documents have been completed, or at its first public meeting after such
18 documents have been completed, unless the Port Director agrees to a different date.

19 (d) A project within a Waterfront Special Use District shall be reviewed under the
20 ~~standards~~provisions set forth in Sections 240.1 through 240.4 for the Waterfront Special Use
21 District within which boundaries it is located, and shall not be considered, for review purposes
22 under this Code, as including or being part of a project within an adjoining Waterfront Special
23 Use District, notwithstanding the timing of development, the physical proximity or type of uses
24 associated with any other such projects, or the applicant or other person or agency initiating
25 the action.

1 **SEC. 240.1. WATERFRONT SPECIAL USE DISTRICT NO. 1.**

2 The following provisions shall apply within Waterfront Special Use District No. 1:

3 (a) **Accessory Uses Related to Maritime Uses.** A related minor use that is
4 identified as an acceptable, existing, or interim land use in the Waterfront ~~Land Use~~ Plan
5 adopted by the Port Commission and that is either necessary to the operation or enjoyment of
6 a Maritime Use, as defined in Section 102 of this Code, or is appropriate, incidental, and
7 subordinate to any such use, shall be permitted as an accessory use when located on the
8 same lot, provided that the minor use does not itself occupy~~involve the use of~~ more than one-
9 third of the site area occupied by such minor use and the principal or conditional use to which
10 it is accessory, except in the case of accessory off-street parking and loading.

11 (b) **Principal Uses shall include:**

12 (1) Maritime Uses as defined in Section 102 of this Code.

13 (2) Any use that is listed in this Code as a permitted use in the district established
14 by Section 201 applicable to the particular property involved shall be permitted as a principal
15 use if the use is identified as an acceptable, existing, or interim land use in the Waterfront
16 ~~Land Use~~ Plan adopted by the Port Commission.

17 (c) **Conditional Uses** shall include any use that is listed in this Code as a
18 conditional use in the district established by Section 201 applicable to the particular property
19 involved, provided that the use is identified as an acceptable, existing, or interim land use in
20 the Waterfront ~~Land Use~~ Plan adopted by the Port Commission. The specific use or uses
21 requiring a conditional use within a project, and not the project in its entirety, shall be subject
22 to the provisions set forth in Section 303 and Article 3.5 of this Code and ~~§~~subsection (d),
23 below.

24 (d) Any use, other than Maritime Uses defined in Section 102 of this Code, that is
25 listed in this Code as a permitted use or conditional use in the use district established by

1 Section 201 applicable to the particular property involved, that involves (1) new construction
2 or (2) projects with lease terms longer than 10 years that include substantial exterior alterations
3 visible from the street or other major public site, excluding minor changes including but not
4 limited to maintenance, alterations, and repairs involving replacing features with similar
5 features or adding similar features; restoration of preexisting conditions; and signs, awnings,
6 or canopies, shall be subject to review of the urban design of the proposed use under the
7 waterfront design review process, as provided under Section 240(c) of this Code.

8 (e) In considering any application in this special use district under Section 303 of
9 this Code, the Planning Commission shall consider the following criteria in lieu of the criteria
10 set forth in Section 303(c):

11 (1) That such use or feature as proposed is consistent with the Waterfront ~~Land~~
12 ~~Use-Plan (WLUP)~~ adopted by the Port Commission, including any amendments thereto which
13 the Planning Commission has found to be consistent with the General Plan;

14 (2) That the design of such use or feature as proposed is consistent with the ~~WLUP~~
15 ~~Waterfront Design and Access goals, policies, and criteria adopted by the Port Commission~~ Waterfront
16 Plan urban design, historic preservation, and public access goals, policies, and objectives, including
17 any amendments thereto which the Planning Commission has found to be consistent with the
18 General Plan;

19 (3) Provision to the extent feasible, along the sea wall and along the perimeters of
20 piers or platforms, of public access and of open spaces available for public use and suitable
21 for viewing purposes or water-oriented recreation;

22 (4) Limitation of water coverage in the Northern Waterfront area from the Hyde
23 Street Pier to Pier 46 so as not to exceed the degree of coverage by piers as existing ~~at the~~
24 ~~effective date of this Section~~ as of February 16, 1998;

1 (5) Construction of new piers or platforms so that the water's edge shall be
2 maintained at the sea wall where feasible;

3 (6) Provision or maintenance of view corridors along streets into the Bay, and of
4 panoramic views, in accordance with the view policies of the Northeastern Waterfront Plan, a
5 part of the General Plan; and

6 (7) Development over the water generally on piers or platforms rather than on fill.

7 (f) The basic Floor Area Ratio limit shall be 5.0 to 1 to the extent provided in Section
8 124(e) of this Code. To calculate the Floor Area Ratio on piers under the jurisdiction of the
9 Port Commission, all building permit applications shall include a map of the lot or lease area
10 with precise boundaries showing its location on the pier under consideration. The proposed lot
11 shall be reviewed and approved as part of the building permit and be the basis for further
12 alterations or expansions of the structure.

13 **SEC. 240.2. WATERFRONT SPECIAL USE DISTRICT NO. 2.**

14 The following provisions shall apply within Waterfront Special Use District No. 2:

15 (a) Industrial, commercial, and other operations directly related to the conduct of
16 waterborne commerce or navigation shall be permitted as Principal Uses, except in residential
17 zoning districts.

18 (b) A Hotel or Motel, if otherwise listed in this Code as a permitted use, shall be
19 permitted only upon approval by the Planning Commission as a Conditional Use under
20 Section 303 of this Code.

21 (c) An Automotive Service Station, if otherwise listed in this Code as a permitted use,
22 shall be permitted only upon approval by the Planning Commission as a Conditional Use
23 under Section 303 of this Code.

24 (d) Any building or use which provides a greater number of off-street parking spaces
25 than required under Section 151 of this Code shall be permitted only upon approval by the

1 Planning Commission as a ~~e~~Conditional ~~u~~Use under Section 303 of this Code; provided,
2 however, that this subsection (d) shall not apply in any case where fewer than 10 such spaces
3 are provided. Any building or use which provides 10 or more off-street parking spaces shall be
4 permitted only upon approval by the Planning Commission as a Conditional Use under
5 Section 303 of this Code.

6 ~~Any Use, whether Principal or Accessory, not screened from view from adjacent streets and~~
7 ~~other public areas, with the exception of accessory off street parking areas for nine or fewer~~
8 ~~automobiles, shall be permitted only upon approval by the Planning Commission as a Conditional Use~~
9 ~~under Section 303 of this Code.~~

10 * * * *

11 **SEC. 240.3. WATERFRONT SPECIAL USE DISTRICT NO. 3.**

12 The following provisions shall apply within Waterfront Special Use District No. 3:

13 (a) Industrial, commercial, and other operations directly related to the conduct of
14 waterborne commerce or navigation shall be permitted as Principal Uses.

15 (b) A wholesale establishment conducted entirely within an enclosed building shall
16 be permitted as a Principal Use.

17 (c) Any development on property not under the jurisdiction of the Port Commission
18 which includes an area (excluding the area of public streets and alleys) of at least three acres
19 shall be permitted only upon approval by the Planning Commission according to the
20 procedures for conditional use approval in Section 303 of this Code. In considering any
21 application for such a development under Section 303, the Planning Commission shall
22 consider the following criteria in addition to those stated in Section 303(c):

23 (1) Conformance to the Northeastern Waterfront Plan, a part of the General Plan,
24 including streets and roadways as indicated therein;

25

1 (2) Assurance of a general profile for development having higher portions near
2 Telegraph Hill or other inland areas and lower portions near The Embarcadero;

3 (3) Assurance of view corridors along public streets between Telegraph Hill or
4 other inland areas and the waterfront and Bay;

5 (4) Provision of open spaces available to the public; and

6 (5) Adherence to the character of surrounding areas of the City.

7 (d) Any new development (excluding alterations to existing development) on property
8 under the jurisdiction of the Port Commission that requires a Port lease of more than 10 years,
9 ~~(excluding alterations to existing development) and which~~ includes an area ~~(excluding the area of~~
10 ~~public streets and alleys)~~ of at least ½ acre (excluding the area of public streets and alleys) shall be
11 subject to review of the urban design of the proposed use by the waterfront design review
12 process, as provided under Section 240(c) of this Code.

13 (e) In considering any application for development on property under the jurisdiction
14 of the Port Commission on which a specific use or uses require a conditional use, the specific
15 use or uses requiring a conditional use within a project, and not the project in its entirety, shall
16 be subject to the provisions set forth in Section 303 and Article 3.5 of this Code. The Planning
17 Commission shall consider the following criteria in lieu of those stated in Section 303(c):

18 (1) That such use or feature as proposed is consistent with the Waterfront ~~Land~~
19 ~~Use Plan (WLUP)~~ and the design of the use is consistent with Waterfront Plan urban design, historic
20 preservation, and public access ~~its WLUP Waterfront Design and Access~~ goals, policies, and
21 objectives ~~criteria~~, adopted by the Port Commission, including any amendments thereto which
22 the Planning Commission has found to be consistent with the General Plan;

23 (2) Assurance of a general profile for development having higher portions near
24 Telegraph Hill or other inland areas and lower portions near The Embarcadero;

25 ~~—(3) [Reserved.]~~

1 (34) Assurance of view corridors along public streets between Telegraph Hill or
2 other inland areas and the waterfront and Bay, in accordance with the view policies of the
3 Northeastern Waterfront Plan, a part of the General Plan;

4 (45) Provision of open spaces available to the public consistent with the
5 Waterfront Plan urban design and open space Design and Access goals, policies, and
6 objectives/criteria; and

7 (56) Adherence to the character of surrounding areas of the City.

8 (f) A Hotel or Motel, if otherwise listed in this Code as a Permitted Use, shall be
9 permitted only upon approval by the Planning Commission as a Conditional Use under
10 Section 303 of this Code.

11 (g) An Automotive Service Station, if otherwise listed in this Code as a Permitted
12 Use, shall be permitted only upon approval by the Planning Commission as a Conditional Use
13 under Section 303 of this Code.

14 (h) Any building or use which provides a greater number of off-street parking spaces
15 than required under Section 151 of this Code shall be permitted only upon approval by the
16 Planning Commission as a conditional use under Section 303 of this Code; provided,
17 however, that this subsection (h) shall not apply (1) in any case where fewer than 10 such
18 spaces are provided, or (2) for property under the jurisdiction of the Port of San Francisco, to
19 the extent such off-street parking spaces existed as of ~~the effective date of this~~
20 ~~Subsection~~ February 16, 1998. Any building or use which provides 10 or more off-street parking
21 spaces shall be permitted only upon approval by the Planning Commission as a Conditional
22 Use under Section 303 of this Code.

23 ~~(i) Any use, whether Principal or Accessory, not screened from view from adjacent streets~~
24 ~~and other public areas, with the exception of temporary uses pursuant to Section 205.1, accessory off-~~
25 ~~street parking areas for nine or fewer automobiles, or off street parking areas on property under the~~

1 ~~jurisdiction of the Port of San Francisco in existence as of the effective date of this subsection, shall be~~
2 ~~permitted only upon approval by the Planning Commission as a Conditional Use under Section 303 of~~
3 ~~this Code.~~

4 (j) The basic Floor Area Ratio limit shall be 5.0 to 1 to the extent provided in
5 Section 124(e) of this Code.

6 **SEC. 240.4. WATERFRONT SPECIAL USE DISTRICT NO. 4.**

7 The following provisions shall apply within Waterfront Special Use District No. 4:

8 (a) Accessory Uses Related to Maritime Uses. A related minor use that is identified as an
9 acceptable, existing, or interim land use in the Waterfront Plan adopted by the Port Commission and
10 that is either necessary to the operation or enjoyment of a Maritime Use, as defined in Section 102 of
11 this Code, or is appropriate, incidental, and subordinate to any such use, shall be permitted as an
12 accessory use when located on the same lot, provided that the minor use does not itself occupy more
13 than one-third of the site area occupied by such minor use and the principal or conditional use to
14 which it is accessory, except in the case of accessory off-street parking and loading.

15 (b) Principal Uses. Principal uses shall include:

16 (1) Maritime Uses as defined in Section 102 of this Code.

17 (2) Any use that is listed in this Code as a permitted use in the district established by
18 Section 201 applicable to the particular property involved shall be permitted as a principal use if the
19 use is identified as an acceptable, existing, or interim land use in the Waterfront Plan adopted by the
20 Port Commission.

21 (c) Conditional Uses. Conditional uses shall include any use that is listed in this Code as a
22 conditional use in the district established by Section 201 applicable to the particular property involved,
23 provided that the use is identified as an acceptable, existing, or interim land use in the Waterfront Plan
24 adopted by the Port Commission. The specific use or uses requiring a conditional use within a project,
25

1 and not the project in its entirety, shall be subject to the provisions set forth in Section 303 and Article
2 3.5 of this Code and subsection (d) below.

3 (d) Any new development (excluding alterations to existing development) on property under
4 the jurisdiction of the Port Commission that requires a Port lease of more than 10 years, and includes
5 an area of at least 1/2 acre (excluding the area of public streets and alleys) shall be subject to review of
6 the urban design of the proposed use by the waterfront design review process, as provided under
7 Section 240(c) of this code.

8 (e) In considering any application in this special use district under Section 303 of this Code,
9 the Planning Commission shall consider the following criteria along with the criteria set forth in
10 Section 303(c). Only the specific use or uses requiring a conditional use within a project, and not the
11 project in its entirety, shall be subject to the following criteria:

12 (1) That such use or feature as proposed is consistent with the Waterfront Plan
13 adopted by the Port Commission, including any amendments thereto which the Planning Commission
14 has found to be consistent with the General Plan; and

15 (2) That the design of such use or feature as proposed is consistent with the
16 Waterfront Plan urban design, historic preservation, and public access goals, policies, and objectives
17 adopted by the Port Commission, including any amendments thereto which the Planning Commission
18 has found to be consistent with the General Plan.

19
20 Section 3. Effective Date. This ordinance shall become effective 30 days after
21 enactment. Enactment occurs when the Mayor signs the ordinance, the Mayor returns the
22 ordinance unsigned or does not sign the ordinance within ten days of receiving it, or the Board
23 of Supervisors overrides the Mayor's veto of the ordinance.

1 Section 4. Scope of Ordinance. In enacting this ordinance, the Board of Supervisors
2 intends to amend only those words, phrases, paragraphs, subsections, sections, articles,
3 numbers, punctuation marks, charts, diagrams, or any other constituent parts of the Municipal
4 Code that are explicitly shown in this ordinance as additions, deletions, Board amendment
5 additions, and Board amendment deletions in accordance with the “Note” that appears under
6 the official title of the ordinance.

7

8 APPROVED AS TO FORM:
9 DAVID CHIU, City Attorney

10 By: /s/ Peter R. Miljanich
11 PETER R. MILJANICH
 Deputy City Attorney

12 n:\legana\as2023\2300067\01669964.docx

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25



PLANNING COMMISSION RESOLUTION NO. 21305

Project Name: General Plan Amendments associated with the Port of San Francisco Waterfront Plan Update
Case Number: 2019-023037GPA MAP PCA
Initiated by: Planning Commission
Staff Contact: Mat Snyder, Citywide Planning
Mathew.snyder@sfgov.org, (628) 652-7460
Reviewed by: Lily Langlois, Principal Planner, Citywide Planning
Lily.Langlois@sfgov.org, (628) 652-7472

INITIATING AMENDMENTS TO ZONING MAPS ZN-08, TO REZONE A PORTION OF ASSESSOR’S BLOCK 3941 LOT 031 FROM P (PUBLIC) TO M-1 (LIGHT MANUFACTURING), AND AMENDMENTS TO ZONING MAPS SU-08 AND SU-09, TO ESTABLISH WATERFRONT SPECIAL USE DISTRICT NO. 4 THAT WOULD GENERALLY ENCOMPASS PROPERTIES UNDER PORT JURISDICTION SOUTH OF MISSION ROCK; ADOPTING FINDINGS, INCLUDING ENVIRONMENTAL FINDINGS, PLANNING CODE SECTION 302 FINDINGS, AND FINDINGS OF CONSISTENCY WITH THE GENERAL PLAN AND PLANNING CODE SECTION 101.1.

WHEREAS, Pursuant to Planning Code Section 302 the Planning Commission (“Commission”) initiated a Planning Code to amend Zoning Maps ZN-08, SU-08, and SU-09, per Planning Commission Resolution No. 21273, on March 9, 2023.

WHEREAS, Lot 31 of Assessor’s Block 3941 includes several businesses that legally exist on the site; the parcel had inadvertently been rezoned sometime in the past to P (Public), a designation intended for public entities not private entities that exist on the site; the Port wishes to amend the Zoning Map to reestablish the M-1 (Light Industrial) Zoning consistent with other Port owned properties that contain similar private businesses; and

WHEREAS, the Port is proposing to create a new Waterfront Special Use District No. 4 under Planning Code Section 240 to encompass most Port owned property along the waterfront generally east and south of Mission Rock to assure adequate and transparent design review of development projects along the southern waterfront similar to design review of development projects along the northeastern waterfront; and

WHEREAS, Provisions in Planning Code Section 240 implement, in part, policies of the Port of San Francisco’s Waterfront Plan. The Waterfront Plan (previously the Waterfront Land Use Plan) is the long-range plan that set forth policies for the use and improvement of properties owned and managed by the Port of San Francisco,

developed pursuant to requirements in Proposition H approved by San Francisco voters in 1990, which was adopted by the Port Commission in 1997, with occasional subsequent amendments that were approved by the Port Commission; and

WHEREAS, the San Francisco Port Commission (“Port Commission”) directed the creation of a Waterfront Plan Working Group to lead a public planning process and public discussions about existing waterfront activities, regulations, challenges, public desires and needs to incorporate diverse viewpoints and perspectives to develop policy recommendations to update the Waterfront Land Use Plan; and

WHEREAS, The Working Group recommendations updated or added new goals and policies in nine categories to expand the breadth of content and policy direction, such that the Port has renamed the document to, simply, the Waterfront Plan which addresses: Maritime & Water-dependent Uses; Diverse Non-Maritime Uses; Public Access & Open Space; Urban Design & Historic Preservation; A Financially Strong Port; Transportation and Mobility; Environmental Sustainability; A Resilient Port; Community Engagement and Partnering; and updated objectives for five waterfront subareas that flow from the new goals and policies: Fisherman’s Wharf, Northeastern Waterfront, South Beach, Mission Bay and Southern Waterfront; and

WHEREAS, In conjunction with the updates to the Waterfront Plan, Port staff recommends several amendments to Planning Code Section 240. A key provision of Section 240 is the establishment of the WDAC which provides advise to the Planning and Port Commission on the design of certain projects under Port jurisdiction, within two of three of the Waterfront SUD sub-Special Use Districts (Waterfront SUD No. 1 and No. 3). There is not a special use district for Port properties in the Southern Waterfront, specifically east and south of Mission Rock. These amendments, among other provisions, create a new Special Use District No. 4 to extend the established design review process for properties under Port jurisdiction east and south of Mission Rock, thereby assuring equitable and transparent review of projects in the Southern Waterfront. This Zoning Map amendment would officially assign most parcels under Port jurisdiction east and south of Mission Rock to Waterfront SUD No. 4; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Department as the Lead Agency responsible for the implementation of CEQA, California Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq., the Guidelines for Implementation of CEQA, 14 California Code of Regulations Section 15000 et seq. (“CEQA Guidelines”), and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code, and undertook an environmental review process for the proposed Waterfront Plan Project and related General Plan, Planning Code, and Zoning Map amendments and provide appropriate public hearings before the Planning Commission; and

WHEREAS, on February 23, 2022, the Planning Department published the Waterfront Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report (“DEIR”) for the Waterfront Plan Project (Case No. 2019-023037ENV), which included the December 2019 Draft Waterfront Plan, and amendments to the San Francisco General Plan, San Francisco Planning Code and Zoning Map, and BCDC Special Area Plan, and provided public notice in a newspaper of general circulation of the availability of the DEIR for public review and comment and of the date and time of the Planning Commission public hearing on the DEIR; this notice was mailed to the Department’s list of persons requesting such notice. Notices of availability of the DEIR and the date and time of the public hearing were posted near the project site by the Department beginning on February 23, 2022. The DEIR contains analysis at a “program level” pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15168 for the adoption and implementation of the Waterfront Plan; and

WHEREAS, on March 24, 2022, the Planning Commission held a duly advertised public hearing on the DEIR, at which an opportunity for public comment was given, and public comment was received on the DEIR. The period for commenting on the DEIR ended on April 25, 2022. The Department prepared responses to comments on environmental issues received during the 60-day public review period for the DEIR, prepared revisions to the text of the DEIR in response to comments received or based on additional information that became available during the public review period, and corrected clerical errors in the DEIR; and

WHEREAS, between September and December 2022, Port staff produced further proposed revisions to the Waterfront Plan to incorporate information updates, technical edits, and policy refinements, which underwent public review and comment and were presented to the Port Commission at its September 13, 2022 and January 24, 2023 meetings, and which revisions were reviewed by the Planning Department staff and determined to not result in any required changes to the information or conclusions in the FEIR; and on January 19, 2023, the Planning Department published a Responses to Comments document. A Final Environmental Impact Report (hereinafter “FEIR”) has been prepared by the Department, consisting of the DEIR, any consultations and comments received during the review process, any additional information that became available, and the Responses to Comments document, all as required by law; and

WHEREAS, on March 10, 2020, the Planning Department published an Errata to the FEIR, and on March 16, 2020, the Planning Commission reviewed and considered the FEIR (including the Errata) and found that the contents of said report and the procedures through which the FEIR was prepared, publicized, and reviewed comply with the provisions of CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code. The FEIR was certified by the Planning Commission on March 19, 2023.

WHEREAS, on April 5, 2023, the Planning Department published Addendum No. 1 to the FEIR (the “Addendum”), and determined that the additional information in Addendum No. 1 does not change the analyses and conclusions presented in the FEIR. The Addendum provides additional language to clarify the CEQA review process for subsequent projects; and

WHEREAS, on April 11, 2023, the San Francisco Port Commission (“Port Commission”) approved the Waterfront Plan by Resolution No. 23-15, which incorporated the adoption of CEQA Findings and a statement of overriding considerations [\[link\]](#); and

WHEREAS, On January 12, 2023, The Planning Department issued a Common Sense Exemption for the rezoning of Block 031 in Assessor’s Block 3941 under Case No. 2023-00037PRJ.

WHEREAS, the Commission has heard and considered the testimony presented to it at the public hearing and has further considered written materials and oral testimony presented on behalf of Department staff and other interested parties; and

WHEREAS, all pertinent documents may be found in the files of the Department, as the Custodian of Records, at 49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco; and

A draft ordinance, attached hereto as Exhibit A, would amend Planning Code Section 240 pursuant to Planning Code Section 302.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Planning Commission hereby finds that the Zoning Map Amendments promote the public welfare, convenience and necessity for the following reasons:

- By creating a new Waterfront Special Use District No. 4 under Planning Code Section 240, development projects on Port properties in the Southern Waterfront would be subject to the Waterfront Design Advisory Committee review, which would help assure better quality and transparent review of such projects.
- By rezoning Lot 31 of Assessor's Block 3941 back to M-1 (Light Industrial) the existing businesses can remain as conforming uses consistent with the Port's intention for the lot as laid out in the Waterfront Plan.
- The proposed amendments are in general conformity with the General Plan, as amended, and Planning Code Section 101.1 as described in Planning Commission Resolution No. 21303.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Commission has reviewed and considered the CEQA Findings, including the statement of overriding considerations, that the Port Commission adopted, and hereby adopts these CEQA Findings as its own; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Commission has reviewed the Addendum and hereby agrees with its analysis and findings, including the determination that the additional information in Addendum #1 does not change the analyses and conclusions presented in the FEIR, and has considered the Addendum as part of the decisions described in this Resolution; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that pursuant to Planning Code Section 302 the Commission adopts a Resolution to recommend to the Board of Supervisors approval of amendments Planning Code Zoning Maps ZN-08, SU-08, and SU-09;

I hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was adopted by the Commission at its meeting on April 20, 2023.

Laura Lynch

Laura Lynch
Acting Commission Secretary

AYES: Braun, Diamond, Imperial , Koppel, Moore, Tanner

NOES: None

ABSENT: Ruiz

ADOPTED: April 20, 2023

1 [Planning Code - Port of San Francisco Waterfront Plan Update]

2

3 **Ordinance amending the Planning Code to revise certain Waterfront Special Use**
 4 **District controls and to add Waterfront Special Use District No. 4 covering areas east of**
 5 **the Mission Bay and Southern Waterfront areas; and making environmental findings,**
 6 **including adopting a statement of overriding considerations, and findings of**
 7 **consistency with the General Plan and the eight priority policies of Planning Code,**
 8 **Section 101.1, and findings of public necessity, convenience, and welfare under**
 9 **Planning Code, Section 302.**

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

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

18

19 Section 1. Environmental and Planning Code Findings.

20 (a) On _____, after a duly noticed public hearing, the Planning Commission, by
 21 Motion No. _____, certified the Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Port of
 22 San Francisco’s Waterfront Plan (the Project), which updates and amends the Port’s 1997
 23 Waterfront Land Use Plan and sets long term goals and policies to guide the use,
 24 management, and improvement of properties owned and managed by the Port. The Planning
 25 Commission motion finds that the Final EIR reflects the independent judgment and analysis of
 the City and County of San Francisco, is adequate, accurate and objective, contains no
 significant revisions to the Draft EIR, and the content of the report and the procedures through

1 which the Final EIR was prepared, publicized, and reviewed comply with the provisions of the
2 California Environmental Quality Act (California Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et
3 seq.), the CEQA Guidelines (14 Cal. Code Regs. Section 15000 et seq.), and Chapter 31 of
4 the San Francisco Administrative Code. Copies of the Planning Commission Motion and Final
5 EIR are on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. ___ and are incorporated
6 herein by reference. The Board affirms this determination.

7 (b) The Project evaluated in the Final EIR includes the proposed amendments to the
8 Planning Code set forth in this ordinance as well as amendments to the General Plan and the
9 Zoning Map. The proposed Planning Code amendments set forth in this ordinance are within
10 the scope of the Project evaluated in the Final EIR.

11 (c) On _____, the Port Commission, in Motion No. _____, adopted
12 findings under CEQA regarding the Project's environmental impacts, the disposition of
13 mitigation measures, and project alternatives, as well as a statement of overriding
14 considerations (CEQA Findings), and adopted a mitigation monitoring reporting program
15 (MMRP). A copy of said Motion is on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No.
16 _____, and is incorporated herein by reference.

17 (d) On _____, the Planning Commission, in Motion No. _____, adopted
18 findings under CEQA regarding the Project's environmental impacts, the disposition of
19 mitigation measures, and project alternatives, as well as a statement of overriding
20 considerations (CEQA Findings) and adopted a mitigation monitoring reporting program
21 (MMRP). A copy of said Motion is on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No.
22 _____, and is incorporated herein by reference.

23 (e) On _____, the Planning Commission, in Resolution No. _____,
24 recommended the proposed Planning Code amendments for approval and adopted findings
25 that the actions contemplated in this ordinance are consistent, on balance, with the City's

1 General Plan and eight priority policies of Planning Code Section 101.1. The Board adopts
2 these findings as its own. A copy of said Resolution is on file with the Clerk of the Board of
3 Supervisors in File No. _____, and is incorporated herein by reference.

4 (f) On _____, the Planning Commission, in Resolution No. _____,
5 adopted findings under Planning Code section 302 that the actions contemplated in this
6 ordinance will serve the public necessity, convenience, and welfare. The Board adopts these
7 findings as its own. A copy of said Resolution is on file with the Clerk of the Board of
8 Supervisors in File No. _____, and is incorporated herein by reference.

9 (g) The Board of Supervisors has reviewed and considered the Final EIR and the
10 environmental documents on file referred to herein. The Board of Supervisors has reviewed
11 and considered the CEQA Findings, and hereby adopts them as its own and incorporates
12 them by reference as though such findings were fully set forth in this ordinance.

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

17 (i) The Board of Supervisors finds that since certification of the Final EIR no
18 substantial changes have occurred in the proposed Project that would require revisions in the
19 Final EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial
20 increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects, no substantial changes have
21 occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the proposed Project is to be
22 undertaken that would require major revisions to the Final EIR due to the involvement of new
23 environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of effects identified in the Final
24 EIR, and no new information of substantial importance to the proposed Project has become
25 available which indicates that (1) the Project will have significant effects not discussed in the

1 Final EIR, (2) significant environmental effects will be substantially more severe, (3) mitigation
2 measure or alternatives found not feasible that would reduce one or more significant effects
3 have become feasible, or (4) mitigation measures or alternatives that are considerably
4 different from those in the Final EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects
5 on the environment.

6
7 Section 2. Article 2 of the Planning Code is hereby amended by revising Sections 240,
8 240.1, 240.2, and 240.3, and adding Section 240.4, as follows:

9 **SEC. 240. WATERFRONT SPECIAL USE DISTRICT.**

10 (a) **Purpose.** In order to provide for certain areas with unique natural and man-
11 made physical characteristics, distinct historic and maritime character, special traffic, parking,
12 and use considerations, recognized development potential, and proximity to residential,
13 public, and commercial areas of regional, national, and international significance which should
14 be protected from adverse adjacent development, there shall be ~~three-four~~ Waterfront Special
15 Use Districts, Numbers 1, 2, ~~and 3,~~ and 4, as designated on Sectional Maps No. 1 SU, 8 SU,
16 and 9 SU* of the Zoning Map. The original copy of said Sectional Maps with these Special Use
17 Districts indicated thereon is on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors under File No.
18 171-70-4, pursuant to Ordinance No. 131-70 and subsequent amendments ~~thereunder File No.~~
19 _____. The provisions set forth in Sections 240.1 through ~~240.3~~240.4 shall apply, respectively,
20 within these Special Use Districts, and shall be applicable to all property, whether public or
21 private, including property under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Port Commission.

22 (b) **State and Regional Land Use Controls.** Much of the property within Waterfront
23 Special Use District Numbers 1, ~~and 3,~~ and 4 is subject to land use controls in addition to those
24 set forth in this Code. Most of the land under the jurisdiction of the Port Commission is public
25 trust land and is subject to use limitations as provided in California Statutes of 1968, Chapter

1 1333, as amended (the "Burton Act") and the San Francisco Charter. In the event of a conflict
2 between the provisions of the Burton Act and this Code, the State legislation prevails. A
3 portion of the property under the Port Commission's jurisdiction is further subject to use
4 limitations as provided in the California Government Code, Sections 66600 et seq. (the
5 "McAteer-Petris Act"). The San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission is
6 responsible for implementing the provisions of the McAteer-Petris Act. Other property within
7 ~~this~~these Waterfront Special Use Districts is subject to redevelopment plans adopted by the
8 Board of Supervisors.

9 (c) **Waterfront Design Review Process.**

10 (1) In order to best achieve the public objectives that have been established in law
11 and policy for the property under the jurisdiction of the Port Commission, a waterfront design
12 review process is hereby established to review the urban design of new development on
13 certain land under the Port Commission's jurisdiction within ~~the~~ Waterfront Special Use
14 Districts Numbers 1, 3, and 4, consistent with applicable provisions of the Port's Waterfront ~~Land~~
15 ~~Use Plan and its Waterfront Design and Access goals, objectives and criteria, urban design, historic~~
16 ~~preservation, and public access goals, policies, and objectives,~~ as provided below. The purpose of
17 the waterfront design review process is to identify and integrate the State, regional, and local
18 objectives pertaining to the urban design of major, non-maritime development projects and
19 proposed uses in order to optimize the public enjoyment and beneficial use of this public trust
20 resource.

21 (2) The waterfront design review process shall be conducted by the Waterfront
22 Design Advisory Committee ("Committee"), which shall consist of five members. ~~a Design Advisory~~
23 ~~Committee. The Mayor shall appoint a qualified professional urban planner or architect (general,~~
24 ~~historic or landscape) who resides or works in San Francisco as one member.~~ The Director of
25 Planning and the Director of the Port of San Francisco shall each appoint two members who

1 ~~are, consisting of (1) a senior member from their respective staffs and (2) a~~ qualified professional
2 urban planner_s or architect_s (general, historic, or landscape) who resides or works in San
3 Francisco, and are not employed within their agency. In addition to these members, the Director of
4 the Port shall also appoint one member who is a historic preservation professional who meets the
5 Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standard. Port of San Francisco staff shall
6 maintain Committee records and administrative procedures reflecting the roster, qualifications, and
7 terms for each Committee member. ~~Of the original appointments, the Mayor's appointment shall serve~~
8 ~~for a four year term and the Planning Director and Port Director shall each appoint one member for a~~
9 ~~two year term and one member for a four year term. After expiration of the original terms, all~~
10 ~~appointments shall be for four year terms.~~ The Port Commission may ~~is granted the authority to~~
11 increase the number of Committee members by adding representatives appointed by the
12 Director of the Bay Conservation and Development Commission, if needed. The
13 ~~Committee~~ Design Advisory Committee shall select a chairperson from among its voting
14 members, and shall establish rules and regulations for its own organization and procedure.
15 The ~~Committee~~ Committee may establish subcommittees to which it may assign Committee
16 design review responsibilities. The Committee shall act by vote of a majority of those present
17 at a meeting with a quorum of Committee members.

18 (3) The ~~Design Advisory~~ Committee shall review proposed projects to be developed
19 on property of the Port of San Francisco, as set forth in Sections 240.1, 240.3, and ~~240.34~~
20 of this Code.

21 (4) The ~~Design Advisory~~ Committee shall be advisory to the Planning Department
22 and Port of San Francisco, and shall provide its design recommendations to the Bay
23 Conservation and Development Commission for proposed projects within its jurisdiction. The
24 Port shall convene and provide staff assistance to the Committee and consult with the
25

1 Committee on non-maritime development projects as set forth in this Code and at such other
2 times as the Port deems appropriate.

3 ~~(5) The Planning Commission and the Port Commission shall hold a joint hearing within~~
4 ~~two years from the date of adoption of this ordinance to evaluate the design review process and make~~
5 ~~recommendations to the Board of Supervisors for its improvement.~~

6 (65) The Committee shall hold a public hearing on a proposed project and make
7 design recommendations to ensure that the urban design of the proposed project is consistent
8 with applicable provisions of the Waterfront ~~Land Use Plan's Waterfront Design and Access goals,~~
9 ~~objectives and criteria~~ urban design, historic preservation, and public access goals, policies, and
10 objectives. In addition to any other notice required by law, the Committee shall provide public
11 notice for this hearing by electronic mail to the applicant or other person or agency initiating
12 the action and other parties who have requested ~~mailed notice of such hearing on the project in~~
13 ~~writing~~ notice of such hearing on the project and submitted their contact information to the Port of San
14 Francisco.

15 (76) The Committee, as an advisory board, must review and consider any final
16 environmental documents, or draft documents if final documents are not yet available,
17 prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act, before it makes its final
18 recommendations.

19 (87) The determination of the Committee on urban design issues related to the
20 proposed project shall be final as to those design issues, except as provided below. The
21 Committee shall transmit the design recommendations to the Planning Department and Port,
22 and to the Bay Conservation and Development Commission for proposed projects within
23 BCDC's jurisdiction, ~~within five days~~ two weeks following the Committee action for
24 consideration by those agencies prior to any action on the project.

1 (A) For a project that is permitted as a Principal Use, the Planning Commission
2 ~~may~~, by majority vote within 14 days of receipt of the design recommendations of the
3 Committee, make a determination to review the design recommendations. If the item cannot
4 be calendared for Planning Commission consideration within that period due to a canceled
5 meeting, the Commission may consider whether to review the design recommendations at its
6 next available meeting. If the Planning Commission requests review, it shall conduct a public
7 hearing on the matter within 14 days following its determination to review the design
8 recommendations, if legally adequate environmental documents have been completed, or at
9 its first public meeting after such documents have been completed, unless the Port Director
10 agrees to a different date. At the request of the Port Director, the meeting shall be conducted
11 as a joint public hearing of the Planning Commission and the Port Commission. The Planning
12 Commission, by majority vote, may adopt, amend, or reject the design recommendations of
13 the Committee, subject to the same standards and criteria that govern Committee decisions
14 as provided in subsection (c)(~~5~~) above.

15 If the Port Commission accepts the design recommendations of the Committee
16 or of the Planning Commission, the Port Commission shall incorporate the design
17 recommendations into the Port action on the project.

18 If the Port Commission objects to or seeks to modify the design
19 recommendations of the Committee, the Port Commission may request Planning Commission
20 review of the design recommendations of the Committee. The Planning Commission shall
21 schedule a public hearing and review the design recommendations of the Committee within
22 20 days following receipt of the request, if legally adequate environmental documents have
23 been completed, or at its first public meeting after such documents have been completed,
24 unless the Port Director agrees to a different date. At the request of the Port Director, the
25

1 meeting shall be conducted as a joint public hearing of the Planning Commission and the Port
2 Commission.

3 If the Port Commission objects to or seeks to substantially modify design
4 recommendations that have been approved by the Planning Commission as set forth above,
5 the Port Commission may appeal the design recommendations to the Board of Supervisors
6 pursuant to the procedures set forth in Section 308.1 of this Code and in Charter Section
7 4.105 for appeals of Conditional Uses. The Board of Supervisors may disapprove the decision
8 of the Commission by a vote of not less than two-thirds of the members of the Board.

9 (B) For a project that requires a conditional use authorization, the Director of
10 Planning shall incorporate the design recommendations of the Committee on urban design
11 issues related to the proposed project into the recommendation to the Planning Commission.
12 The Director of Planning may recommend specific modifications to the Committee's design
13 recommendations, in which case the Director's recommendation shall specify why the
14 Committee's design recommendations should not be considered final. The Director of
15 Planning shall schedule a public hearing before the Planning Commission within 30 days
16 following receipt of the Committee's design recommendations, if legally adequate
17 environmental documents have been completed, or at its first public meeting after such
18 documents have been completed, unless the Port Director agrees to a different date.

19 (d) A project within a Waterfront Special Use District shall be reviewed under the
20 ~~standards~~provisions set forth in Sections 240.1 through 240.4 for the Waterfront Special Use
21 District within which boundaries it is located, and shall not be considered, for review purposes
22 under this Code, as including or being part of a project within an adjoining Waterfront Special
23 Use District, notwithstanding the timing of development, the physical proximity or type of uses
24 associated with any other such projects, or the applicant or other person or agency initiating
25 the action.

1 **SEC. 240.1. WATERFRONT SPECIAL USE DISTRICT NO. 1.**

2 The following provisions shall apply within Waterfront Special Use District No. 1:

3 (a) **Accessory Uses Related to Maritime Uses.** A related minor use that is
4 identified as an acceptable, existing, or interim land use in the Waterfront ~~Land Use~~ Plan
5 adopted by the Port Commission and that is either necessary to the operation or enjoyment of
6 a Maritime Use, as defined in Section 102 of this Code, or is appropriate, incidental, and
7 subordinate to any such use, shall be permitted as an accessory use when located on the
8 same lot, provided that the minor use does not ~~itself occupy~~ ~~involve the use of~~ more than one-
9 third of the site area occupied by such minor use and the principal or conditional use to which
10 it is accessory, except in the case of accessory off-street parking and loading.

11 (b) **Principal Uses shall include:**

12 (1) Maritime Uses as defined in Section 102 of this Code.

13 (2) Any use that is listed in this Code as a permitted use in the district established
14 by Section 201 applicable to the particular property involved shall be permitted as a principal
15 use if the use is identified as an acceptable, existing, or interim land use in the Waterfront
16 ~~Land Use~~ Plan adopted by the Port Commission.

17 (c) **Conditional Uses** shall include any use that is listed in this Code as a
18 conditional use in the district established by Section 201 applicable to the particular property
19 involved, provided that the use is identified as an acceptable, existing, or interim land use in
20 the Waterfront ~~Land Use~~ Plan adopted by the Port Commission. The specific use or uses
21 requiring a conditional use within a project, and not the project in its entirety, shall be subject
22 to the provisions set forth in Section 303 and Article 3.5 of this Code and ~~§~~ subsection (d),
23 below.

24 (d) Any use, other than Maritime Uses defined in Section 102 of this Code, that is
25 listed in this Code as a permitted use or conditional use in the use district established by

1 Section 201 applicable to the particular property involved, that involves (1) new construction
2 or (2) projects with lease terms longer than 10 years that include substantial exterior alterations
3 visible from the street or other major public site, excluding minor changes including but not
4 limited to maintenance, alterations, and repairs involving replacing features with similar
5 features or adding similar features; restoration of preexisting conditions; and signs, awnings,
6 or canopies, shall be subject to review of the urban design of the proposed use under the
7 waterfront design review process, as provided under Section 240(c) of this Code.

8 (e) In considering any application in this special use district under Section 303 of
9 this Code, the Planning Commission shall consider the following criteria in lieu of the criteria
10 set forth in Section 303(c):

11 (1) That such use or feature as proposed is consistent with the Waterfront ~~Land~~
12 ~~Use-Plan (WLUP)~~ adopted by the Port Commission, including any amendments thereto which
13 the Planning Commission has found to be consistent with the General Plan;

14 (2) That the design of such use or feature as proposed is consistent with the ~~WLUP~~
15 ~~Waterfront Design and Access goals, policies, and criteria adopted by the Port Commission~~ Waterfront
16 Plan urban design, historic preservation, and public access goals, policies, and objectives, including
17 any amendments thereto which the Planning Commission has found to be consistent with the
18 General Plan;

19 (3) Provision to the extent feasible, along the sea wall and along the perimeters of
20 piers or platforms, of public access and of open spaces available for public use and suitable
21 for viewing purposes or water-oriented recreation;

22 (4) Limitation of water coverage in the Northern Waterfront area from the Hyde
23 Street Pier to Pier 46 so as not to exceed the degree of coverage by piers as existing ~~at the~~
24 ~~effective date of this Section~~ as of February 16, 1998;

1 (5) Construction of new piers or platforms so that the water's edge shall be
2 maintained at the sea wall where feasible;

3 (6) Provision or maintenance of view corridors along streets into the Bay, and of
4 panoramic views, in accordance with the view policies of the Northeastern Waterfront Plan, a
5 part of the General Plan; and

6 (7) Development over the water generally on piers or platforms rather than on fill.

7 (f) The basic Floor Area Ratio limit shall be 5.0 to 1 to the extent provided in Section
8 124(e) of this Code. To calculate the Floor Area Ratio on piers under the jurisdiction of the
9 Port Commission, all building permit applications shall include a map of the lot or lease area
10 with precise boundaries showing its location on the pier under consideration. The proposed lot
11 shall be reviewed and approved as part of the building permit and be the basis for further
12 alterations or expansions of the structure.

13 **SEC. 240.2. WATERFRONT SPECIAL USE DISTRICT NO. 2.**

14 The following provisions shall apply within Waterfront Special Use District No. 2:

15 (a) Industrial, commercial, and other operations directly related to the conduct of
16 waterborne commerce or navigation shall be permitted as Principal Uses, except in residential
17 zoning districts.

18 (b) A Hotel or Motel, if otherwise listed in this Code as a permitted use, shall be
19 permitted only upon approval by the Planning Commission as a Conditional Use under
20 Section 303 of this Code.

21 (c) An Automotive Service Station, if otherwise listed in this Code as a permitted use,
22 shall be permitted only upon approval by the Planning Commission as a Conditional Use
23 under Section 303 of this Code.

24 (d) Any building or use which provides a greater number of off-street parking spaces
25 than required under Section 151 of this Code shall be permitted only upon approval by the

1 Planning Commission as a ~~e~~Conditional ~~u~~Use under Section 303 of this Code; provided,
2 however, that this subsection (d) shall not apply in any case where fewer than 10 such spaces
3 are provided. Any building or use which provides 10 or more off-street parking spaces shall be
4 permitted only upon approval by the Planning Commission as a Conditional Use under
5 Section 303 of this Code.

6 ~~Any Use, whether Principal or Accessory, not screened from view from adjacent streets and~~
7 ~~other public areas, with the exception of accessory off street parking areas for nine or fewer~~
8 ~~automobiles, shall be permitted only upon approval by the Planning Commission as a Conditional Use~~
9 ~~under Section 303 of this Code.~~

10 * * * *

11 **SEC. 240.3. WATERFRONT SPECIAL USE DISTRICT NO. 3.**

12 The following provisions shall apply within Waterfront Special Use District No. 3:

13 (a) Industrial, commercial, and other operations directly related to the conduct of
14 waterborne commerce or navigation shall be permitted as Principal Uses.

15 (b) A wholesale establishment conducted entirely within an enclosed building shall
16 be permitted as a Principal Use.

17 (c) Any development on property not under the jurisdiction of the Port Commission
18 which includes an area (excluding the area of public streets and alleys) of at least three acres
19 shall be permitted only upon approval by the Planning Commission according to the
20 procedures for conditional use approval in Section 303 of this Code. In considering any
21 application for such a development under Section 303, the Planning Commission shall
22 consider the following criteria in addition to those stated in Section 303(c):

23 (1) Conformance to the Northeastern Waterfront Plan, a part of the General Plan,
24 including streets and roadways as indicated therein;

25

1 (2) Assurance of a general profile for development having higher portions near
2 Telegraph Hill or other inland areas and lower portions near The Embarcadero;

3 (3) Assurance of view corridors along public streets between Telegraph Hill or
4 other inland areas and the waterfront and Bay;

5 (4) Provision of open spaces available to the public; and

6 (5) Adherence to the character of surrounding areas of the City.

7 (d) Any new development (excluding alterations to existing development) on property
8 under the jurisdiction of the Port Commission that requires a Port lease of more than 10 years,
9 ~~(excluding alterations to existing development) and which~~ includes an area ~~(excluding the area of~~
10 ~~public streets and alleys)~~ of at least ½ acre (excluding the area of public streets and alleys) shall be
11 subject to review of the urban design of the proposed use by the waterfront design review
12 process, as provided under Section 240(c) of this Code.

13 (e) In considering any application for development on property under the jurisdiction
14 of the Port Commission on which a specific use or uses require a conditional use, the specific
15 use or uses requiring a conditional use within a project, and not the project in its entirety, shall
16 be subject to the provisions set forth in Section 303 and Article 3.5 of this Code. The Planning
17 Commission shall consider the following criteria in lieu of those stated in Section 303(c):

18 (1) That such use or feature as proposed is consistent with the Waterfront ~~Land~~
19 ~~Use Plan (WLUP)~~ and the design of the use is consistent with Waterfront Plan urban design, historic
20 preservation, and public access ~~its WLUP Waterfront Design and Access~~ goals, policies, and
21 objectives ~~criteria~~, adopted by the Port Commission, including any amendments thereto which
22 the Planning Commission has found to be consistent with the General Plan;

23 (2) Assurance of a general profile for development having higher portions near
24 Telegraph Hill or other inland areas and lower portions near The Embarcadero;

25 ~~—(3) [Reserved.]~~

1 (34) Assurance of view corridors along public streets between Telegraph Hill or
2 other inland areas and the waterfront and Bay, in accordance with the view policies of the
3 Northeastern Waterfront Plan, a part of the General Plan;

4 (45) Provision of open spaces available to the public consistent with the
5 Waterfront Plan urban design and open space Design and Access goals, policies, and
6 objectives/criteria; and

7 (56) Adherence to the character of surrounding areas of the City.

8 (f) A Hotel or Motel, if otherwise listed in this Code as a Permitted Use, shall be
9 permitted only upon approval by the Planning Commission as a Conditional Use under
10 Section 303 of this Code.

11 (g) An Automotive Service Station, if otherwise listed in this Code as a Permitted
12 Use, shall be permitted only upon approval by the Planning Commission as a Conditional Use
13 under Section 303 of this Code.

14 (h) Any building or use which provides a greater number of off-street parking spaces
15 than required under Section 151 of this Code shall be permitted only upon approval by the
16 Planning Commission as a conditional use under Section 303 of this Code; provided,
17 however, that this subsection (h) shall not apply (1) in any case where fewer than 10 such
18 spaces are provided, or (2) for property under the jurisdiction of the Port of San Francisco, to
19 the extent such off-street parking spaces existed as of ~~the effective date of this~~
20 ~~Subsection~~ February 16, 1998. Any building or use which provides 10 or more off-street parking
21 spaces shall be permitted only upon approval by the Planning Commission as a Conditional
22 Use under Section 303 of this Code.

23 ~~(i) Any use, whether Principal or Accessory, not screened from view from adjacent streets~~
24 ~~and other public areas, with the exception of temporary uses pursuant to Section 205.1, accessory off-~~
25 ~~street parking areas for nine or fewer automobiles, or off street parking areas on property under the~~

1 ~~jurisdiction of the Port of San Francisco in existence as of the effective date of this subsection, shall be~~
2 ~~permitted only upon approval by the Planning Commission as a Conditional Use under Section 303 of~~
3 ~~this Code.~~

4 (j) The basic Floor Area Ratio limit shall be 5.0 to 1 to the extent provided in
5 Section 124(e) of this Code.

6 **SEC. 240.4. WATERFRONT SPECIAL USE DISTRICT NO. 4.**

7 The following provisions shall apply within Waterfront Special Use District No. 4:

8 (a) Accessory Uses Related to Maritime Uses. A related minor use that is identified as an
9 acceptable, existing, or interim land use in the Waterfront Plan adopted by the Port Commission and
10 that is either necessary to the operation or enjoyment of a Maritime Use, as defined in Section 102 of
11 this Code, or is appropriate, incidental, and subordinate to any such use, shall be permitted as an
12 accessory use when located on the same lot, provided that the minor use does not itself occupy more
13 than one-third of the site area occupied by such minor use and the principal or conditional use to
14 which it is accessory, except in the case of accessory off-street parking and loading.

15 (b) Principal Uses. Principal uses shall include:

16 (1) Maritime Uses as defined in Section 102 of this Code.

17 (2) Any use that is listed in this Code as a permitted use in the district established by
18 Section 201 applicable to the particular property involved shall be permitted as a principal use if the
19 use is identified as an acceptable, existing, or interim land use in the Waterfront Plan adopted by the
20 Port Commission.

21 (c) Conditional Uses. Conditional uses shall include any use that is listed in this Code as a
22 conditional use in the district established by Section 201 applicable to the particular property involved,
23 provided that the use is identified as an acceptable, existing, or interim land use in the Waterfront Plan
24 adopted by the Port Commission. The specific use or uses requiring a conditional use within a project,
25

1 and not the project in its entirety, shall be subject to the provisions set forth in Section 303 and Article
2 3.5 of this Code and subsection (d) below.

3 (d) Any new development (excluding alterations to existing development) on property under
4 the jurisdiction of the Port Commission that requires a Port lease of more than 10 years, and includes
5 an area of at least 1/2 acre (excluding the area of public streets and alleys) shall be subject to review of
6 the urban design of the proposed use by the waterfront design review process, as provided under
7 Section 240(c) of this code.

8 (e) In considering any application in this special use district under Section 303 of this Code,
9 the Planning Commission shall consider the following criteria along with the criteria set forth in
10 Section 303(c). Only the specific use or uses requiring a conditional use within a project, and not the
11 project in its entirety, shall be subject to the following criteria:

12 (1) That such use or feature as proposed is consistent with the Waterfront Plan
13 adopted by the Port Commission, including any amendments thereto which the Planning Commission
14 has found to be consistent with the General Plan; and

15 (2) That the design of such use or feature as proposed is consistent with the
16 Waterfront Plan urban design, historic preservation, and public access goals, policies, and objectives
17 adopted by the Port Commission, including any amendments thereto which the Planning Commission
18 has found to be consistent with the General Plan.

19
20 Section 3. Effective Date. This ordinance shall become effective 30 days after
21 enactment. Enactment occurs when the Mayor signs the ordinance, the Mayor returns the
22 ordinance unsigned or does not sign the ordinance within ten days of receiving it, or the Board
23 of Supervisors overrides the Mayor's veto of the ordinance.

1 Section 4. Scope of Ordinance. In enacting this ordinance, the Board of Supervisors
2 intends to amend only those words, phrases, paragraphs, subsections, sections, articles,
3 numbers, punctuation marks, charts, diagrams, or any other constituent parts of the Municipal
4 Code that are explicitly shown in this ordinance as additions, deletions, Board amendment
5 additions, and Board amendment deletions in accordance with the “Note” that appears under
6 the official title of the ordinance.

7

8 APPROVED AS TO FORM:
9 DAVID CHIU, City Attorney

10 By: /s/ Peter R. Miljanich
11 PETER R. MILJANICH
 Deputy City Attorney

12 n:\legana\as2023\2300067\01669964.docx

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25



MEMORANDUM

April 7, 2023

TO: MEMBERS, PORT COMMISSION
Hon. Kimberly Brandon, President
Hon. Willie Adams, Vice President
Hon. Gail Gilman
Hon. Steven Lee

FROM: Elaine Forbes,
Executive Director

SUBJECT: Adoption of CEQA Findings, Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, and the Final Waterfront Plan.

DIRECTOR'S RECOMMENDATION: Approve Attached Resolution No. 23-15

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On January 24, 2023, Port staff provided a Port Commission presentation on proposed revisions to the Draft Waterfront Plan, and a briefing on interagency coordination with the San Francisco Planning Department and San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) to align policies for the Port of San Francisco waterfront. The January 2023 revisions, together with other Plan revisions and technical edits presented to the public in September 2022, are proposed to be incorporated to create a Final Waterfront Plan (Final Plan), which is presented for Port Commission adoption. To respond to Port Commission comments received at the January 24th meeting, the Final Plan includes revisions to the background discussion of pedestrian and bicycle safety along The Embarcadero and the Embarcadero Promenade which are presented in this report.¹

The Final Plan is the result of a deep, thorough public planning process led by the Waterfront Plan Working Group, a 30-member body of San Francisco and Bay Area residents and waterfront stakeholders that represented maritime, recreational, environmental, economic, transportation, and neighborhood perspectives. The Working

¹ See the September 2022 and January 2023 Port Commission reports, which are incorporated by reference, for detailed discussion of proposed revisions to the Draft Waterfront Plan.

Group was supported by seven advisory teams, which provided expertise and insights on specific topics including resilience, economic, water recreation, and public access.

The process resulted in 161 comprehensive policy recommendations produced by the Working Group, which were endorsed by the Port Commission and incorporated into the updated Draft Waterfront Plan, published in December 2019. The addition of further Plan revisions produced in September 2022 and January 2023, which were presented for public review and comment, create the proposed Final Plan for adoption by the Port Commission.

The environmental review process required under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) must be completed before the Port Commission can consider adoption of the Final Waterfront Plan. On March 16, 2023, the San Francisco Planning Commission certified the Waterfront Plan Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR). On April 5, 2023, the Planning Department published Addendum #1 to the Final EIR.

Port staff recommends approval of the attached Port Resolution 23-15 to adopt Waterfront Plan Final EIR CEQA Findings (Attachment 1), a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment 2), and the Final Waterfront Plan.

STRATEGIC PLAN GOALS

The Waterfront Plan, developed pursuant to Proposition H, describes goals and policies developed by the public and approved by the Port Commission to guide the long-term use and improvement of the Port's 7½ mile public waterfront, from Fisherman's Wharf to India Basin. The Waterfront Plan provides direction and support for these Port Strategic Plan goals:

Economic Recovery: Develop and implement strategies to address the economic impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic and stabilize the Port's financial position during an expected five-year recovery period.

Economic Growth: Grow business portfolio to create an economically successful and vibrant waterfront.

Equity: Create a diverse, equitable, and inclusive organization and waterfront, and empower Black, Indigenous, and other People of Color (BIPOC) in Port operations and opportunities through equitable policies and practices.

Resilience: Reduce seismic and climate change risks to protect the waterfront, City neighborhoods and infrastructure.

Sustainability: Advance environmental stewardship to limit climate change and protect the Bay.

Evolution: Evolve the waterfront to respond to changing public and Port needs.

Engagement: Engage constituents and the public on Port functions and activities.

ADDITIONAL PLAN REVISIONS

On January 24th, the Port Commission reviewed the Plan revisions proposed by Port staff to address public comments. At that meeting, Port Commission members expressed concerns about, and the importance of, prioritizing pedestrian safety along the Embarcadero Promenade, and how this issue is addressed in the transportation section of the Waterfront Plan.

As a long-range planning document, the transportation goal and policies of the Waterfront Plan recognize and support a full suite of transportation modes and services along the waterfront -- by land and water-- in alignment with City transportation and climate policies. The Waterfront Plan transportation policies describe public needs and objectives to inform how future waterfront projects and improvements should be created to incorporate design or other features that achieve safe, reliable transportation functions, managed in coordination with the transportation needs of the rest of the waterfront and city. These are high-level policies that are not designed nor intended to dictate specific outcomes or details in future projects. The Waterfront Plan policies describe the context and parameters within which future projects of many types will each need to craft and incorporate details that work with the nature of the given project to achieve the applicable transportation objectives.

The Waterfront Plan policies provide one layer of direction, which must also be coordinated with other transportation policies and regulations that also may apply to future waterfront improvement projects. These include the City's Transit First and Vision Zero policies to promote public transit and pedestrian safety, and Climate Action policies to avoid greenhouse gas emissions. The Port itself also provides further regulation of transportation operations and details through the Port Code, and Port development and property agreements. Together, the Waterfront Plan and additional policies and controls come into play in future project proposals to determine transportation design and operational details, and implementation requirements.

It is helpful to have this understanding of the relationship of Waterfront Plan policies with other policy and regulatory documents as context for additional Plan revisions to address Port Commission comments about improving pedestrian safety and comfort along the Embarcadero Promenade. Port staff proposes new revisions **highlighted in blue** in Table 1 below, which layer on top of technical edits and other Plan revisions to respond to comments from the public and SFMTA.

Most of the new revisions affect the Plan's background discussion on Walking and Bicycling, which include making a clear distinction between The Embarcadero roadway (the roadway vehicle travel lanes) and the Embarcadero Promenade, and Port collaboration with SFMTA on the Embarcadero Enhancement Project. In addition, Port staff proposes a revision to Transportation Policy #18 to highlight the objective of improving pedestrian safety and enjoyment along the Embarcadero Promenade as part of

developing and implementing improvements and associated regulations for the Embarcadero Enhancement Project.

Table 1: Proposed Additional Waterfront Plan Revisions (highlighted in blue) to Walking and Bicycling Background Discussion, and Transportation Policy #18

Walking and Bicycling

Walking and bicycling to, through, and along the waterfront are increasingly popular activities for entertainment leisure, recreation and commuting, consistent with nation-wide trends. These are low carbon sustainable transportation choices that reduce traffic volumes congestion and greenhouse gas emissions, promote healthy lifestyles, and are fun ways to visit and explore make the waterfront a more interesting place to be and enrich the public realm.

The Embarcadero – A Walking and Cycling Destination

The Embarcadero Promenade is one of the most popular walking and cycling routes in the Bay Area and is the alignment of the San Francisco Bay Trail, a nine-county, 500 mile regional trail system that encircles the San Francisco Bay.

The bicycle lanes on the Embarcadero roadway are not comfortable for many recreational cyclists, who thus choose to ride on the Promenade. When it was constructed, the Embarcadero Promenade provided ample space to accommodate for a mix of walking pedestrians and bicyclists. The number of pedestrians and bicyclists has grown since then, however, and conditions today can often be crowded, uncomfortable and unsafe. Because the original bicycle lanes on The Embarcadero are narrow and exposed to heavy vehicle traffic, they are not comfortable for many recreational cyclists, who thus choose to ride on the Embarcadero Promenade. Today, however, the combined volume of pedestrians and bicyclists often creates crowded and uncomfortable conditions, along with public safety problems.

Additional challenges have emerged with the advent of e Electric bicycles, scooters, and other transportation devices have brought additional challenges. Although these devices support valuable “last mile” connections between public transit stops and work or other destinations, these motorized devices are not allowed on the Embarcadero Promenade which is a designated park, and must operate in facilities created in the bike lanes the roadway. The Port is working with the SFMTA to carry out City and Port regulations for rules developed to regulate electric transportation these devices, as well as bicycles along The Embarcadero.

The Embarcadero is listed as one of the City’s “High Injury” Network streets for pedestrians and bicyclists and is a high priority for public safety improvements under pursuant to the City’s Vision Zero policy. The Port is collaborating with supporting the SFMTA is on the Embarcadero Enhancement Project, to construct which will provide a protected bikeways along The Embarcadero bicycle facility to improve public safety for all modes and especially to create a better improved pedestrian experience along the Embarcadero Promenade from King Street to Fisherman’s Wharf. The Embarcadero Promenade is prioritized for pedestrians. The SFMTA is working closely with Port tenants and public stakeholders to develop a design that meets the project’s objectives while in a manner that preserves adequate access to Port businesses and loading curb zones areas to support goods movement and loading services.

Revision to Transportation Policy #18:

187. Support SFMTA efforts to improve safety for all transportation modes with in the development of the Embarcadero Enhancement Project (for a protected bicycle facility along Tthe Embarcadero from King Street to Fisherman’s Wharf). This project is designed to provide a better pedestrian experience along the Embarcadero Promenade and safe operation of vehicle access to support Port tenant and maritime operations.

A ROBUST PUBLIC PROCESS

The proposed Final Waterfront Plan is the product of a deep, thorough public planning process led by the Waterfront Plan Working Group, an extraordinary group of citizens representing San Francisco and Bay Area residents and waterfront stakeholders, community, environmental, public agency and business partners, including representatives from each of the Port's standing advisory committees. The Working Group was supported by additional citizen volunteers who served on seven Waterfront Plan Advisory Teams, providing additional focus and perspectives on resilience, recreation and open space, transportation, waterfront urban design, maritime, land use and neighborhood planning, and financial and economic issues.

The Working Group was co-chaired by Rudy Nothenberg and Janice Li, who led or provided advice to Port staff throughout a three-phase planning process over three years, leading to publication of the Draft Waterfront Plan in December 2019. Table 2 below provides an overview of the public process, which involved 62 public meetings and workshops with in-depth exchange of technical information, knowledge and public conversations. The first phase of the process provided a comprehensive orientation of the Port in public meetings that were videotaped and broadcasted on SFGovTV. The meetings included presentations and content from all Port divisions about the scope of the Port's responsibilities as a city department and a State public trust grantee. The Port and public were very fortunate to also have many public agency partners participate to educate about waterfront regulations, including the State Lands Commission and BCDC. Other agencies, including SFMTA, SF Office of Resilience, WETA, and the Planning Department addressed how waterfront uses, functions and operations relate to neighborhoods, City infrastructure systems and transportation operations.

The Working Group and public also received a deep-dive on the economic and financial responsibilities of the Port to build an understanding about what is required to maintain and improve Port properties, equity and opportunity, and successfully implement improvements. The Port hired Economic Planning Systems, which produced a financial model used to analyze the viability of different pier lease and development scenarios. That information was supplemented by case studies to help the public understand the successes and challenges of past Port projects, and the types of trade-off values and decisions to support implementable improvements.

This orientation equipped the Working Group with knowledge to apply to the second phase of the process, to develop policy recommendations. The Working Group broke into three subcommittees – Land Use, Transportation and Resilience – and established Guiding Principles to support the subcommittee meetings and focus. All subcommittee recommendations were then reviewed together by the entire Working Group, resulting in 161 policy recommendations, 160 of which were unanimously endorsed, which were submitted to the Port Commission to update the Waterfront Land Use Plan. The Port Commission endorsed them all and, because the scope of the recommendations extended far beyond land use issues, Port staff proposed that the updated plan be renamed to, simply, the Waterfront Plan.

The third and last phase of the process focused on community outreach to educate citizens and stakeholders about the Working Group’s policy recommendations. In addition, Port staff led walking tours and public workshops to educate about The Embarcadero public realm, and pier development, using Piers 30-32 as a case study.

Table 2: Waterfront Plan Update Public Process Summary
<p>Phase 1: Introduction to the Port (October 2015 – September 2016)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public Boat Tour of the waterfront • Waterfront Vision Workshop • 10 Working Group public meetings to receive Port orientation
<p>Phase 2: Policy Recommendations (October 2016 – June 2018)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish guiding principles for the Working Group’s Land Use, Transportation and Resilience Subcommittees • 29 Subcommittee and Working Group meetings to produce 161 policy recommendations • Port Commission review meetings and endorsement
<p>Phase 3: Community Engagement, Walking Tours & Workshops (April - August 2018)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Educating public about Working Group policy recommendations • Walking tours and workshops on Embarcadero public realm, and Piers 30-32
<p>Waterfront Plan Production:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft Waterfront Plan for Public Review and Comment: June 2019 • Port Commission endorsement of Draft Waterfront Plan, as revised to address public comments: December 2019 • Revised Draft Waterfront Plan with information updates, technical editing, public comment revisions: September 2022, January 2023
<p><i>Periodic briefings and updates to Port Commission and Port Advisory Committees were included as part of the public process.</i></p>

THE WATERFRONT PLAN: AN ALIGNED PUBLIC PARTNERSHIP

The above planning process summary attests to the extraordinary civic investment devoted by the Waterfront Plan Working Group, the Advisory Teams, agencies, partners and citizens who participated in the public meetings and comment process. It is clear that people continue to care deeply and are willing to volunteer a lot of time and energy to partner with the Port to protect and improve San Francisco’s public waterfront and San Francisco Bay.

The original Waterfront Land Use Plan was developed following approval by San Francisco voters of Proposition H in 1990. Proposition H required the creation of the Plan that gives first priority to maritime and water-dependent uses and prohibits hotel development on Port piers. The updated Final Waterfront Plan continues to comply with those requirements, as well as expands the scope of forward-looking goals and policies. This includes new policies to create a resilient waterfront, and new ways to make the waterfront affordable, attractive and inviting to people of diverse economic, racial and cultural backgrounds. Those resilience and equity discussions and policies have also informed the development of more detailed strategies and objectives advanced through the Port’s Waterfront Resilience Program and Racial Equity Action Plan, which are supported in the Port’s Strategic Plan.

This alignment of the Waterfront Plan and other strategic Port programs and initiatives is important to maintain a shared commitment and accountability among citizens, the Port Commission and staff, necessary to carry out waterfront improvements and investments that achieve multiple public benefits. The Waterfront Plan will provide the framework and criteria for future Port leasing and developments, open space and public access, transportation, historic preservation and environmental stewardship projects, with public review guided by the Plan's community engagement policies.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The environmental review process required under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) must be completed before the Port Commission can consider adoption of the Final Waterfront Plan. The Waterfront Plan Draft EIR was published by the San Francisco Planning Department on February 23, 2022 and EIR comments were received through April 25, 2022. Responses to those public comments were published on January 20, 2023 to create the Waterfront Plan Final EIR (FEIR). On March 10, 2023, the Planning Department published an Errata to the FEIR which was reviewed together with the FEIR by the San Francisco Planning Commission, which certified the FEIR on March 16, 2023. On April 5, 2023, the Planning Department published Addendum #1 to the FEIR to provide clarifying information in response to questions received from representatives of the South End Rowing Club and Jean Allen. The Planning Department determined that the analyses and conclusions presented in the certified FEIR are not changed by the information in Addendum #1.

Port staff has worked with Planning Department staff to prepare CEQA findings, which are attached as Exhibit 1 to Port Resolution 23-15. The CEQA findings articulate the Waterfront Plan project description and objectives, significant impacts, significant and unavoidable impacts, mitigation measures and alternatives, and a statement of benefits and considerations about the Waterfront Plan project that overrides the significant adverse effects described in the Final EIR. In addition, a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program is attached as Exhibit 2 to Port Resolution 23-15 which describes all required mitigation measures and implementation details. Port staff recommends approval of Port Resolution 23-15 to adopt the CEQA findings, Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, and Final Waterfront Plan.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

As described in this report, the public process has been multi-faceted, involving a large, diverse cast of participants and deep public discussions that resulted in a robust update to the Waterfront Plan. This effort was supported by staff from all divisions of the Port, but special thanks are in order to an extraordinarily collaborative Waterfront Plan team that covered all the bases: Diane Oshima, Kari Kilstrom, Anne Cook, Carol Bach, David Beaupre, Brad Benson, and Byron Rhett.

It was easy for Port staff to be inspired in this effort given the depth of civic investment by the Waterfront Plan Working Group, the Waterfront Plan Advisory Teams, public agency and community partners, Port Advisory Committees, and interested citizens who enriched the public process and outcomes. The Port Commission and staff express special thanks

and deep appreciation to the Waterfront Plan Working Group for leading the process of inclusive public meetings and discussions that produced informed recommendations and a strong consensus for the future of San Francisco's public waterfront:

Rudy Nothenberg and Janice Li
Waterfront Plan Working Group Co-chairs

Alice Rogers, Linda Fadeke Richardson and Pia Hinckle
Waterfront Plan Working Group Subcommittee Chairs

Waterfront Plan Working Group Members:
Grant Ballard, Lawrence Beard, Kirk Bennett, Reid Boggiano, Mike Buehler, Troy Campbell, Kevin Carroll, Chris Christensen, Jeffrey Congdon, Jane Connors, Jon Golinger, Carolyn Horgan, Aaron Hyland, Earl James, Ellen Johnck, Ken Kelton, Ron Miguel, Stewart Morton, Karen Pierce, Tom Radulovich, Jasper Rubin, Christina Rubke, Peter Summerville, John Tobias, Anne Turner, Dilip Trivedi, Corinne Woods, DeeDee Workman

Port staff recommends approval of Resolution 23-15 to adopt CEQA Findings presented in Exhibit 1 and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program presented in Exhibit 2 of this staff report, and to adopt the Final Waterfront Plan.

Port staff will continue inter-agency work with the San Francisco Planning Department and BCDC, as detailed in the January 20, 2023 Port Commission staff report, to align planning policies for the San Francisco waterfront.

Prepared by: Diane Oshima
Special Projects

For: David Beaupre
Deputy Director, Planning & Environment Division

Exhibit 1: CEQA Findings
Exhibit 2: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

**PORT COMMISSION
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
RESOLUTION NO. 23-15**

ADOPTING FINDINGS PURSUANT TO THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT, INCLUDING FINDINGS OF FACT, FINDINGS REGARDING SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS, EVALUATION OF MITIGATION MEASURES AND ALTERNATIVES, AND A STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS IN CONNECTION WITH THE ADOPTION OF THE WATERFRONT PLAN, AN UPDATE TO THE WATERFRONT LAND USE PLAN.

WHEREAS, the Waterfront Land Use Plan is the long-range plan that sets forth policies for the use and improvement of properties owned and managed by the Port of San Francisco, developed pursuant to requirements in Proposition H approved by San Francisco voters in 1990, which was adopted by the Port Commission in 1997, with occasional subsequent amendments that were approved by the Port Commission; and

WHEREAS, in 2015, the Port published the Port of San Francisco Waterfront Land Use Plan 1997-2014 Review report which presented a comprehensive review and assessment of land use changes during this period, and identified policy needs and challenges that dictated the need to conduct a public process to update the Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Port Commission directed the Port staff to conduct a public planning process that maximized public participation in public discussions about existing waterfront activities, regulations, challenges, public desires and needs to incorporate diverse viewpoints and perspectives to develop policy recommendations to update the Waterfront Land Use Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Port conducted an application process to solicit interest and selected citizens and public stakeholders to serve on a Waterfront Plan Working Group and seven Waterfront Plan Advisory Teams to participate in public meetings, and review and comment on draft reports to develop recommendations for the update of the Plan; and

WHEREAS, the citizens on the Working Group and Advisory Teams included residents from all 11 supervisor districts in San Francisco, Bay Area residents, and representatives from Port advisory committees with knowledge and interest in a comprehensive range of issues related to the waterfront, including maritime and non-maritime land use planning, urban design, open space, environmental sustainability and stewardship, historic preservation, engineering and sea level rise resilience, water recreation, transportation and financial resources, and

WHEREAS, the public process included presentations and participation of public agency partners, including the California State Lands Commission, San Francisco Planning Department (“Planning Department”), San Francisco Municipal

Transportation Agency, and San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (“BCDC”) to build an understanding of numerous policies and regulations that must be coordinated and aligned to enable use and improvement of Port properties and resources; and

WHEREAS, from 2016 to 2018, the Waterfront Plan Working Group public meetings conducted three phases of work and meeting discussions which supported a robust public process that included Phase 1 (Orientation of the Port and Waterfront Issues); Phase 2 (Waterfront Plan Working Group Subcommittee meetings to develop Land Use, Transportation and Environmental Sustainability and Resilience policy recommendations); and Phase 3 (Public outreach to explain the Part 2 recommendations, walking tours and workshops on Embarcadero public realm, and Pier 30-32 development); and culminating meetings of the Working Group to vet, refine and ultimately endorse 161 policy recommendations, of which 160 were unanimously endorsed; and

WHEREAS, The Working Group recommendations updated or added new goals and policies in nine categories to expand the breadth of content and direction to guide existing and future uses, operations and improvements of the Port of San Francisco waterfront: Maritime & Water-dependent Uses; Diverse Non-Maritime Uses; Public Access & Open Space; Urban Design & Historic Preservation; A Financially Strong Port; Transportation and Mobility; Environmental Sustainability; A Resilient Port; Community Engagement and Partnering; and updated objectives for five waterfront subareas that flow from the new goals and policies: Fisherman’s Wharf, Northeastern Waterfront, South Beach, Mission Bay and Southern Waterfront; and

WHEREAS, given the expanded scope of topics and recommendations, the Waterfront Land Use Plan was formally renamed the Waterfront Plan, which addresses far more than land use and urban design issues, continues to adhere to Proposition H, which prioritizes maritime and water-dependent uses of Port properties and does not allow hotel development on piers, and promotes improvements and community engagement that are inclusive of all populations, including those in historically marginalized communities; and

WHEREAS, in 2019, the Port Commission held four public meetings to receive and review the Working Group policy recommendations, which ultimately were all endorsed by the Port Commission and incorporated into the production of the Draft Waterfront Plan in June 2019, which underwent public review and comment, leading to changes and refinements that were made to produce a revised Draft Waterfront Plan, which was endorsed by the Port Commission in December 2019; and

WHEREAS, the Port has consulted and worked closely with the staff of the Planning Department and BCDC to include presentations to the Working Group and evaluate the following Planning Department and BCDC planning documents with the objective of identifying amendments to maintain consistency with

updated Waterfront Plan policies across the three agencies: San Francisco General Plan, San Francisco Planning Code, and BCDC San Francisco Waterfront Special Area Plan (“Special Area Plan”); and

WHEREAS, prior to considering approval, the updated Waterfront Plan requires completion of environmental review, as required under the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”), and

WHEREAS, the Planning Department is the Lead Agency responsible for the implementation of CEQA, California Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq., the Guidelines for Implementation of CEQA, 14 California Code of Regulations Section 15000 et seq. (“CEQA Guidelines”), and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code, and undertook an environmental review process for the proposed Waterfront Plan Project and provide appropriate public hearings before the Planning Commission; and

WHEREAS, on February 23, 2022, the Planning Department published the Waterfront Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report (“DEIR”) for the Waterfront Plan Project (Case No. 2019-023037ENV), which included the December 2019 Draft Waterfront Plan, and amendments to the San Francisco General Plan, San Francisco Planning Code and Zoning Map, and BCDC Special Area Plan, and provided public notice in a newspaper of general circulation of the availability of the DEIR for public review and comment and of the date and time of the Planning Commission public hearing on the DEIR; this notice was mailed to the Department’s list of persons requesting such notice. Notices of availability of the DEIR and the date and time of the public hearing were posted near the project site by the Department beginning on February 23, 2022. The DEIR contains analysis at a “program level” pursuant to CEQA Guidelines section 15168 for the adoption and implementation of the Waterfront Plan; and

WHEREAS, on March 24, 2022, the Planning Commission held a duly advertised public hearing on the DEIR, at which an opportunity for public comment was given, and public comment was received on the DEIR. The period for commenting on the DEIR ended on April 25, 2022. The Department prepared responses to comments on environmental issues received during the 60-day public review period for the DEIR, prepared revisions to the text of the DEIR in response to comments received or based on additional information that became available during the public review period, and corrected clerical errors in the DEIR; and

WHEREAS, between September and December 2022, Port staff produced further proposed revisions to the Waterfront Plan to incorporate information updates, technical edits, and policy refinements, which underwent public review and comment and were presented to the Port Commission at its September 13, 2022 and January 24, 2023 meetings, and which revisions were reviewed by the Planning Department staff and determined to not result in any required changes to the information or conclusions in the FEIR; and

on January 19, 2023, the Planning Department published a Responses to Comments document. A Final Environmental Impact Report (hereinafter “FEIR”) has been prepared by the Department, consisting of the DEIR, any consultations and comments received during the review process, any additional information that became available, and the Responses to Comments document, all as required by law; and

WHEREAS, on March 10, 2020, the Planning Department published an Errata to the FEIR, and on March 16, 2020, the Planning Commission reviewed and considered the FEIR (including the Errata) and found that the contents of said report and the procedures through which the FEIR was prepared, publicized, and reviewed comply with the provisions of CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code. The FEIR was certified by the Planning Commission on March 19, 2023. On April 5, 2023, the Planning Department issued Addendum #1 to the FEIR and determined that the additional information in Addendum #1 does not change the analyses and conclusions presented in the FEIR; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the Port Commission hereby adopts the CEQA findings set forth in Exhibit 1 (hereafter “Findings”) and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (“MMRP”) set forth in Exhibit 2 to this Resolution, which material was made available to the public, including findings regarding the Project description and objectives, significant impacts, significant and unavoidable impacts, mitigation measures and alternatives, and a statement of overriding considerations, based on substantial evidence in the whole record of this proceeding and pursuant to CEQA, particularly Sections 21081 and 21081.5, the CEQA Guidelines, particularly Sections 15091 through 15093, and Chapter 31; and further

RESOLVED, that the Port Commission, after balancing the significant adverse effects of the Project on the environment, and the benefits of the Project, concludes that the benefits of the Project override the significant adverse effects based on the considerations stated in the Findings; and further

RESOLVED, that the Port Commission has reviewed the FEIR, and adopts the CEQA Findings and MMRP, and finds that the approvals before the Port Commission are within the scope of the FEIR and that no substantial changes in the Project or the circumstances surrounding the Project have occurred and no new information that could not have been known previously showing new significant impacts or an increase in severity in impacts has been discovered since the FEIR was certified; and further

RESOLVED, that this Port Commission hereby adopts the Final Waterfront Plan; and further

RESOLVED, that this Port Commission requests staff to continue working with the Planning Department staff to complete conforming amendments to the San Francisco General Plan, Planning Code, and Zoning Map for consideration

and submittal to the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to achieve conformity in the land use regulations governing Port property, and to support implementation of waterfront improvements under the Final Waterfront Plan; and further

RESOLVED, that this Port Commission request staff to work diligently with BCDC to develop conforming amendments to the BCDC Special Area Plan to support improvements along the Port waterfront, and provide information updates on schedule and draft amendment documents for public review; and further

RESOLVED, that the Waterfront Plan is foundational to maintaining trust and understanding between the Port Commission and the public to support partnerships and collaborations to improve the San Francisco waterfront, including projects and investments in the Port's Strategic Plan, Waterfront Resilience Program, and that advance applicable City policies; and further

RESOLVED, that this Port Commission expresses its deep admiration and appreciation to all citizens, stakeholders, agency, community and business partners, and the Waterfront Plan Advisory Teams and Waterfront Plan Working Group, for their participation in the 62 public meetings of the Waterfront Plan update process, which produced such comprehensive and forward-looking policies, with special recognition and gratitude to the members of the Waterfront Plan Working Group, which dedicated extraordinary time and insights to lead the process to update the Waterfront Plan, which will guide the continuing evolution and improvement of San Francisco's urban waterfront:


Rudy Nothenberg and Janice Li
Waterfront Plan Working Group Co-chairs

Alice Rogers, Linda Fadeke Richardson and Pia Hinckle
Waterfront Plan Working Group Subcommittee Chairs

Waterfront Plan Working Group Members:

Grant Ballard, Lawrence Beard, Kirk Bennett, Reid Boggiano, Mike Buehler, Troy Campbell, Kevin Carroll, Chris Christensen, Jeffrey Congdon, Jane Connors, Jon Golinger, Carolyn Horgan, Aaron Hyland, Earl James, Ellen Johnck, Ken Kelton, Ron Miguel, Stewart Morton, Karen Pierce, Tom Radulovich, Jasper Rubin, Christina Rubke, Peter Summerville, John Tobias, Anne Turner, Dilip Trivedi, Corinne Woods, DeeDee Workman.

I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted by the Port Commission at its meeting of April 11, 2023.

DocuSigned by:

Secretary
2A9BEF9AAF934F9...



PLANNING COMMISSION MOTION NO. 21277

HEARING DATE: MARCH 16, 2023

Record No.: 2019-023037ENV
Project Title: Waterfront Plan
Neighborhood: North Beach, Financial District, South of Market, Potrero Hill, Bayview/Hunters Point
Zoning: Multiple
Block/Lot: Multiple Piers and Seawall Lots
Project Sponsor: Diane Oshima, Port of San Francisco
Pier 1, The Embarcadero
San Francisco, CA 94111
(415) 274-0553
Staff Contact: Sherie George – (628) 652-7558
sherie.george@sfgov.org

ADOPTING FINDINGS UNDER THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT RELATED TO THE CERTIFICATION OF A FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE WATERFRONT PLAN.

MOVED, that the San Francisco Planning Commission (hereinafter “Commission”) hereby CERTIFIES the Final Environmental Impact Report identified as Case No. 2019-023037ENV, for the Waterfront Plan Project (hereinafter “Project”), based on the following findings:

1. The City and County of San Francisco, acting through the Planning Department (hereinafter “Department”) fulfilled all procedural requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (Cal. Pub. Res. Code Section 21000 et seq., hereinafter “CEQA”), the State CEQA Guidelines (Cal. Admin. Code Title 14, Section 15000 et seq., hereinafter “CEQA Guidelines”) and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code (hereinafter “Chapter 31”).
 - A. The Department determined that an environmental impact report (hereinafter “EIR”) was required and provided public notice of that determination by publication in a newspaper of general circulation on August 26, 2020. The public notice also provided notice of the date and time of a virtual public scoping meeting held on September 9, 2020. The notice was mailed to the Department’s list of persons requesting such notice, the State Clearinghouse, local agencies/department/jurisdictions including decisionmakers on August 26, 2020.
 - B. On February 23, 2022, the Department published the draft EIR (hereinafter “DEIR”) and provided public notice in a newspaper of general circulation of the availability of the DEIR for public review and comment, and of the date and time of the Planning Commission public hearing on the DEIR; this notice was mailed to the Department’s list of persons requesting such notice, individuals who submitted comments on the notice of preparation of an EIR, the State Clearinghouse, and local agencies/departments/jurisdictions

including decisionmakers on February 23, 2022. Hard copies of the document were mailed to individuals who requested physical copies.

- C. The notice of availability of the DEIR and of the date and time of the public hearing were posted along the project site on February 23, 2022.
 - D. On February 23, 2022, copies of the DEIR were mailed or otherwise delivered to state government agencies through the State Clearinghouse.
 - E. A notice of completion was filed with the State Secretary of Resources via the State Clearinghouse on February 23, 2022.
2. The Commission held a duly advertised public hearing on said DEIR on March 24, 2022, at which opportunity for public comment was given and public comment was received on the DEIR. The period for acceptance of written comments ended on April 25, 2022.
 3. The Department prepared responses to comments on environmental issues received at the public hearing and in writing during the 61-day public review period for the DEIR, prepared revisions to the text of the DEIR in response to comments received or based on additional information that became available during the public review period, and corrected errors in the DEIR. This material was presented in a Responses to Comments document, published on January 19, 2023, distributed to the Commission and all parties who commented on the DEIR, and made available to download from the Department web site as well as to others upon request at the Department.
 4. A final environmental impact report (hereinafter "FEIR") has been prepared by the Department, consisting of the DEIR with appendices and attachments, as well as the Responses to Comments document including any consultations and comments received during the review process, and any additional information that became available, and the Errata document dated March 10, 2023, all as required by law.
 5. The FEIR consisting of the DEIR with appendices and attachments, Responses to Comments and the Errata document dated March 10, 2023 are available for review by the Commission and the public on the San Francisco Planning Department website on the Environmental Documents page at <https://sfplanning.org/environmental-review-documents>. Other project files are available to the public at the San Francisco Planning Department, 49 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 1400, San Francisco, CA 94103. These project files are part of the administrative record before the commission.
 6. The Commission, in certifying the completion of said FEIR, hereby does find that that none of the factors that would necessitate recirculation of the FEIR under CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5 are present. The FEIR contains no information revealing (1) any new significant environmental impact that would result from the Project or from a new mitigation measure proposed to be implemented, (2) any substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified environmental impact, (3) any feasible Project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed that would clearly lessen the environmental impacts of the Project, but that was rejected by the Project's proponents, or (4) that the Draft EIR was so fundamentally and basically inadequate and conclusory in nature that meaningful public review and comment were precluded.


The Commission finds that the Project proposed for approval is within the scope of the Project analyzed in the FEIR, and the FEIR fully analyzed the Project proposed for approval. No new impacts have been identified that were not analyzed in the FEIR.

7. On March 16, 2023, the Commission reviewed and considered the information contained in the FEIR and hereby does find that the contents of said report and the procedures through which the FEIR was prepared, publicized, and reviewed comply with the provisions of CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code.
8. The Commission hereby does find that the FEIR concerning File No. 2019-023037ENV reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the City and County of San Francisco, is adequate, accurate and objective, and that the Responses to Comments document and the Errata dated March 10, 2023 contains no significant revisions to the DEIR, and hereby does CERTIFY THE COMPLETION of said FEIR in compliance with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code.
9. The Commission, in certifying the completion of said FEIR, hereby does find that the Project described in the EIR:
 - A. Would have significant unavoidable impacts on the following:
 - Project-level Impacts
 - Transportation and circulation (loading)
 - Air quality (criteria pollutants and exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial levels of fine particulate matter and toxic air contaminants)
 - Cumulative Impacts
 - Transportation and circulation (construction-related transportation, transit delay, and loading)
 - Air quality (exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial levels of fine particulate matter and toxic air contaminants)

Some of these significant impacts would be reduced with the implementation of mitigation measures but would remain significant and unavoidable with mitigation.

10. The Commission reviewed and considered the information contained in the FEIR prior to approving the Project.

I hereby certify that the Planning Commission ADOPTED the foregoing Motion on March 16, 2023.



Jonas P. Ionin
Commission Secretary

AYES: Braun, Diamond, Imperial, Koppel, Moore, Tanner
NAYS: None
ABSENT: Ruiz
ADOPTED: March 16, 2023

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689
Tel. No. (415) 554-5184
Fax No. (415) 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. (415) 554-5227

**NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING
LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco will hold a public hearing to consider the following proposals and said public hearing will be held as follows, at which time all interested parties may attend and be heard.

Date: July 10, 2023

Time: 1:30 p.m.

Location: **IN-PERSON MEETING INFORMATION**
Legislative Chamber, Room 250, located at City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA

REMOTE ACCESS

Watch: www.sfgovtv.org

Public Comment Call-In: <https://sfbos.org/remote-meeting-call>

Subject: **Port of San Francisco Waterfront Plan Update**


File No. 230501. Ordinance amending the Zoning Map of the Planning Code to rezone certain waterfront parcels from P (Public) to M-1 (Light Industrial), and to add Waterfront Special Use District No. 4 covering areas east of the Mission Bay and Southern Waterfront areas; 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.

File No. 230502. Ordinance amending the Recreation and Open Space Element, Central Waterfront Area Plan, and Northeastern Waterfront Area Plan of the General Plan to maintain consistency with the Port of San Francisco's Waterfront Plan update; 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 340.

In accordance with Administrative Code, Section 67.7-1, persons who are unable to attend the hearing on these matters may submit written comments prior to the time the hearing begins. These comments will be made as part of the official public record in these matters and shall be brought to the attention of the Board of Supervisors. Written comments should be addressed to Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board, City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA, 94102 or sent via email (board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org). Information relating to these matters are available with the Office of the Clerk of the Board or the Board of Supervisors' Legislative Research Center (<https://sfbos.org/legislative-research-center-lrc>). Agenda information relating to these matters will be available for public review on Friday, July 7, 2023.

For any questions about this hearing, please contact the Assistant Clerk for the Land Use and Transportation Committee:

Erica Major (Erica.Major@sfgov.org) ~ (415) 554-4441)



Angela Calvillo
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
City and County of San Francisco

em:jec

CALIFORNIA NEWSPAPER SERVICE BUREAU

DAILY JOURNAL CORPORATION

Mailing Address : 915 E FIRST ST, LOS ANGELES, CA 90012
Telephone (800) 788-7840 / Fax (800) 464-2839
Visit us @ www.LegalAdstore.com

ERICA MAJOR
CCSF BD OF SUPERVISORS (OFFICIAL NOTICES)
1 DR CARLTON B GOODLETT PL #244
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

EXM# 3709469

**NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING
SAN FRANCISCO BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE
MONDAY, JULY 10 - 1:30 PM**

attention of the Board of Supervisors. Written comments should be addressed to Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board, City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA, 94102 or sent via email (board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org). Information relating to this matter is available with the Office of the Clerk of the Board or the Board of Supervisors' Legislative Research Center (<https://sfbos.org/legislative-research-center-lrc>). Agenda information relating to this matter will be available for public review on Friday, July 7, 2023. For any questions about this hearing, please contact the Assistant Clerk for the Land Use and Transportation Committee: Erica Major (Erica.Major@sfgov.org) - (415) 554-4441

EXM-3709469#

COPY OF NOTICE

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco will hold a public hearing to consider the following proposals and said public hearing will be held as follows, at which time all interested parties may attend and be heard. **File No. 230501.** Ordinance amending the Zoning Map of the Planning Code to rezone certain waterfront parcels from P (Public) to M-1 (Light Industrial), and to add Waterfront Special Use District No. 4 covering areas east of the Mission Bay and Southern Waterfront areas; 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. **File No. 230502.** Ordinance amending the Recreation and Open Space Element, Central Waterfront Area Plan, and Northeastern Waterfront Area Plan of the General Plan to maintain consistency with the Port of San Francisco's Waterfront Plan update; 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 340.

Location: IN-PERSON MEETING INFORMATION
Legislative Chamber, Room 250, located at City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA

REMOTE ACCESS
Watch: www.sfgovtv.org
Public Comment Call-In: <https://sfbos.org/remote-meeting-call>

In accordance with Administrative Code, Section 67.7-1, persons who are unable to attend the hearing on these matters may submit written comments prior to the time the hearing begins. These comments will be made as part of the official public record in these matters, and shall be brought to the

Notice Type: GPN GOVT PUBLIC NOTICE

Ad Description

File Nos. 230501 & 230502

To the right is a copy of the notice you sent to us for publication in the SAN FRANCISCO EXAMINER. Thank you for using our newspaper. Please read this notice carefully and call us with ny corrections. The Proof of Publication will be filed with the County Clerk, if required, and mailed to you after the last date below. Publication date(s) for this notice is (are):

06/30/2023

The charge(s) for this order is as follows. An invoice will be sent after the last date of publication. If you prepaid this order in full, you will not receive an invoice.

Publication	\$414.00
Total	\$414.00



* A 0 0 0 0 0 6 3 2 8 7 5 5 *

835 MARKET ST, SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94103
Telephone (415) 314-1835 / Fax (510) 743-4178

ERICA MAJOR
CCSF BD OF SUPERVISORS (OFFICIAL NOTICES)
1 DR CARLTON B GOODLETT PL #244
SAN FRANCISCO, CA - 94102

EXM#: 3709469

PROOF OF PUBLICATION

(2015.5 C.C.P.)

State of California)
County of SAN FRANCISCO) ss

Notice Type: GPN - GOVT PUBLIC NOTICE

Ad Description:
File Nos. 230501 & 230502

I am a citizen of the United States and a resident of the State of California; I am over the age of eighteen years, and not a party to or interested in the above entitled matter. I am the principal clerk of the printer and publisher of the SAN FRANCISCO EXAMINER, a newspaper published in the English language in the city of SAN FRANCISCO, county of SAN FRANCISCO, and adjudged a newspaper of general circulation as defined by the laws of the State of California by the Superior Court of the County of SAN FRANCISCO, State of California, under date 10/18/1951, Case No. 410667. That the notice, of which the annexed is a printed copy, has been published in each regular and entire issue of said newspaper and not in any supplement thereof on the following dates, to-wit:

06/30/2023

Executed on: 06/30/2023
At Los Angeles, California

I certify (or declare) under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.



Signature



* A 0 0 0 0 0 6 3 5 0 0 3 6 *

Email

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING
OF SUPERVISORS
LAND USE AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE
MONDAY, JULY 10 - 1:30 PM

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN THAT the Board of Supervisors of the Board and County of San Francisco will hold a public hearing to consider the following proposals and said public hearing will be held as follows, at which time all interested parties may attend and be heard. File No. 230501. Ordinance amending the Zoning Map of the Planning Code to rezone certain waterfront parcels from P (Public) to M-1 (Light Industrial), and to add Waterfront Special Use District No. 4 covering areas east of the Mission Bay and Southern Waterfront areas; 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. File No. 230502. Ordinance amending the Recreation and Open Space Element, Central Waterfront Area Plan, and Northeastern Waterfront Area Plan of the General Plan to maintain consistency with the Port of San Francisco's Waterfront Plan update; 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 340.

Location: IN-PERSON MEETING INFORMATION
Legislative Chamber, Room 250, located at City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA
REMOTE ACCESS
Watch: www.sfgovtv.org
Public Comment Call-In: https://sfbos.org/remotemeeting-call
In accordance with Administrative Code, Section 67.7-1, persons who are unable to attend the hearing on these matters may submit written comments prior to the time the hearing begins. These comments will be made as part of the official public record in these matters, and shall be brought to the

attention of the Board of Supervisors. Written comments should be addressed to Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board, City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244, San Francisco, CA, 94102 or sent via email (boardofsupervisors@sfgov.org). Information relating to this matter is available with the Office of the Clerk of the Board or the Board of Supervisors' Legislative Research Center (https://sfbos.org/legislative-research-center-irc). Agenda information relating to this matter will be available for public review on Friday, July 7, 2023. For any questions about this hearing, please contact the Assistant Clerk for the Land Use and Transportation Committee: Erica Major (Erica.Major@sfgov.org - (415) 554-4441)

EXM-3709469#

BOARD of SUPERVISORS



City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689
Tel. No. (415) 554-5184
Fax No. (415) 554-5163
TDD/TTY No. (415) 554-5227

MEMORANDUM

Date: May 12, 2023
To: Planning Department / Commission
From: Erica Major, Clerk of the Land Use and Transportation Committee
Subject: Board of Supervisors Legislation Referral - File Nos. 230501, 230502, 230503
Zoning Map - Port of San Francisco Waterfront Plan Update; Waterfront Zoning
Correction; General Plan - Port of San Francisco Waterfront Plan Update; Planning Code
- Port of San Francisco Waterfront Plan Update

- California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Determination
(*California Public Resources Code, Sections 21000 et seq.*)
 - Ordinance / Resolution
 - Ballot Measure

- Amendment to the Planning Code, including the following Findings:
(*Planning Code, Section 302(b): 90 days for Planning Commission review*)
 - General Plan
 - Planning Code, Section 101.1
 - Planning Code, Section 302

- Amendment to the Administrative Code, involving Land Use/Planning
(*Board Rule 3.23: 30 days for possible Planning Department review*)

- General Plan Referral for Non-Planning Code Amendments
(*Charter, Section 4.105, and Administrative Code, Section 2A.53*)
(Required for legislation concerning the acquisition, vacation, sale, or change in use of City property; subdivision of land; construction, improvement, extension, widening, narrowing, removal, or relocation of public ways, transportation routes, ground, open space, buildings, or structures; plans for public housing and publicly-assisted private housing; redevelopment plans; development agreements; the annual capital expenditure plan and six-year capital improvement program; and any capital improvement project or long-term financing proposal such as general obligation or revenue bonds.)

- Historic Preservation Commission
 - Landmark (*Planning Code, Section 1004.3*)
 - Cultural Districts (*Charter, Section 4.135 & Board Rule 3.23*)
 - Mills Act Contract (*Government Code, Section 50280*)
 - Designation for Significant/Contributory Buildings (*Planning Code, Article 11*)

Please send the Planning Department/Commission recommendation/determination to Erica Major at Erica.Major@sfgov.org.