

Plan Bay Area		
January 2012 Public Workshops		
Oral Comments: Land Use and Complete Communities		
County	Comment	
1	San Fran.	Prefers more mixed-use and less car dependence.
2	San Fran.	"Complete communities" are biased against a family lifestyle.
3	San Fran.	There should be fewer buildings, more open space, less population.
4	San Fran.	Living/shopping/walking is not possible all in one area.
5	San Fran.	Eliminate minimum parking requirements.
6	San Fran.	More rigid cap on maximum parking in PDAs.
7	San Fran.	80-85% of housing in San Francisco is market income priced. Is working-class housing being considered?
8	San Fran.	How did the committee decide what a "complete community" is?
9	San Fran.	Concerned that no housing density numbers are reflected in the presentation.
10	San Fran.	Concerned about seismic safety.
11	San Fran.	Many of these issues are integrated; questions should be re-phrased.
12	San Fran.	No more building in eastern Contra Costa County until Vasco Road is a freeway or improved.
13	San Fran.	What defines Growth Opportunity Areas? How are they converted into Priority Development Areas?
14	San Fran.	Water availability should be considered.
15	San Fran.	Are dogs being considered in the Plan?
16	San Fran.	Why is Bayview-Hunter's Point not considered a suburban area?
17	San Fran.	Why are Treasure Island and Bayview-Hunter's Point considered high-priority development areas given their remoteness?
18	San Fran.	More development around BART stations.
19	San Fran.	If eastern San Francisco is already heavily populated, why densify it even more?
20	San Fran.	How is population density being considered in relation to public transit?
21	San Fran.	Preserve architectural features; suggests adding a statement supporting local architectural features.
22	San Fran.	Should model new development after Mission Bay, with mandatory open space and transit.
23	San Fran.	Suggests more diverse outreach efforts.
24	San Fran.	Be mindful of urban or existing resident displacement.
25	San Fran.	PDAs have a destructive effect on local areas, local character.
26	San Fran.	Families will not thrive under this ABAG scenario: not safe, too dense, people's quality of life suffers (see Brooklyn as an example).
27	San Fran.	Where is the increased investment in San Francisco to accommodate additional population?
28	San Fran.	Where is the policy connection to the question of funding available for transit?
29	San Fran.	San Francisco has missed opportunities for growth through increased density; e.g., Market Street, Church Street, 16th Street, 24th Street.
30	San Fran.	Land is more than "opportunity sites." There needs to be more open space.
31	San Fran.	These nine county meetings are not enough to hear the voices of everyone in the region.
32	San Fran.	Visuals show no differences between 2010 and 2040; hard to imagine there is no growth [in Visitacion Valley] during this time period.

33	San Fran.	Rezoning areas would take away the protections of Proposition 13.
34	San Fran.	Presentation does not show the information; avoided areas where there will be lots of growth (low-income communities).
35	San Fran.	This is a useful demonstration of future changes; it's unambitious if sticking with current land use types in all areas.
36	San Fran.	How will the 15% GHG emission reduction target be reached?
37	San Fran.	Where is the transit by the redevelopment area? Is there surface parking included?
38	San Fran.	Growth is not in line with the current feel of the neighborhood; it's a "pack them in" strategy.
39	San Fran.	Visualization worked well, but it does not show the "draw" to the neighborhood, e.g., schools, open space, etc.
40	San Fran.	What is an "intermodal station?"
41	San Fran.	Concern about noise and other health impacts from transit on the residents nearby, especially mothers and children.
42	San Fran.	There are economic justice issues related to low-income residents having to move near noise.
43	San Fran.	Transit is not efficient this far from downtown and is not cost effective.
44	San Fran.	Invest more in bus, not in light rail.
45	San Fran.	PDA's in eastern San Francisco will show much higher levels of growth than Visitacion Valley.
46	San Fran.	Concerned about displacement of residents.
47	San Fran.	Need funding for low-income housing, especially by the new transit stations.
48	San Fran.	Good visualization tool.
49	San Fran.	Would like to see an analysis of whether this growth dense is enough to fund/support the transit.
50	San Fran.	Not impressed with the visualization; the variations are so subtle it doesn't seem worth all the effort.
51	San Fran.	Concerned about displacement of residents; need to maintain more affordable housing.
52	San Fran.	More flexible zoning needed (e.g., small lots). Look to Mexico and Thailand for examples.
53	San Fran.	Decrease the costs of housing by providing more types of housing.
54	San Fran.	How do you increase transit/reduce emissions in areas with growth outside of downtown?
55	San Fran.	Start with a large map of where Visitacion Valley is in San Francisco.
56	San Fran.	Need to better link questions to the presentation.
57	San Fran.	Emphasize that growth will occur no matter what, so the denser some areas are, the less growth other communities have to take on.
58	San Fran.	Density preserves single-family neighborhoods; show the trade-offs.
59	San Fran.	Show the livability that comes with density.
60	San Fran.	Other housing developments in San Francisco have offered ownership to people who haven't owned before. Encourage these projects.
61	San Fran.	Offer more funding for redevelopment of affordable housing and home ownership.
62	San Fran.	We cannot predict the future.