



**Waterfront Plan Working Group  
Land Use Subcommittee Meeting**

Final Accepted Meeting Notes: June 7, 2017

**Present:** Alice Rogers (chair), Larry Beard, Jane Connors, Jon Golinger, Stewart Morton, Don Neuwirth, Corinne Woods, Kirk Bennett, Ron Miguel, Karen Pierce

**Not Present:** Ellen Johnck, Jasper Rubin, Dee Dee Workman

**Other Working Group and Advisory Team Members Present:** Linda Fadeke-Richardson

**Port Staff:** Diane Oshima, Kari Kilstrom, David Beaupre, Aaron Golbus, Norma Guzman, Mark Paez, Byron Rhett

**Agency Staff:** Reid Boggiano (State Lands via conference call), Josh Switzky, SF Planning Dept.

1. Introductions

2. May 24, 2017 draft meeting notes: accepted

3. May 31, 2017 draft meeting notes: the following edits will be made

- Include Jon's poll results (read aloud); Note that 2/3 voter approval required
- Revise "consensus" to "a majority", in last bullet of p. 2

4. Policy Guidance Recommendations for Embarcadero Historic District Leasing & Development

The final draft includes non-substantive edits from Jasper Rubin, in red. Subcommittee will review and let staff know if any concerns; acceptance is postponed to the next meeting (June 21<sup>st</sup>).

5. Public-oriented use criteria discussion. Subcommittee discussed and made edits to criteria that express desired characteristics for diverse, public-oriented uses:

- Bullet #1 Acknowledge that waterfront attracts both national and international visitors (from "California and the world"), and that uses should be accessible to low- and moderate-income visitors (all "income levels"). The term 'visitors' is preferred over 'tourists'
- Bullet #2 Design public uses to be "inclusive"
- Bullet #5 – replace "as opposed to" with "not only"
- Bullet #6 Incorporate Peter Brastow's comments for access to and enjoyment of the natural Bay shoreline
- Add language to prioritize maritime related public-oriented uses that can only be on the waterfront (i.e. water dependent). Subcommittee already made recommendations for maritime uses; use "water-oriented" to clarify the character of public-oriented uses.

## 6. Seawall Lot discussion

Presentation Diane Oshima, Director of Planning and Environment, presented background information on seawall lots. This is a link to the PowerPoint presentation and related notes: [http://sfport.com/sites/default/files/2017-06-07%20Presentation%20on%20Seawall%20Lots-%206-7-17%20NOTES\\_0.pdf](http://sfport.com/sites/default/files/2017-06-07%20Presentation%20on%20Seawall%20Lots-%206-7-17%20NOTES_0.pdf).

Historical information described the way in which seawall lots (SWL) originally supported Port maritime operations and over time, became separated from waterfront operations and developed in concert with adjacent neighborhoods (South Beach area, Levi Plaza area, etc.). Waterfront Plan established use and design policies recognizing SWL relationship with surrounding neighborhoods, allowing housing, office, general retail as acceptable uses. SB815 State legislation permitted trust use restriction to be lifted for SWLs south of Market Street, to enable comparable infill development and revenue generation to support piers and waterfront open spaces recognized by BCDC.

Diane reviewed SWL projects currently underway (88 Broadway; Hotel Teatro Zinzanni) and provided an overview of five undeveloped seawall lots that are currently used as surface parking, generating significant Port revenue.

Other considerations:

- Seawall lot developments can generate revenue and Infrastructure Finance District proceeds for Port capital improvements
- Part 3 of the Plan Update process will include more site-specific focus in South Beach and Northeast Waterfront areas, including SWLs for use and improvement ideas and discussion

Port is not proposing changes to the Waterfront Plan SWL land use policies which support:

- Acceptable uses that reflect surrounding neighborhood mix of uses
  - Most seawall lots allow hotel, housing, office, retail, parking
  - Some seawall lots allow assembly & entertainment, artist, recreation and open space
- Provide transition and connections between City and pier waterfront
- Mix of uses on piers and seawall lots that, together, complement neighboring development and serve needs of diverse interest groups
- Architecture and urban design on west side that frames Embarcadero Historic District on the east side

Summary of Seawall Lot Subcommittee Comments (followed by detail points in bullets)

- State legislation which has lifted trust use restriction and allowed SWLs to develop consistent with neighborhood generates significant financial benefits to support historic rehabilitation of piers and BCDC-recognized waterfront parks and public access

- SWL developments should emphasize access - physical and visual - from the street and sidewalk - to The Embarcadero, piers, and Bay
- Use of SWLs should as much as possible support the most diverse population (whether oriented to residents or visitors or workers)

### **Parking on Seawall Lots**

- Parking on SWLs is a valued trust use and furthers trust objectives by:
  - accommodating visitors to the waterfront from the region/state that drive
  - supporting access to waterfront attractions (i.e. Ferry Building Marketplace, Exploratorium)
- Recommend a visitor study, including number of people visiting waterfront, that includes origin and destination points, and mode(s) of transportation used
- Any parking garage design should improve the pedestrian experience at ground level

### **Activate or improve underutilized Seawall Lots (or portions)**

- Consider policy or planning to activate and clean-up underutilized seawall lot areas, which may be incorporated with public realm plans for the west side of the Embarcadero

### Questions

- How did Port get fair-market-value for non-market rate housing at 88 Broadway? State legislation allowed fair market value to be received with a combination of rent and jobs/housing credits (utilized at Pier 70)
- What would it mean if trust restriction is lifted for North of Market Street (as has been done for South of Market Street SWLs)? It would allow housing, office, general retail, assembly and entertainment, recreational enterprise uses currently allowed in Waterfront Plan. Legislation could apply to three SWLs collectively vs. a one-off approach

### Discussion/comments

#### Seawall lot development and legislation

- Seawall legislation permits a broader array of uses, so Port captures the financial benefit of non-trust developed uses
- Port has only a few seawall lots (assets) to utilize for revenue generation; don't put pressure on these sites, don't give them up, because Port needs some assets of value to work with
- Seawall lots create a particular transition/connection between that the city and the port. Designs of structures should emphasize access - physical and visual - from the street and sidewalk - to the Embarcadero, piers, etc. and vise-versa, form the waterfront into the city proper
- Use of seawall lots should as much as possible support the most diverse population (whether oriented to residents or visitors or workers)

### Parking on seawall lots

- Visitors from out of town drive to San Francisco waterfront. The existing parking on Port seawall lots is valued.
- Parking is a trust use and furthers trust objectives by accommodating visitors to the waterfront from the region/state that drive. Many people aren't comfortable with transit (i.e. BART) if they have never used it/don't use it on a regular basis.
- Support waterfront attractions Ferry Building marketplace and farmer's market attracts chefs and others who want to buy food in quantities that are not easily carried across 6-lanes of Embarcadero; the market lost business when Pier 1/2 (next door to Ferry Building) closed.
- Deliveries, workers must move by car/truck and park Discourage daily parking, but must accommodate the day-to-day requirements of businesses along the waterfront. Parking is a vital use.
- Maintain parking for existing uses that rely on it New developments may minimize parking. Hostels may generate less parking than a hotel. Or family-centric hotel that attracts more locals. Projects with no parking: Ferry Building office tenants; Teatro Hotel; 88 Broadway (housing)
- People drive to work on the waterfront Waterfront Plaza relies on two parking lots (they are full). F-line is full and unreliable. Caution re removing parking – the next project may need it.
- Study visitor patterns Recommend a significant study of visitor-ship, including number of people visiting waterfront, where are they coming from. Transit first is great, but 70% of Ferry Building Market customers buy in quantity, and they drive.
- Parking garage City Planning looks for improving the 'pedestrian experience' at ground level, along the sidewalks. If parking garage were developed, the design should take that into consideration.

### Activate or improve underutilized seawall lots (or portions of seawall lots)

- Some seawall lots are leased, but others are underutilized. Consider policy/evaluating a way to activate or clean-up underutilized areas.
- Prior BCDC/Port planning process discussed ways to improve the public realm on the west side of Embarcadero; Port wants to continue this thinking and develop a plan for those pockets along the west side to improve the public realm and pedestrian experience

### Site specific comments

- SWL 351 Consider "activity center" with bikes, aquatics, fitness, café as per FOGG Vision Plan produced by Asian Neighborhood Design
- SWL 314 Hotel or other potential uses may not need parking; parking currently serves Fisherman's Wharf

This SWL discussion will be continued to the next meeting. Jasper's SWL comments (sent via email to Alice) should be included in meeting notes.

Alice suggested a new idea for public-oriented uses: If Port supports, we would like to explore a Request for Interest to invite ideas for public-oriented uses (cultural, recreational) to activate piers, and see what the market would bring forward for Port historic piers, and financial feasibility opportunities and needs. Various concerns expressed:

- Be careful that so that it doesn't yield something that people don't like
- Ideas are trouble
- There are enough examples of existing projects and operations that can be researched
- It's a great idea.

Meeting adjourned.