Richmond District Strategy Community Conversation
December 10th Meeting Notes

Table #1
Facilitator and Note Taker: Brittany Bendix and Victoria Chong

Notes

Housing and Development
- Build more housing for all types, increase housing stock
- More senior housing
- More BMR units
- More vertical and horizontal mixed-use buildings
- Encourage mixed residential unit buildings (studios, 1 bedroom, 2 bedroom, 3+ bedroom)
- Diversity is a neighborhood strength
  - Affordable housing a driver of diversity
- Can D1 have a program where BMR units are given preference to displaced residents?
- Legalization of in-law units
- Housing policy \(\rightarrow\) less parking requirements in new development
- Taller buildings can be suitable in certain areas of D1
  - (some examples such as 25th Ave and Lake St, 15th Ave and Clement St)
- More buildings along transit corridors (should we reconsider 40 foot height limit?)
- Start a community trust to purchase properties (e.g., 16th Ave and Fulton St w/ 5+ units) or 3+ units should also be explored
- More transit is crucial
- If heights restrictions are more lax, setbacks should conform with neighborhood character
- Target (Masonic Ave and Geary Blvd) is an ideal location for building
- Bring back entertainment and cultural center to activate neighborhood \(\rightarrow\) Alexandria Theater, Balboa Theater, etc)
- Part of Balboa Street can be revitalized (1st floor retail, services, entertainment)
  - How do we curate these places so that people and resident can use the services for their everyday needs
- Chain stores \(\rightarrow\) why do these types of stores come with new development (i.e., Whole Foods)
- Explore more OEWD funding \(\rightarrow\) revitalize small businesses or youth and cultural services
  - Mediation between landlords and the city

Parks, Open Space and Pedestrian Safety
- Discouragement of auto dependence comes hand in hand with pedestrian safety
  - Make other modes more appealing, while increasing safety measures
  - East-west streets are dangerous
  - School loading zones are dangerous for cyclists
  - More bike boulevards
• Concerns of practicality of transit → the current transit system is already at full capacity
  o Good transit needs to come before density
• How can we shape things that are already happening to benefit the community
• Streets should be more activated for pedestrians
• More bulb-outs to shorten distance at crosswalk
  o Bring street up to level of the sidewalk
• Streets should be balanced between bikers and drivers
  o If streets are predominantly for cars, fears of the “Fulton effect”
• Increase night time visibility → crossing Geary, especially for seniors, is dangerous
• More access points (for pedestrians and cyclists) are needed to enter/exit parks
• 14th Ave @ Fulton St has crosswalks, but cars do not slow down, but instead continue to drive fast
  o Current crossings are not safe

Goals
  o Retain family-friendly character of community
  o More safety initiatives for pedestrians/cyclists from vehicles
  o More housing of all types
  o More mixed use buildings that provide residential uses and activated storefronts for a better pedestrian experience
  o Increase in the number of non-vehicle access points to the park
  o More pedestrian and cyclists safety measurements in D1

Table #2
Facilitator and Note Taker: Joseph Smooke and David Leong

Notes

Ideas/Concerns
How do we plan for more development?
• Rezoning
• Raising height limits
• Micro units
• Applying density bonus

BRT
• Saving 5 minutes not worth removing auto lanes/parking (some members rely on their cars and do not want automobile infrastructure to be removed)
• Bus already crowded, dirty during rush hour (members were skeptical that BRT would improve these conditions)
• BRT gives more predictability. One bus every 5 minutes instead of 4 buses all bunched up with large gaps after

*Higher/Taller Development*
• *Where* matters, not just what kind (one person said that survey was specific about the type of buildings, not as much about the locations)
• Taller = more shadowy (some group members did not want this, said not very hot anyway, don’t need that much shade. However…)
• Bigger residential developments would help support small businesses (logic being that more people = more patronage)
• Gentrification driving prices up (goods, services, food, etc)
• Linking rent prices and property values to average income (a proposed idea, cited European cities as example)
• Higher density/taller buildings are not as picturesque

*Transportation*
• Parking? Where will cars go? Putting more parking despite public transit? → deprioritize parking in transit-heavy areas (members mentioned that surface parking lots are undesirable)
• Increasing pedestrian friendliness → pedestrian malls (also based on European cities)
• Smaller scale transit (vanpool, minibus, intra-district service, etc) (members wanted better alternatives to MUNI)
• Exploring autonomous vehicle options (touted as potentially safer option, however, someone else said that these cars can’t handle the hills)
• Enforcing speed limits, penalties → sliding income scale? (also based on European cities, saying that people are less likely to break the law if the fees are exorbitantly high)
• No more tech shuttle stops! Gentrification around those stops (several members linked the shuttles with gentrification, including a lady who worked in tech. Some members said that no shuttles would mean more cars, but others said if stops don’t exist, people simply won’t live in those areas)

**Goal**
Maintain both character and affordability by only allowing taller development in suitable locations

---

*Table #3*
*Facilitator: Kimia Haddadan*

**Notes**

**Concerns**
• Evictions are high and neighbors are going through displacement. Need protections against evictions.
• There was concern about the potential overcrowding and interest in keeping the neighborhood the way it is
• Some members disagreed. Expressed the need for more housing, because currently they cannot afford looking for housing that match their needs.
• Most members agreed that cities change and we need to accommodate people’s needs, especially young people trying to form households
• We need to allocate more resources to low income households.
• Need entertainment uses for seniors to be able to stay
• Members of the group were unanimously concerned about pedestrian safety
• One member asked for speed limit blinking signs similar to the one on Sloat Blvd.

Goals
A Neighborhood Where:
• opportunities exist for people who go through hard times
• Protections exist for people going through evictions
• Underutilized sites are used for housing and other neighborhood needs; find better ways to utilize under-utilized sites (under-utilized sites could mean parking lots, or even vacant residential units where owners have not been renting)
• options for housing especially middle income households exist and are abundant
• Growth is planned for the neighborhood from Stanyan to 28th and Fulton to Lake (through an Area Plan)
• A balance exists between accommodating new residents and stabilizing existing residents
• Golden Gate Park is more safely accessible to pedestrians (this was agreed amongst all members)
• Traffic moves slower along Fulton Street
• Pedestrian improvements are planned in an area-wide comprehensive way
• Multiple safe transportation options exist to get around

Table #4
Facilitator: Sue Exline

Notes
• Muni eliminating 38 bus
• Better Muni service
• Don’t lose the heart and soul of the Richmond
• Bike and pedestrian safety – cars don’t see red lights, traffic calming measures
• Increase frequency of Muni ➔ want all to have seats
• Strict guidelines for AirBnB
• Geary Blvd ➔ if increasing heights, there needs to be setbacks so sunlight on streets
• Crossing time isn’t adequate on Geary
- Safety as a ped
- Speeding traffic and why no speed bumps on back of 15th Ave (??)
- Ped safety especially at night
- Lack of civility → encourage Uber, Lyft, and Chariot
- Households should not spend more than 33% of income on housing
- Serious visibility issue on Fulton – need to access the park
- No pesticides
- Balboa corridor vacancies
- Geary – long term vacancies

Goals
- Desire to keep all local stops and improve transit
- More affordable housing
- Maintain sunlight on sidewalks
- A neighborhood that is safe for pedestrians and bikes
- A neighborhood that is safe for kids and seniors

Table #5
Facilitator and Note Taker: Paolo Ikezoe and Maria De Alva

Notes
Housing
- Vulnerable Populations
  - Definite increase in homelessness
- Housing Stability/Affordability
  - Small lots limit development potential + “built-out” nature means potential for new development to cause displacement
  - Not every existing building is sacred, many unattractive buildings that we wouldn’t mind replacing (with strategy to help any displaced tenants or businesses)

Transportation
- Lyft and Uber change the need for parking
- Call for more pedestrian bulb outs
- Get stop signs off of Anza so that bikes don’t have to stop every block

Goals
- Find solutions for vulnerable groups to seek aid
- Provide incentives for developers of new housing to include mixed-income housing or services for homeless individuals
- Higher heights for more housing
• Focus development on larger “opportunity sites”
• Come up with strategy for relocation for displaced residents and businesses
• Underground parking preferred in new development
• Underground MUNI on Geary
• Improve neighborhood transportation options so surface parking is less necessary
• Faster, more frequent transit with less stops
• Not all streets designed to prioritize cars
• At least one 2-way protected cycle track through the neighborhood
• More bike-friendly side streets
• Improved bicycle and pedestrian access to Golden Gate Park
• Continue to support diverse local businesses serving daily needs
  • Call for more grocery stores, diverse restaurants, and healthy options
• Come up with strategy to fill long-vacant storefronts (i.e. on Clement)