

Comments on Mission Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan, October 21, 2013

The report uses the word “vibrant” 19 times. I suggest banning the word for one year.

I advise against adopting Amendments to Appendix C of the Hayward General Plan, Sustainable Mixed Use zoning. (PDF p. 67). In Section III of the Resolution in Attachment I, you should strike “and text changes to General Plan Appendix C as identified in attached Exhibit “C”” (PDF pp. 43-44). (Since the document has four different page numbers on each page, I will use the PDF number for ease of search.)

The minimum density for SMU should be kept at 25 and not lowered to a low density number for single family housing. Such low density should not be allowed “along major transit corridors, near transit stations or in close proximity to public higher educational facilities or large, employment centers.” The reason for the change is given as “to accommodate the T-3 Zone (Attachment I – Exhibit C)” (PDF p. 17).

However, if you look at Attachment I – Exhibit C, it does not have the T-3 Zone (PDF p. 67). This zone is evidently also called the T3 Zone, and is shown on PDF p. 181, where it states “The T3 (Sub-Urban) Zone is intended to consist of low density residential areas...” Again, PDF p. 826 has “T3 Sub-urban Zone.”

The SMU only needs to conform to the General Urban Zone T4-1, to which it already seems to conform. I can't be sure because the T4-1 zone has so many details. I don't have the time to figure it out, and the maximum density shown on p. 826 of 35 DU/ac is low for well-planned three story construction, as in the Bayview plan.

Sustainable Mixed Use is not possible at such a low density, or even the high end of 17.5 DU/ac. The General Plan already has more appropriate language for such low densities. It does not make sense to make SMU virtually meaningless.

It gets worse. PDF p. 826 shows a T3 maximum density of 17.5 unit per acre and requires side yard setback, and 2 stories maximum, thus precluding most row houses, townhouses, condominiums, and flats. The low end of current SMU, 25 DU/ac, is not permitted. Even T4-1 has a high limit of 35 units per acre. The Bayview Quarry site plan has 46 DU/ac. (Densities, I believe, should be based on number of bedrooms, not units.)

While some of the Mission plan seems useful, too much seems based on a priori transect theory not applicable to the lack of regular city blocks in most of the corridor or in other SMU areas. It seems vastly too prescriptive and detailed to be useful to a developer, or duplicates existing zoning. Have you consulted with the three developers who have built three story townhouses recently in Hayward? The form code makes some visual sense on its own and does not need an overly rigid and abstract theory to be useful. Zonings also make some sense to control use and densities. There is a big gap between the guidelines and the reality. Fortunately, General Plans are so vague the details hopefully don't matter.

This City has an historic culture of confusing progress with using taxpayer money to subsidize traffic and parking. It would be unfortunate to add to the problem by pretending that single family density supports sustainable mixed use.

Sherman Lewis, President, HAPA, sherman@csu Hayward.us

Comments on Mission Boulevard Corridor Specific Plan, Part 2, October 22, 2013

A Slip lane for parking is a nice idea. Taking thirty feet more from private property and the tax rolls is not. Attachment X gives Council a take it or leave choice it that does not look at the full existing right of way and the potential to have diagonal parking on it. You could have a 10' travel lane (PDF p. 880), 15' diagonal parking, and 5' of sidewalk in the existing right of way. It was not studied. Does it work elsewhere? How much slower would traffic go? Would speed humps slow traffic down? How would the traffic volumes compare to Orchard Ave.? Does council want choices or a rubber stamp?

Appendix D: Parking and Transportation Demand Strategy sounds like a good idea but it's not in the packet. I don't understand why staff recommends adopting it after the GP Update instead of as part of the GP Update, even though more detailed development could occur afterward. Having TDM in the GP would be a good basis for detail work later on.

The mobility Plan is headed in the right direction. "Install multi-space, pay-by-space parking meters" (PDF p. 188) will hopefully use FasTrak or SF Park technologies.

The N/N South Hayward reports have no particular sins of commission, but as I have explained at great length in previous communications, great sins of omission that greatly reduce the systemic changes needed for sustainable smart growth. The City is partly at fault, because it needs to understand pedestrian neighborhood systems before it can get a consultant to give better answers. Consultants are hired guns, and they won't tell you what you are not ready to hear.

Please read *Creation Care for Neighborhoods, the Quest for Bayview Village*, http://www.bayviewvillage.us/database/resources/bayview_village_ebook.pdf, on top of the thousand page meeting packet. It covers ideas in the Mobility Plan and also transportation pricing reforms, implementation techniques, short corridor systems, land based capital and operating finance of fast, frequent, free shuttle buses, eco-pass, taxi vouchers, guaranteed ride home, economies of scale of pedestrian area and density for walking-based commerce, the grocery store trip, and many other topics.

I tried to get through the 353 references to parking, but did not make it, even half way.

Sherman Lewis, President, HAPA, sherman@csu Hayward.us