4.1 LAND USE AND PLANNING

A. SUMMARY

The Main Campus Master Plan would increase the total square footage and capacity of the Main Campus. Although these increases would be substantial, they would be consistent with the current use of the campus for academic purposes. The Master Plan could result in impacts on the character of the vicinity due to the increased intensity of use of the Main Campus. These changes could be experienced together as negative changes to the quality of life in the area. This significant impact could be reduced substantially by the implementation of transportation demand management measures and residential parking permit requirements, but would remain significant after mitigation because the effectiveness of mitigation is not known at this time.

The project would not conflict with most General Plan policies, but might conflict with those policies that relate to the disruption of nearby residential areas. In addition, the project might raise issues with respect to policies regarding visual character and air quality. The physical impacts associated with these potential conflicts and issues are addressed by the character impact identified above, as well as the visual quality and air quality impacts identified elsewhere in this EIR. The project would be consistent with the P (Public Use) zoning district designation for the site. Some of the proposed buildings could exceed the Planning Code height and bulk limits; the visual impacts related to these conflicts are discussed in Section 4.2, Visual Quality and Shadow.

The proposed Main Campus Master Plan and planned and approved projects at other campuses are part of the CCSF Master Plan, which would be the College’s Institutional Master Plan. As the Main Campus Master Plan is implemented, individual project components could differ from the Master Plan, but overall the proposed project would be consistent with the planned development and use of the site as outlined in the Plan.

B. INTRODUCTION

This section describes existing land uses and features of the Main Campus and planned development in the project vicinity. The compatibility of the project with nearby existing and planned land uses is also discussed. CCSF, as part of the California Community Colleges system, is not subject to most local regulations, and for classroom uses, may choose to exempt itself from local planning and zoning requirements. However, this section includes an analysis of the project relative to the plans, policies, and regulations of the San Francisco General Plan and San Francisco Planning Code for informational purposes and to analyze and assess the project’s environmental impacts. Although in draft form, the Balboa Park Station Area Plan is also discussed (for informational purposes).
C. EXISTING CONDITIONS

C1. Existing Land Use

As discussed in Section 3.0, Project Description, and shown on Figure 3.0-1, Project Location, the CCSF Ocean Avenue (Main) Campus is located in the south-central part of the City and encompasses approximately 67.4 acres. The campus is bounded to the north by Judson Avenue; on the east by Interstate 280 (I-280); on the south by Ocean Avenue; and currently on the west by Phelan Avenue. The campus encompasses all of Assessor’s Block 3179, Lot 10.

CCSF also owns the South Reservoir (10.9 acres)\(^1\) that along with the North Reservoir\(^2\) comprise the 25-acre Balboa Reservoir just west of the Main Campus and Phelan Avenue. Although constructed by the San Francisco Water Department (SFWD)\(^3\) in 1957, these two reservoirs have never been used for water storage and instead provide student parking. Both basins are lined with asphalt and separated from the surrounding land uses (and each other) by a series of berms. The South Reservoir is bounded on the north by the North Reservoir; on the south by the MUNI turnaround, known as the “Phelan Loop,” and commercial properties on Ocean Avenue; on the east by Phelan Avenue; and on the west by the rear property line of homes on Plymouth Avenue. The Reservoir encompasses most of Assessor’s Block 3180, Lot 1. The remainder of Block 1 is occupied by a fire station, the California Bookstore, and the “Phelan Loop,” all near the intersection of Phelan and Ocean Avenues.

The land area utilized by the Main Campus is not owned in its entirety by CCSF. Specifically, the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department owns two triangular parcels in the northeast and southeast corners of the site; the northeast parcel is used for tennis courts and the southeast parcel is vacant. Both parcels are maintained by CCSF.

Existing buildings are distributed throughout the campus. Space in the Main Campus buildings totals about 944,000 gross square feet (a detailed list is provided in Section 3.0, Project Description). The northern and central areas of the campus are dominated by academic uses. The east side of the campus has mostly athletic and recreation uses, including the stadium (football/track) and the tennis courts. The southwest area, including the bookstore west of Phelan Avenue, is dominated by student services and administration uses. The reservoirs west of Phelan Avenue are solely devoted to parking. The southeast corner contains almost equal percentages of athletic, physical plant, academic support, and parking uses.

Small-scale, generally single-family residential uses predominate in the neighborhoods surrounding the Ocean Avenue Campus, with residential uses abutting the campus across Ocean Avenue, Judson Avenue

\(^{1}\) City College of San Francisco, Master Plan (Draft), November 19, 2003, pp. 6 and 18.

\(^{2}\) The North Reservoir is owned by the San Francisco Public Utilities Commissions (SFPUC).

\(^{3}\) The SFWD is now part of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC).
and Havelock Street. The South and North Reservoirs separate the campus from residential uses to the west. Balboa Park, a city park, lies immediately east of I-280, and includes ballfields, a swimming pool and other recreational facilities. Ocean Avenue west of Phelan Avenue is an active neighborhood commercial corridor. Two private high schools are immediately adjacent to the campus - Lick Wilmerding High School across Ocean Avenue and Bishop Riordan High School across Phelan Avenue at Judson Avenue. The Balboa Park BART station and MUNI facilities are near campus, located at the intersection of Ocean and Geneva Avenues and I-280. Caltrans owns the right of way for I-280 and its on- and off-ramps. The land uses near the Main Campus are depicted in Figure 4.1-1, Existing Land Uses in Campus Vicinity.

C2. Existing Zoning

Use Districts

As shown in Figure 4.1-2, Existing Zoning Districts in Campus Vicinity, the campus and Balboa Reservoir are in the P (Public Use) zoning district. The P district applies to “land that is owned by a governmental agency and in some form of public use, including open space,” and allows “[p]ublic structures and uses of the City and County of San Francisco, and of other governmental agencies…”

The Balboa Park BART Station, MUNI facilities, I-280 and Balboa Park (all zoning district P) are located directly southeast and east of the campus. These areas represent a sizeable concentration of public uses lying within an otherwise low-density residential area of the City. Specifically, the zoning north and south of the campus as well as on the opposite side of Balboa Park from the campus is predominantly RH-1 (Residential, House Districts, One-Family), with small enclaves of RH-2 (Residential, House Districts, Two-Family) to the north and south. Areas to the north also contain small enclaves of NC-1 (Neighborhood Commercial Cluster), P and RM-1 (Residential, Mixed Districts, Low Density). RH-1 (D) (Residential, House Districts, One-Family [Detached Dwellings]) dominates the area northwest of the campus, with a well-defined zone of NC-2 (Small-Scale Neighborhood Commercial District) running along Ocean Avenue to the west. Distinct areas of RH-1 and RH-2 and a small patch of NC-1 are found just south of Ocean Avenue and southwest of the campus.

The residential neighborhood west and north of the Balboa Reservoir is within the Westwood Park Residential Character District, a Restricted Use Sub-District on the Zoning Map. Section 244 of the Planning Code notes that residential character districts “provide for certain areas with special building forms and natural characteristics…” Section 244.1 requires that the construction of new residential
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4 City and County of San Francisco, Planning Code, Section 234, “P Districts,” and Section 234.1, “Principal Uses Permitted, P Districts,” June 1990; and City and County of San Francisco, Zoning Map, Sheet 12.
5 City and County of San Francisco, Zoning Map, Sheet 11.
buildings and alterations of existing residential buildings in the Westwood Park Residential Character District “…be consistent with the design policies and guidelines of the Master [General] Plan and with the previously adopted ‘Residential Design Guidelines’ as amended by portions of ‘The Westwood Park Association Residential Design Guidelines’…” The Westwood Park neighborhood of 650 homes, established in 1917 and constructed into the early 1920s, is known for its oval curving streets and bungalows representing the Arts and Crafts movement.6

**Height and Bulk Districts**

The San Francisco Planning Code assigns height and bulk district requirements to the campus and adjacent areas.7 Figure 4.1-3, Existing Height and Bulk Districts in Campus Vicinity, shows the height and bulk districts for the Main Campus and surrounding area.

The campus falls into three height and bulk districts. Most of the South Reservoir, the area of the campus north of Cloud Circle and Havelock Street, and the southern edge of the campus are in the 65-A district. In this district, heights are limited to 65 feet, building length is limited to 110 feet and the maximum diagonal dimension allowed is 125 feet. The 105-E district, which applies to the remainder of the campus south of Havelock Street, allows a 105-foot height limit, 110-foot maximum length and 140-foot maximum diagonal dimension. The North Reservoir and the western edge of the South Reservoir are in the 40-X district, with a height limit of 40 feet and building-width dimensions dependent on site and fronting street slope. Although certain exceptions apply, building height is generally measured from curb level at the building centerline (per Planning Code Section 102.12), and measured to the highest point on a finished flat roof (per Section 260).

The height and bulk district designations near the project site are predominately 40-X, with an area of 28-X directly west and northwest of the North Reservoir (Westwood Park). The 28-X district generally provides for heights of up to 28 feet.

**D. EXISTING PLANS, POLICIES AND REGULATIONS**

**D1. City and County of San Francisco**

As an entity within the State California Community Colleges system, CCSF is generally not subject to local regulations. In addition, CCSF may choose to exempt itself from local planning and zoning requirements with respect to classroom uses. Therefore, the following information regarding the City

---

6 From www.westwoodpark.com, the web site of the Westwood Park Association.
and County of San Francisco planning/regulatory context is not necessarily applicable to the Master Plan, and is presented for informational purposes and to assess and analyze environmental impacts.

San Francisco General Plan

The San Francisco General Plan designates the project site as an Educational Facility in the Community Facilities Element, thus including the project site in the Public Schools Facilities Plan. In addition to specific land use designations, the San Francisco General Plan contains objectives and policies related to physical environmental issues that are applicable to this project. Some of the key General Plan objectives and policies pertinent to the project are listed below.

Residence Element

- Objective 12: To provide a quality living environment.
  - Policy 3: Minimize the disruption caused by expansion of institutions into residential areas.

Commerce and Industry Element

- Objective 7: Enhance San Francisco’s position as a national and regional center for governmental, health and educational services.
  - Policy 2: Encourage the extension of needed health and educational services, but manage expansion to avoid or minimize disruption of adjacent residential areas.
  - Policy 3: Promote the provision of adequate health and educational services to all geographical districts and cultural groups in the city.

Transportation Element

- Objective 1: Meet the needs of all residents and visitors for safe, convenient and inexpensive travel within San Francisco and between the City and other parts of the region while maintaining the high quality living environment of the Bay Area.
  - Policy 1.2: Ensure the safety and comfort of pedestrians throughout the city.
  - Policy 1.3: Give priority to public transit and other alternatives to the private automobile as the means of meeting San Francisco’s transportation needs, particularly those of commuters.
- Objective 2: Use the transportation system as a means for guiding development and improving the environment.

---

8 City and County of San Francisco, Master Plan (General Plan), as amended.
Policy 2.2: Reduce pollution, noise and energy consumption.

Policy 2.3: Design and locate facilities to preserve the historic city fabric and the natural landscape, and to protect views.

Policy 2.5: Provide incentives for the use of transit, carpools, vanpools, walking and bicycling and reduce the need for new or expanded automobile and automobile parking facilities.

Objective 11: Maintain public transit as the primary mode of transportation in San Francisco and as a means through which to guide future development and improve regional mobility and air quality.

Objective 12: Develop and implement programs in the public and private sectors, which will support congestion management and air quality objectives, maintain mobility and enhance business vitality at minimum cost.

Objective 16: Develop and implement programs that will efficiently manage the supply of parking at employment centers throughout the City so as to discourage single-occupant ridership and encourage ridesharing, transit and other alternatives to the single-occupant automobile.

Policy 16.1: Reduce parking demand through the provision of comprehensive information that encourages the use of alternative modes of transportation.

Policy 16.2: Reduce parking demand where parking is subsidized by employers with "cash-out" programs in which the equivalency of the cost of subsidized parking is offered to those employees who do not use parking facilities.

Policy 16.3: Reduce parking demand through the provision of incentives for the use of carpools and vanpools at new and existing parking facilities throughout the City.

Policy 16.4: Manage parking demand through appropriate pricing policies including the use of premium rates near employment centers well-served by transit, walking and bicycling, and progressive rate structures to encourage turnover and the efficient use of parking.
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- Policy 16.5: Reduce parking demand through limiting the absolute amount of spaces and prioritizing the spaces for short-term and ride-share uses.
- Policy 16.6: Encourage alternatives to the private automobile by locating public transit access and ride-share vehicle and bicycle parking at more close-in and convenient locations on-site, and by locating parking facilities for single-occupant vehicles more remotely.

**Objective 20:** Give first priority to improving transit service throughout the City, providing a convenient and efficient system as a preferable alternative to automobile use.

- Policy 20.2: Reduce, relocate or prohibit automobile facility features on transit preferential streets, such as driveways and loading docks, to avoid traffic conflicts and automobile congestion.

**Objective 21:** Develop transit as the primary mode of travel to and from Downtown and all major activity centers within the region.

- Policy 21.9: Improve pedestrian and bicycle access to transit facilities.

**Objective 23:** Improve the City’s pedestrian circulation system to provide for efficient, pleasant, and safe movement.

- Policy 23.2: Widen sidewalks where intensive commercial, recreationally, or institutional activity is present and where residential densities are high.
- Policy 23.6: Ensure convenient and safe pedestrian crossings by minimizing the distance pedestrians must walk to cross a street.

**Objective 28:** Provide secure and convenient parking facilities for bicycles

- Policy 28.1: Provide secure bicycle parking in new governmental, commercial, and residential developments.

**Objective 30:** Ensure that the provision of new or enlarged parking facilities does not adversely affect the livability and desirability of the City and its various neighborhoods.

- Policy 30.1: Assure that new or enlarged parking facilities meet need, locational and design criteria.

**Objective 31:** Establish parking rates and off-street parking fare structures to reflect the full costs, monetary and environmental, of parking in the City.

- Policy 31.1: Set rates to encourage short-term over long term automobile parking
- Policy 31.2: When off-street parking near institutions and in commercial areas outside of downtown is in short supply, set parking rates to encourage higher turnover and more efficient use of the parking supply.

**Objective 33:** Contain and lessen the traffic and parking impact of institutions on surrounding residential areas.
Policy 33.1: Limit the provision of long-term parking facilities at institutions and encourage such institutions to regulate existing facilities to assure use by short-term clients and visitors.

Policy 33.2: Protect residential neighborhoods from the parking impacts of nearby traffic generators.

Objective 40: Enforce a parking and loading strategy for freight distribution to reduce congestion affecting other vehicular traffic and adverse impacts on pedestrian circulation.

Policy 40.1: Provide off-street facilities for freight loading and service vehicles on the site of new buildings sufficient to meet the demands generated by the intended uses. Seek opportunities to create new off-street loading facilities for existing buildings.

Policy 40.2: Discourage access to off-street freight loading and service vehicle facilities from transit preferential streets, or pedestrian-oriented streets and alleys by providing alternative access routes to facilities.

Policy 40.9: Where possible, mitigate the undesirable effects of noise, vibration and emission by limiting late evening and early hour loading and unloading in retail, institutional, and industrial facilities abutting residential neighborhoods.

Urban Design Element

Objective 1: Emphasis of the characteristic pattern which gives to the city and its neighborhoods an image, a sense of purpose, and a means of orientation.

Policy 1.1: Recognize and protect major views in the city, with particular attention to those of open space and water.

Objective 2: Conservation of resources which provide a sense of nature, continuity with the past, and freedom from overcrowding.

Policy 2.4: Preserve notable landmarks and areas of historic, architectural or aesthetic value, and promote the preservation of other buildings and features that provide community with past development.

Policy 2.5: Use care in remodeling of older buildings, in order to enhance rather than weaken the original character of such buildings.

Policy 2.6: Respect the character of older development nearby in the design of new buildings.

The Ocean Avenue campus is not identified as an “outstanding and unique area” under Urban Design Element Policy 2.7.

Objective 3: Moderation of major new development to complement the city pattern, the resources to be conserved, and the neighborhood environment.
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- Policy 3.1: Promote harmony in the visual relationships and transitions between new and older buildings.
- Policy 3.2: Avoid extreme contrasts in color, shape and other characteristics which will cause new buildings to stand out in excess of their public importance.
- Policy 3.4: Promote building forms that will respect and improve the integrity of open spaces and other public areas.
- Policy 3.5: Relate the height of buildings to important attributes of the city pattern and to the height and character of existing development.
- Policy 3.6: Relate the bulk of buildings to the prevailing scale of development to avoid an overwhelming or dominating appearance in new construction.
- Policy 3.7: Recognize the special urban design problems posed in development of large properties.
- Policy 3.8: Development is carefully designed with respect to its impact upon the surrounding areas and upon the city.

- Objective 4: Improvement of the neighborhood environment to increase personal safety, comfort, pride and opportunity.
  - Policy 4.1: Protect residential areas from the noise, pollution, and physical danger of excessive traffic.
  - Policy 4.15: Protect the livability and character of residential properties from the intrusion of incompatible new buildings.

Environmental Protection Element

- Objective 4: Assure that the ambient air of San Francisco and the Bay Region is clean, provides maximum visibility, and meets air quality standards.
  - Policy 4.1: Support and comply with objectives, policies, and air quality standards of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District.

- Objective 5: Assure a permanent and adequate supply of fresh water to meet the present and future needs of San Francisco.
  - Policy 5.2: Exercise controls over development to correspond to the capabilities of the water supply and distribution system.

- Objective 7: Assure that the land resources in San Francisco are used in ways that both respect and preserve the natural values of the land and serve the best interest of all the city’s citizens.
  - Policy 7.5: Prohibit construction, as a general rule, on land subject to slide or erosion.

- Objective 10: Minimize the impact of noise on affected areas.
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- Policy 10.1: Promote site planning, building orientation and design, and interior layout that will lessen noise intrusion.

  - Objective 11: Promote land uses that are compatible with various transportation noise levels.
    - Policy 11.1: Discourage new uses in areas in which the noise level exceeds the noise compatibility guidelines for that use.
    - Policy 11.3: Locate new noise-generating development so that the noise impact is reduced.

Community Facilities Element

- Objective 8: Assure that public school facilities are distributed and located in a manner that will enhance their efficient and effective use.
  - Policy 8.1: Provide public school facilities for education in accordance with the need for such facilities as defined by the Unified School District and Community College District. Locate such facilities according to the Public School Facilities Plan and, whenever possible, make available for community use.

- Objective 9: Assure that institutional uses are located in a manner that will enhance their efficient and effective use.
  - Policy 9.1: Locate institutional uses according to the Institutional Facilities Plan. The areas that are shown on the Institutional Facilities Plan are those occupied by or reserved for large groups or buildings of a public or semi-public nature. They include San Francisco State College, University of San Francisco, Laguna Honda Home, Youth Guidance Center, several large parochial schools and the University of California Medical Center and the Civic Center.

Community Safety Element

- Objective 2: Reduce structural and non-structural hazards to life safety, minimize property damage and resulting social, cultural and economic dislocations resulting from future disasters.
  - Policy 2.1: Assure that new construction meets current structural and life safety standards.
  - Policy 2.3: Consider site soils conditions when reviewing projects in areas subject to liquefaction or slope instability.
  - Policy 2.9: Consider information about geologic hazards whenever City decisions that will influence land use, building density, building configurations or infrastructure are made.
Air Quality Element

- Objective 2: Reduce mobile source of air pollution through implementation of the transportation element of the General Plan.
  
  - The General Plan includes cross-references to policies from the Transportation Element that strive to reduce automobile trips and promote the use of alternative transportation modes.
- Objective 3: Decrease the air quality impacts of development by coordination of land use and transportation decisions.
  
  - Policy 3.1: Take advantage of the high density development in San Francisco to improve the transit infrastructure and also encourage high density and compact development where an extensive transportation infrastructure exists.
  
  - Policy 3.2: Encourage mixed use development near transit lines and provide retail and other types of services oriented uses within walking distance to minimize dependent development.
- Objective 5: Minimize particulate matter emissions from road and construction sites.
  
  - Policy 5.1: Continue policies to minimize particulate matter emissions during road and building construction and demolition.

Balboa Park Station Area Plan

The CCSF Main Campus would be affected by strategies, objectives and policies outlined in the Balboa Park Station Area Plan (currently in draft form). In general, the Plan calls for a number of near-campus projects, in particular upgrades and improvements to various street and transit facilities, including increasing bicycle access to and from the campus. The Plan’s two key strategies and associated policies that are especially pertinent to the Main Campus Master Plan are described below.

Key Strategy #8: Integrate City College Into the Community

- Objective 1: Plan for physical changes
  
  - Policy 1.1: Ensure the growth and development of the Phelan Campus is guided by an up-to-date institutional master plan.
- Objective 2: Better integrate the existing campus, and future expansions, with the surrounding neighborhood and the transit station.
  
  - Policy 2.1: Direct development of new campus facilities to the eastern edge of the campus first.
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- **Policy 2.2**: Direct certain new campus facilities to the Balboa Reservoir, including housing.
- **Policy 2.3**: Develop active campus facilities along Ocean Avenue to contribute to enlivening the street.
- **Policy 2.5**: Develop a new southern gateway to the campus.\(^9\)
- **Policy 2.6**: Upgrade and improve various streets and transit facilities related to the college.

*Objective 3:* Minimize the impacts that the College, as a large institution, places on the surrounding neighborhood.

- **Policy 3.1**: Establish a parking and transportation demand management program for City College.
- **Policy 3.2**: Plan locations of parking facilities so as to minimize traffic through the neighborhood.

**Key Strategy #9: Realize the Potential of the Balboa Reservoir**

- **Objective 1:** Redevelop the Reservoir so that it becomes better connected with its surroundings.
  - **Policy 1.1**: Regardless of the type of new development that occurs on the reservoir, it should be planned so as to respect the grid structure of the surrounding neighborhoods so that the reservoir in the future can become an amenity connected to the neighborhood rather than isolated from it.

- **Objective 2:** Develop the east basin of the reservoir in accordance with the needs of City College but acknowledge its importance to the neighborhood and the City as a whole.
  - **Policy 2.1**: Encourage a "campus village" on the east basin.

- **Objective 3:** Ensure that the east basin of the reservoir is developed in a manner that embraces the surrounding neighborhood.
  - **Policy 3.1**: Continue Phelan Loop Plaza with a central promenade.
  - **Policy 3.2**: Create a new east to west pedestrian pathway.
  - **Policy 3.3**: Create a strong system of streets and pathways and make sure new buildings are designed to address them.
  - **Policy 3.4**: Ensure parking facilities are well designed and not larger than necessary.

- **Objective 4:** Develop the west basin of the reservoir for the greatest benefit of the City as a whole as well as for the surrounding neighborhoods.
  - **Policy 4.1**: Complete a comprehensive cost-benefit analysis of upgrading the west basin for water storage.
  - **Policy 4.2**: Ensure that a future reservoir can also function as public open space.

\(^9\) The *Balboa Park Station Area Plan* does not list a Policy 2.4 under Objective 2.
Policy 4.3: Consider development of housing, in addition to public open space, on the west basin if not needed for water storage.

Policy 4.4: Create significant open space on the west basin.

**Institutional Master Plan**

The *San Francisco Institutional Uses Plan* and Section 304.5 of the Planning Code require that “each post-secondary educational institution...in the City and County of San Francisco shall have on file with the Department of City Planning a current institutional master plan describing the existing and anticipated future development of that institution...” Among the required elements of the plan is a description of “[t]he development plans of the institution for a future period of not less than 10 years, and the physical changes in the institution projected to be needed to achieve those plans.” The Main Campus Master Plan and approved and planned projects at other CCSF campuses together constitute a Master Plan intended to fulfill the Institutional Master Plan requirements.

**Accountable Planning Initiative**

On November 4, 1986, the voters of San Francisco approved Proposition M, the Accountable Planning Initiative, which is codified as Section 101.1 (b) of the Planning Code. These policies call for: (1) preservation and enhancement of neighborhood retail uses; (2) protection of neighborhood character; (3) preservation and enhancement of affordable housing; (4) discouragement of commuter automobiles; (5) protection of industrial and service land uses from commercial office development and enhancement of residential employment and business ownership; (6) earthquake preparedness; (7) landmark historic building preservation; and (8) preservation of open space. Prior to issuing a permit for any project, or adopting any legislation that requires an Initial Study under CEQA, or adopting any zoning ordinance or development agreement, and before taking any action that requires a finding of consistency with the *General Plan*, the City is required to find that the project is consistent with the Priority Policies established by Proposition M. The Main Campus Master Plan would be exempt from Proposition M, because no approval by the City is required.

**Applicable Planning Code Provisions**

If CCSF chooses that the Master Plan be subject to the San Francisco Planning Code, the Master Plan would be subject to those Code controls applicable on publicly owned property. Those controls include Article 1.5 (Off-Street Parking and Loading), Article 2 (Use Districts), and Article 2.5 (Height and Bulk Districts). In addition, Planning Code Section 295 limits new shade on property under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Recreation and Park Commission; new construction over 40 feet in height is subject to

---

that limit. The potential shadow impacts of the CCSF Master Plan are discussed in Section 4.2, Visual Quality and Shadow.

D2. San Francisco Public Utilities Commission

The Final Urban Water Management Plan for the City and County of San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (February 2001) does not refer specifically to the Balboa Reservoir. The Plan does emphasize the importance of reservoir storage. The Water Supply Master Plan for the SFPUC system (April 2000), which includes recommended facility improvements, does not refer to the Balboa Reservoir. The reservoir also is not mentioned in the SFPUC Long-Term Strategic Plan (May 2002). Construction of the Balboa Reservoir is not in the current SFPUC Capital Improvement Program (August 2003). Because future development of the Balboa Reservoir by the SFPUC is speculative, it is not considered in this EIR.

E. PLANNED AND APPROVED LAND USES

There are no major planned or approved projects in the area of the campus. Building permits for a mixed-use project on Ocean Avenue between Brighton and Lee Avenues were approved in 2000, and it appears that the project is under construction. The approved use is a four-story building with nine residential units, 2,000 square feet of retail uses and about 900 square feet of office uses. The only other known plans call for moving the Ingleside Branch of the San Francisco Public Library, currently located on Ocean Avenue at Faxon Avenue, to a new 6,000 square foot one-story building on Ocean Avenue at Plymouth Avenue. Construction is scheduled to begin in 2005, with the new branch expected to open in 2007 or earlier.

The Draft Balboa Park Station Area Plan includes a recommended development program for the Phelan Loop Area. The program would include the extension of Harold, Lee, and Brighton Avenues across Ocean Avenue; relocation of the MUNI layover facility; several public open spaces; mixed-use development of up to five stories (45 to 55 feet); and possible redevelopment of the fire station/bookstore parcel near the corner of Phelan and Ocean Avenues. The Balboa Plan is still in draft form and the anticipated date of approval is unknown; no specific projects within the Phelan Loop have been formally
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11 Pearl, Barry, SFPUC, personal communication, September 11, 2003.
12 Washington, Delvin, San Francisco Planning Department, personal communication, October 20, 2003. Renovations and expansion at Lick-Wilmerding High School were completed in August 2003 (Lick-Wilmerding, www.lwhs.org/, January 14, 2004). MUNI’s improvements to the K-Ingleside line along Ocean Avenue are in the final stages and scheduled to be finished by March 2004 (Anthony Bryant, Project Manager, MUNI, personal communication, January 14, 2004).
14 (Source: San Francisco Public Library, Branch Library Improvement Program, sfpl.lib.ca.us/news/blip/improvementprogram.htm, January 13, 2004.)
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initiated.\textsuperscript{15} Therefore, future use of the area is considered too speculative to analyze in detail (and thus is not included in the cumulative impacts analysis in this EIR).

The draft Balboa Park Station Area Plan proposes that public open space be developed on top of the western part of the Balboa Reservoir if the SFPUC uses it for water storage. Should the SFPUC determine that the reservoir is not needed or not feasible, the Plan proposes that housing and open space be developed. As noted above, the Plan has not been approved by the City, and the MOU between CCSF and the SFPUC states that the PUC does not intend to allow any use or activity on top of the reservoir should it be constructed. Therefore, future use of the area is considered too speculative to analyze in detail (and thus is not included in the cumulative impacts analysis in this EIR).

F. SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA

For purposes of this EIR, thresholds were used from both the City and County of San Francisco Initial Study Checklist and Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines (Environmental Checklist Form).

The City and County of San Francisco typically uses the following criteria (from the City’s Initial Study Checklist) when determining whether a project could have a significant effect on the environment:

Could the project:

a. Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community?

b. Have any substantial impact upon the existing character of the vicinity?

In addition, Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines (Environmental Checklist Form) lists the following items to be considered when determining whether a project could have a significant effect on the environment:

- Physically divide an established community;
- Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal plan, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect; or
- Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

If implementation of the project exceeds any of the standards outlined above, the project would result in a significant impact.

The following analysis considers impacts related to the existing character of the vicinity and potential policy/regulatory conflicts. The Main Campus Master Plan would not disrupt or divide the physical

\textsuperscript{15} Rich, Ken, San Francisco Planning Department, personal communication, November 5, 2003.
arrangement of an established community because all Master Plan projects would occur within the existing Main Campus or on the Balboa Reservoir. The campus is not subject to any habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans.

**Land Use-1  Impacts on Existing Character**

**Impact**

The Main Campus is currently an educational facility occupied by classroom buildings and related uses, parking, athletic fields, open space, and vegetated/landscaped areas. The proposed Master Plan would result in the demolition of a number of the existing structures on the site, and construction of new academic, physical education, performing arts, and support services buildings. The existing Main Campus buildings provide about 943,560 gross square feet of building space; of that total, up to about 128,240 gross square feet would likely be demolished or removed within the time frame of the Plan. Therefore, about 815,320 gross square feet of existing space would remain when potential demolition and building removal are included. When considered with existing space and potential demolition and removal, the proposed Main Campus bond projects and potential building program would result in a total building space of up to 1,483,320 gross square feet, or an increase of up to 539,760 gross square feet over existing conditions.

The Master Plan is intended to accommodate an increase in enrollment from 36,900 students currently to 50,400 students by the 2015/2016 school year, a 36.6 percent increase. It is expected that employment on the campus would increase at a rate similar to the increase in enrollment. Based on the projected enrollment, full-time faculty and classified employees would increase from about 900 to about 1,200 persons, and part-time employment would increase from about 1,100 to about 1,500 persons, within the Master Plan horizon.

The Master Plan would increase the total square footage and capacity of the Main Campus. Although these increases would be substantial, they would be consistent with the current use of the campus for academic purposes.

The use of the eastern part of the Balboa Reservoir would change from surface parking to structures with below-grade parking. Although this part of the reservoir would continue to be used for College purposes, the Master Plan would extend the built uses on campus across Phelan Avenue. The future use of the western part of the reservoir has not been determined at this time, but could include the existing surface parking, a reservoir, a reservoir and open space, or housing.

The Master Plan could result in impacts on the character of the vicinity due to the increased intensity of use of the Main Campus. Neighborhood streets in the vicinity would experience increased traffic and pedestrian activity, with associated concerns about emergency access, lack of street parking, noise from cars, litter, and pedestrian/vehicle conflicts. Although these changes are not identified individually as
significant physical impacts elsewhere in this EIR, they could be experienced together as negative changes to the quality of life in the area. Whether these changes would be considered “substantial” is subjective, but an argument could be made that, given the existing problems in the area, any increase in student activity would be significant.

The Master Plan could also result in impacts on the visual character of the vicinity, due to the more built-up character of the area west of Phelan Avenue. Although the proposed development west of Phelan could be seen as a benefit compared to the reservoir basins, the change in character could be considered by some as out of scale with the neighborhoods in the vicinity. The physical impacts related to this visual change are analyzed in Section 4.2.

Mitigation

**Land Use-1a:** CCSF shall implement the transportation demand management (TDM) measures identified in Sections 4.3 and 4.5.

**Land Use-1b:** CCSF shall formally request that the City institute and enforce residential permit parking requirements in the area north and northeast of the campus.

**Land Use-1c:** CCSF shall formally designate a Neighborhood Liaison to serve as a contact person for the residents of the adjacent neighborhoods and to work with them to address their concerns, comments, and complaints related to the daily operations of CCSF.

**Land Use-1d:** CCSF shall work with the City and other organizations (e.g., community service and environmental groups) to establish litter pick-up and beautification efforts on and around the Ocean Avenue Campus.

**Significance After Mitigation**

The transportation demand management measures identified in Sections 4.3 and 4.5 could help to minimize the increase in vehicle trips and could reduce existing vehicle trips to the campus. Residential permit parking, if enforced, would help to reduce parking spillover into the neighborhoods. These measures together would help to reduce the level of activity and associated problems. However, the actual effectiveness of a TDM program is not known at this time, and establishment and enforcement of residential permit parking are not within CCSF jurisdiction. In addition, the effectiveness of a formal liaison and litter pick-up efforts are difficult to measure. For these reasons, the impact would remain significant after mitigation.
Land Use-2 Potential Conflicts with Plans, Policies and Regulations

Impact

General Plan

Residence Element. Although the Master Plan could result in indirect impacts to the nearby residential areas, it would not involve direct expansion into any residential areas. Therefore, it would not conflict with Objective 12, Policy 3.

Commerce and Industry Element. The Master Plan would be consistent with Objective 7, Policies 2 and 3 because it would accommodate projected future enrollment and would serve a variety of geographical districts and cultural groups. Impacts related to potential disruption of nearby residential areas (Policy 2) are discussed under Land Use-1, above.

Transportation Element. The Master Plan includes implementation of a TDM program to reduce vehicle trips and to emphasize alternative modes of transportation. Therefore, the Master Plan would not conflict with Policy 1.3; Policies 2.2 and 2.5; Policy 11.3; Policies 12.1 and 12.4; Policies 16.1 through 16.6 (though some of the specific strategies identified might not be feasible); Policy 28.1; and Policies 31.1 and 31.2 (though the specific strategies identified might not be feasible).

The Master Plan would not result in significant impacts to pedestrian safety (see Section 4.3), and thus would not conflict with Policy 1.2. New buildings that would be developed as part of the Master Plan would not result in significant impacts to historic architectural resources, and therefore, the Master Plan would not conflict with Policy 2.3.

The Master Plan would include a new entry to the campus from Ocean Avenue at Howth Street, an existing intersection. No driveways or loading docks would be located on Ocean Avenue. Therefore, the Master Plan would not conflict with Policy 20.2. The Master Plan includes features to improve pedestrian and bicycle access through the campus, and thus would not conflict with Policy 21.9 or Policies 23.2 and 23.6.

Proposed parking would be consolidated within the campus and would help to meet future parking needs. The proposed parking would not result in significant visual impacts. For these reasons, the project would generally not conflict with Policy 30.1. The parking structure proposed in the eastern part of the campus might result in increased noise annoyance to College neighbors, due to the concentration of activity in that area; impacts related to potential disruption of nearby residential areas are discussed under Land Use-1, above.

This EIR does not identify the lack of adequate parking as a significant transportation impact (see Section 4.3). The disruption of nearby residential areas caused by increased parking spillover (Policy 31.2) is discussed under Land Use-1, above.
No significant impacts related to loading facilities have been identified (see Section 4.3); therefore, the project would not conflict with Policy 40.1. Loading would continue to occur at the same central locations as it does currently; therefore, the project would not conflict with Policies 40.2 and 40.9.

**Urban Design Element.** The Master Plan would not result in impacts to scenic views (see Section 4.2); therefore, the Master Plan would not conflict with Policy 1.1. Proposed demolition and new construction would not result in significant impacts to historic architectural resources; therefore, the Master Plan would not conflict with Policies 2.4, 2.6, or 3.1. Proposed renovation could result in significant impacts (Policy 2.5); mitigation is identified in the EIR to reduce the impacts to less-than-significant levels (see Section 4.9). Visual impacts related to the character of existing development (Policies 3.5, 3.6, and 3.8) have been identified as significant in the absence of specific design information (see Section 4.2). Impacts related to potential disruption of nearby residential areas (Policies 4.1 and 4.15) are discussed under Land Use-1, above.

**Environmental Protection Element.** The increased enrollment accommodated by Master Plan buildout would result in significant air pollutant emissions (Policy 4.1); these impacts are analyzed in Section 4.5. The Master Plan buildout would not cause any significant impacts related to water supply and distribution (Section 4.6); therefore, the project would not conflict with Policy 5.2. Slope instability and erosion impacts could occur as the result of the project (Policy 7.5), but would be mitigated through standard controls and engineering practice (Section 4.7). The proposed buildings would not be exposed to noise exceeding State land use compatibility standards (Section 4.4); therefore, the project would not conflict with Policies 10.1, 11.1, or 11.3.

**Community Facilities Element.** The Master Plan is intended to accommodate the need for facilities identified by CCSF, and the Main Campus is shown on the Institutional Facilities Plan. Therefore, the project would not conflict with Policies 8.1 or 9.1.

**Community Safety Element.** New construction would be required to meet the stringent structural and life safety standards that govern community colleges. This EIR includes consideration of site soils conditions and geologic hazards, with mitigation identified as appropriate. Therefore, the project would not conflict with Policies 2.1, 2.3, or 2.9.

**Air Quality Element.** The Master Plan is intended to take advantage of the extensive transportation structure in the area, by siting the Community Health & Wellness Center near the BART station, improving pedestrian paths, and including TDM measures. Therefore, the project would not conflict with Policy 3.1. Construction of individual Master Plan projects could generate significant particulate emissions; the EIR includes dust control provisions as mitigation (Policy 5.1).

For a project within the jurisdiction of the City and County of San Francisco, the Planning Commission and other City decision makers would evaluate that project against the objectives and policies of the General Plan, and would consider conflicts with the General Plan as a part of the decision-making process.
The consideration of the General Plan objectives and policies would be carried out independently of the environmental review process, as part of the decision to approve, modify, or disapprove that project. The decision makers would identify potential conflicts between the project under review and the General Plan. A conflict would be considered a significant environmental effect only if it resulted in a significant impact on the environment. During the decision-making process, the decision-makers would evaluate and balance the potentially conflicting goals of different General Plan policies.

As stated previously in this section, CCSF may not be subject to the San Francisco General Plan, and the proposed Master Plan is not subject to City and County of San Francisco approval. However, any potential conflicts with the provisions of the General Plan that would cause physical environmental impacts have been evaluated as part of the impact analysis carried out in other topical sections of this EIR.

Planning Code Conformance

Zoning. The existing P (Public Use) zoning district designation of the Main Campus and Balboa Reservoir permits land that is owned by a governmental agency and that is used for public purposes. Most of the Main Campus is owned by CCSF, and the eastern part of the Balboa Reservoir would be owned solely by CCSF with the proposed reservoir reconfiguration. The proposed campus facilities would be principal permitted uses within the P zoning district.

Height Districts. The tallest buildings proposed as part of the Master Plan would be up to four stories. These buildings include the Academic Facility, the Arts Center, and the parking structure at the east end of the campus. Although specific designs have not been prepared for most of the buildings, it is assumed that a four-story building would have a height of about 56 feet above grade. In addition, the proposed Community Health & Wellness Center, a three-story building, would have a height of up to 65 feet from the proposed grade to the top of the parapet. Other potential three-story buildings include the Advanced Technology Learning Center and the Administration Building; it is assumed that these buildings would have a height of about 42 feet above grade.

The Academic Facility, Technology Center, and Administration Building, which are proposed for the northeastern part of the Balboa Reservoir, would likely exceed the height limit of 40 feet. The potential visual impacts related to this conflict are discussed in Section 4.2 of this EIR and the potential impact on the existing character of the neighborhood is discussed earlier in this section. The Arts Center, proposed for the southeastern part of the reservoir, and the Community Health & Wellness Center, proposed in the southeastern part of the campus, would not exceed the height limit of 65 feet.

Bulk Requirements. The Academic Facility, Technology Center, and Administration building are proposed for the northeastern part of the Balboa Reservoir, within the 40-X height and bulk district. No specific bulk requirements would apply to these buildings, but (depending on how the requirements are applied to an institutional use) the buildings could exceed the requirements for front and rear setbacks.
The Arts Center is proposed for the southeastern part of the Balboa Reservoir, within the 65-A height and bulk district. Depending on the building design, the length could exceed the 110-foot limit and one or more diagonal dimensions could exceed the 125-foot limit. The potential visual impacts related to these conflicts are discussed in Section 4.2 of this EIR and the potential impact on the existing character of the neighborhood is discussed earlier in this section.

The Community Health & Wellness Center is proposed for the southeastern part of the campus, within the 65-A height and bulk district. The building design provides for two wings arranged in an “L” shape; the building length where the two wings are joined is more than 400 feet. The maximum diagonal dimension is more than 570 feet. These dimensions would exceed the limits of the 65-A height and bulk district. However, the visual impacts of the Community Health & Wellness Center would be less than significant because of its location and the intent to build the structure into the hillside.

Institutional Master Plan

The proposed demolition of some of the existing facilities, renovation of some facilities, and construction of new facilities are all components of the Main Campus Master Plan, which is a component of the CCSF Institutional Master Plan. The details of the actual design and location of individual project components may differ from what is shown in the Master Plan; however, the overall proposed project would be consistent with the Institutional Master Plan. Review of the final design and location of individual project components by CCSF would occur as the Master Plan is being implemented.

Mitigation

The discussion of impacts identifies several potential conflicts with General Plan policies, specifically with those policies regarding intrusion into residential neighborhoods. Physical impacts related to potential intrusion and corresponding mitigation measures are addressed under Land Use-1, above. The discussion of Planning Code conformance identifies potential conflicts with the height and bulk requirements; the physical impacts related to these conflicts and corresponding mitigation measures are addressed in Section 4.2, Visual Quality.

Significance After Mitigation

Not applicable. Where conflicts with policies and regulations result in physical impacts on the environment, they have been discussed in the relevant impact sections of the EIR.
Land Use-3  Citywide Master Plan Development

Impact

The land use impacts associated with the Mission and Chinatown/North Beach campuses have already been analyzed in certified EIRs (see Section 3.0, Project Description, for full citations of these documents). That analysis has been incorporated into this EIR by reference.

The 1998 EIR and 2003 EIR Addendum for the Mission campus concluded that the project “would not disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community, nor would it be incompatible with established uses, because the existing Mission Campus facilities are already housed at the Bartlett Street site.” The project would not require demolition of any existing buildings or relocation of any existing uses. The project would exceed the 50-foot Planning Code height limit but the EIR Addendum did not find any significant visual or other type of physical effect associated with the building height. The EIR and Addendum did not find any significant effects related to zoning or planning policies.

The 1998 EIR and 1999 Addendum for the Chinatown/North Beach campus concluded that the project would not be incompatible with, or substantially alter, the mixed-use character of the site and vicinity. Demolition of the Fong Building would result in the loss of 21 residential units; this loss of housing was identified as “substantially inconsistent with San Francisco General Plan policies related to housing.” Mitigation identified in the EIR required the District to participate in the Treasure Island Consortium to renovate existing housing at the former Treasure Island Naval Station, to be made available for City College employees and students. The mitigation would reduce the impact, but the impact would remain significant after mitigation. The EIR Addendum found the project to be substantially consistent with the design goals in the General Plan Urban Design Element and with the relevant objectives in the Community Facilities Element. The project would exceed San Francisco Planning Code height and bulk requirements, but no significant visual effects were found.

The other planned development at other CCSF campuses involves only minor renovations and would not result in any land use impacts. The land use impacts of the Main Campus Master Plan would not combine with the land use impacts resulting from planned development at the other CCSF campuses because of the physical separation of all of the campuses.

Mitigation

No mitigation is required.

Significance After Mitigation

Less than significant.
4.1 Land Use and Planning

**Land Use-3  Cumulative Impacts**

Impact

As stated in the Setting, there are no major projects within the vicinity of the Main Campus. An apartment complex is under construction on Ocean Avenue several blocks west of the campus, and a new library building is projected for construction south of the west end of the Balboa Reservoir; both projects are relatively small and are located on a busy urban roadway. Therefore, they would not combine with the Master Plan to create cumulative land use impacts.

The *Draft Balboa Park Station Area Plan* includes a recommended development program for the Phelan Loop Area. The program would include the extension of Harold, Lee, and Brighton Avenues across Ocean Avenue; relocation of the MUNI layover facility; several public open spaces; mixed-use development of up to five stories (45 to 55 feet); and possible redevelopment of the fire station/bookstore parcel near the corner of Phelan and Ocean Avenues. The *Balboa Plan* is still in draft form and the anticipated date of approval is unknown; no specific projects within the Phelan Loop have been formally initiated. Therefore, future use of the area is considered too speculative to analyze in detail (and thus is not included in the cumulative impacts analysis). From a general standpoint and for informational purposes, the CCSF Master Plan and Phelan Loop redevelopment (if it occurs) would not combine to create adverse land use impacts because the Phelan Loop redevelopment is located away from the residential neighborhoods that would be affected by the Master Plan, and the Phelan Loop redevelopment could result in benefits to the visual character of the area (see Section 4.2).

The draft *Balboa Park Station Area Plan* proposes that public open space be developed on top of the western part of the Balboa Reservoir if the SFPUC uses it for water storage. Should the SFPUC determine that the reservoir is not needed or not feasible, the Plan proposes that housing and open space be developed. As noted above, the Plan has not been approved by the City, and the MOU between CCSF and the SFPUC states that the PUC does not intend to allow any use or activity on top of the reservoir should it be constructed. Construction of the Balboa Reservoir is not currently proposed by the SFPUC, nor is it in the SFPUC Capital Improvement Program. For these reasons, any future use of the western part of the reservoir is considered too speculative to analyze in detail (and thus is not included in the cumulative impacts analysis in this EIR). From a general standpoint and for informational purposes, the CCSF Master Plan and reservoir development (if it occurs) would not combine to create adverse land use impacts because the reservoir uses would be oriented away from the residential neighborhoods that would be affected by the Master Plan, and the reservoir development would not detract from the visual character of the area (see Section 4.2).

**Mitigation**

No mitigation is required.
Significance After Mitigation

Less than significant.

G. CONCLUSION

The overall change in character that could occur as the result of increased intensity in the neighborhoods near the campus (Land Use-1) would remain significant after mitigation. The physical impacts related to potential policy/regulatory conflicts are addressed as part of Land Use-1 and in the Visual Quality and Air Quality sections of this EIR.
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