

My name is Tom Sjostrom. I represent the Building Owners and Managers Association. We have some concerns with the Multiuse Zones Project and would like to present the following comments

Overall we think that the timing of this project is poor because the Plan does not include the changes that are likely due to the legislatures recent approval of inclusionary zoning. Why go through this project is that are likely to be substantive changes to the plan?

First, we think that the use of FAR transfers is counter-productive, especially as it relates to the seismic upgrades of un-reinforced masonry buildings. As we read the plan the actual bonus received is very limited and the ability to transfer is further restricted by distance and districts. The City's goal of encouraging owner to upgrade may not be helped at all with these conditions.

The use of façade articulation in the plan seems to emphasize design preferences more than when it really represents a loss of square footage for a developer. The spaces required at 200 feet don't seem to have a purpose other than breaking up facades but will be a problem for owners and tenants alike.

Lastly, we think the handling of parking is not thought through completely. If the number of parking spaces is reduced for whatever reason aren't we suggesting creating a bias to those who can afford to rent a space if there are not enough spaces to go around? The plan says that spaces may be limited. Do we actually mean that spaces will be limited? A likely result is that spaces are likely to be rented to the highest bidders.

Lastly, we find the restrictions on drive-throughs to be a fundamental problem. The intent of all zoning codes is to bring non-conforming uses into compliance with current zoning. We think that a likely outcome of the restrictions will be a reduction, over time, of all drive-throughs in the effected neighborhood seriously changing the livability of those neighborhoods.