

Public Comments Received for Draft Downtown Station Area Plan

1. MARA letter	01/06/2012
2. Simeone letter	01/10/2012
3. Planning Commission	01/10/2012
4. MARA	01/15/2012
5. MCBC	01/18/2012
6. Design Review Board	01/18/2012
7. Wietgreffe	01/22/2012
8. Federation of Neighborhoods	01/22/2012
9. Sustainable San Rafael	01/23/2012
10. Online survey responses	01/23/2012



**P.O. Box 150266
San Rafael, CA**

DATE: Jan 6, 2012

FROM: The Montecito Area Residents' Association (MARA)

TO: City of San Rafael Mayor and City Councilmembers
Planning Commission
Rebecca Woodbury
Nancy Mackle
Jim Shutz
cc: Federation of San Rafael Neighborhoods

FOR THE PUBLIC RECORD

RE: DRAFT Downtown San Rafael Station Area Plan dated Jan 5, 2012

We have just received the draft Plan noted above, and would like to make some brief comments on it as it relates to our neighborhood, which is the closest neighborhood in San Rafael to the Plan area. These comments are not comprehensive, but touch on the issues which we feel to be of most importance/concern to our neighborhood. We are aware that this plan is merely conceptual, and looks out far into the future. We appreciate all of the hard work and outreach that has gone into it.

- 1) We are very happy to see that preserving/re-using the old Train Station (the **Whistle Stop building**) is part of this plan. This is a valuable historic asset, and we agree that it should be used as described in the Plan. There is universal support for this in our neighborhood.
- 2) **PARKING** Our next concerns are, in order, parking, parking, parking, parking, etc....As described in the Plan, dozens of currently legal parking spaces will be eliminated in this area very soon by the arrival of the SMART train. When the bus station/Transit Center was built, no parking was provided for bus commuters. This has already resulted in commuters routinely parking on our neighborhood streets. Because of this, and because

the City has relaxed off street parking requirements for the many now legal extra units, etc., our neighborhood streets have a severe parking problem. It is our understanding that SMART will also not be providing any parking for its commuters, which will exacerbate this situation. In addition, this Plan contemplates an enormous amount of commercial and residential development in the future, and suggests “solutions” to the parking problem among which are a further reduction in parking requirements for such new development.

There is one small paragraph in the 137 page long plan about “protecting residential neighborhoods” (see page 68). We have been inquiring about the possibility of the City looking into residential parking permits for years, and we are very glad to see the subject mentioned in this draft Plan. Unfortunately, the tone of this one mention of the neighborhood parking problem and a possible solution is fairly pejorative and dismissive. The idea of residential permit parking, as it is used in SF, for example, is NOT “to prevent non-residents from parking on residential streets”. It is to prevent COMMUTERS from using residential streets as parking lots. Thus, most such permit programs allow short term parking, evening parking, weekend parking, etc. by anyone. The paragraph goes on to state that “previous studies” have found the cost prohibitive – what studies? We have been asking for such a study for years, and have never been told that one had ever been done. Cities such as SF, Sausalito, Mill Valley, and San Anselmo have various sorts of residential parking programs, and have been able to do that without charging prohibitive costs back to residents. Usually these programs only apply in certain geographic areas which are unusually impacted by nearby commercial/transit areas. We respectfully request that this wording be amended to suggest that the City look into the possibilities of how this sort of program might be introduced to ameliorate the impact of the new transit and development on our old historic neighborhood.

- 3) The last concern we would like to mention at this time is the extension of a **FAR of 1.5 all the way down both sides of Fourth St. to Grand Ave.** This extends the original 2020 Plan idea of the “Hetherton Gateway” not only to both sides of Irwin St., but intrudes it further into our neighborhood. In fact, this area is beyond the “Plan Area” of this Plan (see page 8). Any 5+ story buildings built on the North side of Fourth St. would back up to the back yards of the historic residences along the South side of Fifth street, towering over, and peering down into, their back yards, as well as the yards of many other residences in our neighborhood. Fifth St. is 100% residential from the corner of Irwin to Grand, as is Mission. As we have all noted lately, the winter sun is very low in the Southern sky, and these proposed huge buildings would plunge the residences along Fifth St. into shadows all day long. Also, both sides of Grand are 100% residential beyond the corner of Fourth St., and the proposed huge buildings would similarly negatively

impact that part of our neighborhood, which is also composed of well kept historic homes. We would suggest, at a minimum, limiting the new FAR 1.5 designation to the SOUTH side of Fourth St. only, which is surrounded by commercial buildings. In the same way, allowing a FAR on the East side of Irwin St. will put them right next to one/two story homes along Fifth and Mission St. We would like to suggest limiting the FAR of 1.5 to the West side of Irwin St. That way the shorter commercial buildings along the East side of Irwin provide a “step down” in height to the neighborhood.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,

The Board of MARA

Vickie Hatos
Sid Waxman
Jackie Schmidt
Constanza Perry
Helenclare Cox
Bryn Deamer
Sherna Deamer
Kay Corlett
Scott Kaplan

From: UserFrnley@aol.com [mailto:UserFrnley@aol.com]
Posted At: Tuesday, January 10, 2012 2:51 PM
Posted To: Community Development Internet Mail
Conversation: Please halt the plans for SMART in San Rafael! (I forgot to sign my name)
Subject: Fwd: Please halt the plans for SMART in San Rafael! (I forgot to sign my name)

I forgot to sign my name on this email.

From D. Simeone in San Rafael

From: UserFrnley@aol.com
To: planning@cityofsanrafael.org
Sent: 1/10/2012 2:48:36 P.M. Pacific Standard Time
Subj: Please halt the plans for SMART in San Rafael!

I see you are already having a meeting tonight. Well don't you think you should wait until the Repeal Smart Petition is finished. There are more people in San Rafael that don't want a train to run through it or stop in it. San Rafael is already so congested, this will only make it worse as there will be traffic stops, more traffic, more parking problems, more noise, more danger of getting hit by a train (oh yes), mandatory density housing (from what I've read, but it seems we already have a lot of that, more crime if so).

___ This should be a Sonoma thing, not a Marin thing, as there is little Marin can profit from by it. It took 4 tries on the ballot to get it through, and it only won because 101 Highway Work in San Rafael was holding up traffic so badly that people were frustrated, and even then, only a little over 50% of people in Marin voted for it. When all the 101 work is done up North, Marinites will prefer to take their cars, as most already do. We have buses for those who don't. We don't want SMART, so why is San Rafael trying to push it down our throats??

Public Comment

Jackie Schmidt (MARA)

- Pedestrian improvements will help Montecito access Downtown
- Supports connections under freeway
- Whistlestop is an important building; should be preserved
- Montecito wants residential parking permits
- Height increases should be limited to south side of Fourth St and west side of Irwin St

Scott Kaplan (Montecito resident)

- Opposes any increased heights east or west of freeway; tall buildings seem like a “fence” rather than a “gateway”

Alisha O’Laughlin (MCBC)

- Bike lanes on Tamalpais should be barrier separated and Class I
- Canal Paseo connection to Mahon Creek idea should be medium-term and wide enough for bikes and peds

Edward Schinick (Montecito resident)

- Opposes increased heights east of Irwin St; concerned about limited light and sun on residential properties

Christine Durphey (Montecito resident)

- Opposes increased heights east of Irwin St

Jerry Belleto (Lincoln/San Rafael Hill Neighborhood Association)

- Excited about improved bike and pedestrian connections

John Nemeth (SMART)

- Proposed greenspace next to tracks on Tamalpais has safety issues and there will need to be a fence
- Switch may move south to Fourth St which will shorten the length of the double track in Downtown and provide more space for parking, bike paths

Commissioner’s Comment

Viktoriya Wise

- Concerned about pedestrians crossing 3rd St. Asked if mid-block crossing was considered and what barriers will look like.
- Hard to reconcile increased traffic capacity improvements with goals of improving pedestrian experience
- Supports multi-use path south of 2nd St
- Supports improvements under freeway
- Supports height and FAR increases, but adjusted per MARA’s concerns about increased height east of freeway
- Supports parking policies: shared parking, car share, lower parking standards (parking maximums instead of minimums)

Jack Robertson

- Unsure if plaza is good idea – may attract undesirable activity, freeway does not make is a pleasant place to “gather”
- Height on east side may not be achieved from a practical standpoint (lots are not big enough); suggested testing heights with prototypes
- Supports Canal paseo idea
- Supports improvements under freeway
- Needs to involve Caltrans in the process

Maribeth Lang

- Connection to Canal neighborhood is important
- Supports pedestrian and bicycle improvements
- Plan seems abstract in TOD emphasis
- Concerned there is not enough parking for transit users
- Concerned that existing bus operations and riders not be compromised
- Height increases on east side do not make sense

Charles Pick

- Purist TOD vision might not work considering the area’s constraints
- Traffic must be addressed to keep buses on time; can’t afford gridlock
- Acknowledges 2nd and 3rd Streets as important regional arterials
- Would rather sacrifice a pedestrian crossing to improve other ones
- As a terminus station, it may need parking
- Plaza should service station and not be too big
- Don’t over-rely on retail
- Supports increased residential

Kate Colin

- Walkability is at odds with increased traffic capacity improvements
- Tamalpais Ave is lynchpin of plan: maximize walkability and bicycle access
- Supports improvements under freeway
- Concerned about Canal Paseo concept due to crossing of freeway on-ramp
- “Strong edges” can be landscaping as well; be careful not to make walls
- Height increases on east side do not make sense; may overwhelm neighborhoods
- Whistlestop is a unique and important building to the area

Larry Paul

- Whistlestop is important to the area
- Increased height on east side does not make a lot of sense; maybe with height transitions from freeway
- Form based zoning may be appropriate for the area
- Questions whether housing next to freeway is viable
- Parking structure under freeway would be good utilization of that space
- Trees should be planted as soon as possible for a pedestrian-friendly environment
- Enhanced bike/ped connections could be best result of the Plan
- Bikes on Tamalpais seem better than Hetherton
- Supports traffic capacity improvements
- Supports consolidated transit block concept, but concerned about capacity
- Supports carshare concept

Daniel Sonnet

- Tall buildings will not achieve “gateway,” needs to be smaller scale for San Rafael
- Opposes height increases on east side of freeway
- Improvements under freeway do not have to be expensive
- Talk to Caltrans about not cutting trees
- Important to make area work for transit users, otherwise ridership will decrease
- Increase enforcement of traffic rules to improve pedestrian safety
- Weather protection for transit users is important



**P.O. Box 150266
San Rafael, CA**

DATE: Jan 15, 2012

FROM: The Montecito Area Residents' Association (MARA)

TO: Design Review Board

cc: Rebecca Woodbury, Stephanie Lovette

FOR THE PUBLIC RECORD

RE: DRAFT Downtown San Rafael Station Area Plan dated Jan 5, 2012

We have received the draft Plan noted above, and would like to make some brief comments on it as it relates to our neighborhood, which is the closest neighborhood in San Rafael to the Plan area. These comments are not comprehensive, but touch on the issues which we feel to be of most importance/concern to our neighborhood. We are aware that this plan is merely conceptual, and looks out far into the future. We appreciate all of the hard work and outreach that has gone into it.

- 1) We are very happy to see that preserving/re-using the old Train Station (the **Whistle Stop building**) is part of this plan. This is a valuable historic asset, and we agree that it should be used as described in the Plan. There is universal support for this in our neighborhood. We are also very happy to see that improvements are contemplated to facilitate pedestrian and bicycle circulation in this area – most of us walk around/through this area frequently, and some of us bike in it – we understand the current problems pedestrians and bicyclists face trying to navigate these streets.

- 2) **PARKING** Our next concerns are, in order, parking, parking, parking, parking, etc....As described in the Plan, dozens of currently legal parking spaces will be eliminated in this area very soon by the arrival of the SMART train. When the bus station/Transit Center was built, no parking was provided for bus commuters. This has already resulted in commuters routinely parking on our neighborhood streets. Because of this, and because the City has relaxed off street parking requirements for the many now legal extra units, etc., our neighborhood streets have a severe parking problem. It is our understanding that SMART will also not be providing any parking for its commuters, which will exacerbate this situation. In addition, this Plan

contemplates an enormous amount of commercial and residential development in the future, and suggests “solutions” to the parking problem among which are a further reduction in parking requirements for such new development.

There is one small paragraph in the 137 page long plan about “protecting residential neighborhoods” (see page 68). We have been inquiring about the possibility of the City looking into residential parking permits for years, and we are very glad to see the subject mentioned in this draft Plan.

Unfortunately, the tone of this one mention of the neighborhood parking problem and a possible solution is fairly pejorative and dismissive. The idea of residential permit parking, as it is used in SF, for example, is NOT “to prevent non-residents from parking on residential streets”. It is to prevent COMMUTERS from using residential streets as parking lots. Thus, most such permit programs allow short term parking, evening parking, weekend parking, etc. by anyone. The paragraph goes on to state that “previous studies” have found the cost prohibitive – what studies? We have been asking for such a study for years, and have never been told that one had ever been done. Cities such as SF, Sausalito, Mill Valley, and San Anselmo have various sorts of residential parking programs, and have been able to do that without charging prohibitive costs back to residents. Usually these programs only apply in certain geographic areas which are unusually impacted by nearby commercial/transit areas. We respectfully request that this wording be amended to suggest that the City look into the possibilities of how this sort of program might be introduced to ameliorate the impact of the new transit and development on our old historic neighborhood.

- 3) The last concern we would like to mention at this time is the extension of a **FAR of 1.5 all the way down both sides of Fourth St. to Grand Ave. , and all along both sides of Irwin St. from Second St. to Mission Ave.** This extends the original 2020 Plan idea of the “Hetherington Gateway” way to the East of 101, and will result in the construction of high rise walls on two sides of our neighborhood. In fact, the area along Fourth St. is actually outside of the “Plan Area” of this Plan (see page 8). At the Planning Commission meeting on this draft Plan on Jan 10th one of the Commissioners called this an example of “**mission creep**”, and all seven of the Commissioners agreed with us about it. Any 5+ story buildings built on the North side of Fourth St. would back up to the back yards of the historic residences along the South side of Fifth street, towering over, and peering down into, their back yards, as well as the yards of many other residences in our neighborhood. Fifth St. is 100% residential from the corner of Irwin to Grand, as is Mission. The very tall proposed buildings along Fourth and Irwin would plunge the residences along Fifth St. and parts of Mission Ave. into shadows all day long, and invade their privacy. Also, both sides of Grand are 100% residential beyond the corner of Fourth St., and the proposed huge buildings would similarly

negatively impact that part of our neighborhood. No “step down” in heights is provided to make a transition to the neighborhood.

These proposed extensions of the FAR breaches the current General Plan (2020) in areas too numerous to list them all, but paragraph NH-2 provides an example of the main ideas that are repeated in many places in the 2020 Plan:

NH-2: (goal)

Preserve, enhance and maintain the residential character of neighborhoods to make them desirable places to live”

The irony is that our neighborhood is an example of what is now desired as a residential neighborhood that is within walking distance of transit and commercial areas. It does NOT represent “suburban sprawl”, and never has. It was originally built over 110 years ago, BECAUSE OF ITS PROXIMITY TO DOWNTOWN AND THE RAIL ROAD! It consists of old well maintained historic homes, as well as many rental apartment buildings, and many previously single family homes which have added units or become multi-family buildings. It is the home of two large senior living facilities, and several group homes. It is very dense and very diverse, and its residents represent a very wide range of income levels. Residents, and students who attend SRHS, take advantage of its proximity to Downtown and the bus transit center, as well as the thriving commercial area along Fourth and Third Streets which include a Whole Foods, a CVS, a Rite Aide, a Trader Joe’s, and United Market, among many other things. This neighborhood is an example of a neighborhood which already fits perfectly into the future, while preserving some of the best historic architecture of San Rafael’s past.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,

The Board of MARA

Vickie Hatos
Sid Waxman
Jackie Schmidt
Constanza Perry
Helenclare Cox
Bryn Deamer
Sherna Deamer
Kay Corlett
Scott Kaplan



www.marinbike.org

V 415 456 3469

F 415 456 9344

733 Center Blvd.

Fairfax, CA 94930

Board of Directors

Maureen Gaffney, *President*

Scott Klimo, *Vice President*

Don Magdanz, *Secretary*

Ian Roth, *Treasurer*

Matt Adams

Phil Brewer

Mark Comin

Vince O'Brien

Scott Penzarella

Tom Woolley

Advisors

Mark Birnbaum

Joe Breeze

Tom Hale

Deb Hubsmith

Jim Jacobsen

Patrick Seidler

Julia Violich

Staff

Kim Baenisch

Executive Director

Tom Boss

Membership Director

Bob Trigg

Administrator

Kristin Nute

Volunteer Coordinator

Andy Peri

Advocacy Director

Alisha Oloughlin

Advocacy Coordinator

Deb Hubsmith

Advocacy Advisor

Wendi Kallins

Safe Routes to Schools Director

Laura Kelly

Safe Routes Volunteer Liaison

Peggy Clark

Safe Routes Project Coordinator

Share the Road Program Manager

Gwen Froh

Safe Routes Teen Coordinator

James Sievert

Safe Routes Teen Coordinator

and Instructor

Frances E. Barbour

Safe Routes Instructor

January 18, 2012

Attn: Rebecca Woodbury
City Manager's Office
P.O. Box 151560
1400 Fifth Avenue, Room 203
San Rafael, CA 94915-1560

Re: Draft Downtown San Rafael Station Area Plan

Dear Members of the Advisory Committee on Economic
Development and Affordable Housing:

The Marin County Bicycle Coalition (MCBC) would like to thank you for your time and effort in preparing the Draft Downtown San Rafael Station Area Plan (DSAP). We respectfully request that the Committee consider the following comments and ask that they be included in the DSAP.

Class I Multi-use Pathway between Mission and 4th Street

It has long been a goal of MCBC to have a separated, Class I multi-use pathway on the East side of West Tamalpais Avenue along the SMART right-of-way between Mission Avenue and 4th Street. This pathway would then connect to another multi-use pathway on Tamalpais Avenue between 4th and 2nd Streets (see discussion below).

MCBC strongly supports the Tamalpais Avenue multi-use facility, as Tamalpais has fewer cars and provides for a safer experience than does the option presented in the SAP, which puts cyclists onto Heatherton Avenue, a highly congested road with a high potential for bicycle/car collisions.

One of MCBC's primary safety concerns regarding a multi-use pathway along the west side of Hetheron is that there are a high percentage of vehicles making "free" right hand turns onto southbound Hetheron from 5th Avenue and Mission Avenue. Drivers waiting to make a right hand turn onto Hetheron are looking left toward southbound traffic. At the same time, cyclists and pedestrians travelling north on the Hetheron multi-use pathway will be attempting to cross 5th Avenue and Mission Avenue. This situation presents a very high probability for vehicle/bicycle/pedestrian collisions.

Class I Multi-use Pathway between 4th Street and 2nd Street

The DSAP proposes a southbound Class II bicycle lane and northbound Class III ("Sharrows") on Tamalpais Avenue between 2nd Street and 4th Street. The total roadway width available for all travel-related uses proposed totals 50 feet. MCBC is requesting a separated multi-use pathway be built on these two blocks instead of the current Class II/Class III configuration.

The multi-use pathway will not only increase the safety of its users, it will result in a better cycling and pedestrian experience. This improvement coupled with our recommended improvements

between Mission Avenue and Fourth Street, would result in a separated, traffic-free, bicycle/pedestrian promenade from 2nd Street to Mission Avenue. The promenade's park-like atmosphere would promote aesthetic beauty, additional foot and bike traffic, and lead to increased activity for local businesses (a benefit which has been well documented).

Barriers to Pedestrian Routes Beyond the Plan Area

As expressed in the Plan, enhanced bicycle/pedestrian connectivity between Downtown and areas to the east of US-101 is important for improving access to the Canal and Montecito neighborhoods, San Rafael High School and the Montecito Shopping Center. Currently, the freeway, canal, and Mahon Creek all provide significant barriers to local bicycle and pedestrian mobility.

MCBC is very pleased to see that the DSAP presents two conceptual design options (short-term and long-term) for the proposed Canal Paseo Pathway which will serve to connect the Station to the east side of US-101. MCBC would like to suggest that the phrase "long-term option" be replaced with "medium-term option" as a means of encouraging bringing these project elements to fruition sooner rather than later.

Of the two options presented, MCBC supports the "long-term" option which would continue the Canal Paseo Pathway along the sound side of 2nd Street from Hetheron Boulevard to Francisco Boulevard. Continuing the pathway to Francisco Boulevard would provide the greatest benefit to cyclists and pedestrians, as the pathway would not only serve to connect the Bettini and SMART Stations to the east side of the freeway, but would also provide an already much needed connection from the east side of the freeway to the existing Mahon Creek Pathway.

Extending the Canal Paseo Pathway to the Mahon Creek Pathway would result in a seamless east-west pathway network that would serve to connect the Downtown, Montecito/Happy Valley, Canal, Francisco Boulevard West, Albert Park and Gerstle Park communities. Additional communities less proximity to the Plan area that would benefit from greater connectivity include Bret Harte, Country Club, Loch Lomond, Bayside Acres, Glenwood and Peacock Gap.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Sincerely,



Alisha O'Laughlin, Advocacy Coordinator
Marin County Bicycle Coalition
P.O. Box 1115
Fairfax, CA 94978

Board Comments

Mohit Garg

- Buildings that open to outside, lots of glass, open facades
- Renderings in the plan are nice, showing retail, plaza
- Concerned about 66' height at the entrance of Fourth St as well as heights on east side of freeway
- Concerned about the feasibility of a parking garage and stacked parking

Serge Federov

- Asked question about parking demand for SMART

Stewart Summers

- Likes overall intent of the Plan
- Concerned about the charm and scale of Fourth St with tall buildings
- Step backs in upper stories can help
- Troubled by automatic height & FAR bonuses; wants Planning Commission & Design Review Board to have discretion in approvals
- Renderings don't match the FAR and height verbage
- Plan should encourage the existing charm of Downtown through good design guidelines (eclectic, architecturally diverse)

Bob Huntsberry

- Plan is a good start
- Need to look at heights very carefully
- Parking is important; most people use cars
- Include motorcycles as a mode of transportation
- Wary of moving Bettini; seems like there may be more of a need to expand it
- Buildings east of freeway should step down

Jeff Kent

- Plan represents an excellent direction for San Rafael
- Goals 3 & 4 are essential to the success of the area
- Concerned about delays in completion of bike/ped paths
- Pay attention to the existing character of Fourth St
- Buildings should step back

Cheryl Lentini

- Concurs with need for good design guidelines and building step backs

Public Comments

Jackie Schmidt (MARA)

- Greenway on Tamalpais will not be possible, according to SMART
- City has agreed to a study session on residential parking permits in Spring
- Repeated comments from Planning Commission, letter re building heights east of freeway

Christine Durphey (Montecito resident)

- Plan does not show Coleman Elementary on the map
- Improvements made under the freeway are important
- Opposes increased heights east of the freeway
- A nice gateway does not need tall buildings
- Would like to see more Sycamore trees

Jeremy Durphey (Montecito resident)

- Buildings should be so tall that they peer into other people's yards

Alisha O'Laughlin (MCBC)

- Suggests Class I bike path on East side of West Tam
- Concerned about bikes on Hetherton, prefers bikes on Tam
- Multi-use path on Tam should be Class I
- Suggests Tam from Mission Ave to Fourth St be traffic-free promenade for bikes and pedestrians

Dear Rebecca Woodbury,

Thank you receiving my comments on the draft SMART Station Area Plan and submitting them to the San Rafael Redevelopment Agency Citizen's Advisory Committee. Please see below for topical comments.

Public Participation Process

I was extremely disappointed in the one meeting I attended with my wife for the plan in the summer of 2011. The meeting was located at Whistlestop, which was a great location, but yet, no signs or postings were put at the transit center! The building is located right across the street and the plan is about encouraging transit. My wife and I had a tough time finding how to get into the meeting and we knew about it. In addition, as far as I could see, no postings or literature was in Spanish, despite the fact that 33% of people in study area are Hispanic or Latino. This plan is extremely important for the people in the Canal neighborhood (of which a larger % of persons in that neighborhood are Hispanic or Latino), but most people there know nothing about. I am regular volunteer at the Canal Alliance and no one I spoke to knew anything about the planning process. In fact, some people who worked there didn't even know the SMART train was coming to downtown San Rafael. They were excited when I informed them, but it just exemplifies the lack of outreach to that community in this process. My frustration expressed in this comment is the reasoning behind many of my frustrations shown in the comments that follow.

No offense to San Rafael Redevelopment Agency CAC, but why aren't these comments being presented to the planning commission and/or city council? Furthermore, what will happen do this CAC, now that Redevelopment will no longer exist as February 1st?

Parking

This is a draft of the **SMART** Station Area Plan. The plan should encourage people to take the SMART train to the plan area or to walk or bike to the plan area to take the SMART train. Instead, the draft plan has a number of policies to encourage people to drive to the plan area. Too much space in the plan is devoted to parking. This is a failure of the plan.

Part of the vision statement states, "in 2035, the Downtown San Rafael Station Area is a place people can easily reach by walking, biking, or using transit" (p. 22). Goals and implementation actions are supposed to be based on the vision. The vision does not mention parking and driving anywhere. Yet a number of goals and implementation actions are based entirely on parking and driving. By doing this, the plan is setting a precedent for the City to encourage these actions. These goals and implementation actions should be deleted. The following are examples of conflicting statements and/or questions about parking throughout the plan.

P. 22 "In keeping with the vision of a transit-oriented, walkable, and active environment, the amount of parking provided is limited to encourage transit use, as well as walking and bicycling." Please explain to me how providing a new 400 to 500 space off-site structure for parking encourages transit use, walking, and bicycling.

The plan assumes parking is an existing problem in the study area. A 90% occupancy rate for off-street parking and a 50% occupancy rate for on-street parking does not indicate a problem. In fact, the latter rate indicates underutilization of on-street parking. The plan only provides two public misconceptions that the lack of parking is a problem: 1) business owners concerns over parking loss and 2) parking infringing upon neighborhoods (page 33). The first concern is an antiquated one as shown in studies.¹ The second concern is legitimate if you are a person that worries about “strangers” parking in front of your house. If that is your concern, you may want to consider moving out of the plan area because the plan proposes higher density and a mix of uses which do not currently exist. These uses are sure to bring more strangers to the area. Despite the lack of a problem, the plan recommends a 413 or 500 parking space municipal structure, without any justification as to why such a huge structure would be needed. Once again, this does not encourage people to take alternative forms of transportation to the plan area.

Goal 3 should not exist as I stated before, goals should reflect the vision. The recommended parking policies could be placed somewhere else (e.g., goal 6).

I appreciate reducing the minimum parking requirements to one space for two-bedroom residential units and 1.5 spaces for three-bedroom residential units (page 55). This is pretty consistent with a recent study on TOD parking requirements in Santa Clara County, which recommended 1.3 spaces per residential unit.² However, I am confused to what the requirement is for studios and one-bedroom apartments (which a lot of units should be to encourage affordable units) as it is not listed. Furthermore, instead of minimum requirements, the requirements should be maximum allowed. Another strategy should be to get rid of 2 hour zones. If people want to stay and pay for an on-street parking spot, let them. By doing this, they spend more time in the plan area (and spend money), instead of them worrying about having to leave within 2 hours.

Affordable Housing

Marin County has the highest workforce in-commuters percentage in the Bay Area. This is highly attributable to the lack of affordable housing.³ The planning area has lower incomes than the rest of the city. Yet the plan devotes barely any attention to affordable housing, instead it spends far too much wasted space on parking policies and recommendations that will encourage people to drive to the plan area. The plan needs to identify the lack of affordable housing as a problem, so that solutions (goals, implementation actions) can be made.

Other

¹ The Clean Air Partnership, “Bike Lanes, On-Street Parking and Business,” February 2009; and Emily Drennen, “Economic Effects of Traffic Calming on Urban Small Businesses,” San Francisco State University, December 2003.

² Eduardo C. Serafin, et. al. “Residential TODs in Santa Clara County are ‘over-parked,’” December 2010.

³ Live Local Marin, “Miles from Home, the Traffic and Climate Impacts of Marin’s Unaffordable Housing,” February 2011.

Some of the figures are barely readable (e.g., Figure VI-5, what bike lanes are proposed, what lanes are class I,II, III?). Most figures should take up a whole page as these are often the most important aspects of a plan.

Existing air quality is a legitimate concern for new residential development in the study area. The BAAQMD lists over 30 stationary sources in the study area, however, by not providing a summary of the projected emissions from these sources, the Figure III-4 provides nothing to the reader, other than scaring them into thinking that they are going to inhale dangerous pollutants by living or walking in the study area. Different stationary sources have different amounts of emissions and some pose no health risk at all. I do feel the study area does need new residential development, but it would be advantageous to zone for residential development to the west of Highway 101 in the study area (and setback a good distance), because of the prevailing wind direction from the west. Therefore, new sensitive receptors are not as exposed to the pollutants from heavily traveled highway. Examples for residential development would include Opportunity Sites A and B, as opposed to C, D, and E. The latter sites would be better served for office and retail (Figure III-6). Lastly, trees will hardly do enough to mitigate dangerous air pollutants such as particulate matter from new residential development. Proper mitigation would include good site design and good ventilation systems.

Why didn't the plan study the locations of where people who come to the plan area or use the transit station live? These statistics would really be helpful in understanding how people get to the plan area and shape future policies to encourage people to take alternative modes of transportation to the plan area.

What is the timeline for CEQA?

Thank you,

Wade Wietgreffe, AICP
San Rafael Resident

Federation of San Rafael Neighborhoods

PO Box 151485, San Rafael, CA 94915-1585

January 22, 2012

For the Public Record

To: City of San Rafael
c/o Rebecca Woodbury

RE: Draft Downtown San Rafael Station Plan, January 5, 2012

The need for developing a Station Area presents an opportunity to see goals of General Plan 2020 realized and provides a chance to unify and strengthen our districts and neighborhoods. The Citizen's Advisory Committee (CAC) that is working on the Draft Station Area Plan (The Plan) has an important duty to ensure representation of San Rafael's interests, and more so in the midst of the multi-agency involvement which certainly represents competing interests outside of the San Rafael Community.

The Federation of San Rafael Neighborhoods (FSRN) supports concerns expressed in the Montecito Area Residents' Association (MARA) letter dated January 15, 2012 to the Design Review Board on The Plan. The FSRN concerns are: preserving goals and the vision outlined in General Plan 2020, protecting Neighborhood character and livability, and adhering to elements of the SMART EIR related to non-significant growth-inducing impacts of the project.

- We suggest removing all sections from The Plan which expand the Plan Area boundary with FAR increases/building height-density increases and the like—specifically East of 101 and including expansion further North on the West of 101. The SMART DEIR (November 2005) section 5.3 denies any growth-inducing impact significance by proposed project. The San Rafael City Council accepted the FEIR based upon this assumption. Certainly the ridership projections of the proposed SMART project (now scaled back from proposed) do not typify need to expand the Plan Area boundaries included in the CAC's charge. Aside from no justification for expanding The Plan Area, the overall effect as prescribed in The Plan as currently drafted runs counter to the General Plan 2020 goals of creating connectivity and a gateway to Downtown and neighborhoods.

In contrast, in an earlier Downtown San Rafael Station Area Plan Community Visioning Workshop Summary Report dated June 15, 2011, the vision statement includes this description (bold is ours): "The area immediately around the transit center **reflects and enhances the surrounding neighborhoods**. New buildings form a strong sense of place, reflecting the community's focus on creating an exciting and **friendly edge to downtown**."

415.453-6541

415.459-4337

www.fsrn.info

~the business of neighborhoods~

- In conjunction with the proposed Plan Area height changes discussed above which we do NOT support, specific supporting concepts to Goal 5 (Zoning Changes to Provide Consistent Urban Fabric) and Goal 6 (Bonus and Incentives to Enable Transit Oriented Development) are egregious contradictions to objectives outlined in General Plan 2020 goals—especially related to Neighborhoods. These concepts at issue are related to Height/FAR bonuses above State Mandates, relaxed or removal of density requirements and parking standards. We do not support this level of “Mission Creep” being included in The Plan at all as we recognize that it later becomes the springboard for debating merits for future requests for zoning ordinance changes and General Plan amendments.

However, should The Plan Area be reined in from that currently shown to something which retains consistency with General Plan policies and goals, certain application of some of the concepts under Goals 5 and 6 *might* provide interesting latitude for qualifying projects in the station area. We suggest that a reworking of the Goals/Concepts could prove worthwhile. We do request wherever building heights are discussed, the NET effect of State mandated height, density and parking bonuses should be spelled out so it is clear what qualifying projects might would result.

- We clearly support honest and accurate assessment of existing and project parking being included in The Plan so that all transportation area related parking stays within the Plan Area and other Downtown boundaries. Nearby adjacent neighborhoods, namely Montecito in this case-- but certainly other close-in neighborhoods years past--have expressed desire to explore how permit parking might serve to keep commuter and commercial car parking off residential area streets.
- We support the high interest for amenities expressed and support these remaining of high priority to The Plan including more trees and native vegetation, multi-modal and safe paths/corridors, respecting strong sentiments to avoid fencing the train, incorporating WhistleStop and ensuring that design and improvements need to all work toward achieving the outcome of “drawing one toward Downtown”.

Respectfully,

Tymber Cavasian, Vice-Chair
Federation of San Rafael Neighborhoods
(415) 459-4337



January 23, 2012

Citizens Advisory Committee on Redevelopment
San Rafael City Hall
1400 5th Avenue
San Rafael, CA 94901

Greetings:

Sustainable San Rafael has had the opportunity to review the draft Downtown Station Area Plan and is pleased to see a vision that is consistent with the best available information and practices consistent with creating a sustainable, walkable and less carbon dependent city. The goals express a vision for a vibrant, transit-friendly downtown and establish a blueprint to direct growth in a healthy direction in the coming decades. We commend the efforts of both the Committee and City's staff and consultants.

The draft Plan is a complex document and by necessity approaches the task mindful of existing constraints and the need to coordinate with other planning documents. Our comments, likewise, reflect these concerns. Overall, considering the scope, we have only minor comments.

Public Space – We feel that the discussion of public spaces is limited. A small plaza at the north end of Whistlestop has been identified and seems a clear fit. A green buffer area on Tamalpais north of Fourth has been suggested for some type of planting/buffer from the tracks. A more centralized and identifiable space, perhaps combining these two adjacent proposals, is needed to focus and enhance the entry to the downtown.

Bike/Pedestrian Path – The current plan is consistent with the BPAC plan that has the newly finished path by the freeway continuing down Hetherton. We are unclear why the path takes this seemingly dangerous route rather than continuing west along Mission and south along Tamalpais, which seems a more natural and pleasant fit. The advent of SMART may present a near-term opportunity to create a more inviting path, integrated with the treatment of the SMART right-of-way and with the Plan's other proposed improvements along Tamalpais.

Canal Paseo – Clearly a key to the success of the plan for pedestrians and cyclists is the linkage to the east side of the freeway. The CanalVision Plan stresses this linkage as well. The proposed Paseo from the Canal to the existing Mahon Creek pathway would be a wonderful realization of this vision. We encourage working with Caltrans in the near term to identify solutions to the difficult freeway ramp crossing along this route.

Parking – The plan does not provide clear answers to the delicate balance between providing adequate parking for development and transit and the goal of reducing auto use. The major benefit of SMART is reduced auto use and improved multimodal transit options. The plan needs to reflect that priority and, while not eliminating parking, should clearly recognize the objective of less auto use and keep parking to a minimum.

Densities – We support the higher densities in the Plan for several reasons. By encouraging greater transit use, higher density produces a cleaner environment with less burning of fossil fuels. It creates a more walkable area with greater activity and vitality. It will also help meet regional requirements for funding and is consistent with the Climate Change Action Plan, helping the city meet its SB 32 goals.

Sea Level Rise – Since portions of the Plan area are within the zone that BCDC has identified as subject to sea level rise, the Plan needs to reference the Climate Change Action Plan provision calling for shoreline defense from this eventuality.

We are excited about the direction of the Downtown Station Area Plan and look forward to the detailed work of realizing its vision through rezoning, possible design guidelines, traffic studies, facilitation of re-use of the Whistlestop building, and strategic public improvements (including finding pedestrian-friendly solutions to the safe crossing of Third Street between the Bettini Center and the new SMART Station).

Sincerely,

Jerry Belletto
Secretary

Community [Edit](#)[Design Survey](#)[Collect Responses](#)[Analyze Results](#)[View Summary](#)

Default Report

[Browse Responses](#)[Filter Responses](#)

Displaying 1 of 10 respondents

[Crosstab Responses](#)[Download Responses](#)[Share Responses](#)**Response Type:**
Normal Response**Collector:**
Web Link
(Web Link)**Custom Value:**
*empty***IP Address:**
68.65.65.62**Response Started:**
Tuesday, January 17, 2012 4:26:00 PM**Response Modified:**
Tuesday, January 17, 2012 4:30:42 PM**1. How are you most familiar with the study area?**

I work in the study area

I shop/do business in the study area

2. Which category below includes your age?

50-59

3. What was your gross (before taxes) household income in 2011?

\$150,000+

4. How long have you lived in San Rafael?

10+ years

5. In what neighborhood do you live?

Marinwood

6. What is the primary mode of transportation you use in the plan area?

Automobile

7. Have you participated in the station area planning process?

This is all new to me!

8. Select your top 2 choices for the types of improvements you would like to see throughout the planning area?

More public space and plazas

More parking

9. The bus station should be moved to the same block as the train station.

Agree

10. What would you like to see the Whistlestop building used for?

Retail with housing on second floor.

11. How important is having a public gathering place/plaza near the station?

Very important

12. The plan area is zoned for a mix of land uses. What types of development would you like to see more of?

	Most preferable (1)	(2)	Least preferable (3)
Housing			X
Office	X		
Retail	X		
<i>Other (please specify):</i>			

13. Prioritize the following parking-related options.

	Most important (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Least important (7)
Reduce on-site parking requirements for new development							X
Electronic meters with credit card payment options			X				
Shared parking, such as allowing overnight residential parking at office building lots			X				
Construction of a new municipal garage	X						
Provide more parking for transit users	X						
Car-sharing, as a strategy to reduce the demand for parking spaces						X	
Parking permits for residential neighborhoods							X
<i>Other (please specify):</i>							

14. Prioritize the following ways of creating a stronger sense of place in the plan area.

	Most important (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Least important (5)
Unique buildings and uses			X		
Unique streets and pathways			X		
Strong architectural and landscape edges to define public spaces	X				
Connection to natural features					X
A safe and inviting environment for pedestrians	X				
<i>Other (please specify):</i>					

15. Select the 3 most important potential amenities or attractions for the plan area.

More restaurants/cafes/outdoor dining
Fountain
More bike racks

Follow Us: [Facebook](#) • [Twitter](#) • [LinkedIn](#) • [Our Blog](#)

Help: [Tutorials](#) • [Answers & FAQs](#) • [Contact Support](#)

About Us: [Management Team](#) • [Board of Directors](#) • [Partners](#) • [Newsroom](#) • [Contact Us](#) • [We're Hiring](#)

Policies: [Terms of Use](#) • [Privacy Policy](#) • [Anti-Spam Policy](#) • [Security Statement](#) • [Email Opt-Out](#)

[Dansk](#) • [Deutsch](#) • [English](#) • [Español](#) • [Français](#) • [한국어](#) • [Italiano](#) • [Nederlands](#) • [日本語](#) • [Norsk](#) • [Português](#) • [Русский](#) • [Suomi](#) • [Svenska](#) • [中文\(繁體\)](#)

[View Summary](#)

Default Report

[Browse Responses](#)

[Filter Responses](#)

Displaying 2 of 10 respondents

[Crosstab Responses](#)

[Download Responses](#)

[Share Responses](#)

Response Type:
Normal Response

Collector:
Web Link
(Web Link)

Custom Value:
empty

IP Address:
24.113.254.35

Response Started:
Tuesday, January 17, 2012 5:15:17 PM

Response Modified:
Tuesday, January 17, 2012 5:25:30 PM

1. How are you most familiar with the study area?

I shop/do business in the study area

2. Which category below includes your age?

50-59

3. What was your gross (before taxes) household income in 2011?

\$75,000-99,999

4. How long have you lived in San Rafael?

10+ years

5. In what neighborhood do you live?

Montecito

6. What is the primary mode of transportation you use in the plan area?

Automobile

7. Have you participated in the station area planning process?

This is all new to me!

8. Select your top 2 choices for the types of improvements you would like to see throughout the planning area?

Wider sidewalks

More parking

9. The bus station should be moved to the same block as the train station.

Agree

10. What would you like to see the Whistlestop building used for?

transportation customers retail support (people waiting for a bus, train can get food/drink).

11. How important is having a public gathering place/plaza near the station?

11. How important is having a public gathering place/plaza near the station?

It would be nice

12. The plan area is zoned for a mix of land uses. What types of development would you like to see more of?

	Most preferable (1)	(2)	Least preferable (3)
Housing			X
Office	X		
Retail		X	
<i>Other (please specify):</i>			

13. Prioritize the following parking-related options.

	Most important (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Least important (7)
Reduce on-site parking requirements for new development						X	
Electronic meters with credit card payment options							X
Shared parking, such as allowing overnight residential parking at office building lots			X				
Construction of a new municipal garage	X						
Provide more parking for transit users				X			
Car-sharing, as a strategy to reduce the demand for parking spaces			X				
Parking permits for residential neighborhoods							X
<i>Other (please specify):</i>							

14. Prioritize the following ways of creating a stronger sense of place in the plan area.

	Most important (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Least important (5)
Unique buildings and uses					X
Unique streets and pathways				X	
Strong architectural and landscape edges to define public spaces			X		
Connection to natural features	X				
A safe and inviting environment for pedestrians			X		
<i>Other (please specify):</i>					

15. Select the 3 most important potential amenities or attractions for the plan area.

More benches/places to sit
More restaurants/cafes/outdoor dining
More street trees and landscaping

Follow Us: [Facebook](#) • [Twitter](#) • [LinkedIn](#) • [Our Blog](#)

Help: [Tutorials](#) • [Answers & FAQs](#) • [Contact Support](#)

About Us: [Management Team](#) • [Board of Directors](#) • [Partners](#) • [Newsroom](#) • [Contact Us](#) • [We're Hiring](#)

Policies: [Terms of Use](#) • [Privacy Policy](#) • [Anti-Spam Policy](#) • [Security Statement](#) • [Email Opt-Out](#)

[Dansk](#) • [Deutsch](#) • [English](#) • [Español](#) • [Français](#) • [한국어](#) • [Italiano](#) • [Nederlands](#) • [日本語](#) • [Norsk](#) • [Português](#) • [Русский](#) • [Suomi](#) • [Svenska](#) • [中文\(繁體\)](#)

[Customer Feedback](#) • [Product Feedback](#) • [Market Research](#) • [Employee Satisfaction](#) • [Performance Reviews](#) • [Healthcare Surveys](#) • [Event Planning](#)

Community [Edit](#)[Design Survey](#)[Collect Responses](#)[Analyze Results](#)[View Summary](#)

Default Report

[Browse Responses](#)[Filter Responses](#)

Displaying 3 of 10 respondents

[Crosstab Responses](#)[Download Responses](#)[Share Responses](#)**Response Type:**
Normal Response**Collector:**
Web Link
(Web Link)**Custom Value:**
*empty***IP Address:**
208.54.5.209**Response Started:**
Tuesday, January 17, 2012 5:24:04 PM**Response Modified:**
Tuesday, January 17, 2012 5:32:46 PM**1. How are you most familiar with the study area?**

I live in the study area

2. Which category below includes your age?

21-29

3. What was your gross (before taxes) household income in 2011?

\$75,000-99,999

4. How long have you lived in San Rafael?

Less than 2 years

5. In what neighborhood do you live?

Dominican

6. What is the primary mode of transportation you use in the plan area?

Walking

7. Have you participated in the station area planning process?

Attended community workshops

8. Select your top 2 choices for the types of improvements you would like to see throughout the planning area?

More public space and plazas

More residential (affordable and market) and office

9. The bus station should be moved to the same block as the train station.

Agree

10. What would you like to see the Whistlestop building used for?

Train station and retail

11. How important is having a public gathering place/plaza near the station?

11. How important is having a public gathering place/plaza near the station?

It would be nice

12. The plan area is zoned for a mix of land uses. What types of development would you like to see more of?

	Most preferable (1)	(2)	Least preferable (3)
Housing	X		
Office	X		
Retail		X	
<i>Other (please specify):</i>			

13. Prioritize the following parking-related options.

	Most important (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Least important (7)
Reduce on-site parking requirements for new development	X						
Electronic meters with credit card payment options			X				
Shared parking, such as allowing overnight residential parking at office building lots				X			
Construction of a new municipal garage							X
Provide more parking for transit users							X
Car-sharing, as a strategy to reduce the demand for parking spaces			X				
Parking permits for residential neighborhoods						X	
<i>Other (please specify): Why is so much of the plan devoted to parking?</i>							

14. Prioritize the following ways of creating a stronger sense of place in the plan area.

	Most important (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Least important (5)
Unique buildings and uses			X		
Unique streets and pathways			X		
Strong architectural and landscape edges to define public spaces			X		
Connection to natural features				X	
A safe and inviting environment for pedestrians	X				
<i>Other (please specify):</i>					

15. Select the 3 most important potential amenities or attractions for the plan area.

More restaurants/cafes/outdoor dining
Creek/canal improvements
1) transit station!

Follow Us: [Facebook](#) • [Twitter](#) • [LinkedIn](#) • [Our Blog](#)

Help: [Tutorials](#) • [Answers & FAQs](#) • [Contact Support](#)

About Us: [Management Team](#) • [Board of Directors](#) • [Partners](#) • [Newsroom](#) • [Contact Us](#) • [We're Hiring](#)

Policies: [Terms of Use](#) • [Privacy Policy](#) • [Anti-Spam Policy](#) • [Security Statement](#) • [Email Opt-Out](#)

[Dansk](#) • [Deutsch](#) • [English](#) • [Español](#) • [Français](#) • [한국어](#) • [Italiano](#) • [Nederlands](#) • [日本語](#) • [Norsk](#) • [Português](#) • [Русский](#) • [Suomi](#) • [Svenska](#) • [中文\(繁體\)](#)

[Customer Feedback](#) • [Product Feedback](#) • [Market Research](#) • [Employee Satisfaction](#) • [Performance Reviews](#) • [Healthcare Surveys](#) • [Event Planning](#)

Community [Edit](#)[Design Survey](#)[Collect Responses](#)[Analyze Results](#)[View Summary](#)

Default Report

[Browse Responses](#)[Filter Responses](#)

Displaying 4 of 10 respondents

[Crosstab Responses](#)[Download Responses](#)**Response Type:**
Normal Response**Collector:**
Web Link
(Web Link)[Share Responses](#)**Custom Value:**
empty**IP Address:**
71.135.57.16**Response Started:**
Tuesday, January 17, 2012 8:37:38 PM**Response Modified:**
Tuesday, January 17, 2012 8:50:52 PM**1. How are you most familiar with the study area?**

I live in the study area

2. Which category below includes your age?

50-59

3. What was your gross (before taxes) household income in 2011?

\$150,000+

4. How long have you lived in San Rafael?

10+ years

5. In what neighborhood do you live?

Bayside Acres

6. What is the primary mode of transportation you use in the plan area?

Automobile

7. Have you participated in the station area planning process?

Have kept up via on-line or Marin IJ only. Have not been able to attend evening meetings. Have active children but CARE about this project.

8. Select your top 2 choices for the types of improvements you would like to see throughout the planning area?

We (our East San Rafael community) fears the monumental traffic that will occur with train stopages at the San Rafael station. It is a nightmare now (getting under the overpass) we can't imagin what it will be like during train stops!!! We'll probably move from the area if this goes through!

9. The bus station should be moved to the same block as the train station.

Agree

10. What would you like to see the Whistlestop building used for?

No Response

11. How important is having a public gathering place/plaza near the station?

Don't want it

12. The plan area is zoned for a mix of land uses. What types of development would you like to see more of?

	Most preferable (1)	(2)	Least preferable (3)
Housing			
Office			
Retail			
<i>Other (please specify): Consider the economy...</i>			

13. Prioritize the following parking-related options.

	Most important (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Least important (7)
Reduce on-site parking requirements for new development							X
Electronic meters with credit card payment options							
Shared parking, such as allowing overnight residential parking at office building lots							X
Construction of a new municipal garage		X					
Provide more parking for transit users							X
Car-sharing, as a strategy to reduce the demand for parking spaces							X
Parking permits for residential neighborhoods							X
<i>Other (please specify):</i>							

14. Prioritize the following ways of creating a stronger sense of place in the plan area.

	Most important (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Least important (5)
Unique buildings and uses					
Unique streets and pathways					
Strong architectural and landscape edges to define public spaces					
Connection to natural features					
A safe and inviting environment for pedestrians					
<i>Other (please specify): If the plan goes through, the buildings MUST be useful!</i>					

15. Select the 3 most important potential amenities or attractions for the plan area.

It would have been nice to review the site plan with this site use survey. For those of us (most) that have not reviewed it we do not know the site or the plan so far. a site plan would have been valuable!!! Couldn't answer many questions without seeing the current plan.

Follow Us: [Facebook](#) • [Twitter](#) • [LinkedIn](#) • [Our Blog](#)

Help: [Tutorials](#) • [Answers & FAQs](#) • [Contact Support](#)

About Us: [Management Team](#) • [Board of Directors](#) • [Partners](#) • [Newsroom](#) • [Contact Us](#) • [We're Hiring](#)

Policies: [Terms of Use](#) • [Privacy Policy](#) • [Anti-Spam Policy](#) • [Security Statement](#) • [Email Opt-Out](#)

[Dansk](#) • [Deutsch](#) • [English](#) • [Español](#) • [Français](#) • [한국어](#) • [Italiano](#) • [Nederlands](#) • [日本語](#) • [Norsk](#) • [Português](#) • [Русский](#) • [Suomi](#) • [Svenska](#) • [中文\(繁體\)](#)

[Customer Feedback](#) • [Product Feedback](#) • [Market Research](#) • [Employee Satisfaction](#) • [Performance Reviews](#) • [Healthcare Surveys](#) • [Event Planning](#)

Community [Edit](#)[Design Survey](#)[Collect Responses](#)[Analyze Results](#)[View Summary](#)

Default Report

[Browse Responses](#)[Filter Responses](#)

Displaying 5 of 10 respondents

[Crosstab Responses](#)[Download Responses](#)[Share Responses](#)**Response Type:**
Normal Response**Collector:**
Web Link
(Web Link)**Custom Value:**
empty**IP Address:**
71.202.6.246**Response Started:**
Wednesday, January 18, 2012 7:54:04 AM**Response Modified:**
Wednesday, January 18, 2012 8:13:05 AM**1. How are you most familiar with the study area?**

I live in the study area

2. Which category below includes your age?

60 or older

3. What was your gross (before taxes) household income in 2011?

\$25,000-49,999

4. How long have you lived in San Rafael?

10+ years

5. In what neighborhood do you live?

Montecito

6. What is the primary mode of transportation you use in the plan area?

Walking

7. Have you participated in the station area planning process?

Attended advisory committee meetings

Attended community workshops

8. Select your top 2 choices for the types of improvements you would like to see throughout the planning area?

Wider sidewalks

9. The bus station should be moved to the same block as the train station.

No Response

10. What would you like to see the Whistlestop building used for?

retail specialty food, Chamber of Commerce maps, & info about downtown, transit info about buses, ferries, etc., temporary art exhibits

11. How important is having a public gathering place/plaza near the station?

Don't want it

12. The plan area is zoned for a mix of land uses. What types of development would you like to see more of?

	Most preferable (1)	(2)	Least preferable (3)
Housing			X
Office		X	
Retail	X		
<i>Other (please specify):</i>			

13. Prioritize the following parking-related options.

	Most important (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Least important (7)
Reduce on-site parking requirements for new development							X
Electronic meters with credit card payment options					X		
Shared parking, such as allowing overnight residential parking at office building lots				X			
Construction of a new municipal garage		X					
Provide more parking for transit users		X					
Car-sharing, as a strategy to reduce the demand for parking spaces				X			
Parking permits for residential neighborhoods		X					
<i>Other (please specify):</i>							

14. Prioritize the following ways of creating a stronger sense of place in the plan area.

	Most important (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Least important (5)
Unique buildings and uses					
Unique streets and pathways			X		
Strong architectural and landscape edges to define public spaces			X		
Connection to natural features			X		
A safe and inviting environment for pedestrians		X			
<i>Other (please specify):</i> improve natural environment in creek under 101					

15. Select the 3 most important potential amenities or attractions for the plan area.

More restaurants/cafes/outdoor dining
More street trees and landscaping
Creek/canal improvements

Follow Us: [Facebook](#) • [Twitter](#) • [LinkedIn](#) • [Our Blog](#)

Help: [Tutorials](#) • [Answers & FAQs](#) • [Contact Support](#)

About Us: [Management Team](#) • [Board of Directors](#) • [Partners](#) • [Newsroom](#) • [Contact Us](#) • [We're Hiring](#)

Policies: [Terms of Use](#) • [Privacy Policy](#) • [Anti-Spam Policy](#) • [Security Statement](#) • [Email Opt-Out](#)

[Dansk](#) • [Deutsch](#) • [English](#) • [Español](#) • [Français](#) • [한국어](#) • [Italiano](#) • [Nederlands](#) • [日本語](#) • [Norsk](#) • [Português](#) • [Русский](#) • [Suomi](#) • [Svenska](#) • [中文\(繁體\)](#)

[Customer Feedback](#) • [Product Feedback](#) • [Market Research](#) • [Employee Satisfaction](#) • [Performance Reviews](#) • [Healthcare Surveys](#) • [Event Planning](#)

Community [Edit](#)[Design Survey](#)[Collect Responses](#)[Analyze Results](#)[View Summary](#)

Default Report

[Browse Responses](#)[Filter Responses](#)

Displaying 6 of 10 respondents

[Crosstab Responses](#)[Download Responses](#)**Response Type:**
Normal Response**Collector:**
Web Link
(Web Link)[Share Responses](#)**Custom Value:**
*empty***IP Address:**
67.164.67.54**Response Started:**
Wednesday, January 18, 2012 9:27:31 AM**Response Modified:**
Wednesday, January 18, 2012 9:31:14 AM**1. How are you most familiar with the study area?**

I shop/do business in the study area

2. Which category below includes your age?

60 or older

3. What was your gross (before taxes) household income in 2011?

\$50,000-74,999

4. How long have you lived in San Rafael?

No Response

5. In what neighborhood do you live?

No Response

6. What is the primary mode of transportation you use in the plan area?

Automobile

7. Have you participated in the station area planning process?

Attended community workshops

8. Select your top 2 choices for the types of improvements you would like to see throughout the planning area?

More parking

9. The bus station should be moved to the same block as the train station.

Disagree

10. What would you like to see the Whistlestop building used for?

as a station.

11. How important is having a public gathering place/plaza near the station?

Not important

12. The plan area is zoned for a mix of land uses. What types of development would you like to see more of?

	Most preferable (1)	(2)	Least preferable (3)
Housing	X		
Office			X
Retail		X	
<i>Other (please specify):</i>			

13. Prioritize the following parking-related options.

	Most important (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Least important (7)
Reduce on-site parking requirements for new development						X	
Electronic meters with credit card payment options			X				
Shared parking, such as allowing overnight residential parking at office building lots			X				
Construction of a new municipal garage			X				
Provide more parking for transit users			X				
Car-sharing, as a strategy to reduce the demand for parking spaces			X				
Parking permits for residential neighborhoods			X				
<i>Other (please specify):</i>							

14. Prioritize the following ways of creating a stronger sense of place in the plan area.

	Most important (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Least important (5)
Unique buildings and uses				X	
Unique streets and pathways			X		
Strong architectural and landscape edges to define public spaces				X	
Connection to natural features				X	
A safe and inviting environment for pedestrians			X		
<i>Other (please specify):</i>					

15. Select the 3 most important potential amenities or attractions for the plan area.

More benches/places to sit
Directional signage/wayfinding

Follow Us: [Facebook](#) • [Twitter](#) • [LinkedIn](#) • [Our Blog](#)

Help: [Tutorials](#) • [Answers & FAQs](#) • [Contact Support](#)

About Us: [Management Team](#) • [Board of Directors](#) • [Partners](#) • [Newsroom](#) • [Contact Us](#) • [We're Hiring](#)

Policies: [Terms of Use](#) • [Privacy Policy](#) • [Anti-Spam Policy](#) • [Security Statement](#) • [Email Opt-Out](#)

[Dansk](#) • [Deutsch](#) • [English](#) • [Español](#) • [Français](#) • [한국어](#) • [Italiano](#) • [Nederlands](#) • [日本語](#) • [Norsk](#) • [Português](#) • [Русский](#) • [Suomi](#) • [Svenska](#) • [中文\(繁體\)](#)

[Customer Feedback](#) • [Product Feedback](#) • [Market Research](#) • [Employee Satisfaction](#) • [Performance Reviews](#) • [Healthcare Surveys](#) • [Event Planning](#)

[Education Surveys](#) • [Non Profit Surveys](#) • [Phone Polling](#) • [Forms By Wufoo](#) • [SurveyMonkey Audience](#)

Community [Edit](#)[Design Survey](#)[Collect Responses](#)[Analyze Results](#)[View Summary](#)

Default Report

[Browse Responses](#)[Filter Responses](#)

Displaying 7 of 10 respondents

[Crosstab Responses](#)[Download Responses](#)[Share Responses](#)**Response Type:**
Normal Response**Collector:**
Web Link
(Web Link)**Custom Value:**
*empty***IP Address:**
69.228.95.250**Response Started:**
Wednesday, January 18, 2012 11:22:06 AM**Response Modified:**
Wednesday, January 18, 2012 11:28:48 AM**1. How are you most familiar with the study area?**

I shop/do business in the study area

I use the transit center for bus transportation

2. Which category below includes your age?

60 or older

3. What was your gross (before taxes) household income in 2011?

\$50,000-74,999

4. How long have you lived in San Rafael?

No Response

5. In what neighborhood do you live?

Montecito

6. What is the primary mode of transportation you use in the plan area?

Walking

7. Have you participated in the station area planning process?

Attended advisory committee meetings

Attended community workshops

8. Select your top 2 choices for the types of improvements you would like to see throughout the planning area?

More public space and plazas

Wider sidewalks

More parking

9. The bus station should be moved to the same block as the train station.

Agree

10. What would you like to see the Whistlestop building used for?

Top floor for senior stuff; bottom for public transit. No commercial!

11. How important is having a public gathering place/plaza near the station?

It would be nice

12. The plan area is zoned for a mix of land uses. What types of development would you like to see more of?

	Most preferable (1)	(2)	Least preferable (3)
Housing		X	
Office		X	
Retail			
<i>Other (please specify):</i>			

13. Prioritize the following parking-related options.

	Most important (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Least important (7)
Reduce on-site parking requirements for new development							
Electronic meters with credit card payment options							
Shared parking, such as allowing overnight residential parking at office building lots							
Construction of a new municipal garage		X					
Provide more parking for transit users		X					
Car-sharing, as a strategy to reduce the demand for parking spaces		X					
Parking permits for residential neighborhoods						X	
<i>Other (please specify):</i>							

14. Prioritize the following ways of creating a stronger sense of place in the plan area.

	Most important (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Least important (5)
Unique buildings and uses					
Unique streets and pathways					
Strong architectural and landscape edges to define public spaces					
Connection to natural features					
A safe and inviting environment for pedestrians		X			
<i>Other (please specify):</i>					

15. Select the 3 most important potential amenities or attractions for the plan area.

More benches/places to sit
More street trees and landscaping
More bike racks
Directional signage/wayfinding
Creek/canal improvements

Follow Us: [Facebook](#) • [Twitter](#) • [LinkedIn](#) • [Our Blog](#)

Help: [Tutorials](#) • [Answers & FAQs](#) • [Contact Support](#)

About Us: [Management Team](#) • [Board of Directors](#) • [Partners](#) • [Newsroom](#) • [Contact Us](#) • [We're Hiring](#)

Policies: [Terms of Use](#) • [Privacy Policy](#) • [Anti-Spam Policy](#) • [Security Statement](#) • [Email Opt-Out](#)

Community [Edit](#)[Design Survey](#)[Collect Responses](#)[Analyze Results](#)[View Summary](#)

Default Report

[Browse Responses](#)[Filter Responses](#)

Displaying 8 of 10 respondents

[Crosstab Responses](#)[Download Responses](#)**Response Type:**
Normal Response**Collector:**
Web Link
(Web Link)[Share Responses](#)**Custom Value:**
empty**IP Address:**
24.5.24.185**Response Started:**
Wednesday, January 18, 2012 5:47:33 PM**Response Modified:**
Wednesday, January 18, 2012 5:53:26 PM**1. How are you most familiar with the study area?**

I live in the study area

2. Which category below includes your age?

50-59

3. What was your gross (before taxes) household income in 2011?

\$50,000-74,999

4. How long have you lived in San Rafael?

5-10 years

5. In what neighborhood do you live?

Montecito

6. What is the primary mode of transportation you use in the plan area?

Bicycle

7. Have you participated in the station area planning process?

Attended advisory committee meetings

Attended community workshops

8. Select your top 2 choices for the types of improvements you would like to see throughout the planning area?

More public space and plazas

More bikeways

9. The bus station should be moved to the same block as the train station.

Agree

10. What would you like to see the Whistlestop building used for?

A mini Ferry building providing services for those waiting for the train.

11. How important is having a public gathering place/plaza near the station?

Very important

12. The plan area is zoned for a mix of land uses. What types of development would you like to see more of?

	Most preferable (1)	(2)	Least preferable (3)
Housing		X	
Office		X	
Retail		X	
<i>Other (please specify):</i>			

13. Prioritize the following parking-related options.

	Most important (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Least important (7)
Reduce on-site parking requirements for new development						X	
Electronic meters with credit card payment options				X			
Shared parking, such as allowing overnight residential parking at office building lots			X				
Construction of a new municipal garage	X						
Provide more parking for transit users			X				
Car-sharing, as a strategy to reduce the demand for parking spaces			X				
Parking permits for residential neighborhoods			X				
<i>Other (please specify):</i>							

14. Prioritize the following ways of creating a stronger sense of place in the plan area.

	Most important (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Least important (5)
Unique buildings and uses			X		
Unique streets and pathways			X		
Strong architectural and landscape edges to define public spaces	X				
Connection to natural features			X		
A safe and inviting environment for pedestrians	X				
<i>Other (please specify):</i>					

15. Select the 3 most important potential amenities or attractions for the plan area.

More restaurants/cafes/outdoor dining
Fountain
Creek/canal improvements

Follow Us: [Facebook](#) • [Twitter](#) • [LinkedIn](#) • [Our Blog](#)

Help: [Tutorials](#) • [Answers & FAQs](#) • [Contact Support](#)

About Us: [Management Team](#) • [Board of Directors](#) • [Partners](#) • [Newsroom](#) • [Contact Us](#) • [We're Hiring](#)

Policies: [Terms of Use](#) • [Privacy Policy](#) • [Anti-Spam Policy](#) • [Security Statement](#) • [Email Opt-Out](#)

[Dansk](#) • [Deutsch](#) • [English](#) • [Español](#) • [Français](#) • [한국어](#) • [Italiano](#) • [Nederlands](#) • [日本語](#) • [Norsk](#) • [Português](#) • [Русский](#) • [Suomi](#) • [Svenska](#) • [中文\(繁體\)](#)

[View Summary](#)

Default Report

[Browse Responses](#)

[Filter Responses](#)

Displaying 9 of 10 respondents

[Crosstab Responses](#)

[Download Responses](#)

[Share Responses](#)

Response Type:
Normal Response

Collector:
Web Link
(Web Link)

Custom Value:
empty

IP Address:
108.67.147.52

Response Started:
Wednesday, January 18, 2012 7:13:26 PM

Response Modified:
Wednesday, January 18, 2012 7:14:28 PM

1. How are you most familiar with the study area?

I live in the study area

I shop/do business in the study area

I use the transit center for bus transportation

2. Which category below includes your age?

50-59

3. What was your gross (before taxes) household income in 2011?

\$25,000-49,999

4. How long have you lived in San Rafael?

10+ years

5. In what neighborhood do you live?

No Response

6. What is the primary mode of transportation you use in the plan area?

Automobile

7. Have you participated in the station area planning process?

No Response

8. Select your top 2 choices for the types of improvements you would like to see throughout the planning area?

No Response

9. The bus station should be moved to the same block as the train station.

No Response

10. What would you like to see the Whistlestop building used for?

No Response

11. How important is having a public gathering place/plaza near the station?

No Response

12. The plan area is zoned for a mix of land uses. What types of development would you like to see more of?

No Response

13. Prioritize the following parking-related options.

No Response

14. Prioritize the following ways of creating a stronger sense of place in the plan area.

No Response

15. Select the 3 most important potential amenities or attractions for the plan area.

No Response

Follow Us: [Facebook](#) • [Twitter](#) • [LinkedIn](#) • [Our Blog](#)

Help: [Tutorials](#) • [Answers & FAQs](#) • [Contact Support](#)

About Us: [Management Team](#) • [Board of Directors](#) • [Partners](#) • [Newsroom](#) • [Contact Us](#) • [We're Hiring](#)

Policies: [Terms of Use](#) • [Privacy Policy](#) • [Anti-Spam Policy](#) • [Security Statement](#) • [Email Opt-Out](#)

[Dansk](#) • [Deutsch](#) • [English](#) • [Español](#) • [Français](#) • [한국어](#) • [Italiano](#) • [Nederlands](#) • [日本語](#) • [Norsk](#) • [Português](#) • [Русский](#) • [Suomi](#) • [Svenska](#) • [中文\(繁體\)](#)

[Customer Feedback](#) • [Product Feedback](#) • [Market Research](#) • [Employee Satisfaction](#) • [Performance Reviews](#) • [Healthcare Surveys](#) • [Event Planning](#)

[Education Surveys](#) • [Non Profit Surveys](#) • [Phone Polling](#) • [Forms By Wufoo](#) • [SurveyMonkey Audience](#)

Copyright © 1999-2012 SurveyMonkey

Community [Edit](#)[Design Survey](#)[Collect Responses](#)[Analyze Results](#)[View Summary](#)

Default Report

[Browse Responses](#)[Filter Responses](#)

Displaying 10 of 10 respondents

[Crosstab Responses](#)[Download Responses](#)**Response Type:**
Normal Response**Collector:**
Web Link
(Web Link)[Share Responses](#)**Custom Value:**
*empty***IP Address:**
98.248.188.7**Response Started:**
Friday, January 20, 2012 9:58:42 AM**Response Modified:**
Friday, January 20, 2012 10:21:12 AM**1. How are you most familiar with the study area?**

I shop/do business in the study area

I use the transit center for bus transportation

I am a SMART supporter and what to do what I can to contribute to its success including to help realize development of transit oriented communities along the corridor.

2. Which category below includes your age?

50-59

3. What was your gross (before taxes) household income in 2011?

\$50,000-74,999

4. How long have you lived in San Rafael?

2-5 years

5. In what neighborhood do you live?

San Rafael High School

6. What is the primary mode of transportation you use in the plan area?

Automobile

7. Have you participated in the station area planning process?

I was aware of the effort but am now becoming engaged in the process.

8. Select your top 2 choices for the types of improvements you would like to see throughout the planning area?

Improved streetscapes, greater density, fine grained ground floor uses, better connectivity between rail and bus transit, replacement of surface parking with structured parking having other more active street level uses

9. The bus station should be moved to the same block as the train station.

Agree

10. What would you like to see the Whistlestop building used for?

Second level as interim SMART executive offices, Ground level for transit and transit serving retail uses. Consider the use of the ground floor as a food hall if the building can be configured to satisfy program requirements. SMART

should purchase the building from Whistle Stop to allow them to secure more suitable space to suit their needs elsewhere.

11. How important is having a public gathering place/plaza near the station?

It would be nice

12. The plan area is zoned for a mix of land uses. What types of development would you like to see more of?

	Most preferable (1)	(2)	Least preferable (3)
Housing	X		
Office	X		
Retail	X		
<i>Other (please specify):</i> Suitable supportive public amenities including meeting space			

13. Prioritize the following parking-related options.

	Most important (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Least important (7)
Reduce on-site parking requirements for new development	X						
Electronic meters with credit card payment options	X						
Shared parking, such as allowing overnight residential parking at office building lots	X						
Construction of a new municipal garage	X						
Provide more parking for transit users	X						
Car-sharing, as a strategy to reduce the demand for parking spaces	X						
Parking permits for residential neighborhoods						X	
<i>Other (please specify):</i> Bicycle storage to encourage alternative modes, Identification of key pedestrian corridors to inform parking structure design and access. Certain corridors should be understood as having highest priority for fine grain pedestrian oriented uses and not for blank walls, parking lot access drives and parking edges.							

14. Prioritize the following ways of creating a stronger sense of place in the plan area.

	Most important (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Least important (5)
Unique buildings and uses			X		
Unique streets and pathways					X
Strong architectural and landscape edges to define public spaces	X				
Connection to natural features			X		
A safe and inviting environment for pedestrians	X				
<i>Other (please specify):</i> I prefer good urban design over forced efforts to be unique. Great cities are composed of good background buildings which define good pedestrian supported street edges accented with occasional great architecture thoughtfully integrated into the urban landscape					

15. Select the 3 most important potential amenities or attractions for the plan area.

More restaurants/cafes/outdoor dining

More street trees and landscaping

Creek/canal improvements

Follow Us: Facebook • Twitter • LinkedIn • Our Blog

Help: Tutorials • Answers & FAQs • Contact Support

About Us: Management Team • Board of Directors • Partners • Newsroom • Contact Us • We're Hiring

Downtown Station Area Plan

Community [Edit](#)

[Design Survey](#) [Collect Responses](#) [Analyze Results](#)

- [View Summary](#)
- [Browse Responses](#)
- [Filter Responses](#)
- [Crosstab Responses](#)
- [Download Responses](#)
- [Share Responses](#)

Default Report [+ Add Report](#)

Response Summary

Total Started Survey: 10
Total Completed Survey: 9 (90%)

[Show this Page Only](#)

PAGE: GENERAL/DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONS

1. How are you most familiar with the study area?		
	Create Chart	Download
	Response Percent	Response Count
I live in the study area	50.0%	5
I work in the study area	10.0%	1
I shop/do business in the study area	60.0%	6
I use the transit center for bus transportation	30.0%	3
Other (please specify) Show Responses		1
answered question		10
skipped question		0

2. Which category below includes your age?		
	Create Chart	Download
	Response Percent	Response Count
17 or younger	0.0%	0
18-20	0.0%	0
21-29	10.0%	1
30-39	0.0%	0
40-49	0.0%	0
50-59	60.0%	6
60 or older	30.0%	3
answered question		10
skipped question		0

3. What was your gross (before taxes) household income in 2011?		
	Create Chart	Download
	Response Percent	Response Count
Less than \$25,000	0.0%	0
\$25,000-49,999	20.0%	2

SurveyMonkey - Survey Results

\$50,000-74,999	40.0%	4
\$75,000-99,999	20.0%	2
\$100,000-149,999	0.0%	0
\$150,000+	20.0%	2

answered question 10

skipped question 0

4. How long have you lived in San Rafael?

Create Chart

Download

	Response Percent	Response Count
Less than 2 years	12.5%	1
2-5 years	12.5%	1
5-10 years	12.5%	1
10+ years	62.5%	5

answered question 8

skipped question 2

5. In what neighborhood do you live?

Download

	Response Count
Show Responses	8
answered question	8
skipped question	2

6. What is the primary mode of transportation you use in the plan area?

Create Chart

Download

	Response Percent	Response Count
Bicycle	10.0%	1
Walking	30.0%	3
Transit	0.0%	0
Automobile	60.0%	6
Motorcycle/scooter	0.0%	0
Other (please specify)		0
answered question		10
skipped question		0

7. Have you participated in the station area planning process?

Create Chart

Download

	Response Percent	Response Count
Attended advisory committee meetings	42.9%	3

Attended community workshops	71.4%	5
This is all new to me!	28.6%	2
Other (please specify) Show Responses		2
answered question		7
skipped question		3

Show this Page Only

PAGE: PLAN SPECIFIC QUESTIONS

8. Select your top 2 choices for the types of improvements you would like to see throughout the planning area?

Create Chart

Download

	Response Percent	Response Count
More public space and plazas	57.1%	4
Wider sidewalks	42.9%	3
More parking	57.1%	4
More bikeways	14.3%	1
Other (please specify) Show Responses		3
answered question		7
skipped question		3

9. The bus station should be moved to the same block as the train station.

Create Chart

Download

	Response Percent	Response Count
Agree	87.5%	7
Disagree	12.5%	1
answered question		8
skipped question		2

10. What would you like to see the Whistlestop building used for?

Download

	Response Count
Show Responses	8
answered question	8
skipped question	2

11. How important is having a public gathering place/plaza near the station?

Create Chart

Download

	Response Percent	Response Count
Very important	22.2%	2

It would be nice	44.4%	4
Not important	11.1%	1
Don't want it	22.2%	2
Don't know	0.0%	0
answered question		9
skipped question		1

12. The plan area is zoned for a mix of land uses. What types of development would you like to see more of?

Create Chart

Download

	Most preferable		Least preferable	Rating Average	Response Count
Housing	37.5% (3)	25.0% (2)	37.5% (3)	2.00	8
Office	50.0% (4)	37.5% (3)	12.5% (1)	1.63	8
Retail	42.9% (3)	57.1% (4)	0.0% (0)	1.57	7
Other (please specify) Show Responses					2
answered question					8
skipped question					2

13. Prioritize the following parking-related options.

Create Chart

Download

	Most important				Least important		Rating Average	Response Count
Reduce on-site parking requirements for new development	25.0% (2)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	37.5% (3)	12.5% (1)	25.0% (2)	4.63
Electronic meters with credit card payment options	14.3% (1)	42.9% (3)	14.3% (1)	14.3% (1)	0.0% (0)	14.3% (1)	0.0% (0)	2.86
Shared parking, such as allowing overnight residential parking at office building lots	12.5% (1)	50.0% (4)	12.5% (1)	12.5% (1)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	12.5% (1)	2.88
Construction of a new municipal garage	77.8% (7)	11.1% (1)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	11.1% (1)	1.78
Provide more parking for transit users	44.4% (4)	22.2% (2)	0.0% (0)	11.1% (1)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	22.2% (2)	2.89
Car-sharing, as a strategy to reduce the demand for parking spaces	22.2% (2)	22.2% (2)	22.2% (2)	11.1% (1)	0.0% (0)	11.1% (1)	11.1% (1)	3.22
Parking permits for residential neighborhoods	11.1% (1)	22.2% (2)	0.0% (0)	11.1% (1)	11.1% (1)	11.1% (1)	33.3% (3)	4.56
Other (please specify) Show Responses								
answered question								
skipped question								

14. Prioritize the following ways of creating a stronger sense of place in the plan area.

Create Chart

Download

	Most important	Least important	Rating Average	Response Count
--	----------------	-----------------	----------------	----------------

SurveyMonkey - Survey Results
important

					important	Average	Count
Unique buildings and uses	0.0% (0)	33.3% (2)	33.3% (2)	16.7% (1)	16.7% (1)	3.17	6
Unique streets and pathways	0.0% (0)	57.1% (4)	14.3% (1)	14.3% (1)	14.3% (1)	2.86	7
Strong architectural and landscape edges to define public spaces	42.9% (3)	28.6% (2)	14.3% (1)	14.3% (1)	0.0% (0)	2.00	7
Connection to natural features	14.3% (1)	28.6% (2)	14.3% (1)	28.6% (2)	14.3% (1)	3.00	7
A safe and inviting environment for pedestrians	75.0% (6)	12.5% (1)	12.5% (1)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	1.38	8
Other (please specify) Show Responses							3
answered question							8
skipped question							2

15. Select the 3 most important potential amenities or attractions for the plan area.

Create Chart

Download

	Response Percent	Response Count
More benches/places to sit	37.5%	3
More restaurants/cafes/outdoor dining	75.0%	6
Fountain	25.0%	2
Public art displays	0.0%	0
More street trees and landscaping	50.0%	4
More bike racks	25.0%	2
Directional signage/wayfinding	25.0%	2
Creek/canal improvements	62.5%	5
Other (please specify) Show Responses		2
answered question		8
skipped question		2

Follow Us: Facebook • Twitter • LinkedIn • Our Blog

Help: Tutorials • Answers & FAQs • Contact Support

About Us: Management Team • Board of Directors • Partners • Newsroom • Contact Us • We're Hiring

Policies: Terms of Use • Privacy Policy • Anti-Spam Policy • Security Statement • Email Opt-Out

Dansk • Deutsch • English • Español • Français • 한국어 • Italiano • Nederlands • 日本語 • Norsk • Português • Русский • Suomi • Svenska • 中文(繁體)

Customer Feedback • Product Feedback • Market Research • Employee Satisfaction • Performance Reviews • Healthcare Surveys • Event Planning

Education Surveys • Non Profit Surveys • Phone Polling • Forms By Wufoo • SurveyMonkey Audience