

Document	Page	Comment	Type
SA Corridors Draft Comments (as of 12/7/17)			
Station Area Concepts - All	1	<p>I understand the concept of providing the mass transport where the masses are, where they are moving/growing and with the communities that are supporting the effort with their own planning; however, the southern 50% of the greater Bexar County region will always be underdeveloped unless something promotes growth and development in these areas.</p> <p>While this plan will serve the greatest number of people, it continues to promote the sprawl into the northwest where the most developed roadways already exist. The people with the greatest need for mass transport are in the poorest areas. I work at SAC and many of the people who come to visit our planetarium have to take multiple buses to reach us and plan well ahead of any programs to be able to attend. One of the most often mentioned reasons for cancellations to a high school program in the spring was the inability to get transportation early on a Saturday morning from their south - southwestern locations.</p> <p>I would continue to serve the people, but plan for expansion phases that enable developers to point to this as a rationale for future buyers in these underdeveloped areas.</p>	General
Station Area Concepts - Airport	6-7	Housing around the airport has already cost the city. The housing areas already there sued for the noise from the airport. how will this be handled?	Clarification
Future Land Use / Corridor Profiles	1-2	All the plans run into at least 410. There is no east/ west plans along 1604. Currently that area is a parking lot of traffic at most times of day. To encourage use of mass transportation, that area must be addressed. I'm not riding from Stone Oak into 410 to come back out to an area along 1604. I can drive there, even in bad traffic, faster.	Clarification
Station Area Concepts - UTSA Blvd	3	This plan nicely connects with recent pedestrian and bicycle-friendly improvements to both UTSA Blvd and Hausman Rd. I would very much like to see all routes to UTSA (Babcock) from neighboring residential areas be similarly developed to make bicycle transit safe and enjoyable.	General
Future Land Use / Corridor Profiles	all	We need more and safer bike infrastructure, mainly protected bikeways with barriers from car traffic.	General
Future Land Use / Corridor Profiles	all	The draft needs to be vetted by the neighborhoods it impacts. Neighborhood land use plans should not be overridden by the proposed corridor study. This creates pressure from speculators that will harass neighbors to sell their property within a half mile from these corridors betting on the fact that incentives...from wherever, including city dollars-not just federal...will be used to invade their neighborhoods and result in deterioration of the same. Issues such as parking for transit centers, etc., has not been vetted. the draft needs oversight by the very neighborhoods it impacts. Why the hurry to approve if the draft serves the neighborhoods it impacts? I propose a consultant be hired to represent the neighborhoods, not just the city staff proposing these changes to neighborhood land use plans.	Policy

Future Land Use / Corridor Profiles	29-30	The Fredericksburg Corridor has significant potential and portions of the corridor, particularly between Balcones Heights and Five Points need a boost of economic development. Improving transit will be a boon to the area, but how will VIA address the parking along bus or rapid transit routes? Of particular concern is that cars will begin to utilize narrow neighborhood streets, impeding traffic flow within older and historic neighborhoods. In addition, what about the areas where congestion, such as the intersections of Hildebrand, Fred, and Club Drive meet - the area is so narrow, buses and other wide vehicles cannot turn right from Hildebrand to Fred. As it is, buses turning from Fred onto Hildebrand tend to jump the curb. With regard to light rail, it is difficult to envision how a rail line could be accommodated along certain portions of Fred, such as the area where the Mary Louise Primo Station is located. Has the impact on older and historic neighborhoods located within a half mile of the corridor been fully considered? Light rail at the entrance of these historic neighborhoods is hardly in line with the charm and character of the surroundings.	General
Future Land Use / Corridor Profiles	20	Extend the corridor profile for Bandera Rd all the way out to 1604. Designate Bandera Rd as a high capacity roadway.	Clarification
Future Land Use / Corridor Profiles		FLUM ".....neighborhood plans were the starting point,..." The future community plans contain neighborhood groupings as stated on page 17.2 SA Comp plan. It had the been the communication that the City would no longer have individual neighborhood plans.	Clarification
Future Land Use / Corridor Profiles		The event table interaction did not show the 1/2 mile implications for each corridor and is not an adequate representation on "how transit supportive development should look and feel" There were no density renderings only maps with dots not showing actual conditions. wording should be more towards, placing dots on a grid as there was no map.	Clarification
Future Land Use / Corridor Profiles		Austin Hwy-Community acceptance-there are several CCRs to address protection of surrounding neighborhoods. The draft is not accurate to the "current conditions" to update the Mahncke Park NCD, housing form on MF zoned properties, and IDZ. The plan should protect the encroachment of commercial uses on shallow lots. NCD and Historic do not determine zoning on new developments. Therefore, it should be explicitly stated mitigating impact on surrounding neighborhoods is important as A GOAL for the entire FLUM	Clarification
Transit-Supportive Land Use Framework		Bandera as a corridor should be extended pass Leon Valley to 1604	Clarification
Future Land Use / Corridor Profiles		Policy needs: The City of San Antonio should also work with Leon Valley. All municipalities, VIA, Bexar County, and TX DOT should be working together. Not including the municipalities within SA is leaving a hole in a plan	Policy

Future Land Use / Corridor Profiles		Community acceptance: The Community Plan for this area should be supported with transportation corridor. This should extend to 1604 or even Helotes. Why not a station at 1604 to encourage a park and ride from Helotes and reduce the number of cars on 1604 and north Bandera.	Clarification
Future Land Use / Corridor Profiles		About: Fredericksburg The statement in about is incorrect. The proposed route does NOT follow the path of the existing Primo route. It travels down 1-10 and exists W. Hildebrand instead of W. Woodlawn.	Clarification
Future Land Use / Corridor Profiles		Policy needs: Any corridor which bisects a municipality should have a policy goal of interacting and working together.	Policy
Future Land Use / Corridor Profiles		Community Acceptance: The Fredericksburg Rd Corridor Study is mentioned and should be available to be read. Where is the final report as it was completed in 2016? Transparency. Solve the VIA problems on Fredericksburg Rd. VIA has created a mess of stacking buses and transfer points for other lines aka a transit center without adequate support personnel and facilities. The HEB is now a transit center. Lots of on/off numbers but very low There is a redundancy of bus stops on small block lengths on Fredericksburg Rd. There should be consolidation. ViA has created congestion where non was present with the primo. Efforts to have the HEB designed with pedestrian friendly amenities were discarded by VIA's haphazard placement of stops on Fredericksburg Rd. The transfer points on W. Hildebrand, Fredericksburg Rd and Mary Louise are disrespectful to the community. The FLUM should have language to be sensitive to the shallow commercial parcels and close proximity of the single family residential.	Clarification
Future Land Use / Corridor Profiles		should state the \$10M in prioritized signal lights along Fredericksburg funded by COAS bond monies, lack of pedestrian infrastructure, and the corridor bisects the 100 year flood plain. Also, mention the history of the old Spanish trail	Clarification

Future Land Use / Corridor Profiles		The new proposed route to direct the corridor down W. Hildebrand has serious concerns and has not been properly communicated. Case in point see erroneous language on page 28. The turn from W. Hildebrand onto Fredericksburg Rd does not have adequate right of way. The new Starbucks is not going to relinquish property. The intersection is a troublesome point today. The community had requested with the City to restrict access points at the Starbucks and HEB and were not successful. The TIA for the HEB when constructed with respect to the intersection redeveloped (West Ave, Hildebrand, Fredericksburg Rd, Club Dr-City gave West Ave property to HEB) indicated no increase in traffic into the residential community on Club. However today's traffic count shows a huge increase so much so that Club Dr has more traffic by over 1500 trips than Donaldson Ave (which has a bus route).	Clarification
Future Land Use / Corridor Profiles		Policy needs: The corridor bisects the 100 yr flood plain and any additional density development on the larger parcels of land within loop 410 should be mandatory detention. Specifically: On Fredericksburg Rd between Balcones Heights and W. Hildebrand. Today, there are needs in excess of 50 Million in drainage just off Fredericksburg Rd with no funding identified. There are existing density in the area for affordable housing. There have been significant deaths in the corridor and pedestrians injured. Vision zero should be included in language. Transportation investments should be comprehensive and include sidewalks. Significant gaps and drainage channels on the areas of Fredericksburg with large ROW	Policy
Future Land Use / Corridor Profiles		The Corridor travels through HIGH Density of SINGLE Family residential areas with limited ROW. Policies should be developed to protect the single family homes. This area has few registered neighborhoods and caution should be used with transitional uses, buffers and noise/air pollution. The flooding concerns are paramount to quality of life and mandatory detention should be required. The corridor passes through 3 100 year flood plain.	Clarification
Future Land Use / Corridor Profiles		Policy needs: The Huebner-Grissom corridor should mention Leon Valley and Bexar County, VIA and TXDOT working together for transportation needs in the area. Drainage is a major concern with Leon Valley. The proposed route crosses 100 yr flood plain in more than 7 areas along Huebner and Grissom.	Policy
Future Land Use / Corridor Profiles		Community Acceptance: nice comment on well-established neighborhood plans but that is an incorrect statement. This should be a comment for all corridors!	Clarification
Future Land Use / Corridor Profiles		The Looper Premium passes through 4 municipalities and there should be policies to work together for transit solutions, also working with TXDOT is critical. Noise and AIR pollution reduction should be mentioned.	Policy

Future Land Use / Corridor Profiles	TOC	TOC: Double-check page numbers (i.e. Should Corridor Profile Explainer be p. 12 instead?)	Clarification
Future Land Use / Corridor Profiles	5	(Public Outreach, first line): int he in the process of developing	Clarification
Future Land Use / Corridor Profiles	7	(Residential Uses, last line): Tomorrow Comprehensive Plan	Clarification
Future Land Use / Corridor Profiles	12-15	p. 12-15: Corridor Profiles <u>Profile Explainer</u>	Clarification
Future Land Use / Corridor Profiles	13	p. 13: Zoning – Suggest adding to ...and parking requirements friendly to transit oriented development (Otherwise, not sure how to take what a high vs low score is saying)	Clarification
Future Land Use / Corridor Profiles	53	p. 53: Brooks City Base: Double-check usage of “Brooks” and remove instances where “City Base” still pops up	Clarification
TSLU Framework		Overall, we support increased density throughout the inner core to support more viable, sustainable rapid transit options. However, we would ask that SA Corridors consider other tools in the study for promoting affordable housing. One is supporting higher density (low to midrise apartments) throughout neighborhoods, not just at transit locations. Other cities experiencing housing shortages and housing affordability crises have targeted density only at transit stations and along corridors. Cities that have targeted density not just at corridors, but also within neighborhoods do not see as much of an affordability crisis and have more middle housing options.	General
TSLU Framework	4	We would also encourage growth not just along the corridors but also low-to-midrise apartments within neighborhoods near the corridor. This type of density is seen throughout neighborhoods in Montreal and has been used to retain affordability. Equity issues – if density/growth and access to rapid transit happens in a way that connects regional centers, this could lead to the Westside lacking investment and growth opportunities, as well less access to transit opportunities. The Westside lacks a regional center, which could lead to the delay of rapid transit on the Westside and lead to investors and developers ignoring the Westside for future development and investment.	General

TSLU Framework	8	Hopefully the study recommends that Multifamily unit minimum parking requirement be lowered – doesn't make sense that a family dwelling has a lower parking requirement. Often, people in apartment buildings don't even own a car or share a car per household, particularly if living near downtown.	General
TSLU Framework	17	Graphic shows majority of the Westside as not supportive of rapid transit – this may delay rapid transit or cause rapid transit to not be placed in this area. This needs serious consideration, as the Westside has been historically disinvested in, leading to the fact that it doesn't have the investment today to support rapid transit. Regardless of its ability to support transit or not, it should be considered as a priority area to make up for decades of policy and decision-making that led to disinvestment and lack of opportunities for the residents.	Clarification
TSLU Framework	19	The city needs to incentivize investments in areas like Zarzamora (not just downtown) to encourage development that would support transit.	General
TSLU Framework	24	The tools and incentives mentioned need to be more specific, which tools? Which incentives? What are some tools and incentives that were successful in other, similar cities?	Clarification
TSLU Framework	27	We support increasing density and reducing parking requirements near transit stations and beyond!	General
TSLU Framework	29	Yes! Expand incentives beyond downtown! TSLU grant programs – If the city would provide grants/loans to private developers for multifamily developments, then we would hope they require a percentage of the units to be affordable (60% or 80% AMI) units.	General
TSLU Framework	31	In some cities, requiring inclusionary zoning has led to a reduction in the development of housing units. Incentivizing affordable units with density bonuses may be a better tool. This should be analyzed.	Policy
TSLU Framework	32	Density bonuses and set asides should be much higher for incentivizing affordable housing – please review the SA Housing Commission recommendations.	Policy
TSLU Framework	34	What about bike network? Biking and rapid transit go hand-in-hand. Many people finish their transit commute by biking to their final destination.	General
Fresno/San Pedro Station		"Fresno...has limited capacity for growth beyond major commercial areas" – a concept of low to midrise apartment buildings in the current SF zoning could be introduced to increase density and growth. Growth doesn't just need to happen on the corridors – this was a mistake that Portland and Seattle made, which has led to their housing affordability crisis. Growth needs to happen not just along corridors, but also within SF zoning areas.	Clarification

Nacogdoches/thousand oaks		This area is not even close to being walkable. Adequate and accessible pedestrian infrastructure, narrowing streets, reducing parking and slowing traffic needs to be seriously considered.	General
Zarzamora and Buena Vista		The TOD zoning recommendations, development incentives and density incentives for affordable housing/mixed-use should be extended up to Martin St, as there is new development that will occur soon on Martin and Zarzamora. (incentivize on what is already occurring).	Policy
Zarzamora and Buena Vista		Zarzamora and Buena Vista desperately needs pedestrian and bike infrastructure improvements – wider sidewalks, slower traffic, crosswalks, etc. This should be considered in this corridor concept.	General