

River North District Master Plan

Compiled Question List for Moule & Polyzoides

(forwarded to consultants 8/6/2008)

I. Questions from the Monday, July 28 Planning Team meeting, Sub-committee Plan Review

⇒ Vision & Development Framework – Group I

River Corridor, pages 2:7 - 2:12

Pearl Brewery Connection, pages 2:19 - 2:20

Museum Neighborhood, pages 2:21 - 2:24

Madison Sq. Park Neighborhood, pages 2:37 - 2:38

Sub-Committee Discussion Questions:

- Are you aware that the River can be as far as 18 feet below street level at some points?
 - Knowing this, would you change the location of the sidewalks and linear parks at the street level?
 - Was the park plan along the river coordinated with the Museum Reach Improvements? Is this proposal duplicating what has already been planned?
- Was this plan created with the notion that it would supersede all aspects of the RIO's?
- Do you feel that the 20 story buildings along the river will create a tunneling effect at the river level?
- Once the plan is adopted, is it the final say in the River North District or is there some wiggle room (especially pertaining to the location of parks)? Or is the the Park location plan to be considered conceptual in nature?
- Explain the terminal vistas concept in the River Corridor. Exactly what does this mean in plain English?
- Is there a reason the guiding principles in appendix A did not specifically address density?

⇒ Vision & Development Framework – Group II

Performing Arts Neighborhood, pages: 2:13 - 2:18

Broadway Corridor, pages: 2:25 - 2:28

Avenue B, pages: 2:29 - 2:32

Alamo Corridor, pages: 2:33 - 2:34

Maverick Park, page: 2:35 - 2:36

Sub-Committee Discussion Questions:

- Was property availability considered in the Performing Arts Neighborhood?
- What was the rationale to route the trolley down Avenue B instead of Broadway?
- Was angled parking considered for Broadway?
- What effect does the Master Plan have on the current RIO standards?

⇒ **Parks and Open Space**, pages 2:41 – 2:54

Sub-Committee Discussion Questions:

- Why was Travis Park left out of the plan?
- Regarding parks and open spaces, will property owners be restricted as to how their property will be used?
- Where are the bike and walking lanes?
- Who regulates the linear parks along the river?
- Regarding Community Park A) why was that particular space designated for water treatment?
- Will there be an increase in law enforcement once the parks and open spaces are built?
- Can or will the larger parks be broken up into pocket parks?
- Please elaborate on the water recycling aspect.
- Will there be enough open spaces to walk to?
- Will the development of Freeway Park H) hinder the Fiesta family tradition of families camping out to watch the parade?
- Will the water features be of a smaller scale and conserve water?

⇒ **Mobility Plan**, pages 2:55 - 2:66

Sub-Committee Discussion Questions:

- To what extent does the RNDMP accommodate all wheelchair users?
- Why was road along the River proposed in RNDMP?
- Would eminent domain be used to build new streets?
- How does park once plan coordinate with overall intensity of RNDMP?
- How will the proposed garages get built? Will eminent domain be used?
- Do we really need a site specific parking map? Could a formula based approach be utilized?
- Does the requirement for all parking for dwellings provided on site include guest parking?
- Is residential community parking encouraged in RNDMP?

Questions from Comment Cards

- In reference to p 2:11, what information is available concerning any noise level for steel-wheel-track-based street trollies?
- In reference to p 2:49, who yields the property for the Alamo Streetscape? What are the right-of-way-issues?
- In reference to p 2:38, what is the purpose of the Park-Once at St. Mary's & Baltimore?
- In reference to p 2:33, who gives up the real estate for the proposed Alamo Corridor?
- In reference to p 2:13, concerning the area in paragraph 4 dealing with parcels of land currently used for the surface parking-What is meant by "recycling some of that land for high-density structured parking" and how will that be accomplished?
- In reference to p 2:6, explain how the Park-Once strategy (which is said to, "Multiply the value of the existing and future investments in parking infrastructure") will work.
- In reference to p 1:6, what type of entity is Park-Once?
- In reference to p 1:IV, does Park-Once Utility have the right of Eminent Domain?
- Should we consider street car on Broadway?
- Should we consider hiring additional expert on transit (IE street car)?

- In reference to section 2.1, Vision and Plan, p 2:11:
 - 2nd paragraph, 1st Line: "Two such modes of transit are already in operation in the Downtown..."
 - Why is existing bus service not being considered as current transit?
 - 3rd paragraph, 3rd line: "and a coordinated system of signage and transit stop shelters will be designed to make navigation..."
 - Is the intent to coordinate w/ VIA?
 - 5th paragraph, 5th line "...alleviate in part the parking crisis Downtown."
 - What crisis? Do any of the COSA sponsored parking studies support this comment?
 - 6th paragraph - last lines "The Street Trolley can become the economic engine for the development of River North."
 - Should VIA be considered "player" for integration of this important transit element? Or intent is for private developer to operate as well?

II. Questions Submitted by Planning Team Members Post July 28 Planning Team Meeting

- p.1:2 Please describe the planning process from the end of the charette process in late Sept. 2007 through the first presentation of the proposed plan in December 2007.
- Please cite some examples of similar "New Urbanism" planning efforts in other communities that are similar in size, scope and urban infill as San Antonio's River North.
- p. 2:10 Please explain how the string of River Parks relate to and integrate with the River Improvement Project.
- p. 2:12 Please explain the concept of Vista Terminations and describe how they were located on the proposed plan.
- p. 2:12 Please explain how the trolley route was determined and how it might connect to other parts of the city, namely the Broadway corridor to the North.
- p. 1:2 and 2:4 Although section 1.3 seems to state that the plan "incorporates all of the direction of RIO-2", the massing plan indicates spots of greater density on the river than allowed by RIO-2. Please explain this apparent inconsistency.
- p. 2:56 Please explain the recommended interventions regarding the addition of several streets across what is currently private property and what the property owner might expect upon implementation.
- p. 2:62 Please explain the park once concept and cite examples where it has been implemented in other communities.
- p. 2:64 Please explain the lack of park once facilities in Zones 2 & 6.
- What will happen to the RIO II Overlay District? Why not just accept form based Code and keep the Overlay district in place as a guide line? Why create all the additional guidelines?
- What is the goal or purpose of the new roads being drawn with the extension of 9th into St. Mary's and the intersection change of Arden Court and 9th? If that comes to fruition will property owners have condemnation procedures applied to their properties?
- Question 3 - 201 Arden Court (northwest corner of the river at 9th and Arden Court) has a park drawn into that location, what will ultimately be available for the site? Currently under RIO II guidelines a 10 story building is available?

- Because architectural character was inherent throughout the master plan, is there a way local senior architects, through the American Institute of Architects, San Antonio chapter, The Architecture Foundation of San Antonio, or UTSA and other local colleges and universities, could be made available to provide input recommendations and assistance to persons proposing to build or remodel commercial, residential or office structures in the district?
- Could a funding source be provided for high quality sculpture and other art in parks, other open spaces, river entrances, private courtyards visible to the public, and sidewalks to feature the district as a public art community? It is possible that local collectors might provide major and minor public art pieces on a rotating or loan basis.
- I attended a neighborhood meeting in the district recently. Several questions were repeated in varying forms:
 - Why were detailed development plans for specific lots presented as if they were not becoming part of specific zoning action the if proposals in the plan were only possible uses, and structures, why weren't the possibilities uses provided written form within each block with possible mixes of structures and uses shown as samples without giving a specific location? New zoning schemes were actually depicted in the plan.
 - Why was there a suggestion in the plan that the proposed specific structures and uses would be incorporated in a new zoning scheme?
 - Were parking structures primarily for residents or for the public?
 - Aren't nonconforming use rights an unsatisfactory remedy for owner opposing rezoning? Future restorations or enhancements are precluded.
 - Why is "D" zoning not satisfactory?
 - Does the proposed trolley does serve a dense enough corridor or neighborhood to be used sufficiently?
- Why shouldn't a light rail line serving Broadway and perhaps Austin Highway be located in Broadway in the plan?