



# SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

L0037

**MEMO**

**DATE:** November 13, 2014

**TO:** Ricardo Olea, City Traffic Engineer, MTA  
Jarrett Hornbostel, MTA

**FROM:** Pilar LaValley, Historic Preservation Technical Specialist,  
(415) 575-9084

**REVIEWED BY:** Architectural Review Committee of the Historic Preservation  
Commission

**RE:** **Meeting Notes - Review and Comment at the November 5, 2014  
ARC-HPC Hearing for Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place mid-block  
crosswalk, Case No. 2014-001363COA**

1650 Mission St.  
Suite 400  
San Francisco,  
CA 94103-2479

Reception:  
**415.558.6378**

Fax:  
**415.558.6409**

Planning  
Information:  
**415.558.6377**

---

At the request of the Planning Department, the Architectural Review Committee (ARC) was asked to review and comment on the proposed project at Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, which involves replacing the mid-block flashing crosswalk system in front of the east side of City Hall with conventional three-color traffic signals and pedestrian signals.

As the project sponsor is MTA, work is in the public right-of-way, and no permit need be issued, a Certificate of Appropriateness is not required. However, the project will return to the full Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) for review and the HPC will be making a finding of consistency with the Secretary of Interior's Standards and Article 10 standards.

## ARC RECOMMENDATIONS/COMMENTS

### Existing light poles

In an effort to reduce the overall number of utility poles in the vicinity of one of the main entrances to City Hall, the ARC recommends exploring the possibility of mounting the proposed traffic signal mast arm to an existing light pole. The ARC recommends installing as few new poles as possible in this location and indicated that they felt there were different ways this might be achieved, including eliminating any redundant poles, developing a combination pole that would allow for mounting of the mast arm with traffic signal as well as street light, or incorporating the traffic signal on mast arm onto an existing light pole.

### Mast Arm mounted signal

The ARC questioned the necessity of the proposed mast arm mounted signal, citing other signalized intersections in the city where no such mast arm occurs. The MTA Traffic Engineer responded that MTA believes that the proposed mast arm mounted signal is needed for this type of mid-block crosswalk. The ARC conceded that they are not specialists in this area, but did indicate that they have concerns about the size and extent of the proposed mast arm.

Since the hearing, staff has seen a smaller version of a mast arm mounted signal with a shorter projection and slimmer profile, which was recently installed at the former mid-block crosswalks along 16<sup>th</sup> Street at the intersection with Capp Street. To meet or address direction given by the ARC, staff would recommend consideration of this alternative mast arm design, as it appears to be smaller and, therefore, less of a visual intrusion within the Historic District. Further, it is a design and hardware that already exist in the MTA system.

### **Finish**

The ARC recommends that any new traffic and pedestrian signal poles be finished to match adjacent light standards. The MTA representative indicated that the majority of light standards in the vicinity have a dark finish (blue or black) and the ARC recommended that all traffic and pedestrian signal poles be finished to match these adjacent light standards with either a painted or powder-coated finish.

The ARC also recommends that ADA pads at crosswalks within the Historic District not be the bright yellow color that is typically installed. The MTA representative indicated that this was under the purview of DPW, but that such a recommendation could be passed along between the Departments.

### **Traffic Signal versus Stop Signs**

While they did not make any recommendation in this regard, several ARC members did state that they thought that stop signs might be more appropriate in this location than the proposed traffic signals. Commissioner Wolfram stated that he believed that with traffic signals there would still be rampant jaywalking of pedestrians who are unwilling to wait for the signal and that perhaps a stop sign, which also requires cars to stop, would be a better option. Commissioner Pearlman also stated his opinion that stop signs and rumble strips might work better in this location.

### **Other options**

The ARC felt that MTA had adequately explored other potential traffic calming options for this crosswalk.