UPPER "B" STREET NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN

Hayward, California

Adopted by City Council Resolution No. 92-264
September 15, 1992
City of Hayward
NEIGHBORHOOD PLANNING PROGRAM

UPPER "B" STREET NEIGHBORHOOD

NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN

Adopted by Resolution 92-264
September 15, 1992
TASK FORCE MEMBERS

John Cavolowsky, Chair
Daniel Alarcon
William Crosby
Monte Florence
Raymond Gumbs
Glenn Kirby
Elizabeth Macera
Fred Martin
Patty Rhoads
Diane Riggs
Angelino Santos
Don Sheppard
Gail Steele
Stuart Warner
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preface</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies and Strategies</td>
<td>PS1 to PS11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use and Zoning</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Land Uses</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Land Uses</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Transportation</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Character</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Maps**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maps</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper &quot;B&quot; Study Area</td>
<td>ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Land Use</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current General Policies Plan</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Zoning</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning Inconsistencies</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Activity</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Designation Areas</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper &quot;B&quot; Street Land Uses</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Network</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recent Traffic Counts</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Route 238</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Owned Property</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed &quot;D&quot; Street Extension</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Right-of-Way</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Routes</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transit Facilities</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markham Elementary School - Proposed Site Improvements</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Recreation Resources</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Historic District</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Map of Hayward</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Roads</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tract Dates</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potentially Historic Buildings</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The General Plan
The City of Hayward has a General Plan to guide future development. The General Plan consists of elements required by state law including Housing, Land Use, Circulation, Open Space, Recreation, Conservation, Safety and Noise.

The General Policies Plan is the core of the City of Hayward General Plan. It was adopted by the City Council in May 1986, after an 18-month effort by a 30-member citizen task force. The General Policies Plan provides for the preparation of neighborhood plans to further refine citywide policies. The Neighborhood Planning Program follows a process modelled after the General Plan Revision Program.

The Neighborhood Planning Program
The City of Hayward Neighborhood Planning Program was approved by City Council on May 13, 1986. Neighborhood plans are to be prepared for all residential and commercial areas within the City’s planning area. The Upper “B” Street plan is the eighth plan undertaken in this program; it is preceded by the Mission-Garin, Burbank, Tennyson-Alquire, Harder-Tennyson, Mt. Eden, Jackson Triangle, and Mission-Foothills plans. After completion of the Upper “B” Street Neighborhood Plan, eight additional planning areas remain.

The purpose of the neighborhood planning program is: 1) to provide for greater involvement of citizens in the planning process; 2) to refine General Plan policies based on a more detailed study by residents and property owners from the area; 3) to develop specific implementation measures such as capital improvement programs, and new development standards.

The Upper “B” Plan
The Upper “B” Street Neighborhood is bounded by Second Street, Bellina Street, Third Street, San Lorenzo Creek, the boundary between the City of Hayward and Alameda County, and “B” Street. The planning process began with a neighborhood meeting on December 5, 1990. The purpose of this initial meeting was to explain the planning process, identify local issues and concerns, and solicit applications for a citizens task force to work with City staff in the preparation of a draft neighborhood plan. On February 5, 1991, the City Council appointed a 13-member task force. An additional task force member was added on March 5, 1991. The Upper “B” Street Task Force met with staff from Fire, Police, Housing, Current Planning, Engineering, Transportation Services, Community and Economic Development, Hayward Area Recreation and Parks District, Hayward Unified School District, Caltrans, and AC Transit. They solicited information from neighborhood residents and commercial establishments and developed alternatives for addressing neighborhood issues and future needs.

On November 13, 1991, planning ideas for the Upper “B” neighborhood were discussed at a neighborhood meeting. The Upper “B” Street Task Force reviewed neighborhood responses to the proposed alternatives before finalizing their recommendations.
UPPER "B" STREET
NEIGHBORHOOD
PLAN

POLICIES AND STRATEGIES
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/Resolution No. 92-264
September 15, 1992
The Upper “B” Street area can be a neighborhood in the best sense of the word. We recognize that we have problems, but we also recognize that we have a lot going for us. Our few, key issues - fully explained in the following document - all share a common theme: build on the existing solid foundation to bring our neighborhood to its full potential.

Here are the highlights of our report. Know that every recommendation presented here was approved by a near-unanimous vote of this task force; it accurately reflects input gathered at both all-neighborhood meetings.

Recognize existing land use conditions: decrease density and zoning throughout the neighborhood. We encourage no expansion; rather, let’s upgrade what’s here. We welcome commercial use where appropriate, so long as a residential character is maintained.

Return “B” Street to the neighborhood: reduce through traffic. Officially keep “B” Street at its present width by amending the plan line. Impel the county to stop leading traffic down to “B” Street. Improvements at the Center-“B”-Kelly intersection should aid movement only between Center and Kelly Streets. Improve cross circulation in the neighborhood with traffic controls at “D” and 7th, “B” and 7th, and “A” and 4th.

Only this reduction in traffic could make “B” Street (our only flat E-W through street) safe for bicycles. Pedestrians need improved sidewalks and ramps at street corners. Also place benches and/or shelters at the bus stops for riders and pedestrians.

Save the trees along “B” Street; they are essential to the character of our neighborhood. Get Vermont Plaza and its environs vital again. Set and enforce design standards on “B” Street that expand on the basic premises of community preservation.

Involve the community in improving its few problem areas. Vermont Plaza is seen as a problem; bring all in the community’s arsenal to bear to make it once again a vital, integral part of the neighborhood.

Recognize the west end of our neighborhood as an historical district. This piece of Old Hayward can be preserved, and historical buildings from elsewhere in the city could be relocated within its borders.

Proposed 238? Don’t build it. Return the property to the neighborhood. The right-of-way through our neighborhood will provide space for a practical arterial bordered by historical houses as well as two much-needed parks. Until such time as the freeway project is killed, insist that Caltrans maintain their holdings in our neighborhood.

Make Markham School the pride of the neighborhood. Upgrade the playfield (the only one in our neighborhood), and provide improved and safer access. Expand after-school and evening, neighborhood-oriented programs there. Make it a magnet for the neighborhood as a well-cared-for, well-used, park-like facility.

Read on; you will find our arguments compelling . . .

Upper “B” Street Task Force
LAND USE POLICIES AND STRATEGIES

Policy 1
RECOGNIZE EXISTING DEVELOPMENT IN ESTABLISHING A TRANSITION FROM DOWNTOWN HIGH INTENSITY AREAS TO LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL AREAS.

A. East of Third Street, between "A" and "B" streets, expand the Downtown-City Center Area-High Density Residential area to the east side of the Gatehouse Square condominiums, and zone Central City-Residential with a maximum residential density at 65 units per acre, and maximum building height at 55 feet.

B. West of the Route 238 right-of-way, designate the areas east of the Gatehouse Square condominiums between "A" and "B" streets, and the north side of "A" Street, Commercial/High Density Residential to provide for a mixture of uses. Designate the area north of properties fronting on "A" Street (on Russell Way and Rockaway Lane) Medium Density and zone RM.

C. West of the Route 238 right-of-way and south of "B" Street preserve the historic character by changing the area between "B" and "E" streets to Medium Density (except for existing high density developments). Zone properties on the south side of "B" Street Commercial Office (CO) to provide for a mixture of uses.

D. For Medium Density areas, incorporate the guidelines expressed in the Neighborhood Character section of this plan.

Policy 2
MAINTAIN A PREDOMINANTLY SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL CHARACTER WITH RECOGNITION OF EXISTING MULTIFAMILY DEVELOPMENT

A. East of the Route 238 right-of-way, redesignate Medium and High density areas to Low Density and zone for single-family development, with the exception of those properties along "B" Street and all properties with multifamily development; recognize existing developments by assigning the appropriate General Policies Plan designation and zoning to conform with existing densities.

B. Recognize all approved development projects and projects for which applications had been submitted by June 4, 1992, with appropriate General Policies Plan and zoning designations; if the Planned Development currently approved for 23 units at 2246-2276 Kelly St. does not have an adopted precise plan by October 22, 1992, recommend that the property be redesignated Low Density and zoned for single-family use.
Policy 3
RECOGNIZE THE BENEFIT OF THE MIXED RESIDENTIAL/COMMERCIAL CORRIDOR ALONG “B” STREET

A. Allow a predominance of commercial office, multifamily and single-family mixed uses along “B” St., east of the 238 right-of-way to Center-“B”-Kelly.

B. Retain Neighborhood Commercial (CN) zoning for the convenience store at "B" and Seventh, Vermont Plaza and to a depth of 150 feet for properties on the south side of the Center-“B”-Kelly intersection.

C. Change Commercial Office (CO) zoning to Single-family Residential zoning to reflect existing single-family subdivision west of Vermont Plaza.

D. For “B” Street lots that exceed a depth of 150 feet, limit commercial buildings (excluding religious institutions and residential care facilities) to the front 150 feet of the lot to avoid encroachment into residential areas.

E. On “B” Street encourage adjoining property owners to share curb cuts and parking for better design of off-street parking areas.

F. Along “B” Street, support the re-use of single-family residences as commercial offices. Retain a residential character in the design of new office buildings, prohibiting free-standing pole signs and internally illuminated signs. (see Policy 10, Strategy I)

G. Resolve miscellaneous zoning inconsistencies to clarify future land use policies.
CIRCULATION POLICIES AND STRATEGIES

Policy 4
PROMOTE “B” STREET FOR LOCAL TRAFFIC.

A. Amend precise plan line for “B” Street to a 60-foot precise plan line west of Vermont Street to discourage increased through traffic and to reflect existing conditions.

B. Limit traffic improvements to the Center-“B”-Kelly intersection to those that facilitate movement between Center and Kelly.

C. Promote Grove Way, Redwood Rd. and “A” St. as alternatives to “B” St. in the following manner:
   1) Urge Alameda County to restripe Grove Way for four lanes.
   2) Urge Alameda County to reduce the number of left-turn lanes from Grove Way onto Center from two lanes to one lane.
   3) Urge Alameda County to retain approach to the Center-“B”-Kelly intersection over San Lorenzo Creek at two lanes.
   4) Look into lengthening green time for drivers traveling on 4th at “B” St. to discourage non-local traffic.
   5) Install signs/banners to encourage use of Foothill Blvd. and “A” St./Redwood Rd./Grove Way routes to and from I-580.

Policy 5
PROVIDE A CIRCULATION SYSTEM TO IMPROVE SAFETY AND FACILITATE THE FLOW OF LOCAL TRAFFIC

A. Improve safety and access onto “B” St. by considering installing a traffic signal at the intersection of “B” and Seventh streets.

B. Consider installing a 4-way stop at “D” and Seventh streets to improve safety.

C. Assign a high priority to the installation of a traffic signal at “A” and Fourth streets.

D. Adopt street plan lines to reflect existing widths of neighborhood streets.

E. Study the feasibility of developing a north-south connection between “B” and “D” streets at Templeton.
Consideration of this policy has been postponed at least until such time as the Final Environmental Impact Report/Statement on the Proposed Route 238 is available for review by the City Council.
Policy 7
PROMOTE ALTERNATIVE FORMS OF TRANSPORTATION BY PROVIDING FOR PEDESTRIAN, BICYCLE, AND TRANSIT TRAVEL.

A. Develop bike routes on “A”, “D”, and Fourth Street as proposed by the Hayward Bicycle Facilities Plan, and on Second St. as proposed by the East Bay Bicycle Coalition. On Fourth St., improve right-of-way prior to development of a bike route.

B. For bicycle access to schools designate bike routes on Sixth from “B” to “D” streets, and along Fifth St. from Markham to “E” St.

C. Encourage provision of a secure place to lock bikes at Markham Elementary School.

D. Encourage businesses to provide bicycle racks/lockers.

E. Encourage AC Transit to provide bike racks on buses, particularly on Route 95.

F. Encourage BART to increase access to bicyclists and to increase secure storage at stations.

G. For pedestrian access and safety make the following improvements:

1) Repair/replace broken sidewalks along “B” Street. (see Policy 10, Strategy A)

2) Provide sidewalks on at least one side of all through public streets in the Upper “B” St. area, begin with routes to schools.

3) To improve safety at “B” St. pedestrian crossing at Arlette, restrict “B” St. access to Vermont Plaza to entry only, and review timing of traffic signals.

H. Install wheelchair ramps at all street corners where there are sidewalks in the Upper “B” Street area.

I. Take immediate steps to integrate with the plans of AC Transit to restructure bus service in Hayward.

J. Provide bus shelters and/or benches in the Upper “B” area; the design should consider vandalism and safety factors.
Policy 8

WORK WITH HAYWARD UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT TO DEVELOP PROGRAMS AND IMPROVE FACILITIES AT MARKHAM ELEMENTARY SCHOOL FOR THE BENEFIT OF NEIGHBORHOOD CHILDREN AND ADULTS

A. To improve parking conditions, traffic circulation and pedestrian safety on and near the school grounds recommend the following:
   1) Designate drop-off/pick-up sites along entire school frontage, especially on the south side of “C” St. opposite the school walkway, on school days from 8:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.
   2) For vehicles, develop a one-way circulation system through the school grounds from Ward St. to Fifth St.; install clear signage and provide for pedestrian safety.

B. Improve landscape maintenance along the school’s frontage on “C” Street and lower Ward St. (off Fourth St.) for safety and beautification. Pave the parking strip along “C” Street to accommodate drop-off/pick-up site.

C. To improve access to school grounds, maintain walkways from “C” St. and from lower Ward St. Construct stairs from lower Ward St. to lower play field. Construct sidewalks in the following locations:
   - on lower Ward St.
   - on the west side of Fifth St. between “D” Street and the school grounds.
   - along the east side of Fourth Street between “B” and “D” streets.

D. Improve pedestrian safety at Ward and Sixth streets by installing a 4-way stop or providing a crossing guard during peak crossing times.

E. Install additional lighting at the entrances to the school grounds.

F. Consider the feasibility of a Senior live-on program to improve security.

G. Encourage the City, HARD, and HUSD to develop the school grounds as a neighborhood park resource. Install new turf. Upgrade play equipment and landscaping. Develop a jogging track and softball and soccer fields. Provide access to lower field from blacktop area near basketball courts. Install spectator benches utilizing slope between upper and lower play areas.

H. Encourage the development of after-school activities such as supervised recreation and latchkey programs. Seek on-going funding to support latchkey program.

I. Investigate the possibility of developing a program whereby college students receive credit for supervising after-school activities.

J. Promote self-reliance and “pride of place” by encouraging environmental programs, a trash/litter clean-up program, graffiti abatement, and the like.

K. Encourage the use of Markham School as a community meeting place.

L. Pursue State funding for modernization of Markham School.

PS7
Policy 9
WORK WITH THE HAYWARD AREA RECREATION AND PARK DISTRICT TO PROVIDE
ADEQUATE PARK AND RECREATIONAL FACILITIES THAT ARE ACCESSIBLE TO
NEIGHBORHOOD RESIDENTS

A. Encourage the City, HARD, and HUSD to develop Markham Elementary School as a
neighborhood park resource. Upgrade play equipment and landscaping. Develop
softball and soccer fields. Provide access to lower field from blacktop area near
basketball courts. Install spectator benches utilizing slope between upper play area and
the lower field. Improve access to lower Ward Street.

B. Build a walkway from the terminus of Vermont St. into San Felipe Park to provide access
for residents in the “B” Street area.

C. Acquire additional land for future park development; potential park sites, listed in order
of preference, include:

1) Caltrans properties between “D” and “E” streets
(subject to final outcome of Route 238).
2) Caltrans property between “A” and “B” streets, east of Fourth Street
(subject to final outcome of Route 238).
3) Northeast corner of Templeton St. and Hill Avenue
4) North side of Kelly St. between Wildwood & Bayview
5) South side of Kelly St. between Lorand and Upland
6) Southwest corner of Templeton St. and Hill Avenue

D. Develop facilities within the neighborhood for specialized uses, such as flat playground
with play equipment for tots, rose garden, community gardening, pet park, flat play
fields.
Policy 10
PROMOTE NEIGHBORHOOD PRIDE THROUGH CLEAN-UP AND BEAUTIFICATION PROGRAMS

A. Maintain existing street trees on “B” Street. Meander sidewalks and curbs to create wells that can support mature trees; acquire additional right-of-way as necessary; encourage the City to share costs with adjacent property owners on a 50%-50% basis. Where necessary replace trees with existing species or species of similar stature.

B. Encourage the planting and proper maintenance of trees throughout the neighborhood. Plant street trees to create a shaded streetscape; prune street trees to maximize the natural form and branching structure, with consideration of necessary clearance and safety requirements; replace street trees where warranted.

C. Review efficiency of the neighborhood street sweeping program by considering a possible change in the schedule to provide daytime sweeping of residential areas and nighttime sweeping of commercial areas, and by publishing a schedule.

D. Expand the Community Preservation Program to schedule an earlier target date for the Upper “B” Street neighborhood.

E. Direct the City Council’s Shopping Center Committee to address neighborhood concerns regarding Vermont Plaza, such as landscaping, uses, design, and maintenance.

F. Recommend to small business owners that facade and landscaping improvements be made, and that sites be better maintained. Perhaps the small business revolving loan fund be used.

G. In Medium Density areas the design of multifamily housing should incorporate single-family development patterns mirroring existing conditions.

H. Establish an attractive neighborhood focal point at the Center-“B”-Kelly area by installing and maintaining landscaping, street furniture, lighting, and signage.

I. Enforce the standards in the housing code and related ordinances to assure maintenance of the housing stock, and enforce minimum standards in the community preservation ordinance to resolve problems concerning fencing, plantings, signage, parking areas, and lighting.

J. Aggressively pursue Caltrans maintenance of Route 238 right-of-way properties.

K. Place utilities underground.
Policy 11
PROTECT AND ENHANCE THE NEIGHBORHOOD’S HISTORIC CHARACTER

Consideration of Strategies A-D pertaining to the proposed historic district has been postponed at least until such time as the FEIR/S on the Proposed Route 238 is available for review by the City Council.

E. Preserve views of All Saints Church as follows:
   1. Provide adequate setbacks and limit building heights as appropriate to preserve public views of All Saints Church within the neighborhood and from other parts of the city, particularly from “D” St.
   2. Amend the Urban Design Objectives of the Downtown Hayward Design Plan by identifying All Saints Church as a visual focal point for consideration in development of the downtown area.
PUBLIC SAFETY POLICIES AND STRATEGIES

Policy 12
IMPROVE PUBLIC SAFETY

A. To deter crime, utilize innovative programs including Neighborhood Watch, COPPS, landlord training and accountability, and the Safe Streets program. Empower the community to work with police to monitor and improve conditions in problem locations, such as Center-"B"-Kelly to Vermont Plaza, "B" at Seventh, the Caltrans corridor, and under the "A" St. bridge.

B. Encourage coordination among City departments (Community and Economic Development, Police, Fire, Building) for improved response to chronic problem properties.

C. Appoint a community access ombudsman to champion citizen complaints and follow through on solutions. In the interim, distribute lists of phone numbers for City departments.

D. Improve city and county cooperation when handling jurisdictional incidents near city-county boundary, specifically but not exclusively at Center-"B"-Kelly, and on "A", "D", and "E" streets.

E. Establish an annual community awareness event at Markham Elementary School to promote fire safety, disaster preparedness, proper disposal of hazardous materials, traffic safety, and crime reduction, and to supply information on changes in the neighborhood.

F. Continue to maintain storm drains.

G. Study and improve street lighting around Markham School, along "B" St., and in commercial district from Center-"B"-Kelly to Vermont Plaza. Regularly review lighting adequacy in the neighborhood.
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**LAND USE AND ZONING**

**Existing Pattern of Development**
The existing development in the Upper “B” Street Neighborhood is comprised primarily of residential and commercial uses. Small office buildings and neighborhood commercial businesses are generally located on “B” Street; residential development, both single-family and multifamily, dominates the remainder of the study area. While there is little vacant land available, the capacity exists for further infill and the potential for redevelopment.

Properties between downtown Hayward and Fourth Street include some of the earliest residential development in the City. These coexist with scattered medium and high density residential uses and commercial businesses. This western portion of the study area is currently planned for high density residential development and holds capacity for additional dwelling units and intensification of commercial development. The future of this area will be influenced by its proximity to downtown Hayward. If built, the Rt. 238 bypass will bring additional development and redevelopment pressures for properties adjacent to the bypass.

The middle portion of the neighborhood, from Fourth Street to just east of Seventh Street, also contains older single-family development. Typical lots are in the range of 5,000 to 10,000 square feet. Over the years there has been construction of additional dwelling units in back of homes on some of the deeper lots. In recent years, multifamily development has occurred south of “D” St. and east of Seventh Street. A few parcels remain vacant and the potential for further infill exists within current zoning. Markham Elementary School occupies a site between Fourth, Sixth, “C” and “D” streets. Small post-war subdivisions characterize residential areas in the eastern portion of the study area.

“B” Street, east of Fourth Street, is developed with a mixture of single-family and multifamily residential uses, residential care facilities, and office uses. Neighborhood-serving businesses and several apartment buildings are clustered near the Center-“B”-Kelly intersection.

**Current General Plan Land Use Policies**
The General Policies Plan land use map, in conjunction with policies and strategies contained within the Plan, indicates the desired future land use pattern. The attached General Policies Plan map identifies land use designations for the Upper “B” Street Neighborhood. Patterns on this map show the study area to be planned primarily for residential use with density generally decreasing to the east, away from downtown. A commercial center, with adjacent high and medium density residential areas, is designated near Center-“B”-Kelly. In general, land use policies seek to balance needs for conserving residential neighborhoods and historic and natural features with needs for additional residential and economic development.
Zoning Classifications
Zoning is the primary method used by the City to implement the land use designations and policies contained in the General Policies Plan. The Zoning Ordinance regulates specific land uses and standards such as parking, building heights, setbacks, and lot coverage for each zoning district. The zoning of a property should be consistent with the intent of the General Policies Plan designation for that property. Several zoning classifications may be potentially consistent with a plan designation. For example, the General Policies Plan designation of Medium Density Residential is potentially consistent with Residential, Neighborhood Commercial, Commercial Office, Agricultural or Planned Development zoning.

A number of properties in the Upper “B” Street study area are currently zoned inconsistently with the General Policies Plan. In some cases, the inconsistency involves a difference in residential densities. For other properties, the land uses allowed by the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance may be quite different, such as residential vs. commercial uses. Task force recommendations for land use and zoning resolve these inconsistencies.

Current zoning patterns are shown on the Existing Zoning map.

Downtown Design Plan
The western boundary of the Upper “B” study area abuts the downtown planning area. On April 21, 1987, the Hayward City Council adopted the Downtown Design Plan to further implement the redevelopment plan and to regulate development standards in downtown Hayward. The Design Plan addresses not only the redevelopment project areas, but the surrounding portions of the Central City Zoning district as well. The purpose of the Central City District is to promote the development of the downtown area as the central dominant area of the City for business, cultural, financial, residential, office and entertainment uses. Three properties (same owner) have a Central City Residential (CC-R) zoning designation within the Upper “B” study area. The CC-R zoning district permits multifamily and complementary commercial uses with use permits. Higher densities and provision for mixed use support policies in the General Policies Plan encouraging development which reduces the need for car trips. The task force has suggested that Center City zoning be expanded to include property occupied by the Gatehouse Square condominiums.

Alameda County
County lands in the Fairview area border the Upper “B” study area to the north, east and south. While most of this area is zoned for low density, single-family residential use, there are four areas that permit multifamily development. These are located on the north side of “D” Street adjacent to the southeast border of the study area, and between “E” Street and East Avenue, adjacent to the southern portion of the study area.

Recent Development Activity
Development projects that have been recently approved, or are still pending, are shown in the following table and map.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REF. #</th>
<th>FILE NO.</th>
<th>APPLICATION/LOCATION</th>
<th>PROPOSAL</th>
<th>PROJECT STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>UP 90-40</td>
<td>Al Hutchinson 1352/60/68 &quot;B&quot; St.</td>
<td>Construct a Lubrication Facility</td>
<td>Approved 9/24/91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SPR 88-14</td>
<td>Amos Picker 1962 &quot;B&quot; St.</td>
<td>Extend Approval of Commercial Bldg.</td>
<td>Approved 10/88 No activity, filed has been closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SPR 90-61</td>
<td>Bautista/Federighi 2361 Kelly St.</td>
<td>Construct 17 Single-Family Approved with Tract 6278</td>
<td>Dropped - Plans to Resubmit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SPR 88-77</td>
<td>John Otteson 22722-30</td>
<td>14 Condos 7th St.</td>
<td>Approved 1/90 Constructed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ZC 86-15</td>
<td>Hanson &amp; Hanson 2246-2276 Kelly St.</td>
<td>22 Units (9 Duets, 4 Single-Family)</td>
<td>Approved 6/89 Preliminary Plan Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>SPR 89-20</td>
<td>Ben Huey 1305-1317 Russell</td>
<td>9 Apartments</td>
<td>Constructed Approved 10/89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>ZC 91-3</td>
<td>Zaballlos 1782 &quot;D&quot; St.</td>
<td>11 Apartments (Access from Adjacent Project)</td>
<td>Approved 10/10/91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>SPR/V 91-29</td>
<td>Dan Duggan 1325 &quot;B&quot; St.</td>
<td>Construct Second Office Building</td>
<td>Under Review to Board of Adjustments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>UP 91-37</td>
<td>Mr. &amp; Mrs. Valencia 22750 6th St.</td>
<td>Convert Garage, Expand Single-Family Home</td>
<td>Approved 6/17/91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>SPR 91-70</td>
<td>G &amp; T Associates 22721 7th St.</td>
<td>Construct 5 Units</td>
<td>Approved 10/7/91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>UP 91-25</td>
<td>Neil Gabbay 22595 6th St.</td>
<td>Construct Three Townhouse Apartments</td>
<td>To be Scheduled Board of Adjustments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>ZC 92-4</td>
<td>Third St. Association 1302 &amp; 1312 &quot;B&quot; St., 22530-22540 Third St.</td>
<td>Construct 28 Condos in a PD Zone</td>
<td>To be scheduled for Planning Commission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UPPER "B" STREET
STUDY AREA

DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY
PENDING/RECENTLY APPROVED
PROJECTS

1. Al Hutchinson
   1350-60/68 "B" St.
2. Amos Picker
   1362 "B" St.
3. Bautista/Federighi
   2361 Kelly St.
4. John Otteson
   22722-30 7th St.
5. Hanson & Hanson
   2248-2275 Kelly St.
6. Ben Huey
   1305-1317 Russell
7. Zaballos
   1782 "D" St.
8. Duggan
   1325 "B" St.
9. Mr. and Mrs. Valencia
   22750 6th St.
10. G&T Assoc.
    22721 7th St.
11. Gabbay
    22595 8th St.
12. Third St. Association
    1302 & 1312 "B" St.
    22530-22540 Third St.
Comments made at the initial Upper "B" Street Neighborhood Meeting in December, 1990, called for preservation and promotion of single-family housing, and improvement in the appearance of existing apartments. There was support for downzoning of existing multifamily areas and for development of Caltrans right-of-way properties with single-family housing. A desire for upscale as well as affordable housing and a need for more sensitive infill development were expressed. There was support for the promotion of owner-occupied housing. Some were of the opinion that multifamily housing should be located near downtown, and some said that commercial and residential uses do not mix.

**Historic Perspective**
Subdivided prior to 1900, many turn-of-the-century Victorian-style residences and craftsman-style bungalows remain on lands west of Seventh Street. Many of the homes on larger lots have had units added in the back; a few have been replaced by or converted to apartment buildings, generally with five units or less. A resurgence of subdivision activity occurred in the 1940's and 1950's with the addition of 220 lots off "B" Street and Kelly Street. As in most parts of Hayward, apartment construction dominated residential development activity in the Upper "B" Street area throughout the 1960's and 1970's. Six large apartment projects were built in the sixties, adding 245 multifamily units to the neighborhood. A like amount were built in the 1970's, including "The Park", a 99-unit condominium project on the south side of "D" Street.

**Current Development and Recent Trends**
Field inspection and development records indicate a current total of 1,986 dwelling units in the Upper "B" area, of which 777 are single-family homes and 1,209 are multifamily units. Of the multifamily units, 835 are within developments of 5 or more units. Translated in percentages, 40% of the dwellings in the Upper "B" study area are single-family homes, and 60% are multifamily units. Citywide figures from the 1990 Census indicate 49% single-family, 45% multifamily, and 6% mobile home or other.
There are a total of 346 beds within five congregate care facilities, three of which are located on the north side of "B" Street.

1) Majestic Pines Convalescent Hospital
   1618 "B" Street
   75 beds

2) Hayward Hills Convalescent Hospital
   1832 "B" Street
   72 beds

3) Board and Care Home
   2125-31 Kelly Street
   30 residents

4) Linda Vista Manor Rest Home
   1659 "D" Street
   70 beds

5) Hayward Convalescent Hospital
   1832 "B" Street
   99 beds

Residential Development Activity
As indicated on the following chart, there have been 237 multifamily units added to the housing stock since 1980, most of which have been in projects of five units or less.

UPPER "B" STREET NEIGHBORHOOD
MULTIFAMILY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT
(Multifamily units for which building permits were issued)
1980 to 1991

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1305-17 Russell Way</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22722-30 Seventh St.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1306 &quot;C&quot; St.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1389 &quot;C&quot; St.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1821 Hill Ave.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22621-25 Seventh St.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1754 &quot;D&quot; St.</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1609 &quot;B&quot; St.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22832 Fifth St.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1741 &quot;B&quot; St.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22618 Third St.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1718 &quot;D&quot; St.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22661-63 Vermont St.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1315 &quot;A&quot; St.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1318 &quot;B&quot; St.</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>237</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Few single-family homes have been built in recent years in the Upper "B" Street neighborhood. In census tracts within the study area there were 10 building permits issued for single-family homes between 1980 and 1991. Residential units currently proposed total 59, including 21 single-family and 38 multifamily dwellings.
Housing Development Potential

The potential for construction of additional housing can be determined in a number of ways. The maximum potential is the maximum number of units per net acre allowed by the General Policies Plan, minus the number of existing units. In the Upper “B” area the maximum potential per net acre allowed by the current General Policies Plan is 4,417 dwelling units. There are currently 1,986 units in the plan area, resulting in a maximum potential of 2,431 additional units. Task force recommended land use designations would reduce the maximum potential to 1,081. (See table.) If the Route 238 bypass is constructed as planned, the maximum potential would be further reduced by approximately 339 units to 742 units (based on High Density development west of Fourth Street and north of “A” Street, and Medium Density east of Fourth Street).

In the Upper “B” Street study area however, the potential for housing development in the near term is constrained by a high proportion of developed land. Much of the study area has already been subdivided into single-family sized lots and there is little vacant land available. Evaluation of the potential for near-term housing includes calculation of the average density allowed by the current General Policies Plan for vacant and underutilized lands, and estimation of the potential for infill and redevelopment within existing neighborhoods. In the Upper “B” Street study area the potential for near-term development on vacant and underutilized land, and through redevelopment (excluding Route 238 right-of-way property) is estimated at 418 units, as described below.

Areas Designated Low Density: Vacant and underutilized land designated Low Density by the General Policies Plan have a capacity for 102 single-family dwellings, 17 of which have been approved for construction. The remaining 85 units are estimated at a midrange density of 6 units per net acre of vacant and underutilized land.

Area Designated Limited Medium Density: This designation is confined to a 2.9 acre site for which 22 units have been approved within a Planned Development (PD) zone.

Areas Designated Medium and High Density: There is capacity for an estimated 74 dwelling units on vacant and underutilized land designated Medium Density. This figure is calculated using the midrange of 12 units per net acre. The remaining potential for Medium and High density areas is based on an estimation of redevelopment and infill activity. Redevelopment is more likely to occur on properties where land value exceeds the improvement value, and less than 25% of the lot is occupied by structure. In the Upper “B” Street area, redevelopment and infill are constrained by the existence of small and/or narrow lots combined with Zoning Ordinance restrictions on lot and yard areas. Lots can be combined to allow greater density, as has occurred along the east side of Seventh Street. It is difficult to assess how much future development will occur on lots that have been joined together. Analysis of lot sizes, land and improvement values, and lot coverages, indicates a potential for 133 units in the Medium Density area and 87 units in areas designated High Density.

Other constraints on housing development include commercial zoning along “B” Street and near downtown, lack of elementary school capacity, lack of a neighborhood park, and traffic congestion, particularly at the intersection of “B” St., Center and Kelly.
## HOUSING POTENTIAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area and Designation</th>
<th>Net Acres</th>
<th>Maximum Units*</th>
<th>238 R.O.W. Net Acres (Approx) (Units Loss)</th>
<th>Maximum Units Under Task Force Recommended General Policies Plan Designation</th>
<th>Near-Term (Vacant &amp; Underutilized Land)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a High Density</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>1.2 acres (40 units)</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b City Center High Density</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 High Density</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>1 acre (34 units)</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 High Density</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>3 acres (102 units)</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Medium Density</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>4.1 acres (70 units)</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a Medium Density</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>4 acres (68 units)</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b Public</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Medium Density</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>1.5 acres (25 units)</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a Low Density</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b High Density</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c Commercial</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8a Medium Density</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8b Low Density</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9a High Density</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9b Commercial</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9c Medium Density</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10a Low Density</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10b Limited Medium Density</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL POTENTIAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Units</th>
<th>276.4</th>
<th>4,417</th>
<th>(399 units)</th>
<th>3,067</th>
<th>418</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- 1,986</td>
<td>- 1,986</td>
<td>1,081</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maximum Additional Potential 2,431 1,081

*Under Current General Policies Plan Designation*
Citywide Housing Issues
The City of Hayward seeks to “encourage the provision of an adequate supply of housing in a variety of housing types which accommodate the diverse housing needs without adversely compromising the character and integrity of residential areas”. Strategies from the General Policies Plan that influence the location of new housing include the following:

- Utilize vacant and underutilized land within existing residential areas.

- Encourage high densities for new residential development in areas near transit or activity centers or along major arterials.

- Utilize surplus public lands for housing development (e.g. excess rights-of-way) where appropriate.

- Encourage second units in existing residential areas and new housing developments as permitted by the zoning ordinance.

- Continue to allow second units to accommodate the large increase in one and two person households who could benefit from small, less expensive units.

- Promote design and landscaping of infill development which is sensitive to the neighborhood during review by city staff and boards and commissions.

- Encourage buffers such as landscaping or transitional land uses between residential areas and conflicting land uses.

Housing costs in the Bay Area are among the highest in the nation. Bay Area residents who do not already own their own homes find it very difficult to enter the market. The mean household income in Hayward in 1991 is estimated to be about $40,000 by the Association of Bay Area Governments. With an income of $40,000, it is estimated that a household can afford to spend up to $1000 per month on housing. Housing costs sampled from both rental and housing for sale in the Upper “B” Street neighborhood are reflected in the table below. Purchase prices range from $150,000 to $300,000, requiring an annual income range between $45,000 and $72,000. Rents range between $590 and $870 per month, with income requirements between $21,000 and $30,000.

While task force members have indicated a preference for holding development at current levels to preserve the single-family appearance and historic quality of the neighborhood, they are also sensitive to the problems associated with rendering existing properties non-conforming by downzoning. The task force generally favors recognizing condominium developments by recommending zones that fit existing densities, such as Central City Residential (CC-R) for the Gatehouse Square condominiums on “B” Street. In addition to reducing future density it is important that the design of new development be in character with surrounding development. Development along “B” Street strongly influences the character of the neighborhood. The task force is particularly concerned about future development on corner lots with respect to impacts upon residential side streets. Homes on “B” Street between Zaballos Court and Vermont Plaza, currently zoned Commercial Office (CO), could be rezoned Single-family (RS) to recognize their connection to single-family subdivision.
# UPPER "B" STREET - HOUSING COSTS

## FOR-SALE HOUSING:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Asking Price</th>
<th>Required Income</th>
<th>Monthly Mortgage Payment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22869 5th St</td>
<td>3 BR/2 BA + Den 1,620 sq. ft.</td>
<td>$239,950</td>
<td>$72,197</td>
<td>$1,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwood Dr.</td>
<td>2 BR/2 BA 2,200 sq. ft.</td>
<td>$270,000</td>
<td>$81,238</td>
<td>$1,896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwood Dr.</td>
<td>2 BR/1.5 BA 1,358 sq. ft.</td>
<td>$219,000</td>
<td>$65,893</td>
<td>$1,538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosehill Pl.</td>
<td>4 BR/2.5 BA 2,400 sq. ft.</td>
<td>$299,950</td>
<td>$90,249</td>
<td>$2,106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22775 Templeton St.</td>
<td>3 BR/1 BA 1,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>$149,900</td>
<td>$45,102</td>
<td>$1,052</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assumptions:** 20% down, 30-year loan at 10%, does not include cost of taxes and insurance. Based upon housing expense-to-income ratio of 28%.

## RENTAL HOUSING:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Unit Description</th>
<th>Monthly Rent</th>
<th>Required Annual Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sun River Apts.</td>
<td>1 BR</td>
<td>$800-825</td>
<td>$28,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1627 &quot;D&quot; St.</td>
<td>2 BR</td>
<td>$850</td>
<td>$30,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridgecrest Apts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1782 &quot;D&quot; St.</td>
<td>1 BR</td>
<td>$685-740</td>
<td>$24,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 BR/1 BA</td>
<td>$805-870</td>
<td>$28,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 BR/2 BA</td>
<td>$830-870</td>
<td>$29,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;B&quot; Street</td>
<td>2 BR</td>
<td>$590</td>
<td>$21,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aloy Apts. Vermont St.</td>
<td>2 BR/2 BA</td>
<td>$590</td>
<td>$21,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkhill Apts. Vermont St.</td>
<td>2 BR</td>
<td>$750</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assumption:** Annual income based upon 3 times monthly rent times 12.

*Information from Dept. of CED July 2, 1991*
COMMERCIAL LAND USES

At the initial neighborhood meeting residents listed professional offices, convalescent homes, mixed use buildings, and neighborhood serving retail stores as desirable uses. Uses listed as undesirable include industrial uses and fast food restaurants. Super markets were listed as both desirable and undesirable. Of primary concern is the appearance of existing commercial properties. Vermont Plaza is rundown, lacks landscaping and is perceived to be unsafe. Respondents to a survey of commercial property owners suggest that, while the Upper “B” area is a good location for businesses, traffic congestion is of major concern.

Current Development Patterns
Commercial uses in the Upper “B” Street area are developed primarily along “B” Street and the one-block segment of “A” Street. An exception is the corner store at the north-east corner of Third and “D” streets. Retail uses and restaurants are located in the Neighborhood Commercial (CN) zone near the “B”-Center-Kelly intersection. Offices are scattered along “B” Street in the Commercial Office (CO) zone east of Fourth Street and in the Central Business (CB) zone west of Fourth St. A carwash is located on the south side of “A” Street in the General Commercial (GC) zone and a lube facility was recently approved on adjoining lots which front on “B” St. An outline of the commercial zoning districts is provided on the following table.

Existing Commercial Land Use Policy
The General Plan map shows Retail and Office Commercial uses in the vicinity of Center-“B”-Kelly. This designation is used to indicate community shopping centers as well as areas where offices and professional services are encouraged. All commercial zoning districts (CB, CO, CN, CL, CN-R) are considered consistent (or potentially consistent) except for the General Commercial (CG) district.

City policies encourage concentrating commercial development into attractive shopping areas by breaking up underutilized commercial strips with higher density housing. This mix of development increases customers within walking distance of those centers, and avoids traffic conflicts caused by strung-out commercial development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Min. Lot per unit (sq. ft.)</th>
<th>Maximum Coverage</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Commercial-Office 1,250 or 2,500</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>Encourages office use; allows residential use; prohibits retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>Neighborhood Commercial NA</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>Encourages retail uses; allows uses of CO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN-R</td>
<td>Neighborhood Commercial-Residential 1,723 or 2,500</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Allows commercial and residential; 10' setback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG</td>
<td>General Commercial NA</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>Allows all types of commercial; prohibits residential; no height limit; no setback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB</td>
<td>Central Business none</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>Allows uses of CO, CN and multi-family; no height limit; 10' setback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC-R</td>
<td>Central City-Residential none</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>Encourages multi-family and complimentary uses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Character of Upper “B” Street
Though the General Policies Plan designates most of the properties along “B” Street as residential, a large percentage are zoned for commercial uses. Currently a mixture of uses prevail. Sixty-three percent of the properties on “B” Street between Third and Kelly are residential and 28% are commercial. The remaining 9% are split among residential care facilities, religious institutions, and vacant land. Of the commercial properties 23% are offices and 5% are retail. “B” Street acts as the spine of the community. Being the most traveled street the appearance strongly influences the character of the neighborhood. As a neighborhood commercial center the Center-“B”-Kelly area, particularly Vermont Plaza, would benefit from landscaping and upgrades to building facades. West of Vermont Plaza commercial development takes the form of small office buildings, many of which are converted from single-family residences. Front yards of these offices are typically dominated by landscaping rather than parking, thus making a positive contribution to the visual quality of this tree lined street. Task force members generally appreciate the eclectic mix of development along “B”. The task force supports commercial re-use of single-family residences on “B” St. and proposes that design of new offices retain a residential character.
At the initial neighborhood meeting circulation and traffic were listed among the most pressing issues in the Upper "B" neighborhood. Problems associated with "B" St. include: heavy traffic (particularly at rush hour); congestion at intersections; the width of the street; competition among drivers, bicyclists, and pedestrians; and need for street resurfacing and sidewalk repairs. Some residents recognized a need for additional traffic signals on "A" and "D" streets and for greater enforcement of speeding laws to improve safety. There is concern about the widening of "D" Street. Many residents feel generally that the local streets are too congested with through traffic, that roadways are in poor condition, and that traffic control is needed to slow traffic down. Specific improvements that were suggested at the initial neighborhood meeting include the following:

- Install traffic signal at Fourth and "A" streets.
- Improve Fourth Street between "A" and "E" streets.
- Consider 4-way stops (or traffic signals) at Seventh and "D" streets, Sixth and "B" and Seventh and "B".
- Consider 4-way stop, yield or crossing guard at Ward and Sixth.
- Lengthen green for drivers on Fourth at "B" Street.
- Improve safety for pedestrians crossing "B" Street at Arlette Avenue.

EXISTING CIRCULATION

The Upper "B" Street study area is primarily served by "A" and "B" streets to the north; "D" and "E" Streets to the south. "A" and "B" streets serve as major connections between the Castro Valley-Pleasanton area and Hayward. In addition, this corridor provides access between Interstate 580 and State Route 92 which leads to the Hayward-San Mateo Bridge. Traffic is also generated from development in the hills and Don Castro Regional Park.

Connecting streets oriented in the north-south direction are limited; Second Street is a major arterial at the boundary of the Upper "B" Street neighborhood and provides access to the California State University, Hayward. Fourth Street connects "A" to "D" Street; Sixth and Seventh Streets link "B" Street to "D" Street. East of Seventh Street, connections to "B" Street are limited.

For better north-south travel Templeton Street could be extended to "D" Street, and Seventh or Kings Court could be extended to "E" Street. Because of the high costs of bridging Sulphur Creek it is suggested that a southward extension of Templeton Street is more viable than Seventh or Kings Court.
Existing "B" Street Conditions

"B" Street currently allows for one travel lane in each direction with numerous left-turn pockets. Between Third and Fourth Street on-street parking is allowed with a maximum time limit of 2 hours. The curb to curb width is 51 feet which allows for a left-turn pocket at Fourth Street. From Fourth Street to Kelly Street, "B" Street narrows to 40 feet curb to curb except for one section east of Vermont where the curb-to-curb width widens to 52 feet. This section accommodates two through lanes and numerous left turn pockets within a 60 foot right-of-way. A continuous left turn center lane is provided between Linden Street and Madrone Street. On-street parking is allowed in some sections along both sides from Fourth Street easterly to Zabaltos Court; no on-street parking at any time is allowed east of Zabaltos Court.

Pavement markings which say "Slow School Xing" exist at the approaches to Sixth Street and Madrone Street. "Keep Clear" or "Ped Xing" markings are provided at Arlette Avenue, Vermont Street and Woodridge Drive. There are traffic signals at Fourth Street, Vermont Street and Kelly Street.

During hours of heavy traffic, queues along "B" Street west of the Center-"B"-Kelly intersection become exceedingly long because of limited capacity at the intersection. These long lines block side streets and restrict visibility of cross traffic. This traffic problem is further compounded by the large number of driveways and intersecting streets along "B" Street.

"B" Street is not designated as a truck route; trucks are allowed on "A" Street. A traffic count taken in 1974 indicated that trucks accounted for two percent of the average daily traffic on "B" Street. Future truck volumes will depend on the continuance of the ban, the status of alternate truck routes, level of enforcement and changes in land use along "B" Street. Currently, there are no major truck generators on "B" Street within the study area.

Average daily traffic volumes for streets within the study area are shown on Traffic Counts Map. These counts were taken between 1987 and 1990, with the majority of the counts completed during 1989-90.

HISTORY OF "B" STREET WIDENING PROJECT

In 1959 the County of Alameda adopted an ordinance establishing 80-foot future widening lines on Center Street from the Hayward City limit to Grove Way. The Hayward City Council adopted identical right-of-way requirements on "B" Street in 1963. Preliminary field surveys and engineering studies for the widening of "B" Street were initiated in 1973.

The adopted 80-foot right-of-way (60 feet curb to curb) would allow for two travel lanes in each direction and a median with left turn pockets. No on-street parking would be allowed; signals would remain at Vermont, Center-Kelly and Fourth Street.

If improved as planned, acquisition of right-of-way, reconstruction and widening of the roadway, installation of new and replacement of existing traffic signals, curbs, gutters, sidewalks, and street lights would be required. Construction of a new sewer line, and a bridge over San Lorenzo Creek, as well as undergrounding of existing utilities, were also included in the project.
The objectives of this project were to: 1) decrease traffic congestion by increasing capacity of “B”, Center, and Kelly Streets and the intersection of Center-“B”-Kelly; 2) improve safety by increasing visibility and reducing lines of traffic, and; 3) improve movement of cross traffic by decreasing congestion.

Various alternatives were considered including no project, various lane configurations within the 80-foot right-of-way and an intermediate improvement. These alternatives are briefly outlined below.

"No Project" Alternative: The no project alternative means leaving B Street as it presently exists. This alternative was expected to have the following results: 1) traffic would divert to Grove Way and A Street as volumes increased and level of service deteriorated on B Street; 2) B Street would operate at level of service “F” during the morning and evening peak hours, and; 3) side street and driveway delays would increase considerably as the frequency of gaps in B Street traffic decreased. Pedestrians wishing to cross would face the same problem.

80-Foot Right-of-Way Alternative: An 80-foot right-of-way would provide a curb-to-curb width of 60-feet. This would be sufficient to supply four 12-foot lanes with 16 feet left. This 16 feet could be used to provide one 8-foot parking lane on each side of the street, a median barrier with left-turn channelization, or a continuous left-turn lane.

The alternative which provides for on-street parking was not chosen because four-lane undivided facilities have high accident rates and left turning vehicles would significantly reduce the street’s capacity at that point.

Alternatives Within the Existing Alignment: The question asked here is “Is there an intermediate level project that could supply an acceptable level of service without being as disruptive as the project under consideration?”.

The minimum width for a four-lane facility is around 52 feet curb-to-curb. This type of facility would supply a fairly low level of service “D” during peak hours, provided left turn lanes were installed at the signalized intersections. Drawbacks of this alternative include safety considerations and unstable traffic flow caused by breakdowns or turning movements.

Another alternative would be to create a one-way couplet out of “A” and “B” streets. This would have some advantages west of Fourth Street but would not be feasible east of Fourth Street due to lack of a suitable crossover and the widening gap between “A” Street and “B” Street.
A citizen's group brought suit to halt the proposed street improvement project on the grounds that the City had abused its discretion in adopting a negative declaration in lieu of an environmental impact report, that the project was inconsistent with the City's General Plan, and that the General Plan lacked a statutorily required noise element. The Court found that the City's failure to prepare an environmental impact report constituted an abuse of discretion, since an initial study on the proposed project had revealed substantial evidence that the project would significantly and adversely affect the surrounding environment.

Short term effects of the "B" Street Project include increased dust and auto exhaust, disruption of businesses during construction of the project, and increased bank erosion and possible loss of wildlife habitat along San Lorenzo Creek during construction of a bridge.

Long term effects of the project includes increased traffic, noise and paving, removal of landscaping (including the removal of 153 mature trees some of which are older than 80 years), and the elimination of on-street parking along "B" Street. Two neighborhood stores would be removed, and 12 families would be displaced due to the removal of residential structures. The project might accelerate the loss of the residential community character of the area if single-family dwellings were converted to commercial or multi-family uses. In addition, the residential desirability of adjacent properties might be adversely affected by the increased noise and exposure to traffic, reduced setbacks of the structures from the street, and the loss of on-street parking.

In regard to "B" Street, the vast majority of task force members support the concept of "B" Street as a local neighborhood street instead of a commuter thoroughfare. During task force meetings there was much discussion of this issue. Most task force members feel that widening "B" Street to an 80-foot right-of-way would degrade the quality of life in the neighborhood by increasing the amount of through traffic and by spoiling the beauty of the streetscape. A task force vote to amend the precise plan line from an 80-foot right-of-way to a 60-foot right-of-way passed by a margin of ten to one, with two abstentions. The 60-foot precise plan line reflects the existing conditions along "B" Street and is intended to prevent future widening. At the neighborhood meeting held on November 13, 1991, participants of discussion groups indicated a strong preference for a 60-foot right-of-way over an 80-foot right-of-way. Additionally, tally sheets submitted by individuals at the neighborhood meeting show that 38 out of 42 respondents agreed with the 60-foot alternative, while 12 out of 29 respondents agreed with the 80-foot alternative. Public Work's staff has indicated that the 80-foot right-of-way is more appropriate given existing traffic volumes and congestion.

Using the concept of "B" Street as a neighborhood street as a guide, the task force prepared additional recommendations intended to promote alternate routes for through traffic.

**CENTER-"B"-KELLY**

The City of Hayward and the County of Alameda are looking at ways to improve the traffic flow (level of service) at this intersection. Improvements could also include changes to the Center Street bridge. Funding has been set aside as a development prerequisite by the William Lyon Company (Rancho Palomares) and Hayward Hills Development (Walpert Ridge). A public meeting was held in June, 1991, to gather community ideas on existing problems and possible solutions. Opinions regarding desired improvements ranged from "do nothing" to "build an overpass". A Community Advisory Group representing the Castro Valley, Hayward, and Fairview areas has been formed to work with city and county staff to identify problems and goals, define standards and options, and to evaluate conceptual designs. The Upper "B" Street Task Force is represented on this advisory group. Given the task force's desire to return "B" Street to a locally serving street, the preferred course of action for the Center-"B"-Kelly intersection would be to limit improvements to those that facilitate movement between Center and Kelly.
To reduce traffic on "B" Street the task force is also recommending that the Center Street bridge be kept at two lanes, that a westbound left turn lane from Grove onto Center Street be eliminated, and that Grove Way be restriped for four lanes. County Public Works staff indicates that the elimination of a left turn lane at Grove and Center would not likely change conditions at Center-"B"-Kelley, but would increase congestion on Grove at Center. Alameda County cited local resident opposition to improving Grove Way to four lanes. Improvements to Grove Way are underway, including restriping for one lane in each direction, bike lanes, parking lanes, and a center median with left-turn pockets, within an 80-foot right-of-way.

Data collection for traffic analysis, in conjunction with the Center-"B"-Kelly study, will start once Grove Way improvements are completed and traffic patterns normalize. The Upper "B" Task Force has requested that their concerns be addressed by the County Public Works Agency and that their recommendations regarding Center-"B"-Kelly, the Center Street bridge, and Grove Way be considered as a part of the traffic analysis.

AREAWIDE CIRCULATION PROJECTS

Proposed Route 238 Project
The most substantial project proposed within the study area is Route 238. Route 238 is planned to run parallel to Fourth Street through the study area and extends between I-580 and Industrial Parkway.

Freeway History: The present freeway proposal is a remnant of a 1961 state plan to build an eight lane freeway from 580 to 680 to relieve traffic on the Nimitz Freeway. By 1971 nearly all of the Hayward rights-of-way needed to build that facility were acquired. In July of 1971, the Sierra Club and La Raza Unida sued seeking to deter federal and state agencies from acquiring additional rights-of-way in Union City until certain requirements were met, including establishment of a satisfactory relocation program. An injunction was subsequently issued. By 1975 the funds needed to construct the freeway were no longer available and Caltrans chose not to pursue the prerequisite environmental studies and relocation programs necessary to terminate the injunction. In 1978 Route 238 south of Hayward was deleted from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's Regional Transportation Plan.

The City of Hayward, however, was allowed to continue working on a plan for the bypass route that would largely be funded by selling surplus right-of-way. The 1971 injunction was lifted in 1990 after approval of a Consent Decree requiring 449 units of replacement housing, park mitigations, additional studies and maintenance of Caltrans housing.

In 1986, the voters of Alameda County approved "Measure B", which established a one-half cent sales tax for fifteen years to pay for transportation improvements. Currently, $84.6 million from Measure B is earmarked for a Route 238 "six-lane freeway/expressway along Foothill and Mission Boulevard to Industrial Parkway". As of February, 1992, there was $123.7 million from Measure B, excess right-of-way sales, state and local partnership funds, and other sources. The approximate current construction cost of the entire project is $230 million.
Design: Existing Route 238 from the I-580 interchange follows the surface streets of Foothill and Mission Boulevards through Hayward, Union City and Fremont to its junction with I-680. The proposed Route 238 Bypass Freeway is intended to reduce severe congestion in downtown Hayward and on the Foothill-Mission boulevard corridor, reduce accidents and accommodate future traffic demands.

A Draft Environment Impact Statement for Rt. 238 was issued in October, 1987. The final EIS has been delayed to incorporate additional evaluation of air quality impacts. It would take two years after the certification of the EIS for construction plans to be drawn and three years to build.

Options to phase construction in three stages are currently being evaluated. The Stage 1 project would consist of a segment from the Route 238/I580 Interchange to Harder Road. It would consist of a four lane divided facility with on and off ramps at Carlos Bee Boulevard. Stage 2 would consist of a segment from Harder Road to Tennyson Road, and Stage 3 would complete a four lane facility to Industrial Parkway. Final stages would complete the bypass to a 6-lane freeway.

The proposed freeway would be an eventual six lane grade-separated facility with a design speed of 60 mph. Within the Upper B Street study area, structures are planned at North Third Street (continues to “B” Street with “C” Street closed), “D” Street and “E” Street with frontage roads connecting interchanges at “A” and “D” streets. These structures will introduce a vertical visual barrier to this area. The location of proposed interchanges was based primarily on providing access to major traffic generators with consideration of interchange spacing and highway operations. “A” and “D” Streets provide major access to the downtown area.

Noise Levels: In acoustical studies the decibel (dB) is used as a unit of sound; dBA refers to sound measurements on the “A” scale which correlates well with the human hearing response. Sound levels are further described by the “Equivalent Average Level (LEQ)”.

Projected future noise levels which will be caused by traffic depend on the volume of traffic, the speed of traffic and the number of trucks in the flow of traffic. Generally, the loudness of traffic noise is increased by heavier traffic volumes, higher speeds, and greater number of trucks.

Future noise levels were determined by the LEQV2 computer program which uses the theory presented in the Federal Highway Administration report FHWA-RD-77-108 "Highway Traffic Noise Prediction Model" (108 report). This model calculates noise levels and expected barrier attenuations given traffic volumes, distances and barrier heights. These figures are based on the highest expected hourly traffic volume for a 4/6-lane freeway (or expressway), therefore, they represent the worst case situation.

Within the project area numerous residences, a school and parks/recreational facilities were studied for possible adverse impacts. The projected six-lane freeway traffic noise level by the year 2010 is expected to range from Leq 45 dBA to Leq 77 dBA along the proposed route, an increase of 0 to 31 dBA from the existing (ambient). With mitigation, some of the predicted increases will be reduced to levels below present ambients while others could range up to 22 dBA above present levels.

Mitigation for proposed traffic noise levels is noise walls ranging from 8 feet to 16 feet in height. Barrier dimensions are considered approximate; exact heights, lengths and locations will be refined during the final design phase.
Areas For Which Mitigation Will Not Be Provided: In an area between “A” and “D” streets, the projected noise levels will be in the range of up to Leq 71 dBA. About ten residents within this area will have noise levels 7 to 16 dBA above the present ambient levels. The majority of this increase in traffic noise will emanate from a proposed street improvement that would front, and continue to give access to these homes. Sound barriers are not feasible at this location.

Along the area comprising the south side of the “D” Street extension, the projected noise levels will be in the range of up to Leq 75 dBA. Eleven homes, an apartment building and three historic properties (two homes and a church), within this area, will have noise levels 4 to 15 dBA above the present ambient. The increase in traffic noise and the reason for no mitigation is the same as cited for the previous “A” to “D” street areas.

For example, an increase of 8 decibels over ambient, would be perceived as being one and a half times as loud, to the same listener. An increase of 20 decibels could be perceived to a listener as being four times louder than the previous existing level.

Markham Elementary School/Playfield: The proposed freeway will be separated from this school play yard by a frontage road. The present play yard noise levels during the lunch hour with children playing are approximately 60 dBA. A noise wall is proposed between the freeway and the frontage road with an additional wall between the frontage road and the playfield. These walls should reduce the expected freeway traffic noise of 71 dBA to 61 dBA in the playfield.

Markham School will be adversely impacted by traffic noise from the proposed freeway. The future noise level at the playing field, which is 125 feet closer than the classrooms, is predicted to be Leq 71 dBA. A 14-foot high noise wall and a 12 foot high wall should mitigate this to Leq 61 dBA, which is only slightly above the ambient level (with children) of 60 dBA. The barrier will also reduce the predicted classroom noise to below the 52 dBA Federal Highway Administration and state criteria.

Cultural Resources: The EIS identifies areas where potential cultural resources within the right-of-way would be impacted. Findings of an historic architectural study conclude that six properties appear to meet the criteria for historic architectural significance to be eligible for inclusion into the National Register. These properties are located at the following addresses:

- 24077 Second St.
- 1444 “C” Street
- 1465 “B” Street
- 1436 “B” Street
- 22588 Chestnut Street
- 22589 Chestnut Street
An additional study of the area where “D” Street is proposed for widening in coordination with Route 238 project design produced three more properties which appear to meet National Register criteria. Addresses of these properties are as follows:

1329 “D” Street
1233 “D” Street
22834 Second Street - All Saints Church

The “D” Street widening project is designed to widen only on the north side of the street to avoid direct impact with these three buildings.

**Benefits:** A summary of the benefits of the proposed bypass cited in the City’s Local Alternative Transportation Improvement Plan (1984) includes the following:

- It would provide an alternative parallel route to the Nimitz Freeway that would help reduce congestion on that facility;

- It would provide more regional traffic capacity than any alternative project proposed at this time, and would do so by utilizing the State of California’s previously investment in project right-of-way;

- It would serve to improve the connection between Route 580 and 680 freeways and more efficiently utilize the capacity and investment in those facilities;

- It would utilize the public investment in local street facilities that were designed and built to connect with Route 238;

- It would improve access to public institutions such as the California State University at Hayward;

- It would reduce congestion in downtown Hayward and thereby promote that district’s revitalization with new residential office developments; and

- It would, in general, make travel safer and more convenient (whether by public transit of private automobile) and would have beneficial effects on air quality and emergency vehicle service as well.
**Alternatives:** The Upper “B” Street Task Force has heard suggestions for congestion relief on Foothill and Mission boulevards. These include extending Whitman and Huntwood Avenue along the rail corridors and widen Mission Boulevard to create three lanes in each direction, and building a grade separation at the intersection of Mission-Jackson-Foothill. Improved transit and improving regional traffic flow around Hayward were also suggested as alternatives. The task force supports the appointment of a citywide task force to develop alternatives to alleviate traffic throughout Hayward.

The status of the proposed bypass is a most pressing concern in the Upper “B” Street area. While some residents voice support for construction of the freeway, most have registered opposition.

At the November 13, 1991, neighborhood meeting, participants of eight discussion groups responded to the following alternatives:

- **a.** Expedite construction of the Route 238 bypass to relieve traffic congestion; seek additional funding for completion.  
  _OR_
- **b.** Do not build the Route 238 bypass; develop or improve other north-south routes as alternatives.

Five groups indicated support for the "no-build" alternative, two groups favored the "build" alternative, and one group indicated a mixed response. Individual tally responses from the neighborhood meeting show 13 of 31 respondents agree with constructing the freeway, while 35 of 54 respondents support the "no-build" alternative.

There are concerns about the design of the proposed bypass and concern about changes in neighborhood and community cohesion which will result from implementation of the Route 238 construction. The EIS states "implementation of either of the alternatives (freeway/expressway) will not permanently disrupt or alter existing patterns of social interaction, or have any impact on family life, socio-economic mobility, cultural diversity, and crime and safety". Residents of the Upper “B” Street area currently experience a distinct disruption resulting from right-of-way properties being in public ownership, and not improved or maintained as well as privately owned properties in the neighborhood. Residents feel that the status of these properties contributes to an element of impermanence and acts as a hindrance to improvements to both public and private properties. The task force opposes construction of the freeway and favors reversion of right-of-way properties to private ownership for residential use. Right-of-way properties could be incorporated into an historic district proposed for the neighborhood. Should the freeway not be built, the task force supports the improvement of Fourth Street and its extension across East Avenue to Second Street.

**“D” Street Extension**  
The “D” Street Extension project extends from Soto Road/Myrtle Street to Second Street. This project is intended to provide an alternative east-west link to expedite the flow of traffic, improve traffic safety, reduce traffic congestion and improve access to downtown Hayward and the BART station. Recently the section from Winton Avenue at Myrtle/Soto Road to Grand Street was completed. Phase III of this project would extend from Second Street to Third Street where it would connect into improvements planned as part of the Route 238 Freeway. Improvements on “D” Street between Third Street and Route 238 would require the existing right-of-way to be widened on the north side of the street by 38 feet (for a total of 98 feet) to provide for two travel lanes in each direction, left turn pockets, bike lanes, and on-street parking (see attached diagram). All of the widening is expected to occur on the north side to avoid impacting All Saints Church. This widening will result in the demolition of a number of homes; the exact number is not known at this time. The improvements from Second Street eastward will be constructed only if Route 238 is built.
UPPER "B" STREET STUDY AREA

UPPER "B" STREET Public Right-of-Way

Existing Width of Public Right-of-Way

- Less than 40' Residential
- 40'-48' Residential
- 50'-55' Residential
- 56' Residential (City Standard)
- 60'-68'
- 70'-92'

Streets with Precise Plan Lines:

Adopted:
- "A" Street 92'
- "B" Street 80'
- 2nd Street 92'
- 3rd Street 52'
- Dole Way 31'
- Rockaway 68'

Proposed:
- "D" Street 98'
  (2nd to 4th)
- 7th Street 50'
- Templeton 42'
STREET STANDARDS

The public right-of-way includes travel lanes, bike lanes, parking lanes, curb, gutter, sidewalk, planter strips and, in some cases, an easement behind the sidewalk. The City of Hayward Municipal Code specifies that the minimum right-of-way for residential streets shall be 56 feet. This typical street section is used when reviewing development applications unless some other specific street section has been approved. Special street sections can be approved by the adoption of a precise plan line, tentative map, assessment district or planned development. Existing rights-of-way and adopted plan lines in the Upper "B" Street area are shown on the following pages. Many existing streets in this neighborhood were built with narrower rights-of-way. When new development occurs on these streets, the City must require additional dedication (to the 56 foot line). The extra right-of-way is not needed in some cases because the curb-to-curb width is already established and would not be changed by the additional right-of-way.

The Public Works Department recommends that precise plan lines be prepared for streets with a 50-foot right-of-way when those streets have already been built curb-to-curb. This right-of-way allows for two 10-foot travel lanes and two 8-foot parking lanes. In addition, staff also recommends that a 42-foot precise plan line be adopted for Templeton Street to allow two way travel, on-street parking and sidewalks along the west side of the street.

TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES

Installation and maintenance of traffic control devices are the responsibility of the Transportation Services Division. Warrant systems are used to evaluate the need for traffic control devices such as stop signs, traffic signals and keep clears.

Stop Signs: The following criteria are evaluated to determine if an intersection warrants the installation of a stop sign:

- Relative traffic volumes on the two streets, so as not to interrupt flow on a major street for a minor volume side street.

- Number of accidents at that intersection that could have been prevented if there had been controls.

- Traffic delays to vehicles coming from the minor streets.

- Relative speed limits on the two streets.

The Upper "B" Task Force is recommending that a four-way stop be installed at "D" and Seventh, and that either a four-way stop be installed at Sixth and Ward or a crossing guard be assigned at peak crossing times, even though these intersections do not meet the criteria listed above.
Traffic Signals: Traffic signals are located along "B" Street and Second Street. Signals along "B" Street are traffic actuated, meaning that the signal lights vary according to changing traffic demand. The Center-"B"-Kelly and Vermont traffic lights are inter-connected to ensure that traffic clears between these lights with each light change. Signals along Second Street are timed to facilitate traffic movement northbound (towards downtown) during the AM peak hours and southbound (away from downtown) during the PM peak hours.

The need for traffic signals is determined by evaluating the existing conditions using criteria established by the State of California. This warrant system looks at factors such as vehicular volume, interruption of continuous traffic, pedestrian volume and accident experience. Delay, congestion, confusion or other evidence of this need for right-of-way assignment are also reviewed in an effort to determine if a traffic signal would solve existing problems.

Within the Upper "B" Street study area, two intersections are listed on the traffic signal priority list; "A" and Fourth currently ranks sixth; "B" and Seventh ranks 14th. A recent study at B and Sixth shows that this intersection does warrant a traffic signal. Its ranking on the signal priority list has not yet been determined. The signal at "A" and Fourth will be installed with the construction of Route 238. If Route 238 is not built, the signal will be installed as funds become available. Given that typically one traffic signal is installed per year, it may take 5-6 years before the intersection of "A" and Fourth is signalized and almost 15 years before "B" and Seventh is signalized. Because of severe concerns for pedestrian safety a temporary signal at "A" and Fourth will be installed by June, 1992.

The task force is also recommending that the green time for drivers traveling on Fourth at "B" Street be lengthened to improve the north-south flow and discourage turns onto "B" Street. Task force members support the installation of signs or banners to encourage drivers to take alternate routes. All permanent traffic signage in the city must comply with state standards and there is no standard sign to recommend permanent use of an alternate route. Public Works staff notes that banners are not permitted on existing street light standards or traffic signal poles; they require special poles for safety reasons.

Keep Clear: Blocking of intersections by stopped vehicles is prohibited by the California Vehicle Code (22526) under the "gridlock" law. In common practice, however, this rule is often broken, making it difficult for drivers on side streets to cross (or enter into) congested streets.

Requests for installation of keep clear pavement markings are reviewed according to a warrant system which looks at two criteria; accident records and delay experienced by traffic on the minor intersection or driveway. The first criterion stipulates that five or more accidents must occur within a twelve month period which could have been prevented by the installation of a "keep clear". The second criterion is met if, for a period of 30 minutes, one or more vehicles is consistently left waiting on the minor street after the vehicles on the major street have moved through the signal light. If either criteria is met, the "keep clear" would be warranted.

Task Force members discussed the merits of painting "Keep Clears" at cross streets intersecting "B" Street; opinions were divided and the task force eventually decided not to recommend "Keep Clears".
**Speed-Curtailing Bumps:** Speed bumps have been suggested by area residents as a means for reducing speeding on city streets. This traffic control device is not endorsed by the Transportation Services Division or the State of California Traffic Control Device Committee because they have been shown not to be effective in reducing vehicle speeds and cause other safety and noise problems. The Transportation Services Division cites a study entitled “An Evaluation of Speed-Curtailing Bumps” by A. R. Turturici (PUBLIC WORKS, August 1975), in which speed bumps were shown to cause damage to vehicles and in some cases caused drivers to lose control of their vehicles. In the study the hazard posed to two-wheel vehicles such as bicycles and motorcycles.

**Crosswalks:** By definition, crosswalks exist at all intersections, whether they are painted or unpainted. Public Works staff believes that marked crosswalks are appropriate at controlled intersections where channelization of pedestrians will improve safety. A number of pedestrian crosswalk studies indicate that marked crosswalks not only do not increase pedestrian safety at uncontrolled intersections but actually decrease safety. One study completed in 1974 concluded that approximately twice as many pedestrian accidents occur in marked crosswalks as in unmarked crosswalks. The increased accident rate was attributed to the false sense of security pedestrians have when using painted crosswalks.
Concerns were raised in the initial Upper "B" Street Neighborhood regarding bicycle and pedestrian safety, and public transit. It was suggested that neighborhood streets be analysed for potential bike lanes; "B" and "D" streets were mentioned. Hazards associated with the broken sidewalks, curbs and gutters, particularly on "B" Street, were discussed. There was support for sidewalk installation in areas where there are currently no existing sidewalks. Better handicap access to "D" Street and Ward Street was mentioned, and a need for bus shelters at bus stops was also voiced.

**General Plan Policies**
The Hayward General Plan states that “alternatives to automobile transportation will be encouraged through development policies and provision of transit, bike and pedestrian amenities”.

Land use strategies which encourage the use of alternative transportation include:

- Improve bike and pedestrian access and availability of bike racks at transit stations, shopping centers, and employment centers. Improve pedestrian access to bus stops.

- Work with AC Transit to post routes and schedules at bus stops, to coordinate routes and service times and to provide attractive, sheltered bus stops whenever feasible.

**Bicycle Facilities in Upper "B" Street**
The Bicycle Facilities Plan, adopted in 1979, recommends that bicycle use be encouraged as a means of transportation and recreation in the community. A primary objective of the plan is to improve cycling safety. Updating of this plan has been postponed to the 1991-92 fiscal year.

The Upper "B" Street area lacks bicycle facilities. The adopted Hayward Bicycle Facilities Plan recommends signing "A" Street, Fourth Street and "D" Street as bicycle routes (see Bike Route map). To date, this has not been done. On routes, bicyclists share the roadway with vehicles without benefit of a designated lane. Bicycle lanes, preferred by many riders for safety reasons, do not exist in the Upper "B" Street area.

The East Bay Bicycle Coalition suggests bicycling commute-riders use "A" Street and Second Street. In the Mission-Foothills neighborhood a route along the Hayward fault line is proposed to replace a bike lane proposed along the Rt. 238 bypass in the General Plan.

37
The Upper "B" Street Task Force solicited input from bicycle organizations and the School District regarding needed bicycle facilities in this neighborhood. Existing conditions which discourage bicycle riding in this area were explored in order to come up with suggestions for encouraging use of bicycles. The importance of connecting with other existing or planned links in the area was considered as were major destination points like BART, Don Castro Regional Park, Lake Chabot and Cal State Hayward.

Conditions which discourage bicycle riders in the Upper "B" Street neighborhood include the perceived safety hazard caused by insufficient room between riders and drivers, poor maintenance of the roadway adjacent to the curb and damaged sidewalks. Task force members are recommending that bicycle routes be established to guide riders and that lanes be provided where necessary to clearly delineate a "safety zone" for bicyclists.

Bicycle routes/lanes were considered along "B" Street, "C" Street, Sixth Street (between "B" and "D" Streets) and Fifth Street (from Markham School to "E" Street). "B" Street is the only east-west connector available to residents living in the eastern portion of the study area; it also provides the most direct route to Don Castro Regional Park and Lake Chabot for area residents. The narrow width of "B" Street combined with heavy traffic make this route undesirable for bicycle riders. Installation of bike lanes would require the removal of on-street parking along one side of the street. An alternative route considered by the task force follows "B" Street from Center to Seventh Street; Seventh Street to "C" Street and then "C" Street to Second Street. "C" Street carries much less traffic, making it a much nicer route for bicycle riders. Task force members opted to neither support or discourage the use of "B" Street as a route. Both Sixth and Fifth are recommended by the task force as routes to facilitate bike access to schools.

Bicycle lanes are planned along the County portion of "A" Street and "D" Street from approximately Fourth Street west; Task force members recommend that bicycle lanes be considered along Fourth Street (if Route 238 is not built and Fourth Street is improved) and "A" Street from the County line west.

Task force members also considered designating the sidewalk along one side of "B" Street for bicyclists and directing pedestrians to use the sidewalk on the other side. Public Works staff advised against this proposal because the State Vehicle Code defines bikes as vehicles and vehicles are not allowed on sidewalks.

Task force members also felt the provision of safe bicycle racks on public transportation and at commercial/recreational locations would encourage use of bicycles. These recommendations could be incorporated into future citywide trip reduction programs.
Sidewalks
Prior to September 1961, curbs, gutters and sidewalks were not uniformly required with development. Subsequent to 1961, street improvements have either been installed at the time of development or improvement agreements have been recorded which require property owners to install street improvements at some future date. The City may delay the installation of street improvements if doing so on a piecemeal basis would disrupt the drainage system. Potential funding and implementation programs for sidewalk, curb and gutter installation include the following:

1) Property owners could voluntarily participate in an assessment district. Assessment districts are formed under the authority of cities and counties. The City Engineer would need to provide the Council with plans, specifications, and cost estimates for the work to be done. Council would need to adopt a resolution of intention to do the project and notice a future hearing, at which time written protests of property owners would be taken. If less than a majority object, the project may be undertaken by the City using cash or bonds, to be repaid through assessments which become a lien upon each lot in the district.

2) City could force property owners to install sidewalks in those cases where existing sidewalks (including agreements) total more than 50% of a block.

3) City could place street improvement project on unfunded Capital Improvement Program (CIP). If funding is approved, the City could seek reimbursement from affected property owners at such time as future development occurs. Unfunded projects in the CIP total $173,794,000.

4) The City could install asphalt berm/sidewalk in public right-of-way as a short-term solution. Funding would need to be identified.

5) City could force property owners to install sidewalks if it is determined that a lack of sidewalks constitutes a health and safety problem.

6) Federal legislation requires the City to implement a program to reduce pollutants that enter the storm drains. This program may empower the City to tax citizens to fund a more efficient street sweeping program, perhaps including installation and repair of curbs and gutters.

Damaged Sidewalks: Throughout the City tree-damaged sidewalks, curbs and gutters are an issue. Broken sidewalks particularly affect children, the elderly and the handicapped. Residents are concerned about damaged sidewalks along much of "B" Street.
Current City policy regarding sidewalks damaged by street trees places the responsibility for repair and replacement with the abutting property owner. As an on-going service, the Street Division provides toe patches to sidewalks that have a vertical lift of 1/2" to 1" or more. The responsibility to replace damaged curbs and gutters is the City’s. Because of budgetary limitations, replacement has been minimal in comparison to the amount of damaged curbs and gutters. Tree removal and root pruning are the responsibility of the Landscape Division.

“B” Street Sidewalk Repair Study: In November 1987, a preliminary sidewalk repair study of “B” Street was conducted between Seventh Street and Arlette Avenue. This study was done to present options for correcting damage to existing curbs, gutters, sidewalks and driveways caused by existing trees in the curb planters.

Sidewalk widths vary from 4.0’ to 6.5’, and curb planter widths vary from 1.5’ to 5.5’ except where the sidewalk is adjacent to the curb. Thirty mature trees were identified in the study area, with the dominant tree being the Camphor. Twenty of the trees have caused moderate to severe sidewalk damage, and twelve trees have caused moderate to severe curb and gutter damage. Some of the curb planters have been filled in with concrete or asphalt. The remaining curb planters are poorly maintained, and most are filled with weeds.

Two alternate solutions were proposed to repair the curb, gutter, sidewalk and driveway damage caused by the street trees. Both solutions would result in the reconstruction of sidewalks and the installation of 28 additional trees behind the newly installed sidewalk.

The estimated cost per linear foot to replace sidewalk, curb and gutter is $150 (1990 costs). This cost includes; sidewalk, curb/gutter, three linear feet of asphalt street repair, root pruning, root barrier, balance pruning, engineering and inspection. Tree and stump removal could add an additional $850 per location. From experience, the average length of sidewalk, curb and gutter damage needing replacement is 25 feet per location. The average location would cost approximately $3,750 (1990 costs). On a Citywide basis, the number of damaged locations is estimated to range between 4,000 to 5,000. This translates into $15,000,000 to $20,000,000 to repair damaged locations.

At this time, due to limited financial resources the City Council has not changed the existing sidewalk replacement policy which requires the property owner to repair the damaged sidewalk. The City Council is likely to review this policy in the future, once there is significant improvement in the City’s financial condition.

Task force members and area residents are very concerned about the poor condition of sidewalks along “B” Street, but equally concerned about the preservation of street trees. This concern was voiced repeatedly at neighborhood meetings. Interest in issuing “fix-it” tickets to property owners with damaged sidewalks was expressed. The task force recommends that the City share the cost of repairs with the property owner on a 50%-50% basis. A March, 1988, survey by the League of California Cities shows that the majority of California cities are participating in repairs to tree-damaged sidewalks, curbs, and gutters in a 50%-50% or 100% basis. Public Works staff indicated that implementation of such a program would require an ordinance to be prepared on a citywide basis. Another proposed method to finance sidewalk repair work involves placing a deferred lien on the property with payment recovered at time of sale or transfer of title. The City Council has been exploring the feasibility of a 50/50 Sidewalk Repair Program with property owners; funding for this proposed program has not been identified.
**AC Transit**

Along with a sensitivity to through traffic in the neighborhood, there is objection to noise from the use of full-size buses on neighborhood streets during times when riderships warrant the use of a mini-bus. Upper “B” Street Task Force members are interested in pursuing bicycle racks on buses, and bus shelters and benches for pedestrians and transit riders. Although concern about graffiti on bus shelters and benches was expressed, a majority of the members felt that the community should not shy away from needed improvements because those improvements may become targets for abuse. Instead, an emphasis was placed on encouraging public-private cooperation in placing and maintaining these amenities. The Police Department notes that bus shelters often present policing problems as they are frequently used by vagrants.

Upper “B” Street residents are served by the Alameda-Contra Costa (AC) Transit District and BART express service. Routes are designed to provide direct travel wherever possible. Local routes emphasize direct access between neighborhoods and major activity centers or transit centers. The average distance between parallel routes is based on residential densities, location of major activity centers, topography, and street patterns. In the Upper “B” Street area, bus routes operate along “B” Street, “D” Street and Second Street (see map). A BART express line runs along “A” Street.

AC Transit currently operates four lines (#’s 80, 92, 94 and 95) in this neighborhood. Line 80 runs between San Leandro BART, Castro Valley, and Hayward BART via residential areas on “B” Street. Line 95 serves residential areas on “D” Street and in the Kelly Hill area, providing service to Hayward BART. Line 94 provides direct service between Hayward BART, downtown Hayward, Hayward High School, and the Hayward Highlands area. Line 92 connects Cal State Hayward to Hayward BART and continues to Southland Mall and Chabot College. Headways (the time between buses on a route) are based on population, densities, major activity centers served, actual or potential route usage, schedule design considerations, timed transfer considerations, and District resources. Bus routes servicing the Upper “B” Street area generally operate on a 30 minute frequency.

Standard sized buses (30 or 40 feet in length) are assigned to most of the District’s bus lines. AC Transit also has a limited number of mini-buses, all of which are dedicated to routes in hill areas. Mini-buses carry up to 15 passengers. Standard buses would not normally be replaced with mini-buses for several reasons: 1) There is a limited number of mini-buses available and, because of numerous mechanical problems, it is unclear if more will be purchased in the future. 2) Buses are assigned by the maximum load of the particular line. Though there may be few riders on Line 95 in the Kelly Hill area, increased ridership toward downtown precludes the use of a mini-bus. 3) While midday ridership may warrant a smaller bus, it is quite costly to send replacement buses from the yard on a regular basis.

AC Transit currently upholds a general policy to disallow bicycles on buses. One exception exists for a line which serves Tilden Regional Park. Past experience with bike racks on buses proved problematic for a variety of reasons. Although it is possible that a bike rack program may be reconsidered, at present it is a low priority.
Bus stops are usually located along the street curb for direct, safe passenger access to and from the sidewalk, waiting and walking areas. Stops may be located on the near-side or far-side of an intersection, or in mid-block locations. As a general rule, bus stops in business districts and in high density residential areas should be 500-750 feet apart. In flat residential areas, bus stops should be 750-1000 feet apart. In low density areas, stops may be further apart. Recent federal legislation requires transit agencies and local jurisdictions to insure wheelchair accessibility to all new bus stops. AC Transit is in support of sidewalk improvement programs and has, in the past, worked with cities to obtain funding for pedestrian improvements.

AC Transit has a number of bus shelters throughout the service area. Due to the high costs of maintenance and the acquisition of additional shelters, the District has discontinued the program. In the cities of San Francisco, Walnut Creek and San Leandro an advertising transit shelter program is currently underway whereby an advertising firm installs and maintains bus shelters at no cost to the transit agency or to the local jurisdiction, in exchange for the right to sell advertising in the shelters. Such a program would allow replacement of all existing shelters and add shelters at many new locations. The maintenance and appearance of the shelters will greatly improve at no cost to the public. AC Transit recognizes the benefits of this program and encourages cities to coordinate directly with shelter advertising agencies. A similar program is available for the installation and maintenance of bus benches.

AC Transit is in the process of implementing the Comprehensive Service Plan (CSP). The CSP is a major AC Transit planning effort designed to increase transit ridership by restructuring the District’s route network to serve more destinations and provide timed transfer connections. Phase IV of the CSP, which would include the City of Hayward, is currently scheduled to be implemented in June of 1993 (assuming funding is secured). Proposed changes in the Upper “B” Street area include a new Line 96 which will also serve the Hayward City Center area, and a new Line 92 which will use the new Carlos Bee extension to serve the Cal State Hayward campus. Information regarding the proposed changes can be obtained from the AC Transit Research & Planning Department. The public is invited to comment on the proposal and public workshops will be held to solicit feedback. The Upper “B” Task Force recommends that the City of Hayward take steps to integrate with AC’s current service planning program.
Residents feel that recreational facilities at Markham Elementary School are inadequate and outdated and that Markham needs to be better maintained. Overgrown landscaping is seen as a safety hazard as well as an eyesore. Parking/circulation at Markham is a problem. There is a need for latchkey programs and organized after-school activities. Parents are concerned about traffic safety at Ward and Sixth streets. There is perceived a need for additional outdoor lighting.

Students in the Upper "B" Street area attend public educational facilities at Markham Elementary (K-6), Bret Harte Intermediate (7-8) and Hayward High (9-12). Markham Elementary is located within the neighborhood boundaries on Ward Street; Bret Harte and Hayward High are located nearby on "E" Street and East Avenue respectively.

Private educational facilities include All Saints Catholic School (K-8) and two Montessori campuses (2-6 year olds). Current enrollment at All Saints is 290 students; maximum capacity is 295 students. The "B" Street Montessori campus has a current enrollment of 36 children; maximum capacity is 46 children. The Hill Street campus, established 3 years ago has capacity for 50 children and there are currently openings.

**Markham Elementary:** Markham Elementary School was built in 1949, replacing the original Markham School located on Foothill at "B" Street. At 6.7 acres the current site is small for an elementary school; typical elementary sites are about ten acres. The need for space has become a persistent problem in public schools. Program changes over the years affect the use of school facilities. Computers, photocopy machines, latchkey, and staff facilities compete with expanding class size for adequate room. Markham has been expanded with the installation of four portable classrooms. Due to the small size of this school site, placement of portables result in the loss of sparse outdoor play area. Current enrollment at Markham stands at 499 students; capacity at this 6.7 acre site is 500 students. The Hayward Unified School District anticipates a projected enrollment of 516 students during the 1991-92 school year with an increase to 529 students by the 1994-95. Capacity could be expanded by buying additional land (funds are not available), instituting double sessions, adding portable classrooms, or relocating a magnet program to another school site. School District officials do not consider the projected overenrollments to be significant.

Task force members met with representatives from the Hayward Unified School District to discuss neighborhood concerns and to look for ways to address these issues. District staff acknowledged that the different elevations and slopes at Markham make maintenance especially difficult and discussed funding shortages which inhibit their ability to better maintain school sites. None-the-less, Upper "B" Street Task Force members felt that the District should strive for better maintenance. The proposed Maintenance Assessment Fee under consideration by the School Board at that time was discussed as a way to make improvements desired by area residents. Markham Elementary has been identified as a high priority site for improvements. Public opposition to this proposed assessment influenced the School Board to drop this proposed fee.
Regarding the on-site parking shortage problem at Markham, the following ideas were discussed; (1) designate a drop-off/pick up area on “C” Street opposite the walkway to Markham to reduce congestion in the parking lot, (2) develop a one-way circulation system whereby parents would enter from Ward Street and exit via Fifth Street (currently exists but is not efficiently utilized), and (3) encourage employees to carpool. Markham School staff have taken an active role in improving the circulation problems in recent months. Fliers were distributed to parents identifying several drop-off areas around the perimeter of the school for their use when transporting children to and from school.

A latchkey program to provide care for students before and after school will be starting up next year. Task force members are encouraging school district officials to recognize the importance of providing latchkey services to the children and urge the School District to seek continuous funding.

Upper “B” Street residents and task force members point out that Markham Elementary is the only play area within the study area and stressed the importance of developing it as a park for the neighborhood. The following needs were identified: additional play equipment for all age groups, regulation softball and soccer fields with turf and irrigation, spectator seating, outdoor lighting, and improved access to the school grounds and to the lower play area. Newly purchased play equipment for K-3 students has been installed recently. Additional improvements could be installed by the Hayward Area Recreational and Park District as funds become available; maintenance agreements of those improvements would need to be negotiated between HARD and the school district.

The Upper “B” Task Force supports expansion of community programs at Markham. A senior live-on program has been suggested to improve security at Markham. Fremont’s school district currently has a vandal-watch program whereby inhabited mobile homes are placed at school sites. These mobile homes are privately owned, the inhabitants receive a few dollars per month as employees, and they have the advantage of a free place to park their home. Markham staff support this concept but point out that space is a major constraint for such a program. The task force has also suggested an after-school program whereby college students receive credit for supervising activities. School staff would favor such a program provided the participants are adequately trained. Environmental and clean-up programs were also recommended by the task force. There is currently a regular litter pick-up program at Markham and the school district is conscientious about painting out graffiti in a timely manner.
Residents in the Upper "B" area commented that existing parks are too far from neighborhood residents. There is support for the acquisition of land for park development and open space. Mini-parks on in-fill lots were suggested as a permanent or interim measure. Flat playfields for organized games are particularly needed. Some commented that recreational facilities need to be upgraded and improved and that parks need to be better maintained and policed. Better access to San Felipe Park for residents in the "B" Street area could be accommodated by developing a path at the terminus of Vermont. It was also suggested by residents that developers be required to dedicate land for parks instead of in-lieu fees, and that bond issues be initiated to make needed improvements.

Existing Policies and Standards
The HARD Master Plan (1990) is intended to provide long-term policies, programs and standards for guiding the District for the next 15 years. This plan establishes a goal of acquiring and developing 10-20 new local parks totalling at least 90 acres to meet neighborhood needs and 5-7 new community parks encompassing a minimum of 90 acres at designated locations to meet the needs of present and future populations. Specific sites are not designated in the master plan; the Upper "B" Street area is identified as a local park "gap" area. The master plan also proposes enhancing and expanding existing parks, improving additional school sites for park uses, developing new sports facilities and expanding recreation programs.

In developed areas, local parks (including school parks) are intended to serve residents within a 1/4 to 1/2 mile radius. Ideally, users should not be required to cross major arterial roads. Community parks are larger and are intended to serve residents within 2-3 miles. Community centers are recommended to be within 2-3 miles of residents.

Recreation Facilities Within Study Area
Within the boundaries of the Upper "B" Street neighborhood, Markham Elementary School provides the only public recreational area available to residents. Facilities include basketball courts, play structures and one field where an informal game of softball could be played. The playing field has not been turfed; school district personnel have identified Markham as one of thirteen Priority One sites needing turf and irrigation (funds are not available at this time). New play equipment has recently been installed in both upper and lower play areas. As valuable as school sites are, they are limited in terms of the hours they are available to the public and the type of facilities they provide.

Markham is located within a half-mile walking distance for residents in the western half of the Upper "B" Street area. Pedestrians and vehicles can access Markham Elementary from Ward Street (off 6th) and 5th Street; pedestrian paths are provided via Ward Street (off 5th Street) and "C" Street.
**Nearby Parks and Recreation Facilities**

**San Felipe Park** is a 10.75 acre community park developed with basketball courts, a community center, picnic and barbecue facilities, tot lot equipment and irrigated turf. This park, located in the County off “D” Street, is within a half-mile walking distance for residents in the vicinity of “D” Street, 6th and 7th Streets. An informal pedestrian path connecting Vermont Street to San Felipe Park is used by some residents. The HARD Master Plan recommends adding additional barbecue facilities.

**Sulphur Creek** is an 8.6 acre special use park developed with picnic/barbeque facilities, turf, caged wildlife, a lending library, amphitheater and museum. Typical park amenities such as a tot lot are not available. This County park, located on the southside of “D” Street, is near San Felipe Park. The creekside setting contributes to the special feel of this site. An informal hiking path exists along the creek which can be followed eastward towards Hidden Lane.

The **Botany Grounds** is a special use facility developed with the Japanese Gardens, Little Theater, a koi pond and wandering paths with seating. It contains approximately five acres and is situated between San Lorenzo Creek and the Hayward City Center. The facility is within 1/2 mile walking distance of the Russell/“A” Street area. Improved access and visibility from “A” Street is recommended by the HARD Master Plan.

**Hayward High** has a soccer field, a football field, two baseball fields, a track, ten handball courts, four tennis courts and a dozen basketball courts. The swimming pool is not currently in use because of operating expense. Hayward High is located outside of the Upper “B” Street study area, however, it is within a half-mile walk of the southwestern portion of the study area and is a resource used by many residents.

**Bret Hart JHS** has 4.2 acres developed with softball fields, basketball courts, soccer fields and turf. These playing fields are accessible to Upper “B” Street residents.

**Don Castro Regional Park** is a special use fee facility developed with swimming and picnic areas. Its entrance is approximately two-thirds of a mile uphill from the eastern limit of the Upper "B" Street area.

**Funding Sources for Park Acquisition and Development**

Funding sources for parks and recreational facilities include bond measures, special taxes, assessment districts, development fees and transfer taxes. The development of additional parks usually depend on a combination of several funding sources.

The City’s Park Dedication In-Lieu Fees are one-time fees assessed on new residential development. The parkland dedication ordinance is based on the premise that new residential development will generate an immediate demand for parks and recreation, which will impact existing public facilities. Projects with less than 50 units pay in-lieu fees; larger projects may dedicate land but there are very few projects proposed in Hayward for 50 units or more. On June 11, 1991 the City Council increased Park dedication fees to $3000 for single-family dwellings and $2300 per unit for multi-family residences.
In compliance with State law, Hayward is divided into five park service zones to insure that park dedication fees benefit residents of the projects from which the fees are generated. The Upper “B” Street area is included in Zone D, which consists of downtown Hayward and the surrounding neighborhoods of Burbank, Foothill/Mission, and Santa Clara. Fees collected in Zone D must be used to improve existing facilities or to acquire new facilities within the zone, except for contributions to regional facilities. As of December, 1991, there was approximately $96,406 available for park acquisition and/or improvements in Zone D. Funds recently set aside for acquisition or improvement of parks in Zone D include approximately $153,000 for a local park in the Burbank neighborhood and $15,300 to be distributed for improvements to Skywest Golf Course (regional facility). During the past several years, approximately $100,000 per year has been collected from park dedication fees citywide. The amount of fees collected annually has varied widely due to cyclical fluctuations in building activity.

Bonds for financing park development are issued at the state level and are not generally initiated locally.

Possible Future Sites
In December, 1991, HARD purchased a 4.0 acre park site (Fairview Park) located on Lakeridge Avenue south of Kelly Avenue. Planned improvements, pending a public hearing, include play equipment, picnic areas and turf. Although this site is outside of the half-mile recommended service area, HARD believes it will provide a resource for some “B” Street residents.

Proposed improvements to be provided if Route 238 is constructed are shown on the Corridor Enhancement Program map attached. Preliminary plans show a pedestrian pathway under the freeway structure connecting “A” Street to the Botany Grounds. Other improvements include turf, picnic areas, basketball courts and a children’s play area.

Several park acreage standards can be used to forecast the amount of needed parkland. Currently, the acres of local and community parks/1000 population stands at 3.78 for Hayward residents. The City’s Park Dedication Ordinance specifies a minimum of 5 acres/1000 population. A third standard of 10 acres/1000 population is deemed desirable.

The population of the Upper “B” study area is estimated to be approximately 4,700 residents. At 5 acres/1000 population this figure indicates a need for 23 acres of parkland. Park and recreation facilities within and near to the study area total over 35 acres, but a deficiency of parks within walking distance is apparent, particularly east of Seventh Street. Build-out of the planning area to the levels permitted by the 1986 General Policies Plan would result in an additional 2,431 households, profoundly increasing the need for future parks.
Six potential park sites were identified by the task force (see map). These sites represent the few remaining areas of undeveloped or underdeveloped land within the Upper "B" study area. Two are located in the Route 238 right-of-way; the potential for park development on these is severely reduced if the freeway is built. The two sites located off Kelly Street currently have approved development proposals. The site on the northeast corner of Templeton Street and Hill Avenue is vacant. A religious institution occupies the site to the southwest of Templeton and Hill.

The Upper "B" Street Task Force strongly favors the upgrade of Markham Elementary School as a neighborhood park resource, with a priority for the installation of new turf. Task force members would welcome creative solutions by HARD and the school district to achieve this goal. The task force supports the acquisition of other parkland within the study area and the installation of a path from the terminus of Vermont Street to improve access to San Felipe Park. (See map of potential park sites.) Additionally, the task force has made recommendations on developing specific facilities at neighborhood parks for specialized uses, including tot lots, community gardens, etc.

Likewise, HARD has identified the installation of new turf, irrigation, and playing fields as top priority at Markham School. In regard to development of facilities HARD makes park improvements based upon the outcome at public hearings.
Residents are very concerned about the appearance of their community. The need for neighborhood clean-up/maintenance, preservation, and beautification programs is recognized. Litter, run-down and poorly maintained properties, abandoned and improperly located vehicles, and overgrown vegetation were cited as conditions that detract from the neighborhood. Features within the Upper “B” Street area that contribute positively to the neighborhood image include street trees (particularly along “B” Street), All Saints Church, and historic residences.

Street Trees
The Tree Maintenance Program of the Landscape Division is responsible for the maintenance of 30,000 City street trees. At present, the four tree crews annually prune about 3,500 trees. With the current tree population and full staffing, it takes 8.6 years to completely prune the City’s urban forest. The Landscape Division currently has three vacancies which are frozen because of the city’s financial condition. Therefore it is estimated that the pruning cycle will be lengthened to 10.5 years. Data is being gathered to establish the precise impact the vacancies have on the pruning cycle.

In the ideal urban setting, street trees should be pruned every three to six years to provide a high standard of service. Some of the varieties we have, due to their rapid growth rate, require pruning every 1.5 to 2 years to provide a uniform service level in all areas. Almost 300 new replacement street trees are planted each year, but replacement is not keeping pace with the number needing to be removed. Official street trees planted in public rights-of-way are maintained by the City.

As seen all over the city, large canopy trees (e.g., Camphor, Fruitless Mulberry, Liquid Amber) growing in narrow planter strips, in some cases, have resulted in uplifted sidewalks. This is particularly evident along Upper “B” Street. (See Alternative Transportation section for a discussion on “B” Street trees and sidewalk damage.) Root control methods have been used to minimize sidewalk damage, and hence costs to the property owner. In some cases, a root pruner can be used which prunes off the roots along the sidewalk or curb. A plastic root barrier is then installed below ground to guide trees roots down, rather than out under sidewalks. Unfortunately budget constraint may eliminate the root control program. When new trees are to be planted within the planting strips, more appropriate varieties are chosen.

Concern about the cost of street tree maintenance and sidewalk damage caused by roots led to the elimination of the planting strip. Since 1977, Council policy has dictated that sidewalks be placed next to curbs, street trees are planted in the front yard area and telephone poles and traffic signs are placed in surplus public right-of-way or public utility easements located behind sidewalks.
The Landscape Beautification Plan and Zoning Ordinance are two City documents which serve as guides for landscape improvements to public and private property. The zoning ordinance requires, as a condition of development, a minimum of one street tree per 20-40 lineal feet of commercial or multifamily residential frontage. Within single-family developments a street tree is required for the front yard of each lot or at a minimum of one tree per 50 lineal feet (for lots greater than 50 feet in width). The City’s tree preservation ordinance requires that property owners apply for a permit to remove trees with a circumference of 30 inches or more.

Replacement of curb, gutters, and sidewalks along Upper “B” Street would result in a loss of approximately one-third of the existing street trees. A 1987 study recommends bowing future sidewalks, curbs and gutters around the base of existing trees and planting new trees in an easement behind the sidewalk. Because of ill effects on drainage and bike travel, some consider it undesirable to bow the curb and gutter around the base of the tree. While the task force has indicated that tree maintenance and sidewalk repair take precedence over replacement of curb and gutter, a long term solution needs to be specified. A sidewalk, curb and gutter repair/street tree replacement program could be phased over a period of 10 to 20 years, replacing those trees most in need first, and providing larger planting strips for replacement trees. Camphor trees require a 6-foot to 7-foot planting strip. Widening the planting strip along upper “B” Street might necessitate taking additional right-of-way from “B” Street properties. A different species could be recommended, perhaps a smaller species planted at shorter intervals. Funding is the key constraint to resolution of problems associated with street trees and sidewalks.

The Upper “B” Street Task Force has expressed a desire to maintain the existing Camphors on “B” Street and to replace them when necessary with the same species. Task force members favor meandering sidewalks and bowing curbs out to accommodate surface roots, acquiring additional right-of-way as needed. The task force indicated a preference for phasing repairs (as opposed to a one-time capital improvement project) as a means of getting more immediate results. Some task force members feel that tree pruning methods used by the City do not do justice to the trees or the streetscape, and reduce the potential for shade. While more drastic, higher pruning is needed for longer (8-10 year) pruning cycles, the Camphor tree branches upward; the need to clear low branches is not as prevalent as in species with a drooping branch structure. Landscape Maintenance staff indicate that it is necessary to provide a minimum of 14 feet clearance at the curb to accommodate trucks and buses. Within that parameter tree pruners attempt to preserve the lowest canopy possible.

Street Sweeping
The Public Works Department is responsible for the ongoing street sweeping program in Hayward. Presently, most streets are cleaned approximately every three weeks. Variations in the schedule may be caused by a variety of factors including the amount of leaf droppings along some streets and mechanical problems. In areas where there are no curbs and gutters, street sweeping is not as effective.
Residents in many of Hayward’s neighborhoods have expressed concern that vehicles parked on the street during cleaning times are reducing the effectiveness of the street sweeping program. Area residents have suggested that the city post the street cleaning schedule and enforce a “no parking” restriction during the time posted for cleaning. In response to resident concerns the City instituted several trial programs and analysed street sweeping practices in other Bay Area cities to evaluate options. Several options for enhancing the street sweeping program are being evaluated. One option would be to establish a twice-monthly cleaning schedule, post “no parking” signs, and staff a community service officer to issue citations in advance of the sweeper. Public Works staff feel that signing is crucial to an effective program; enforcement with citation makes it a meaningful policy.

A requirement imposed on municipalities by the Environmental Protection Agency and California Water Quality Control Board calling for a reduction in pollutants entering storm sewers has resulted in an urban runoff control program. A funding mechanism for more frequent and complete street sweeping may be a product of this program.

The task force opposes the posting of signs and issuance of citations to improve cleaning. They would prefer that a schedule be published, that sweeping of residential streets be done in the daytime, and commercial areas be swept at night.

**Neighborhood Improvement Programs**

Community Preservation is a City program designed to improve the health, safety and appearance of Hayward. The Community Preservation and Improvement Ordinance, adopted in 1989, regulates problems associated with weeds, junk, vehicles, graffiti, and other nuisances on private property. Specific violations include:

- Accumulation of dirt, litter or debris;
- Clotheslines (except in rear yard);
- Trash, junk, discarded furniture, shopping carts, etc., stored in yards for an unreasonable period of time;
- Attractive nuisances dangerous to children including abandoned equipment, refrigerators, excavations;
- Overgrown vegetation and other nuisances;
- Graffiti visible from a public street;
- Dismantled or abandoned boats, trailers, vehicles, or parts; or vehicles in areas other than the paved driveway;
- Camper shells visible from a public street; and
- Abandoned buildings or buildings which are unpainted or where exterior paint is mostly worn off.
The Community Preservation program is designed to target neighborhoods for inspection in order to implement the ordinance in a systematic way. The ranking of target neighborhoods is based on a set of criteria including the completion of a neighborhood plan, proximity to previous target areas, coordination of other programs such as the Mandatory Apartment Inspection Program and the Community Development Block Grant program. The Upper “B” Street neighborhood is ranked ninth with start date no sooner than 1996. Community Preservation inspectors dedicate two days per week responding to complaints in areas other than the current target area. Additionally, Community Preservation sponsors Community Service Fairs, Neighborhood Block Clean-up parties as well as offering a variety of educational and assistance programs. The Upper “B” Task Force suggests that the Community Preservation program be expanded so that the Upper “B” area can be targeted sooner than 1996.

The City provides two additional programs to assist property owners/businesses in upgrading their properties:

1. The City Council’s Shopping Center Committee has, in the past, funded design studies to assist owners in upgrading existing shopping centers in Hayward. This program has had little success because there is no mandatory requirement to upgrade, unless the owner is in need of a permit or variance. The cost of design services is usually much less than the cost of improvements, thus there is little economic incentive for owners to participate in the program. There are currently no funds in the Committee’s budget.

2. The Small Business Revolving Loan Fund provides loans to qualified businesses in Hayward. The principal purpose of the program is to enable businesses to create job opportunities for low and moderate income residents. Funds may be used for facade improvements, equipment acquisition, leasehold improvements, working capital, and real estate acquisition/rehabilitation.

*Improvements to “B” Street*

The task force is recommending beautification of the Center-“B“-Kelly intersection through installation of landscaping, street furniture, lighting and signage. In addition there is interest in improving the quality of the streetscape by establishing standards for development along “B” Street for fencing, plantings, signage, parking areas, and lighting. There is specific objection to the disjointed appearance of side yard fencing of properties west of Vermont Plaza.

**Fencing:** Fencing in front yards is currently limited to a height of four feet. This could be reduced to 3 feet. Solid fencing could be prohibited or a particular type of fencing encouraged. Side yard fencing is limited to six feet in residential zones.
Plantings: Front yards requirement for the Commercial Office zone is a minimum of 10 feet. Current design standards stipulate that yard areas be landscaped with trees, shrubs, turf grass, groundcover, or a combination of the above. In commercial areas one street tree is required for each 20-40 lineal foot of frontage.

Signage: The City's Sign Ordinance requires that signs in the Commercial Office district be limited in number and area depending upon the type of business. Current height limits are set at 20 feet and a reduction to 12 feet is now being considered. In addition signs must be set back 10 feet from all property lines. Moving signs, flashing signs, sandwich signs, fluorescent signs, and general advertising signs are prohibited. Further limitations on height, location, and type of sign could be considered.

Parking Areas: The number of off-street parking spaces required varies depending upon the use. For general offices and professional offices, except medical, spaces required are 1 for each 200 sq.ft. of net ground floor area, plus 1 for each 250 square feet of net floor area of offices above or below the ground floor. For medical offices the requirement is 5 per physician or dentist, or 1 per 150 square feet of gross floor area, whichever is greater. Current design standards prohibit parking within front and side street yards. Being that many of the lots fronting on "B" Street are small (5,000 sq.ft.), more flexible parking design could be achieved if adjoining property owners coordinated their development plans.

Lighting: Current design standards pertaining to exterior lighting require the use of a qualified lighting designer and prohibit fixtures that cast light or glare onto adjacent properties or public rights-of-way. More closely spaced, lower level lighting might be considered, or the fixtures might be restricted to vintage styles.

Site Plan Review approval is required for any building or construction permit or fence in the Commercial Office (CO) district.

Undergrounding Utilities

The Department of Public Works is responsible for working with Pacific Gas and Electric, as well as other utilities, to underground overhead facilities. Funds for undergrounding, known as “Rule 20” funds, are obtained for PG&E according to a yearly allocation system. Money for undergrounding in Hayward currently accumulates at $450,000 per year. The yearly allocation is adjusted after each five-year cycle. PG&E Rule 20 funds can be used to replace existing overhead distribution facilities with underground facilities along public streets provided that the undergrounding is in the general public interest for one or more of the following reasons:

1) Such undergrounding will avoid or eliminate an unusually heavy concentration of overhead distribution facilities;

2) Said street is extensively used by the general public and carries a heavy volume of pedestrian or vehicular traffic;

3) Said street adjoins or passes through a civic area, public recreation area or an area of unusual scenic interest to the general public.
Priorities of the expenditure of Rule 20 monies are established by the City Council and have concentrated on the Downtown area of Hayward and on major arterial streets leading to Downtown. Priorities can be adjusted to maximize the benefit which can be realized when undergrounding is done in conjunction with major street improvement projects. Recent City priorities for the use of available funds were Foothill Boulevard (between Hazel Avenue and the northerly City limits), "D" Street (between Grand Street and Second Street) and West "A" Street (between Interstate 880 and Hesperian Boulevard). These projects used up the available funds through 1990-91. No streets in the Upper "B" area are currently on the priority list.

There are 14 undergrounding projects on the unfunded list. These are concentrated in the downtown area and on major collector and arterial streets, including "B" Street between Foothill Boulevard and Second Street. "B" Street between Second Street and Kelly Street could be added to the unfunded list.

Since 1978 all new subdivisions in Hayward have been required to install on-site electric, telephone and cable TV lines underground. In recognition that the aesthetic aspects of development affect the quality of life for residents, some cities require all new development, as well as redevelopment projects, to underground on-site utilities and utilities in the adjacent public right-of-way. To improve the effectiveness of this program and to make it as equitable as possible, a fee program can be established whereby, as an alternative to actual undergrounding, development projects are conditioned to pay in-lieu fees for the undergrounding of utilities.

**Historic Preservation**

The economic feasibility of preservation has changed as appreciation of earlier architectural styles and historical roots has grown. Many cities have discovered that restored districts have attracted residents and businesses away from suburban tracts. The concept of preservation has been expanded beyond the retention of a few choice buildings to conservation of whole districts in recognition of their viability. Preservation has also become more economic because there tends to be less delay in initiating projects than with new construction. Also occupancy can begin as space is completed, and cost of new construction has risen faster than renovation costs.

Preservation efforts need to be coordinated with land use policies; if zoning allows much more intense development than exists, preservation may be made uneconomic because of speculative land values. Where land is to be redeveloped, architecturally interesting buildings could be moved to fill in historic districts. Preserving existing significant buildings in the Upper "B" Street area can enhance the City's image.

The historic preservation ordinance adopted by City Council provides for the designation of historic structures, sites, or districts. Once designated, special review of alterations, additions, new development and demolition permits is required. While designation cannot preclude demolition, it can forestall demolition while other options are explored. In addition, designation of a structure or district allows the City Building Official to utilize the State Historic Building Code to enable more flexible standards for historic buildings. Review of alterations can ensure that proposed changes do not detract from the character of the designated district or structure.
Designation of historic structures, sites, or districts may be initiated by filing a request with the Planning Director. This application is referred to the Planning Commission for its consideration. The Planning Commission reviews the request and makes a determination based upon a set of criteria for evaluating the proposed structure, site, or district. Structures should be an example of a period, style, architectural movement or method of construction, or associated with a well-recognized architect or citizen who contributed to the development of the City. The City Council to-date has designated ten buildings as historic structures, two of which are in the Upper “B” area.

An historic district must be found to contain a significant concentration or number of buildings or sites unified by either past events or aesthetically unified by plan or physical development. The Upper “B” Street Task Force recognizes that a portion of the Upper “B” Street neighborhood has an historic character which contributes to the local heritage and significantly enhances the community’s image. This plan proposes that an historic district be established within the boundary on the Proposed Historic District map to recognize and preserve remnants of Hayward’s beginnings.

Lands in the western portion of the Upper “B” Street study area are reflective of town development by Hayward’s first American pioneers. This part of Hayward became settled at the decline of the Spanish rancho cattle grazing era in California’s history, and at the onset of Yankee occupation of the Bay Area. The western portion of the study area is in easy walking distance to the old City Hall, the site of Don Guillermo Castro’s adobe. This marked the operations center for the Rancho San Lorenzo and was the point from which the town of Hayward emerged in the Gold Rush years. Castro’s first town plan drawn in 1856 reflected the grid of streets and blocks for the area between Atherton and Main, from Jackson to Washington streets. An 1864 addition to this plan laid out the twelve blocks extending to the east, from Main to Fourth, and “A” to “D” street. Some of these neighborhood streets trace the paths of early trails which grew into roads as a part of a regional network. “A” Street, for example, was the route connecting Hayward’s landing to Castro Valley and Livermore. “B” Street, previously called Dublin Road, was also used for travel to the Livermore area. “D” Street led to the Lone Tree Cemetery and was once called Cemetery Road. (See maps.)

The 1870’s was a time of population expansion for the small town of Hayward, including an influx of Portuguese settlers who bought acreage for farming and also established a community on town lots clustered around All Saints Church. At the time of Hayward’s incorporation (1876) the population was approximately 1,000. Streets were laid out to east of Fourth Street, and there was an established business district in the downtown area. By the turn of the century most of the area west of Fifth Street between “A” and “D” was built up, residences and small farms trailed up “B”, “D” and “E” streets, and as shown on the map of tract dates, small subdivisions were taking shape on surrounding lands.

It is unfortunate that much of this old Hayward no longer exists. Many buildings have been lost to fire and earthquake damage, general decay and replacement. However, within the Upper “B” study area there is a collection of buildings, some over 100 years old, which were built and occupied by early, prominent residents and founders of the community, and which are characteristic of particular building styles that are no longer used in modern construction.
This map is an extension of the one Don Guillermo Castro laid out in his first subdivision of the downtown area of Hayward in 1856.
While candidates for preservation exist throughout the study area, the most significant concentration exists in those blocks that were subdivided prior to 1900, generally west of Fifth Street. The proposed boundary is based upon a number of factors:

- Extent of subdivision of town lots by 1900, as portrayed by historic maps and tracts;
- Location and concentration of historic buildings (estimated to have been constructed prior to 1925);
- Visibility of historic buildings within the community;
- Compatibility of non-historic buildings.

Of approximately 200 buildings in the proposed historic district (60) are identified as historic. Non-historic buildings in the district are, for the most part, one and two-story dwellings. Their similarity in scale and placement on the lot contributes to their compatibility with the historic buildings.

With the understanding that stylistic mixtures are common in American domestic architecture, buildings that set the historic context for the proposed district fall into the following styles:

- Styles that reflect the Victorian era (1860-1900) including Queen Anne, Italianate, Eastlake.
- Classic Box (1890-1910) emanating from turn of the century Colonial Revivalism
- Craftsman and California Bungalows (1905-1925)
- Early 20th century Mission and Spanish Eclectic
A short description of some of the notable buildings in the district are as follows:

**All Saints Church, 22824 Second Street**
Built in 1909-10, replacing an earlier structure which was the first Catholic parish church in Hayward. It is a lavish Spanish baroque style cathedral with bell towers and molded details above the entrance. The interior has massive wooden columns painted to resemble marble, and a Renaissance-style vaulted, arched ceiling. On its 75th anniversary in 1984, earthquake reinforcements and other renovations were done to the Church. All Saints is identified in the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Rt. 238 bypass as a building that appears to meet the Criteria of Eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places. All Saints presents a striking image that can be seen from many parts of the City. The task force recommends that views of the church be preserved.

**The Laurel District School, 22651 Third Street.**
Currently on the City's list of historic structures. Built in 1853, this was the first one-room school and meeting house in the Hayward area. During the past 138 years it has been used as a school, firehouse, church, meeting hall and residence.

**1325 “B” Street.**
Currently on the City's list of historic structures, this residential building is a well preserved example of a Queen Anne Victorian dating from 1892. It was the boyhood home of Harry Bradford, founder and curator of the Hayward Historical Society. Its current use is as a law office.

**22588 Chestnut Street.**
Queen Anne cottage built around 1885. This example has an L-shape plan, decorative shingles, and a round tower with a conical roof. The Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Rt. 238 bypass identified this building among those eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places.

**1329 “D” Street.**
A one and a half story building with a cross gabled roof built in the 1850's or early 1860's. This building was moved from the east side of Main Street, south of “B” Street, when the Green Shutter Hotel expanded in the 1920's. According to the Draft EIS for the Rt. 238 bypass, this building also meets the criteria for the National Register of Historic Places.

The Rt. 238 bypass properties bisect the proposed historic district. If built, the freeway will require the removal of three properties that have been determined to be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. While property owned or proposed for acquisition by a public agency are exempt from the provisions of the City's Historic Preservation Ordinance, the task force is recommending that, should the freeway not be built, right-of-way properties be incorporated into the historic district.
Outside the proposed historic district are buildings that should also be considered for designation as historic structures on an individual basis. Many of these buildings have been identified as worth saving by the Hayward Area Historical Society. Addresses are provided below:

1328 "A" St.  
1302 "B" St.  
1344 "B" St.  
1376-80 "B" St.  
1641 "B" St.  
1808 "B" St.  
1814 "B" St.  
1628 "C" St.  
1662 "C" St.  
1415 "D" St.  
1439-41-43 "D" St.  
1520 "D" St.  
1521 "D" St.  
1535 "D" St.  
1608 "D" St.  
1616 "D" St.  
1624 "D" St.  
1631 "D" St.  
1644 "D" St.  
1654 "D" St.  
1660 "D" St.  
22827 High St.  
22836 High St.  
1261 Terrace St.  
1263 Terrace St.  
1307 Terrace St.  
1310 Terrace St.  
22770-72 Templeton St.  
1805 Hill Ave.  
1809 Hill Ave.  
22516 Linden St.  
22574 Pearl St.

The Upper "B" Street Task Force supports the establishment of an historic district to preserve existing historic structures in the neighborhood and to ensure compatible new development. Task force members are concerned about the loss of historic structures in other parts of the City as well, and recommend that the City, 1) develop a policy for relocation of threatened historic structures, and 2) develop a means for acquiring land on which to relocate historic structures.
At the initial neighborhood meeting residents voiced a need for better police protection, particularly for quicker response to calls, for better enforcement of traffic laws, and for policing that is more community oriented. Problems cited include drug dealing at Vermont Plaza, public drinking, speeding on “B” and “D” streets, and problems associated with transients. Street lighting inadequacies and malfunctioning storm drains were also identified at the initial and middle neighborhood meetings.

Police Services
There were a total of 2,375 high priority calls for service (6.5 per day) from Upper "B" area residents during 1991. High priority calls (classified 1,2, or 3) are incidents that require immediate response. These priorities are assigned to violence or criminal activity in progress.

Hayward Police response time for high priority calls in the Upper "B" area is 3.1 minutes after the call is received. Emergencies continue to be a priority, however traditional attempts at rapid response to all calls for service has been re-evaluated. Police will manage calls differently and refocus upon solving long-term problems through partnerships with citizens.

Crime statistics for census areas generally covering the Upper “B” study area are compared with citywide statistics in Crime Statistics Table. Over the past decade Hayward has experienced an increase in crime, drugs, gangs, and other social disorders that decrease the quality of life in the City. On July 1, 1991, the Police Department implemented a five-year plan called Community Oriented Policing and Problem Solving (COPPS) in an effort to address these quality of life issues. COPPS is a philosophy, management style and organizational strategy that shifts emphasis and focus from random incident handling to problem solving in a community setting. The City has been divided into three areas and the Police Department has been reorganized to facilitate community problem solving. The Upper "B" Street area falls into Area 1. Police staff in command of Area 1 are responsible for developing and implementing custom problem solving strategies to serve the demands of individual neighborhoods.

In addition to law enforcement, the Hayward Police Department takes an active role in crime prevention. Officers are assigned to high schools, educational programs are provided at elementary schools, and professional counselors are available. This spring the Police Department will be overhauling a landlord education program. This new landlord training effort will be patterned after an innovative program developed by Campbell Resources, Inc. for the city of Portland, Oregon. Hayward’s program will provide landlords, property owners and managers, with information on how to combat drug activity and help enhance tenants’ safety. The course will cover tenant screening, rental agreements, management techniques, signs of drug activity, eviction, role of the police, and applicable laws and local resources. The Hayward Police Department is also planning a self-help academy to teach citizens of Hayward the role of the police and how to protect their property from crime.
# Crime Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Upper &quot;B&quot; Street Neighborhood</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>City-Wide</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rape</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Robbery</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-37%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Burglary:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>+10.1%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-8.4%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aggravated Assault</strong></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Simple Assault</strong></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>+19%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>1,212</td>
<td>1,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Auto Theft</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>+83.3%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disturbance Calls</strong></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>+11%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Malicious Mischief</strong></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>+29%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>1,135</td>
<td>1,478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ARRESTS:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Felony Drug</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-20%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Misdemeanor Drug</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-14.3%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>501</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Police Department encourages citizen participation through the Neighborhood Watch Program. Staff from the Police Department work with neighborhood groups to organize each block. Once a group is established, the Police Department publishes a neighborhood bulletin and holds monthly meetings for all the group leaders. This program has been shown to be very effective in reducing crime where there is active participation. The Upper “B” Street area currently has four active Neighborhood Watch groups.

Residents and Task Force members are very concerned about drug dealing and other crimes associated with Vermont Plaza and neighboring apartment buildings. In the past, police have had some success in eradicating problem drinking establishments by working with liquor licensing agents. However, the process is very time consuming and a serious crime pattern must be well documented for licenses to be revoked. The Police Department is implementing a new “Safe Streets Program” in which law suits through Small Claims Court serve as another approach to addressing businesses or properties with chronic crime problems.

In addition to Neighborhood Watch activities and crime prevention programs, the Police Department identifies other strategies for improving public safety, as follows:

- Formation of Community Advisory Group for Area 1;
- Implementation of Computer Assisted Dispatch and Records Management System, and Crime Analysis upgrades;
- Networking with other City departments and social service agencies;
- Formulation of “Drug Free Zones”;
- Implementing problem solving strategies which encourage citizen and police partnerships.

The Upper “B” Task Force is very interested in working with the Police Department to use and develop innovative programs to reduce criminal activity in the neighborhood.

**Street Lighting**

Inadequate lighting was listed as a safety concern at neighborhood meetings. General locations include Markham School (see Public School section), and along “B” Street. While other general locations were mentioned, there was also the opinion that some street lighting is too bright. The Upper “B” Task Force supports improved lighting near Markham and in commercial areas, and recommends regular review of lighting adequacy throughout the neighborhood.

The City of Hayward purchases electricity from Pacific Gas and Electric Company. It costs approximately $950,000 per year to light up the Hayward’s streets. In new subdivisions the installation of street lights is considered a street improvement to be paid for by the developer. Current City standards require steel poles and a higher level of illumination than in the past. Costs for a new street light can vary between $1,500 to over $3,000.

The Department of Public Works responds to complaints of inadequate street lighting in
established areas of the City. On request by the City, PG&E will provide additional street lighting free of installation charge, provided there is an existing wooden pole at the location and there are no technical problems with the installation. The amount of illumination is geared to neighborhood preference. The current City budget specifies over 100 lights per year to be installed on existing wooden poles. While there is no installation charge for lighting on existing wooden poles, PG&E will charge the City for removal of a street light. To avoid removals due to resident complaints the Department of Public Works requests a petition for street light installation from adjoining property owners.

Malfunctioning street lights can be reported to PG&E directly.

**Storm Drains**
Several problem storm drains were identified by task force members and at the middle neighborhood meeting. The Streets Maintenance Division made repairs at three of the sites in response to task force concerns.

The Street Maintenance Division is responsible for servicing the 2,130 storm water drains in Hayward. An annual maintenance of all drains occurs in the month of September, when there is likely to be the largest accumulation of leaves. In addition, storm drains are continuously surveyed, particularly in the winter months, and are cleaned out as needed. It is estimated that each drain is cleaned almost twice per year. Service calls for drain maintenance are handled immediately.

**Fire Services**
There are currently six fire stations and ten fire companies serving the City of Hayward. An additional fire station is planned for the Tennyson-Alquire neighborhood. Fire companies are of two basic types, engine companies which are responsible for supplying water and extinguishing the fire, and truck companies which are responsible for providing the equipment to make forcible entries, ventilating roof areas to release combustible smoke and heated gases, and providing ladders to personnel to conduct search and rescue operations.

The Upper “B” Street study area is served by Fire Station #1, located on the corner of “C” and Main streets, which has two engine companies and one truck company. Additionally, one truck company from Fire Station #6 (located on Winton Avenue) and one engine company from Fire Station #2 (located on Harder Road) automatically serve the area as support apparatus for fires larger than single-family residences. Adequate services and facilities are available to serve the Upper "B" area.

Response times are monitored by the Fire Department as an indicator of the level of services provided. The response time standard is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emergency Medical Service Response</th>
<th>Five minutes from receipt of call for first due Engine Company (90%).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fire/Other</td>
<td>A. Five minutes from receipt of call for first due Engine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Seven minutes from receipt of call for first due Ladder Company.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Ten minutes from receipt of call for balance of first alarm assignment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The western most portion of the planning area (Kelly and associated side streets) lay outside the standard. The Fire Department is currently negotiating a contract for service to the Fairview Fire Protection District that will correct this deficiency. A Hayward Fire Company will actually provide service to the Fairview area out of their fire station.
The remainder of the Upper "B" study area is within the acceptable performance standards.

Water for extinguishing fires is supplied, for the most part, by the City of Hayward. The City's water system extends as far east as Kelly St. at Wildwood St. and has adequate pressure at 80-85 lbs. Water in the Kelly Hill area is supplied by the EBMUD system which is currently operating at a lower pressure of 40 lbs. If needed in the event of an emergency, the EBMUD and Hayward water systems can be inter-tied to provide adequate water pressure in the Kelly Hill area.

Hazardous material usage is monitored by the Fire Department. Inspections are made of facilities handling hazardous materials to check storage conditions, safety mechanisms, and travel routes. Records show no properties within the Upper "B" area handling acutely hazardous materials. However, a significant amount of battery acid is stored in batteries nearby at the Pacific Bell facility, located at 1129 "B" Street.

The Fire Department is also responsible for the organization and administration of the City's Emergency Preparedness Program. This program establishes a plan of action in the event of any major emergency, such as floods, earthquakes, or hazardous materials spills. The Emergency Preparedness Program has two functions: first, to prepare and organize the City's administrative staff to take over in emergency functions of the city in event of a disaster; and second, to educate and inform the public, about disaster preparedness for individuals and business. As professional help will not be able to act effectively. The disaster education preparedness program holds workshops and seminars to teach people how to prepare for a major disaster and what to do during and after the disaster. This program is available to any group of interested persons.

Earthquake Hazard
The active Hayward Fault Zone lies approximately 1,000 feet west of the western edge of the Upper "B" study area. Most of the active fault zone is characterized by essentially continuous creep behavior, in which the earth materials lying on either side of the fault zone move slowly past one another, on the order of a few centimeters per year. This type of behavior has no known impact on the study area because all known active traces of the fault zone lie to the west. However, the fault zone is also subject to both large and small magnitude earthquakes, in which a sudden release of significant energy may occur, sometimes accompanied by rupture of the fault zone trace. Inactive fault traces within the Upper "B" area include the East and West Chabot Fault traces which are generally located along Sixth Street and Third Street respectively. Though inactive, these fault traces are planes of weakness within the earth's crust and may be subject to movement during earthquakes.
Ground shaking associated with a major earthquake would most likely constitute the principal geologic hazard in the study area. The ground shaking that accompanies a large magnitude earthquake has the potential to cause significant damage in areas that are some distance from the main fault trace. Factors that affect the degree of ground shaking in a particular area principally include: earthquake magnitude, soil type, depth to bedrock, and location relative to the earthquake epicenter.

Damage during an earthquake would be dependent on type of building construction. Most residences in the Upper "B" Street area are the relatively safe, wood frame structures. However, many of these were built before seismic design standards were introduced in 1943. In a large earthquake there is a greater potential for damage to older homes that have not been bolted to their foundations. In older neighborhoods extinguishing fires after an earthquake may be hampered by brittle, cast iron water mains. In such areas widespread damage would result not only in a loss of housing, but also a loss of historic character. Structures which are potentially the most hazardous are unreinforced masonry buildings and concrete tilt-ups built prior to 1973. The City requires that buildings of unreinforced masonry construction built prior to 1944 be seismically retrofitted to comply structurally with the 1973 State Uniform Building Code. As this regulation does not apply to single-family dwellings, there are no such buildings located in the Upper "B" area. All Saints Church was retrofitted for seismic safety in 1984.