

**BALBOA RESERVOIR COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

**DOCUMENTS RECEIVED FROM
PUBLIC DURING
10/19/15 REGULAR MEETING**

AND

**EMAILS RECEIVED FROM
PUBLIC VIA BRCAC@SFGOV.ORG**

Period: 10/01/15 – 10/29/15

**BALBOA RESERVOIR COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

**DOCUMENTS RECEIVED FROM
PUBLIC DURING
10/19/15 REGULAR MEETING**

**Lick Wilmerding High School, Cafeteria
755 Ocean Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94112**

Monday, October 19, 2015

6:30 PM

Regular Meeting

Public Realm Principles - Comments from Sunnyside Neighborhood Association

The SNA Balboa Reservoir Committee's comments are based on a survey SNA conducted of Sunnyside residents, input at SNA meetings, and committee discussion. The Sunnyside neighborhood has 2200 households.

Principle 1

Parameter a: Create a publicly accessible open space network of at least 4 acres - Given the size of the property, the scale of the proposed development, the expressed desires of Sunnyside for open space for multiple uses, and current use of the property by neighbors and students as open space for recreation and other uses, the Sunnyside Neighborhood Association finds the 4-acre size inadequate and supports a specific goal of exceeding that size by at least 1.5 acres (5.5 acres total), rather than simply "aiming to exceed the minimum".

SNA supports safe pedestrian walking routes and the concept of linear parks. We ask the Planning Department to provide much more specific information regarding its definition of "open space" in terms of what sort of open space apart from a contiguous park, off-street walking routes, or linear parks. We are concerned that there be real, usable open space for the activities for which our residents currently enjoy the Balboa Reservoir, not just walking paths.

Parameter b: The Sunnyside Neighborhood Association strongly supports designating a significant contiguous open space for a park. The 1.5 acres specified in this parameter for a park is inadequate for the same reasons cited in Parameter a.

SNA recognizes that open space is not necessarily green space. We recognize the importance, for example, of making parking available particularly for students who work and may be unable to use public transit. We also encourage creativity in making multiple use of space throughout the day. The same space can provide parking for students during the day and residents at night.

Parameter e: If this buffer is not open space usable by residents, it must not be included in the calculation of site total open space, i.e., the 4 acres now cited.

Parameter f: The Sunnyside neighborhood, directly to the northeast of the reservoir property, must be specified in this parameter in addition to the Westwood Park neighborhood in regard to the need to recognize the privacy and scale of adjacent uses.

Parameter h: SNA does not support prioritizing views of the CCSF Science Hall if this is any way will be used to promote or justify building height limits in excess of current zoning.

Principle 2

SNA asks Planning to specify who are "CCSF affiliates": students, faculty, staff?

SNA supports design to incorporate linear spaces and otherwise moderate building scale, both of which are in keeping with the character of existing neighborhood surrounding the site.

Re: Affordable Housing 04.19th.2015

Westwood Park Association Balboa Reservoir Subcommittee – Working Meeting
Agenda and Notes:

Date: September 17, 2015

Time: 6:30 to 8:00 pm

Attendees: Kishan Balgobin, Laura Frey, Linda Judge, Francine Lofrano, Fred Lofrano

Agenda:

I. Debrief on September 14th CAC meeting and related September 4th draft parameters specific to Housing:

a. What worked, what didn't:

1. CAC & others to request that the City provides change logs each time they update the website with modified or revised information so the public can clearly understand what documents or information has changed.
2. WP Community requests that the meeting location be posted at least a week in advance of the meeting time.
3. Recommend CAC and City Staff agree to table what is not finished to the following meeting (i.e., not set up a special mid-month meeting). It is difficult for the interested public to change their schedule to attend multiple meetings in one month.
4. Meetings to end at the agreed upon time. If all topics are not covered, respectfully request that they push to the next meeting. The first meeting felt like it was very rushed towards the end.
5. Be respectful of major religious holidays when scheduling.

b. Were any WP community, or individual comments/concerns missed or not addressed, that need to be included as public comments, either by sending to Kate, to the BRCAC govt. e-mail, or, to be read at the next CAC meeting?

1. WP Community indicates 33% affordable is the ideal maximum for the site, with the highest % for moderate income levels, as presented by City staff in the first community meeting (January 21st).
2. Crime is a concern with increased transitory populations.
3. WPA Community strongly supports homeownership at the site.
4. WPA strongly supports that the new neighborhood have the same sense of cohesiveness that WPA has; specifically, benefits of limited through traffic (Supports Neighborhood character for both WPA and new neighborhood).

c. Affordable housing: is there anything that was left unsaid that needs to be put on record? See above (b) 1 comments. Also see comments below on specifics.

Excerpt from September 4th Memo related to CAC parameters specific to Housing:

Principle #1: Build new housing for people at a range of income levels.

Draft Parameters:

a. Make at ~~least~~ **maximum** 33% of total housing units permanently affordable to low or moderate -income households. (Note: This is consistent with Proposition K (2014), which is described above.)

1. Make **at least** 15% of total housing units affordable to low-income households (earning up to 55% of Area Median Income (AMI)).

2. Make **an additional the remaining** 18% **(or more)** of total housing units affordable to low-or middle-income households (earning up to 120% of AMI).

Note: Since the most underserved group is the middle income household, they should have the larger percentage of the housing allocation.

~~b. Maximize the number of affordable units for low (55% of AMI), moderate (120% of AMI), and middle-income (earning up to 150% of AMI) households; aim to include at least 50% of housing affordable to low, moderate, and middle-income households.—~~

Note: This is not acceptable to Westwood Park community

c. Produce sufficient market rate housing to cover costs, provide an economic return to the SFPUC ratepayers, and ensure project feasibility.

Principle #2: Create housing that can serve a diverse group of household types.

Draft Parameters:

a. Maximize the proportion of affordable housing that is provided on-site (as opposed to off-site or through paying an in-lieu fee).

b. Design a substantial proportion of housing units, common spaces within residential buildings, and public amenities to be suitable for families with children.

c. Indicate how family-friendly units will be made accessible to households at a range of incomes.

d. Consider partnering with City College and/or area schools to allocate on-site units to **house students**, faculty, and/or staff.

Principle #3: Help to alleviate City's undersupply of housing.

Draft Parameters:

a. Within the confines of other relevant parameters (e.g. **Principle 1(a)**, neighborhood character, open space, transportation), and subject to the desired unit sizes and family- oriented units cited above, maximize the amount of new housing created to address the current and projected affordability challenges faced by the neighborhood and the City **as proposed and outlined by the 2009 Balboa Park Station area plan.**

b. **Create** ~~Maximize the pace of~~ housing **creation** without compromising the quality of design or construction or outpacing needed transportation infrastructure.

General Westwood Park Community Comments:**WPA Community Comment:**

We appreciate the proposed parameters provided by the City, and support the voter approved Prop K. mandate. We further appreciate the Public Land for Housing Program's focus on our neighborhood site, as well as three other study sites including the Upper Yard located at Geneva and San Jose, the 4th and Folsom site, and 1950 Mission. At this early juncture, the community wishes to remind the city, reconfirm and restate the results and input from the greater San Francisco community on the City sponsored online survey. The top five choices, as listed in the Public Workshop #2 from May 5th, 2015 are:

1. Large open spaces for multiple uses (24%)
2. Affordable housing for all incomes (13%)
3. Neighborhood character and integrity (12%)
4. Large open spaces for programmed uses (6%)
5. Paths, walkways or routes to go on walks (6%)

Further, the Westwood Park Association residents would like to restate and confirm the top 5 choices of their neighborhood specific survey, which asked the same questions as the city sponsored survey. The top 5 choices of the 113 WPA residents who responded were:

1. Retaining neighborhood character and integrity (30.09%)
2. Large open spaces for multiple uses (25.66)
3. Large open space for programmed use (14.16%)
4. Affordable housing for all incomes (13.27)
5. Housing for local workforce / Paths walkways, or routes to go on walks (11.80% and 11.50%)

Finally, we appreciate and support Objective 5.2, Policy 5.2.1 of the Balboa Park Station Plan:

Policy 5.2.1**Require good quality public open space as part of major new developments**

As more people live in the neighborhood, greater pressure is placed on existing open spaces. Major new developments in the plan area should assist in meeting the demand that they create for open space. These developments should be required to provide publicly accessible open space in a quantity directly proportional to the size of the development or to the lot size, whichever is greater.

Public Realm Parameters Memo to Members of the Balboa Reservoir CAC - 10/8/15 3 of 6 PROPOSED PUBLIC REALM PRINCIPLES AND PARAMETERS

Principle #1: *Develop a cohesive public realm (network of streets and open spaces) which provides a range of programmed and unprogrammed spaces for functional, recreational and social activities. Public spaces should be visible and activated from adjacent streets and uses; connect gathering places, destinations and residences on the site and beyond; and provide a sense of identity unique to the neighborhood.*

Draft Parameters

- a. Create a publicly-accessible open space network, totaling at least **4.5 to 7** acres, including off-street walking routes or linear parks, and privately owned public open space (POPOS) but excluding streets. Aim to exceed this minimum requirement.

Westwood Park Community Comments: The Westwood Park community feels strongly that a minimum of **5 to 7 acres of parks and open space should be included.**

- b. Create one significant open space to serve as a park for the site and neighborhoods beyond the Balboa Reservoir (aka Balboa Public Site). Include a mix of programmed and unprogrammed spaces based on community input and neighborhood need. Rather than creating a large void, the park should be varied in design and uses, be scaled appropriately with the pattern of blocks and buildings, and create a sense of shared neighborhood identity. This **contiguous continuous significant** open space **(which may be intersected only by pedestrian pathways)** (which may extend multiple blocks if intersected by shared public ways or pedestrian priority streets), should be at least **2 acres** and would constitute a portion of the minimum **4.5 to 7** acres of open space referenced in Section 2.a. This park will be designed with the community in a public process.

1.5

Westwood Park Community Comments: Please note, the Westwood Park specific survey as well as the City Planning Survey both favored the need of large open spaces.

c. Consider the childcare facility that may be built on-site and its needs for open space.

d. Create a walking route or network of walking routes which facilitates walking for recreational purposes, minimizing street crossings and connecting or defining on-site open spaces. Pedestrian networks should connect to surrounding networks of streets, paths and open spaces **while minimizing the impact on the adjacent Westwood Park neighborhood.**

e. Create a buffer zone or open space along the southern end of the Balboa Public Site, an area which cannot accommodate new structures since it contains existing SFPUC underground water transmission pipelines.

f. Respect the privacy and scale of adjacent uses, especially Westwood Park neighbors to the west with appropriate public space design, landscape, topography **and** walking routes to serve as a buffer or ~~transition~~ from the new buildings on the Balboa Public Site.

g. Build in enough flexibility to the open space network to allow for it to evolve with changing neighborhood needs, incorporating successive layers of programming, public art, and community stewardship over time.

Westwood Park Community Comments: In order to preserve the open space in perpetuity, any open space buffer zone between the new development and the Westwood Park neighborhood, as well as the large open space defined in Principal 1(b), should be deeded to San Francisco Recreation and Park Department, or otherwise legally protected from any future development.

h. Prioritize views of Mt Davidson, Mt Bruno and the main entrance to the CCSF Science Hall **without impeding the views of residents in the surrounding neighborhoods.**

i. Emphasize the special nature of the area through distinctive landscaping and other features that complement and respect adjacent neighborhoods **and Bishop Riordan High School.**

Principle #2: Design the public realm as a useful, safe and welcoming part of daily experience for diverse neighbors of all ages, visitors to the site, and CCSF affiliates.

Draft Parameters:

- a. Create public and common open spaces that are active, well defined by landscape features, streets or walking routes, active pedestrian entries to adjacent buildings, and adjacent building massing.
- b. Design the landscape and buildings so that they complement each other in support of site-wide design public realm and urban design goals (see urban design section).
- c. Incorporate linear spaces, smaller common areas, courtyards ~~or mid-block alleys into the site and buildings to moderate building scale, provide intimate spaces~~ and diversify activities in the public realm. Wherever possible, pair spaces with complementary adjacent land uses to help activate the public realm, for example small plazas near natural gathering places, playgrounds near daycare etc.

Westwood Park Community Comments: Please provide the community with the definition and examples of "linear spaces" and "intimate spaces". The contextual meaning of the phrase "...and buildings to moderate scale" is unclear. Please provide examples and additional information to help the community understand.

- d. Avoid corner public areas, fore courts and other designs that are ultimately passed through or observed from outside rather than serving a necessary, recreational or social purpose.
- e. Propose a gradual transformation of the site, maintaining access to usable open space throughout all construction phases to allow people to experiment with new ways of using the site, and to give the community time to adapt to the physical changes of the site. For example, create a nursery for trees to mature on-site in advance of future site construction **with careful consideration of any site changes on the neighboring 98-year-old foundations, as well as displacement of wildlife.**

Principle #3: Incorporate the different needs and hours of activity for diverse users in the area.

Draft Parameters:

- a. Ensure **safe** opportunities for people of all ages, including students, seniors and families, to utilize the public realm.
- b. Design for sight lines between caregivers and open spaces or adjacent uses such as daycare, family residential units or other ground-floor uses. Buildings with family units should maximize the number of units overlooking play areas.
- c. Locate gathering places at natural confluences of pedestrian activity, walking routes, and public life **and away from the private Westwood Park backyards.**

Principle #4: Privately-owned public open spaces (POPOS) should read as part of an overall, coordinated pattern of open space. Recognize that per City policy, buildings will be required to provide a minimum 80 square feet of private open space per unit or 60 square feet of public open space per unit (above and beyond the public open space requirements above).

Westwood Park Community Comments: Please define how POPOS in Principal #1 is different from POPOS in Principal #4. The requirement in Principal #4 appears to suggest that the 80 sq.ft. or 60 sq.ft. will be in addition to the open space described in Principal #1, please confirm.

Although detailed building design will occur following the selection of a master developer, the following parameters should guide RFP respondents' general site planning vision, as applicable.

Draft Parameters:

- a. Maximize the percentage of private open space at ground level.

Westwood Park Community Comments: Could the City please clarify what the definition of "ground level" is for this site, given the existing elevation slopes?

- b. Connect courtyards and/or mid-block alleys wherever possible.

Westwood Park Community Comments: The community would like to be provided with examples within San Francisco where alleys have been successfully implemented in recent new or reconfigured developments, and where safety is prioritized and enforced. The WP Community prefers that alleys are well lit and safe, and that alleys are not considered as part of the proposed developments' total open space.

- c. Private open spaces should be intimate and inviting. They should maximize green space, programmable spaces and visibility from residential units.

Westwood Park Community Comments: WP assumes if Principal 4(c) is specific to POPOS within new buildings on the site, then WP does not have any comments.

- d. Consider including residential building(s) with a shared open space designed for children and families, with play equipment and good visibility from larger, family-sized units.

Principle #5: Design a variety of open spaces within the public realm network to create a variety of sensory experiences, incorporating the surrounding natural and/or cultural environment into the siting and design.

Draft Parameters:

- a. If open space includes grade changes, use topography as a means of adding variation or creating a series of intimate spaces, without limiting visibility or accessibility.

- b. Maximize sun exposure in public spaces without impacting sun exposure to surrounding neighborhoods.

- c. Design open space areas that are protected from westerly winds.

- d. Integrate stormwater management features, such as bioretention planters and green roofs, into the public realm.

- e. Use drought tolerant species that will minimize the need for irrigation.

Principle #6: All public rights of way should be attractive, safe and useable public open spaces with generous landscaping, lighting and greenery as appropriate to the scale and use of buildings and the site. Street design should be built to standards established in Better Streets Plan.

(See Better Streets Policy. This section addresses street design only; pedestrian, transit, bicycle and auto activity are discussed in the transportation section.)

Draft Parameters:

a. Design new streets ~~and alleys~~ as public spaces which create intimate, safe pedestrian environments, while encouraging social interactions between diverse users from the site, adjacent neighborhoods and CCSF. Use shared streets/public ways ~~and living alleys~~ where appropriate.

b. Street and sidewalk designs should be consistent with Better Streets Plan and other applicable standards, such as utility separation requirements. Streets will generally fall under neighborhood commercial, neighborhood residential, park edge, alley or shared public way Better Streets Plan types.

Westwood Park Community Comments: The community would like to understand where “neighborhood commercial” will be placed.

Principle #7: Plan and design in coordination with a long-term, sustainable maintenance plan and community-serving programming.

Draft Parameters:

a. Describe what types of recreational uses are intended for the various public parks and open spaces included in the proposal.

b. Describe how parks and open spaces will be managed or programmed to promote safe and active use and enjoyment **and who will be accountable on a day-to-day and long-term basis.** Include a funding proposal to support these management and programming activities.

c. Plan proposed park and open spaces with an eye toward efficient maintenance and management, including establishment of funding sources to support such operations.

d. Integrate educational or cultural opportunities into the public realm and adjacent community spaces, including funding sources to support such operations; work with community partners on this effort is necessary.

**BALBOA RESERVOIR COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE
CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

**EMAILS RECEIVED FROM
PUBLIC VIA BRCAC@SFGOV.ORG**

Period: 10/01/15 – 10/29/15

Wong, Phillip (ECN)

From: gumbo1368 <gumbo1368@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 01, 2015 2:29 PM
To: Shaw, Jeremy (CPC); BRCAC (ECN); wpa.balboa.reservoir@sonic.net; Wong, Phillip
Cc: Linda Judge
Subject: Re: Balboa Reservoir Development - Community Advisory Committee - Comment re Impact of Requirements

Thanks a lot Jeremy - this helps a lot.

Will the RFP be available to the public for comment before it is issued? The reason I ask is that I know some departments issue the RFP in draft FIRST, allow people to ask questions, make sure the RFP is clear as to the proposals sought. THEN, issue the RFP in "final" form.

Thanks again,

Adrienne

From: "Shaw, Jeremy (CPC)" <jeremy.shaw@sfgov.org>
To: BRCAC (ECN) <brcac@sfgov.org>; gumbo1368 <gumbo1368@yahoo.com>; "wpa.balboa.reservoir@sonic.net" <wpa.balboa.reservoir@sonic.net>; "Wong, Phillip" <phillip.wong@sfgov.org>
Cc: Linda Judge <linda.judge@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Thursday, October 1, 2015 2:21 PM
Subject: RE: Balboa Reservoir Development - Community Advisory Committee - Comment re Impact of Requirements

Hi Adrienne,

Thanks for staying so involved. I apologize for the late response. While you may have some of your answers now that we've had two CAC meetings, I'd like to address some of your comments:

I urge you not to focus on housing alone, without regard to the other demands of the Plan and the community. We know one thing is true -- private developers will require a strong return on their investment. And that return depends on ALL of the "requirements" that will be specified in the RFP.

Indeed we are focusing on more than housing. Our next meeting will focus solely on open space and the "public realm." Following that, likely early November, we will have a special meeting on urban design/neighborhood character, which is closely related. This will allow a for more time to dig into urban design, form and some the concerns you brought up below. The language of the RFP will have many principles, of equal import in all topic areas (e.g. open space, housing, design, transportation), as well as some minimum and maximum standards. But our hope is to make the values of the community and City known to the developer through the principles, and enable them to compete on those principles as best they can in a cohesive design / development proposal. This will necessitate a balance of all the principles, values and requirements the RFP puts forth.

- 1) Is the City proposing height limits for the development?

You can see the draft parameters related to heights and urban design in the memo for the last CAC meeting (attached or [online](#)). The underlying themes are fitting in with surrounding context, variation and graduated height changes within the site. That would mean focusing height where buildings are already

tall (CCSF, Ocean Ave) and tapering down in height towards Westwood Park. There is language about respecting the scale, privacy, light and views of homes in Westwood Park. There will also be more language in the draft open space parameters that will relate to protecting privacy of Westwood Park neighbors. Within the context of those principles, there is a range of permissible height from 25' to 65', with a potential bonus on the eastern side if they can provide more community benefits. The development proposals that best meet these principles, including respecting neighbors, will perform the best in this category.

A second item to note is that the proposals from this RFP process are only the beginning of the design process. There will be additional CAC and community design input after the developer is on the table. The sooner we can bring the developer/architect team onto the project, the sooner we can dig into the design and height issues that are on people's minds.

2) If so, are those height limits starting at current grade of the property (lower than street level), or at street level?

There's a LOT of planning code on how to measure heights. At risk of over simplification, heights are taken from the curb level and then at several cross sections of the building if it is on a slope. There will likely be some re-grading of the site. So the new grade would be the basis from where height is measured.

Hope this addresses your questions. Let me know if there's anything else.
Thanks,
Jeremy

JEREMY SHAW | *Planner/Urban Designer* | [SF PLANNING](#) | 415.575.9135

From: BRCAC (ECN)

Sent: Tuesday, September 15, 2015 10:37 AM

To: gumbo1368; BRCAC (ECN); wpa.balboa.reservoir@sonic.net; Shaw, Jeremy (CPC); Wong, Phillip

Cc: Linda Judge

Subject: RE: Balboa Reservoir Development - Community Advisory Committee - Comment re Impact of Requirements

Ms. Go,

Good morning.

Thank you for the email.

This email has been distributed to the members of the CAC.

Staff will have responses to your questions shortly.

Best regards,

Phillip C. Wong

--

Project Assistant

Office of Economic and Workforce Development
City Hall, Room 448
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4653

****Please note that I will be out of the office and unavailable beginning on 9/21/15 and returning on 9/29/15.****

From: gumbo1368 [<mailto:gumbo1368@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Sunday, September 13, 2015 6:49 PM
To: BRCAC (ECN); wpa.balboa.reservoir@sonic.net; Shaw, Jeremy (CPC); Wong, Phillip
Cc: Linda Judge
Subject: Balboa Reservoir Development - Community Advisory Committee - Comment re Impact of Requirements

Dear Committee members and City staff.

Thank you for working to develop a process that addresses the concerns of all San Franciscans:

YES, I agree that affordable housing is in short supply, and I support the development of many of the parcels identified in the Balboa Park plan - with caution. The Plan also calls for open space and preservation of neighborhood character. I urge you not to focus on housing alone, without regard to the other demands of the Plan and the community. We know one thing is true -- private developers will require a strong return on their investment. And that return depends on ALL of the "requirements" that will be specified in the RFP.

For example, if the City demands 50% affordable housing, then the other 50% of the units (at market) will have to be sufficiently profitable to support both the under-market units AND the community concerns (preserve architectural integrity, open space, height-managed).

And I am very very concerned that the City (and the RFP) will prioritize housing needs over community concerns. It has to be balanced to achieve the multitude of goals.

I also have some questions:

- 1) Is the City proposing height limits for the development?
- 2) If so, are those height limits starting at current grade of the property (lower than street level), or at street level?

Thank you,
Adrienne Go
concerned San Francisco resident

Wong, Phillip (ECN)

From: Linda M. Judge <linda.judge@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Thursday, October 01, 2015 4:24 PM
To: BRCAC (ECN)
Cc: R. and K. Favetti
Subject: Meeting Agenda for next CAC Meeting (October 19th)?

Dear Mr. Wong,

I am writing to inquire when the October CAC Meeting Agenda will be available and posted on the BR website.

In order to perform effective community outreach within our neighborhood, it is helpful to have at least two weeks lead-time on what the agenda points will be. Community input and comments are facilitated by obtaining the CAC Agenda as early as possible.

Thank you in advance.

Kind regards,

Linda M. Judge
Westwood Park Board Member
Westwood Park Balboa Reservoir Committee, Chair
415-823-6297

Wong, Phillip (ECN)

From: Maureen Klier <mpklier@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 08, 2015 10:59 AM
To: BRCAC (ECN)
Subject: Meeting minutes and schedule = scant time for neighbor input

Dear BRCAC,

This committee was formed to receive neighbor input. However, the actions of not providing meeting minutes and scheduling a "special" makeup meeting on what the public voted as one of the most important aspects, neighborhood character, are directly contrary to the CAC's purpose.

Please schedule a regular monthly meeting on neighborhood character and give neighbors enough time to read and research the all upcoming agendas. Otherwise, it seems purposeful that you don't want neighbors to come and be informed.

Sincerely,
MP Klier.

Wong, Phillip (ECN)

From: Shaw, Jeremy (CPC)
Sent: Thursday, October 08, 2015 3:13 PM
To: Rita M EVANS; BRCAC (ECN)
Cc: Lesk, Emily (ECN)
Subject: RE: Dates and Location of Next BRCAC Meetings

Rita, Next meeting is focusing on the public realm (open space + streets). The documents are being uploaded to the web in the next hour. Phillip will notify when all is online. Thanks for your patience. Jeremy

From: Rita M EVANS [mailto:rita.evans@berkeley.edu]
Sent: Thursday, October 08, 2015 2:28 PM
To: BRCAC (ECN)
Cc: Shaw, Jeremy (CPC); Lesk, Emily (ECN)
Subject: Re: Dates and Location of Next BRCAC Meetings

Thank you. What Principle will be addressed at the October 19 meeting? That meeting is only 10 days away and we need to alert our neighbors regarding the topic to be discussed. Rita

On Thu, Oct 8, 2015 at 2:19 PM, BRCAC (ECN) <brcac@sfgov.org> wrote:

Ms. Evans,

Good afternoon.

Apologies for the confusion, we recently updated the language of the regular meeting schedule as follows:

"The Community Advisory Committee regularly meets on the second Monday of the month at 6:30 p.m. (except on City holidays). If you are new to the project, please arrive at 6:00 p.m. for a brief overview. Click here for holiday changes, meeting schedules and downloads."

Hopefully this will help clear up some confusion regarding the changes to the regular meeting schedule due to holidays.

The next meeting of the CAC will be Monday, October 19, 2015 due to the Columbus Day holiday on Monday, October 12, 2015. The location will be Lick-Wilmerding High Schools' Cafeteria at 755 Ocean Avenue. An agenda will be posted online tomorrow on the Planning website via the following link: <http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=4224>

A special meeting will be held on the Urban Design/Neighborhood Character on Thursday, November 5, 2015. The agenda along with determining the time and location are not yet solidified, but will be well in advance of the meeting.

Best regards,

Phillip C. Wong

--

Project Assistant

Office of Economic and Workforce Development

City Hall, Room 448

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place

San Francisco, CA 94102-4653

Office: [415-554-6512](tel:415-554-6512)

Email: phillip.c.wong@sfgov.org

From: Rita M EVANS [mailto:rita.evans@berkeley.edu]

Sent: Tuesday, October 06, 2015 2:03 PM

To: BRCAC (ECN)

Subject: Dates and Location of Next BRCAC Meetings

We want neighbors to attend the next BRCAC meetings but we've got conflicting information about meeting dates and locations. Information on the website at <http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=4224> is not complete and is inconsistent with the statement that the CAC regularly meets on the second Monday.

When will the next two BRCAC meetings be held? What time? What location? We'd also like links to the agendas.

Thanks for your assistance.

Rita

Sunnyside Neighborhood Association, Balboa Reservoir Committee

--

Rita Evans

Library Director

Institute of Transportation Studies

University of California, Berkeley

[510-643-3564](tel:510-643-3564)

--

Rita Evans

Library Director

Institute of Transportation Studies

University of California, Berkeley

510-643-3564

Wong, Phillip (ECN)

From: Linda Judge <linda.judge@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Friday, October 16, 2015 1:46 PM
To: BRCAC (ECN)
Cc: board@westwoodpark.com
Subject: Westwood Park Association Balboa Reservoir Subcommittee - Westwood Park Community Comments - Public Realm
Attachments: Public Realm Parameters Memo to Members of the Balboa Reservoir CAC 10_WPA BR SC Final.pdf

Dear Mr. Wong,

In advance of Monday's CAC Meeting, we respectfully submit the Westwood Park community comments related to the **Public Realm Parameter Memo to Members of the Balboa Reservoir CAC dated October 8, 2015.**

Kind regards,

Linda Judge
Westwood Park Association Board Member
Westwood Park Association Balboa Reservoir Subcommittee, Chair

General Westwood Park Community Comments:

WPA Community Comment:

We appreciate the proposed parameters provided by the City, and support the voter approved Prop K. mandate. We further appreciate the Public Land for Housing Program's focus on our neighborhood site, as well as three other study sites including the Upper Yard located at Geneva and San Jose, the 4th and Folsom site, and 1950 Mission. At this early juncture, the community wishes to remind the city, reconfirm and restate the results and input from the greater San Francisco community on the City sponsored online survey. The top five choices, as listed in the Public Workshop #2 from May 5th, 2015 are:

1. Large open spaces for multiple uses (24%)
2. Affordable housing for all incomes (13%)
3. Neighborhood character and integrity (12%)
4. Large open spaces for programmed uses (6%)
5. Paths, walkways or routes to go on walks (6%)

Further, the Westwood Park Association residents would like to restate and confirm the top 5 choices of their neighborhood specific survey, which asked the same questions as the city sponsored survey. The top 5 choices of the 113 WPA residents who responded were:

1. Retaining neighborhood character and integrity (30.09%)
2. Large open spaces for multiple uses (25.66%)
3. Large open space for programmed use (14.16%)
4. Affordable housing for all incomes (13.27%)
5. Housing for local workforce / Paths walkways, or routes to go on walks (11.80% and 11.50%)

Finally, we appreciate and support Objective 5.2, Policy 5.2.1 of the Balboa Park Station Plan:

Policy 5.2.1

Require good quality public open space as part of major new developments

As more people live in the neighborhood, greater pressure is placed on existing open spaces. Major new developments in the plan area should assist in meeting the demand that they create for open space. These developments should be required to provide publicly accessible open space in a quantity directly proportional to the size of the development or to the lot size, whichever is greater.

Public Realm Parameters Memo to Members of the Balboa Reservoir CAC – 10/8/15 3 of 6 PROPOSED PUBLIC REALM PRINCIPLES AND PARAMETERS

Principle #1: *Develop a cohesive public realm (network of streets and open spaces) which provides a range of programmed and unprogrammed spaces for functional, recreational and social activities. Public spaces should be visible and activated from adjacent streets and uses; connect gathering places, destinations and residences on the site and beyond; and provide a sense of identity unique to the neighborhood.*

Draft Parameters

- a. Create a publicly-accessible open space network, totaling at least 4 **5 to 7** acres, including off-street walking routes or linear parks, and privately owned public open space (POPOS) but excluding streets. Aim to exceed this minimum requirement.

Westwood Park Community Comments: The Westwood Park community feels strongly that a minimum of 5 to 7 acres of parks and open space should be included.

- b. Create one significant open space to serve as a park for the site and neighborhoods beyond the Balboa Reservoir (aka Balboa Public Site). Include a mix of programmed and unprogrammed spaces based on community input and neighborhood need. Rather than creating a large void, the park should be varied in design and uses, be scaled appropriately with the pattern of blocks and buildings, and create a sense of shared neighborhood identity. This ~~contiguous~~ **continuous significant** open space **(which may be intersected only by pedestrian pathways)** ~~(which may extend multiple blocks if intersected by shared public ways or pedestrian priority streets)~~, should be at least 2 acres and would constitute a portion of the minimum 4 **5 to 7** acres of open space referenced in Section 2.a. This park will be designed with the community in a public process.

Westwood Park Community Comments: Please note, the Westwood Park specific survey as well as the City Planning Survey both favored the need of large open spaces.

c. Consider the childcare facility that may be built on-site and its needs for open space.

d. Create a walking route or network of walking routes which facilitates walking for recreational purposes, minimizing street crossings and connecting or defining on-site open spaces. Pedestrian networks should connect to surrounding networks of streets, paths and open spaces **while minimizing the impact on the adjacent Westwood Park neighborhood.**

e. Create a buffer zone or open space along the southern end of the Balboa Public Site, an area which cannot accommodate new structures since it contains existing SFPUC underground water transmission pipelines.

f. Respect the privacy and scale of adjacent uses, especially Westwood Park neighbors to the west with appropriate public space design, landscape, topography **and** walking routes to serve as a buffer ~~or transition~~ from the new buildings on the Balboa Public Site.

g. Build in enough flexibility to the open space network to allow for it to evolve with changing neighborhood needs, incorporating successive layers of programming, public art, and community stewardship over time.

Westwood Park Community Comments: In order to preserve the open space in perpetuity, any open space buffer zone between the new development and the Westwood Park neighborhood, as well as the large open space defined in Principal 1(b), should be deeded to San Francisco Recreation and Park Department, or otherwise legally protected from any future development.

h. Prioritize views of Mt Davidson, Mt Bruno and the main entrance to the CCSF Science Hall **without impeding the views of residents in the surrounding neighborhoods.**

i. Emphasize the special nature of the area through distinctive landscaping and other features that complement and respect adjacent neighborhoods **and Bishop Riordan High School.**

Principle #2: *Design the public realm as a useful, safe and welcoming part of daily experience for diverse neighbors of all ages, visitors to the site, and CCSF affiliates.*

Draft Parameters:

- a. Create public and common open spaces that are active, well defined by landscape features, streets or walking routes, active pedestrian entries to adjacent buildings, and adjacent building massing.
- b. Design the landscape and buildings so that they complement each other in support of site-wide design public realm and urban design goals (see urban design section).
- c. Incorporate linear spaces, smaller common areas, courtyards ~~or mid-block alleys into the site and buildings to moderate building scale, provide intimate spaces~~ and diversify activities in the public realm. Wherever possible, pair spaces with complementary adjacent land uses to help activate the public realm, for example small plazas near natural gathering places, playgrounds near daycare etc.

Westwood Park Community Comments: Please provide the community with the definition and examples of “linear spaces” and “intimate spaces”. The contextual meaning of the phrase “...and buildings to moderate scale” is unclear. Please provide examples and additional information to help the community understand.

- d. Avoid corner public areas, fore courts and other designs that are ultimately passed through or observed from outside rather than serving a necessary, recreational or social purpose.
- e. Propose a gradual transformation of the site, maintaining access to usable open space throughout all construction phases to allow people to experiment with new ways of using the site, and to give the community time to adapt to the physical changes of the site. For example, create a nursery for trees to mature on-site in advance of future site construction **with careful consideration of any site changes on the neighboring 98-year-old foundations, as well as displacement of wildlife.**

Principle #3: *Incorporate the different needs and hours of activity for diverse users in the area.*

Draft Parameters:

- a. Ensure **safe** opportunities for people of all ages, including students, seniors and families, to utilize the public realm.
- b. Design for sight lines between caregivers and open spaces or adjacent uses such as daycare, family residential units or other ground-floor uses. Buildings with family units should maximize the number of units overlooking play areas.
- c. Locate gathering places at natural confluences of pedestrian activity, walking routes, and public life **and away from the private Westwood Park backyards.**

Principle #4: Privately-owned public open spaces (POPOS) should read as part of an overall, coordinated pattern of open space. Recognize that per City policy, buildings will be required to provide a minimum 80 square feet of private open space per unit or 60 square feet of public open space per unit (above and beyond the public open space requirements above).

Westwood Park Community Comments: Please define how POPOS in Principal #1 is different from POPOS in Principal #4. The requirement in Principal #4 appears to suggest that the 80 sq.ft. or 60 sq.ft. will be in addition to the open space described in Principal #1, please confirm.

Although detailed building design will occur following the selection of a master developer, the following parameters should guide RFP respondents' general site planning vision, as applicable.
Draft Parameters:

a. Maximize the percentage of private open space at ground level.

Westwood Park Community Comments: Could the City please clarify what the definition of "ground level" is for this site, given the existing elevation slopes?

b. Connect courtyards and/or mid-block alleys wherever possible.

Westwood Park Community Comments: The community would like to be provided with examples within San Francisco where alleys have been successfully implemented in recent new or reconfigured developments, and where safety is prioritized and enforced. The WP Community prefers that alleys are well lit and safe, and that alleys are not considered as part of the proposed developments' total open space.

c. Private open spaces should be intimate and inviting. They should maximize green space, programmable spaces and visibility from residential units.

Westwood Park Community Comments: WP assumes if Principal 4(c) is specific to POPOS within new buildings on the site, then WP does not have any comments.

d. Consider including residential building(s) with a shared open space designed for children and families, with play equipment and good visibility from larger, family-sized units.

Principle #5: Design a variety of open spaces within the public realm network to create a variety of sensory experiences, incorporating the surrounding natural and/or cultural environment into the siting and design.

Draft Parameters:

a. If open space includes grade changes, use topography as a means of adding variation or creating a series of intimate spaces, without limiting visibility or accessibility.

b. Maximize sun exposure in public spaces without impacting sun exposure to surrounding neighborhoods.

c. Design open space areas that are protected from westerly winds.

d. Integrate stormwater management features, such as bioretention planters and green roofs, into the public realm.

e. Use drought tolerant species that will minimize the need for irrigation.

Principle #6: All public rights of way should be attractive, safe and useable public open spaces with generous landscaping, lighting and greenery as appropriate to the scale and use of buildings and the site. Street design should be built to standards established in Better Streets Plan.

(See Better Streets Policy. This section addresses street design only; pedestrian, transit, bicycle and auto activity are discussed in the transportation section.)

Draft Parameters:

a. Design new streets and alleys as public spaces which create intimate, safe pedestrian environments, while encouraging social interactions between diverse users from the site, adjacent neighborhoods and CCSF. Use shared streets/public ways and living alleys where appropriate.

b. Street and sidewalk designs should be consistent with Better Streets Plan and other applicable standards, such as utility separation requirements. Streets will generally fall under neighborhood commercial, neighborhood residential, park edge, alley or shared public way Better Streets Plan types.

Westwood Park Community Comments: The community would like to understand where “neighborhood commercial” will be placed.

Principle #7: Plan and design in coordination with a long-term, sustainable maintenance plan and community-serving programming.

Draft Parameters:

a. Describe what types of recreational uses are intended for the various public parks and open spaces included in the proposal.

b. Describe how parks and open spaces will be managed or programmed to promote safe and active use and enjoyment **and who will be accountable on a day-to-day and long-term basis.** Include a funding proposal to support these management and programming activities.

c. Plan proposed park and open spaces with an eye toward efficient maintenance and management, including establishment of funding sources to support such operations.

d. Integrate educational or cultural opportunities into the public realm and adjacent community spaces, including funding sources to support such operations; work with community partners on this effort is necessary.

Wong, Phillip (ECN)

From: ajahjah@att.net
Sent: Saturday, October 17, 2015 9:59 PM
To: Lesk, Emily (ECN); Shaw, Jeremy (CPC); BRCAC (ECN); Wong, Phillip (ECN)
Cc: BRC.SNA@gmail.com; board@westwoodpark.com; Brigitte Davila
Subject: Housing Parameters, Urban Design & Neighborhood Character Parameters

Ms. Lesk, Mr. Shaw:

In reviewing your 10/9/2015 Memo on Revised Housing Parameters, I see that community feedback has been incorporated into the revision. I thank you for that.

I had submitted my comments on your earlier 9/4/2015 Memo to CAC on draft parameters for Housing, and for Urban Design & Neighborhood Character.

HOUSING PARAMETERS

One of my comments on your 9/4/2015 Memo was what I termed an overarching, and perhaps a loaded question:

OWNERSHIP OF LAND & PROPERTY:

Will there be a sweetheart transfer of public land to private interests in the name of affordable housing?

Who will benefit when housing changes hands after initial owners/tenants/residents?

Will there be a point at which 'affordable' becomes unaffordable for any particular unit?

I understand that this overarching question may lie in the realm of power politics more than on a Departmental Staff level, but I think that the community should have an inkling about this subject.

I didn't attend the September CAC meeting, but I have looked over the Minutes of the meeting. I could not tell if this overarching question had been addressed. I hope that you will provide the community with an answer to this question, if it hasn't already been done.

URBAN DESIGN & NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER PARAMETERS

Although this will not come up until the November CAC meeting, I hope that your future revised parameters on Urban Design & Neighborhood Character will incorporate my two comments on your 9/4/2015 Memo:

On Principle 4a (which pointedly ignored the "current use" of Reservoir as parking):
sufficient parking so as not to contribute to illegal parking (blocked driveways) in Sunnyside!!!!

On Principle 4c:

Emphasize the reality that CCSF is the central economic, cultural, cultural focus of the neighborhood.

These two comments are importantly intertwined because if we accept the importance of CCSF to the community, car access and yes, parking availability is necessary.

Anti-car zealotry in the form of making parking difficult is not a realistic alternative for those who need to get to CCSF. The ideal of lessening private car usage and carbon footprint is great, but it needs to be modulated by the real world needs of CCSF students, staff and faculty.

--Alvin Ja
Sunnyside resident

Wong, Phillip (ECN)

From: ajahjah@att.net
Sent: Sunday, October 18, 2015 9:39 PM
To: Lesk, Emily (ECN); Shaw, Jeremy (CPC); BRCAC (ECN); Wong, Phillip (ECN)
Cc: brc.sna@gmail.com; board@westwoodpark.com; Brigitte Davila; Lisa Spinali; Estelle Smith; Ray Kutz; Jennifer Heggie; Ellen Wall; Monica Collins; Bob Byrne; Rita Evans
Subject: Input on 3/2015 AECOM Transportation Analysis and on Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Proposal

OEWD, Planning, BRCAC:

Prior to the formation of the Reservoir CAC, I had posted input on the BR Public Land for Housing Google Group that was moderated by Jeremy Shaw.

I wish to submit this earlier input officially into the BR-CAC record regarding:

- the 3/17/2015 AECOM Transportation Analysis prepared for the Balboa Reservoir project;
- the 7/21/2015 Draft Proposal for the Balboa Area TDM Study

Forwarded below are 3 messages:

A. EXCERPT FROM A 7/27/2015 POST FROM BALBOA RESERVOIR PUBLIC LAND FOR HOUSING GOOGLE GROUP:

I have reviewed the Reservoir Transportation Analysis [AECOM].

Overall, the transportation study is very thorough. Most of its content matches my real-world experience as a MUNI employee as well as a resident of Sunnyside.

However, the study has major shortcomings in the section on parking (beginning on p. 31):

1. It does not address parking impacts on the north-side of CCSF (Sunnyside) at all.

I live on Flood near Phelan. Prior to the Reservoir being opened up for student parking, blocked driveways was a constant, ongoing problem--and this was even with officially marked red zones.

2. The section's goal of discouraging driving by making parking more difficult/expensive will re-introduce past blocked driveway problems in Sunnyside.

3. The parking survey took place on only 2 days--one in November 2014 and one in February 2015. This reflects the much lowered attendance (up to 40% drop) due to accreditation crisis. This parking picture will not reflect true parking needs when CCSF attendance recovers.

Furthermore the 2 dates of the study is unable to reflect peak traffic and parking demand for the 2 weeks of the start of a given semester. This peak demand at the beginning of a semester must be accounted for.

B. EXCERPT FROM A 7/29/2015 POST ON RESERVOIR GOOGLE GROUP:

Jon Winston wrote:

"The removal of parking and neighborhood permits would be the stick that would discourage students from driving to school but transit fees could be used to provide the carrot. Improving the walk to BART, increasing frequency for Muni, adding more car share and lots of bike share stations would be a start."

Jonathan Plowman [Planning Dept] wrote regarding:
12. Isn't this going to add traffic and congestion?

"The analysis has not been completed yet. Current congestion and traffic are related to the availability of free and cheap parking on the site and throughout the surrounding neighborhoods.... For example, fewer parking spots and parking pricing closer to the true cost of parking will encourage less driving than currently. The project could also contribute to increased Muni service and a safer, more comfortable environment for pedestrians and bicyclists. Those changes could make alternate transportation modes easier, and take cars off the roads."

I believe that these two quotes fail to take into a broader perspective of the importance of CCSF to entire Bay Area community. These two quotes only take the POV of: easy, cheap parking ==> more cars, more congestion ==> BAD.

I propose a different POV: CCSF is of primary importance for the entire Bay Area community ==> decisions that impact CCSF and its students must be taken into consideration ==> will Transportation Demand Management not only discourage driving, but discourage enrollment?

Does "taking cars off the road" take precedence over the real-world needs of students? It's easy to say that they should take public transit or bike as an ideal. However, how practical is public transportation/biking/car-pooling for students in terms of time management for students who are juggling work, family and school responsibilities?

Would difficult parking push students out of CCSF to other schools (Skyline, Berkeley City College, Laney College)? Would this be an acceptable outcome for those who want to take cars off the road? [And would this really take cars off the road, as opposed to merely shifting car usage to another destination?]

Would it be in the broad public interest to push out these students in order to promote lessened use of cars [in the immediate area]?

C. 8/7/2015 E-MAIL TO JEREMY SHAW:

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: "ajahjah@att.net" <ajahjah@att.net>

To: "jeremy.shaw@sfgov.org" <jeremy.shaw@sfgov.org>

Cc: Lisa Spinali <sunnyside.president@gmail.com>; Renee Espinoza <vicepresident.sunnyside@gmail.com>; Estelle Smith <secretary.sunnyside@gmail.com>; Ray Kutz <ray.kutz@gmail.com>; "jonathan.plowman@sfgov.org" <jonathan.plowman@sfgov.org>

Sent: Friday, August 7, 2015 6:15 PM

Subject: TDM Proposal

Mr. Shaw--

I have reviewed the TDM proposal that was presented to the BP Station CAC last week.

I see the following shortcoming:

The new study needs to add that there needs to be sufficient parking such that:

1. It does not discourage student enrollment and attendance at CCSF;
2. It does not push desperate students into blocking the narrow driveways on narrow streets in the neighborhood.

I believe that students' need for education is a higher priority than discouraging use of cars. The traffic analyses so far have failed to take this into consideration.

--Alvin Ja

Wong, Phillip (ECN)

From: T R <biggihan@hotmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, October 18, 2015 10:18 PM
To: BRCAC (ECN)
Subject: Amendment requested on minutes: 8/26

I made the comment at 6.b.11. I feel that the official minutes misrepresent my opinion. I said something like, "The laws that set up this committee say that it will dissolve in 5 years unless the Supervisors renew it, so we should not make this process too tedious."

Wong, Phillip (ECN)

From: macozad115@aol.com
Sent: Sunday, October 18, 2015 2:21 PM
To: BRCAC (ECN)
Subject: San Ramon Way

My name is Mark Cozad. I live at 744 Faxon Ave. I am a member of the Westwood Park Homeowners Association. There has never been either pedestrian or vehicular access to the Balboa Reservoir area from San Ramon Way. San Ramon Way needs to remain closed to both pedestrian and vehicular traffic. The Balboa Reservoir Development Project needs to be designed so that emergency service vehicles do not need to access the Balboa Reservoir Development Project area via San Ramon Way.

Wong, Phillip (ECN)

From: Jonathan Rapp <jonathan.rapp@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, October 18, 2015 9:10 PM
To: BRCAC (ECN)
Subject: Fwd: Delivery Status Notification (Failure)

Jonathan

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Mail Delivery Subsystem <mailer-daemon@googlemail.com>
Date: Sun, Oct 18, 2015 at 8:20 PM
Subject: Delivery Status Notification (Failure)
To: jonathan.rapp@gmail.com

Delivery to the following recipient failed permanently:

brcac@sf.gov

Technical details of permanent failure:

DNS Error: Address resolution of sf.gov. failed: Domain name not found

----- Original message -----

DKIM-Signature: v=1; a=rsa-sha256; c=relaxed/relaxed;
d=gmail.com; s=20120113;
h=mime-version:date:message-id:subject:from:to:content-type;
bh=AOBCyEv0JTd0yf/MEPEhAFwQTSrXDxS25sYVi48f/vY=;
b=V4rmKiou+Qz6ImhsAw1TsrZ4FMq6Aodx3OBBXYmXnsjDkqpqChWl/kHhWwI5we+VcY
kUyD2Uj3FCVOF8DNrpRXTp1871nnTdKPV5kECh+CyheCYQup1yb7xz5glCjJO4LQ7k5z
yhvAVKLMm/cvphgzdQCIKTNGczFhLIPKgxuGaFLbpOgpcgeCo/QBGTro96GyBykb1xY6
m/mJ1rSQI9qIMT2eSXmDLj278au45xmPVDARLbYcA0dZy0d6ThxkFPhXOvWtjNsSOiyB
al4cnKQ2llk7SaBPzj6U5ZfisOfpigAbBv6YsadorD2GMfPJvSF82GIYh8l+az8TEMKD
1fPQ==

MIME-Version: 1.0

X-Received: by 10.202.80.141 with SMTP id e135mr15984756oib.43.1445224809153;
Sun, 18 Oct 2015 20:20:09 -0700 (PDT)

Received: by 10.76.151.231 with HTTP; Sun, 18 Oct 2015 20:20:09 -0700 (PDT)

Date: Sun, 18 Oct 2015 20:20:09 -0700

Message-ID: <CADERaM6wEFa1c16O6iGyVw6k414V79x7T4tvn_Z0y_+9RcYJnQ@mail.gmail.com>

Subject: reservoir development

From: Jonathan Rapp <jonathan.rapp@gmail.com>

To: jeremy.shaw@sfgov.org, brcac@sf.gov, wpa.balboa.reservoir@westwoodpark.com

Content-Type: multipart/alternative; boundary=001a113b056a5eca2705226c9f9c

Please keep in mind

- 1.the need for open space, quite limited in this area
2. increased density but not significantly different from already existing neighborhood
3. true low income housing, not just middle class housing.

Jonathan

Wong, Phillip (ECN)

From: Aaron Goodman <amgodman@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, October 19, 2015 8:42 PM
To: BRCAC (ECN)
Subject: Affordability in perpetuity legally

BRCAC members

This issue was brought up prior in the concerns on leases 99 year and developer Agreements such as Parkmerced where there Are existing units and densification.

At question is Costa Hawkins and Palmer vs 6th

When the development changes ownership and the developer agreement is challenged in a court of law it goes directly to this question and all developer agreements by the city can be questioned by developers or property owners.

see the article by dean Preston tenants together website where he discusses the legal issues on Parkmerced's developer agreements

These were challenged by San Francisco Tomorrow but not heard at the California state court of appeals.

All agreements made can still be challenged under the statement of new construction being limited in perpetuity

Sincerely

Aaron Goodman
D 11

Amgodman@yahoo.com

Sent from my iPhone

Wong, Phillip (ECN)

From: Jennifer Heggie <jdheggie@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 21, 2015 11:28 AM
To: BRCAC (ECN)
Subject: Submission following Oct 19 meeting
Attachments: BRCAC_Open_Space_submission_J_Heggie.docx

Thank you for accepting comments on the October 19 Balboa Reservoir CAC meeting. Attached please find my comments on principles 5 and 7, most of which were covered by me or others at the meeting. Since not all the points were fully covered, I am submitting the full document.

Sincerely,
Jennifer Heggie

Sunnyside resident and
member, SNA Balboa
Reservoir Committee
jdheggie@gmail.com

TO: Balboa Reservoir Citizens Advisory Committee and San Francisco Planning Department

FROM: Jennifer Heggie, resident of Sunnyside and member of the SNA Balboa Reservoir Committee

DATE: October 19, 2015

I am Jennifer Heggie, a member of the SNA Balboa Reservoir Committee, and will specifically address Principles 5 and 7. Most of these points were made by me or others from Sunnyside at the October 19 meeting, but since not everything was included, I appreciate the opportunity to forward these comments by email.

Principle #5: Design a variety of open spaces within the public realm network to create a variety of sensory experiences, incorporating the surrounding natural and/or cultural environment into the siting and design.

a. If open space includes grade changes, use topography as a means of adding variation or creating a series of intimate spaces, without limiting visibility or accessibility.

For 5a: The SNA Committee appreciates the aesthetics of variations in topography, and would like to emphasize that pathways best serve our community if there are only the most gradual of grades to accommodate elderly and disabled walkers, though we support greater grade variations off the walking pathways as long as the pathways are generally visible.

c. Design open space areas that are protected from westerly winds.

For principle 5c: The winds have shifted directions in the past so we would suggest changing this wording to protection from all wind patterns, not just westerly winds. We would like any analysis of wind patterns to include what possible impacts new buildings on the reservoir will have on the neighborhoods. Many thousands of dollars have been poured down the drain installing trees in Sunnyside and at City College on Judson because they could not withstand the power of current wind patterns.

d. Integrate stormwater management features, such as bioretention planters and green roofs into the public realm.

For 5d. We are fully supportive of stormwater management features, but we would like to call attention to the level of maintenance that is actually required for living roofs. We would ask you to check with the Academy of Sciences to understand the maintenance and other costs associated with installing a roof garden before recommending one. We have a local implementation of a living roof at City College's child development center. After its first months, it became a nest of mostly dead and sometimes tall weeds and has continued to look derelict ever since. I recommend as an alternative to a living roof, the green solution of solar panels or other forms of renewable energy generation that will be more energy and cost efficient and could be used to support lighting costs for pathways and open spaces. This will also serve to minimize any strain to the grid of multiple new housing units.

Principle #7: Plan and design in coordination with a long-term, sustainable maintenance plan and community-serving programming.

a. Describe what types of recreational uses are intended for the various public parks and open spaces included in the proposal.

For 7a: Based on two different surveys of neighborhood residents conducted by the SNA, input at SNA meetings, and committee discussion, the first priority of the neighbors is that the Balboa Reservoir be offered as open space for multiple activities. The second priority is parking. Desired recreational activities fell into the following categories in order of importance, with most interest in walking paths or trails, followed by indoor recreation or an arts center (this is a windy neighborhood), followed by organized activities. Next in priority, community gardens and bicycle trails were tied and followed by requests for a dog park exercise area. One neighbor suggested using the space for special events. Many of these priorities are current uses of the existing space. Our residents currently walk the berm because it is convenient, accessible, quiet and separate from the

road. The relatively flat space is used by the elderly and disabled for walking exercise. We have many residents who walk their dogs along the berm and would like to be able to use any reconfigured space for dog walking as well. Neighbors would like the walking areas to be well-lighted and generally visible.

Sunnyside neighbors expressed overwhelming support for access to the open space for parking by City College students as one of the most important of the multiple uses for the open space. One of the best ways to serve the community with arts as a form of recreation is to ensure City College has a vibrant performing arts education center. Providing parking as one of the multiple uses for the reservoir will contribute to the success of enrollment at City College and the arts education center and ensure its contribution to arts in the region for many years to come.

b. Describe how parks and open spaces will be managed or programmed to promote safe and active use and enjoyment. Include a funding proposal to support these management and programming activities.

c. Plan proposed park and open spaces with an eye toward efficient maintenance and management, including establishment of funding sources to support such operations.

Combining 7b and c. The City College Campus Police already oversee the parking area on the reservoir, and if the open space is also used for parking for students, the campus police may be prevailed upon to oversee the site while students are using it, thereby reducing security costs for at least part of a 24-hour day. We suggest that costs for additional oversight and landscaping should be paid by the developer and out of monthly rent. To ensure landscaping is adequately maintained around walking paths and for other uses, we recommend requesting funds in the next park and recreation bond, which we understand may not be on the ballot until 2018. Enhanced programming can be considered once that funding source is determined. Again, we would advocate the shared use of the space. By keeping the open space design simple, the costs for maintaining it for multiple uses should be minimal.

d. Integrate educational or cultural opportunities into the public realm and adjacent community spaces, including funding sources to support such operations; work with community partners on this effort is encouraged.

For 7d. Having an artistic hub such as the new performing arts education center will have a significant impact on this side of San Francisco and is being funded from sources outside of the City and County of SF government. Not only will the center encourage students to enroll in classes and provide a destination for neighbors wishing to attend performances, but we expect an ancillary result to be an increased number of beginning performers on this side of town performing at a fraction of the cost of venues downtown. We expect that over time there will also be benefits to regional high schools as well. To encourage this development and the growth of the arts in this area, the single most important thing we can do is to ensure there is adequate parking near the Performing Arts Center for students, staff and audience members. There are many reasons why students and staff need to drive and park, but specifically for those in the performing arts, some obvious reasons are to transport instruments, costumes and stage sets. The Sunnyside community supports efforts to use the multi-use open space for parking as a key use.

Wong, Phillip (ECN)

From: ajahjah@att.net
Sent: Monday, October 26, 2015 8:52 AM
To: Martin, Michael (ECN); Lesk, Emily (ECN); Shaw, Jeremy (CPC); BRCAC (ECN); Wong, Phillip (ECN)
Cc: board@westwoodpark.com; Lisa Spinali; Brigitte Davila; rmuehlbauer@live.com; hnhchung@yahoo.com; tsaiweilee@hotmail.com; cgodinez@lwhs.org; jon.winston.brcac@outlook.com; BRCAC (ECN)
Subject: COMMENT ON NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER (Reservoir) for 11/5 CAC meeting

OEWD, Planning, BR CAC--

In case you missed it from my September submission regarding Draft Parameters, my comments are in red boldface here:

Principle #2: Harmonize the relationships between existing buildings, streets and open spaces.

Draft parameters:

- a. Design the site and buildings to integrate with, respect and reflect local character, scale, design, and uses.
- b. Design variation in building height, scale, massing and materials. Maintain visual interest and limit the extent of uniform, unvaried surfaces.
- c. Locate taller buildings where adjacent buildings are tallest, with heights tapering down on approach to single-family neighborhoods. Buildings on the west side of site should generally be of lower height than the east, and respect the scale, privacy and light of adjacent homes to the west.
- d. Building heights should fall within a range of 25' to 65' feet, allowing for heights of up to 85' in the eastern portion of the site where, due to economic efficiencies, the additional height allows for additional community benefits.

Current zoning for PUC lot is 40 ft, 65 ft for CCSF (MUB) lot.

Principle 2d's proposal of 85 ft. would require zoning increase of 45 ft in PUC lot. The proposed 85 ft. is 20 ft. more than what CCSF lot (MUB) allows. This needs thorough open discussion and vetting with community.

- e. Site and design buildings to enhance public spaces, while minimizing their impacts on existing residential privacy and access to light.
- f. Shape the height and bulk of buildings to respect views and vantage points; avoid top-heavy or bulky appearance.
- g. Design roofs to enhance and not detract views from above.

Principle #4: Express neighborhood character, celebrate cultural history and build on neighborhood activities.

Draft Parameters:

- a. Design amenities and the public realm to align with neighborhood activities, desires or needs, including current uses of the site for families, dog walking and exercise

**"Current use" for parking seems to have been deliberately excluded.
Principle 4a needs to include parking.**

Sufficient parking as a parameter is needed so as not to contribute to illegal parking (blocked driveways) in Sunnyside!!!!

b. Express the cultural and historical elements of the community in the site or public realm design.

c. Design the site and public realm to respect and reflect community heritage, the City College campus, and the role of Ocean and Phelan as a “gateway” to the neighborhood.

Emphasize the reality that CCSF is the central economic, cultural, educational focus of the neighborhood.

The desire of anti-car crusaders to discourage car use should not be allowed to take precedence over needs of CCSF students, workers.

--Alvin Ja

Sunnyside resident

Wong, Phillip (ECN)

From: Save CCSF Coalition <save.ccsf.coalition@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 27, 2015 11:28 PM
To: Martin, Michael (ECN); Exline, Susan (CPC); Lesk, Emily (ECN); Shaw, Jeremy (CPC); BRCAC (ECN)
Subject: Input for planning – CCSF needs must be accomodated
Attachments: CAC-Comments-From-SaveCCSF final.doc

Office of Economic & Workforce Development
Planning Dept
Balboa Reservoir Community Advisory Committee

Mr. Martin, Ms. Exline, Ms. Lesk, Mr. Shaw, BR CAC:

Attached is our submission from the Save CCSF Coalition regarding the importance of CCSF in regards to Neighborhood Character and Transportation parameters.

Wendy Kaufmyn
Save CCSF Coalition

Save CCSF Coalition

www.saveccsf.org

**Memo to:**

OEWD: Michael Martin michael.martin@sfgov.org
Susan Exline susan.exline@sfgov.org
Emily Lesk emily.lesk@sfgov.org

Planning: Jeremy Shaw jeremy.shaw@sfgov.org

Reservoir CAC: brcac@sfgov.org

From: Save CCSF Coalition

Date: November 5, 2015

Subject: Input for planning – CCSF must be considered

Comments:

CCSF is the central educational, economic, cultural focus of the neighborhood. Any planning and development at the PUC's west reservoir site cannot be allowed to impact CCSF negatively, whether it's in relation to the need for parking for students, faculty and staff; or the needs of PAEC.

Current Balboa Reservoir planning is focused on discouraging private auto use by making parking difficult and more expensive. This goal has the side effect of discouraging enrollment and attendance. Such a policy would only result in shifting car usage to other schools where parking is easier, or causing students to drop out!

Planning documents presented to date make inadequate evaluation of cumulative impacts and fail to account for past, present and reasonably foreseeable projects by completely ignoring the PAEC!

On behalf of the Save CCSF Coalition,

Wendy Kaufmyn
Monica Collins, staff
Christine Hanson, student
Francine Podenski, retired Department Chair
Donna Hayes, Counselor
John Hayes

Richard Baum, Instructor
Tarik Farrar, Instructor
Harry Bernstein, Instructor
Steven Brown, Department Chair
Leslie Simon, Program Coordinator

Wong, Phillip (ECN)

From: Francine Podenski <francine.podenski@mail.ccsf.edu>
Sent: Thursday, October 29, 2015 9:43 AM
To: BRCAC (ECN)
Subject: Balboa Reservoir Transportation/Character Public Comment

BACKGROUND:

City College of San Francisco's Ocean Campus campus has roughly 30,000 students traveling through it daily during regular enrollment plus over 1000 faculty and staff. Thousands arrive via public transit but there are also many who need to drive in order to attend or work on the Ocean Campus.

The lower Balboa Reservoir is currently packed with cars every weekday morning by 10 am even now during a down enrollment period. These cars belong to students who need to drive in order to fit a class in between work hours, adjunct faculty who teach at multiple Bay Area Colleges and commute between those colleges daily, and students, faculty and staff with elder care and child care issues that require driving from one location to another daily — or at least some days each week. These individuals can not travel by public transportation to attend and/or work at City College of San Francisco's Ocean Campus. Eliminating parking means eliminating their attendance or ability to accept teaching assignments on Ocean Campus. For example: most adjunct faculty teach at multiple Bay Area community colleges in order to make ends meet. In one day, the faculty member might teach a morning class at CCSF- Ocean Campus, an afternoon class at College of San Mateo and then an evening class at CCSF or San Francisco State. The only way to meet this schedule is to drive to/from each location. Eliminate parking and many excellent adjunct faculty can no longer accept teaching assignments at CCSF.

Also it is important to consider the completion of the Performance Arts Education Center on the upper Balboa Reservoir area. This project IS moving forward at this time. Already \$25 million bond funds have been spent preparing the ground and building the basement of the PAEC. Many are working to complete this project at this time.

RECOMMENDATION FOR TRANSPORTATION AND CHARACTER:

I strongly support building an attractive large 3000 car parking structure with a public park installed on the garage roof in the North End of lower reservoir. The parking structure could have a couple of underground stories and a couple of stories above ground stories with a public park on the garage roof overlooking the ocean. Adding plantings along the sides of the structure could make it attractive and a park on the roof would be a great option with ocean views, picnic areas, paths, etc. this would provide parking for the residents with perhaps a floor set aside for car share, resident personal vehicles and bikes. The other three floors could be open to the public (college, local shoppers, and Riordan) for a reasonable fee.

The housing element could be on the south end near Ocean Avenue and the Muni turn around...and the parking structure could serve the residents, the college and provide somewhat of a sound buffer between the housing element and Riordan. Am pretty sure a playground included on the roof of the garage would be high enough that the sound from children playing would not disturb Riordan classrooms.

There should be a careful sound study to ensure proper placement for maximum sound buffering to ensure minimal or NO disturbance to CCSF and Riordan classrooms when the project is completed.

Francine Podenski
City College of San Francisco
