

Substantive changes proposed to the Draft BRCAC 2019 Annual Report:

PROJECT'S RELATIONSHIP WITH CITY COLLEGE

It is imperative that the Balboa Reservoir project not adversely impact San Francisco City College's mission to provide a quality education at an affordable price for a large number of the City's residents. CCSF has produced a transportation demand management plan (March, 2019) that, if implemented, intends to reduce the need for a large portion of its staff and student body to drive. ~~It will, therefore, have a smaller shortfall in parking needs than the one thousand parking spots that will be replaced by housing. The developer team plans to accommodate the shortfall with public parking in the Reservoir.~~ The amount of this public parking is undetermined at this time as the College finalizes decisions on their Master Plan and which version of their TDM they will settle on. The developers have promised that provided public parking will be scaled according to the need once these variables are resolved. As of this date, both CCSF and the City have informed the BRCAC that the problem caused by loss of needed parking on the reservoir has not been resolved. Hence, the Developer Team's Proposal does not abide yet by the Principles and Parameters which stress that the Developer must address the new development's transportation and parking impacts as well as alternative parking for CCSF students. The BRCAC intends to closely monitor any purported resolution of this matter.

There has been a discussion that student or faculty housing be built by the DDeveloper Team on CCSF property.

There is a danger that the CCSF Master Plan and the Reservoir project will evolve separately. There is a need for ongoing monitoring to ensure that discussions are taking place. The CAC will be a forum for updating progress or issues as they come up.

URBAN DESIGN AND NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER

~~For the most part, there has been considerable input and good continuing fine-tuning revisions.~~—The Developer Team's Proposal strives purports to fit into the existing neighborhood design by scaling from twenty foot heights near the western side of the site to taller buildings on the eastern side. Public comment has been mixed. Some neighbors are wary of higher density in the neighborhood while others constituencies feel the urgent need for housing necessitates it. The project has deviated from the sixty-five foot height limit proscribed in the *Principles and Parameters* with a proposal that some buildings on the east side of the site reach a maximum height of seventy-seven feet— twelve feet taller.

In addition, the Developer Team's Proposal further deviates from the Principles and Parameters. Such Parameters provide that buildings should be separated from Westwood Park rear yards by setbacks or open spaces. [See Principles and Parameters pages 22-23, Urban Design Principle, Principle 2(c)]. The Developer Team's Proposal did not honor this Parameter.

Moreover, the Principles and Parameters provide that the buildings should integrate with respect to the local character, scale design of the neighborhood, including the designs of Westwood Park, Sunnyside and other nearby residences [Principles and Parameters page 22 of 30, Urban Design Principle, Principle 2(a)]. With a possible density exceeding 10 times that of such neighborhoods, and with the failure to abide by Parameter height limits, the Developer Team's Proposal does not abide by this Principle and Parameter.

5. Comment on the City's Additional Housing Option

Representatives of the City have presented at the BRCAC meetings information on another proposal urged by the City, commonly called the "Additional Housing Option". The Additional Housing Option propose a total of 1550 residential units with a maximum permitted height of 88 feet. Obviously, this proposal would exceed the height limit of the Principles and Parameters even more than the Developer Team's Proposal. It would exceed the height limit contained in the Principles and Parameters by 23 feet.

6. Comment on Reduced Density Alternatives

After parties in interest suggested at CAC meetings that a reduced density alternative be analyzed, such an alternative is being analyzed in the CEQA process ("Reduced Density Alternative"). The Reduced Density Alternative being analyzed consists of 800 units. In fact, another developer proposed in the Request for Proposal process to develop a total of 680 units, of which 50.2% were proposed to be affordable and work force units. This proposal, made by Related California, found that such a proposal was financially feasible. Either the Reduced Density Proposal or the Related California Proposal would clearly comply with all the Principles and Parameters.

8. BRCAC Activities Moving Forward

- The Committee will continue to serve as a forum for community feedback.

- The committee will continue to monitor the discussions between CCSF and the Developer relating to their collaboration, especially the requirement in the Parameters that CCSF and the Developer “address parking needs by identifying alternative parking and transportation solutions that do not compromise student’s ability to access their education.” [Parameters letter of September 9, 2016].
- The BRCAC will submit a further report or reports in advance of consideration of these matters by the Board of Supervisors, the Planning Commission, the SFPUC, and possibly other City Agencies.
- ~~Continuing updates on CCSF and Reservoir developer team collaboration.~~
- ~~Once the environmental review is satisfactorily complete the project will return to the Board of Supervisors, then the Planning Commission, the SFPUC Commission, and possibly City agencies, for final approvals. The approvals package is likely to include a disposition agreement, a development agreement, design and development controls, and related revisions to the planning code.~~

~~Jon Winston~~

~~Chair, Balboa Reservoir Community Advisory Committee~~