

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

AMENDED MEETING MINUTES

(AMENDED DURING 11/05/15 MEETING)

**Lick-Wilmerding High School, Cafeteria
755 Ocean Avenue, San Francisco
Monday, October 19, 2015
6:30 PM
Regular Meeting**

Please note that a supplemental audio recording of this meeting is included on the Planning website via the following link:

http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/plans-and-programs/planning-for-the-city/public-sites/balboareservoir/balboareservoir_CAC_Audio_101915.mp3

Documents received during this meeting are included as attachments to this document.

Committee Members Present:

Howard Chung, Brigitte Davila, Kate Favetti, Christine Godinez, Rebecca Lee, Robert Muehlbauer, Maria Picar, Lisa Spinali, Jon Winston

Committee Members Absent:

None

Staff Present:

Sue Exline, Nick Perry, Planning Department; Mike Martin, Phillip Wong, Office of Economic and Workforce Development; Craig Freeman, San Francisco Public Utilities Commission; Supervisor Norman Yee Matthias Mormino, District 7 Supervisor Yee's Office

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

1. Roll Call

2. Approval of Minutes from Previous Meeting. (Action Item)

1. Spinali: Incorporate 10/18/15 (6.b.11) email into 10/26/15 meeting minutes

- i. Minutes approved with correction; Motion: Favetti, Second: Winston
 1. Ayes: Chung, Davila, Favetti, Godinez, Lee, Muehlbauer, Picar, Spinali, Winston
 2. Noes: [none]
2. Spinali: Add a standing agenda item called "Partnership Updates"
3. Spinali: Want to remind everyone about ground rules
 - i. Suggest adding a parameter that no one clap or jeer
 - ii. Suggest adding a parameter that when you get up to speak, identify who you are and where you're from/what you represent
 - iii. Suggest adding: Stay on topic
 - iv. Does anyone else have ground rules to add? (no one had anything to add)
 - v. Does anyone from the public have ground rules to recommend? No
 - vi. Motion to approve additional ground rules; Motion: Favetti, Second: Muehlbauer
 1. Ayes: Chung, Davila, Favetti, Godinez, Lee, Muehlbauer, Picar, Spinali, Winston
 2. Noes: [none]

3. Scheduling of Future Meetings.

1. Spinali: Reminder: November 5 is a special meeting. Part 2 of Sept. 4 meeting. We'll be talking about urban design and neighborhood character.
 - i. Public question. Where will November 5 meeting be held?
 1. Lick-Wilmerding High School Cafeteria
 - ii. Spinali: Would like to recommend changing the bylaws to have the meeting start at 6:15.
 - iii. Motion to change the bylaws so that the meeting start time reflects 6:15pm. Motion: Favetti, Second: Davila
 1. Ayes: Chung, Davila, Favetti, Godinez, Lee, Muehlbauer, Picar, Spinali, Winston
 2. Noes: [none]
 - iv. No public comment

4. General Public Comment.

- a. Spinali. We have to be done by 8:30. Hard stop. So everyone will have two minutes for public comment. General public comment is on things that are not on the agenda tonight.
- b. Aaron Goodman. District 11. Would like to comment on Mike Martin's comments to the general public. Talk about expanded energy creation, related to electrical, water, and sewer, at the site in addition to housing at the site; this could be a part of the Sustainability discussion at a later meeting. This is something that is key and critical. Charts and graphs all talk about housing need. It doesn't show a lot of housing being built in the Western edge of the City, in the Sunset. How are we getting the financing and funding for housing at the site? How much money is actually going towards the creation of this housing? How are we going to be getting money to build units

throughout the rest of the City, e.g. Upper Yard, it would be good to have something that provides this information. [Consider equitable development \(Edits per public comment during 11/05/15 meeting of the CAC\)](#)

- c. Francine. Westwood Park resident. Would like to comment on schedule of the meetings. Very unrealistic to have so many meetings close together; special meeting on the 5th and another meeting on the 9th; you said that covering housing and urban design was ambitious, and each of those topics is very important to be discussed. Coming to meetings is an encumbrance for people to come and stay until 8:30. One meeting per month is a hardship, let alone attending 3. Topics need to be moved to the following month and the process needs to be extended.
- d. Chris Hanson. Excelsior. Note taker is from Planning. Why isn't the note take from [Phil Ting Supervisor Yee](#)'s office? Not kosher to have someone from the developer taking the notes. There is a recording of this meeting. Will there be a transcript? Is this part of the CEQA? How will these meetings be reflected in the CEQA documents, which are really the only thing that matters? Excelsior Next Door chat line got put onto a Google chat that was run by Planning. [\(Edit per public comment during 11/05/15 meeting of the CAC\)](#)
- e. Mike Barnes. Sunnyside resident. After a year of work, we should know the number of units, the impact to the neighborhoods, both positive and negative, and the social and economic impact. Concerned about how this large development will impact us. Units have been put in areas of the City that can absorb such structures. This is a large and massive development, and I'm concerned how this will impact us. I think it's important that we start generating these numbers.
- f. Monica Collins. Sunnyside resident, City College staff. Most CCSF students need their cars. Don't have the option to spend time on MUNI or BART. Issue of blocking driveways of residents who live near CCSF. It's a health and safety issue not a matter of convenience.
- g. Bob Murray. Sunnyside resident. Document is filled with urban planning jargon. This is language I don't speak. Are we taking into account teens and tweens? I would like to understand this document better.
- h. Hedda Thieme. Westwood Park resident. Usually the parking lot is full between 11am and 2pm. CCSF is a commuter school. We cannot cut any parking spaces. Who set up the income levels in the AMI table? What are the sources?
- i. Sydney Cass. Glen Park. This land might hold 60 or 80 single family homes. But it should be saved for City College to complete its campus; a number of master plans have included the reservoir. Plans for an arts center, which would be open to the neighbors. Hysteria has contributed to housing conversation and education has become a lower priority. Consider not developing it. Give it to City College. It has the most students per acre in California.
- j. Jenny. Born and raised in Westwood Park, Plymouth. Over 35 years there have been a lot of parking problems in the neighborhood. Avalon residents have several cars. Cars get sideswiped because of the congestion on Ocean. More housing will cause more problems for the fire department; more difficult for them to respond to emergencies at our homes. Congestion comes from City College and other

developments in the neighborhood. Developer should look further into the neighborhood to ease congestion that's already there. Please reconsider how you develop the whole neighborhood in general. Traffic goes past the freeway; I have to go all the way to Junipero Serra to escape the traffic.

- k. Theodore. Excelsior. In San Francisco we have a housing crisis. We need to build more houses. Through this process we will determine what circumstances we would build on the reservoir, if any circumstances. No profit to extend the process longer than it already is. The process already seems longer ~~er than it needs to be to me.~~ (Edit per public comment email dated 11/05/15)
- l. Chris Peterson. Local resident, Dorado Terrace. I have a different perspective on transportation and parking issues. This location is within easy walking distance of BART station, served by multiple MUNI lines. It's an ideal location for transit-oriented development. Easy walk to neighborhood commercial. Development of this site in coordination with transportation agencies to make this as transportation-oriented a development as possible. Make transit service better. Signal override to K and bus lines. Maximize use of transit services, rather than focusing on auto transit.
- m. Harry Bernstein. Teaches at City College. The Lower Balboa Reservoir was made surplus in 2012. Has the fire department agreed that the land is not needed for water storage? I heard rumblings from 10-15 years ago that it's okay to give it away and be used for general usage, but some officials have said otherwise; what is the case? Would like to picture the parking situation. Jeremy Shaw expressed interest in seeing the City College master plan because he wants to know how the college will manage without access to parking in the lower reservoir, hundreds of parking spaces. If performing arts center is built, it will displace 600-700 parking spaces at the upper reservoir. This is not mentioned in the Planning Dept. report. There's an access way, agreed upon by PUC and City College, between Phelan Avenue and the lower reservoir. It will not be like the one next to Riordan. It will be 60' wide. That will displace more parking. There might even be two access ways, with sidewalks. Where will people park if the college builds back its enrollment?
- n. Sheila Hawthorne. Westwood Park. 33% affordable housing throughout the City. Where are we with the 33% in terms of the slides [project context presentation]? There's already development on Ocean Ave. across from McDonalds. The 76 station, which has deeded the land to the City, has structure going up. How many units are there? I wonder if we've saturated the number of housing for this area. Last weekend we had a near medical emergency; fire and police and ambulance couldn't get up Plymouth Ave. Cars park on both sides. Where are the egresses going to be from the Reservoir? Are we saturated already? If you look at the area we have enough development in this neighborhood already. There is a Target opening next week. El Dorado Terrace will have to share their parking spaces.

5. Parks and Open Space: Background and Parameters.

- a. Public Comment and Questions
 - i. Ellen Wall. Sunnyside. Delighted with principles. City College campus also fits these seven principles and more. We have excellent amenities. Turn over the

site to City College to finish planning its campus here. Pass resolution to give land to City College because they meet all the outlined principles.

- ii. Rita Evans. Sunnyside. Sunnyside Neighborhood Association – Balboa Reservoir Committee. We have taken a survey and we’re providing comments on principles 1 and 2 based on committee comments.
 - 1. 4 acres of open space is inadequate. Increase it to 5.5 acres or approximately 30% of the land. Schlage was not open space before.
 - 2. What is included in open space? Want it to be real useable open space.
 - 3. Parameter B: 1.5 acres for a park is inadequate.
 - 4. Recognize that open space is not necessarily green space.
 - 5. Importance of providing student parking.
 - 6. Encourage creativity in making multiple use of space throughout the day and throughout the week.
 - 7. Parameter F. Sunnyside should be included in the parameter that mentions Westwood Park.
- iii. Christopher Campbell. Westwood Park. I think the overall size is disingenuous, sidewalks with trees should not be considered open space. 1.5 acres of a park is not adequate, it is excessively small. You can’t have dense vegetation. The number of people using the space would far exceed its capacity. It should be 50% or 75% of open space. 4 acres will hopefully turn to 10.
- iv. Jennifer Heggie. Sunnyside Neighborhood Association – Balboa Reservoir Committee. Principle 7. Based on two different SNA surveys and input at meetings and community discussions, first priority is that the reservoir be offered as open space for multiple activities. Second priority is parking. Desired recreational activities in order of importance:
 - 1. Paths/trails
 - 2. Indoor recreation/arts center
 - 3. Organized activities
 - 4. Community gardens or bicycle trails
 - 5. Dog park/ exercise area
 - 6. Special eventsCurrently used for exercise for the elderly. Walking. Many residents walk their dogs on the berm. Would like the walking areas to be well-lighted and visible. Importance of providing CCSF parking and ensuring performing arts education center. If the open space is used for parking for students, maybe CCSF police can patrol it. Additional costs should be paid by the developer and out of monthly rent. Get parks bond money to maintain landscaping.
- v. Madeline Mueller. Music teacher at City College. City College has great ~~facilities~~faculty (Edit per public comment during 11/05/15 meeting of the CAC); best in the nation. Use the college’s expertise as the best in the nation. CCSF is trying to move the playground and childcare facility; tried to move it next to Riordan. Consider acoustical factors when you think about buffers.

Students need quiet so that they can study, this needs to be kept front and foremost.

- vi. Harry Bernstein. Principle 1. We have no idea what is being proposed, what is that around? What goes around the open space? Has heard proposals for different numbers of units on the site. Sunnyside and Westwood Park input is good, I hope you will consider their concerns. Performing arts center is part of recreation, and a way to attract more people to City College.
- vii. Laura Frye. Westwood Park. Remember that open space was the top priority for City ~~and Westwood Park~~ survey; open space twice as important as than affordable housing. 4 acres and 1.5 acres are not enough. 1.5 acres might be broken up by streets. The main park cannot be broken up by streets. It should be larger. [\(Edit per public comment during 11/05/15 meeting of the CAC\)](#)
- viii. Jordan. Master of City Planning student at Berkeley. You want to build a buffer between the development and the surrounding neighborhoods. What would a buffer look like? What would the purpose be?
- ix. Chris Hanson. Land is serving an important function currently. As of 2013, due to San Francisco's land-locked status, San Francisco General Plan policy 1.2 said that if SF water department property becomes surplus, appropriate land areas should be dedicated for use as public open space. When and why did this policy change?
- x. Aaron Goodman. D11 Resident. San Francisco Tomorrow. Balboa Park Station CAC. Design streets for emergency services. [There is an issue of evacuation areas.](#) We're looking at these parameters in a vacuum since we don't know what City College wants to do; how would a performance arts building relate to anything else we build? It is difficult to get down to the BART station. Regarding 1.f, -walking routes should be connectors as well as buffers. Look at more precedents for how to design open space. 4 acres, throwing numbers out there is not the way to approach this. In the RFP, give the developers creativity for what to do with open space. Don't use it all for building material. [\(Edit per public comment during 11/05/15 meeting of the CAC\)](#)
- xi. Monica Collins. Performing Arts Education Center will have an important impact on the City and the college. Funded by sources outside of the City and County. Growth of arts. Need to ensure that there is adequate parking for the performing arts center for student, staff and audience members. Parking is a key use. Sunnyside supports using the multi-use open space for parking.
- xii. Chris Peterson. Dorado Terrace. Agree that well-designed open space is important for long-term viability for however the space is developed. Don't have a strong opinion about exact acreage. The amount sounds like the right ballpark. The amount of open space impacts the amount of housing that can be provided, and the City is in a housing crisis. It's vital that this site should be playing a significant role in addressing the housing shortage; especially for moderate to low income households.

- xiii. Linda Judge. Westwood Park. Chair of Westwood Park Association – Balboa Reservoir committee. Reiterating Westwood Park’s resident’s top 5 choices on Westwood Park-specific survey. 113 residents responded.
 - 1. Retaining neighborhood character, large open spaces for multiple uses, large open spaces for programmed use, affordable housing for all incomes, housing for local workforce tied with paths/walkways/routes to go on walks.
 - 2. Appreciate and support 5.2.1 of Balboa Park Station plan – require good quality open space as part of all major new developments; quantity to should be proportional to development or lot size, whichever is greater.
 - 3. Community would like to see a minimum of 5 to 7 acres of open space.
 - 4. Contiguous open space should be at least two acres not 1.5.
 - 5. Will turn in written comments to be put in the meeting minutes.
- xiv. Francine. Westwood Park resident. 1.5 acres of contiguous open space is not enough. There are a lot of unknowns, like lease or sale of land, everything is so up in the air, it’s hard to know exactly how much open space is needed. 1(g) – What does that mean? Does it mean that over time there will be building on those open space sites? Principle 2 – Alleys and intimate spaces. Undesirable usage happens in alleys and intimate spaces. What is meant by intimate space? Would like to know more about prior commenter’s comment about PUC lands being returned to public use as San Francisco is a land-locked City.
- b. CAC member feedback:
 - i. Muehlbauer. How do you determine the amount of open space? Is it a code requirement, or based on expected residency? Schlage Lock had a lower ratio. What is the methodology for coming up with that number?
 - 1. Sue Exline (Planning Dept.): Methodology – We look at what other projects do and similar site plans, think about how much we can do. We do want to put this number into the RFP as a minimum. There is a balance. This is a goal that is attainable, based on these other plan areas.
 - Buffers – don’t want to create a walled city within a city with buffers
 - 1. Sue: Showing a photo from presentation. Buffers are a transition between neighborhoods, not meant to be a wall; more of a meeting space, maybe buffer and connector.
 - If we’re going to get people out of their cars, access to transit is a key priority. That should be about trails that connect to Unity Plaza and out toward the BART station.
- ii. Lee. What is Planning’s definition of open space? Distinguish between permeable vs. paved space/non-permeable space.
 - 1. Sue: Permeable vs. paved space; private open space can be unattractive; balcony, hardscape limitations by code on what

private developers must do. Public open space is a public design process and it can be as permeable or paved as desired.

- iii. Favetti. Clarify around privately owned public spaces and access to them. They aren't always successful downtown and are difficult to find and not always accessible.

- 1. Sue. Privately owned publically accessible spaces. We can require that at this development they be at ground level. Downtown they can be on roof decks and theoretically they are still publically accessible by elevators.

Are there dangers that we need to be concerned about around water transmission lines and amount of buffer?

- 1. Sue. You can walk on top of the water pipes. You just can't build on top of them so PUC can get in and maintain them. It is an access consideration and not a danger.

Also, there is a lot of wind coming off of the ocean. Emphasize there is a significant wind impact from ocean breezes.

- iv. Chung. Everyone loves open space, but it's part of a puzzle. No developer is going to want to develop if there is too much open space. Is the amount of open space a requirement that we can impose on the developer? Or is it a goal or target? Is this from existing regulations? Schlage Lock had 1.7 acres.

- 1. Sue. Yes, we want to put a minimum into the RFP. We can require this.

- v. Davila. At the next CCSF board meeting, CCSF is going to make a formal request to PUC that they give/donate the land to City College. Open space is more than flat area on the ground, could open space be above a parking garage, on a deck, or a garden on top of a building? Infrastructural considerations, are streets and access ways included in open space?

- 1. Sue. Private open space can be on top of a building, but public open space cannot be on top of a building.
 - 2. Sue. Public open space can be on top of a parking structure. Examples, Union Square and Portsmouth Square, where parking is underground. Elevated spaces are more difficult to access.
 - 3. Sue. Will come back with examples of good privately owned public spaces.
 - 4. Sue. POPO's would be part of the 4 acres. It's just a different maintenance structure. It could be a reduction in private open space amount; code provides incentive to make private open space public.

- vi. Lee. SFPUC CAC acutely aware of this project. I always report back to the SFPUC CAC about the diversity of perspectives. They want to understand the legal and transactional mechanics of the real estate transfer. Is this lease or sale? How do you fulfill fair market value in terms of a lease or a sale? City staff will be making that presentation at the next SFPUC CAC meeting on November 17.

1. Spinali: Make sure to put up the SFPUC CAC meeting on the website.
- vii. Winston. As a buffer the berm is important. The berm is functional but ugly. It would be better if it were levelled. In addition to a buffer, it should be a place where the two neighborhoods should meet. 4 acres of open space isn't enough. There are great alleys between Van Ness and Octavia Blvd. Something like that could be done in this neighborhood. Keep an open mind.
- viii. Spinali. Focusing on principle #5.
 1. (a) Be careful about grade changes. Want to make sure it's safe for seniors, children in strollers.
 2. (b) Sun exposure. Utilize alternative energy sources, in particular how can we use solar to light the paths?
 3. (c) Winds are not just westerly. Wind comes from all different directions. Will need to do a wind study to figure that out. Make sure to plant things that will make sense and survive.
 4. Green roofs. Talk to Academy of Sciences, Gap/YouTube building in San Bruno. Make sure they really work before putting it out there.
 5. Principle #7. Maintenance. Articulate more clearly. What will developer be responsible for? Maintenance is really important. Don't need something that will not be maintained. Weather patterns influence maintenance needs.
- ix. Muehlbauer – Is there something written into the Planning code in terms of a public open space ratio (x number of square feet per person or per unit)? How was 4 acres determined beyond this just looking reasonable?
 1. Sue. There is not a city standard. There are no standards nationally. Sue. Will follow up via email with info about Citywide open space delivery. We also look at access as a proxy.
- x. Sue in response to Favetti. With the wind study, we can put something in the RFP requiring that the developer addresses the wind study.
- xi. Chung – If 4 acres is the number, is that the number that gives adequate housing and density? Did you know the amount of housing and use that to arrive to the amount of open space.
 1. Sue. We're trying to think through all of the pieces first. Open space is the priority so we want the developer to think about this first.
- xii. Davila. I want the RFP to include a shadow study. Maximize sun exposure.
- xiii. Spinali. We need to do FAQ's online for the public comment questions.
 1. Sue. We'll provide a similar matrix for open space.

6. Proposed Revisions to Housing Parameters.

1. Public Comment
 - i. Christopher Campbell. Westwood Park. Anticipating future uses with open space and comparing accessibility to McLaren Park and Dolores Park. For our location we have several parks adjacent to us. Dolores Park also has many

- parks adjacent to it. Accessibility issues for parks nearby; Mt. Davidson is large. If housing is considered to be the main justification for the property it is a disservice for folks who live there if space use is not considered.
- ii. Alvin Ja. Sunnyside. 3rd item on matrix, non-profit developer for affordable housing. Current prop K requires 100% affordable units be given to non-profit developers? How can the City ensure that affordable housing stays affordable for life of the building? Once the building is destroyed, can they make a killing? "Who will own the land? It could be sold or leased" I want to give an example, in Chinatown, the Old Hall of Justice across from Portsmouth Square, transferred to Holiday Inn and now is the Hilton, and they gave one floor to Chinese Culture Center. Is this an excuse for transfer of public assets to private interests?
 - iii. Aaron Goodman. D11. Housing Report issued at Land Use; we are lacking the essential housing we need for these districts and Citywide. 2f. Co-op, concerned with "consider" as it can be written off. We have a lot of market-rate, for-sale housing; co-op housing is an alternative. 3b. Transit prior to development or during. We need to make transit first. How do we get folks to the high-speed rail and intermodal Bayshore facility? How do we accelerate transit development to get people where they need to go on the southern side of the City? 1c. Housing to cover the cost, housing numbers determining how much open space, and it doesn't consider philanthropy, how would we acquire financing from incoming businesses/corporations to support development where we need it not just where we might want to see something else?
 - iv. Gene. Westwood Park: If you want x amount of open space, developer will still want x amount of units. The developer if restricted by open space, development will be vertical. The developers who say this amount of open space won't work, are they selected or bidding? Can you ensure that the developers must adhere to the development parameters? Majority of comments I've heard don't want this housing, except they are telling us what housing will be built and we get to paint the color of the houses.
 - v. [Commenter did not state name.] I looked up crime committed in 2015 on a map, and they are concentrated around where these affordable homes are built. How will crime be addressed if this development will bring this kind of crime into our neighborhood?
 - vi. Frances. Middle and moderate income housing. We were told affordable housing was taken care of, and we have a need for middle and moderate income housing, but we're back in the same place. Seems like a shell game. Special populations, we have Transitional Age Youth developments on Ocean Avenues, can we get crime statistics surrounding these developments? Legal residency should not be required for affordable housing placement, should adhere to MOHCD standards, can I get clarification on this? During conversations about affordable housing, seems that comments are directly related Bay Area Rental Foundation. BARF provides information on how to

infiltrate meetings and that's what happening here. These organizations are stacking the deck against people like us who come to these meetings.

1. Emily Lesk (OEWD). This project will follow standard City policy, MOHCD standards, they will check IDs but will not be checking green card status.
- b. CAC member feedback:
 - i. Davila. Principle #2. Consider targeting affordable housing towards special populations: I was strong about specially targeted housing for faculty, and for co-operatives. I think we should use stronger language to emphasize cooperative housing. I hope that you are not checking green cards.
 1. Emily: Housing for Faculty is still in original parameters
 2. Martin: Developer can propose these as long as they satisfy other development parameters including affordable housing. We cannot mandate a co-operative. What is objective of a co-operative structure?
 1. Davila: The objective is to find a fair way to house faculty and staff.
 - ii. Muehlbauer. Concerned about how the City ensures affordable housing stays affordable in perpetuity. Owners turning their affordable units into rentals. If you find areas not in compliance, e.g. developer not maintaining affordable ratios or ownership condo being converted into a rental. Discuss how that works. What is the affordable housing portfolio status?
 1. Mike:

MOHCD was at the last meeting and can respond in more detail on monitoring and enforcement.

Perceptions are that past enforcement and monitoring was low in past decades, but last time MOHCD explained that currently state and federal funding for affordable housing comes along with robust monitoring requirements. This includes annual income certifications for everyone benefiting from income-restricted units. Here, we are also working on the middle and moderate-income band, and we will apply the same model of income certifications and oversight. This is more of a challenge for ownership units. When someone owns their unit in the US, they have certain rights around unreasonable search and seizure, etc., but we will make sure to go

to the fullest extent of the law in making sure that condoshave the same income certification requirements and do our best to ensure that no one is running a subsidized rental program. For-sale units are meant to create homeowner interest at the Reservoir. We will develop this further when a developer partner is selected. We are building off of the Mayor's Office of Housing program.

- iii. Lee. Once a property is privatized, how do you enforce income restrictions? Are there co-ops in San Francisco currently?
 - 1. Mike: Deed restriction. On the title deed to the property, there are limitations on how we transfer the land. When you acquire deed, you agree to those restrictions and for the City to go in and enforce those restrictions. Deed is ultimate thing that governs the property and gives us rights to ensure that affordability is maintained.
 - 2. Davila: St. Francis Co-op.
- iv. Winston. Council of Community Housing Organizations had a proposal to designate a portion of the land for 100% affordable and the other half will be sold at cost to be developed to a minimum of 33% of affordable housing. Is this possible? Can we have the City buy a portion of the City and build 100% affordable and the other part be developed with a mix of affordable and market-rate?
 - 1. Mike. Taking a step back, this project is within the Prop K goal of 30,000 units by 2020. The Mayor's Office of Housing's funds are fully programmed through 2020 to help achieve the 30,000 unit goal, and if the affordable housing bond measure on this November's ballot is passed, its revenue is also fully programmed to help meet that goal. So we want to go out to the development community, set a minimum percentage of affordable housing, and challenge them to do better than that. We want to move that forward during our current crisis and not wait until more funds becomes available after 2020
- v. Lee. Would like to respond to public comment re: cultural/performing arts uses. Have members of the public heard anything from the performance arts community? Have they expressed a need for affordable housing?
 - 1. Spinali. Add arts community to list of special groups including veterans.

7. City College Master Plan Process Update.

- a. Davila. CCSF does not currently have a master plan. I will have more to say in December. We are currently in the process of approving a consultant and we need to take the Balboa Reservoir planning process into consideration. Community is driving the process. Regarding crime in areas with affordable housing, there will be more people like me. I hope you're not checking green cards. I think that would be a violation of City policy, and I'm kind of appalled that someone would say that besides Donald Trump. (Edit per public comment during 11/05/15 meeting of the CAC)

8. Adjournment.

- a. Motion to adjourn: Chung, Second: Muehlbauer
 - i. Ayes: Chung, Davila, Favetti, Godinez, Lee, Muehlbauer, Picar, Spinali, Winston
 - ii. Noes: [none]

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.

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.