DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL PROCESS (Proposed Timeline)

2014
Public Workshops
Neighborhood meetings

2015
CAC meetings
to advise RFP

2016
RFP/Select Developer
CAC meetings
Community design workshops

2017
Draft Design & Dev’t Proposal

2018
Environmental Review & Public Comment
Final Environmental

2019
Approvals

Orange = Public Input Opportunity

RFP = Request for Proposals from developer/designer teams
Revisions to Draft Parameters based on Feedback

Draft Housing Parameters
September 14

Draft Public Realm Parameters
October 19

Draft Urban Design Parameters
November 5

Draft Transportation Parameters
November 30

Next Meeting: Sustainability, City College, and Additional Benefits

Public Land for Housing – Balboa Reservoir CAC
January 11, 2016
RFP Parameters: Process of Balancing Competing Needs

- Parameter Input to Date
  - Affordable housing need
  - Workshop and survey Input
  - 300+ Public comments

- Post-RFP
  - Developer solutions will compete based on community priorities
  - Trade off conversation about community benefits will continue
Housing: Public Comments Incorporated into RFP
as summarized at the October 19th BRCAC meeting

- Encourage larger unit sizes that are friendlier to families
- Seek a mix of ownership and rental units
- Consider alternative housing ownership models such as coops
- Specify target populations for below-market-rate units (e.g. elderly, public servants, disabled, veterans)
- Balancing housing considerations with other issue areas
Housing: Public Questions Answered
as summarized at the October 19th BRCAC meeting

- Considerations around student housing
- Prioritization of neighborhood residents
- Durability and oversight of affordability restrictions
- Determination of fair market value
Mixed income model

- Parameters incorporate Proposition K of November 2015 directives
  - Use 33% affordability level to establish fair market value for properties owned by agencies like the SFPUC
  - Large sites (such as this one): at least 50% affordable to low/moderate/middle incomes if feasible

- Challenges of 100% affordable development
  - 100% affordable projects require significant subsidy
  - Proposed use of property tax increment financing tool would be directly affected; unclear how infrastructure and public amenities would be financed
Public Realm: Public Comments and Questions

- Clarifications of Open Space Types (e.g. green, private, permeable)
- Will open spaces remain open spaces forever?
- Qualities of open space
  - Multiple activities and populated throughout day
  - Safe, well-lit, concern over alleys
  - Using open space to minimize scale of buildings
- Relationship to neighbors
  - Minimize impacts on existing neighbors
  - Connect to different neighborhoods, don’t wall off
- Desire for larger park area
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS:
Balance need for open space and affordable housing
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS: Over 2x the Open Space

SCHLAGE LOCK
- 20 acres total
- 1.75 open space

BALBOA RESERVOIR
- 17 acres total
- 4 acres open space
  *minimum*
Minimum one significant open space of at least 1.5 acres

Sunnyside Recreation Center (1.5 acres)

Minnie and Lovie Ward Recreation Center (1.5 acres)
## Open Space requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLANNING CODE for comparable buildings</th>
<th>RFP Parameters Minimum for Balboa Reservoir</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impact fees (typically not enough for new park)</td>
<td>4 acres of open space, including at least one 1.5 acre-park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicly-accessible space (54 ft(^2)) Or Private (80 ft(^2)) open space</td>
<td>Publicly-accessible space (60 ft(^2)) Or Private (80 ft(^2)) open space <em>in addition</em> to 4 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Landscaped paths or buffers near neighbors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Streets &amp; publicly-accessibly spaces to read as part of overall public realm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESPONSE TO COMMENTS:
Option for Publicly Accessible Open Space
Urban Design: Public Comments and Questions

- Desire for Successful Streets
  - Connections, safe, small

- Desire to Respect neighbors and impacts
  - Shadows, Heights
  - Variety in design and break up scale of buildings
  - Character and Compatibility

- Heights
  - 85’ Only with *substantial* additional benefits, don’t compromise for more height
  - Desire for lower height, especially on west

- City College connections
Response to Comments: Urban Design

- Language was made stronger to address concerns

- Height:
  - Remains a range of 25-65 feet
  - Stronger language
  - Clear direction about impacting neighbors

- Several comments are also addressed in Public Realm, Transportation and City College sections
Transportation: Public Comments and Questions

1. Circulation and Congestion
2. Parking – concerns for students, neighborhoods, future residents
3. Prioritize pedestrian safety and access
4. How does TDM change travel choice and car ownership
5. Support incentives and encouraging alternatives, especially for students
6. Isn't TDM a citywide issue? Shouldn’t the City be doing more?
Response to Comments

Understanding that...

- We need open space and affordable housing
- Peak hour congestion has long been a challenge
- City College access is critical...

1. Limited road space; take this opportunity to improve it
2. Neighborhood can benefit from parking analysis & management
3. Pedestrian safety and access is of highest priority
4. Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures can make it easier to choose transit, walk, bike during peak periods
Response to Comments: Manage limited ROW
Neighborhood Benefit from Parking Analysis & Management

TDM Study stakeholders:
- Current residents
- Future residents
- CCSF students, faculty, staff
Response to Comments: Pedestrian safety & access

RFP Parameters strongly protect pedestrians

Ocean and Geneva – passed environmental review.

San Jose / Geneva
Response to Comments: Parking Ratio

- “One size does not fit all”
- Added:
  - Family units = 1 parking space per unit ratio
  - Student units = no more than 1 in 4
# Next Steps and Meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Workshops</td>
<td>Neighborhood meetings</td>
<td>RFP/Select</td>
<td>Draft Design &amp; Dev’t Proposal</td>
<td>Environmental Review &amp; Public Comment</td>
<td>Final Environmental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Developer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CAC meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to advise RFP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CAC meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community design workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Orange = Public Input Opportunity*
THANK YOU!

SIGN UP FOR FUTURE UPDATES:
sf-planning.org/brcac

brcac@sfgov.org