

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

**MEETING MINUTES**

**City College of San Francisco  
Multi-Use Building, Room 140  
55 Phelan Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94112  
Monday, February 8, 2016  
6:15 PM  
Regular Meeting**

Please note that a supplemental audio recording of this meeting is included on the Planning website via the following link: [www.sf-planning.org/brcac](http://www.sf-planning.org/brcac)

Documents received during this meeting are included as attachments.

**Committee Members Present:**

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

**Committee Members Absent:**

[none]

**Staff Present:**

Jeremy Shaw, Sue Exline, Planning Department; Emily Lesk, Mike Martin, Phillip Wong, Office of Economic and Workforce Development; Craig Freeman, San Francisco Public Utilities Commission; Jen Low, Supervisor Norman Yee, Office of D7 Supervisor Norman Yee; Beth Rubenstein, Supervisor John Avalos, Office of D11 Supervisor John Avalos

**1. Call to Order and Roll Call.**

- a. Roll Call

**2. Opening of Meeting.**

- a. Amendments to 1/11/16 Minutes.
  - i. Kate Favetti

1. Page 6 of 14. We have to think in terms of planning for Millennials, but there are generations behind the Millennials and those are the Young Creative Urban Professionals. You don't just plan for today, you also plan for tomorrow.
- ii. Madeleine Mueller
  1. Page 13. Number 5. 30 years ago we took care of 200 units; there were no units of housing built.
  2. Number 9. Says strong language; I hope that wasn't me, I hope I wasn't using strong language.
- iii. Christine Hanson.
  1. Page 14. The sentences don't make sense.
  2. Number 4. There was no mention in your parameter that it's currently and continuing to be used for parking.
  3. Number 7. No mention of parking as a need.
  4. Number 6. Public land should stay in public hands.
- iv. Harry Bernstein. *Submitted written comments, attached here and to 1/11/16 minutes.*
- v. Motion to approve with amendments: Favetti, Second: Winston
  1. Ayes: Chung, Davila, Favetti, Godinez, Lee, Muehlbauer, Spinali, Winston, Picar
  2. Noes: [none]
- b. April Meeting
  - i. Spinali. Request to reschedule April 11 meeting.
    1. Move to either April 13 or 14.
    2. We will discuss availabilities.
    3. Looking at Wednesday, April 13.
    4. We will discuss by email and put it online.
- c. Context Presentation (Emily Lesk and Jeremy Shaw) [***see Presentation online at [www.sf-planning.org/brcac](http://www.sf-planning.org/brcac)***]
  - i. Spinali. Every picture shown is illustrative; to give an idea.
  - ii. The CAC will ensure we will be additive to the content, and continue with the decorum; we will make sure there are opportunities to hear the collective voice of the community.

### **3. Housing, Urban Design, and Public Realm Parameters: Version 3.**

- a. Housing Presentation (Mike Martin). [***see Presentation online at [www.sf-planning.org/brcac](http://www.sf-planning.org/brcac)***]
  - i. CAC Comment.
    1. Godinez. What are the challenges of having 75% affordable housing or even starting with 100%?
      1. Mike Martin. If we go to 100% affordable to low-income as a starting point and we take the 500 units in the Balboa Park Station Area Plan (BPSAP) for this site, realizing that all the

- parameters will dictate the number of units that eventually will be; take those 500 units and multiply by \$250,000 per unit.
2.  $\$250,000 * 500 \text{ units} = \$125,000,000$
  3. The source of property tax increment would not exist due to exemption discussed during presentation; so we're back to the existing set of subsidy funds.
  4. Increased competition for this limited amount of funding.
  5. Pursue instead, using the site itself to subsidize the affordability.
  6. Opportunity to not go to the same spigot of money.
2. Muehlbauer.
    1. Data on the AMI in the surrounding neighborhoods? Just so we can get a sense of the context?
      - a. Mike Martin. We will come back with this.
  3. Favetti.
    1. Westwood Park Association issued a survey on 1/26 to all of our 670 units and to-date have received 239 mailed-in responses.
    2. Results: ~95% responding are supportive of the following points: 500 units from 2009 Balboa Park Station Area Plan (BPSAP), FEIR worst-case scenario (so many residents participated in a long process, ~10 years in the making, to develop BPSAP), 5 acres of open space, not to exceed 28' on the west closest to Plymouth Avenue residents and 40' on the rest of the site, 33% affordable – 50% low-income, 18% low and middle-income, with their remaining being 120-150% of the adjusted mean income, strong desire to have 50% of homeownership opportunities, one-to-one parking for each residential unit, replacement parking for CCSF, adopted program has to address all transportation needs, if we are going underground the M also underground the K.
    3. *Comments submitted in writing and attached here.*
- b. CAC Comment on Changes to Housing Principles. (Spinali presenting changes)
    - i. Winston.
      1. In favor of broad diversity of incomes on this property. Good for different kinds of people to live together in the same place.
      2. Understand PODER's point of view for 100% affordable housing.
      3. It does leave a bad taste that developers will build market-rate housing.
      4. Determine how much profit is appropriate.
      5. Mission Rock is a good project, and maybe we can exceed it.
      6. I understand the need, but there is so much market-rate housing in this City (call it luxury housing) we don't need much more of it.
      7. We will have to compromise on this.

8. Would like to see the very low-income represent a larger percentage of affordability; they are the most desperate; also recognize middle-incomes needs.
  9. Partner developer with a non-profit developer; CCHO mentioned as a possibility and we may want to look at it.
  10. Prop K is setting the baseline; can we start at a slightly higher number? 50% seems arbitrary but maybe it isn't.
- ii. Godinez.
1. I'm struggling with the percentage being so low; I can't afford to live in San Francisco.
  2. I want it to be 100%, but realize that might not be realistic something in the middle.
- iii. Chung.
1. SFPUC Charter mandate receiving market-rate; how does it work if demand 100%, can the board veto it?
    1. Lee. The PUC Commissioners have to vote to approve real estate transactions; if there was an action before them it would be contingent on their approval.
    2. Mike. Not so much that they can veto, Commissioners would not have the legal authority to enter a transaction knowing they would not receive fair-market value because of obligation as a trustee to ratepayers; there's a potential to be sued.
- iv. Muehlbauer.
1. My priority is that we're building a quality neighborhood.
  2. 17 acres, what is it going to look like? What's the street plan? How many units are we talking about?
  3. Best kind of affordable housing is the type where you don't notice it; it just blends into the urban fabric. I'm not ready to say the ratio.
  4. Even at 150% of the median income many still can't afford to live here.
  5. Ownership housing and affordability are mutually exclusive; affordability in perpetuity, and ownership assumes equity gain over time, if you build in a restriction protecting perpetual affordability, you don't have the ownership dream, might just be a glorified rental.
  6. Creating additional restrictions is problematic. How do you make sure people aren't cheating; who would provide enforcement to make sure the owners are actually living there?
  7. It still becomes managing rental housing at 150% or 120% and is probably easier administratively.
  8. Look at the long-term of what we're trying to accomplish here.
  9. I've gotten calls if I support 100% affordable and it's too early to have that conversation.
- v. Lee.
1. Here to represent SFPUC CAC.
  2. I relay a lot of what I hear.

3. At our last meeting I relayed comments from neighborhoods and other concerns (traffic, CCSF, PAEC, and parking).
  4. Members of the SFPUC CAC, even understanding the need for fair-market value, still strongly support 100% affordable development.
  5. The notion of privatizing land that is in the public trust is a difficult concept to grapple with.
  6. We will have another conversation at our next CAC meeting.
  7. Comparing to Mission Rock, which is a long-term lease reverting to public ownership, this is a sale; meaning it's likely to privatize.
  8. Draft resolution is proposed and have just begun the conversation.
  9. Diversity of perspectives on the SFPUC CAC.
- vi. Spinali.
1. Be responsible to the ratepayers to get market-rate, and if the SFPUC CAC supports 100% can that shift how we think about it?
    1. Lee. It does not shift the legal requirement that SFPUC ratepayers be compensated at fair-market value.
    2. This is the tension that we're seeing at the SFPUC CAC.
    3. Emily Lesk. Rebecca's body is the SFPUC CAC and is advisory to staff at SFPUC, and the Commission is making the ultimate decision about the SFPUC's interest advised by SFPUC's attorneys.
    4. Lee. Any recommendation that SFPUC makes, the audience is the Commissioners and management for managing the real estate transaction.
  2. This is an opportunity to unite neighborhoods; we need it to be mixed-use, without it, it might not integrate well.
  3. We need to be shoulder to shoulder. This is how we build community in this neighborhood with a diversity of income and backgrounds.
  4. How this development can be a hub similar to CCSF?
  5. The high-return for the ratepayer is very important.
  6. Having to listen to my colleagues discuss taking public land and privatizing it is a serious thing to do in perpetuity. If we're going to do it what does that really mean? Why would we not do a 99 year lease? What makes this different from the Mission Rock property?
  7. Developer partner may come up with something creative.
  8. The CAC represents the public interest.
  9. We have seen the construction of market-rate housing to maximize profits for developers.
  10. It's a heavy thing to say that we're going to give this land to a developer.
  11. Particularly important for CCSF; no more room for expansion if this happens.
- c. Public Comment on Changes to Housing Principles. (Spinali presenting changes)
- i. Hedda Thieme. Westwood Park.

1. Single out Kate Favetti for an excellent performance.
  2. She's the only one that spoke up when 85' came up.
  3. Concerned about Affordable Housing Bonus Program because 85' is 8 stories and if you get 20% that's 12 stories, which we don't want.
  4. 40' on the Westside is too high, 28' should remain.
  5. Affordable housing for people that live in San Francisco.
  6. SFPUC: Do we have pipes on the property on the Westside in addition to Southside and are they remaining in the ground?
    1. Jeremy Shaw. We will respond later.
- ii. Laura Clark. Noe Valley.
1. Excited for more housing; my rent is too high.
  2. Too much focus on percentage of affordability.
  3. Goal is to maximize total number of affordable units.
  4. We need to talk about number of units; maximize total number of affordable housing as a principle goal of the project.
- iii. Yonathan Randolph. Ingleside.
1. Maximize the number of affordable units to maximize the amount of good.
  2. Principle 1.a. and 1.d. Can we convert the percentages to numbers?
  3. Principle 3. Maximize the number of housing units created without compromising the quality of design.
  4. We want to make affordable housing not just for those under 55% AMI, but bring market-rate down to make people who don't qualify for affordable housing can afford housing on the open market.
  5. Dispute presentation's point to minimize market-rate, it should be the opposite. Maximize the amount of good we can do.
- iv. Jennifer. Sunnyside.
1. 3.a. Appreciate calling out CCSF; appropriately added.
  2. 3.b. Already an under-capacity of MUNI streetcars and busses for the needs of the area; access to BART is not safe at night; fix transportation infrastructure before new housing is constructed.
  3. Tenants of a market-rate ocean avenue development publically complained about lack of sound proofing between floors.
  4. 3.b. Should include sound privacy between units; make sure floors are adequate.
  5. What is effect of the local TDM on state legislation of consideration of traffic impacts from new development?
- v. Chris Hanson. Excelsior.
1. Francisco Reservoir was sold/transferred to SFRPD from SFPUC.
  2. Non-profit put together funding of 22 million dollars.
  3. 15 acres on Russian Hill; might be transferred for less than fair-market value for the area.
  4. Land is being turned into a park and will remain in the public domain.
  5. The transfer was approved by the commission.

6. SFPUC Commission meeting tomorrow at 1:30 PM, City Hall, Room 400. They take public comment on items not on the agenda early in the meeting.
7. Flooding presentation.
8. Re: earlier presentation, when referring to middle-income, people at City College do not qualify for middle-income; should not be confused with the middle-class. Middle-income is way above where we think it should be.
- vi. Brian Hamlin. Mission.
  1. Maximize the number of BMR units, not the percentage.
  2. Maximize the overall number of units given housing crisis.
  3. We aren't building enough market-rate housing, according to economists.
  4. Have you done any analysis on how many people will be de-housed by lowering height limits from 85' to 65' or lower in other areas?
  5. What effect will this have on crisis and displacement in other neighborhoods?
- vii. Rita Evans. Sunnyside.
  1. Comment on Public Realm.
    1. Spinali. Splitting up comments; will give comment later.
- viii. Charlie Sciammas. Excelsior. CUHJ.
  1. We want development that meets the needs of the people here.
  2. Develop equitable solution.
  3. We believe there is a comprehensive solution that sets the bar high given this is public land.
  4. Affordable to a wide range of incomes, open space, parking, transit infrastructure for fully-enrolled students at CCSF, and community-based design these are complementary interests.
  5. We have talked to over 100 families; tremendous support for 100% affordable housing.
  6. The need to sell it at market-rate does not preclude achieving maximum affordable.
  7. CCHO presented alternative viewpoint from the City; showed that we can think strategically and creatively about how to create and maximize affordability.
- ix. Michael.
  1. Maximize the number of affordable units created by this project, not just the percentage.
  2. To Jon Winston's point, conflating with market-rate with luxury housing; that's more the result of having low housing stock. Housing is scarce so market-rate is considered luxury.
  3. Increase the amount of housing we have at all levels eventually people will be able to pay market-rate.
  4. Getting affordable units means winning a lottery.

- x. Tory Fisher. Oakland.
  - 1. Focus on the ratios instead of the raw numbers of affordable housing.
  - 2. 100% is great but if you only build one unit it doesn't matter.
  - 3. Parking. 1 unit of parking for every one unit of housing. There are transit improvements nearby; parking is not all that necessary for folks that live here.
  - 4. Other cities in the region are not cooperating and San Francisco needs to build as much housing as possible at all income levels.
- xi. Jesse Fernandez. Inner Sunset.
  - 1. 17 acres is an opportunity to provide some sense of normalcy and stabilization to our low-income families.
- xii. Theodore. Excelsior.
  - 1. I think that the height limits shouldn't be decreased so drastically.
  - 2. 85' might seem high due to four decades of lack of proper construction throughout the City. Over 100' could be fine if fulfills the other parameters.
  - 3. This location is good for increased density.
  - 4. BPSAP includes transit improvement and safety.
  - 5. UCLA paper, mandates on housing size inevitably leads to enclaves of super rich.
- xiii. Supervisor John Avalos.
  - 1. Thank you for sitting on the CAC and balancing all the different interests.
  - 2. My district is on the corner of Phelan and Ocean; it used to be the entire southern side of Ocean Avenue to Faxon, but redistricting was done to accommodate the population boom in my district.
  - 3. Residents in my district double or tripled up in houses and in-law units; often unpermitted.
  - 4. We have partnered with CUHJ to get the upper yard site designated 100% affordable; corner of Geneva and San Jose; it took many years.
  - 5. Site on Mission next to Safeway proposed for close to 100% affordable.
  - 6. Francisco Reservoir was kept as park land and PUC still received fair-market value.
  - 7. SFPUC CAC is also looking to pass a resolution for the SFPUC commission to get 100% affordable housing.
  - 8. The huge demand for housing all across San Francisco; we could affect the demand by building hundreds of units of 100% affordable housing.
- xiv. Laura Fry.
  - 1. In-lieu payments make it seem like the City isn't doing their job to make sure developers are putting units in their buildings.
  - 2. There is a backlog of units that they decide to put here.
  - 3. *Comments submitted in writing and attached here.*



4. Developer wanted to put in affordable housing, but City demanded fees.
  5. The goal should be to make a nice neighborhood, not to max it out.
  6. I'm glad they took away the height at 85'.
  7. Muelhbauser, Park Commons, when you leave the unit becomes affordable at a higher prices so you do get some equity.
- xv. Tim Colen. SFHAC. Resident, District 7.
1. This is a priceless opportunity.
  2. This is a responsibility to San Francisco and the region as a whole.
  3. How do we put in more housing where there is great transit infrastructure? This is a regional transit node; this is a great area to build housing.
  4. How do you extract value in this land to create the maximum benefit?
  5. More parking or more affordable housing; more open space?
  6. You missed an opportunity by lowering the height from 85' to 65'. It goes against what the affordable housing advocates. Reducing the height reduces the amount you can get out of it.
  7. Francisco Reservoir. I believe many very wealthy people purchased the land to take it out of public use.
  8. Affordable housing is incredibly expensive.
- xvi. David Melamen.
1. To build high-density housing will clobber the neighborhood.
  2. What makes San Francisco great is a diversity of interesting neighborhoods.
  3. Building high density and tall buildings would go against that; especially if done against the existing infrastructure.
  4. There have been a lot of power failures in the neighborhood.
  5. Put in the parameters that the infrastructure not be further strained/damaged.
  6. CCSF should get their PAEC.
  7. Interest of CCSF should be strongly considered.
  8. Moral force for more affordable housing, the answers aren't all here.
  9. Good people are being used as a cover for selling off public stuff to a private developer for more money.
- xvii. Carol Ito. Westwood Park.
1. Reinforce what Kate Favetti reported from our recent survey of just under 700 respondents.
  2. Disagree with John Avalos and those in the audience who want 100% affordable, as well-intentioned as this is, there needs to be a balance that the 17 acres can provide for the City and the surrounding neighborhoods.
  3. Respect that businesses and neighborhoods have made an investment.

4. 33% affordability is a starting point and the middle-class was severely neglected in citywide planning and we hope anything above 33% will take into respect the middle-class families between 120-150% AMI.
- xviii. Linda Judge. Westwood Park.
  1. Push to define a number of units.
  2. Push to maximize density and height and number of units in our neighborhood.
  3. I understand at many different levels the concern around affordability and I know a number of people who have been pushed out.
  4. I've worked in real estate for 30 years and there has always an affordability crisis in San Francisco.
  5. It's important to thoughtfully develop this piece of land that makes sense for the community, the surrounding neighborhoods, and the middle-class, which for those involved this is the socio-economic group that is most underserved.
- xix. Francine Lofrano.
  1. Pleased to see the height limit was reduced.
  2. BPSAP was an extensive process that we all participated in; and 500 units was a worst-case scenario.
  3. Westwood Park does touch the development, so the height limits is crucial to our neighborhood.
  4. Respect our investment to our communities and homes; it's been a struggle to maintain our homes. We pay property taxes that support and subsidize PAEC and other things.
  5. We want to preserve what we've invested in.
  6. I moved here to keep away from density and urban sprawl.
- xx. Jesus. SFSU. Formerly a commuter student to CCSF.
  1. I had to live in co-ops because I was from a different city, and other students I knew had to do the same.
  2. Stress the urgency of affordable units for students.
  3. Pushing people out to different areas making society worse.
- xxi. Victoria Sanchez. Cayuga. PODER.
  1. My grandchildren as me, "when are we going to have a place to stay?"
  2. My family shares one bathroom for 7 people.
  3. This is a good project and I hope we do something about it.
- xxii. Clarita Natividad. Westwood Park.
  1. I wish of finding a way to build a high-rise to have everyone live here.
  2. However, there needs to be a balance.
  3. If it's really high-density I will be pushed out.
- xxiii. Harry Bernstein. Merced Heights.
  1. Something to analogous to the Francisco property. Look into the options for affordability and something community-supported.

2. Reconcile the current uses; we need to have numbers for the realistic usages; units for living and units for parking to meet current and projected needs.
3. There are a lot of things to contend with that aren't very clear right now.
4. I'm not personally for maximizing the number of units.
5. 3,000 is overdoing it; might make 500 seem more palatable.
- xxiv. Spinali.
  1. Heard from various vantage points.
  2. Challenge of building in an existing area with existing housing stock.
  3. Situation of uniting disparate desires.
  4. Definition of consensus is, is this something you can live with?
  5. That is how we can move forward.
  6. We want to maximize the property to address the affordability crisis. This crisis won't be solved by this 17 acre site but we can contribute to solving it.
  7. Need to be careful how much responsibility we can take.
- d. CAC Comment on Changes to Urban Design Principles. (Spinali presenting changes)
  - i. Winston.
    1. We have to look at balance when considering these parameters.
    2. Westwood Park deserved to not be encroached upon and have their standard of living lowered.
    3. I want to see most of the public open space be built adjacent to their backyards; no buildings next to surrounding neighborhoods.
    4. Create a buffer and a living space to contribute to quality of life.
    5. Balance; you might need to have taller buildings on the eastside to have a smaller footprint for more people.
    6. Variation in building heights/sizes.
    7. Taller buildings near Phelan loop in the southeast; shorter buildings abutting the park on the Westside.
    8. Variation in architecture; to emulate organic, fine-grain texture of other cities that developed slowly.
  - ii. Lee.
    1. Consensus does not mean unanimous agreement.
    2. Consensus means all parties can live with the outcome, sustain the outcome, and commit to the outcome.
  - iii. Favetti.
    1. Reiterate appreciation of positive changes.
    2. Think about the quality of life of the new community coming in.
    3. Ensure the new community integrates seamlessly in the neighborhood.
  - iv. Muehlbauer.
    1. Public Transit is not mentioned here.

2. When you talk about urban fabric we need to talk about transit linkages from the outset.
3. Better walking paths, better lighting that gets people in an automatic mode to get to transit as opposed to getting into a car to get to transit.
4. Add “harmonize relationship between existing streets, open spaces, and public transit nodes.”
- v. Davila.
  1. I don’t think a lot of things that have come up are mutually inconsistent such as the PAEC and the affordable housing; they can coexist.
  2. A transportation study will be done, which will clear up issues around parking and whether if we need more busses and where they should go and what they should do; they are built into this process.
- e. Public Comment on Changes to Urban Design Principles. (Spinali presenting changes)
  - vi. Bob. Sunnyside.
    1. 2.d. Ask that all surrounding neighborhoods are afforded same protections from building with reasonable buffers like those for Westwood Park.
    2. Don’t sacrifice the privacy, light, and neighborhood character of the neighborhoods to the east and north.
  - vii. Laura.
    1. Address not being at previous meeting.
    2. Great burden to come and talk about these issues.
    3. Stalinist architecture was for function.
    4. Developer wants to build a desirable neighborhood.
    5. 2.d. Openness through contiguous private open spaces; private open spaces by definition do not necessarily have a public good, they have a good for those people that have access to contiguous private open spaces; others don’t necessarily have walkthrough rights.
  - viii. Rob Hamlin.
    1. 2.b. Winston wants variation in heights and facades; this increases the cost of construction and fewer people will be able to live here because the subsidy required for each unit will be higher.
    2. Important that we balance the concerns.
    3. Build to scale is misused.
    4. Think rather about the scale of the need for housing; there is a tremendous need.
    5. Those speaking for more housing are younger, and those speaking for less are older.
    6. This isn’t an issue about aesthetics, this is a class issue.
  - ix. Yonathan. Ingleside.
    1. Was told to get a side-job to afford to live in San Francisco; not possible.

2. 2.c. Do not neuter the economic benefits of this site next to a major bus terminal for aesthetic concerns.
  3. Don't limit to 65', it's inappropriate; a blanket height restriction of 6 stories is inappropriate.
  4. We can't solve the housing crisis with this one project, but it symbolizes what San Francisco is willing to do to improve the welfare of its citizens.
- x. Laura Fry.
1. 1.a. Several block scale. Recommend that a good neighborhood feature is curved streets, wind and traffic calming, also pretty.
  2. 2.c. Definition of setbacks and space.
  3. 2.c. The building heights; glad it's at 65'. Not every development is not maxing out heights.
  4. Whatever is decided, post-development make this a permanent height; no matter what density bonus is put forward that this RFP will mandate this height in perpetuity.
  5. Affordability always has been a problem. I can't remember a time when I paid only 33% of my income for housing costs.
  6. I'm paying rent to live in a place and have access to amenities.
- xi. Madeleine Mueller. CCSF.
1. Principle 2. These parameters/designs apply to the neighborhood and CCSF.
  2. Reincorporate CCSF into these parameters; in all the parameters.
- xii. Tori.
1. Comment to Muehlbauer. Glad that he is discussing the urban design parameters paired with access to transit.
  2. Consider bike infrastructure.

#### **4. General Public Comment.**

a. Public Comment

- i. Linda Judge. Westwood Park.
  1. Pass out survey results. *Submitted and attached.*
  2. Passed out on the 26<sup>th</sup> and received on the 28<sup>th</sup>.
  3. In a week we received 200 responses, and today received 37 responses.
  4. Of the responses received, 95% - 98% of people are supportive of the board's position.
- ii. Chris Hansen.
  1. Question for Jeremy Shaw. Earlier presentations mentioned a final due diligence commission memo to determine the property as surplus.
  2. When the property was actually declared surplus?
    1. Jeremy Shaw. Site has not been declared surplus. There are formal procedures for declaring land surplus. From my recollection, not speaking on behalf of the PUC, part of that

presentation was from our deputy general manager of the PUC stating there have been a lot of studies surmised that the site is not critical for use as a reservoir/it's design.

2. Formal declaration of surplus has not happened.
3. Spinali. That was one of the questions we asked at one of the first meetings, to have the SFPUC here to say they aren't planning on using the land and it's not a working reservoir. Let's find out what it would take to make that happen.

iii. Laura.

1. People have come a long distance to make their voices heard.
2. We have an extreme need for affordable housing.
3. Massive number of people have demanded more housing.
4. Balboa Park should step up. Every community has the potential to have an impact to the total number of houses and the total number of people that can live in the City.
5. Just because we need transit and other infrastructure needs, it shouldn't preclude building more housing.

iv. Francine Lofrano. Westwood Park.

1. It's City policy to preserve neighborhoods.
2. Respectfully disagree this is a classist argument; It's not renters against owners.
3. I own my house; I went to CCSF and could not afford to go anywhere else.
4. I work full-time, and we have a vested interest because I own a home.
5. I struggled for everything I have.
6. I have participated in community meetings for 10 years.
7. I would love to live in Pacific Heights, but you buy where you can afford and you live where you can afford.

v. Harry Bernstein. Merced Heights.

1. An article I read asking, why is there another CAC?
2. What are the responsibilities of the other CAC (Balboa Park Station)?
3. Does one trump the other regarding the reservoir or transit mitigations?
4. Jeremy, I'm also interested in the process of declaring land surplus.
5. Confusing that the site has not been declared surplus.
6. New housing proposal for the Giants, UCSF is there and in December a suit was filed, and the Mayor forced the Chancellor to waive rights for hospital access. I'm wondering if that suit is successful and it stops the Giants would the City consider using land such as that or in addition to this land requiring less development.

**5. Close of Meeting.**

- a. Spinali.
  - i. Next meeting will be a similar process during this meeting; showing you changes.
  - ii. First action item on next agenda, finalize at our next meeting parameters for housing and urban design, as points have been well articulated.

**6. Adjournment.**

(item xi)

1. What AJ just said, given the present circumstances, the present environment, how that will go forward?
2. Lower reservoir is for overflow parking.
3. The Lower reservoir's description is an area for dog-walking.
4. Parking should be mentioned.
5. This is part of the CEQA process.

3. 2014(?) study of current uses of the Reservoir site mentioned dog walking but ignored the present and historic use of site for student parking.

4.45 - Those present uses of the land must be acknowledged to properly enable the proper environmental review process.

Additional Public Benefits Parameters.

a. CAC

i. Lee.

1. In the First slide there are the amenities desired. How did you narrow into these 7 bullet points?
  1. Emily Lesk. Not a narrowing, this is exhaustive list from what we heard. We believe everything on this list is covered in the full set of the parameters. Highlighted that additional public benefits are a catch-all from this exhaustive list that weren't covered in the fall.
  2. Spinali. Mapped what was covered by other parameters and then additional items are not covered by other parameters.
  3. Emily Lesk. Let us know if anything was missed.

ii. Favetti.

1. Looks like a wish list.
2. We have a need for youth and childcare center and recreation facilities.
3. Glad to see housing for multi-generations.
4. My kids are millennials or Young Urban Creatives.

iii. Spinali.

1. Principle 2. Maximizing an active first floor.
2. We already see this on Ocean Avenue and there are vacancies where there shouldn't be.
3. We want to ensure there's vibrancy and mitigate vacancy.
4. Active things happening on the ground floor will be important for this site.

b. Public Comment

i. Sheila. Teacher, CCSF.

1. Live in Oakland.
2. Spoke at 12/15 meeting.
3. Parking is heavily used by CCSF students and faculty.
4. My students need a place to park.
5. Developer needs to create permanent parking for CCSF, that isn't shared that matches number of open spots that are there.
6. This area is land-locked, there is no way to access this plot of land.
7. It will be hard to get to these things because there is no access.

ii. Ray. Sunnyside.



# WESTWOOD PARK



February 9, 2016

Via USPS and email to [John.Avalos@sfgov.org](mailto:John.Avalos@sfgov.org)

Supervisor John Avalos  
City Hall  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Re: Telephone Message Requesting Westwood Park to Support  
100% Affordable Housing for the Proposed Balboa Reservoir Development

Dear Supervisor Avalos,

I am responding to your voicemail message requesting the support of the Westwood Park Association for 100% affordable housing.

Westwood Park supports an affordable housing component to whatever development occurs provided that it serves the needs of all those negatively impacted by rising housing costs.

The terms of that affordable component that the Board of Directors of the Westwood Park Association and over 95% of all property owners who responded to a survey stating our position support our position are as follows:

The City has proposed 33% affordable housing minimum (broken down by: 15% to low income and 18% to low and middle income) and wants the developer to maximize the amount of affordable housing for up to 50% affordable housing units on the site.

Westwood Park recommends that any amount of affordable housing over the 33% should be solely allocated to the Middle Class (between 120% and 150% AMI), since this is the income group that is being least served and is currently being pushed out of the City.

Sincerely yours,

Kate Favetti, President

c: Norman Yee, Supervisor, District 7  
Balboa Reservoir Community Advisory Committee  
Westwood Park Association Board of Directors and Balboa Reservoir Committee



# SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

*Laura Fry*

## Reissued Letter of Determination

### CORRECTED INTERESTED CALCULATION

March 19, 2014

Sean Keighran  
251 Rhode Island, Suite 111  
San Francisco, CA 94107

Site Address:	248 Ocean Avenue
Assessor's Block/Lot:	3211/009
Zoning District:	NC-1 (Neighborhood Commercial, Cluster) District
Staff Contact:	Kate Conner, (415) 575-6914 or <a href="mailto:kate.conner@sfgov.org">kate.conner@sfgov.org</a>

1650 Mission St.  
Suite 400  
San Francisco,  
CA 94103-2479

Reception:  
415.558.6378

Fax:  
415.558.6409

Planning  
Information:  
415.558.6377

Dear Mr. Keighran:

This letter is in response to your request for a Letter of Determination regarding the property at 248 Ocean Avenue ("Project"). This parcel is located in the NC-1 (Neighborhood Commercial, Cluster) Zoning District and 40-X Height and Bulk District. The Letter of Determination request is to resolve whether a previously approved five unit project may switch the method of compliance with the Inclusionary Affordable Housing Program ("Program") after issuance of the first construction document and first Certificate of Occupancy.

The Project was approved by the Planning Commission on May 15, 2008 (Case No. 2007.1470D - new construction and Case No. 2007.1417D - demolition) to demolish the existing two-story, single-family dwelling and construct a new four-story, mixed-use building with ground floor commercial and five dwelling units. A Notice of Special Restrictions ("NSR")<sup>1</sup> was recorded October 14, 2008 and included a condition which stated: "the project shall require an on-site affordable unit as the inclusionary requirement provided under Planning Code Section 315. To meet the inclusionary requirement, the two-bedroom unit #202 will be reserved as affordable." The Project received its first construction document on October 5, 2011.

In May, 2012, the Project Sponsor contacted the Planning Department about renting the affordable unit. Planning Department staff informed the Project Sponsor that the Project would have to enter in to an agreement with the City to allow the affordable unit to be rented. This agreement ("Costa Hawkins Agreement") would state that the Project's affordable unit is not subject to the Costa-Hawkins Rental Housing Act based upon a received density bonus or concessions (as defined in California Government Code Section 65915 et seq.).

*based upon - why have to have*

<sup>1</sup> NSR 20080665407 Recorded on October 14, 2008 Reel J748 Image 0484



Sean Keighran  
251 Rhode Island, Suite 111  
San Francisco, CA 94107

March 19, 2014  
Letter of Determination  
248 Ocean Avenue

*Handwritten: This is goblin good*

The owners contacted the Planning Department in June 2012 to request a determination of the Project's eligibility to enter into a Costa-Hawkins Agreement. The Planning Department determined that the Project did not qualify for a Costa Hawkins Agreement because the Project did not receive a density bonus, concession, or incentive for the production of on-site inclusionary units. The Discretionary Review Application was mandatory to allow for the demolition and new construction. The Project complied with the Planning Code in all other respects. The Planning Commission did not grant a separate density bonus or any other significant concessions or incentives. *Handwritten: ???*

*Handwritten: don't make sense*

It should also be noted that the Letter of Determination request indicates that the Program threshold was raised to 10 units as part of Proposition C. Although part of the conversation regarding Proposition C, this particular change was made by Board of Supervisors Ordinance No. 219-12. This ordinance did not specifically apply to this project because it only applied to projects that had not received a first construction document prior to January 15, 2013.

As stated in the Letter of Determination request, on July 26, 2012, the Project Sponsor contacted the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development ("MOHCD") to pursue payment of the Affordable Housing Fee as an alternative to providing the affordable units on-site because it was a rental project. There is no mechanism within the Planning Code to allow for payment of the Affordable Housing Fee after the issuance of the first construction document. Planning Code Section 415.5(g)(3) states:

If a project sponsor fails to choose an Alternative before project approval by the Planning Commission or Planning Department or if a project becomes ineligible for an Alternative, the provisions of Section 415.5<sup>2</sup> shall apply.

In this case, the Zoning Administrator has determined that that the Project located at 248 Ocean Avenue is ineligible for the On-Site Alternative because it is a rental project that cannot qualify for a Costa Hawkins agreement. As such, the project is no longer eligible to provide units on-site and therefore must pay the Fee. Payment of the Fee is due prior to the issuance of first construction document or in this particular case: October 5, 2011; therefore, payment of the Fee is late. Planning Code Section 415.5(d) addresses recourse for late payment, including lien proceedings. Planning Code Section 415.5(d) states:

If, for any reason, the Affordable Housing Fee imposed pursuant to Section 415.5 remains unpaid following issuance of the first Certificate of Occupancy, the Development Fee Collection Unit at DBI shall institute lien proceedings to make the entire unpaid balance of the fee, plus interest and any deferral surcharge, a lien against all parcels used for the development project in accordance with Section 408 of this Article and Section 107A.13.15 of the San Francisco Building Code

This Letter of Determination request serves as written acknowledgement of the intent to pay the Fee. Interest on the Fee would begin accruing after the issuance of the first construction document, on October 5, 2011. Accrual would cease on November 18, 2013, when the Project Sponsor filed the Letter of

<sup>2</sup> Planning Code Section 415.5 refers to payment of the Affordable Housing Fee ("Fee").

Determination, formally requesting switching to payment of the Affordable Housing Fee. The Letter of Determination request suggests that interest and penalties should cease accrual on July 26, 2012, when the Project Sponsor contacted the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD). The Letter of Determination request serves as a formal commitment to pay the Affordable Housing Fee; thus that date of Letter of Determination request, November 18, 2013, will serve as the date when interest and penalty will cease accrual.

The Interest Rate is adjusted monthly and is based on the most current Pooled Fund Portfolio Statistic Report issued by the Treasurer/Tax Collector's Office. The Interest Rate used is the Earned Income Yield which represents the annualized rate based on one month of earnings. The interest rate applicable to this project is 0.002% per day.

MOHCD determines the Affordable Housing Fee and issued a Fee Determination Letter on January 28, 2014 stating that the Affordable Housing Fee for the Project is \$358,618. The first construction document for the Project was issued on October 5, 2011 and interest accrual ceased on November 18, 2013 (when the Project Sponsor filed the Letter of Determination request formally requesting switching to payment of the Affordable Housing Fee), resulting in 775 days subject to interest accrual. The interest total is: \$6,092. The table below includes the necessary payment due to MOHCD.

Affordable Housing Fee	\$358,618
Interest 0.002%/day for 775 days	\$6,092
<b>Total due to MOHCD:\$364,710</b>	

Planning Code Section 415.9 addresses enforcement procedures for projects that fail to meet Program requirements after issuance of first Certificate of Occupancy. The Project received its first Certificate of Occupancy on July 25, 2012. Planning Code Section 415.9 states:


If, after issuance of the first Certificate of Occupancy, the Commission or Department determines that a project sponsor has failed to comply with any requirement in Section 415.1et seq. or any reporting requirements detailed in the Procedures Manual, or has violated the Notice of Special Restrictions, the Commission, Department, or DBI may, until the violation is cured, (a) revoke the Certificate of Occupancy for the principal project or required affordable units, (b) impose a penalty on the project pursuant to Section 176(c) of this Code, and/or (c) the Zoning Administrator may enforce the provisions of Section 415.1et seq. through any means provided for in Section 176 of this Code.

Penalties may be assessed after the issuance of first Certificate of Occupancy under Section 176 of the Planning Code at a maximum rate of \$250.00 per day. The Project has failed to comply with the Program. As such, penalties began accrual on July 25, 2012 and ceased on November 18, 2013 (when the Project Sponsor filed the Letter of Determination request formally requesting switching to payment of the Affordable Housing Fee), resulting in 481 days subject penalty accrual. The Zoning Administrator and Director of Planning have determined that penalties should accrue at a reduced rate of \$50.00 per day for this violation. The reduced penalty rate is due to the size of the project. This Project would not be subject

Daniel Frattin  
One Bush Street, Suite 600  
San Francisco, CA 94104

June 25, 2014  
Letter of Determination  
1461 Pine Street

If a project sponsor fails to choose an Alternative before project approval by the Planning Commission or Planning Department or if a project becomes ineligible for an Alternative, the provisions of Section 415.5<sup>2</sup> shall apply.

 In this case, the Zoning Administrator has determined that that the Project located at 1461 Pine Street is ineligible for the On-Site Alternative because it is a rental project that did not procure a Costa Hawkins agreement as currently required by Planning Code Section 415<sup>3</sup>. As such, the Project is no longer eligible to provide units on-site and must pay the Fee per Section 415.5(g)(3). Payment of the fee was due prior to the issuance of first construction document or in this particular case: August 24, 2011; therefore, payment of the Fee is late. Planning Code Section 408(a) addresses recourse for late payment, including lien proceedings. Planning Code Section 408(a) states:

Except in the case of a project for which MTA is responsible for the determination and collection of the TIDF under Section 411.9(d) of this Article, if a first construction document or first certificate of occupancy, whichever applies, is inadvertently or mistakenly issued prior to the project sponsor paying all development fees due and owing, or prior to the sponsor satisfying any development impact requirement, DBI shall institute lien proceedings to recover the development fee or fees, plus interest and any Development Fee Deferral Surcharge, under Section 107A.13.15 of the San Francisco Building Code.

The Project Sponsor contacted the Department on May 10, 2013 inquiring about switching the method of compliance with the Program to the Affordable Housing Fee. Department staff provided a preliminary interest and penalty calculation, which the Project Sponsor contested in a Memorandum submitted on September 11, 2013. After further discussion, the Department adopted a revised policy regarding the interest and penalty calculation. Your request suggests that interest and penalties should cease accrual on May 10, 2013, when the Project Sponsor first contacted the Planning Department. It has been determined that the Memorandum serves as a formal commitment to pay the Affordable Housing Fee; thus that date of Memorandum, September 11, 2013, will serve as the date when interest will cease accrual. The penalties will cease accrual on May 10, 2013, as requested.

Interest on the Fee commenced accrual after the issuance of the First Construction Document on August 24, 2011. The Interest Rate is adjusted monthly and is based on the most current Pooled Fund Portfolio Statistic Report issued by the Treasurer/Tax Collector's Office. The Interest Rate used is the Earned Income Yield which represents the annualized rate based on one month of earnings. The interest rate applicable to this project is 0.002% per day.

!!! The Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD) determines the Affordable Housing Fee and issued a Fee Determination Letter on May 6, 2014 stating that the Affordable Housing Fee for the Project is \$1,354,863. The first construction document for the Project was issued on August 24, 2011 and interest accrual ceased on September 11, 2013 (when the Project Sponsor filed the Memorandum

<sup>2</sup> Planning Code Section 415.5 refers to payment of the Affordable Housing Fee ("Fee").

<sup>3</sup> A Costa Hawkins exception agreement may be pursued by the Project Sponsor to provide units on-site.





## SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

### Reissued Letter of Determination

#### CORRECTED INTEREST CALCULATION

March 19, 2014

Melinda Anne Sarjapur  
Reuben, Junius & Rose  
One Bush Street, Suite 600  
San Francisco, CA 94104

Site Address:	246 Ritch Street
Assessor's Block/Lot:	3776/092
Zoning District:	SLI (Service Light Industrial) District
Staff Contact:	Kate Conner, (415) 575-6914 or <a href="mailto:kate.conner@sfgov.org">kate.conner@sfgov.org</a>

1650 Mission St.  
Suite 400  
San Francisco,  
CA 94103-2479

Reception:  
415.558.6378

Fax:  
415.558.6488

Planning  
Information:  
415.558.6377

Dear Ms. Sarjapur:

This letter is in response to your request for a Letter of Determination regarding the property at 246 Ritch Street ("Project"). This parcel is located in the SLI (Service Light Industrial) Zoning District and 55-X Height and Bulk District. The Letter of Determination request is to resolve whether a previously approved Single Room Occupancy (SRO) Project may switch the method of compliance with the Inclusionary Affordable Housing Program ("Program") after issuance of the first construction document.

The Project was approved by the Planning Commission on June 17, 2010 (Case No. 2006.1348EKC - Motion No. 18108) to demolish the existing 4,130 square-foot building and to construct a five-story, 50-foot tall building with 19 market-rate SRO residential units. Conditions of Approval Nos. 6-11 of Motion 18108 address compliance with the Program and mandate that three of the SRO units be provided as on-site affordable units. Motion 18108 stated that the units are ownership-only unless the Project Sponsor enters in an agreement with the City in order to provide rental units. This agreement ("Costa Hawkins Agreement") would state that the Project is not subject to the Costa-Hawkins Rental Housing Act based upon a received density bonus or concessions (as defined in California Government Code Section 65915 et seq.) The Project received its first construction document on August 14, 2012.

As stated in the Letter of Determination Request, the owners contacted the Planning Department on August 13, 2013 to request a determination of the Project's eligibility to enter into a Costa-Hawkins Agreement. On August 21, 2013 the Planning Department determined that the Project did not qualify for a Costa Hawkins Agreement because the Project did not receive a density bonus, concession, or incentive for the production of on-site inclusionary units. The Conditional Use Application was to allow for a type of housing (SRO units) to be constructed within the SLI Zoning District. The Project complied with the Planning Code in all other respects. The Planning Commission did not grant a separate density bonus because SRO's are permitted by the Planning Code to have a higher density and the Planning Commission did not grant any other significant concessions or incentives.

Melinda Anne Sarjapur  
Reuben, Junius & Rose  
One Bush Street, Suite 600  
San Francisco, CA 94104

March 19, 2014  
Letter of Determination  
246 Ritch Street

Subsequent to this decision, the Project Sponsor contacted the Planning Department to pursue payment of the Affordable Housing Fee as an alternative to providing the affordable units on-site because it was a rental project. There is no mechanism within the Planning Code to allow for payment of the Affordable Housing Fee after the issuance of the first construction document. Planning Code Section 415.5(g)(3) states:

If a project sponsor fails to choose an Alternative before project approval by the Planning Commission or Planning Department or if a project becomes ineligible for an Alternative, the provisions of Section 415.5 shall apply.

Planning Code Section 415.5 refers to payment of the Affordable Housing Fee ("Fee"). The Zoning Administrator has determined that the Project located at 246 Ritch Street is ineligible for the On-Site Alternative because it is a rental project that cannot qualify for a Costa Hawkins agreement. The project is no longer eligible to provide units on-site and therefore must pay the Fee. Payment of the fee is due prior to the issuance of first construction document or in this particular case: August 14, 2012.<sup>1</sup> Payment of the Fee is late. Planning Code Section 415.5(d) addresses recourse for late payment, including lien proceedings. Planning Code Section 415.5(d) states:

If, for any reason, the Affordable Housing Fee imposed pursuant to Section 415.5 remains unpaid following issuance of the first Certificate of Occupancy, the Development Fee Collection Unit at DBI shall institute lien proceedings to make the entire unpaid balance of the fee, plus interest and any deferral surcharge, a lien against all parcels used for the development project in accordance with Section 408 of this Article and Section 107A.13.15 of the San Francisco Building Code

Although the Project has not received its first Certificate of Occupancy, this Letter of Determination request serves as written acknowledgement of the intent to pay the Fee. Interest on the Fee would begin accruing after the issuance of the first construction document, on August 14, 2012. Accrual would cease on September 23, 2013, when the Project Sponsor filed the Letter of Determination, formally requesting switching to payment of the Affordable Housing Fee.

The Interest Rate is adjusted monthly and is based on the most current Pooled Fund Portfolio Statistic Report issued by the Treasurer/Tax Collector's Office. The Interest Rate used is the Earned Income Yield which represents the annualized rate based on one month of earnings. The interest rate applicable to this project is 0.002% per day.

The Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD) determines the Affordable Housing Fee and issued a Fee Determination Letter on August 1, 2013 stating that the Affordable Housing Fee for the Project is \$ 683,818.00. The first construction document for the Project was issued on

---

<sup>1</sup> Building Permit Application No. 2007.01.05.1074 received its first construction document on August 14, 2012. This fee cannot be deferred. In order to defer payment of the Affordable Housing Fee, the Project Sponsor would have had to submit a deferral request to the Department of Building Inspection. The deferral option expired on July 1, 2013.



## GOVERNMENT CODE

### SECTION 65915-65918

65915. (a) When an applicant seeks a density bonus for a housing development within, or for the donation of land for housing within, the jurisdiction of a city, county, or city and county, that local government shall provide the applicant with incentives or concessions for the production of housing units and child care facilities as prescribed in this section. All cities, counties, or cities and counties shall adopt an ordinance that specifies how compliance with this section will be implemented. Failure to adopt an ordinance shall not relieve a city, county, or city and county from complying with this section.

(b) (1) A city, county, or city and county shall grant one density bonus, the amount of which shall be as specified in subdivision (f), and incentives or concessions, as described in subdivision (d), when an applicant for a housing development seeks and agrees to construct a housing development, excluding any units permitted by the density bonus awarded pursuant to this section, that will contain at least any one of the following:

(A) Ten percent of the total units of a housing development for lower income households, as defined in Section 50079.5 of the Health and Safety Code.

(B) Five percent of the total units of a housing development for very low income households, as defined in Section 50105 of the Health and Safety Code.

(C) A senior citizen housing development, as defined in Sections 51.3 and 51.12 of the Civil Code, or mobilehome park that limits residency based on age requirements for housing for older persons pursuant to Section 798.76 or 799.5 of the Civil Code.

(D) Ten percent of the total dwelling units in a common interest development as defined in Section 4100 of the Civil Code for persons and families of moderate income, as defined in Section 50093 of the Health and Safety Code, provided that all units in the development are offered to the public for purchase.

(2) For purposes of calculating the amount of the density bonus pursuant to subdivision (f), the applicant who requests a density bonus pursuant to this subdivision shall elect whether the bonus shall be awarded on the basis of subparagraph (A), (B), (C), or (D) of paragraph (1).

(3) For the purposes of this section, "total units" or "total dwelling units" does not include units added by a density bonus awarded pursuant to this section or any local law granting a greater density bonus.

(c) (1) An applicant shall agree to, and the city, county, or city and county shall ensure, continued affordability of all very low and low-income rental units that qualified the applicant for the award of the density bonus for 55 years or a longer period of time if required by the construction or mortgage financing assistance program, mortgage insurance program, or rental subsidy program. Rents for the lower income density bonus units shall be set at an affordable rent as defined in Section 50053 of the Health and Safety Code.

(2) An applicant shall agree to, and the city, county, or city and county shall ensure that, the initial occupant of all for-sale units that qualified the applicant for the award of the density bonus are persons and families of very low, low, or moderate income, as required, and that the units are offered at an affordable housing cost, as that cost is defined in Section 50052.5 of the Health and Safety Code. The local government shall enforce an equity sharing agreement, unless it is in conflict with the requirements of another public funding source or law. The following apply to the equity sharing agreement:

(A) Upon resale, the seller of the unit shall retain the value of



**Balboa Reservoir Survey Results**

Total # of surveys collected=200 ( as of 2-5-2016)

	Agree	Disagree
1. Number of Units	177	19
2. Open Space	185	12
3. Height	183	17
4. Affordability	185	14
5. Own vs. Rent	187	12
6. Parking	178	19
6 (a) Replacement Parking for CCSF	187	11
7. Balboa Park Station Area Plan & CCSF Master Plan Transportation Infrastructure	188	11

Notation: some surveys did not check agree or disagree on one or more items

# WESTWOOD PARK



## Survey:

1. **Number of Units:** The City Staff [i.e., *City Planning* and the *Mayor's Office of Economic and Workforce Development* ("MOEWD")] says 500 units on the BR site is only a 'starting point', not the maximum. Your WPA Board recommendation is a maximum of 500 units. The maximum of 500 units is part of the larger Balboa Park Station Park Area Plan which already agreed to a **65% increase in population density** for the Plan Area. Do you agree or disagree with the Board position:

☐ Agree   ☐ Disagree

2. **Open Space:** City Staff has proposed 4 acres of open space total (not including parking), which includes 1.5 contiguous acres of a 'large open space' (i.e., "Park"). The site is 17.7 acres. Your WPA Board recommendation is a minimum of 5 acres of open space, including a 1.5 acre Park. Do you agree or disagree with the Board position:

☐ Agree   ☐ Disagree

3. **Height:** How high should the new buildings be? The current zoning for the site is 40 feet across the site, with a small portion on the eastern boundary of 65 feet. The City wants 25 feet on the western part up to 85 feet on the eastern part. Your WPA Board recommendation is for a maximum of 28 feet closest to Plymouth Ave resident's backyards and 40 feet on the rest of the site. Do you agree or disagree with the Board position:

☐ Agree   ☐ Disagree

4. **Affordability:** The City has proposed 33% affordable housing minimum (broken down by: 15% to low income and 18% to low and middle income) and wants the developer to maximize the amount of affordable housing for up to 50% affordable housing units on the site. Your WPA Board recommendation is that any amount of affordable housing over the 33% should be solely allocated to the Middle Class (between 120% and 150% AMI), since this is the income group that is being least served, and is currently being pushed out of the City. Do you agree or disagree with the Board's recommendation:

☐ Agree   ☐ Disagree

5. **Own vs. Rent:** City Staff has indicated the developer should "provide a mix of rental and ownership units" for the full site. Your WPA Board's recommendation is that at least 50% of the affordable units should be owned. Do agree or disagree with the Board's recommendation?

☐ Agree   ☐ Disagree

(con't)

6. **Parking:** The City Staff has proposed 1 parking space for every two units, with a dedicated 1 space for 2 bedroom units (meaning some units will have no parking). Your WPA Board's recommendation is for 1 parking space for each unit, regardless of how many bedrooms the units have. Do you agree or disagree with the Board's recommendation?

☐ Agree    ☐ Disagree

**6(a). Replacement Parking for CCSF:** As it is now, there is no clear City Staff or CCSF policy for how the 1,000 CCSF parking spaces on the site will be replaced. If the 1,000 spaces are not replaced, it is very likely that CCSF students will park in Westwood Park and Sunnyside residential neighborhoods. Your WPA Board's recommendation is that City Staff, CCSF and MOEWD need to clearly define in the RFP how the 1,000 parking spaces now on the site are going to be replaced and by whom. Do you agree or disagree with the Board's recommendation?

☐ Agree    ☐ Disagree

7. **Balboa Park Station Area Plan and CCSF Master Plan Transportation Infrastructure:** As it is now, City Staff does not address funding or implementation of any necessary Master Plan Transportation and related Infrastructure improvements as a requirement of the development. This means the development could happen without the necessary transportation and infrastructure improvements, which would place an undue burden on surrounding neighborhoods parking, traffic and congestion conditions. Your WPA Board's recommendation is that the larger Transportation Infrastructure improvements need to be planned, funded, and implemented before any Balboa Reservoir residential or mixed use development is final. Do you agree or disagree with the Board's recommendation?

☐ Agree    ☐ Disagree

Additional Comments to Survey:

---

---

---

---

**IF YOU WOULD LIKE US TO PROVIDE YOU WITH UPDATES ON THIS IMPORTANT MATTER, PLEASE PROVIDE YOUR CONTACT INFORMATION AND CIRCLE YOUR PREFERRED CONTACT METHOD:**

E-mail address: \_\_\_\_\_

Mailing Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone: \_\_\_\_\_