

Questions and concerns re the Design Standards and Guidelines (DSG)

Amy O’Hair, Sunnyside SNA representative, BRCAC

Apr 8 2020

Amy O’Hair, Sunnyside SNA representative, BRCAC Apr 8 2020	Responses
<p>Page vi: This page notes: <i>“In the event provisions in this DSG directly conflict with those in the Planning Code, this DSG will control so long as the DSG remains consistent with the SUD.”</i> Why would the design and infrastructure of the BP project ever conflict with San Francisco Planning Code? I would like an explanation as to why this proviso was included, and what conflicts might arise.</p>	<p>The SUD will govern in the event of any conflict. Any direct conflict between the DSG, the SUD and the Planning Code is unlikely. Therefore the Balboa Reservoir design team is proposing to delete this statement from the DSG.</p>
<p>Page 11: There is an incomplete acknowledgement of the many actual uses of the Balboa Reservoir in its current state, as ad hoc open space, The scrappy growth and two large trees are home to a great many small animals and birds. Hawks hunt here daily. In addition, of course, to its use as City College parking, the open space is home to a weekend motorcycle school, frequent driving practice and instructions by family members, and bicycle-riding lessons for kids--in addition to being unmatched dog-walking territory used by dog lovers from all surrounding neighborhoods.</p> <p>These uses, requiring large swaths of open land, will be lost, although that trade-off in order to build housing is one the City and many citizens want to see. I am not suggesting the project not go ahead as planned, but I would request the DSG document present an honest picture of the present uses of the reservoir lot which are not being replaced by the planned project.</p>	<p>We appreciate the comment. See suggested revision to final paragraph, page 11:</p> <p>Today, while essentially a blank slate, with no remaining buildings nor original landscape elements, the 17-acre site is host to a variety uses including parking for City College, a motorcycle training school, urban wildlife habitat, and neighborhood dog walking destination.</p>
<p>Page 13: I note that most of drawings that are shown on pages 13-15 (of the presentation) as examples do not display the types of mass reduction and roof line variations that are specified for the project on pages 7-9.</p>	<p>Noted. The mass reduction and roof line variations are illustrated in the DSG document. Refer specifically to illustrations in DSG sections 7.15 and 7.16.</p>

<p>Page 14 (DSG): As a historian of the neighborhood, I'd like to see the first six sets of dates on this timeline corrected. References are available on my history page for the Reservoir.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1894: Sutro sells land for reservoir to Spring Valley Water Company. • 1909-1929: Development of streetcar line, Westwood Park and Sunnyside neighborhoods. • 1945-1956: WWII use by Navy and temporary campus use by City College. [<i>campus, not housing</i>] • 1958: Reservoir constructed, but not finished or filled. • 1964-1973: I-280 Freeway constructed and Balboa Park BART Station built. • 1991: Half of original reservoir given to City College. [<i>official east/west realignment did not take place till 2012</i>] 	<p>We will update the timeline to reflect this information.</p>
<p>Page 17 (of the presentation): Are these fog-proof materials? Anyone living in the areas surrounding the BP site knows what a persistent foe surface molds are on the outside of our houses. The lessons from the disastrous green-roofed buildings recently pulled down on the NW corner of the City College Ocean Campus show what the fog and damp in this area can do to materials that are not chosen with those conditions in mind.</p> <p>So I would like to make sure that the building cladding materials are vetted for their abilities to withstand years of our notoriously fog-sodden weather.</p>	<p>Yes, exterior materials will be resistant to fog and other environmental conditions. See Standard 7.17.1 Quality And Durability (page 207 of the DSG) which specifically discusses that materials shall be suitable for long-term exposure in a coastal marine environment.</p>
<p>CHRIS Hanson</p> <p>April 8, 2020 Via Email</p>	

If you look at figure 4.2.5* in the 800 page design document, this TDM framework is based on insufficient data regarding parking usage at CCSF's Ocean Campus. Planning stated that their parking survey, which was done on May 10 and 11, 2016 represented average parking usage. But this data was collected the week before finals when the school's attendance is as small as it will be all semester.

Some data is missing completely: TDM surveyed the parking lot usage at night from 10:00PM to 12:30AM after all classes at the school are over. This is the only data collected in the evening and it completely omits parking for night students—

Does this sound familiar? I said this to the CAC in 2016. Longtime members of the CAC have heard Jeremy Shaw say this was just a beginning, that more data would be collected, that this was not "it".

But here we are with a complete design and still the insufficient data to replace the existing use of a parking lot used by City College for decades.

***later confirmed**

But one thing has changed. We have no idea what that it will look like, but we are headed to a recession, and judging by the vast number of people who lost their jobs in the last 4 weeks it will be a whopper. During the last recession City College had 100,000 students.

SFMTA has told us at the CAC meetings that it will take years to even open up the doors of a second MUNI car already traveling on Ocean Avenue. How will these students, these people whose lives have been upended, manage to get to City College?

RCP references a CCSF commissioned study by Fehr and Peers (March 2019). This study reports on parking counts conducted in June of 2018 and the first week of the semester in August of 2018. Based on these surveys and a consideration of CCSF growth, the current parking need is projected at ~220 spaces. RCP is required to continue to collect data in the coming years prior to constructing the public parking to determine the actual need, the City will review and approve the analysis determining the final size of the public parking.

<p>Mike Ahrens, Member Balboa Reservoir CAC</p> <p>On behalf of Westwood Park Association</p>	
<p>Dwelling Unit Mix</p> <p>DSG Section 3.2 provides some limited standards addressing dwelling unit density and unit mix. Standard S3.2.2 on page 35 states that the dwelling unit mix shall include a minimum of 25% two-bedroom units and 10% three-bedroom units, which is one of the optional unit mix requirements in the Planning Code. Because one of the stated purposes of the Project is to promote housing for families with children, we believe more of the units should be required to be larger three-bedroom units.</p> <p>The “Data and Needs Analysis” in the Housing Element points out that the City lacks units with three or more bedrooms and that of the 363,660 total units in the City’s housing inventory over 53% were constructed prior to 1940. San Francisco’s housing units generally tend to be small, with approximately 72% of all units being two bedrooms or less. San Francisco is a city of renters who occupy 62% of housing units. Housing units added in the last 27 years represent approximately 12% of all units. The majority of the recently approved mixed used projects after the unit mix requirement was adopted in 2008, have been mainly two-bedroom units. In addition, renter households are more likely to be overcrowded than home-owning households due to high housing costs. Larger households of all races have difficulty securing housing with three or more bedrooms at any price, which is attributed to the City’s very limited stock of larger units. Additionally, if working from home becomes the norm due to the societal changes we live with currently, the need for larger three and more bedroom units will be in even greater demand.</p> <p>Based on this, we suggest that Standard S3.2.2 be amended to provide that minimum of</p>	<p>The Reservoir project is family friendly development. The number one housing issue facing families is affordability – the reservoir offers 550 units of affordable housing at a range of affordability levels. The Reservoir will provide 100 spaces of childcare - childcare availability is another key need for families. The project has made a commitment to provide 25% two bedroom units and 10% three bedroom units – which is a higher commitment to larger units than any requirement in the Planning Code for plan areas or development agreements. Unique to the Reservoir project is a commitment to 10% three bedroom units. Importantly before the affordable housing is developed BRIDGE or Mission will conduct market studies which helps inform the programming for the affordable units – this practice helps ensure that the affordable family units that we build will be rightsized for the families in San Francisco.</p>

<p>30 to 35% of the units have three bedrooms or more, especially when the project is built on public land.</p>	
<p>Affordable Housing The DSG does not address the amount or location of the proposed affordable housing. We understand that fifty percent (50%) of the 1,100 housing units planned will be affordable units and that these units will be located in four 100% affordable multi-family buildings. We believe that the DSG should address the location and mix of affordable units. The Association understands the reasoning behind the necessity for all City subsidized units for households with very low income (below 55% of AMI) to be in a single building for various reasons. However, the DSG should otherwise be consistent with the Planning Department's current implementation of Planning Code Section 415.6(f) that requires a private housing development to integrate affordable units with market rate units throughout every floor of a residential project. Therefore, we suggest the DSG be revised to include the following two additional sections: Residential Uses S3.2.3: <i>All affordable units except for those subsidized by the City shall be integrated with the market rate units, equally, in all residential buildings, Similar to other private development as stated in Planning Code section 415.6(f).</i></p>	<p>Balboa Reservoir will include a wide range of affordable units including low- and moderate-income housing. The affordable buildings are integrated with market rate units, ensuring that at least two affordable buildings are built in each phase and at least two affordable buildings will be located adjacent to the park.</p> <p>The public lands program pushes this project to the goal of providing 50% affordability, including 33% provided without local subsidy – a level far higher than the requirements under section 415 of the San Francisco Planning Code. In order to achieve 50% of onsite affordable housing, the project teams affordable housing developers – BRIDGE Housing, Mission Housing and Habitat for Humanity will rely on traditional affordable housing tools including Low Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC), state grants and philanthropic dollars (especially Habitat). These sources include many requirements and restrictions that do not allow for integration within market rate buildings. BRIDGE, Mission Housing and Habitat's separate development, ownership and operation of the affordable housing at the Balboa Reservoir is fundamental to the</p>

	<p>team’s approach to the site as was described in the initial proposal.</p>
<p>DSG 6.1 and 6.16 Open Space and San Ramon Way: DSG Figure 6.1-1 on Pages refers to the “San Ramon Paseo” as part of the Project’s open space network, which is described in more detail in DSG 6.16 on pages 166-67 as follows: <i>San Ramon Paseo is a pedestrian and slow bike path only, connecting the Balboa Reservoir neighborhood open space network to San Ramon Way at the west. Pedestrian and bike amenities will be provided along the paseo, creating a lush garden-like passage for residents and community members.</i> The Association has no objection to using this area as open space, but does have concerns about the connection to the Westwood Park neighborhood via San Ramon Way. First, this would require use of property owned by the Association and for which neither the City nor the developer has the rights to currently use for the Project The Association reserves all of its rights to prevent its property for any connection to San Ramon Way from the Project site, and continue to object to opening San Ramon Way. The Association does not believe that connection to San Ramon Way is necessary to encourage the use of public transit as most residents will use BART or Muni Metro J, K</p>	<p>Connecting Balboa Reservoir to the west is intended to improve walking and biking access throughout the larger neighborhood. The 10’ wide dimension of a ‘Shared Use Path’ is based on a “shared use path” as defined by (AASHTO) American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials which accommodates pedestrians and bicyclists. Bicyclists are intended to move slowly on this short connecting segment. Narrowing the path further may make the path more hazardous, and is not consistent with City mobility goals. We agree with the suggested language related to pedestrian safety. This will be incorporated into the DSG as an additional standard.</p>

& L lines and walk from the terminal to Ocean, Lee, or the Brighton Avenue paseo to their home, rather than Muni line #23 that stops near Monterey Boulevard and Miramar Avenue. Therefore, the most likely use of the pedestrian connection would be for those looking for parking in Westwood Park and then walking to the site. This should be discouraged, not encouraged.

Moreover, we are also concerned about encouraging the use of bicyclists into Westwood Park, as riders in this City ignore traffic laws and any restriction imposed on them. The same holds true for skateboard riders, scooters, etc. Who will enforce the "slow bicycle" standard in the DSG when those riders are coming to and from the Project site through Westwood Park?

Therefore, we have the following suggested amendments to the DSG, which would also promote a connection with the local neighborhood commercial district on Ocean Avenue.

S6.16.2 Pedestrian and Slow Bike Shared Path
A ~~minimum~~ maximum 10 8 foot wide shared path shall be provided for pedestrian use only at San Ramon Paseo.

S.6.1.6.6 Pedestrian Safety

The design of the San Ramon Paseo shall consider the safety of pedestrians, especially children, when walking between Monterey Boulevard and beyond to Ocean Avenue.

DSG Section 7.2 Height and Height Exceptions

The height limits for the Project range from 2-3 stories on the western property line to 6 and 7 stories adjacent to the City College buildings, with a maximum allowed height of 78 feet. However, Standard S7.2.6 provides for exceptions for features such as solar energy collectors, utility sheds, projections to accommodate additional ceiling height of common amenity spaces located on the top floor, and non-occupied architectural features, including wind screens. Some of these exceptions effectively raise the height limit by 8

See next page

<p>to 10 feet.</p> <p>We suggest amendments to Standard S.7.2.6 to include the limitation from Planning Code Section 260, as follows</p> <p>⌚ The portion of Section 206260 (b)(1) that provides "[t]he sum of the horizontal areas of the exempted features shall not exceed 20% of the horizontal area of the roof above which they are located" .</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Section 206260-(b)(1)(B) for the height and area of the elevator shaft to the roof deck. - Include the exemptions in Section 206260 (b)(2)(A) through 206260 (b)(2)(e) of the Planning Code. - Amend Standard S7.2.6 allowance for common amenity space located at the top floor to have a floor to ceiling maximum height of 10 feet for apartment buildings only. This section shall not apply to the townhouse buildings in TH1 and TH2. 	<p>See revised Section 7.2.6 Attached.</p> <p>Suggest limiting exempted features to 25%</p> <p>S7.2.6 Agree. Townhomes will be excluded from this exception. The DSG will be revised.</p>
<p>DSG Section 7.20 and 7.21 Private and Public Parking Garages.</p> <p>Figure 7.20.1 of the DSG shows the off-street parking locations for both the public and private parking. Standard S.7.21.6 addresses the public parking that may be co-located within private parking garages. The current Project description states that the Project will provide up to 750 public parking spaces, but S.7.21.6 states that “the total number of spaces available got public parking and hours of public use will be limited as set forth in the Development Agreement.” The Development Agreement “draft key terms” document provided for the April 9 Planning Commission hearing does not address parking other than stating approximately 220 spaces will be provided for to accommodate City College and the general public. Based on this proposed standard and the other information provided, we have the following questions and comments:</p> <p>⌚ How many total public and private off-street parking spaces are expected to be colocated within the same garage?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RCP is currently anticipating the public parking requirement will be to provide ~220 public spaces for use between 9am-5pm. This is based on the analysis conducted by the Fehr & Peers (2019) . RCP is required to continue to collect data in the coming years prior to constructing the public parking to determine the actual need, the City will review and approve the analysis determining the final size of the public parking. • The parking spaces are intended to be public parking, and we are interested in working with CCSF to establish a College specific parking program. • The public parking will be co-located with the residential parking. • The above referenced parking study completed by Fehr & Peers indicated that the lower lot was primarily used between 9-5pm. However the final parking

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⌚ Where and how many spaces will be designated for public parking and for City College students and staff? ⌚ Will the CCSF parking be specifically designated or shared with other public parking and the residential off-street parking spaces? ⌚ Many City College classes are in the evening that do not end until almost 10 pm. The DSG should provide more operational details to accommodate this rather than just refer to the Development Agreement for limits on hours of public use. 	<p>requirement will be informed by ongoing data collection.</p>
<p>DSG Section 7.22 On-Site Bicycle Parking</p> <p>The DSG provides that Class II bicycle parking spaces for visitors shall be located near all main pedestrian entries in accordance with the definitions and standards set forth in Planning Code Section 155.1 (See Figure 5.3-3, p. 63 and Standard S7.22.2 on p. 220.)</p> <p>S7.22.3 does not provide specific detailed guidelines but merely refers to number of spaces required by the Planning Code. Will the North, East, South and West Streets be part of the City's' public streets that are maintained by the City or private streets to be maintained by the Owners of the buildings? Will SFMTA determine the locations of the Class II parking spaces, if not who will be?</p> <p>S7.22.3 should provide the number of bicycle parking spaces, their locations, as well as a higher number of Class II bicycle parking spaces than the Planning Code requires since using bicycles as a preferred mode of transportation as stated in Objective 3, Policy 2.4.2 of the Area Plan.</p>	<p>S7.22.3 refers to the Planning Code with no amendments</p> <p>See Figure 5.2-1 for Street Typology. Lee Avenue, North, South and West Streets will be owned and maintained by the City. West Street North and West Street South shown in blue will be owned and maintained by the HOA.</p> <p>The location of public Class II bicycle spaces will be shown on Figure 5.3-3. The number of spaces will be indicated in the TDM plan and approved by the MTA.</p>

DSG Section 7.36 Dwelling Unit Exposure and Rear Yards for Townhouse Units.

Standard S7.36.1 on p. 235 states that all townhouse units shall face onto a street or open space that meets one of the following definitions:

- ⌚ A public street, private street, private drive or pedestrian way at least 20 feet in width, or
 - ⌚ An open area, an inner court or a space between buildings which is unobstructed (except for obstructions permitted in the Planning Code Section 136) and is no less than 20 feet in every horizontal direction.
- How do all the townhouses meet this requirement if the minimum set back of the townhouses facing the western boundary abutting Plymouth Avenue is only 12 feet?

Both the Unit Exposure and minimum side yard standards are correct and both apply. Any townhome located within 12 feet of the western property boundary (or any distance less than 20 feet) is required to also face onto a street or open space at least 20 feet in width.

DSG Section 7.9 and 7.37 Open Space

We suggest a new bullet point for Standard S7.9.1 on page 187 requiring any roof deck on apartment buildings A through G to be setback 10' from the facades fronting on East, South, West and North Streets, or a SFPUC public open space.

For the townhouses, Standard S7.37.1 should include a bullet point that references the Department and Planning Commission requirements and guidelines related to setbacks for roof decks.

DSG Section 7.9- The Reservoir team does not understand the intent of this standard request for buildings A-G and think it detracts from the design.

7.37.1 – Private roof terraces are not permitted adjacent to the western property boundary

<p>Public Comment during CAC meeting</p>	
<p>Mark, CAC Member</p> <p><i>Want sustainability goals to go above and beyond City code, particularly EV standards</i></p> <p><i>what about bike share for transportation amenity?</i></p>	<p>In addition to meeting the City’s sustainability standards, the neighborhood will be an Environmental Leadership Project and be greenhouse gas neutral per AB 900 with a goal of 100% electric buildings. The electrical capacity will be designed to allow for electric vehicle charging stations for up 100% of the spaces if needed.</p> <p>The project aims to encourage all modes of active transportation. As part of the project’s Transportation Demand Management Plan the project offers to host a bike share docking station and contemplates subsidizing bike share membership to residents.</p>
<p>Jennifer Heggie</p> <p>Grey water – how does smell control work?</p> <p>Will the project change wind impacts for Sunnyside?</p> <p>Would trees or buildings mitigate?</p> <p>Private streets by block G will it create congestion?</p> <p>EIR issues addressed? Excessive noise and air quality</p>	<p>Greywater systems are self-contained systems that reclean water from showers, bath tubs, laundries, and bathroom sinks. It does not include toilet water or sink water. The ordinance governing greywater (the non-potable water ordinance) has been governing SF health code since 2012. As the systems are self-contained smell is not expected to be an issue.</p> <p>In the Initial Study of the EIR wind was not considered a potentially significant impact,</p>

	<p>as such it is not expected to impact Sunnyside.</p> <p>The North end of Parcel G is primarily designed for fire access and is not intended to have regular vehicular access.</p>
<p>Theodore Randolph</p> <p>what about practical and economic sustainability of buildings?</p>	<p>The scale and heights of buildings has been carefully design to ensure economic feasibility. The heights of buildings correspond to cost effective construction typologies, including both Type VA and IIIA wood frame construction over concrete podiums. Block sizes are designed to accommodate the financially feasible number of affordable and market rate units in each phase.</p> <p>The buildings will be designed to achieve a high level of sustainability with a standard of LEED Gold or higher. In addition, the neighborhood has committed to be greenhouse gas neutral and is considering all electric buildings.</p>
<p>Jean Barrish</p> <p>will CAC be providing comments on DSG to commission and Board?</p> <p>What about solar power/panels, want to maximize use.</p>	<p>We defer to the CAC.</p> <p>All buildings will be solar ready and we expect many buildings to adopt solar energy. More so through being selected for the Govener’s Environmental Leadership Development Program (AB900) the project and individual buildings commit to being greenhouse gas neutral.</p>
<p>Hedda</p> <p>stoops and cornices, have you considered rear entrances too? Please address accessibility.</p> <p>West street 25’ eastern 4 stories.</p>	<p>Multifamily buildings will provide accessible entries to all units. In the event that there is a raised stoop at the street,</p>

	<p>an accessible entry will be provided from the internal corridor.</p> <p>A minimum of 10% of the townhouse unit entries will be accessible. This percentage may be increased depending on site grading.</p> <p>The 4 story heights designated at West Street is intended to step down from the taller buildings to the ease and allow flexibility at the townhouse development.</p>