

From: BRCAC (ECN) <brcac@sfgov.org>
Sent: Friday, April 24, 2020 7:38 PM
To: ECN, BalboaReservoirCompliance (ECN) <balboareservoircompliance.ecn@sfgov.org>
Subject: FW: For 4/27/2020 meeting: DSG in full context of rezoning

From: aj <ajahjah@att.net>
Sent: Monday, April 20, 2020 1:02 PM
To: BRCAC (ECN) <brcac@sfgov.org>; sunnyside.balboa.reservoir <sunnyside.balboa.reservoir@gmail.com>; mikeahrens5 <mikeahrens5@gmail.com>; Brigitte Davila <bdavila@ccsf.edu>; Jon Winston <jon.winston.brcac@outlook.com>; Peter Tham <peter.tham@ltgroupre.com>; jumpstreet1983 <jumpstreet1983@gmail.com>; cgodinez <cgodinez@lwhs.org>; rmuehlbauer <rmuehlbauer@live.com>; tang.mark <tang.mark@gmail.com>
Cc: CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>; Hood, Donna (PUC) <DHood@sfgwater.org>; Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Yee, Norman (BOS) <norman.yee@sfgov.org>; Low, Jen (BOS) <jen.low@sfgov.org>; Maybaum, Erica (BOS) <erica.maybaum@sfgov.org>; SNA BRC <sna-brc@googlegroups.com>; Public Lands for Public Good <publiclandsforpublicgood@gmail.com>; John Rizzo <jrizzo@ccsf.edu>; Thea Selby <tselby@ccsf.edu>; Shanell Williams <swilliams@ccsf.edu>; Ivy Lee <ivylee@ccsf.edu>; Alex Randolph <alexrandolph@ccsf.edu>; Tom Temprano <ttemprano@ccsf.edu>; studenttrustee@mail.ccsf.edu
Subject: For 4/27/2020 meeting: DSG in full context of rezoning

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

BRCAC:

DSG is once again on the agenda for the 4/27/2020 meeting.

However the DSG topic avoids addressing the broader subject of rezoning...Rezoning that the Planning Commission is being asked to approve.

Early on in the Reservoir Project's "public engagement process" in 2015-2016, people in the community had raised the issues of zoning and density. The Reservoir Team avoided addressing these (unspeakable?) issues during the Principles & Parameters period.

It was only after the RFP process had concluded that it was revealed that the Project was proposing 1,100-1,550 units.

The programmatic Balboa Park Station Area Plan, to which the Reservoir Project is subsidiary, talked about 425-500 units; not 1,100. It was unconscionable and dishonest for the Planning Dept/OEWD to deliberately avoid addressing the issues of zoning and density until after the RFP selection.

It is only now that Planning Dept Staff is asking for the Planning Commission to make major changes in zoning via a "General Plan Amendment."

The proposed General Plan Amendment makes MAJOR changes to the Balboa Park Station Area Plan's Housing Element and Open Space Element.

The 1,100-unit privatized Reservoir Project is not compliant with the existing Balboa Park Station Area Plan and San Francisco General Plan. The Reservoir Project is being reverse-engineered via the proposed General Plan Amendment to make it such. The cart had been knowingly placed before the horse from the git-go.

Planning Dept/OEWD's manipulation of the General Plan Amendment shows egregious lack of integrity. Why were the issues of rezoning from "Public" to "Special Use District" avoided and hidden from public view until recently?

Rezoning of "Public" to private needs full airing out--not just from a stage-managed Staff presentation--but from the public in more than mere 2-minute snippets.

--aj