

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: Harry Bernstein <riquerique@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, April 20, 2020 2:31 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>; aj <ajahjah@att.net>
Cc: CPC-Commissions Secretary <commissions.secretary@sfgov.org>; Hood, Donna (PUC) <DHood@sfgov.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: Re: 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.

Hello, all

I appreciate aj's continuing efforts to focus on the planning procedures that have led us to the present juncture. aj is no doubt right about this less-than-transparent planning process, and the community would have recognized what was being pushed (in terms of zoning) if the planning goals for project density had been more clearly stated. Planning and OEWD might have foreseen the proclivities of the Planning Commission. At the hearing on April 9, one or two of the members went out of their way to commend the use of a General Plan Amendment to update an existing plan. In this case, since the result of the amendment is to provide more housing--an overarching objective of the current City administration--it's seen as a means to an end. The gross process was certainly pointed out by some. The estimated density from the Housing Element was explicitly mentioned at the hearing. The meticulous and lengthy process for approving the original Balboa Park Station Area Plan, lasting eight years or so, was articulately highlighted in a comment from a resident of Westwood Park. That's even longer than it has taken the Balboa Reservoir project to get from the initial public meetings of 2014 to the present, which several of the YIMBY folks contemptuously ridiculed. But you can add another two years or so to that early timeline if you go back to the Golden Shovel real estate challenge of 2012, which produced two detailed analyses of the Balboa Reservoir. (It was intended as advice for the SFPUC, which also happened to be one of the sponsors of the competition.) In 2016, aj summarized one aspect of the winning competition from UC Berkeley:

> Unlike the City Team's unwillingness to acknowledge the importance of parking for CCSF and the neighborhoods, the UC students saw parking to be of obvious importance. "The proposal also took advantage of the site's unique topography to provide below-grade replacement parking at close to above-grade costs. "As the largest student parking area on campus, replacement parking was a focal point of both the CCSF and the local community," says D'Orazi.

=====

The developers of the project are not against more parking facilities than what they have already proposed. It's just that if CCSF wants additional parking, they'll have to provide it, at an unbelievable cost per space, and probably on

their own land. (Note that in the above quote, the suggestion was made for underground parking.)

When the project was at a more preliminary stage, the planning process always seemed to give it the benefit of the doubt--initial approval of a TDM (a Transportation Demand Management plan, which is required for any large housing development) or the ENA (Exclusive Negotiating Agreement), officially recognizing and granting negotiating rights to the developer of the proposed project. The bodies that gave their initial approvals were quick to point out that this was not final approval. There would be a stage further down the line to evaluate the total impact of the project. (At that point, it would have become hard to stop, especially if it was merely about quibbles concerning the transparency of the early planning process. With the familiar adage about broken eggs in mind, the planning process seems to be most concerned with the end product; that is, it's more about erecting omelets than preserving the integrity of eggs.)

This is not to say that it's misguided to continue to raise our voices and to battle inequities and improper procedures. How can such arguments be useful as the development team is beginning to see the end in sight, later this very year--when it comes before the Board of Supervisors in July. If that is a straightforward vote at a virtual meeting, efforts have to be intensified at the remaining preliminary approval procedures continue to come up.

Harry B.

On Monday, April 20, 2020, 01:01:47 PM PDT, aj <ajahjah@att.net> wrote:

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