

Balboa Reservoir Project Review Comment Form

Submittal:
Submittal Date: 5/3/2019
Response Due:

Review Date: 5/3/2019
Agency / Dept: Planning
Primary Contact: Seung-Yen Hong
Other Reviewer(s): Sue Schine, Luc Barata, Lisa Fisher, Tara S

Comment Type Category:

Discussion Item
G - General
T - Technical
E - Editorial
C - Coordination

Response Code:

- 1 - Accepted - Will comply
- 2 - Accepted - Action completed
- 3 - Discussion or clarification required
- 4 - Unacceptable for reasons given

REVIEW					RESPONSE			
Comment No.	Reviewer	Comment Type	Reference (Page / Section / Dwg. / Fig. #)	Review Comment	Respondent	Response Date	Response Code	Response Comment
PLANNING								
1	Planning	Completeness Check	/page 8	page 8 please add more information on deconstruction opps on site - this is a great new trend for the city instead of just demolishing (added term but still not talking about reuse onsite... or target rates)				
2	Planning	Completeness Check	/	with the stars positive infiltration assessment, seems permeable paving is a good BMP opp for stormwater management including parking strips (some folks at public works have expressed interest in proving this and being able to add to standard palette). H as this been considered in the streets where the text says it's hard to meet the 20% reduction? still not seeing connection between infiltration section, stormwater management, and permeable paving in DSG				
3	Planning	Completeness Check	/	the word concept of "protected" is not found in association with any of the bike lanes or intersections? if you're only using the class numbers, please show typical cross sections to understand the difference (still only in DSG)				
4	Planning	Completeness Check	/Section 6.3.4	6.3.4 to include minimizing curb cut outs? (now, the MIP does not mention curb cuts at all - only the DSG)				
5	Planning	Completeness Check	/Section 6.5.3	6.5.3 needs to mention planting palette limited to climate appropriate CAESF native or non-invasive non-native species that support biodiversity, the should include landscaping, since the text is not just trees (still no mention of citywide biodiversity goals, plant palette, sidewalk landscaping)				
6	Planning	Completeness Check	/Section 6.5.5	6.5.5 should also refer to energy efficiency and light pollution standards/goals (still don't)				
7	Planning	Completeness Check	/	please add a section in the intro on this project's overall intentions to make the site climate proof, resilient, etc. to flooding, extreme heat, air quality considerations, etc. As well as a contributor to the City's climate goals. (still no mention of climate, adaptation, resilience)				
8	Planning	Completeness Check	/	my understanding is residential buildings are supposed to be net-zero by 2020 per State regs? we should speak to this and design accordingly. An essential piece will be 100% renewable electricity on site, whether through SFPUC power or green power purchase with PG&E (more expensive). Also, the project proposes having all-electric buildings, which is smart and awesome - the infrastructure plan still mentions natural gas pipelines, etc. Make this get added to the list of discussion topics? (no mention of net-zero, carbon -- and gas systems are not sustainable, page 7)				
9	Planning	Completeness Check	/	more information on all site landscaping irrigation being served by non-potable water? (still not investigating a district scale system)				
10	Planning	Completeness Check	/	stormwater capture/detention/treatment system to service street cleaning fill stations? (still no mention)				
11	Planning	Completeness Check	/	is there consideration / cost/benefit analysis of district non-potable that can service the affordable housing vs. the costs as many separate systems? (seems they're still not investigating, need to ask SFPUC)				
12	Planning	Completeness Check	/	as part of the Lee Ave issues, imagine we are discussing how to continue protected bike lanes to Ocean? (this comment has been addressed)				
13	Planning	Completeness Check	/	does the MIP not need to class 2 cover bike parking? (seems not, but no one answered)				
14	Planning	Completeness Check	/	more info on passenger and commercial loading please, which we know will be significant in today's future neighborhoods (new section 6.2.5 + DSG, also see Comment #34 on Section 6.2.5 below)				
15	Planning	G	all	Figures should be taken into account for page numbering				
16	Planning	G	multiple	Plans should not show building footprints as the final building plans may differ. Planning recommends using just parcel outlines. Please clarify what is the strategy to address the townhouses parcels.				
17	Planning	G	1/1.2	DSG does not focus primarily on the design of buildings, it's a document that regulates the entire development, including streets, open space, and private parcels.				
18	Planning	C	2/1.3	The EIR includes analysis for 1550 units as well. Does the "overall Project Utility demands" take into account 1550 units?				
19	Planning	E	5/1.13	In the previous page, the DSG was referenced as a companion document, but Section 1.13 does not mention the DSG. Please include the DSG here and re-number the appendices.				
20	Planning	E	/Figure 1.1A	Double check on the SFPUC retained fee geometry - it should be a straight line.				
21	Planning	E	/Figure 1.1A	The Block numbers and lot lines do not look right. Block 3180 006-009 should be 4 lots. Parcel 3180010 should be shown separately - this parcel is part of the existing Lee Ave stretch north of Ocean.				
22	Planning	E	/Figure 1.1B	Add curb line to the legend or remove the curb lines from this figure as the curb lines are not a critical part of this figure.				
23	Planning	C	/Figure 1.2B	The portion of Lee Ave north of North Street - at some point, we discussed this portion to be one-way street and privately owned. Clarify the latest decision on the ownership of this portion.				
24	Planning	E	/Figure 1.2B	The legend for Townhome streets reads like there will be no public access. Please revise to read "private street with public access" unless these streets will be gated. Planning does not recommend a "gated community".				
25	Planning	C	/Figure 1.3	Understanding that the portion of existing Lee Ave is not within the project boundary but within the project limits, shouldn't it be part of the first phase?				
26	Planning	E	/Figure 5.1	Define the difference between "Project Boundary" and "Project Limit" and change the line types as the project limits are not clearly shown.				
27	Planning	G	/Figure 5.2	Clarify grading strategy for townhouses parcel.				
28	Planning	E	15/6 STREET, MOBILITY AND CIRCULATION DESIGNS	Typo - delete "at" after "The bicycle network..." in the 5th line of the paragraph.				
29	Planning	E	15/6 Section 6	Last sentence following the first paragraph says "the reviewer shall review both chapter 6 of the IP and chapter 6 of the DSG and then repeats this info in 6.1." The sentence in 6.1 can be removed.				
30	Planning	E	16/6.2.2 Bicycle circulation	Use the industry terms and be consistent throughout the MIP and DSG. Class III should not be referred as a blue line. http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/development/calstrans/draft-blue-plan_bikeway-classification-brochure_072517.pdf (consult with SFMTA)				
31	Planning	E	16/6.2.2 Bicycle circulation	Include Class III for Lee Avenue next to the Whole Foods building where the ROW is limited (south of PUC retained fee)				
32	Planning	E	16/6.2.2 Bicycle circulation	Revise the last sentence to read "The bicycle network and bikeway design guidelines are further defined in chapter 6 of the DSG."				
33	Planning	E	16/6.2.3 Vehicular	1. Typo - delete "at" after "All streets in the first sentence." 2. Define a low-speed street. Will they be speed limits? Revise "Servicing needs for Development Parcels will be accommodated on all streets" - A loading management plan is being developed by the RCP and will be revised by SFMTA and Planning. Off-street loading may be necessary in some cases. The next MIP should reflect the latest discussion on the projects on street and off-street loading strategy.				
34	Planning	C	17/6.2.5	The plan details the public street components, but it does not mention private streets (except in Figure 6.1). Who will develop the private streets, will they be publicly accessible, what are the guidelines? What is the rationale for private streets? and their function should be clearly stated upfront.				
35	Planning	C	17/6.3 Public Street System	If the location of North Street changes in the CCSF parcel, this paragraph needs to be updated. Alternatively, discuss the two options of North Street locations in the MIP.				
36	Planning	G	18/6.3.1	"All streets will project for two-way traffic and fire access. "... What are "all streets"? All publicly owned streets or both publicly and privately owned streets? Please clarify. Some privately owned street range 22-34 feet - explain how fire access is secured in those streets.				
37	Planning	G	18/6.3.2	"The 2015 subdivision regulations will be updated sometime in 2020. SFMTA, Planning, PUC, DPW, and other agencies are currently working on updating the subdivision regulations. The RCP team should closely coordinate with agencies to ensure future plans are consistent with the updated subdivision regulations."				
38	Planning	C	19/6.4.1	The last paragraph states that the Developer or HOA will be responsible for the maintenance of pavement of the raised crosswalks. Will it be stated in the DAT? Is it a typical approach? What about flashing beacons or other traffic controls for raised crosswalks?				
39	Planning	C	21/6.6.1 Raised mid-block crosswalks	See comment on Section 6.3.1 above				
40	Planning	C	22/6.7.1	add flashing beacons and similar to the list (check with SFMTA)				
41	Planning	C	22/6.10 SFMTA infrastructure	A part of Lee Ave within the CCSF property. Should this MIP discuss how the CCSF side will be handled?				
42	Planning	C	23/6.12	Has the provision of bike lanes (class I) on North Street within the CCSF property confirmed?				
43	Planning	E	/Figure 6.2	The portion of Lee Ave south of the PUC retained fee should show Class III.				
44	Planning	E	/Figure 6.2	Graphic suggestion - Use similar colors for the same class bike facilities, just differentiate line types. Use the industry terms (same comment as to 6.2.2).				
45	Planning	E	/Figure 6.2	The existing bike facilities shown on Figure 6.2 are different from the ones in the DSG. Please make them consistent.				
46	Planning	E	/Figure 6.2	Based on other sections (Figure 6.4 D and 6.4E), some bulbouts include bioretention, but this figure indicates only one bulbout within the CCSF property includes a bioretention area, therefore this figure appears to be inaccurate. If the purpose of this figure is to show traffic calming measures, just call out bulbouts and raised crosswalks. The differentiation of different bulbouts does not seem necessary. There should be a separate figure that shows all proposed bioretention facilities.				
47	Planning	G	/Figure 6.3	Who will maintain the bioretention area within the CCSF property? Is it subject to CCSF review?				
48	Planning	C	/Figure 6.3	Typo - the sidewalk width should be 12' not 11' (bottom of the plan view)				
49	Planning	E	/Figure 6.4.C	If the purpose of these figures is to show raised crossing configurations, it is necessary to show all utility lines except for CS? The Utility plan views and sections are shown in the later section - so maybe just cross reference them?				
50	Planning	G	/Figures 6.4.A.E	Provide a key map for each figure				
51	Planning	G	/Figures 6.4.A.E	1. This is the first time "bioretention" is introduced. What kinds of bioretention facilities are they? Provide clarification or cross reference. 2. There should be one figure showing all proposed bioretention facilities within the project site. In addition, are the configurations of the bioretention areas final? Who will be maintaining it? Have PUC and DPW signed off on them? 3. DISCUSSION ITEM: 12' bioretention seems a very wide given that the sidewalk (pedestrian pathway) will be only 6' at that location. Please explain the rationale for the 12' width and consider reducing the width to provide a wider sidewalk (pedestrian pathway). 4. Please include the word "Green Infrastructure" from the SFPUC recommendation to sustain BMPs.				
52	Planning	C	/Figures 6.4.A.E	1. Increase the sidewalk width next to the bioretention area to 6' from 5.5' at a minimum, and consider a wider sidewalk (pedestrian pathway) than 6'. 2. We'd like to see more than striping on the east side of West Street. Could it be a small bulbout? 3. Please add details and sections to illustrate the relationship of the curb ramp, 4' median, and parking lane on the west side of Lee Ave, south of North Street (e.g., ADA compliance, etc.). 4. Add reference to the cross-section drawing in Figure 6.2A-E.				
53	Planning	G	/Figure 6.4.E	25' driveway to building G is too wide. Please reduce the width. For a residential building garage, we usually recommend 10'. If this is for a public parking garage or shared with loading trucks, we will ask for turning templates.				
54	Planning	G	/Figure 6.4.F	The corner design at North Street/West Street does not seem safe. The proposed 30' curb cut should be closely reviewed by SFMTA.				
55	Planning	C	/Figure 6.5.B	In general, the driveway locations have not been finalized. Please add notes about it.				
56	Planning	E	/Figure 6.5.A.E	Same comments as to figure 6.5.B about the curb cut width, the corner design, and driveway location.				
57	Planning	G	/Figure 6.5.B	Question for SFMTA - curb cut to townhomes: could it be narrower than 20'?				
58	Planning	C	/Figure 6.5.D	At Lee/South St, we need a better design for bicyclists. The striping between the bike lane and travel lane will not be sufficient enough to address conflicts between bicyclists and right-turning cars.				
59	Planning	C	/Figure 6.5.B & C	Any reason why we can't have concrete paving blocks at parking lanes?				
60	Planning	G	/Figure 6.5.C					
61	Planning	C	/Figure 6.5.B (North St & West St)					
62	Planning	C	/Figure 6.5.D					

REVIEW					RESPONSE			
Comment No.	Reviewer	Comment Type	Reference (Page / Section / Dwg. / Fig. #)	Review Comment	Respondent	Response Date	Response Code	Response Comment
64	Planning	C	/ Figure 6.9	This plan shows a precise architectural plan instead of a diagram of preferred location/ intentions for services, entries, etc. Clearly how the team will address the discrepancy when the final building plans are not exact the same as depicted? We recommend building flexibility in the MIP.				
65	Planning	G	/ Figure 6.9	This figure is not consistent with the figure in DSG. The DSG shows a parking garage entry to Building C.				
66	Planning	E	24/7	The second to the last sentence - Only design and construction are mentioned as obligations in this section. Please add the word "maintain" as explained in section 7.2				
67	Planning	G	24/7.1 Proposed open space and parks	The numbers in the table should be approximate numbers. The current proposal is slightly less than a 2 ac. central park. Also be consistent - is it Greenway Park or Central Park?				
68	Planning	E	24/7.2	The last sentence is not correct. There are spaces owned by the SFPUC.				
69	Planning	E	24/7.2	The last sentence states "the proposed parks and open spaces will be added to the City inventory of permissible spaces". What does it mean? Please clarify. What is a city inventory of permissible spaces?				
70	Planning	C	/ Figure 8.2F	In the DSG, this portion of West Street is shown as a curbside street. Which one is right? Please be consistent.				
71	Planning	C	38-39/ Figure 13.2	Number of bio-retention planters does not match DSG Figure 5.15-3 Enlargement B.				
72	Planning	G	ATTACHMENT A/ Figure 5.1-1	Recommend splitting this figure into 2-3 diagrams to make them simpler and more intentional about story telling. 1) The regional transit map does not need to show building footprints. It would be helpful to have distinctive colors for "vehicle" routes than transit routes. Using the BART logo would be preferred. In addition, what's the Balboa Park Transit Station that is shown as a red star? Lastly, both bus and train are part of Muni. Relabel them Muni Bus and Muni Metro. Transit lines are unclear, where do they go, where they are coming from? 2) A map zoomed into the project site can show details like nearby bus/metro stops, walking radius to BART and the loss, etc. 3) A building footprints map may not be necessary unless it is referenced in the text. 4) "Primary Auto Connections" doesn't make sense unless it's backed up by data. It would be preferred to have a map showing the street hierarchy that is comprehensive of all street types in a separate diagram.				
73	Planning	G	ATTACHMENT A/ 5.2	"There are many pathway options ... providing convenient access to community facilities, etc." This sentence provides detailed information that are not shown in Figure 5.2-1. Either show these amenities in the figure or delete this sentence.				
74	Planning	E	ATTACHMENT A/ Figure 5.2-1	Show "all" of the potential future crosswalks, do not differentiate raised crosswalks. The goal of this figure is to show the ped network. Explain in the text how "Primary ped flow" routes have been identified.				
75	Planning	E	ATTACHMENT A/ Figure 5.2-1	In general - do not show building footprints in these kinds of diagrams. Parcel lines should be sufficient to tell the story.				
76	Planning	G	ATTACHMENT A/ Figure 5.2-1	Please show transit stops nearby to illustrate how "primary ped flow" is related to transit and nearby destinations.				
77	Planning	G	ATTACHMENT A/ 5.3 Bike Network	After the second sentence or part of the sentence, please describe to where these bike routes lead, so readers understand where bicyclists are coming from/going to using these routes.				
78	Planning	G	ATTACHMENT A/ Figure 5.3-1	Do the bike route numbers mean anything to people (general public)? Please add more description about them or remove the number reference.				
79	Planning	G	ATTACHMENT A/ Figure 5.3-1	See comments (Comments #80 and #46 above) on MIP section 6.2 regarding the bike classification terms and consistency between this figure and MIP figure.				
80	Planning	E	ATTACHMENT A/ Figure 5.3-1	Use different colors or line types for existing, proposed, different bikeway facilities. For instance, bike facilities on Lees should be different from the ones on Folsom/King.				
81	Planning	E	ATTACHMENT A/ Figure 5.3-1	Show street names south of Ocean Ave.				
82	Planning	C	ATTACHMENT A/ Figure 5.3-1	or "shared and bike routes" etc. should have specific design guidelines.				
83	Planning	G	ATTACHMENT A/ 5.4 Vehicle network	Figure 5.4-1 provides more detailed information than the text. The text and the figure should complement each other and consistent. It does not seem to be necessary to illustrate a EV station and signalized intersections here.				
84	Planning	G	ATTACHMENT A/ Figure 5.4-1	For townhome streets, the figure shows "parking courts" while the text says "shared streets". Please be consistent and provide definitions of these terms.				
85	Planning	G	ATTACHMENT A/ 5.4 Vehicle network	please rephrase "the limited traffic street loop of ..."				
86	Planning	G	ATTACHMENT A/ Figure 5.4-1	Rename "auto pedestrian streets" or add a definition.				
87	Planning	G	ATTACHMENT A/ 5.4 Vehicle network	Just all of the cross references as bullet points at the end of the section. (global)				
88	Planning	G	ATTACHMENT A/ 5.4 Vehicle network	Please rephrase this sentence - "this simple loop allows... solely to ped and bike circulation" It is not clear.				
89	Planning	G	ATTACHMENT A/ 5.4 Vehicle network	This sentence - "The arrangement of shared streets ... is illustrative" - can be removed from this section. It seems random calling out just shared street figures.				
90	Planning	G	ATTACHMENT A/ 5.4 Vehicle network	The sentences stating "the final configuration of shared streets may vary. Refer to Chapter 7 ..." also can be removed from this section. These sentences do not add information about the sidewalk vehicle network.				
91	Planning	G	ATTACHMENT A/ Figure 5.4-1	Potential parking garage locations should be shown in the figure as they are referenced in the text.				
92	Planning	G	ATTACHMENT A/ 5.5	In the first sentence, instead of calling it "The North, West and South Street loop" can we call it the "internal streets" or something else?				
93	Planning	G	ATTACHMENT A/ Figure 5.5-1	the red boxes (fire truck) are located on boulevards. Should they be within the roadway?				
94	Planning	G	ATTACHMENT A/ Figure 5.5-1	Add grey arrow to the legend.				
95	Planning	G	ATTACHMENT A/ 5.6	Move the Bicycle Parking section to Section 5.3. Section 5.3 already talks about bike parking. Repeating it here seems redundant. The bike parking facilities can also be removed from Figure 5.6-1.				
96	Planning	G	ATTACHMENT A/ 5.6	The second paragraph under Bike Parking can be removed after "Refer to chapter 7 for buildings requiring private bike parking". These guidelines are in Chapter 7 and do not need to be repeated in this info section.				
97	Planning	G	ATTACHMENT A/	What is the purpose of Section 5.4.9.10? Overview - Standards?				
98	Planning	G	ATTACHMENT A/ Figure 5.6-1	Different from MIP figure (parking garage entry, raised streets)				
99	Planning	G	ATTACHMENT A/ Figure 5.6-1	explain that the public parking garages are potential locations				
100	Planning	G	ATTACHMENT A/ 5.7 Street design objectives	Rephrase the first sentence or delete it. Please state clearly what the street design objectives are				
101	Planning	G	ATTACHMENT A/ 5.7 Street design objectives	Second sentence - shouldn't this chapter describe design objectives and intent before describing recommended materials, etc.?				
102	Planning	G	ATTACHMENT A/ 5.7 Street design objectives	The paragraph under "Concept" does not read like a concept.				
103	Planning	G	ATTACHMENT A/ 5.7 Street design objectives	Under "Concept" the sentence - "The design will provide for street trees ... to encourage walking and cycling." reads like only trees would encourage walking and biking. Please revise this sentence.				
104	Planning	G	ATTACHMENT A/ Figure 5.7-1	Should all townhome streets be shown as privately owned streets?				
105	Planning	G	ATTACHMENT A/ Figure 5.7-1	/ legend should be relabeled to read "publicly owned streets" and "privately owned streets with public access". / Who will develop the private streets, will they be publicly accessible, what are the guidelines? What is the rationale for private streets/ and their function should be clearly stated upfront.				
106	Planning	E	ATTACHMENT A/ Figure 5.7-1	Figure title, "Streetscape Key Plan" does not match the figure content. Should it be "Street ownership"?				
107	Planning	E	ATTACHMENT A/ Figure 5.7-1	There should be no gaps between red bubbles				
108	Planning	G	ATTACHMENT A/ Figure 5.7-2	Describe the design intent and objectives of each street typology next to this figure (tie to the vision)				
109	Planning	E	ATTACHMENT A/ Figure 5.7-3 Street Widths	In the table, clarify the width is the ROW width.				
110	Planning	G	ATTACHMENT A/ Figure 5.7-3 Street Widths	What will be in the Street Element column? Instead of the Street Element column, we recommend adding the following columns - Sidewalk widths, Bike Facility Type, and Street Typology.				
111	Planning	G	ATTACHMENT A/ Figure 5.8-1	Revise it to show Extension Zones and Drive Lane Zones as well to match the text on the left.				
112	Planning	E	ATTACHMENT A/ 5.10 Street Tree Planting	Under "Species", reference to complete tree species list/ street tree palette needs to refer to the correct page number (not page 49)				
113	Planning	G	ATTACHMENT A/ Section 5.11	Combine this section with 5.19				
114	Planning	G	ATTACHMENT A/ Section 5.11	all standards regarding tree spacing should be in one section, not throughout different sections				
115	Planning	G	ATTACHMENT A/ 5.12	MIP did not show any sustainable nonpavement. Are they all on the tables?				
116	Planning	T	ATTACHMENT A/ 5.18 Street Planting	Text should go into a greater level of detail why the street types were chosen for each location, also should list a preferred 2nd choice in case certain species are not available. The plan needs to define parameters for substitutions in case certain species are not available.				
117	Planning	T	ATTACHMENT A/ Figure 5.18-1 and 5.18-2	Street Trees Preferred species table should specify what are the types (Type 1, Type 2, Type 3, etc.) on the table - not only by color.				