

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

**MEETING MINUTES**

**Lick-Wilmerding High School, Cafeteria  
755 Ocean Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94112**

**Thursday, June 15, 2017**

**7:00 PM**

**Regular Meeting**

**Please note:** Meeting minutes are only intended to serve as a summary of the meeting. For a full transcript of the meeting, refer to the audio recording of the meeting [Available online at [www.sf-planning.org/BRCAC](http://www.sf-planning.org/BRCAC)].

Documents received during this meeting are in a document titled balboareservoir\_CAC\_Public\_Documents\_Received\_and\_Emails-061517 available via the following link: [www.sf-planning.org/BRCAC](http://www.sf-planning.org/BRCAC)

**Committee Members Present:**

Michael Ahrens; Howard Chung; Brigitte Davila; Christine Godinez; Rebecca Lee; Robert Muehlbauer; Maurice Rivers; Lisa Spinali; Jon Winston

**Committee Members Absent:**

N/A

**Staff/Consultants Present:**

Office of Economic and Workforce Development: Emily Lesk, Tom Shanahan  
San Francisco Planning Department: Jeremy Shaw

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

**2. Opening of Meeting.**

a. March minutes:

i. Edits:

1. Page 3, section 4:

1. "The proposals...are available on the project website." Change "are" to "will be".

2. Add Ahrens conflict disclosure in March meeting minutes.

- ii. Motion to approve March meeting minutes with edits
  1. Moved: Muehlbauer; Seconded: Winston
  2. Ayes: Chung, Davila, Godinez, Muehlbauer, Rivers, Spinali, Winston; Noes: [none]; Abstain: [none]
- b. New BRCAC start time
  - i. Motion to change start time to 6:00 PM from 6:15 PM
    1. Moved: Ahrens; Seconded: Winston
    2. Ayes: Ahrens, Chung, Davila, Godinez, Lee, Muehlbauer, Rivers, Spinali, Winston; Noes: [None]; Abstain: [None]
- c. Howard Chung, Conflict Disclosure:

*I previously represented Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation a few year ago on two isolated matters. I no longer represent them and have no contact with them now.*

### **3. What do you think about the overall mix and type of land uses, such as various housing types, open space, and community uses?**

- Westwood Park cannot support any of proposals. For the following reasons: (1) all three proposals exceed the five-hundred units described in the Balboa Park Area Plan and associated Environmental Impact Report; (2) parking alternatives for City College need to be resolved prior to development; (3) the parking ratio for the new units should be 1:1; (4) there should be no passage between Westwood Park and the new development for cars, bikes, or pedestrians.
  - I understand that the developers prepared economic proposals for a five-hundred unit development; I would like to be given access to these.
- Parking is an issue I am concerned about. However, the proposed ratio of 0.5 spaces per unit may be enough. I appreciated that all developers are looking to provide housing for City College.
- All three proposals seemed very similar; they were difficult to tell apart.
- The development teams have presented a lot of information, and we need time to digest it. It was clear that the development teams invested effort, time, and thought into their proposals.
- Traffic and the impact on neighborhood character are concerns. However, San Francisco is in the midst of a housing emergency. If nothing is built, housing prices will go up. Middle and lower income people are struggling to afford to live here. In regards to the specific proposals:
  - AvalonBay: The site plan did not adhere to the parameters because it lacked a buffer with Westwood Park. The parking ratio seemed high with the additional shared parking.
  - Emerald Fund: The site plan was good. There was a buffer with Westwood Park and open space. However, the paseos in the design seemed like they would be shady; these should be active spaces.
  - Related: The layout and open space were good. However, the design should have been built out more. The proposal should have gone higher and included more units.
- It is overwhelming; it's a lot to look at. This is a new neighborhood that's being built; the connectivity to streets is important. I am not afraid of density, and the number of units in the proposals is just a starting point. I want to see attractive design and quality materials used in the construction.
- San Francisco State University includes a bus pass with student registration. City College should look into something similar. I was encouraged to see that all the proposals provided housing for City College. The Avalon proposal showed they were really listening to the community. I would like to see more about how they connect with transit.

- I appreciated that all three proposals had 50% of units priced below market rate. The younger generation is deeply concerned about housing and affordable. Young people are less tied to cars, compared with other generations. I have taken classes at City College without using a car for transportation.

**4. Please share your thoughts on the overall design of the site or arrangement of land uses that were presented.**

- None of the teams provided much detail about the connection to Muni. All three proposals had good layouts; AvalonBay could have used a greater buffering with Westwood Park. The Emerald Fund proposal seemed to show a good understanding of how people behave. I liked the idea of the commons. It shows a recognition that a city is people, not buildings. The proposal also had good connections to the neighborhood. I liked the Lee Avenue entrance. The Related Proposal has nice Parks, but the site doesn't connect to the outside.
- Good linkages to Unity Plaza and Ocean Avenue are important. The Emerald Fund and AvalonBay proposals seem better in this regard. The Related proposal appears divisive with the large buildings and townhouses segregated; it does not tie as a neighborhood.
- I'm okay with density as long as it is designed well and fits in with the adjoining communities. San Francisco is in a housing crisis and needs additional housing. It is interesting that the number of units proposed is so different between the three proposals. I wonder how this makes sense economically.
  - AvalonBay: The AvalonBay proposal did a good job connecting to the existing neighborhood. It had a large amount of parking. I'm curious how the shared parking works. I like the central reservoir park with views. The buffer with Westwood Park is an issue; however, the backyards function as a kind of buffer.
  - Related: I liked that the team did not start with a target unit count and instead let the site determine the size of the development. I liked the site design, but it's surprising that with a lower unit count than the other proposals that the open space is not larger.
  - Emerald: It has the greatest density; it needs to be able to justify this number. I'm interested in the 6,000 square feet of commercial space. I would like to know how this space will be divided and oriented and how it will impact the Ocean Avenue merchants.
- I liked that Avalon had farming on the roof and City College housing up front. I would like to see more active outdoor space, possibly a basketball court.
- I liked the shared parking. I am in favor of more density; I don't want to leave young people behind.
- Some important topics that have been raised include: how the shared parking would function, connections to existing public transport, and outdoor space.

**5. What are your thoughts about this development team? How do you think they will work with the community?**

- I appreciated that AvalonBay offered to hold community meetings at times that would accommodate working parents and would reach out to non-English speaking members of the community. I also liked Emerald Fund's plan to create educational opportunities for the engineering programs at Riordan and City College during the development of the site.
- I want to see that the developers have oriented the site to reduce congestion. For, example, has the child care facility been placed in a location that will allow for pick-up and drop-off?

- All three teams spoke about the importance of community relations. I like the existing Mercy building on Ocean Avenue. It's attractive and well planned for the neighborhood and the residents. I like that the commercial space is rented to a local business, like Philz.
- After spending eighteen months developing parameters for the site, I am excited to see something built.

**6. Public Comment:**

- The site should be limited to 500 units and have lower heights.
- I am concerned about rainwater from the site and how it will impact the foundations of neighboring homes.
- This project should be designed with younger people in mind. They are struggling to afford housing and driving less. Every parking spot is less space for people to live. Muni and BART are good alternatives to driving.
- Muni could be routed through the site.
- The AvalonBay and Related proposals are attractive.
- The Related proposal fits in with the neighborhood the best.
- I am concerned about the impact that a large development will have on public transit.
- There will be additional opportunities to comment on the project when it goes before the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors.
- City College and the community need to coordinate. This site was considered for development before but failed because the developer couldn't get everyone on board.
- San Francisco needs more housing.
- The designs need to account for the windy location.
- All the proposals are too dense.
- BMR condo units are preferable to BMR rentals.
- The Related proposal is the most human.
- The townhouse backyards serve as a buffer to Westwood Park.
- There should be more infill development in San Francisco neighborhoods.
- The BMR units should be built at the same pace as the market rate units.

**7. Adjournment.**