
From: Shaw, Jeremy (CPC)
Sent: Thursday, December 13, 2018 1:54 PM
To: Karen Murray; Peter Waller
Cc: Nora Collins; Conrad, Theodore (ECN); Stephanie Easton; Kushal Modi; Kearstin Dischinger; Joe Kirchofer; Small, Maia (CPC); Barata, Luiz (CPC); Hong, Seung Yen (CPC); Fisher, Lisa (CPC); Lutenski, Leigh (ECN)
Subject: Balboa Reservoir UDAT/Design
Attachments: Balboa Reservoir Principles Simplified.docx; Standards vs Guidelines.pdf

Hi Karen and Peter,

Thanks for coming in and taking us through the DSG content last week. At this time, we cannot provide additional feedback on the DSG drafts. Without a clearly articulated vision, guiding principles and resultant physical framework, we do not have a rationale nor criteria by which we can evaluate the content or comment on it. The Plan Overview (Chapter 2) and Design Framework (Chapter 3) chapters are essential to connect the dots between City/community goals, project ambitions, and the physical form and features of proposed development. When these are completed, we will be able to have a more fruitful conversation about the DSGs.

We presume that you already have the vision and goals that guide the document, such as the 3 in the presentation that you shared. Please also utilize the RFP principles (simplified in the attached doc) and the design intent you've already shared with the public.

We'd also like to remind you of the [dropbox folder](#) we set up with DSG precedents. I added a presentation from Allison Albericci that articulates a lot of our expectations of the DSG. Please consider her [presentation](#) in the refinement of your DSG. In particular, we will be using the definitions of standards and guidelines on page 12 (attached).

So at this time, understanding that more feedback will come when we see more of your work, we'll just reiterate a few of the comments mentioned in last week's meeting:

- The transition between the central park and the buildings: Clear design standards are required to avoid the feeling of privatizing the public space (which should also be expressed in the vision and goals of the plan).
- Sidewalk widths and front setbacks for Lee Ave and West Street have not been finalized. We hope the setbacks can help address our concerns about providing enough space for pedestrians
- The street wall and setbacks sections should be next to each other and again tied to the vision and goals.
- Identify graphics, standards and guidelines that would have to change if a scenario other than the base project is ultimately agreed to.
- Consistent with the cover memos Leigh requested, identify unresolved issues in the DSG draft. But be sure to identify your desired solution or design for that issue (e.g. Lee Ave or dog park on PUC property)

After the next submission, the Department will set up a series of bi-weekly meetings to review each topic covered in the Design Standards and Guidelines, beginning with the Plan Overview and Design Framework. The sessions should detail the specific objectives each Development Control is targeting, and the criteria used to develop the proposed Standards and Guidelines. To optimize the efficacy of these meetings, it is expected that a record of comments received — and responses and follow-up efforts — be documented and communicated at each subsequent session.

Feel free to call me with any questions.

Thanks,

Jeremy

Jeremy Shaw, LEED AP
Senior Planner, Citywide Planning Division

San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103
Direct: 415.575.9135 | www.sfplanning.org
[San Francisco Property Information Map](#)