

Balboa Reservoir

Meeting with Planning Department 06/19/2019

Planning Staff:

Seung Yen Hong, Luis Barata, Lisa Fisher, Sue Exline, Jeff Horn, Sheila Nickolopoulos
Development Team & Consultants:

Nora Collins, Kearstin Dischinger, Karen Murray, Kushal Modi, Peter Waller, Parisa Mir
Sadeghi, Wendy Mok

1. Schedule

- a. EIR is pushed by two weeks but it will not affect DSG schedule.
- b. Next DSG draft submittal is September 20.
- c. No change in IMP schedule – next draft due 8/30.

2. General Comments

- a. Overall the added chapters are good.
- b. The vision and framework content needs to be further woven into the other chapters.
- c. Clarify in Chapter 2 that design principles are further developed in the subsequent chapters
- d. Show site & neighborhood context more clearly in Chapter 1, per comments
- e. The document needs to be consistent about terms like “design intent, design principles, goals, theme” and where they get used. Adding a definition to each would help.
- f. No comments on Chapter 5. Chapter 5 to be reviewed by City Agencies along with the MIP and can be integrated back with DSG after the second review of MIP.

3. Chapter 2 - Design Framework

- a. Design team will revisit location of where Design Principles appear. Planning recommends to move the principles to the beginning of Chapter 2, before Key Places.
- b. Design team will reconsider renaming & relocating Key Places in order to achieve clarity on the progression of narrative. Consider moving Design Framework before Key Places.
- c. Key places illustration may be the professional rendered views in which case it would be helpful to have them near the beginning of Chapter 2 to set the stage for the rest of the material. Either order can work as long as it is implemented consistently. Balboa team to decide.
- d. For the Design Framework diagrams, Planning recommends introducing an Existing Conditions diagram first to clearly illustrate what is existing, and what are the proposed framework strategies.
 - i. Fig. 1.4-2 is a good base to build upon for an Existing Conditions diagram
- e. Site Grading diagram: Needs improvement to differentiate existing from proposed.

- f. Public Open Space: Design team to consider redrawing the diagram to have more clarity about where the open space is connecting outside of site.
 - g. Planning suggests that combining all the circulation modes in one diagram might be more clear about intent and network hierarchy and framework than individual modes. Individual circulation networks can be discussed in detail under Chapter 5.
 - i. The term “neighborhood streets” is unclear and should be renamed as it is illustrating vehicular movement.
 - ii. Bike network is not shown currently, but should be added in the “Sustainable Mobility Diagram”
 - iii. Ensure consistency between EIR & DSG diagrams
 - h. Sustainable Neighborhood diagram is not necessary as it does not seem to contribute towards the Design Framework structure.
4. Chapter 3- Land Use
- a. Be clear about definitions - Community Facilities, Retail services, Art Activities
 - b. Need to coordinate with EIR description.
 - c. Allowing maximum flexibility for location of non-residential uses is ideal from Balboa team point of view. Planning Department is Ok with that approach as long as everything is clear.
 - d. Reservoir Park: Privately owned/publicly accessible – how is that use described?
 - e. Clarify what uses are allowed in more detail
5. Chapter 4 - Neighborhood Sustainability:
- a. Planning would like to meet with Development Team’s Sustainability consultants
 - b. Raingardens at public right of way - Discrepancy between location in MIP and DSG – Planning needs to have input on design & location.
 - c. Non-potable Water - LF suggests team consider upsizing grey water recycling at market rate buildings to 125% and then have extra reclaimed water to serve to WCs in the affordable housing? Affordable Housing not required to provide grey water systems due to cost considerations. Team will look at options for enhance water recycling within cost constraints.
 - d. All Electric Systems – Zero Emissions Buildings. City is pushing on complete decarbonization; updating the Green Building Code as early as 2020.
 - i. Planning suggests that Development team consider 100% electrification to be zero-emission development rather than zero-carbon development.
 - ii. Big push by San Francisco and SFPUC for electrification of all buildings. Key challenge for multi-family buildings is electric water heating Team is working on analysis
 - e. Living Roofs - Planning recommends adding living roofs to the projects to avoid having a low greening percentage of the site, currently at 20%. Good examples of living roof and solar inter-mingling are out there. Priority for Balboa team is providing roof space for PV system, which is important for funding sources. It is

possible to combine green roof and PV, but need to evaluate whether that approach is cost effective.

- i. Design team will revisit calculations to see if greening percentage can be increased, and reconsider living roof comment.
- ii. Private open space (courtyards) can be counted towards total greening of site, but consider City requirement of usable open spaces.
- f. Planning suggests sustainability goals to be reflected within chapters, for instance - cross-referencing goals in chapters with an identifier such as a “leaf” graphic, or gray boxes, etc. Balboa team would prefer to keep as separate chapter to highlight issues in one place. This approach is fine as long as elements are coordinated with other chapters.
- g. TDM – Keep general goals in Sustainability Chapter, but emphasize the items that relate to actual design elements. TDM document will be part of the DA.
- h. Certain content such as parking, bike parking, bike repair, lobby amenities, etc. can be described in the DSG under specific Block sections in Chapter 7.

6. Chapter 6 - Open Space:

- a. SFPUC Open Space will remain as SFPUC property, not an easement. Be clear about terminology – should be called “SFPUC Retained Fee” in all locations. City & SFPUC need to decide whether to keep design for SFPUC open space in DSG document or not. Design team strongly recommends that the design remain in the DSG.
- b. SFPUC is counted as part of the 4 acre open space contribution
- c. To the greatest degree feasible SFPUC wants to their space to function independently from adjacent development
- d. Access to ground floor units fronting on SFPUC– clarify in DSG document that entrances are secondary. SFPUC space can be closed for construction without impacting required access to units. Add info to figure 6.4-5
- e. Dog Park - Question about location & size of dog park. Provide Dog Park in central park? RPD recommends 10,000 SF – but can be smaller to avoid displacing other program
 - i. Design team will revisit this issue and figure out a location and size that would work.
- f. Clarify relationship of buildings to Reservoir Park, what is private Vs public. Sections should show interface with the buildings
 - i. Clarity of words such as “Community Porch” would help in understanding if it is a publicly accessible ADA compliant area or private property.
- g. Pavilion A separate section to discuss guidelines for Pavilions would be helpful. India Basin DSG has a similar section. - The image used for Pavilion should be replaced.
- h. Bioretention + Raingarden - Is it bike friendly? Wide enough to be shared between pedestrians and bicyclists? 12’ might be a little narrow. Overall design is fine – need more detail about coordination with building entries, pedestrian paths, etc.

- i. Brighton Paseo – make pedestrian only – not part of bike network.
- j. Brighton and San Ramon Paseo should be under different sub chapter.
- k. 6.7 “Residential Useable Open space”- Move to Chapter 7 sec 7.7), along with any discussion of roof terraces, townhome open space
- l. Private Open Space needs some guidelines such as greening percentage, other uses, etc.

7. Chapter 7 - Building Design

- a. Off street loading: MTA may be asking for off street loading docks at residential buildings which are highly atypical for recent multi-family projects in SF. Need to discuss with MTA
- b. Townhome Guidelines – Guidelines provided in Draft DSG as part of the block by block standards. City to review and provide additional comments. Need final guidelines by next submittal in September, (whether TH developer is identified or not)
- c. New legislation regarding building projections – not formally adopted by City but make sure DSG is consistent with those standards. Include language from draft legislation into the DSG.
- d. Higher density option is still on table at political level. DSG draft is based on 1100 units. Additional Housing option is still under consideration by City. Balboa team does not have alternate DSG standards to accommodate additional housing option. City believes that required changes would not be difficult to implement. No action required at this time.

8. Next Steps

- a. Next round of drafts in September 9/23
- b. Two additional meetings scheduled with Planning. Planning would be glad to have additional check ins by phone or in person
- c. May need focused meetings on land use, sustainability, open space
- d. Balboa team to propose topics and sequence for next meetings
- e. Seung Yen Hong on leave. Sheila and Luis will be covering in her absence.