Overview

MIG and City staff facilitated a public meeting June 10, 2017 regarding the Balboa Reservoir. Three development teams each made 15-minute presentations; after a brief question answer period, small group discussions were facilitated after each presentation and each participant was encouraged to provide written response to seven questions for each presentation:

1. What do you think about the overall mix and type of land uses, such as various housing types, open space and community uses?
2. Please share your thoughts on the overall design of the site or arrangement of land uses that were presented.
3. What are your thoughts about this development team? How do you think they will work with the community?
4. What do you like most about this development proposal and/or the team proposing it?
5. What concerns do you have about this development proposal and/or the team proposing it?
6. Any other comments?
7. (Optional) Are you associated with a local neighborhood, organization, school, or other group? If so, which one(s)?

The City made the presentation and comment cards available online to increase the public’s opportunity to hear and see the presentations and to provide comment.

The following is a summary and overview of responses to each question for each developer based on the comments received at the June 10 community meeting as well as comments submitted online by end of day June 24, 2017. Questions 6 and 7 were not summarized due to the range and/or inconsistency in response; please see all comments for information on these questions as well as to see the full range of comments provided.
Please note that perspectives often varied – the same component may be viewed as a “like” by some and a “concern” by others – but there are trends in the responses which are captured in these summaries.

**Developer 1: AvalonBay Communities and BRIDGE Housing with Mission Housing, Pacific Union Development Company, and Habitat for Humanity of Greater San Francisco**

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

   Summarized responses: Comments vary from there are way too many units, to not having enough units of housing, with a slight lean towards a desire for more units. Many said that integrating more retail space would be beneficial for the development and surrounding communities. There are concerns regarding too little parking for the number of units proposed, an unwanted increase in traffic, and a desire for more retail, commercial and open space. There was a lot of positive feedback surrounding the overall mix of uses.

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

   Summarized responses: There are many shared opinions regarding a desire for greater consideration to the amount of parking and the traffic that the development will cause. Other concerns included wind currents, crowding along Plymouth Street, and over-density. The use of open spaces and integration with CCSF and surrounding neighborhoods appeared to be well-liked by many.

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

   Summarized responses: Many believe this team will be a good fit because they have lots of experience working in this area. However, some are concerned because they have seemingly ignored many of the concerns of the community in their proposal.

4. **What do you like most about this development proposal and/or the team proposing it?**

   Summarized responses: Most comments identified the best aspects of the proposal as appropriate housing unit count, good mixed use and integration with City College, and inclusion of green space. Many expressed they felt positive about this team, that they want the right things for the community, they feel that this team will stick around and be involved long-term with regards to dealing with community
concerns. In opposition, there were several who claimed this team is not right for the job and do not care for the concerns of the community. People also liked the idea of affordable and market rate housing.

5. What concerns do you have about this development proposal and/or the team proposing it?

Summarized responses: The most commonly expressed concerns were questioning if there is sufficient parking and what impacts there will be to the already traffic-congested neighborhoods. Along with these came questions and concerns about whether there were too many units being proposed. Contrarily, there were comments that too much parking was included and there should be encouragement for people to take public transit. Suggestions about maximizing and adding more units also arose. Several expressed concern that 4-5 stories is too high and will bring unwanted shade to an already cold area. Some mentioned a need for more commercial and retail space, senior housing, and concerns about the sewage infrastructure which must be addressed to avoid major flooding.

Developer 2: Related Companies with Sares Regis Group of Northern California, Curtis Development, and Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation

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

Summarized responses: Many raised concern regarding the need for more housing units, arguing that this plan simply wasn’t enough to aid the extreme housing crisis of the area. Several comments noted appreciation for the green space, though several commented that the overall usage of land and open space is poor. Many liked the height of homes and that units were intermingled as well as the commercial space.

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

Summarized responses: Many comments focused on this proposal lacking a large enough number of units and a communal/neighborhood like feel. Respondents indicated the plan appeared to be two separate sections between the townhomes and apartments and had a blocky, uninviting vibe. Several stated there should be more open space within the development so it didn’t look so closed off. Other comments indicated they thought this was a more appropriate number of units but didn’t like the height of the buildings, wishing they were lower. Many gave positive feedback regarding the aesthetics of this plan.
3. What are your thoughts about this development team? How do you think they will work with the community?

Summarized responses: Most comments were positive and said that this team would work very well with the community. Many commented that they liked what the team said and that they seemed open to taking ideas and criticism from the surrounding neighborhoods to increase the benefit of the development for them as well. Several respondents indicated the team seemed genuine when it came to dealing with concerns and addressing them. Many commented that the team was very qualified and liked the fact that some of the team members had lived in a surrounding neighborhood. There were also a few comments from the opposing side saying that they disliked how the team currently deals with neighborhood property. Some suggested that the low number of proposed units was a red flag in regard to the team’s concern over the City’s welfare.

4. What do you like most about this development proposal and/or the team proposing it?

Summarized responses: Many commented that they liked that the lower number of units in this proposal but many others also felt that it was not dense enough and didn’t have enough units. Some liked that there was less parking. Many commented that they enjoyed the pedestrian amenities such as walkways, paths, and connections between the surrounding plazas and neighborhood parks. The community garden and green buffer zone was liked by some, and hated by others. Several liked the integration of retail space and wish there was even more.

5. What concerns do you have about this development proposal and/or the team proposing it?

Summarized responses: Common shared responses indicated that this team wasn’t properly utilizing the space and putting as many housing units as possible in what they consider to be a huge, high demand site. Many expressed that this team didn’t integrate as much parking as they should because they are removing so much of it and not giving it back to the CCSF students. Some, however, said that it was the most respectful to the already existing neighborhood as it wouldn’t increase traffic as much as the other proposals, though it was still noted that traffic would be an issue. Some commented that the low-density, single-use residential design will induce people to drive everywhere instead of taking public transit or biking/walking.

Developer 3: Emerald Fund and Mercy Housing

1. What do you think about the overall the overall mix and type of land uses, such as various housing types, open space and community uses?
Summarized responses: There were numerous comments praising this proposal for increasing the number of units in large buildings while keeping the green space. Although this proposal included the highest unit count, many even suggested that more units should be added. There were some that opposed this proposal because it had the most units and tallest buildings which felt imposing. Many commented that they liked the large variety of housing and liked that there would be CCSF-serving affordable housing and appreciated the good mix of uses.

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

Summarized responses: There were comments that this design was the best but others felt this plan was too congested and there would be a wind tunnel between the buildings. Many commented that the buildings felt too tall and too dense and raised concerns about traffic. Some expressed concern that there were too many semi-enclosed common areas that weren’t open to the public. Some stated that they liked the open spaces, thought they were very well designed, and will be used. Comments were polarized, either very for or very against components of the plan, there were few if any neutral comments.

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

Summarized responses: Most commented that they thought this team would work well with the community just as they have with previous projects, and they had already covered many of the neighborhood’s concerns in their proposal. Many noted that they liked that the team would be working with CCSF and Riordan students and reaching out to the community about what they want. Many commented that the team was well qualified and trusted. This group received the most positive overall feedback, with a few concerns pertaining to quality of life for future residents and unfavorable past work experience with the developer.

4. What do you like most about this development proposal and/or the team proposing it?

Summarized responses: Many noted that they liked the inclusion of senior and affordable housing as well as childcare. Many commented that they thought the team took everybody into consideration when designing this project, noting that the walking paths were nice and the design was pleasing. Some noted disappointment with how tall the buildings were. The large number of housing units garnered the majority of positive responses. Others were impressed by the open spaces and connections to neighboring plazas and parks. Some noted that they liked the symmetric design and the clear opening from the park to the campus. Some mentioned their approval of the idea to include City college students in aspects of
the project and appreciated their approach to harmonizing with surrounding neighborhoods.

5. What concerns do you have about this development proposal and/or the team proposing it?

Summarized responses: Many expressed concerns with the amount of parking that will be needed and how much it will add to the already existing traffic problems. As with other proposals, there were many comments regarding the number of units, some saying we need more, others saying this is too many. Some expressed concern that the plan felt segregated and that it walled off the side facing CCSF. Many stated that they thought there is too much parking and that it should be reduced with the mindset of a more walking/transit oriented community in mind. Again, there was some negative feedback surrounding the unsightliness of tall buildings.