

SAN FRANCISCO BAY CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 10600 • San Francisco, California 94102 (415) 352-3600 • Fax: (415) 352-3606 • www.bcdc.ca.gov

October 28, 2016

TO: All Design Review Board Members

FROM: Lawrence J. Goldzband, Executive Director (415/352-3653; larry.goldzband@bcdc.ca.gov)
Andrea Gaffney, Bay Design Analyst (415/352-3643; andrea.gaffney@bcdc.ca.gov)
Ethan Lavine, Principal Permit Analyst (415/352-3618; ethan.lavine@bcdc.ca.gov)

SUBJECT: India Basin Open Space and 700 Innes Project; First Pre-Application Review
(For Board consideration on November 7, 2016)

Project Summary

Project Proponent. BUILD, Inc.

Property Owners. Build, Inc. and City and County of San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department

Project Representatives. Michael Yarne, BUILD; Inc. (Property Owner and Developer); Nicole Avril, San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department (Property Owner); Marcel Wilson, Bionic (Landscape Architect); Leo Chow, SOM (Architect); John Bela, Gehl Studio (Landscape Architect); John Leys, Sherwood (Civil Engineer); Dilip Trivedi, Moffatt and Nichol (Coastal Engineer); Geoff Smick, WRA (Regulatory Guidance)

Project Site. The approximately 23-acre project site is located adjacent to India Basin at the southeastern shoreline of the City and County of San Francisco. The site is bound by: India Basin Shoreline Park to the north; Innes Avenue and uphill residential developments (Hunters View, Hunters Point East/West, and Westbrook) to the south and west; and a proposed park (“Northside Park”) to the east to be developed in association with the future Candlestick Point-Hunters Point Shipyard Phase 2 project. The site is largely undeveloped, with the exception of Arelious Walker Drive and the Bay Trail within India Basin Open Space (Exhibits 4 and 5). In 2002, a 2.5-acre wetland project was implemented at the shoreline to mitigate for a San Francisco International Airport project (Exhibit 3). The entirety of the project site is located within a *San Francisco Bay Plan*-designated Water-oriented Recreation Priority Use Area noted on Bay Plan Map No. 5 as Waterfront Park, Beach. The project site also carries a Park Priority Use designation under the Commission’s *San Francisco Waterfront Special Area Plan* (SAP).

Project Description. The proposed project includes a mixed-use development (“700 Innes Project”) and an improved open space area along the shoreline (referred to as “India Basin Open Space” in Exhibit 6), and would be located within the above-referenced Commission priority use areas (per the Bay Plan and SAP), and the Commission’s Bay and 100-foot shoreline band jurisdictions. Project elements include:

Mixed-Use Development. Two project alternatives are under consideration for the site: (1) a residential-focused scenario with approximately 1,240 residential units and 275,300 square feet of commercial and retail space; and (2) a commercial-focused scenario with approximately 500 residential units and 1 million square feet of commercial and retail space. Both scenarios include buildings ranging from one to 14 stories (Exhibits 8-10). Both scenarios include a school, residential, employee, and public parking garages (Exhibit 15), a public market area, and a 4.72-acre park space (“The Big Green”). The project would be built in phases with interim uses proposed for certain areas (Exhibit 7).

New and Existing Streets. Within the mixed-use development, a new street grid is proposed (Exhibit 14), which would permit views of the Bay from Innes Avenue along Arelious Walker, Earl Street, Griffith Street, and two publicly accessible pedestrian pathways through the development (Exhibit 11 and 12). The primary bicycle route, a Class IV bike lane, would run through the mixed-use development along the proposed New Hudson Street, while the Bay Trail would run along the project site between the proposed development and the park areas (Exhibits 13).

An illustrative depiction of proposed public space facilities and park programming elements are found in Exhibits 16 and 17. Moving from Innes Avenue toward the Bay, the project would include the following major public spaces:

A Public Market (Exhibit 19) within which a large pavilion structure would be located on a public plaza bayward of New Hudson Street. The plaza would provide connections to the waterfront and adjacent parks, including a terrace graded down to the cove, connecting to the proposed 900 Innes park (Scow Schooner Boatyard). The buildings adjacent to the public market would include commercial and concession spaces, some of which may be located within the 100-foot shoreline band.

The *Big Green* (Exhibits 20 and 21), located northwest of the development Project and adjacent to the Public Market, would include naturalistic landscapes, such as grasslands, wildflower meadows, earthworks, stormwater wetlands, a wet meadow, and groves of trees, as well as more active spaces such as trails and bikeways, play areas, a fitness loop, sculptures and art installations, spaces for picnicking, lawn areas, dog areas, and small gathering spaces. A sheep pen is proposed on the eastern border of the project site, partially within the 100-foot shoreline band.

The existing *India Basin Open Space* (Exhibits 22-24) is located within the Commission’s priority use area(s), 100-foot shoreline band and Bay jurisdiction. The area within the Commission’s 100-foot shoreline band would be significantly re-shaped for public access and recreation, including: a perched beach; a gravel kayak launch; a trail network, including boardwalks and raised overlooks in areas where wetland habitat is present; a small portion of the Bay Trail on the eastern edge of the project site; and commercial uses, including a café, a boat rental facility and concession stands. The lower edge of the shoreline within the Bay jurisdiction would largely remain in a natural state with some enhancements for public access and ecological function, including “living” shoreline elements.

San Francisco Bay Plan and San Francisco Waterfront Special Area Plan Policies. The Bay provides an environment for numerous forms of public enjoyment. In terms of recreational uses on the waterfront, the *San Francisco Bay Plan* (Bay Plan) envisions a variety of accessible, water-oriented recreational facilities and diverse recreational opportunities for people of all races, cultures, ages and income levels, in order to accommodate a broad range of recreational activities. The Board should consider the following applicable Commission policies and design guidelines during this initial pre-application review.

The proposed project is located within a Bay Plan-designated Water-oriented Recreation Priority Use Area that prioritizes **waterfront parks and beaches**. The Recreation policies further encourage certain facilities over others within waterfront parks. Facilities are to “capitalize on the attractiveness of their bayfront location,” and are to “emphasize hiking, bicycling, riding trails, picnic facilities, swimming, environmental, historical and cultural education and interpretation, viewpoints, beaches, and fishing facilities,” over facilities that do not need a waterfront location. “Public launching facilities for a variety of boats and other water-oriented recreational craft, such as kayaks, canoes and sailboats, should be provided in waterfront parks where feasible.” “Limited commercial recreation facilities, such as small restaurants” are permitted “provided they are clearly incidental to the park use, are in keeping with the basic character of the park, and do not obstruct public access to and enjoyment of the Bay.” The Bay Trail is to be developed along “an alignment as near to the shore as possible, consistent with Bay resource protection.” Public transportation is to be provided to waterfront parks, as is public parking “in a manner that does not diminish the park-like character of the site.” “Interpretive information describing natural, historical and cultural resources should be provided in waterfront parks where feasible.” Public utilities and services are allowed “provided they would be unobtrusive, would not permanently disrupt use of the site for recreation, and would not detract from the visual character of the site.”

The *San Francisco Waterfront Special Area Plan* (SAP) states that “[t]he India Basin area should be developed as a major waterfront park in accordance with the Recreation and Open Space Plan of the City of San Francisco.” The plan states that some fill may be needed, and that “[l]imited development, preferably Bay-oriented commercial recreation, should be permitted on the shoreline, provided it is incidental to public access and water-related recreation and does not obstruct public access.”

The Bay Plan **Public Access** policies state that maximum feasible public access to and along the waterfront should “be provided in and through every new development in the Bay or on the shoreline.” The Bay Plan further explains that public access should be designed—using the Commission’s *Public Access Design Guidelines*—“to encourage diverse Bay-related activities and movement to and along the shoreline,” be conveniently located near parking and public transit, “permit barrier free access for persons with disabilities to the maximum feasible extent...and include an ongoing maintenance program.” These policies state in part that “public access should be sited, designed and managed to prevent significant adverse effects on wildlife,” and that, “whenever public access to the Bay is provided as a condition of development, on fill or in the shoreline, the access should be permanently guaranteed.” These policies further state that, “[a]ny public access provided as a condition of development should either be required to remain viable in the event of future sea level rise or flooding, or equivalent access consistent with the project should be provided nearby.”

The Bay Plan **Recreation** policies state in part, that “recreational facilities, such as waterfront parks, trails, marinas, live-aboard boats, non-motorized small boat access, fishing piers, launching lanes, and beaches, should be encouraged and allowed by the Commission, provided they are located, improved and managed,” following certain standards.

As they relate to **non-motorized small boats**, the Recreation policies state, in part, that “where practicable, access facilities for non-motorized small boats should be incorporated into waterfront parks, marinas, launching ramps and beaches, especially near popular waterfront destinations,” that “access points should be located, improved and managed to avoid significant adverse effects on wildlife and their habitats, should not interfere with commercial navigation,” that “site improvements, such as landing and launching facilities, restrooms, rigging areas, equipment storage and concessions, and educational programs that address navigational safety, security, and wildlife compatibility and disturbance should be provided, consistent with use of the site,” that “facilities for boating organizations that provide training and stewardship, operate concessions, provide storage or boathouses should be allowed in recreational facilities where appropriate,” and that “launching facilities should be accessible and designed to ensure that boaters can easily launch their watercraft. Facilities should be durable to minimize maintenance and replacement cost.”

As they relate to **beaches**, the Recreation policies state, in part, that, “sandy beaches should be preserved, enhanced, or restored for recreational use, such as swimming, consistent with wildlife protection. New beaches should be permitted if the site conditions are suitable for sustaining a beach without excessive beach nourishment.”

The Bay Plan **Appearance, Design and Scenic Views** policies state, in part, that, “all bayfront development should be designed to enhance the pleasure of the user or viewer of the Bay” and that “maximum efforts should be made to provide, enhance, or preserve views of the Bay and shoreline, especially from public areas, from the Bay itself, and from the opposite shore.” These policies also state, in part, that “[s]horeline developments should be built in clusters, leaving open area around them to permit more frequent views of the Bay,” and “that views of the Bay from vista points and from roads should be maintained by appropriate arrangements and heights of all developments and landscaping between the view areas and the water.” Lastly, the policies state, in part, that “parking areas should be located away from the shoreline.”

The **Public Access Design Guidelines** state that public access should feel public, be designed so that the user is not intimidated nor is the user’s appreciation diminished by structures or incompatible uses, and that there should be visual cues that public access is available for the public’s use by using site furnishings, such as benches, trash containers, lighting and signage. The *Public Access Design Guidelines* further state that public access areas should be designed for a wide range of users, should maximize user comfort by designing for weather and day and night use, and that each site’s historical, cultural and natural attributes provide opportunities for creating projects with a “sense of place” and a unique identity.

Design Review Issues. The Board's comments and recommendations are sought on the following:

1. Does the proposed design provide adequate, usable, and attractive public access areas that maximize public use and enjoyment of the site?

- Is the project's design consistent with the intent of the Water-oriented Recreation Priority Use Designation, and does it provide the sort of amenities that would be appropriate for this type of location?
- Does the Public Market, Big Green, and India Basin Open Space provide the appropriate mix of program and amenities for the public, and if not, what programs and public access amenities should be provided at this location?
- What is the Board's opinion and advice on the division between India Basin Open Space and the Big Green?
- Are the proposed non-recreational uses, such as stormwater treatment or habitat enhancement components of the proposed project, compatible with the Bay Plan's intent for waterfront parks?
- Will the public access areas feel welcoming to the general public?
- Is there adequate and appropriately sited public parking provided for the public amenities at the site?
- No details have yet been provided about site furnishings, signage, or lighting. Does the Board have advice on these amenities?
- Will adequate public access areas be provided with each phase of development?
- No details have yet been provided on management and maintenance. Does the Board have advice on these topics?

2. Does the proposed project minimize potential conflicts between sensitive habitat and public access uses?

- Are the proposed informal pathways and access piers sited to avoid potential conflicts with sensitive habitat?
- Do the proposed boardwalks provide for protection of the resource areas as well as the optimal Bay viewing and recreational experience for the public?

3. Are the connections to and through the public access spaces adequate and appropriate?

- Are the connections between 700 Innes open spaces and the adjacent parks at 900 Innes and Northside Park adequate to maximize use and connections along the waterfront?
- Are there adequate, usable, and attractive connections through the development to the waterfront public access areas?
- Are there adequate, usable, and attractive views through the development to the waterfront? From the nearest public roadways?

- Are the connections to the Bay Trail adequate, appropriate, and close enough to the Bay shoreline?
 - Does the proposed trail network provide connections between the locations where various users may wish to go?
4. **Is the location and design of the proposed non-motorized boat launch appropriate?**
- Does the proposed boat dock permit barrier-free access for persons with restricted mobility?
 - Are there adequate support facilities proposed, including in terms of parking, restrooms, equipment storage, etc.?
 - Is the distance between the drop-off area and the launch appropriate, and if not, how might the design allow for easier access for recreational boaters and kayakers?
5. **Is the public access designed to be viable in the event of future sea level rise or flooding?**
- Are the public access areas sufficiently elevated, designed to withstand flooding, and/or adaptable to future sea level rise?
 - Is the public access adequate, usable, and attractive during the interim to rising sea levels?