San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission
455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 10600, San Francisco, California 94102 tel 415 352 3600 fax 415 352 3606

July 27, 2017

TO: 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)

SUBJECT: Draft Minutes for July 10, 2017, BCDC Design Review Board Meeting

1. **Call to Order and Safety Announcement.** Design Review Board (Board) Chair Karen Alschuler called the meeting to order at the Bay Area Metro Center, 375 Beale Street, Yerba Buena Room, First Floor, San Francisco, California, at approximately 5:30 p.m., and asked everyone to introduce themselves.

Other Board members in attendance included Jacinta McCann, Stefan Pellegrini, and Gary Strang. BCDC staff in attendance included Andrea Gaffney, Jaime Michaels, and Hanna Miller. The presenters were Richard Kennedy (James Corner Field Operations (JCFO)) and Joe McCarthy (SKS Partners). Also in attendance were Ben Botkin (San Francisco Bay Area Water Trail) and Billy Gross (City of South San Francisco).

Andrea Gaffney, BCDC Bay Design Analyst, reviewed the safety protocols, meeting protocols, and meeting agenda.

The August 7th Board meeting will be a joint meeting with the San Francisco Port Waterfront Design Advisory Committee to review the Pier 31 1/2 Alcatraz Embarkation Project. The Board will also review the East Bay Regional Park District's Doolittle Trail Project in Oakland and the Terminal One Latitude Project in Richmond. The meeting is scheduled to begin at 4:30 p.m.

The Burlingame Point project has been revised to include Board comments and suggestions from the September meeting. The revised project is currently in plan review and is not expected to come before the Board again.

The BCDC will not move to the Bay Area Metro Center this year due to budget issues, although meetings will continue to be held there.

2. **Report of Chief of Permits.** This agenda item was not heard.

3. **Approval of Draft Minutes for June 5, 2017, Meeting.**

MOTION: Mr. Strang moved approval of the Minutes for the June 5, 2017, San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission Design Review Board meeting as presented, seconded by Ms. McCann.

VOTE: The motion carried with a vote of 4-0-0 with Board Chair Alschuler, Board Vice Chair Strang, and Board Members McCann and Pellegrini voting approval with no abstentions.

4. **Oyster Point Phases 1C and 1D, City of South San Francisco, San Mateo County (First Pre-Application Review).** The Board held their first pre-application review of the proposal by Oyster Point Development and the City of South San Francisco for the first two phases of the Oyster Point Specific Plan to redevelop the Oyster Point Peninsulas. The proposed mixed-use project would include the construction of an office/R&D building complex, enhancement of 2,250 linear feet of Bay Trail, addition of 6,435 linear feet of new trails, beach replenishment, and enhancement of existing restrooms. Public access improvements include a lawn area, seating, a picnic site with barbeques, and other public amenities.

a. **Staff Presentation.** Hanna Miller, BCDC Coastal Program Analyst, introduced the project and summarized the issues identified in the staff report, including whether the project:

(1) Encourages diverse activities and creates a “sense of place”

(2) Designs public amenities to balance the needs of the public and natural resources

(3) Creates an appropriate sense of arrival

(4) Encourages use of the water for swimming and/or non-motorized vehicles and includes related facilities

(5) Expands the enjoyment of the shoreline experience

(6) Includes ample parking that does not diminish the park-like nature of the site

Includes materials that are appropriate for the intended public use

(7) Includes appropriate plantings for the beach, meadow, and marina waterfront

(8) Preserves a sandy beach in a manner that considers wildlife compatibility

(9) Designs appropriate connections between the various public areas

(10) Maximizes access to, along, and through the proposed developed area

(11) Designs walkways and trails to connect to the nearest public thoroughfare and Bay Trail connecting pathways

(12) Designs streets, paths, walkways, and landscape features to maximize views to and along the shoreline

(13) Appropriately designs the public areas to be resilient and adaptive to sea level rise

Ms. Miller noted two corrections:

(14) The existing parking spaces listed on the Proposed Public Amenities Phases 1C and 1D chart on page 4 of the staff report should be 374, not 605.

(15) Sea level rise for 2100 on Exhibit 16 was incorrectly shown on the slide. Ms. Miller distributed a corrected copy and stated at elevation 16.5, sea level rise would be above the public access.

b. **Project Presentation.** Richard Kennedy, Senior Principal with JCFO, the lead landscape architect for the proposed project, introduced the members of his team. He provided an overview, accompanied by a slide presentation, of the background, context, existing amenities, and detailed description of the project. He stated the existing loose arrangements of mixed trees provide microclimates, successful wind protection, and added character for the area.

c. **Board Questions.** Following the presentation, the Board asked a series of questions:

Ms. Alschuler asked about the proponent who would operate and maintain the area. Joe McCarthy, with the Oyster Point Development team, stated the developer is Oyster Point Development, LLC, but the proponents for the infrastructure and open space are split between the city and the developer. The developer will design and build out the infrastructure and open space in close collaboration with the city and the city will provide the ongoing maintenance and operations of the green areas in the project area 1C.

Ms. Alschuler asked if the Board should provide comments on the future phases, such as on the orientation of the future hotel. Mr. McCarthy stated today's comments will be limited to Phase 1C and 1D. A separate design process is currently underway for the hotel and open space for other phases that will come before the Board in the future.

Ms. McCann asked about the stormwater strategy that is embedded into the design. Mr. Kennedy stated all stormwater can be captured and retained via low points, swales, and retention gardens.

Ms. McCann asked if the water quality around the marina had been factored into the choice of plant material. Mr. Kennedy stated the area below the highwater tide line is not part of this design, but agreed that it is a good idea to consider what can be planted now to help filter or treat water in the future.

Ms. McCann asked for greater detail on the number of parking spaces in the design. Mr. Kennedy stated the number of parking spaces was established in the 2011 plan. Billy Gross, Senior Planner with the City of South San Francisco, stated there are approximately 630 parking spaces on the entire peninsula. With the proposed changes, there would be over 400 parking spaces with the majority further to the east.

Ms. Alschuler asked if the surrounding buildings would share parking during large events. Mr. Gross stated it is under discussion.

Ms. McCann stated she liked the intimate spaces and the groves of trees, but was concerned about the lack of lighting depicted in the slides. She asked about security. Mr. Kennedy stated the peninsula is beyond the city and presents security and safety issues. He stated the landscaping will be low to keep sight lines clear and there will be lighting on the streets, in the parking lots, and along the trail. Mr. Kennedy clarified that there will likely be planting on both sides of the slough.

Mr. Pellegrini asked if public access along the slough was previously agreed to as part of the project that was not built. Mr. Kennedy stated the slough was considered as a connection to the area but there are technical challenges with that zone due to the steep grade and it is not a destination point.

Mr. Strang asked if there is any original shoreline left or if the peninsula is completely made of landfill. Mr. Kennedy stated the shoreline originally looked like an upturned thumb and adjustments have been made to create access. The original shoreline no longer exists.

Mr. Strang asked about the maximum amount of fill that will be brought in and where it will come from. Mr. McCarthy stated the grading will keep as much existing soil on site as possible and is more about raising and shifting things around and will bring the landfill requirements up to code.

Ms. Alschuler asked if there will be excavation in Phase 1D and for the future hotel. Mr. McCarthy stated there will be excavation and relocation of refuse for Phase 1D. The site will be built in such a way that it mounds up with the open space and curves down to the hotel site.

Ms. Alschuler asked about safety and lighting at the intersection of Oyster Point and Marina Boulevard. Mr. Kennedy stated there will be lighting at the intersection and along the street but it will not obstruct the view corridor out to the Bay. The main ideas are to keep it open for the view with no vertical obstruction to the horizon; to be soft, green, and open to the sky; and to orient visitors to the amenities to the north and west.

Ms. Alschuler asked about bicycle access. Mr. Kennedy stated there are designated Class II bicycle lanes on all streets. The Bay Trail will be maintained as a multiuse pathway.

Mr. Pellegrini asked about public transit locations. Mr. Kennedy pointed to potential bus stop areas near the ferry terminal and near the public restroom. He noted there might be a stop at the drop-off at the beach area. Mr. Gross noted that SamTrans does not currently run east of Highway 101 to this area. Commute.Org shuttles service this area.

Ms. McCann asked about community input on the proposed design. Mr. Kennedy summarized the recent workshops and community forums that have taken place.

Ms. Alschuler asked about adaptation over time based on sea level rise. Mr. Kennedy stated the project is designed to be resilient for 2050, at minimum, and resilient to king tides for 2100. Adaptation would be consistent with community uses and preferences at that time.

d. **Public Hearing.** There was one public comment:

Ben Botkin, the Planner for San Francisco Bay Area Water Trail and San Francisco Bay Trail, spoke in support of the proposal. He stated he wanted to ensure the width and overall approach of the Bay Trail continues through future phases. He asked about the continuity between the existing Bay Trail and the project. He stated there is an opportunity to include the Bay Trail's Migration Art Project along the shoreline. He asked if the duration of parking was sufficient for watercraft.

Ms. Alschuler asked about kayakers on the Water Trail at the proposed project. Mr. Botkin suggested a small designated lay-down area for unloading gear at the drop-off area. The area may also be a popular destination site. He asked that the parking include spaces with longer time-limits to facilitate kayaker paddle times if limits are set.

e. **Board Discussion.** The Board members discussed the following:

(1) Would the Oyster Point Phases 1C and 1D encourage diverse activities and create a "sense of place" that is unique and enjoyable? Does the proposed project "preserve" or provide ample and diverse opportunities for public use of the site, including picnicking, swimming, non-motorized boating, hiking, windsurfing, and fishing opportunities?

Ms. McCann stated the importance of maintenance and operation of the park. She stated she loved the approach and strategy to keep it more informal and in character to the park, but questioned the longevity of the exposed wood furnishings.

Mr. Strang spoke in support of the thorough, well-thought-out plan that provides diverse amenities for a variety of users. He suggested that the street and sidewalks be improved to make the Oyster Point Boulevard Gateway more special. Mr. Strang supported the idea of including a landscape moment at the intersection of Oyster Point Boulevard Gateway and Marina Boulevard.

Mr. Pellegrini suggested establishing better connections across Marina Boulevard to go between the public spaces. He stated that the future phases might benefit from additional pedestrian access on the south side connecting from Gull Drive to the future park area.

Ms. Alschuler stated the importance, to know now, the impacts in terms of public access to the quality of the park or at least a description of the commitment, such as improved access on the south side, a future north/south connector across the peninsula, and a sense of general location where that would be. She suggested extending the podium plaza area further along the building to include the view to the southeast. She suggested including landscaping at the intersection areas.

(2) Are the proposed public amenities at the project site appropriate and would they be distributed and designed to meet and balance the needs of the public and natural resources at the beach area and in the water?

(3) Does the design of Oyster Point Boulevard and the meadow create an appropriate sense of arrival to Oyster Point?

(4) Does the project encourage use of the water for swimming and/or non-motorized boats and include related facilities, e.g., launching facilities, restrooms, docks and rigging areas, equipment storage, etc.?

(5) Considering the existing amenities, the planned development intensity, and the beach/park priority use designation, do the proposed amenities and renovations to the existing amenities expand the enjoyment of the shoreline experience? Do the proposed improvements to the pathways at the site enhance the San Francisco Bay Trail program/alignment? Are the existing public access areas sufficiently improved and do they provide adequate public amenities? Would the public benefit from an enhanced or additional kayak storage area?

Ms. Alschuler suggested expanding the waterfront park use and enhancing the trail along the peninsula.

Mr. Strang suggested including as much green space as possible.

(6) Is the proposed parking designed in a manner that does not diminish the park-like nature of the site? Does the project include ample parking that will be reserved for and used by the general public visiting the park and/or beach area?

Mr. Strang suggested improving the general quality of the street and parking lot. He stated the parking lot may become more useful for special events if a portion of it utilized unit pavers or gravel. He suggested thinking about what else can be done with materials and strategies to make the parking, street, trail, and green space a more continuous experience, including the idea of moving the parking further away from the shoreline. He encouraged the project proponents to reduce the pinch point at the eastern end of the parking lot.

Ms. Alschuler stated the need to consider how the space will be used not only on a daily basis but also during an event. It is important to think about the support for parking, additional shuttles, and buses that would allow for large events to happen.

Ms. McCann asked if the dimension between Marina Boulevard and the parking bay could be narrowed to create a deeper park area around the waterfront.

(7) Are the materials in the Marina Waterfront appropriate for the intended public use? Is the flexible gravel area sufficiently designed to be used by the public outside of planned events?

Mr. Strang stated unit pavers are a cost-effective solution over time when dealing with settling issues.

(8) Are the plantings appropriate for the beach, meadow, and marina waterfront areas considering the views of the water, the strength of the wind, and the intended uses in these areas?

Mr. Strang stated greater soil preparation is necessary to ensure success of the higher end plant palette.

(9) Does the proposed project preserve a sandy beach in a manner that considers wildlife compatibility?

Ms. McCann stated the project maintains the status quo.

(10) Are the connections between the various public areas (beach, flexible lawn, seating areas) designed appropriately?

(a) Would the public benefit from an access path from Gull Drive along the tidal slough to the future park located east of Phase 1D and south of Marina Boulevard?

(b) Would the public benefit from an additional trail connecting the north and south sides of the Oyster Point Marina peninsula that is closer to the beach and Marina waterfront?

Board members discussed the importance of a connection between the Marina waterfront park and the hotel side.

Ms. McCann suggested building in a Gull Drive connection along the slough, which could be connected to an east/west path on the future park and hotel sites. The Board expressed support for a north/south connection from the slough to Marina Boulevard.

(11) Is the project designed to maximize access to, along, and through the proposed developed area, including the areas proposed for office and roadway construction?

(12) Are the proposed walkways and trails designed to connect to the nearest public thoroughfare and Bay Trail connecting pathways?

Ms. Alschuler stated the need to know that the Bay Trail will include an adaptive use plan.

(13) Are the proposed streets, paths, walkways, and landscape features designed to maximize views to and along the shoreline?

Ms. Alschuler suggested a balance between clustering the trees to provide wind protection and an open view corridor.

(14) Are the public areas appropriately designed to be resilient and adaptive to sea level rise? Are the proposed public access areas sited and designed to avoid significant adverse impacts from sea level rise and shoreline flooding?

Ms. McCann stated the plan is designed for resilience through 2050 and includes protection through 2100 in some instances.

Mr. Strang stated the design includes a grading solution, which is reasonable. He stated the need to consider if the fill is a soil mix that can be controlled or what exists on the site, which can be improved.

Ms. McCann suggested greater development of stormwater filtration.

Ms. Alschuler suggested thinking about safety and security.

Ms. McCann suggested re-naming the park.

f. **Applicant Response.** Mr. Kennedy responded positively to the Board's suggestions and stated the design team will take the Board's comments into consideration and will come up with an improved design.

g. **Board Summary and Conclusions.** Ms. Alschuler left it up to staff to decide whether the Board will see this project again. The Board stated that they would like to see the project again if staff would like further input about connections to and along the slough.

5. **Adjournment.** There being no further business, Ms. Alschuler adjourned the meeting at approximately 8:15 p.m.