

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

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: Approved Minutes of November 7, 2016 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 Milton Marks Conference Center - San Diego Room, 455 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, California, at approximately 5:30 p.m., and asked everyone to introduce themselves.

Other DRB members in attendance included Cheryl Barton, Roger Leventhal, Jacinta McCann, Stefan Pellegrini, and Gary Strang. BCDC staff in attendance included Andrea Gaffney, Ethan Lavine, and Jaime Michaels. Also in attendance were Nicole Avril (San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department), Ben Botkin (ABAG Water Trail), Arthur Feinstein (Sierra Club and Golden Gate Audubon), Jill Fox (Neighbor), Maureen Gaffney (ABAG Bay Trail), Michael Hamman (Neighbor), Stefan Hastrup (Turnbull Griffin Haesloop Architects), Ashley Ludwig (Gustafson Guthrie Nichol), Dilip Trivedi (Moffatt and Nichol), Marcel Wilson (Bionic), and Michael Yarne (Build, Inc.)

Andrea Gaffney, BCDC Bay Design Analyst, reviewed the safety protocols, meeting protocols, and meeting agenda. She asked the Board to hold their comments today until both projects have been presented.

The next Board meeting will be held in the new facility at 375 Beale Street in San Francisco on December 5, 2016. Mission Rock, Mission Bay Waterfront Park, and possibly West Gateway Public Access Area projects will be reviewed.

2. **Report of Chief of Permits. Jaime Michaels, the BCDC Chief of Permits, presented her report:**

a. The City of Alameda submitted a briefing on the plans for Alameda Point. Applications have not yet been received for this project.

info@bcdc.ca.gov | www.bcdc.ca.gov
State of California | Edmund G. Brown, Jr. — Governor



DRB MINUTES
November 7, 2016

b. The San Francisco Bay Area Water Emergency Transportation Authority's (WETA) San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project will be heard at the November 17th Commission meeting. She noted that the farmer's market in the public plaza area remains part of the plan, contrary to Board recommendation.

c. The applicant for the proposed hotel in Alameda on Harbor Bay Isle has requested to present at the February Commission meeting.

3. **Approval of Draft Minutes for October 17, 2016.** Ms. Barton requested adding "to ensure coherence of the program elements over time so the Board can see how the site evolved" to the end of a sentence on page 4 that states she "suggested separating the ideas by phase."

Ms. Barton requested changing her suggestion on page 5 that the trees "be clustered for a more organic experience" to "be clustered for a more informal, authentic coastal edge experience."

Ms. Barton requested changing "their use of riprap" to "their inventive use of riprap" at the top of page 7.

Ms. Alschuler requested combining questions 1 and 2 under the Board Discussion on page 8.

Ms. Alschuler requested adding "but needs to better guide people to the water" to "the broken street grid is a good contrast to other areas of the city" on page 9.

MOTION: Mr. Strang moved to approve the Draft Minutes for the October 17, 2016, San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission Design Review Board Meeting as revised. Ms. Barton seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

4. **India Basin Urban Design Briefing.** Ethan Lavine, the BCDC Principal Permit Analyst, provided a quick overview, of specific BCDC guiding policies that are related to the sites to be presented in Agenda Items 5 and 6. He highlighted special land-use designations, such as a waterfront park priority use area, and also mentioned the San Francisco Waterfront Special Area Plan policies.

Mr. Lavine stated, although the projects are adjacent to one another and are undergoing one Environmental Impact Analysis, they will be treated separately for permitting purposes.

Michael Yarne, Principal at Build, Inc., reviewed the unique aspects of the projects, such as that these projects are the last single piece of continuous one-and-a-half miles of shoreline on the Bay that can become a park, and that they include public, private, nonprofit, and community-based partnerships.

Mr. Yarne provided an overview, accompanied by a slide presentation, of the regional and local vicinity context, the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) project boundary, and Bay fill history of India Basin.

Marcel Wilson, Founder and Principal at Bionic Landscape Architecture, continued the slide presentation. He discussed the coastal processes, sea level rise, BCDC jurisdiction and biological communities, India Basin Waterfront parks and trails, Basin-wide pedestrian and bicycle circulation, and concept master plan of the India Basin. He stated Build commissioned a one-foot bathymetric survey of the basin, geotechnical work, sea level rise studies, and coastal processes studies. He submitted the summary document to the Board.

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

Ms. Alschuler stated the Board has a policy to try to have as many Board members as possible visit sites prior to their review. She stated Ms. Gaffney suggested putting in the record who visited the India Basin sites.

Ms. Alschuler stated she recently walked most of the area; also, she and Mr. Strang did a site visit in preparation of today's presentations. She stated the site provides extraordinary opportunity, yet it will be a challenge. She stated the Board will have questions regarding procedures, habitat, and connections to community.

Mr. Strang asked about the planning mechanism that establishes density, height limit, and architectural design guidelines for this site in terms of the big picture.

Mr. Yarne responded that a Development Agreement in a Special-Use District is being done, which will rezone the area. It is currently a remnant of 1950's M-1 zoning. The area was held out of the rezoning as part of the shipyard of Candlestick and was known as Area C. The neighborhood was unhappy with the direction of that rezoning and the area was set aside for a more collaborative effort. Build did a full Development Capacity Study of the site using the existing zoning and has created a design that clusters the development by pulling it back from the public land to create a much larger open space parks resource. Due to the change in zoning that is currently taking place, the heights and use designations will change.

Mr. Leventhal asked about inundation maps, sea level rise, and mean high water. Mr. Wilson stated the focus of the map in question was more on habitat impacts, so the mean high water was chosen as the upper limit.

Ms. McCann stated the road condition is critical to connect the location to the community and the parks. She asked for detailed information about that and also about how the timing and delivery of the parks is tied to the development of the site and whether that will be documented in a development agreement over the 25-year duration of the project.

Mr. Yarne agreed that Innes Avenue has to be done right because it is the lifeline to the project. All transportation planning agencies, PG&E, and FivePoint have worked in collaboration. He offered two websites as information resources: ibtransportationplan.com and ibwaterfrontparks.com. Phasing will be negotiated in the development agreement. The project is planned for seven to eight phases, which are included in the meeting packet.

Mr. Pellegrini asked if there were ever active industrial uses on the site and, if so, whether remedial action has been undertaken. Mr. Yarne stated some of the site has had heavy industrial uses, such as shipbuilding. He pointed out industrial-use locations on a slide.

Nicole Avril, Project Representative at the San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department, stated the 900 Innes site is a former boatyard. She provided facts of the historical perspective of the location. The EPA has provided funding for remediation and the Parks Department is undergoing additional testing of the sediment of the foreshore and the water.

Mr. Yarne stated there has been illegal dumping over the years at the 700 Innes site, so testing and remediation will also be required there.

5. 900 Innes and India Basin Shoreline Park; San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department (First Pre-Application Review). The Board reviewed a proposal by the San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department to redevelop the approximately 14.2-acre project site located adjacent to the India Basin along the southeastern shoreline of the city and county of San Francisco.

The proposed project would include the existing India Basin Shoreline Park and the 900 Innes property, which is a former maritime industrial site that contains several historic structures. The entirety of the project site is located within the San Francisco Bay Plan Priority Use Area for Waterfront Parks.

a. **Staff Presentation.** Mr. Lavine introduced the project and summarized the issues identified in the staff report included in the meeting packet, including adequate, useable, and attractive public access areas, minimal potential conflicts between sensitive habitat and public access uses, adequate and appropriate connections to and through public access spaces, appropriate location and design of the proposed boat launch, and viable public access design to allow for sea level rise.

b. **Project Presentation.** Ashley Ludwig, Landscape Architect at Gustafson Guthrie Nichol, provided an overview, accompanied by a slide presentation, of the project location, existing elements, proposed site plan, circulation, phasing, park areas, marsh edge, sage slopes, neighborhood edge, Scow Schooner Boatyard, historic shorewalk, marineway, formal and informal trails, community stakeholder process, and timeline of the 900 Innes and India Basin Shoreline Park project.

Ms. Ludwig summarized the community priorities gleaned throughout the community stakeholder process that drive the design of the park: gathering space, employment, recreation, amenities and programs for teens and adults, history, natural vista spaces for birdwatching and habitat, and sea level rise.

Stefan Hastrup, Architect at Turnbull Griffin Haesloop Architects, continued the slide presentation. He discussed existing sheds, buildings in the boatyard and the overlook building that pairs with the shipwright's cottage from 1875 to frame the sloped ramp garden and serves to screen the blank warehouse wall to the west, and the outfitter pavilion, which serves as a gathering place, seasonal watercraft station, and birdwatching area.

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

Mr. Leventhal asked about the quantity of Bay fill expected to be used and if it is the minimum amount necessary to accomplish the program goal.

Mr. Strang asked about the minimum and maximum depths of the water at low and high tide in the area of the pavilion. Ms. Avril stated the float was positioned to still have water under it at low tide to remain accessible to kayaks and so it will not get stuck in the mud. Ms. Alschuler asked for further details on this in future project presentations.

Mr. Pellegrini asked how the water feature that runs along the historic shoreline functions and whether it is a natural system. Ms. Avril stated the concept is for the feature to run from the top of the hill to the shoreline; it could potentially be a recirculating water feature.

Mr. Leventhal referred to slide 15 and asked if the trail to the edge of the low marsh is 40 to 50 feet. Ms. Avril stated it is about 40 feet with a pathway of 15 feet. Ms. Alschuler asked for details about the widths and distances in future project presentations.

d. **Public Hearing.** Arthur Feinstein, of Sierra Club and Golden Gate Audubon Society, stated the impact on wildlife was missing in the presentation. Today's project areas are one of the richest habitats for water birds in the area. His organizations presented materials during another EIR process that he will forward to the Board for their consideration. He stated boating activities have a serious impact on water birds. He suggested moving the pavilion and farther to the east end; he also suggested that Lennar be asked to include the kayaking center out where there is more open water and no wetlands.

Jill Fox, of the India Basin Neighborhood Association and advocate for the acquisition of this property, stated she has concerns with the design. She wrote a six-page critique in July that she is willing to share with the Board. She stated India Basin Shoreline Park is currently the second worst maintained park in the Parks Department. She stated the need to design a park that is easy to maintain and that has been vetted by local stakeholders. Stakeholders like that the park is below grade of the road because sound travels up.

Ms. Fox suggested that the grand entrance to the project be next to 900 Innes. She stated the importance of keeping the view unobstructed on Hunters Point Boulevard and on the little stretch between 900 Innes and the existing building.

Ms. Alschuler asked Ms. Fox to share her written comments with the Board.

e. **Board Discussion.** The Board held discussion on this project until after hearing the presentation for Agenda Item 6.

6. India Basin Open Space and 700 Innes Project; Build, Inc. (First Pre-Application Review). The Board reviewed a proposal by Build, Inc. and the city and county of San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department to redevelop a project site located adjacent to India Basin at the southeastern shoreline of the city and county of San Francisco.

The proposed project site is largely undeveloped. The entirety of the project site is located within the San Francisco Bay Plan Priority Use Area for water-oriented recreation.

a. **Staff Presentation.** Mr. Lavine introduced the project and summarized the issues identified in the staff report included in the meeting packet, including adequate, useable, and attractive public access areas, minimal potential conflicts between sensitive habitat and public access uses, adequate and appropriate connections to and through public access spaces, appropriate location and design of the proposed boat launch, and viable public access design to allow for sea level rise.

b. **Project Presentation.** Mr. Wilson provided an overview, accompanied by a slide presentation, of the physical framework, wetlands mitigation history, existing site images, proposed land use, conceptual phasing and massing, site elevations, protected public view corridors, vehicular, pedestrian and bicycle circulation, parking, proposed program, concept master plan, public market, Big Green elements, trail types, beach and living shoreline elements, and sea level rise of the 700 Innes and India Basin Open Space project.

Mr. Wilson stated this project takes a post-industrial site, rearranges it in its relationship to the Bay so it is more ecologically productive, builds a new piece of the city, and creates a greater degree of access and economic vitality to a developing part of the city.

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

Mr. Strang asked about the stormwater element. Mr. Wilson stated the stormwater will be managed in the stormwater system in the Big Green and will be a combination of bio-soils and bioretention.

Mr. Pellegrini asked about the extent of the weir as it runs along the shoreline. Mr. Wilson stated the existing grade will be carved away to create a dissipater in what is currently upland.

Mr. Leventhal asked about the public market. Ms. Wilson stated it will be privately owned, but managed like Pike's Place. The concept is to incubate small businesses, create a great hangout spot, and include temporary markets.

Ms. McCann asked about the two scenarios for the development of the site and how that will impact the park. Mr. Wilson stated the park remains the same in either scenario, as will the rights of way, sidewalks, passageways, and midblock stairs. What would change is the building form on the three blocks closest to Innes Avenue.

Ms. Alschuler stated 1,240 dwelling units versus 500 between scenarios is a big difference that will impact the usage of the park and support of the retail businesses. Mr. Wilson stated the flexibility was built in to encourage significant commercial tenants. Only then will it truly be a 24/7 mixed-use community.

Ms. McCann asked if there is a road for vehicles to reach the kayak launch. Mr. Wilson pointed out the vehicular access route on a slide and stated there are three loading spaces to offload kayaks. Earl Street is another viable access point because it is being brought to Public Works grade.

Ms. Alschuler asked for further details about extending the access to the kayak launch areas on both sites, and if this project will also close down its operation in the winter for less impact on the wildlife. Mr. Wilson stated seasonality has not been discussed but could be done. He compared the access options of the projects.

Ms. Alschuler asked if kayak use would have seasonal or tidal limitations. Mr. Wilson stated there is a broad, sandy shoulder in this project that would allow kayaks out beyond the wetlands during low tide. An additional pier had been considered due to the public interest on this topic for fishing and kayaks, but the permit implications and fill issues were a deterrent. The current design utilizes an existing pier that historically was used by barges and will not disrupt the wetland cells.

Mr. Leventhal referred to slide 10, the draft site elevations, and asked how the proposed buildings will affect the view. Mr. Yarne stated the buildings in white are existing buildings and the others will be new. The heights have been adjusted through an ongoing process of visual analysis. Mr. Wilson added that the EIR has an extensive view simulation. The design adds a fair amount of density without blocking many views, which is unique.

Ms. Alschuler asked who will be programming and maintaining the park spaces for the long-term. Mr. Wilson stated the proposal is inclusive of a community facilities district, which is a 100-year special tax applied to the property with revenues applied to the India Basin Trust, a public interest nonprofit focused on stewardship and maintenance of these projects. More discussion is required with the Parks Department on coordinating that effort. The intent is for all parks to fall into the Parks Department's jurisdiction.

d. **Public Hearing.** Michael Hamman, of the India Basin Neighborhood Association, echoed Mr. Yarne's comment about considering these projects as an integrated whole. Isolating the components misses too many opportunities. Mr. Hamman noted that the PG&E site is missing from today's presentation but is important to discuss because it is the missing link between the India Basin properties.

Mr. Hamman stated these projects provide kayaking opportunities, but the water depth in the basin is mostly shallow. The most ideal place for kayaking may not be where it is placed in the design - at the shallowest end of the basin. The proponent ensures that the floating pavilion will still be afloat at low tide, but it may only be in one to two inches of water.

Mr. Hamman amplified Ms. Fox's comments about the nature of the park planning for the 900 Innes site and how it has not been adequately considered. There are many things that appear to be trivial that are indeed important, such as the basketball court and the entrance to the park and how it relates to the street. He agreed with Ms. Fox about the existing park being below street level and how that affords privacy and a sense of intimacy with the Bay that is lost at street level.

Mr. Hamman stated the need for greater respect of the historical features of the 900 Innes site. The reason for historical preservation is to invoke the story of the lives and activities of the people who lived there before, such as artifacts and structures like the shipwright's cottage. Walking through the cottage, sheds, and outbuildings gives a sense of what it was like living and building ships at this site, but to improve them with glass, chrome, and steel is to disrespect those features. He asked the Board to look closely at the historical preservation aspect of the plans and to give heavy credence to it.

Mr. Hamman stated the 700 Innes site has a parking garage and drop-off zones for kayakers and picnickers, but 900 Innes and Shoreline Park site plan has fewer parking places than exists now, which is absurd - there are few parking places for employees and visitors to the site.

Mr. Hamman stated that India Basin was the epicenter of the anti-Bay-fill movement that created the BCDC. He stated it would be tragic if the BCDC approved a project with imported fill dumping more dirt into the India Basin. Although it is likely that extensive modifications of the landform will be necessary, he suggested requiring that any fill that goes into the Basin come from the Bay to reshape what is already there.

Maureen Gaffney, Bay Trail Planner with the San Francisco Bayshore Project, stated some terminology is confusing, such as Class 1 bike lanes. The terminology Caltrans uses is Class 1 pathway. She defined what a Class 1 fully-separated path is versus a Class 2 bike lane.

Ms. Gaffney stated the width of the Bay Trail is characterized as being generous throughout these projects, but is the minimum requirement of 12 feet with two-foot shoulders on either side. She suggested that the trail be widened to at least 15 feet with shoulders on either side to accommodate the expected multi-use traffic.

Ms. Gaffney asked for bicycle parking to be identified and the type of bicycle parking facilities specified. She suggested including more than just bicycle racks.

Ms. Gaffney suggested a route that does not have the Bay Trail going through the middle of the vehicle turn-around and moving the Bay Trail closer to the shoreline in the area at the 900 Innes site.

Ms. Gaffney suggested defining "minor shared path" and routing the Bay Trail where the minor shared path currently is to position it closer to the shoreline at the 700 Innes site. She also asked about the striping plan for the minor share path.

Ben Botkin, Planner at the San Francisco Bay Area Water Trail, stated this is a unique site for kayaking in that it is in a natural cove that provides shelter from winds, which provides an opportunity to provide programs for children or beginning kayakers to learn in a safer environment. Including multiple access points in the design makes sense with designated loading/unloading zones, kayak storage, and available parking for kayakers. He stated the dock should be Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) accessible.

Mr. Botkin stated the hope that a Parks Department will include a kayaking program at the India Basin Shoreline Park area, because kayaking can be cost-prohibitive.

Mr. Botkin stated the floating dock may not be the best solution to allow sufficient space for a kayak program.

Mr. Botkin suggested providing kayak dollies, which are wheels with a crossbar that can be loaned to kayakers to move kayaks to and from the parking area.

Mr. Bokin stated the concern that the 700 Innes site may become a de facto private launch because of its secluded launch area behind the residential area. He suggested adequate signage noting that it is a public facility.

Mr. Botkin suggested long-term kayak storage for residents and short-term storage for visitors coming from other locations at the 900 Innes site. He stated ramps are not a good way to get in and out of boats as they tend to be slippery and muddy. He noted other ramps around the Bay must be continually scoured to ensure functionality.

Mr. Feinstein stated India Basin is unique and has intense habitat value. He stated the importance of being as sensitive to wildlife impacts as possible in the design. He stated the concern that bright lighting impacts night creatures. He suggested making the lighting as minimal and directed as possible, particularly along the Bay Trail that is close to the shoreline.

Mr. Feinstein stated the draft EIR indicated there was California sea-blite (*Suaeda californica*) in this location, which is listed by the Federal Government as an endangered plant species.

Mr. Feinstein stated mud flats are one of the most important habitats for water birds. The boat launch bisects the mud flats and will impact wildlife.

e. **Board Discussion.** The Board members discussed the projects presented in Agenda Items 5 and 6, as follows:

(1) **India Basin Urban Design - General Comments.** Ms. Alschuler stated the role of this area as part of the Bay waterfront is important. She stated the need to include a broader stretch of waterfront, from Hunters Point to Candlestick Point, in the Board consideration as a potential resource and access point to the Bay. She agreed that more should be learned about the PG&E parcel.

Ms. Barton stated the Board talked about the importance of unifying the sites with a similar palette and aesthetic and making the sites an integrated whole, but the designs presented are not quite there yet. The projects should be less differentiated and less intense to be integrated more successfully. These projects cannot support everything stakeholders suggest. An editing process must now begin to consider what the site can support in partnership with Hunters Point and Candlestick Point. She stated the wildness of the shoreline is one of the resources of this area to consider during the design phase.

Mr. Strang agreed with Ms. Barton that the sites should not have abrupt changes in environment but should be a seamless experience for visitors. He suggested an enlargement of the point where the two sites meet to show the Board how the transition happens at that critical location.

Mr. Strang asked for further details of the locations adjacent to the projects, especially what is known about the park further east and how that might inform the edge of the 700 Innes site and how it will transition into the projects.

Ms. McCann stated the issue of fill is important, whether brought in or redistributed. She asked for the rationale for fill in both sites.

Ms. McCann stated the sites do not need to be one character. It is more about where points of intensive use are located, although there is a common ecology that wraps the interface of the water with the land.

Mr. Pellegrini stated he is struggling with the conceptual marriage of the two parks and what that means for public access.

(2) **900 Innes and India Basin Shoreline Park.** Mr. Strang stated the entry to 900 Innes is currently difficult to find. He asked how the public will learn about the available amenities, and if there will be a main entrance to the whole park or multiple entrances.

Ms. McCann stated the issue of accessibility is critical and will greatly impact the design. She asked for more analysis on the amount of parking and the distances from parking to the kayak launch facilities. Even with a kayak trolley, the current distances seem long.

Ms. McCann asked if there may be another option that could be studied for kayak launches, since there are other projecting walkways already in place. She asked if another walkway could be extended further for a kayak launch to avoid the major disruption to the park and the shoreline.

Ms. McCann stated, in terms of the character of the park, the designs and renderings of the 900 Innes site in the meeting packet depict the habitat and ecology of the area in the forefront. The final rendering, the aerial view from the Bay, seems to convey a different character, almost like there are two parks in one. She suggested defining the core purpose of the 900 Innes site, which presents a challenging design exercise due to the topography and sensitive habitat elements.

Ms. McCann stated another reason that the 900 Innes park is underused, along with Mr. Strang's comment about its seclusion and difficulty of access, is that it is not maintained. Operations and maintenance should not be left to the end of the design phase.

Ms. McCann requested that the Board see the primary views for the 900 Innes site. She suggested that the Bay Trail be the demarcation between the more active parts of the park and the natural shoreline edge.

Mr. Leventhal stated the 900 Innes and India Basin Shoreline Park site is unique in that the Board is being asked to allow the addition of a large amount of fill in order to create the park - up to 18 feet in some locations. He stated he is not convinced with the habitat trade-off benefits of the shoreline edge post-fill. He asked for designs that focus more on the edge, because the slides currently depict constructed fringe marsh over the fill, which does not have the structure to withstand erosion. He stated the inability to use dredge sediment to fill up the 18 feet because of settlement issues. He stated his interest in fill as a measure of the sustainability of the proposed design and how the edge will perform over time.

Mr. Leventhal stated the boat ramp is striking but it is in the middle of shoreline. He suggested a kayak ramp without the large lawn and beach area. The term "living shoreline" is being used inappropriately. An area with gravel is not a beach that functions with the water; it is a landscape feature. He suggested moving the boat ramp to allow for a functioning tidal marsh in one area and leave the rest of the shoreline edge as natural as possible without aiming for a valueless strip marsh.

Mr. Leventhal stated Shoreline Park is an amazing project with great possibilities. There are opportunities along the shoreline that can be fleshed out. He asked for more drawings of profiles with scales, figures, and elevations. He agreed that there is sea-blite along the coast and the opportunity for it to exist is high, especially in sandy areas. There is also an opportunity to do a real living shoreline for stability instead of the engineered reef balls.

Mr. Pellegrini stated 900 Innes still looks like an attempt to separate or buffer the park from Hunters Point Boulevard. The roadway is hostile for pedestrians. He asked if there is an opportunity to provide views across the cove if the street side experience along Hunters Point Boulevard were more open.

Mr. Pellegrini suggested greater transparency, opportunities for views across the cove, and a promenade condition that descends into the old boatyard. The abrupt change to the retail street that comes off Hunters Point requires further study to provide a more unified experience. He suggested an urban design diagram that begins to think about that transition.

(3) **India Basin Open Space and 700 Innes Project.** Ms. McCann stated the direction that the 700 Innes site is going is interesting. She stated she liked the configuration of the beach and the kayak entry node, but the access would need to be clearly signed. She asked how the programming of the Big Green and other areas complement each other.

Mr. Pellegrini asked for greater detail on the 700 Innes site of the sectional relationship of the primary fingers that connect to the shoreline with the retail street, bicycle track, and pedestrian spaces. Also, there are portions of the site where the front/back relationship of the buildings is apparent, but others where it is not yet clear what the relationship will be between the built form and the public space. The frontage is important in areas that need to be very public but must interface with private residences.

Ms. Alschuler stated the views through to the water are not convincing with the blue lines on the drawings. A balance must be sought to convince the Board that visitors to Innes Avenue will understand what is at the end. The largest entry has the market, but the market should not block the view of the water.

f. **Applicant Response.** Mr. Yarne clarified that the proposal is for bicycle share pods; one-for-one biking for the residential area; structured, secure bicycle parking for commercial areas; and a full, grade-separated, protected, 12- to 14-foot-wide, two-way, state-of-the-art bikeway that is solely for bicycles.

Mr. Yarne stated a lot of thought has gone into front/back, eyes on the park, having a range of how buildings interact, laneways, shared auto way, perspectives, views, and ensuring that it feels and reads like a public space.

Mr. Yarne stated there is tension between the wild and active/program spaces. The Bay Trail location and width have been debated. The approach has been to pull the trail back. The intention is for the Bay Trail to be the dividing line between the wild and program spaces. The concern is if the trail is pushed out too far, it will be overactivated. The hope is for more mystery and discovery beyond that trail.

He requested that the Board encourage the cooperation of the adjacent properties. What matters is a consistent palette, signage, and experience.

Ms. Avril talked about the waterfront study that preceded the design effort. Six of the seven properties along the waterfront are in some stage of development. All property owners were brought to the table to talk about the vision for the India Basin Cove. Stakeholders also participated in the process. It was determined that the properties were not going to have redundancies or gaps, but were going to have a complementary set of programs and amenities along all seven properties and would be tied together. There is work yet to be done.

g. **Board Summary and Conclusions.** Ms. Alschuler categorized the Board's requests for additional information at the next presentation:

- (1) Access from all modes such as parking and water approach.
- (2) Character of the sites to better understand what the sites individually and together will provide to this cove and basin area.
- (3) Sequence of the experience of the site, geographically along Innes Avenue and into the site; a main entrance versus multiple entrances.

- (4) Sequence of view.
- (5) Enlargements of particular areas and dimensions of public walkways and sequence of arrival.
- (6) Day/night/seasonal use and the balance of habitat with use.
- (7) Filling is not about measuring amounts, but what the effect is of that filling.
- (8) Marineway is the big move on the map. The Big Green area may not need to go as far because it will be reduced later over time. Think about the position of the gravel edge. Maybe the Board needs to know the path of shore birds and other wildlife using the edge to better understand what the balance should be.
- (9) Sustainability over time of each facility, investing in the places that will remain long-term and how the changing edge will be experienced. More focus on the edge as a whole.
- (10) Sea level rise - get a consistent way of looking at what the Board will compare.
- (11) Beaches - more justification to changes in the shoreline. Use known terminology.
- (12) Urban design diagram is important and will tell the Board how well the public experience will be brought back into the community.
- (13) Views - better understand what the views are and what the public experience will be.
- (14) Operations and maintenance.
- (15) Bay Trail - the location of the trail has been questioned, particularly at the 700 Innes site.

7. **Adjournment.** There being no further business, Ms. Alschuler adjourned the meeting at approximately 9:00 p . m .

Respectfully submitted,

ANDREA GAFFNEY
Bay Design Analyst

Approved, with no corrections at the
Design Review Board Meeting of December 5, 2016