

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

November 23, 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: Mission Rock; First Pre-Application Review
(For Board consideration on December 5, 2016)

Project Summary

Project Proponents. Port of San Francisco and San Francisco Giants *

Property Owner. Port of San Francisco

Project Site. The approximately 28-acre project site is located at Seawall Lot 337 and Pier 48 on the San Francisco waterfront, in the Mission Bay neighborhood, in the City and County of San Francisco (Exhibit 2). The project site is bound by: McCovey Cove (north); Terry A. Francois Boulevard and China Basin (east); Mission Rock Street (south), and Third Street (west). Currently, the site includes China Basin Park, AT&T Park's Lot A parking lot, Pier 48, and Pier 48 ½, which is a marginal wharf located between Pier 48 and Pier 50. Lot A is used for parking and occasional special events. Lot A contains The Yard at Mission Rock, a retail and event space housed in repurposed shipping containers. At Pier 48, the northern shed is used primarily for ballpark overflow parking and Giants' special events and the southern shed is used for the Department of Elections storage. Pier 50—not included in the subject project area—is used for marine industrial activities, including vessel dry docking.

Project Description. The project presented in this report does *not* illustrate a specific design but rather a conceptual design and controls, which would be used as a framework and the parameters for the ultimate design of the project site. The proposed project includes a mixed-use community and an approximately 8-acre (total) area of new or redeveloped public parks. Pier 48 is proposed for renovation to possibly accommodate a mix of maritime and non-maritime uses. Specific project elements are as follows:

***Project Representatives.** Fran Weld, San Francisco Giants (Project Manager); Phil Williamson, Port of San Francisco (Property Owner); Kristen Hall, Perkins and Will (Urban Designer); Willet Moss, CMG Landscape Architecture (Landscape Architect); Claire Maxfield, Atelier Ten (Environmental Designer); James Dallosta, BKF Engineers (Civil Engineer); Harry O'Brien, Coblenz Patch Duffy & Bass (Attorney); Michael Ahern, Ever-Green Energy (District Energy System Developer); Lori Simpson, Langan (Geotechnical Engineer); Dilip Trivedi, Moffat & Nichol (Coastal Engineer); Jeff Tumlin, Nelson Nygaard (Transportation Engineer); Mike Josselyn, WRA (Regulatory Guidance)

1. **Mixed-Use Development.** The proposed project, at full build-out, would result in 1.4 million square feet of office and retail commercial space, and 1,500 units of rental housing. Building heights would range from 90 to 240 feet. The project would provide for 3,100 parking spaces, including a parking garage that would be constructed at Mission Rock Street (Exhibit 4).
2. **Streets and Public Right-of-Ways.** The proposed project would result in a new street grid of 11 blocks, most of which would be less than 200 feet in length (Exhibits 4, 5 and 6). The east-west portion of Terry A. Francois Boulevard along China Basin Park would be eliminated, and the north-south section would be converted into a curb-less two-way pedestrian-priority street that would also accommodate truck traffic serving Piers 48 and 50 (Exhibit 10). The proposed Bay Trail/Blue Greenway would run along Terry A. Francois Boulevard, extending into China Basin Park and connecting at Third Street Bridge. A “cycle track” would connect Terry A. Francois Boulevard to Mission Rock Street at the southern project site boundary, and run north-south along a new road, Bridgeview Way. Internal streets at the project site would have sharrows or Class II bike lanes; portions of several internal streets would be pedestrian-only. Three new public right-of-ways would be established connecting Third Street to Terry A. Francois Boulevard. One of these public right-of-ways, Channel Street, would be a pedestrian connection and the only east-west right-of-way at the project site with an unimpeded Bay view towards Channel Wharf. However, the grade of the development site may mean the Bay may not be visible along this corridor from Third Street. Muni’s T-Third Street rail line (existing) runs along the project perimeter at Third Street.
3. **Mission Rock Square.** This internal square surrounded by proposed development and located between Third Street and Terry Francois Boulevard is designed with a large lawn and plaza. Channel Street, a pedestrian corridor, would intersect with and run through the square.
4. **Channel Wharf.** The marginal wharf located between Piers 48 and 50, Pier 48½, is proposed for redevelopment as a public plaza (Exhibit 13) with a large-scale feature or art piece and public seating at which visitors could observe vessels berthed at Pier 50 and, if maritime uses continue, at Pier 48.
5. **Pier 48.** Pier 48 shed and apron would be renovated to allow a mix of maritime and non-maritime or exclusively non-maritime uses to occur. For example, Anchor Steam Brewery is considered as a potential tenant possibly occupying more than 50 percent of the shed. As proposed, the pier apron could be used as a publicly-accessible area if conflicts with maritime or industrial uses are avoidable. A “missing” link along the apron at the southeast corner could be filled to allow for continuous access around pier apron. A public kayak launch is proposed at the northern apron of the pier.
6. **China Basin Park.** China Basin Park would be redeveloped and expanded (Exhibits 13-17) to include large lawn/landscaped areas with unique prominent features (e.g., a junior league baseball diamond, a restaurant, a plaza, stormwater gardens) separated by promenades and a Bay Trail, a picnic deck area on the Bay next to Pier 48, and a rip-rap shoreline protection system along the park edge at McCovey Cove. The park would support both passive and active recreational activities.

Sea Level Rise. The design approach to address future high water levels and storm surges from sea level rise is to raise the site grade transitioning from the current grade at the perimeter of the project site to roughly four feet above current conditions (Exhibit 7). In addition, building entrances at areas that would be vulnerable to inundation, such as along Terry A. Francois Boulevard, would be elevated above existing grade to allow for future adaptation (Exhibit 8). The project proponents have not yet provided detail on adaptation approaches for low lying areas of the site (such as at China Basin Park and Terry A. Franchoise Boulevard) Pier 48, nor any shoreline protection measures under consideration.

San Francisco Waterfront Special Area Plan Policies. The *San Francisco Waterfront Special Area Plan (SAP)* policies on **Public Access** state that “maximum feasible public access should be provided in conjunction with any development in the area,” and that access “should be located at ground or platform level, but minor variations in elevation intended to enhance design of open space may be permitted. Public access should also be open to the sky, although some covering may be allowed if it serves the public areas and does not support structures. Particular attention should be given to the provision of perimeter public access along the platform edge.” Other uses may extend to the platform edge, provided they “enhance the total design of the project,” “serve to make public access more interesting,” and do not “divert the public way along more than twenty percent (20%) of the total platform edge.” In addition, “[d]eviations of the public way from the platform edge should be limited to short distances.”

SAP policies on **View Corridors** state that “[i]mportant Bay views along the Embarcadero and level inland streets should be preserved and improved.” Minor encroachment into the view corridors from level inland streets may be permitted “a. Where the encroaching element has a distinct maritime character, is separated from the shoreline by water, and adds variety to the views along the waterfront; b. Where minor structures (such as kiosks) are desirable to provide public amenities contributing to a continuity of interest and activity along the waterfront; and c. Where essential maritime facilities cannot reasonably be located and designed to avoid view blockage.”

Pier 48 is subject to policies of the SAP geographically specific to its Northeast Waterfront Geographic Area.[†] Any fill proposed is required to “be designed so as to take advantage of its nearness to the Bay,” and “provide opportunities for enjoyment of the Bay in such ways as viewing, boating and fishing.”

San Francisco Bay Plan Policies. The *San Francisco Bay Plan (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

[†] Recently enacted legislation (AB 2797) removed the Port Priority Use designation shown in the SAP and BCDC’s San Francisco Bay Area Seaport Plan from Seawall Lot 337, Pier 48, and Pier 48 ½. In addition, the geographic boundary of the Northeast Waterfront Geographic Area was extended to include Pier 48.

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’s **Climate Change** policies state, in part, that “[w]herever feasible and appropriate, effective, innovative sea level rise adaptation approaches should be encouraged.”

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...” 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.”

The Bay Plan **Transportation** policies state in part that shoreline projects “should include pedestrian and bicycle paths that will either be a part of the Bay Trail or connect the Bay Trail with other regional and community trails.”

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 affects 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.”

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 Board Issues. In consideration of relevant policies and guidelines of the Commission, the Board’s advice is sought on the following issues related to the proposed conceptual design program and controls, which will shape future specific designs:

1. **Does the proposed design provide adequate, usable, and attractive public access that maximizes public use and enjoyment of the area?**
 - Is the proposed public access scope and size adequate given the proposed intensification

- Are public access amenities, such as the junior baseball diamond (in its current location), and “working waterfront” activities (i.e., along Terry A. Francois Boulevard, at Pier 48 ½, and potentially along the Pier 48 apron) compatible and/or safe, or should such uses be more distinct and separate?
 - Are the proposed public access amenities (e.g., the over-water picnic deck, the junior baseball field, a restaurant, kiosks, trails, stormwater garden, landscaping, etc.) at the renovated China Basin Park sited, distributed, and designed to maximize public use?
 - Is the boat launch appropriately sited and will it be accessible to a wide variety of users of differing abilities?
2. **Does the proposed project provide an appropriate mix of programming and amenities for the public?**
- Does the proposed project include the appropriate types of public amenities given its location and the population to be served? (Consider existing and future populations and events.)
 - Are there additional or different features and amenities that would be appropriate for the site (e.g., facilities for swimming, fishing, etc.) ?
3. **Are the physical and visual connections to and through the project site adequate and appropriate?**
- Are the proposed streets, paths, walkways, and landscape features designed to maximize public access and views through and to the shoreline?
 - Are the pedestrian and bicycle routes designed to minimize conflicts between users?
 - Does the Board anticipate conflicts among users of different modes of transportation on shared streets?
 - Is the proposed alignment of the Bay Trail/Blue Greenway sited appropriately within China Basin Park? The Board’s advice is sought for the design controls for future specific designs.
 - Would the location and amount of proposed parking in the garage influence the public’s ability to use the shoreline area, including at the renovated park, the picnic facilities, the junior baseball field, the kayak launch, etc.?
 - Does the design of China Basin Park allow for maximum views of the Bay from within the proposed mixed-use development and for users of China Basin Park?
4. **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?