**INTRODUCTION:** Our proposal represents a starting point for a dialogue on the policy, planning, and community objectives for this important property on the west side of San Francisco. Bill Witte, the CEO of Related California, and a former director of the San Francisco Mayor’s Office of Housing, knows first-hand the history of community opposition and referendums for this site. And our team understands how critical the outreach and engagement process is for success this time around. Moreover, we genuinely believe that a robust community engagement process makes projects better and makes a real difference in how future residents assimilate into and are accepted by existing neighborhoods.

The discussion below focuses on three of the main themes we heard during the public meeting and summary of comments, how we see approaching these issues, and some of the trade-offs involved.

1. **DENSITY**

In developing our proposal, we did not approach it as a numbers game with respect to density, but rather, we sought to balance the objectives of providing the requested public benefits and a fair market value to SFPUC with a plan that would not overwhelm the surrounding neighborhoods. A viable plan to achieve these objectives is critical to succeeding in developing the Reservoir.

Our objective in developing the site plan was fourfold:

- Generate the greatest amount of economic value for SFPUC and fund the requested community benefits including affordable housing (minimum 33%) and open space, among others.
- Acknowledge and respect the surrounding communities’ concerns about neighborhood character, traffic and other impacts, and, in doing so, have a greater chance of avoiding the problems of past referendums and CEQA challenges.
- Provide a mix of housing types including much-needed for-sale housing for families. Eighty-five percent (85%) of the townhomes will be three and four bedrooms and eighty percent (80%) of the BMR for-sale condominiums targeted to faculty and staff are two, three and four-bedroom homes.
- Include a variation in building heights to avoid the look of a “wall” of similar multifamily buildings, and provide a transition to the lower density Westwood Park.

The townhome component adds to the diversity of housing types, maximizes land value, and minimizes the subsidy required to meet the affordability requirements and provide other community benefits. The BMR condominiums offer housing opportunities for newer staff and faculty who would otherwise be priced out of San Francisco to live in a great neighborhood where they can walk to work.

Related champions and embraces high density housing in appropriate locations. We are currently building two projects (55 stories and 40 stories) in downtown San Francisco that are among the tallest in the city, in neighborhoods where very high density housing has been planned for and is appropriate. The Reservoir site is adjacent to established single family neighborhoods where densities average 12 units to the acre. Our proposal, at 60 units to the net acre, while significantly more dense, carefully places lower densities next to Westwood Park with higher density closer to City College, across a public street from the Performance Arts Center and parking garage shown on the most current version of the Ocean Campus Facilities Master Plan.

Any discussion of density on the site is, of necessity, one that will evolve and be informed by analysis and community input and one that must recognize a balance between legitimate community concerns and the housing crisis that our city is facing. That said, we are open to providing higher density if general community consensus can be achieved. In reviewing our existing plan, we determined that it can support up to an additional 200 units by increasing the height of the 40’ to 50’ buildings on the eastern side of the site to up to 65’. In our effort to achieve consensus, we would work with the community to build more units in a manner that would minimize traffic and parking impacts, with no reduction in open space.
Our proposal includes a matrix delineating the economic impacts of different levels of affordability. As the only developer among the three teams that builds and manages communities ranging from low-income housing to luxury high rise condominiums, we are prepared to execute on the shared vision of the local and broader communities, decision makers, and our team of talented experts.

2. **DESIGN & SITE PLAN**

Ultimately, the goal of the site plan is to encourage community building among future residents and between future residents and the existing community. To achieve this, the site plan must optimize connectivity to Ocean Avenue and City College and be a welcoming place for the broader community. While we have already proposed uses that will help to achieve this type of seamlessness (retail, childcare, community room, dog spa, and a variety of open spaces), we will further investigate the viability of additional retail space on Lee Avenue. In so doing, we will engage with the Ocean Avenue Association, City College and the community to ensure that the proposed retail space will complement existing businesses and be of the greatest benefit.

As noted in the public presentation, our proposal represents only a massing diagram in response to the Development Parameters set forth in the RFP. It will serve as the starting point for an extensive community outreach process. At this juncture, we have not attempted to design the buildings and will only do so after we have engaged with the community to better understand their concerns and desires. This process will bring community members together to discuss and collaboratively address challenges, and to balance the many competing community goals and objectives. A successful plan must weigh the very real need for housing City-wide against local community concerns about quality of life, neighborhood character, and thoughtful place-making.

The townhomes are located adjacent to the Westwood Park neighborhood to respect the scale and historical nature of the homes and community, but can be distributed differently on the site to address the concern that they appear to be “segregated”. These homes average 1,565 square feet and all except 6 of the 120 homes are two to four bedrooms, providing a significant amount of family friendly housing. We will develop several alternative schemes for the placement of buildings on the site as part of an iterative design process for the community to react and respond to.

The 5.8 acres of open spaces will serve the broader community and encourage both passive and active uses. The existing berm on the west side of the site is presently used as an informal trail by the local community and our design intent was to enhance that use while providing larger areas of contiguous open space for more active recreation and as a community gathering place. In response to the comment that there is not a sufficiently large, contiguous open space (the Development Principles and Parameters suggested at least 2 acres and no less than 1.5 acres), our plan offers a contiguous open space of 2.65 acres in the form of a “T”. These spaces are identified on the plan as Reservoir Square (east and west of Brighton Avenue) and Mt. Davidson Walk. In addition, all open spaces are interconnected, creating a circuit around the site. This will encourage activities such as jogging and
offer a safe place for bike riding, especially for children. As the site plan evolves, there will be an opportunity to look at the placement and programming of the open spaces to ensure connectivity to Unity Plaza, Ocean Avenue, and community cultural institutions including City College.

Our design team includes four talented architecture and landscape design firms who will collaborate to ensure a diversity of design vocabulary that will complement the surrounding area yet create variation of building form and open spaces to further enliven and enhance the greater community.

3. PARKING, TRAFFIC & TRANSIT

We have given a lot of thought to the City College parking issue, which has been ongoing for several decades. We believe the only way to provide assurances to City College, while not negatively impacting the site plan for the reservoir site, is to take advantage of the City College Master Plan and contribute to one of the new parking structures identified in the plan, to be controlled by City College, on College property. Through the land value created by the 120 townhomes, our proposal will provide sufficient proceeds to help pay for a garage. We are willing to build the garage on behalf of City College, which could expedite the process for delivering the parking.

We considered and rejected the possibility of building parking underneath buildings on the reservoir site as being far too expensive and significantly eroding the value of the site. Shared parking is another idea we considered but concluded that, in practice, it is very difficult to make work in terms of ensuring the availability of parking spaces to City College on the assumption that a significant number of spaces would be vacated during the day. No one is served by a competition for parking spaces between project residents and City College students.

As requested, we have refrained from contacting City College directly, but would expect to be involved in a robust discussion of their parking and other needs in tandem with the City. We strongly believe it is crucial that City College’s parking needs be resolved in a timely manner.

We fully understand and appreciate the concerns regarding traffic and transit given that this project will add new users to an already strained system. On its own, this project cannot address long standing problems, but in partnership with the City and local stakeholders, we will actively engage in seeking and contributing to long term solutions to ease traffic congestion, improve transit options and connections to transit for pedestrians and bikers. Related and Curtis Development have recent experience on Potrero Hill working with the City and SFMTA to advance their efforts to upgrade transit in the area.

Regarding traffic circulation into and out of the site, we recognize that each of the surrounding neighborhoods has its own specific concerns and that all are equally valid. As such, we will seek circulation solutions that will not disproportionately impact any one neighborhood. If they are interested, we are very open to working with City College and other local institutions to determine the viability of a shuttle to and from BART, which could help to address both traffic and parking issues.

Our operating budget includes implementation of all TDM measures identified in the Balboa Area TDM Framework including an on-site TDM coordinator and transit passes. We will work as an active partner with the community and the City as the Balboa Area TDM framework evolves. This collaboration will be crucial in discussions with SFMTA about improving transit connections for pedestrians and bikes and with DPW regarding implementation of the Ocean and Geneva Avenue Corridor Design study. Notwithstanding our commitment to TDM measures, we understand that these measures alone do not necessarily address City College’s concerns about the parking needs of low-income students who are often single mothers and people of color.

CONCLUSION: It is important to reiterate that any plan proposed at this stage can and will change based on community input. We have crafted a proposal that can retain its economic benefits under a wide variety of scenarios, so that the affordable housing, open space and City College parking can be funded and achieved in a timely manner.