Balboa Park Reservoir – D7 - D11 Districtwide Transit Impacts

"<u>Who should sit at the table when development policy matters that impact the</u> <u>general public are being decided?</u>"

Ву

Aaron Goodman (BPS CAC – Seat 8 (Families + Children)



The Balboa Reservoir site sits adjacent to the 280 interchange connecting 101 to 280 north/southbound. The Balboa Park Station CAC was developed to look at the issues surrounding the district and the impacts on D7 and D11. Appointees were selected from a variety of community interests and for representation by both districts. Ocean Ave. Allemany Blvd. Geneva Ave and Mission St. along with many side routes are directly impacted by decisions on development at this location. Transit impacts already have heavily impacted the Ocean Ave. Corridor into both districts due to recent developments and the Phelan Bus Loop changes.



- Permits indicate the change rapidly occuring in the district, and emphasis on corridors and inbetween areas that require review, or larger projects in progress that may create bigger project impacts unless addressed in the context of the whole of the areas impacted.
- D7 and D11 are both seeing large swings of changes, planning and impact wise, and it requires further efforts to work collaboratively on the planning processes approved and in the future.
- Institutional growth and development proposals must be vetted by the public, and in the public's best interests.



The Balboa Park Station Plan did not at the time have a proposal by the SFPUC, at the time of the review.



The Phelan and Lee Ave changes did not study adequately the impacts on a larger proposed project by CCSF and the SFPUC sites, and the distance to the Balboa Park Station walking over phelan, and across ocean ave. Traffic casued by the Brighton and Lee lights and "X" intersection ignored the back-up caused by the Phelan loop, and need to be assessed and changes made to reduce back-up along Ocean and onto the freeway. Joint cummalative development impacts were also not included due to development pressures.



The prior community meetings noted possible "reservoir" open space. The current push to turn public sites into development land, ignores the prior community proposed future use as a public open space for recreation on the western side of the 280 freeway. Ammenities currently do not sufficiently meet the increased population needs of the two districts.



Existing height and bulk limits, are being used to develop land-use controls, on both sides of the area, but the Balboa Reservoir CAC did not include a D11 representative though parcels shown in the land-use and prior slides indicate a joint area planning effort.

(iii) Balboa Reservoir subarea Tier 2 site:

 Reservoir site, where 60 percent of the site is controlled by SFPUC and 40 percent is controlled by City College. The Area Plan calls for the development of the SFPUC's site holdings with approximately 500 residential units and a large new public open space. This site would only be developed if the SFPUC decides to abandon the site for water storage. The proposed height limit for potential residential development on the reservoir site would be 40 feet; the height limit for the new City College buildings would be 65 feet.

It is key to note the issue of number of units @ 500 possible, and a large new public open space. This is contingent if the SFPUC decides to "abandon" the site for water storage.

If the public's greatest need is related to Water and the current drought, along with housing as an equally pressing need, is housing need the only function of the site that should be considered?

Should the public's views and need's be openly vetted?



FIGURE 1: PROJECT LOCATION

The site's location and impacts were defined in the Balboa Park Station Area Plan EIR by a joint committee who did excellent work in defining the area's impacted, and the need to look wholistically at the entire district inclusive of D7 and D11. I would strongly suggest we continue this effort by including the D11 and community based representation required, including adjacent schools, and neighborhood organizations. Regardless of the size of the panel required, if needed the mayoral appointee's should defer to the communities needs due to the public land concerns of the site.