

# MEETING OF THE CIVIC DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE

Monday, September 18, 2023

2:00 p.m.

Hybrid Meeting

## Draft Minutes

Chair Stryker called the meeting to order at 2:02 p.m.

### 1. Roll Call

(00:11)

**Commissioners Present:** Kimberlee Stryker (Chair); Seth Brenzel, Abby Schnair, Patrick Carney, Janine Shiota, Jessica Rothschild

**Commissioner Absent:** Charles Collins

**Staff Present:** Ralph Remington, Director of Cultural Affairs; Lex Leifheit, Deputy Director of Programs

Chair Stryker welcomed Deputy Director of Programs Lex Leifheit and announced the hybrid meeting instructions.

Program Associate Paris Cotz announced public comment instructions.

Chair Stryker began the meeting reading the Arts Commission's land acknowledgement statement.

Chair Stryker announced changes to the order of the agenda.

### 2. General Public Comment

(8:05)

There was no public comment.

### **3. ZSFG Childcare Center: Conceptual Review**

(9:50)

Greta Jones, Konstantin Zlatev, Seiya Okada, Project Designers, SF Department of Public Works

Melinda Prieto, Project Manager, SF Department of Public Health

Gabriel Lim, Architect, SF Department of Public Works

Nicholas Ancel, Landscape Architect, SF Department of Public Works

The project team provided a brief history on the project, explaining that childcare is a huge need for people who work at ZSFG, and that if there are still openings available, the center will be open to members of the community.

The team sited the location at the hospital campus' southwest corner on Potrero Avenue and 23<sup>rd</sup> Street. They said the structure will be one story, adjacent to the historical campus. The team ultimately preferred massing featuring the entry on Potrero Avenue, and classrooms for toddlers, infants, pre-school aged children (41 in total) surrounding an outdoor play area. The team assured the committee that this layout ensured visibility and security. The team explained the drop-off layout for vehicles as well as pedestrian drop-offs.

The team shared that the roof will need to have a pleasing design since it will be highly visible from above, therefore the team decided to choose a clerestory roof over a butterfly roof. They said the clerestory roof satisfies need for light and security.

The team shared a brief overview of the landscape designs, specifically along the edge and how the topography will be managed. They said the site is 8 feet above street level, so ramps and stairs will help with that as well mimicking other fences and pilasters found around the hospital campus. The team explained that the planting will be mostly transparent for security, and low maintenance and climate adaptive.

Commissioners wondered whether solar roof panels were possible, and the team said they were currently studying it.

Commissioners wondered whether brick could be reintegrated and the team explained that they were still studying materials. Commissioner also felt that the butterfly roof made the building too much of a focal point when it should not be.

Commissioners had questions about the decision between the two roof options and whether there would be an eave for sun screen to ensure that not too much sun light is entering. Commissioners also encouraged the landscape team to be playful in their designs.

Commissioners were curious about the references to the historical buildings to lighten up the institutional feel of the current design, including the flat roof design. Commissioners also questioned where any mechanical equipment would be stored, and what programming would be available in the outdoor play area based on age-levels.

Commissioners wondered whether a translucent canopy was possible on the roof or around the perimeter to allow more light in and to look at topo change in the outdoor play area. Commissioners also suggested making the pilasters out of brick to tie it into the surrounding historical campus. Commissioners also hoped the team would consider inviting in wildlife such as butterflies and birds with the landscaping.

Commissioners asked about space requirements and increase in size, and the team explained why the center would remain one-story and that this center is expected to open by 2025.

There was no public comment.

#### **4. Buchanan Street Mall: Memory Walk: Small Project Review**

(43:13)

Brett Desmarais, Project Designer, SF Department of Public Works  
Lauren Chavez, Project Manager, SF Rec and Parks  
Winnie Chang, Landscape Architect, SF Department of Public Works

The team explained that the Memory Walk is intended to connect all five previously approved blocks of Buchanan Street Mall to create safe passage, Afrocentric monumental design and providing a platform for community-led art

and storytelling. The team shared the many stakeholders that have been working on this project.

The team sited the park in the Western Addition and spans the full width of Buchanan Street between Grove and Eddy Streets. The team reviewed their community engagement process as well as past design features.

The team shared thematic elements and unifying motifs selected for the Memory Walk to create consistency and meaning across the park. The elements are paving, fences and columns. The team shared the paving design, which features patterned unit pavers and nickel bronze inlay symbols (selected through community process). They said the columns are made of painted stainless steel, featuring diamond motif gradient and panels reserved for artwork such as punched metal portraits, waterjet designs and additional signage and storytelling. They explained that the columns would also be illuminated at nighttime. They said the fence is similar height and material to the column, featuring three panels for curated artwork.

The team said they consulted with the Public Art Director on the public art process many times for the community-led art opportunities.

Commissioners asked for clarity on the locations of the elements. The team showed them exactly where each element would be inserted along the park.

Commissioners wondered about graffiti mitigation, and the team shared that the elements would be covered in anti-graffiti coating based on Rec and Park recommendations regarding maintenance. Commissioners also wondered whether the future artwork would enter the Civic Art Collection, and the team said that the artwork would remain with Rec and Park.

Commissioners asked how blue was selected, and the team explained that it was selected during the community decision making process.

#### Public Comment:

Amy from Trust for Public Land explained the Trust for Public Land's role in the project and was supportive of this project's community engagement process. She said the Memory Walk is a through line to the next phase which is art development with community partners.

Commissioner Brenzel, seconded by Commissioner Shiota, moved to approve Small Project Review of the Buchanan Street Mall: Memory Walk.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Carney, Rothschild, Schnair, Shiota, Stryker, Brenzel

#### **5. Additional Fence Work at Three Regional Groundwater Well Stations: Small Project Review**

*(1:08:55)*

Holly Chan, Project Designer, SF Water

Tracy Cael, Project Manager, SF Water

The team explained that they identified the three site locations (Hickey Boulevard and Treatment Facility; Colma Bart, F Street, Well and Treatment Facility; and Linear Park, South Spruce Avenue, Well and Treatment Facility) all located in South San Francisco or Colma.

The team explained that these sites need to install additional fencing due to safety concerns including vandalism, illegal dumping, trespassing, illegal camping, and failing fences. They said the new fences and gates installed will match existing site conditions, which is galvanized chain link fence, 6 to 8 feet high with 1 inch fabric mesh.

The team explained the new fencing layouts at each of the three sites.

Commissioners asked whether landscaping would be included with the insertion of the new fencing. The team explained that the wells are used only during drought years, and therefore these sites do not experience much activity and the addition of planting would increase maintenance.

Commissioners asked if the fence could be installed in a single straight line rather than a terraced installment. Commissioners also asked whether a darker colored fence might be possible to allow it to blend into the landscape. The team said that the project has already closed out and they will see whether there is any additional funding.

Commissioners suggested matching the gates to the upgraded steel gate at Hickey Boulevard station, rather than a chain link gate. The team agreed with this suggestion.

There was no public comment.

Commissioner Schnair, seconded by Commissioner Rothschild, moved to approve Small Project Review of the Additional Fence Work at Three Regional Groundwater Well Stations with the following contingencies (if funding allows): that the fencing will be a single line rather than a stepped fence line panel, and to upgrade the gate on Camaritas Ave to match the other existing gate.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Carney, Rothschild, Schnair, Shiota, Stryker, Brenzel

## **6. SFMTA Potrero Yard Modernization Project: Phase 1**

*(1:30:43)*

Tony Gill, Project Designer, IBI Arcadis

Chris Jauregui, Project Manager, Plenary Americas

Yancey Clayton, Architect, IBI Arcadis

Jennifer Moore, Landscape Architect, IBI Arcadis

The team introduced the project and shared their community engagement process so far. The team said they sited the four side to the block wide project, identifying programmatic components of each side with site context. The team shared the directions of entry and exit for the bus yard on Bryant and Mariposa Streets. They said the design features to entry points for MTA staff on 17th and Hampshire Street, and MTA housing component entry on Bryant Street. The team shared the second level layout featuring training facilities and operational components with the following floors featuring a bus parking.

The team shared updates on the housing podium and art opportunity locations. They said a green wall has been added on 17<sup>th</sup> Street as requested from the previous review. The team shared updates on the perforated metal screen for the bus yard as well as the various street entrances. The team shared updates to the four corners, to show how they break up the corner with scale and materials.

The team shared updates about the nighttime light levels. The team also shared the bronze entryways to the residential housing with updated landscaping, as well as more articulation to the podium housing in the courtyard.

Commissioners had questions about the land use and height precedent this project is setting in the neighborhood, and whether this will change any zoning in the neighborhood. The team answered that the project established the design guidelines, technical requirements, and the parameters were set regarding height and shadows set by several stakeholders including Planning Commission and Potrero Yard Neighbor Working Group. The team explained that this is not an approved special use district, and that they are working with a 24 month pre-development agreement.

Commissioners asked about the various housing entries, specifically for MTA employees. The team explained that there will be 513 total units which includes senior housing, family housing, and workforce housing.

Commissioners asked about how the housing will be built based on approval processes. The team answered that they will be using a phased approach to complete the bus facility within a certain timeline and then the housing will occur on a separate timeline. Commissioners expressed concerns about the phased approach and the difficulty in approving the project in this way.

Commissioners asked whether a model is required for Phase 2 and suggested bringing a malleable model for Phase 2 to show the various segments.

Commissioners suggested pushing back the housing on Bryant Street further behind on the podium level as well as adding back to connected windows to the corner to add to the variety.

Commissioners also had questions about many story-high blank walls on the housing component, and the team responded that they had not finished rendering those walls. Commissioners hope that the team will pay more attention to the affordable housing massing and focus on breaking it down rather than extruding it up. The design team explained that due to the phased approach, the design is not fully there.

Commissioners asked for design guidelines and principles for the project to better understand the project as a whole. The team answered that the guidelines were created to address the bus yard but the entire development assembly, which were distributed to commissioners at an earlier time. They suggested

looking at just the bus yard, with the housing component not fully rendered, to follow the phased approach and funding availability. The team offered a phased review approach for each component but that presents its own complications.

The committee recommended meeting informally to review the project that fits their budget and their time frame to ensure that this project is not slowed down. They said the housing and landscaping remained conceptual in its design, with a lack of clarity around the programming.

There was no public comment.

## **7. Staff Report**

(2:35:08)

There was no staff report.

There was no public comment.

## **8. New Business and Announcements**

(2:36:22)

Commissioner Schnair suggested that all committee members review documentation for each project that is presented on the agenda ahead of time. She said that this process could help answer questions.

There was no public comment.

## **9. Adjournment**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:39pm

Posted 9/29/23, 3:30pm, pc

---



## **Archives Available**

A recording of this meeting will be available online after the meeting at the following address: <https://sanfrancisco.granicus.com/player/clip/40845>

## **Language Accessibility**

Translated written materials and interpretation services are available to you at no cost. For assistance, please notify Paris Cotz, 415-252-2252, [paris.cotz@sfgov.org](mailto:paris.cotz@sfgov.org).

我們將為閣下提供免費的書面翻譯資料和口譯服務。如需協助， Paris Cotz, 415-252-2252, [paris.cotz@sfgov.org](mailto:paris.cotz@sfgov.org).

Materiales traducidos y servicios de interpretación están disponibles para usted de manera gratuita. Para asistencia, notifique a Paris Cotz, 415-252-2252, [paris.cotz@sfgov.org](mailto:paris.cotz@sfgov.org).