



DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC  
AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT  
(650) 829-6620  
FAX (650) 829-6657  
E-MAIL WEB-ECD@SSF.NET

## Attachment 2

CITY COUNCIL 2019

KARYL MATSUMOTO, MAYOR  
RICHARD A. GARBARINO, VICE MAYOR  
MARK ADDIEGO, COUNCILMEMBER  
MARK NAGALES, COUNCILMEMBER  
BUENAFLORE NICOLAS, COUNCILMEMBER

MIKE FUTRELL, CITY MANAGER

### DESIGN REVIEW BOARD COMMENT LETTER

Date: July 31, 2019

Applicant: SSF Housing Partners LLC  
Att: Brian Baker  
500 Sansome Street, Suite 750  
San Francisco, CA 94111

Site Address: 1051 Mission Road - PUC site

Project No.: P18-0081: UP19-0008 & DR19-0028

On Tuesday, July 16, 2019, the Design Review Board reviewed your plans for a proposal to redevelop 5.9 acres of vacant land to construct 800 residential units, a 8,300 SF childcare facility, 13,000 SF commercial retail space, approximately 1 acre of public open space, and related infrastructure at 1051 Mission Road and surrounding parcels.

The Planning Manager has determined that this application is in compliance and pursuant to Title 20, Section 20.480 of the South San Francisco Municipal Code and Design Guidelines after the following changes have been made to the plans:

#### **Overall Architecture**

1. Conduct a massing study to incorporate the adjacent buildings and show how the proposed development fits into the greater neighborhood context, including the Kaiser Building and the new residential development at 988 El Camino Real, SM County future medical center and potential development (Pacific Market) along the El Camino Real corridor under current zoning regulations.
2. The massing study should include dimensions of all the structures or include a key.
3. Views of the massing study should be provided from multiple angles and directions and consider views at 3000' to show view from distance.
4. Articulation – design effort was successful along Mission Road but buildings will be seen from many directions and need to ensure that the rest of the building is well articulated
5. Buildings are too uniformly flat - horizontal roof line along the buildings is a little overwhelming and needs more differentiation. Show details that emphasize existing or proposed articulation on the elevations.

6. Appreciate the way you stepped back mass, elevation is well rendered but doesn't show step back all that well so consider different angles. More renderings and perhaps an animation or a fly through might be helpful.
7. Design Guidelines require a strong base, middle and top, and should be well articulated by vertical planes. Refer to design guidelines in the ECR/C Area Plan.
8. The proposed materials make the buildings look somewhat industrial - consider opportunity to soften the exterior materials. Consider a two-dimensional mock-up of an elevation to show materials and finishes.
9. The revised plans should include a foundation plan.

Building B Specific Comments:

10. Show in plans how building B would be accessed and interact with the site if Phase 2 of the Oak Avenue extension is built along the Market Hall building.
11. Building B is a successful design but consider some roof height variation.

Building C1 Specific Comments:

12. Many ideas incorporated into the C1 elevation but doesn't have a cohesive design - cohesion could help and it might be ok to look like one building and not many within its single facade
13. Focus on C1 roof height variation

**Landscaping and Site Planning**

14. Include a street light design and detail sheet for each fixture on private property or public right-of-way.
15. Be sure to balance bio-retention and verify locations since it can't be used by people once built and designed
16. Most of the proposed landscaping will work for site, except for certain locations of the campus – For Dave and Chris specific comments.
  - Change Platanus acerifolia to Platanus acerifolia 'Columbia', which is mildew resistant.
  - Sequoia sempervirens will not thrive in the wind in SSF. Placement should be carefully considered at wind protected faces of buildings. Coordinate with wind study.
  - Fremontodendron californicum, California Flannelbush, shown in the presentation is likely to fail due to fast root growth in the pot at the nursery, resulting in encircling roots and destabilized plants. Suggest alternate species such as Toyon.
17. Applicant should conduct a wind study to determine what species will survive at this campus.
18. Applicant needs to select tree species that will scale the height of the buildings and incorporate some landscaping in between the trees to create a pattern that will help soften the area. The plant list is mostly small patio size trees 25'-35' tall. The buildings are uniformly 84' tall. The design does not utilize a very good buffering tool of design with tall trees which reach heights up to 100' such as Lombardy Poplar, Western Cottonwood, several Eucalyptus species, Canary Island Pine, Valley Oak, Red Oak, and careful placement of Redwood. The best groups of tall trees in the design are where the future extension of Oak Ave. will necessitate their removal.
19. Applicant should consider age appropriate design of the children's play area. Design for all ages does not work and Toddlers ages 2-5 should be in a signed and fenced area, while ages 6-12

should be separate. The play area should be signed no teens or adults over age 12 allowed, and only adults with children allowed. This area needs to be a safe zone and have proper visibility into the area and provide caretaker seating.

20. Demonstrate how the private and public space will work for the site and include a plan sheet indicating total open space (public and private).
21. Provide landscape material examples to go along with the building material examples
22. Comments on the Mission Road street experience of the project:
  - Consider adding additional mid-block crossings through Mission Road;
  - Traffic calming on Mission Road recommended.
23. Vision for Colma Creek is unclear in plan submittal – provide clear plan sheets of existing and proposed improvements. Show any improvements proposed for fencing along the Colma Creek to help screen the area.
24. The Board would like more information or a walk through explanation of how the parking stackers will work for the site.
25. Show how the site will comply with a pickup & drop off plan for childcare, for residents utilizing Lyft, Uber, delivery services, and guests visiting the site.
26. Indicate where the trash enclosures are located on the campus and a plan from South San Scavenger for a pickup and drop off area. Show any drop chute for the residents to discard their trash or recycle.
27. As a potential safety measure, site planning should incorporate more crosswalks with traffic lights (as possible) on Mission Road.

#### **Public Comments**

There were two speakers from the public:

28. **Katie Stokes** – resides in the Sunshine Gardens neighborhood. Concern with one of the buildings standing out and being very visible from her neighborhood. Would like the applicant to change the color of the building from white to another color. The white color may provide glare.
29. **Francine Andrade** – Concern with overflow traffic when there are events at the campus. Where will everyone park at the site?

Attached is a copy of the Building and Water Quality Control Plan conditions for you to include into your resubmittal. If you have any questions regarding this matter, please feel free to contact the Planning Division at (650) 877-8535.

Sincerely,

---

Tony Rozzi  
Principal Planner

---

Sailesh Mehra  
Planning Manager

Attachments: Building & Water Quality Control Plant comments