



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

**CITY COUNCIL 2019**

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

MIKE FUTRELL, CITY MANAGER

**DESIGN REVIEW BOARD COMMENT LETTER**

Date: September 3, 2019

Applicant: SSF Housing Partners  
500 Sansome Street, Suite 750  
San Francisco, CA 94111

Site Address: 1051 Mission Road

Project No.: P18-0081: UP19-0008, DR19-0028, TDM19-0004,  
EIR19-0002, SA19-0001, WM19-0002, DA19-0002  
& AHA19-0003

On August 20, 2019, the Design Review Board reviewed your plans 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. Building line is still fundamentally level as shown on A30, minor changes to the roof line does not improve this concern. A few dramatic breaks of one or two stories in height should be designed, to provide a significant improvement.
2. The easy opportunity to address the scale of these buildings is not addressed in the plan or the sections and elevations. The existing 80' tall Eucalyptus trees are being removed and replaced with small patio size trees (15'-30') along the foundation of the buildings. The tree planting design shown on the resubmittal of A30 is less effective than the previous submittal. The project demands use of trees that reach 60'-80', and the requirement to construct wide deep plant pits (12' x 12' x 3' deep backfilled with engineered planting soil) is necessary to achieve this result. The trees are shown as patio size trees 15'-30' tall rather than significant height trees 50'-60' tall and the design for much taller species at strategic locations that will reach 70'-100' tall, are not present. The removal of the redwoods is indicated in response to wind, however, these taller species will do quite well if on the wind sheltered sides of the building.

3. C1 building is much more unified in this design, the massing is more complex, but the finishes are simplified and stand as its own building. The massing studies were very beneficial, but still feel that C1 building is still too large.
4. Image A08 does not show any attempt to improve the building roof line, or add/change trees species to taller trees to soften this view.
5. The Board appreciates understanding the context of future buildout within the El Camino Real/Chestnut area and the impression that this is a large-scale development that will not stand alone, it is in the context of other developments and topography.
6. The model was very helpful and the project is benefiting from topography and it helped the Board understand the development.
7. The Board liked the proposed lighting fixtures, applicant going in the right direction.

**Landscaping and Site Planning**

8. The Board liked the choice of Monterey Cypress that will help scale with the height of the buildings, as well as the Monkey Puzzle tree.
9. The Board liked that the applicant pulled away from the all age playground to be mid-range friendly.
10. L7.0 Planting Plan shows added trees on plan, however the impact does not affect the needed screening and scaling of these large buildings. The *Corymbia* spp. does not identify type, to determine potential height, and there are only 6 shown. This is lost potential to address building massing with taller trees.
11. *Tristania laurina* along Mission road is too short of a species and out of scale with 84' building. All the trees along the face of these buildings should be minimum 50'-60' tall, and the use of smaller patio sized (15'-30') should be used where the perimeter view and scaling the building is not a concern.
12. *Platanus acerifolia* should be labeled as *Platanus acerifolia* 'Columbia', the cultivar that is mildew resistant and which does quite well in the SSF microclimate.
13. Image on A05 shows trees along the face of building; however the landscape plan does not reflect this image.
14. A12 shows fewer trees and smaller trees than the same Site Elevations from the prior submittal.
15. Response to lighting, bio-retention, play areas, etc. are much improved.

16. The Public comment about white on the building does not appear to be addressed.
17. The Public comment about parking appears to be addressed.

**Public Comments – PUC AGI KASA**

There were five speakers from the public:

**Diane Stokes** – resides in the Sunshine Gardens neighborhood. Concern is only seeing the upper half of these buildings, so please pay close attention to the colors – there is a lot of foliage and now see lights at Serramonte; there is too much cream and design is not industrial – make the colors warmer and do something to discourage graffiti.

**Corey David** – no public discussion of heights and read comment letter

- Has anyone from staff coached the applicant on presentation?
- Has developer met with any staff member?

**Bob Richardson** – suggests making larger panels with colors so that they can be seen by the public and add renderings to the website – expanded color board, suggests more outreach to the community, show the connections between these buildings and the Civic Campus Center.

**Mike Soreo** – just moved here a year ago – worried about losing view from home, low income housing and one level of parking doesn't seem like enough parking.

**Laura Fanella** – wanted to make some points

- Parking
- Shadow Impact Study for this project? 1256 Mission created shadows on her property since there is a mod problem in SSF.
- Full set of plans not posted online.
- Evacuation plans – El Camino Real or Hillside from Sunshine Gardens are only options and adding 800 units will be many more humans on the ground.
- View of this project from CCC which we are spending \$210 million on – what is the minimum that we have to do on this site to keep state off our back?

Please include these comments and any others into your Planning Commission submittal. 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

