

---

**From:** Richard Frisbie <frfibeagle@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 6, 2019 3:43 PM  
**To:** Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Haney, Matt (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Brown, Vallie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS); Wong, Jocelyn (BOS)  
**Subject:** Comments on 3333 California St. Record No. 2015-014028CUA/PCA/MAP/DUA  
**Attachments:** COMMUNITY PRESERVATION LOOKALIKE VARIANT NARRATIVE w Drawing Table Bldg Summary.docx; EIR Inadequacies.docx; Cal Mart Bryan's Letter001.pdf

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

I would ask that the Board of Supervisors take a serious look at both new Variants presented by the Community, something the Planning Department has studiously avoided doing as it clearly recognizes that the issues raised are serious and pertinent.

Both the Community Preservation Lookalike Variant (CPLV) and the Community Full Preservation Alternative Variant 2 (CFPAV2) are deserving of a detailed review. To date the Planning Department has totally ignored the former (attached) so any conclusions/comments as to the feasibility of the Community's alternatives are without merit. Hard to comment thoughtfully on something you haven't studied.

We believe the two latest Variants, particularly the Community Preservation Lookalike, are the basis for a credible and effective compromise between the Community and the developer. These two plans offer an opportunity to bring all the Stakeholders together.

I would ask that the Board of Supervisors address the inadequacies, inaccuracies and misleading conclusions contained within the EIR-see attached. This is by no means a complete list but it highlights the sleight of hand used to avoid addressing any inconvenient truths.

I would ask that: the 7-15 year entitlement period be scaled back to something a little more human and compassionate. What about the neighbors who live around the site? How is their peace of mind, quality of life and essential well-being factored into the decision? What is San Francisco's commitment to balancing efficiency against humanity? Or is this simply someone else's problem. I believe it is grossly unfair asking the Community to support an uncertain, open-ended long-term development period. We deserve certainty.

I would ask that: no retail be approved for 3333 California Street. It is unwanted and unneeded and threatens the very livelihood of our existing small and family owned businesses-see

attached letter from Cal Mart and Bryan's. One only need walk along Sacramento Street, Presidio Avenue and even Laurel Village to see the empty storefronts and to appreciate the increasing stress that the "Amazon" effect is creating.

And Flexible Retail is the least desirable. The types of businesses that could be allowed are totally inappropriate for a development that extols its neighborhood friendliness, family orientation, senior housing, etc.

The Law of Unintended Consequences states that **"if it can happen, it will happen."** What prevents a future unscrupulous landlord opening an internet gambling site, or a massage parlor that exceeds the term, or a marijuana dispensary, or.....under the guise of Flexible Retail?

It has happened in a San Francisco neighborhood already. Internet gambling was touted as a "computer learning center"; the massage parlor "branched out"; .....and then it became a Public Safety problem involving SFPD.

Are these potential businesses appropriate sitting side-by-side with a senior housing project AND a childcare center? Potentially sharing the very same building. And right across the street from the JCC?

If adult oriented businesses such as massage parlors, tattoo parlors, bars, internet gaming centers, etc. (and lets be clear-these are adult businesses by any credible definition) are never intended it would seem to be very straightforward to use the Development Agreement as a means to specifically exclude them from any potential presence at 3333 California St. Failure to do so is a tacit agreement by both the City, the Board of Supervisors and the developer that these type businesses are in play in the future. Very hard to explain away a failure to address their exclusion in the Development Agreement. These businesses, however credible, have no place in a family-oriented neighborhood. If you believe these businesses are inappropriate for this location simply write that exclusion down-this is not rocket science.

I look forward to the hearing November 12<sup>th</sup>.

Respectfully,

F. Richard Frisbie

IMPACT OF PSKS 3333 DEVELOPMENT PLAN ON LAUREL VILLAGE

1. The surrounding neighborhoods are well served by a diversity of retail businesses in Laurel Village, Sacramento Street, Presidio Avenue, Trader Joe's, an expanding City Center with both Target a Whole Foods-all within two blocks of 3333 California St.
2. The proprietors of Laurel Village have ample capacity to serve the residents of 3333 California St. as well as 3700 California St. especially considering that these new residents will replace the approx. 1,500 employees of UCSF that shopped at Laurel Village for many years.
3. Cal Mart & Bryan's presently operate their checkout lines at approx. 50% capacity and can double the throughput as needed.
4. There is already room for more retail along Sacramento St. as a number of storefronts remain empty.
5. The recent closures of Beautiful and Noah's Bagels, preceded by Gymboree, and the potential closure of others strongly reinforces the position that new retail is both unneeded and unwanted.
6. Laurel Village Merchants have requested that PSKS cease creating the erroneous impression that there would be "long lines" in the Laurel Village stores if PSKS is not allowed to change 3333's zoning and add additional retail.
7. The retail traffic associated with 3333 would negatively impact the parking lot for Laurel Village which is already insufficient for Laurel Village's needs. In addition, 3333 retail parking does not fully meet the retail traffic demands generated at 3333 and this overflow traffic will park in Laurel Village further harming the Customers, and Merchants of Laurel Village.
8. PSKS's plan to charge for parking at 3333 will only exacerbate this harmful situation. Furthermore, it is blatantly unfair to have Laurel Village Merchants provide parking for the competition at 3333.
9. The 7-15 year construction period will be catastrophic to Laurel Village. During last year's streetscape fiasco Cal Mart's business declined over 30%. According to Ron Giampoli of Cal Mart it is doubtful that Cal Mart would remain in business with a 7-15 year construction period. Other businesses in Laurel Village were impacted equally and would be put under immense pressure by the development plan for 3333.
10. Bryan's and Cal Mart are unique and iconic stores that serve Customers from all parts of the city. The loss of one or both would immeasurably impoverish the surrounding neighborhoods.

Ronald Giampoli

T. Flum

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

## EIR INADEQUACIES

The EIR is inadequate for failing to examine any mitigation measures for an historic listed resource. the EIR failed to identify and describe feasible mitigation measures that would reduce or avoid the proposed project's significant adverse impact on the historical resource.

The EIR is further inadequate and incomplete by failing to adequately analyze alternatives to the proposed project. the community proposed two alternatives and the planning department willfully chose to totally ignore the community preservation lookalike variant(attached). Any conclusions drawn as to the adequacy of the community's alternatives are therefore invalid due to the failure to even analyze one of the alternatives, and one based exclusively on the developers proposed plans.

The objectives of the proposed project stated in the EIR were deliberately crafted to be overly narrow and intended to preclude consideration of mitigation measures and alternatives to the proposed project.

The EIR failed to analyze the project's significant shadow impacts on existing open spaces that have been used by the public for recreational purposes, on sidewalks on the east side of Laurel Street, the west side of Presidio Ave. and on publicly accessible open space proposed by the project.

The EIR failed to analyze and address the proposed project's inconsistency with:

San Francisco's General Plan as to Preservation of Historical Resources and neighborhood character.

The Housing Element of the General Plan and related applicable land use plans or regulations and would have a substantial impact upon the existing character of the vicinity.

The General Plan Policies stated in the Urban Design Element.

The proposed project would expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects including the risk of loss, and/or would be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or would become unstable as a result of the project and potentially result in on-site or off- site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse.

The EIR is incomplete and inaccurate as it failed to analyze whether the proposed project could have a significant hazard and hazardous materials impact.

The EIR lacks substantial evidence to support its conclusion that reducing the project's retail parking supply would mitigate the project's significant impact on VMT to a less than significant level and furthermore is inadequate because it used inaccurate models to forecast vehicle- trips and the EIR's traffic demand analysis is

inadequate because it omits substantial traffic that would be attracted to five new loading zones proposed to be installed on the streets surrounding the property, including VMT from transportation network companies such as Uber and Lyft, the TNCs.

The EIR failed to adequately analyze the significant project and cumulative impacts on greenhouse gas emissions that the project/variant could generate.



The major differences are that the Community Preservation Lookalike Variant:

1. Would preserve the key Historic defining characteristics of the site as noted above.
2. Would create an All-Residential development with the retention of the existing café, childcare facility and office space in the Main Building noted below.
3. Would excavate only for a single, approximately two underground parking garage, whereas the developer proposes to excavate for four new under-ground parking garages spread across the site, some consisting of three levels.
4. Would eliminate the Masonic Building to preserve the Historic Eckbo Terrace and also provide a location for the childcare play area in sunlight as opposed to being placed in the heavily shadowed area alongside the Credit Union, as proposed in the developer's plan.
5. Would make modifications to the Euclid Building by removing approximately 30 ft. from the southside of the proposed building to move it off the historically significant green space.
6. Would eliminate two Laurel St. Townhomes from Euclid Green in order to fully preserve the historically significant green space at the top of Laurel Hill.

For a summary of changes that the Community Preservation Lookalike Variant would implement see "Summary of Building Changes" at the end of the document.

Furthermore, the Community Preservation Lookalike Variant would:

(1) convert the interior of the main building to residential use while retaining the existing 1,500 gs cafe, 11,500 gsf childcare center, and 5,000 gsf of the existing office space (at the developer's option, this existing office space could be converted to residential use),

(2) construct three new residential buildings (the Plaza A, Plaza B and Walnut) along

California Street where parking lots are now located; the new Mayfair Building near the intersection of Mayfair Drive and Laurel; five new townhomes along Laurel St north of Euclid Green; and the new Euclid Building with modifications along Euclid Avenue;

(3) provide affordable senior housing on-site with additional affordable housing on-site as determined by the Board of Supervisors,

(4) propose that all freight-loading and unloading be conducted in the underground freight loading areas accessed from Presidio Ave. and Mayfair Ave.

(5) propose that all passenger-loading and unloading be conducted inside the site in turnarounds or in the underground parking garage,

(6) retain the historically significant landscaping designed by the renowned landscape architects of Eckbo, Royston & Williams which is integrated with the window-walled main building, including the Eckbo Terrace, the existing landscaped green spaces along Euclid and Presidio Avenues and some of Laurel Street, all of which would be designated as community benefits in the development agreement,

(7) maintain public vistas of the downtown and Golden Gate Bridge from the landscaping and main building as well as maintain the historically significant main building and integrated landscaping.

(9) provide units in the Walnut Building for affordable senior housing.

(9) the Community Preservation Lookalike Variant would use all the new space for residential use and would not rezone the site for approximately 34,496 gsf of retail uses, as the developer proposes.

**THE COMMUNITY PRESERVATION LOOKALIKE VARIANT WOULD PROVIDE THE SAME AMOUNT OF NEW HOUSING UNITS(744) IN APPROX. FIVE YEARS WITHOUT DESTROYING A HISTORICALLY SIGNIFICANT RESOURCE.**



The Community Preservation Lookalike Variant would preserve all the key character-defining features of the main building and integrated landscaping, which are listed in the California Register of Historical Resources pursuant to Section 4851(a)(2) of the California Code of Regulations. (Ex. A, confirmation of listing). The window-walled main building would be converted to primarily residential use.

The Community Preservation Lookalike Variant would have the same number of residential units as the developer's proposed variant (744 units) and would be constructed in less than four years because the existing main building would be converted to residential use at the same time as the new residential buildings are constructed, to the greatest extent feasible pursuant to staging.

The Community Preservation Lookalike Variant would entail far less excavation, as it would have approximately two levels of parking in a single new underground garage. In contrast, the developer's variant proposes to construct four new underground parking garages, to provide a total of 873 parking spaces. The CPLV would excavate only under the existing parking lots along California St. for garages - the easiest, least disruptive, quickest most efficient excavation- whereas the developer would carry out major excavation in all quadrants of the site including major excavations on Masonic, on Euclid including the excavation of major portions of Laurel Hill as well as under the parking lots along California St.

The Community Preservation Lookalike Variant would preserve the existing Eckbo Terrace and the green landscaped areas along Euclid and Presidio Avenues as well as partly along Laurel Street. The existing Eckbo Terrace would be designated as Privately-Owned, Publicly-Accessible Open Space in recorded deed restrictions and would be open to the public. The new ground level Walnut Passage will run

through the first floor of the main building, opening up into a larger landscaped Center Court mid-building, and lead onto the Walnut Walk alongside Eckbo Terrace and thence onto Masonic Avenue and would be open to the public and marked with signage identifying it as a public thoroughway.

The character-defining features of the existing main building that the Community Preservation Lookalike Variant would retain include all of the following:

- Plan of the building open along Eckbo Terrace and to views of the distant city.

- Horizontality of massing.

- Horizontal lines of projecting edges of concrete floors.

- Horizontal bands of nearly identical compatible window units.

- Uninterrupted glass walls.

- Brick accents and trim

- Wrought iron deck railings that match gates in landscaping.

The character-defining features of the existing landscape that the Community Preservation Lookalike Variant would preserve include all of the following:

- In the Eckbo Terrace, which was designed to integrate the architecture of the building with the site and with the broader setting (through views of San Francisco), key character-defining features include its biomorphic-shaped lawn surrounded by a paved terrace and patio (paved with exposed aggregate concrete divided into panels by rows of brick), brick retaining wall and large planting bed around the east and north sides of the paved patio, custom-designed wood benches, and the three circular tree beds constructed of modular sections of concrete.

All passenger loading, pick-ups and drop-offs are proposed to be internal to the site, and turnarounds will be provided in front of the main building. All freight loading and unloading is proposed to be conducted in the underground freight loading areas accessed from Presidio Avenue and Mayfair.

In the Community Preservation Lookalike Variant, the Masonic Building and two Laurel Townhomes are eliminated and the Walnut building re-designed. The Euclid building, reduced in size to preserve the Euclid Green area, the remaining five Laurel Townhomes, the Mayfair building, Plaza A and Plaza B utilize the developer's footprint and architectural design throughout. The Main Building utilizes Levels 1-4 of the developer's architectural design and adds one setback story at Level 5 consistent with the Secretary of the Interior Standards for the treatment of historic properties, thereby retaining the historic characteristics of the main building and integrated landscaping. Contrary to the developer, the Community Preservation Lookalike Variant does not sever the Main Building with a full height 40 ft gap, thereby creating two separate structures.

As noted previously, the Community Preservation Lookalike Variant creates a ground-level Walnut Passage while fully retaining the historic characteristics of the building.

The Main building, Walnut, Plaza A and Plaza B will have direct access to the underground parking garage. The Laurel Townhomes have their own organic parking. For the Mayfair and Euclid Buildings, parking will be provided in the new underground parking garage constructed under the California Street Front and Back Buildings.

Truck loading and unloading for the buildings along California St. as well as the Main and Mayfair buildings would occur in the underground garage accessed from Presidio Avenue and Mayfair Avenue.

## **SUMMARY OF BUILDING CHANGES**

The Community Preservation Lookalike Variant generally utilizes the developer's footprint and architectural design, unit configuration layouts, sizes, elevations, topography etc. except for the Masonic Building (which is not constructed) and the expanded Walnut Building.

The Community Preservation Lookalike Variant preserves both the historic Eckbo Terrace and the existing green spaces along Euclid and Masonic Avenues (by eliminating the Masonic Building) and partly along Laurel Street.

To this day, these green spaces are used by families, friends, children, moon-watchers, etc. The historically green space is preserved by modifying the south side of the Euclid Building (removing 30 ft.) and eliminating two Laurel St. townhomes at the top of Laurel St. as noted above.

## Analysis of Buildings:

Developers Variant  
7/3/2019



Community Preservation Lookalike  
Variant



As can be seen from the layout above the Community Preservation Lookalike Variant generally mirrors the developers proposed building plans. The primary differences are the elimination of the Masonic Building, modifications to the Euclid Building and redesign of the Walnut Building.

All retail has been converted into residential gsf and affected building heights reduced appropriately.

As shown above, the Community Preservation Lookalike Variant produces an additional 20,000 residential gsf over and above that produced by the developers.

**Masonic Building:** Eliminated.

**Euclid Building:** Identical to developers' submission of 07.03.2019 with the following modification to preserve Laurel Hill greenspace. The south side of the building is cut back approximately 30 ft. (loss of

approximately 35,000gsf). Additionally, the remaining top floor units on the south side are set back 15 ft. to moderate the bulk and intensity of the Euclid Avenue appearance (loss of approximately 4,000gsf). It should be noted that the Euclid Building can be expanded on the east side by approximately 25 ft. along the entire 256 ft (ref. Dwg.A8.01 from submission) by aligning Walnut Walk with Eckbo Terrace which would more than offset the space eliminated by the modification to the south side noted above.

**This potential expansion has not been accounted for in the Community's plan.**

No underground parking garage.

References: A8.01(modified as noted above), .02(same comment), A8.03(same comment), A8.04(same comment), A8.05(same comment), A8.06(same comment), A8.11(same comment), A8.12, A8.21(same comment), A8.22, A8.23(same comment), A8.24(same comment), A8.25(same comment), A8.30, A8.41.

**Laurel Townhomes:** Generally identical to developer's submission of 07.03.2019 modified to reduce height to 30 ft. and set top floor back 15 ft.

Reference A10.01(two southernmost duplexes eliminated to preserve Historic green space), A10.02(same comment), A10.03, A10.11(modified for height, setback and elimination of Duple 01 & 02), A10.12(same comment), A10.13(same comment), A10.21(same comment), A10.23(same comment), A10.24(same comment), A10.25(same comment).

As noted previously the two townhomes at the top of Laurel St. have been eliminated to preserve the green space. The height of the five remaining townhomes is lowered from 40 ft. to 30 ft. to be compatible with the 20 ft. homes on the west side of the Laurel St. block. Additionally, the third floor is set back 15 ft.

**Mayfair Building:** Generally identical to developer's 07/03/2019 submission: predominant references A9.01, A9.02, A9.03, A9.04, A9.11, A9.12, A9.21, A9.22, A9.30, A9.60 .

No underground parking garage.

**Plaza A:** Generally identical to developer's submission of 07.03.2019: references A2.00, A2.01, A2.02, A2.21(modified for the parking design), A2.22(same note on parking), A2.30, A2.41.

All retail gsf is converted to residential. As a result, the height of the building is lowered from 45 ft. to 40 ft., which allows it to comply with the existing height limit.

**Plaza B:** Same comments as to Plaza A above. Developer's submission of 07.03.2019: references A3.00(retail converted to residential), A3.01, A3.02, A3.03, A3.21(modified for the parking design), A3.22(same comment on parking), A3.24(retail converted to residential; building height adjusted accordingly), A3.25, A3.41, A3.42.

**Walnut Building:** The enhanced Walnut Building is re-designed to provide a 7-story residential building. As this building is flanked by the Main Building and the Credit Union and is opposite the approximately 65 ft. tall JCC, it is compatible with the character of its surroundings. The 48,050 square foot net footprint was determined from dimensions in Submittals of 03.06.2017 & 07.03.2019: references VAR 13, 14, 19.

General dimensions: Southside east-west 305ft; Northside east-west 240ft; North-south : 175ft.;

Triangle at Credit Union: 155ft. base, 175ft. height. Adjusted for light-courts and setbacks.

**Main Building/Center A&B:** Use the developer's unit configurations and sizes from 03/03/2019: predominant references A6.02, A6.03, A6.04, A6.05, A6.06, A6.07, A6.08, A6.09, A6.19(modified for Walnut Passage; no Levels 6 and 7), A6.21(modified for Walnut Passage; no levels 6 and 7), A6.22(no Levels 6 and 7), A6.30, A6.46(no Levels 6 and 7).

The Community Preservation Lookalike Variant, unlike the developer's, preserves the historic characteristics of the building and fully complies with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the treatment of historic properties.

The Draft EIR acknowledges that the developer's design would have a substantial adverse effect on the historic characteristics of the listed building and landscaping.

The developer proposes to cut a 40 ft. gap through all levels of the main building, thereby creating two separate structures and adding 2 and 3 new levels on top, thereby impairing the horizontality of the building.

The Community Preservation Lookalike Variant, in accordance with the SOISs, adds one set back level, Level 5, to the main building. As noted above, the developer would add Level 5, Level 6 and Level 7.

**Walnut Passage:** In order for the developer to create the 40 ft. wide Walnut Walk which would connect the north and south sides of the property in alignment with Walnut St., the developer proposes to bifurcate the building with a 40 ft cut through all existing levels of the building.

**There is a better solution.**

The Community Preservation Lookalike Variant design calls for a ground level, utilizing the same elevation as the developer, 15 ft high (Level 1) by 20 ft. wide entry/exit on the north and south sides of the building. This entry/exit would extend 35 ft. into the building where it would open up into a 35 ft. wide by 75 ft. long landscaped Center Court which also serves as a Light Court in the building. This



design fully maintains the historic characteristics of the Main building while at the same time meeting the developer's desire in alignment with Walnut Street for connectivity.

**A case of form follows function.**

**Summary:** Same number of units(744) in approx.. five years, more residential gsf than the developer's proposal, compliant with RM-1 zoning , historically compatible, neighborhood responsive.

FILE Nos. 191035  
191039  
191041

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

My name is Krisanthy Desby and I live 3 blocks from the proposed project.

I am a transplant from Los Angeles, and like many transplants, have grafted onto and love San Francisco. The charm of the neighborhoods, the mix of Victorians and other architecture, the hills, the greenspace and a national park on our doorstep have made it a magnet for visitors, creative people and businesspeople for over a century.

I never thought I would live to see the day when San Francisco would approve a project that stands for everything that has ruined my hometown city. LA, as we all know, cemented over a river, bulldozed neighborhoods and parks, and replaced them with freeways, housing projects, towers, and strip malls. It continues to this very day.

That is what this project, in the plans drawn by <sup>A CONCRETE WALKWAY</sup> The Prado Group, represents. It will bulldoze the hill, remove the trees, extend ~~the streets~~, cram in 2 towers and other buildings, and adds a large, commercial and retail complex where it does not belong: at the intersection of four family neighborhoods. We already have Laurel Village, the shopping complex at Geary and Masonic, many shops along Geary St., the Sacramento Street merchants, and Fillmore Street nearby, all within walking distance.

If this is truly about housing, then we need to build housing on this site. The Community Alternative achieves the objectives that the city claims it wants: housing. Not only that, but it is done without defacing the very things that make our neighborhood and that site unique: the trees and the hill, which The Prado Group will remove and pave over. The Prado Group's plan takes away the beauty that was designed by an architect and an award-winning landscape designer, and leaves us instead with the very thing I left Los Angeles to escape: a charmless cement expanse of commercial buildings, and crowded housing towers.

Please allow our neighborhood to retain its character while adding needed housing. The two can go together beautifully with a thoughtful plan sensitive to the area.

---

**From:** johnmburns48@yahoo.com  
**Sent:** Monday, November 4, 2019 8:30 AM  
**To:** Board of Supervisors, (BOS); Peskin, Aaron (BOS); Safai, Ahsha (BOS); Stefani, Catherine (BOS); Mar, Gordon (BOS); Ronen, Hillary; Haney, Matt (BOS); Yee, Norman (BOS); Mandelman, Rafael (BOS); Fewer, Sandra (BOS); Brown, Vallie (BOS); Walton, Shamann (BOS)  
**Cc:** BOS Legislation, (BOS); frfbeagle@gmail.com; kdesby@sandhill.com; laurelheights2016@gmail.com  
**Subject:** Comments on 3333 California St for BOS Mtg 11052019 or 11122019  
**Attachments:** BOS Comments 11122019.docx

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Please add the following letter to the agenda for the upcoming BOS meeting.

Thank you, John and Usha Burns  
3616-18 Sacramento St  
SF 94118

RE: 3333 California St Proposed Development (2015-014028CUA/PCA/MAP/DUA)

Dear Members of the Board of Supervisors,

My wife and I live in Presidio Heights at 3616-18 Sacramento St at Locust about 3 blocks away from the subject property and have been following this proposed development closely.

Although we recognize that the City is in great need of middle- and lower-income housing, we do not support the developer's plans as currently proposed. We do support the Community Alternative Plans that build the same number of housing units as the developer's plans - 744 units including 185 units of affordable senior housing - and are better because they do not build on the historic green space and will be built in a shorter period of time because they involve less excavation and demolition.

The specific areas of the proposed development that are most concerning and need modification are:

- We oppose adding retail uses to the site as there is adequate retail in Laurel Village and surrounding areas with many vacancies for plenty of growth.
- The prolonged 15-year construction period would jeopardize the survival of Laurel Village merchants, such as the independent quality groceries of Cal-Mart and Bryan's.
- The project phasing over the 15-year period is not definite and the BOS has no guarantee that the developer will complete the senior affordable housing on a definite schedule.
- Flexible Retail uses, which were not evaluated by the EIR, should not be allowed at all in this project (they are not allowed anywhere else in District 2 or in the Sacramento or Fillmore Street commercial districts) as they will bring adverse uses to our otherwise well planned neighborhoods.

We urge this BOS to require the project be redesigned according to one of the well planned Community Alternatives. These alternatives do not remove the significant trees along California Street and retain more on-site Redwoods and trees on the historically significant Eckbo Terrace.

Sincerely,

John and Usha Burns  
3616-3618 Sacramento St.  
San Francisco 94118