

From: [Jalipa, Brent \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS Legislation, \(BOS\)](#)
Subject: FW: Support Letter for One Oak Project (Case 2009.0159 -- 1500-1540 Market Street) Tom Nolan Letter September 26, 2917.docx
Date: Tuesday, September 26, 2017 10:49:47 AM
Attachments: [Nolan One Oak Advocacy Letter Nolan September 26, 2917.pdf](#)

From: Thomas Nolan [mailto:thomasnolan@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 26, 2017 10:13 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>; Jalipa, Brent (BOS) <brent.jalipa@sfgov.org>
Cc: Lou Vasquez <louvasquez@gmail.com>; Michael Yarne <michael@bldsf.com>; Carlos Vasquez <carlos@bldsf.com>
Subject: Support Letter for One Oak Project (Case 2009.0159 -- 1500-1540 Market Street) Tom Nolan Letter September 26, 2917.docx

All --

Attached please find my letter of support for the One Oak project, which is being considered in a hearing today by the Board of Supervisors. I would testify in support of this architecturally significant, excellent project in person, but I will be out of town on business this afternoon. The One Oak project is an architectural gem that will help us build badly needed dense housing near transit, and which will reduce car use and carbon emissions Bay Area-wide by allowing more people to live near their work locations in San Francisco. I hope the Board will support this important project being put forward by a high quality local developer.

Tom Nolan

Cell: (415) 310-2097

E-mail: thomasnolan@yahoo.com

Thomas Nolan

Property Owner

1431 Hayes Street

> San Francisco, CA 94117

September 26, 2017

Clerk of the Board
San Francisco Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Re: 1500-1540 Market Street Project (Case No. 2009.0159)

Dear Supervisors:

As a Western Addition resident and property owner since 2002 and a San Francisco resident since 1990, I strongly oppose the baseless pending CEQA appeal of the One Oak EIR. I urge you to vote against this appeal and in favor of building an architecturally significant new landmark for the Civic Center area.

San Francisco is in the middle of an affordable housing crisis. We cannot stop the technology boom in our region. We need to build more housing in dense projects to reduce carbon emissions and to make our City more livable. This is crucial if we want to preserve the diversity of the City and make it possible for people who are not super wealthy to live here.

The One Oak project is also a rare architectural gem that will occupy a crucial location at the edge of the emerging dense area of housing in the Civic Center. I have asked architect friends why so much new residential architecture in San Francisco is ugly. They tell me that while poor architecture is sometimes the problem, more often its a problem with developers who choose cheap materials or cut corners. Here we have a developer with a proven record of building architecturally distinguished projects, and a stellar architectural plan.

Instead of fighting One Oak, we should be embracing it as a great precedent for the Market-Octavia Plan. In addition to great architecture, One Oak advances the City's Vision Zero policy, voluntarily creating a generous 16,000 sq. ft. public pedestrian plaza that will dramatically transform this important civic intersection and enhance public safety with slow-street improvements, widened sidewalks, generous public seating, new landscaping, abundant bike parking, and flexible performance space, along with improved access to the new Van Ness BRT and the existing MUNI Metro Station.

E-mail: thomasnolan@yahoo.com

Even more importantly, this project will also donate over \$41 million in Impact Fees, plus an additional \$66 million in voluntary contributions and improvements. It deserves to move forward without additional delay.

San Francisco currently has the most stringent wind hazard regulations of any major City. There are only a few cities around the world that even consider the impacts of wind on bicyclists, and the predominant criteria they use allows substantially higher windspeed exceedances than San Francisco's current ordinance. A change in wind analysis methodology, as proposed by the Appellant, is not warranted.

The project opponent's request to apply a zero-tolerance VMT threshold to new projects is not technically feasible for any individual project.

The Appellant also attacks the adequacy of the EIR because it does not specifically analyze TNC demand. TNCs are a substitute for private vehicle and taxi trips. We understand that the City has started to collect new data on TNCs, but is a long way off from understanding the impacts and travel patterns associated with these vehicular alternatives, if any. CEQA analysis cannot rely on speculative or inconclusive data.

This project will also reduce longer range vehicle trips around the Bay Area by adding dense housing in the urban core.

In sum, the claims of CEQA inadequacies raised by the Appellant are baseless. If the appeal is upheld, the consequences, intended or not, will kill a great project and throw the City's EIR process into chaos. I hope that the Board moves expeditiously to uphold the One Oak Project CEQA Certification and deny the appeal.

Sincerely,

/s/ Thomas Nolan

Thomas Nolan

cc: Michael Yarne and Lou Vasquez, BUILD Inc.

From: [Board of Supervisors, \(BOS\)](#)
To: [BOS-Supervisors](#); [BOS-Legislative Services](#)
Subject: FW: In support of the appeal of the One Oak Project
Date: Monday, September 25, 2017 10:28:45 AM

From: Shirley Johnson [mailto:dr_shirley_johnson@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, September 25, 2017 9:17 AM
To: Board of Supervisors, (BOS) <board.of.supervisors@sfgov.org>
Subject: In support of the appeal of the One Oak Project

Dear President Breed and Board of Supervisors,

I am writing out of concern for the excess parking, wind currents, and lack of adequate traffic analysis for the One Oak Project. I am very pleased that a concerned citizen, Jason Henderson, has filed an appeal. I have been watching this project, but have been unable to attend daytime meetings due to my work schedule. I understand you will be hearing the appeal tomorrow.

I fully support interim controls to cap parking in the Hub and enable more affordable transit-oriented housing in the Hub. Developers should not be targeting a luxury market in this transit-rich area by demanding excess parking.

I understand that President Breed has introduced legislation adopting interim controls eliminating conditional uses for excess parking in the Hub. This is a step in the right direction, and I thank Supervisors Kim and Peskin for co-sponsoring this legislation. Please adopt these interim controls as soon as possible! It is critical that the One Oak Project provides a reduction in parking.

I urge you to develop meaningful standards for wind impacts on bicyclists and pedestrians in crosswalks. I do not own a car and ride my bicycle everywhere for transportation. It is already terribly windy at the intersection of One Oak. I'm an experienced cyclist and find it dangerous at times. We must have standards for wind impact to ensure all cyclists, including novice bike riders, are safe riding in our city.

I encourage you to take this opportunity to develop management plans for TNCs and e-commerce delivery in the Hub and citywide. Management of curb in the HUB must be implemented before new buildings are constructed.

I strongly encourage you to require 0.25:1 parking for the One Oak Project. Excess parking is not needed in this transit-rich corridor.

Thank you for considering my comments. We all must work together to ensure that development in our city benefits everyone, and One Oak is too focused on maximum profits instead of what's right for our lovely city.

Respectfully submitted,
Shirley Johnson, Ph.D.
3480 17th Street
San Francisco, CA 94110