

From: [Swiecki, John](#)
To: [Beggs, Kelly](#)
Cc: [Robbins, Jeremiah](#)
Subject: FW: For Tuesday's PC Meeting
Date: Monday, November 15, 2021 2:59:48 PM
Attachments: [Cookie-CuttoerRule10.16.21.pdf](#)
[CurrentEnvironmentalIssues.pdf](#)
[image001.png](#)

From: Earthhelp <earthhelp@earthlink.net>
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 2:58 PM
To: Swiecki, John <johnswiecki@ci.brisbane.ca.us>; Padilla, Ingrid <ipadilla@ci.brisbane.ca.us>; Sayasane, Pamala <psayasane@ci.brisbane.ca.us>
Subject: For Tuesday's PC Meeting

Please provide these comments to the planning commissioners.

I remain disabled and wonder about parking for disabled persons. Reducing parking requirements impedes more than storefront usage and impacts other laws. I think a city-wide parking solution needs to be created rather than reducing the parking requirements. There are some places in San Francisco I will not shop because parking is an issue. Their loss.

Additional comments here:

Cookie-cutter Rule:

To: Planning Commissioners, Staff, and the Public
From: Dana Dillworth
RE: ODD Regulations RZ-2-21
November 16, 2021

Thank you Commissioners for your concern about the scope of this re-zoning document and continuance to this meeting.

Thank you Barbara and Michele for being the stalwart, heart-centered volunteers of this community who spoke about the need to recognize that Brisbane is a special place and that a checklist with a building czar is an inadequate regulation.

Thank you for the opportunity to “speak” at these meetings and I understand your concern of becoming “just a citizen” on discretionary matters that may be being overlooked.

One item missing from this discussion is SB10, it was signed by Governor Newsom September 16th, goes into effect January 1st, 2022. You may want to rephrase or reassess your earlier comments that this zoning ordinance will have no impact in R-1 zoning.

SB10 allows councils to override voter-approved ballot measures and bypass environmental review by meeting certain low- and moderate-income housing unit numbers. I ask that you have a meeting dedicated to understanding how this type of “objective” design review may be required of all buildable lots in Brisbane in the future, or make a stand on the law as Michele, Barbara, and I come to ask of you.

This document needs to be in compliance with our general plan. As such, this document cannot be approved when it only speaks to the facade and not the functionality, the solar orientation, or meeting

other state and community goals such as net zero energy, water production and retention, sufficient recreational open space and self-sufficiency...which are the cornerstones of our General Plan. This document needs to be in compliance with our general plan.

The pandemic and now supply chain issues should have given us some time to reflect on our impacts and values. Is business as usual working?

Where's innovation? Where are the requirements that the skin of the building be involved in meeting one, two, or three plusses to the environment? (Solar orientation, garden or growing vegetation for food and shelter, bird housing, water or energy storage? to name a few.)

I compiled a list of environmental concerns and innovative solutions and presented them to the council. I am adding my list here. In some Scandinavian countries new housing is required to provide rainwater or gray-water cisterns, energy production, and energy storage. (See Dutch Windwheel) I read that Great Britain requires new housing to provide the front lower facade for battery storage. Turkey optimizes roofs for rainwater harvesting. Singapore has a LUSH Garden Law, including food production requirements within the facades or skins of buildings. We need more than bump-out language.

I fear that the first project that clears the checklist hurdle becomes the cookie-cutter for all future development.... Cookie-cutter laws or the lack of subjectivity should be open to public discussion because our General Plan includes not allowing repetition of design. You have to remove those provisions from our General Plan or make this document in compliance with the general plan.

Rear wall articulation required is debatable. There are times where design by book doesn't work, like along rail corridors, where bump-

outs and fenestration just become pigeon lofts and toxic emission zones from idling traffic and delivery trucks.

There is no reason to believe the pretense that the cookie-cutter approach provides usable, functional space. What about design standards that require every bedroom to have a window or natural lighting, i.e. must include light wells and skylights? Orientation to maximize passive solar heating and cooling may require northern facades to be a different type of feature.

Where is the check list?

Please include garden walls in this ordinance so that we mitigate air pollution from the future gridlock community this will inevitably create.

Please include requirements that meet sustainability goals for rainwater and energy retention which may allow / require the skins and walls and open space areas to be multi-purpose.

Owners unwilling to incorporate must contribute to a community garden, community sustainable energy project, or community open space project.

Our General Plan was constructed with a standard for open space and recreation per resident that we remarked was higher than national averages. IF you only look at the facades of the projects and miss the foundations of our community, then this document is not in compliance with our General Plan, it will not create a livable community. It should be sent back for revisions that recognize the community standards as a whole, not one unit at a time to a community that has not been given all the relevant information.

Perhaps the building commissioner should be an elected official that presents their qualifications for adjudication rather than be an "assignee" at the discretion of the hiring of the City Manager.

Water issues-

<https://www.sfgate.com/bayarea/article/Santa-Clara-Bay-Area-water-restrictions-drought-16235537.php>

Loss of Salmon due to Water Policies Favoring Almond Industry:

<https://www.latimes.com/opinion/story/2021-07-26/editorial-california-salmon-extinction-extreme-heat>

Urban Heat Islands -Cooling by Design - Importance of Vegetation: Garden City Concept-

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PM101DvvG4Q>

Issues with Building on Landfills-

Building failures on garbage landfill Sampoong, South Korea

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=259gYwTWUyU>

Millennium Tower sinking, lawsuits

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NFY906qlao0>

Millennium Upgrade Problems

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OgQncSHLfaMs>

Sinking sidewalks in Mission Bay

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ef84rFGGyKE>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jjZmTmZ9Ay8>

EPA Vulnerability of Landfills in Coastal Communities by Climate-Induced Impacts:

https://www.epa.gov/sites/default/files/2019-11/documents/vulnerability_of_waste_infrastructure_to_climate_induced_impacts_in_coastal_communities.pdf

Updated Standards for Solid Waste Landfills:

http://www.gfredlee.com/Landfills/Status_Developing_Protective_MSW_Landfills.pdf

Refer to Recent USGS Tsunami Mapping.

Liquefaction in Tokyo: (10 years old)

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TzlodnjPAuc>

Innovative Energy Production :

Dutch Windwheel starts at 4:20

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nNp21zTeCDc>

Singapore's LUSH Garden Law

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2ueVw83Plec>

South San Francisco Eyeing Limits on Biotech

https://www.smdailyjournal.com/news/local/south-san-francisco-eyeing-limits-on-research-and-development/article_47c526cc-096d-11ec-bbe4-c3de2e3cd69c.html

From: Barbara Ebel <ecology@greenknowe.org>
Sent: Tuesday, November 16, 2021 12:26 PM
To: Padilla, Ingrid <ipadilla@ci.brisbane.ca.us>
Subject: for Planning commission tonight

Ingrid,

Please forward to the BPC as soon as possible. I'm afraid I thought I had until Thursday to finish this, but looked at the calendar on Monday and noted the Planning Commission is meeting tonight and Council on Thursday. I have been working as hard as I can to polish the up since finding my error.

I hope everyone will read it and give it due consideration.

--

Barbara Ebel

Case for using specific Architectural Styles as part of the Objective Design & Development Standards for Brisbane

Is it possible to use a term like Art Deco etc. in objective design standards? When I asked our consultants in a recent meeting on objective design standards, I and the other attendees were told that this is possible so yes. You can do this.

What area should be covered? I would recommend either major or minor renovation of the building exteriors in the NCRO-2 district. There are other options of course.

Why do this? There are multi-fold reasons, all of which come together to make a strong case.

Defining a style(s) upfront guarantees you a cohesive landscape. I have attended countless design meetings and Planning Commission session in my years in Brisbane. I can promise you that the architects rendering of the building is always lovely. There is never any trash on the ground, the colors are muted and blend well with other buildings and the particular shade of blue they have used to shade the sky. The birds sing and sun always shines in a rendering and it always looks great with the building next door. If only this was true in real life. Buildings often fall short of their forecast glory. By defining an architectural style(s), you can ensure at least one level of compatibility not provided by the draft standards.

We already have a number of beautiful Art Deco buildings on Visitacion, and one permitted design on San Bruno Ave. There are other architectural styles, but Art Deco, California Spanish and Arts & Crafts are already represented. In order to avoid an increasing mish-mash of styles, some of which have yet to be invented, go with what you have. I propose adding one or more of the above to the ODDS.

The only guidelines in the proposed design standards center around building articulations and set backs. Articulations are nice, but they don't really define a standard or "look" for an area. You can have Art Nuevo buildings with articulations. You can have Art Deco buildings with articulations. You can have Brutalist buildings with set backs and articulations. Articulations and set backs don't promise you anything about the building you will get other than that it will have set backs and articulations. This is a sort of like saying you like cars, but you only want cars with wheels. So Tesla or El Camino?

Architecture is flighty and fad driven. It is constantly seeking to reinvent itself like runway couture. Some times the results are good, but it also results in a lot of rotten eggs. (see Blobitecture, which btw, is probably compatible with the currently contemplated objective design standards) The [Brianna Rennix & Nathan J. Robinson](#) article, “Why You Hate Contemporary Architecture” states Boston's City hall looks like a “hideous concrete edifice of mind-bogglingly inscrutable shape, like an ominous component found left over after you’ve painstakingly assembled a complicated household appliance,” and “that people were begging for it to be torn down before it was even completed.” If having big names design buildings cannot guarantee a pleasing design, how can we expect to get good results with every project picking arbitrary styles independently? <https://www.currentaffairs.org/2017/10/why-you-hate-contemporary-architecture>

What would be the impact? Take the 23 Club as an examples. Its a much loved building with loads of history, a great interior and a rather unremarkable exterior. Its probably going to be redeveloped soon and one of three things can happen. The exterior could remain relatively unchanged and rather dull. It could be remodeled into some modern facade of stacked and articulated rectangular elements and look out of place with the buildings on either side and loose its sense of connection to a cornerstone of Brisbane history. Or it could be subject of ODDS that include some limitations on architectural style and attain new character and charm (even though we cannot use those words in the ODDS.) The choice is clear.

Can it work? The answer is, it already has! When 50 San Bruno came before the Brisbane City Council for approval, the architect was asked to add more Art Deco details to the exterior of the building, and he did it! It wasn’t even mandatory, but Mr. Trotter does a lot of work in this community and valued the opinion of the council, and we now have a really elegant design approved. We cannot expect architects that have no connection to this community to care about the aesthetic legacy they leave here long term. They are looking for a portfolio page at best. With one or more architectural styles included in the new objective design standards, we can replicate this success with 50 San Bruno.

This would be very good for Brisbane. Architecture helps define a sense of place. You don’t have to be an expert to understand this. In the preceding Baylands EIR, it was projected that more people would head from Brisbane to the Baylands to shop than would come to old Brisbane from the Baylands. We will be looking at a net decrease in business for our local shops. We cannot hope to compete with the newness of the Baylands, so how do we make the businesses in old Brisbane a destination? One is having the right mix of cute and trendy shopping options. Hopefully the Brisbane Chamber can help us develop our business community into something robust. Another component is place making and you have an opportunity to make a start on that today. By choosing Art Deco, or frankly another style, you give old Brisbane an unique, *distinctive* appearance. Something that will stick in peoples minds. Residents often refer to Carmel as their ideal. Google describes Carmel as, 'known for the museums and library of the historic Carmel Mission, and the fairytale cottages and galleries of its village-like center.' Every one I have spoken too in old Brisbane values its quaint charm. This could be us, but not if you let the future take a wandering course.

Why am I just now hearing about this option? I don't know. It’s not like I haven't been saying this for years. My informal polling of residents on social media in February had an overwhelmingly positive response. Shelley Hodes and Frank Martin agreed, “Some of the box structures along Visitation can not be restored into their former glory as there never was any.” Shelly pondered, “what other idea can we come up with to keep our downtown quaint and historic feeling? Number 1: Don't add more sterile boxy modern cost-cutting eyesores to the mix.” She also disparaged older building being made

contemporary to everyone's detriment. Our current tact of letting people do what they want as long as they required number of set backs and articulations are met will not preserve the charming buildings and history we do have.

Leesa Greenlee suggested adding a number of styles to give owners further options but still keep the pallet somewhat cohesive. Leesa noted an example of Arts and crafts style at 248 Visitacion and examples of the California Spanish at 400 Visitacion, Madhouse Coffee Shop. Examples of Art Deco are located at 31 & 185 Visitacion. She noted that many of the buildings appeared to have been built in the 1930 and still bear some resemblance to the Art Deco style of that era.

Will there be objections? Yes, there always are. Let's get this done. Lets' get something done. I have been begging for this since 2017, maybe earlier and the stakes are so much higher now with the state requirement for ODDS. Really, I'd take anything except total inaction. Its like standing at the alter. Speak now, or forever hold your piece because what ever you ask for today, is what we are going to be married to for a long time.

From: [Swiecki, John](#)
To: [Beggs, Kelly](#)
Subject: Fwd: Zoning density, Old Business C
Date: Monday, November 15, 2021 6:59:54 AM

From: anjakmiller@cs.com
Date: November 13, 2021 at 23:09:52 PST
To: "Swiecki, John" <johnswiecki@ci.brisbane.ca.us>
Cc: Sayasane Pamala AT yahoo <sayasanelaw@yahoo.com>
Subject: Zoning density, Old Business C
Reply-To: "anjakmiller@cs.com" <anjakmiller@cs.com>

To the Planning Commission:

Having followed the extensive discussions among the State's elected local officials regarding SB9 and SB10, I am convinced that this legislative effort, along with the housing enforcement measures by the administration, are not intended to provide for affordable housing but for continued support for developers of market-rate housing.

Your task, I hope, is to carefully examine the text of these bills regarding fire-safety districts and lot sizes in Brisbane. The "design standards" could help us avoid the worst.

Thank you for your honest work,

Anja Miller

To: Planning Commissioners, Staff, and the Public

From: Tom Heinz, 41 Humboldt Rd. Brisbane, CA 94005 415.468.8587

RE: ODD Regulations RZ-2-21

November 17, 2021

I've been accused of being against housing. To the contrary, I have always advocated for good architecture, which has gone unheeded. I want the best for Brisbane, not the minimum!

As a retired architect, I see multiple issues with this proposal. Please compare apples with apples and oranges with oranges. The cities that were mentioned are completely devoid of actual comparisons or similarities to Brisbane. Check population vs. acreage, size of houses, lots etc. Brisbane is small and unique. I am offended when outsiders come into our community and tell us we don't deserve anything better than the bare minimum.

Smaller lot size doesn't dictate less parking!!! Regarding guest parking reduction, what about the many families with both parents working, and with 2 teenage daughters? That's 4 cars. Where do their boyfriends park when they visit? Where does grandma park, 7 blocks away? These minimums are dictated by developers who do not want to spend money as it might mean less money in their already fat wallet. That's not design.

When you break the façade every 30 feet, then all the buildings will look alike, only colors and textures different. It's poor architecture and looks like no one had an imagination. Rubber stamp architecture, cookie cutter architecture. Pull a drawing from another project, change a few numbers and you have designed something new? When there is only color/texture variation it then looks 'facady', patchy, not a coherent, integrated well-designed building. Yes, engineers can build a building, but they are not designers, nor even trained in aesthetics, nor how to use the sun or the terrain in their design. Nor are developers.

Why do we (WE, the City/people of Brisbane) have to look like El Camino? Are we planning to build that big?? Brisbane has always been a unique and special place and this proposal wants to homogenize us into automatons. Why not hire lots of different architects – think jobs – not just one developer-designed, nor engineer-designed. Do you have art in your house? Where's the art here?

People are individuals – why should all their housing look the same, monotonous? As a society we become mere drones when we lack imagination. When everyone thinks the same, no one is thinking. When design becomes based on how much it costs a developer to add one more car space it is not design but greedy capitalism. Without imagination we become stagnate individuals.

Setbacks in the rear? Please travel through any of the alleys in South San Francisco, or the new Airport Blvd. at the intersection of Grand Ave. and Bayshore Blvd. and ask yourself if you would sit out on your balcony? This type of set back does not allow any more light into the house than the front. Setbacks in the front help reduce the visual massing on the street side. Define visual interest. It's certainly not just color and texture, so please define.

It was said that this is merely mechanical discussion. Mechanical discussions yield mechanical designs.

Define the qualifications of the Zoning Administrator. Will it be an elected position, so we see the credentials of those running and be able to choose?

Respectfully,

Tom Heinz