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

[vulnerability_of_waste_infrastructure_to_climate_induced_impacts_in_coastal_communities.pdf](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