



**Waterfront Design Advisory Committee (WDAC)  
Draft Meeting Minutes  
April 10, 2023**

This was a joint meeting with the Bay Conservation and Development Commission's (BCDC) Design Review Board (Board). The meeting was held at 375 Beale Street, Yerba Buena Room, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor, in San Francisco.

*Approved on* \_\_\_\_\_

**Waterfront Design Advisory Committee (Committee)**

Members in Attendance: Dan Hodapp (Chair)  
Laura Crescimano  
Kathrin Moore  
Richard Sucre

The meeting commenced at 5:00 p.m.

**1. Call to Order and Meeting Procedure Review.**

**2. First Review of the Ferry Building and Ferry Plaza Alterations.** Katharine Pan (BCDC Staff) provided a staff introduction to the project site and context.

The applicant presentation was given by Lada Kocherovsky (Page & Turnbull) and Sarah Kuehl (EinwillerKuehl) on behalf of the project proponent team, Hudson Pacific Properties. The presentation included an introduction, overarching goals, background and context, and existing site conditions, followed by a detailed description and supplemental visuals of the proposed improvements to the Ferry Building, rear Ferry Plaza, and southern promenade.

**Board and Committee Clarifying Questions**

- Will the Ferry Building Farmer's Market remain the same size or be reduced?
- How is the open space or required public access areas changing from the proposed improvements?
- What is the forecast for ferry ridership and will the proposed improvements have any impact on transit riders?
- Are there any challenges of the existing plaza for the adjacent tenants/ businesses?
- What are the (9) vehicular spaces on the eastern edge of the Ferry Plaza used for and who uses them?
- Would the proposed retail kiosk in the Ferry Plaza be open at night? What are the proposed hours for operations?
- What is planned for the One Ferry Plaza building?

- What is the future relationship between One Ferry Plaza and the proposed plaza improvements?
- What is the anticipated level of traffic that will use the driveway/ EVA lane? Can the driveway be designed to look more like a pathway and/or promenade for pedestrians?
- Is there any consideration to plan or continue the southern (promenade) walkway all the way out to One Ferry Plaza East, and who are the landlords in this area?
- How do you deal with the transition to the WETA plaza and the new elevation?
- How do you find a surface design for the walkway that respects previous design considerations along the waterfront? How do you avoid competition with adjacent design treatments?
- What is the intent and frequency around the proposed flagpoles lining the plaza and promenade?
- What are the proposed building bump outs on the east side of the building and the heights of the proposed soffits?
- In the main east/west breezeway through the Ferry Building, what separates the bayfront kitchens from the required public access walkway?
- Are there requirements for public space in the building where the bayfront kitchens are proposed as they currently act like POPOS?
- What are the proposed materials of the canopy and structure on the west side of the building, and how tall is it?
- Is it intended to be two separate café spaces under the northern arcade?
- Is the area under the arcade on the west side of the building dedicated public access?
- Will the north and south arcades be consistent in design?
- Are there any images of the arcade storefronts while they are enclosed?
- Does Hudson have design standards for seating areas and adjacent barriers for tenants to use?
- What do “light touch” improvements mean?
- How do you uphold the civic nature of the building as a transportation hub?
- How can the outdoor improvements be looked at collectively with the older and historic civic buildings?

### **Public Comment**

1. Public comment letter (attached) from Foodwise (formally CUESA), the Farmer’s Market Operator.
2. Public comment letter (attached) from Telegraph Hill Dwellers (THD).
3. Public comment in the room - Katherine Petrin, San Francisco Architectural Heritage: The commenter had previously sent Hudson a letter asking for clarifications and stated that this presentation has been informative.
4. Public comment in the room - Christine Farren, Foodwise, Farmer’s Market Operator: There is generally support for the project, but the organization is concerned about the design and placement of the kiosk and other fixed elements that when stacked together will make it difficult for the farmer’s market to operate as it does today.
5. Public comment online - Alec Bash, Gateway Tenants Association (GTA): GTA is pleased with the Ferry building operations over the years, specifically with how they respond to the shifting economy brought on by the Covid-19 pandemic. The commenter

agreed with the design concept having a “light touch” to the building and emphasized the need for more openness in the public areas, not limited to public access areas, is important in addressing various conditions of the space, including inclement weather.

6. Public comment online - Bob Harrer, Barbary Coast Neighborhood Association: Noted that the Ferry building is a real asset to the city and felt that the improvements proposed will expand the usable spaces. The commenter also noted that the project will broaden its appeal to a wide range of customers and be able to compete with other large-scale development being proposed along the waterfront.

### **Committee and Board Recommendations**

The Board and Committee gave the following direction and requests for additional information:

1. Boundaries/ Lease Control:
  - a. Need greater clarity on lease control boundaries and public vs. private areas, especially public and privatized seating.
  - b. Would like the concept refined to tie elements and spaces together more clearly (e.g. Golden Gate Ferry Terminal, One Ferry Plaza East, WETA Plaza, etc.).
  - c. Need metrics on spaces that are being changed from public vs. private use in square feet.
2. Farmer’s Market/ Equity of Use:
  - a. Would like to better understand the existing farmers market and how it may transition with the current proposal. How will the changes impact existing market operations?
  - b. Would like key metrics showing how all spaces are changing (is the market being reduced or gaining space, etc.)
3. Materiality/ Lighting:
  - a. Materials should be better refined to tie into adjacent spaces, taking cues from buildings and newer plazas (such as WETA plaza); some materials should be more substantial and/or have civic character like the building.
  - b. Need greater clarity around the proposed lighting and flag poles.
4. Arcades/ Glazing Systems:
  - a. Would like more details on the glazing systems and the closing of arcades. How will they operate and what portions of the arcade will be open to the public during the day/evening?
5. Shift to More Restaurant Spaces:
  - a. Would like more clarity on the transition of the market hall to more cafes/restaurant spaces. Specifically, what is causing this change?
6. Ferry Plaza:
  - a. Need to better understand how the proposed elements in the plaza change from daytime use to programs, events, and evening activities.
  - b. Need more information on the retail kiosk design and operations.
7. Request to review proposal again with further refinements and above requests.

### **Applicant’s Response**

Project applicant team thanked the Board and Committee for the comments and requests for additional information.

**3. Public Comment** (for items not on the agenda)

There was no additional public comment.

-The WDAC meeting was adjourned around 8:30 p.m.-

DRAFT