From: Luc Bouchard

Sent: Wednesday, June 06, 2018 10:20 PM

To: Conway, Clarke; Davis, Madison; Cunningham, Karen; Lentz, Cliff; O'Connell, Terry

Cc: Padilla, Ingrid

Subject: Brisbane Baylands General Plan amendment case GP-1-18

Brisbane, 6 June 2018

Honorable Mayor Conway, Honorable Council Members:

In the continuing history of the Brisbane Baylands, now more than ever, the ball is in Brisbane's camp. It is incumbent upon us, via you, our city council, to put forward a proposal for the type of end goal we want to see for our city. The game has changed: we must lead with our own proposal, not merely react to what others have proposed or threatened us with.

It is time for a proposal of what Brisbane wants to look like as it extends itself on the Baylands. For this new development to truly be an extension of Brisbane, it must carry forward its values: a sense of community, a human scale, respect for the environment, a safe place, open spaces, eclectic, fun, connected to "current" Brisbane... The current proposal put forth by our city council could not be further from those values.

As I am exploring the available information^[1], I do not recognize Brisbane at all in the proposed approach. It puts 1800 to 2200 new dwelling units (Brisbane currently has 1800 units) contained exclusively in the northern-most part of the Baylands, creating a remote enclave of very dense housing, up to 8 stories high, north of the Geneva extension, west of the rail tracks (see area labeled "residential", below), with no explicit open space, amenities, or new community infrastructure to benefit all of Brisbane. This remote, dense concentration of housing feels like it is more part of Daly City or San Francisco. This proposal does not seem to even want to get a benefit for our City: it looks as though it was put together as a defensive move against something else, to merely satisfy some goal other than making Brisbane better, stronger. This is not a plan forward, it is a defensive reaction. When you have the ball, it's not time to play defense.

What is not included in the available documentation is the intent behind the proposal. While I hope to hear from this proposal's authors on what their intent is, I am currently left baffled that any of our council members would desire this as the end state of our fair city – to create a remote enclave, pushed 1.5 miles from Brisbane Village, with twice the residential density of the original UPC proposal. That is not Brisbane. Why not use all of OU1 and OU2 for residential mixed-use development? It would reduce the density and bring us closer. It would also allow us to mandate the maximum levels of remediation for all of the western part of the Baylands. And the eastern part of the land could be used for commercial applications.

As leaders, your task is to rally Brisbane in the right direction. It would be a failure in leadership to not put forth something that has enough appeal to rally a majority of our residents to a common cause in November, so we can set the way forth for Brisbane. We have the ball: let's play to win.

Regards,

Luc Bouchard Brisbane Resident.

Proposed General Plan Land Use Diagram City of Brisbane



