

**2070 Bryant Street  
RFP Questions and Answers, Part 2  
November 18, 2016**

**Q1: Open Space and Variance:** The planning approvals note that the required open space for the affordable building is to be provided at the second floor courtyard, the pedestrian mews, and the rooftop terrace. Is this still valid? Also, it appears that there was an approval granted for a variance in the required width for open space for (at least) the market rate building. Does this variance approval apply to the open space for the affordable building as well, or would the affordable project sponsor need to apply separately for that approval?

**A:** There have been no variances granted for the affordable project because it has not yet been designed or submitted for consideration in any way to Planning. The schematic designs provided as part of the RFP were for reference purposes only. Our expectation is that the affordable development's open space requirements will be satisfied by the courtyard and rooftop deck. The mews cannot be included in the affordable project's open space. Note that as part of the State Density Bonus Program and San Francisco's Affordable Housing Bonus Program, variances/concessions for 100% affordable housing developments are available.

**Q2: Building Height:** It looks like an effort was made to keep the highest occupiable level under 75', we assume to avoid the need for high-rise construction. It is our understanding from recent conversations with SFFD that a roof deck above 75' would be considered occupiable space, and can only be provided in a high-rise building. Were there any discussions with DBI or SFFD about an exception, or an interpretation, that would allow a roof deck at that height in mid-rise construction? Or were you expecting that high-rise construction would be required?

**A:** We did not discuss a 75'+ roof deck with SFFD or DBI. We did, however, talk to Planning Department staff about this issue.

A primary goal for the project is to maximize density while also containing costs. We are hopeful that architects can achieve this outcome through creative designs and the use of variances/concessions available through the state or local density bonus program. Planning staff advises that concessions/exceptions granted through Planning Code Sections 328 and 329 should be considered, and they will work with the selected development team to achieve the best outcomes – i.e., regarding density, design, and quality habitability – by identifying the best available options in 328 and 329. (Again, development teams may also consider, in the alternative, the State Density Bonus Program.)

**Q3: Developer experience:** Can we increase the number of years required under minimum developer experience, from 5 to 10 years?

**A:** No.

**Q4: Mews:** Can tenants access the pedestrian mews during after hours? If so, can we have doors that open up to the mews?

**A:** The mews are meant to be available for tenant and public access during the day and locked for security during the night. The exact easement/access arrangements for both market-rate

and affordable tenants have not yet been negotiated. We are not requesting either that affordable units open onto the mews or that they not have direct access to the mews. Please provide a proposal that best achieves the goals of the RFP for that space.

**Q5: Mews:** How will we get to count it towards our open space if the market rate developer/owner control the space and can limit access to it at night? Are they/Will they be required to grant an easement to the affordable development?

**A:** The mews should not count toward your open space requirements.

**Q6: Development Concept:** If the unit count changes due to a potential roof height change, is 41 units still the number set-aside for LOSP?

**A:** The number of LOSP units should be 30% of your total unit count, exclusive of the manager's unit, rounding up or down to the nearest whole number.

**Q7:** In addition to submitting a design that conforms to the RFP's requirements, we would like to submit a second design concept that we think may better meet the site conditions and neighborhood context. Would this be ok?

**A:** Yes. While all respondents must meet the RFP's minimum thresholds and submit proposals that are responsive to the RFP requirements, you may also submit a second design concept that you think may be more successful for the parcel and community than what is specifically requested. This is simply an option, and not required.