



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

MEMO

DATE: February 13, 2012
TO: Daniel Ruth
FROM: Delvin Washington, Planning Department
RE: PPA Case No. 2011.1323U for 302 Silver Avenue

1650 Mission St.
Suite 400
San Francisco,
CA 94103-2479

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

Please find the attached Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) for the address listed above. You may contact the staff contact, Sophie M. Hayward, at (415) 558-6372 or sophie.hayward@sfgov.org, to answer any questions you may have, or to schedule a follow-up meeting.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Delvin Washington", written over a horizontal line.

Delvin Washington, Senior Planner



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Preliminary Project Assessment

Date: February 13, 2012
Case No.: **2011.1323U**
Project Address: 302 Silver Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94112
Block/Lot: 5952/002
Zoning: RH-2, 50-X
Project Sponsor: Daniel Ruth, President and CEO, Jewish Home of San Francisco
415-334-2500
Staff Contact: Sophie Hayward – 558-6372
sophie.hayward@sfgov.org

1650 Mission St.
Suite 400
San Francisco,
CA 94103-2479

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

DISCLAIMERS:

Please be advised that this determination does not constitute an application for development with the Planning Department. It also does not represent a complete review of the proposed project, a project approval of any kind, or in any way supersede any required Planning Department approvals listed below. The Planning Department may provide additional comments regarding the proposed project once the required applications listed below are submitted. While some approvals are granted by the Planning Department, some are at the discretion of other bodies, such as the Planning Commission or Historic Preservation Commission. Additionally, it is likely that the project will require approvals from other City agencies such as the Department of Building Inspection, Department of Public Works, Department of Public Health, and others. The information included herein is based on plans and information provided for this assessment and the Planning Code, General Plan, Planning Department policies, and local/state/federal regulations as of the date of this document, all of which are subject to change.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The Jewish Home is located at 302 Silver Avenue, on a site bounded by Mission Street to the west, Lisbon Street to the east, Silver Avenue to the north, and Avalon Avenue to the South; the project site is zoned RH-2. The site measures approximately nine acres, and occupies the entire block. The surrounding areas on Silver Avenue, Avalon Avenue, and Lisbon Avenue are primarily residential in use, with a pattern of two-story development. The property includes six buildings (the Friedman, Koret, Goodman, Main, West, and Rosenberg buildings), and also includes extensive landscape and mature trees. The site's primary entrance is accessed from a circular driveway off of Silver Avenue, with egress on to Mission Street.

The Jewish Home is located within an RH-2 (Residential, House, Two-Family) zoning district and a 50-X Height and Bulk district. The existing use is as a residential care facility, permitted through a Conditional Use Authorization granted in 1991 (Case No. 90.362EC), and amended in 2003 (Case No. 2002.0447C). The Residential Care facility use includes both short-term and long-term skilled nursing facilities (SNF), and acute care psychiatric facilities. The Jewish Home is licensed for 478 SNF beds and 13 acute

psychiatric care beds. The site includes 158 off-street surface parking spaces and two off-street loading spaces.

The proposed project is in its conceptual phase, and the precise mix of uses, unit count, and square footage are preliminary at this time. The project may also be phased. As of the date of this letter, the proposed project includes the existing SNF and acute care uses, as well as new, licensed Residential Care for the Elderly (RCFE) uses, which include memory support, to be added to the Goodman building and in the proposed new buildings. The proposed project anticipates:

- 198 beds to remain in use as SNF or acute care psychiatric beds (with up to 37 of the 98 beds in use for acute psychiatric use);
- 338 licensed RCFE residential living units;
- Up to 23,000 gross square feet (gsf) of retail uses in new buildings along Mission Street, including up to 8,000 gsf dedicated to a medical clinic;
- The addition of 117 new off-street parking spaces, for a total of 275 off-street parking spaces on-site;
- One additional off-street loading space, for a total of three loading spaces.

The proposed project includes the demolition of the Main and West Buildings, the construction of five new buildings, and the internal reconfiguration of the existing Goodman Building to convert it to a new, licensed RCFE. The proposed project anticipates the retention of the Friedman Building as a skilled nursing facility, and the retention of the Koret Building with the potential to convert a limited number of its SNF beds to acute psychiatric beds. The project proposes to retain the Rosenberg Family Center, with the possibility of converting a portion of the lobby and clinic areas to facilities/dining areas.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:

In compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the environmental review process must be completed before any project approval may be granted. The project sponsor must submit an Environmental Evaluation Application (EEA).¹ The following issues will be investigated as part of the environmental review process.

- a. *Historical Architectural Resources.* The proposed project includes demolition of the Main and Infirmary Buildings, which were constructed more than 50 years ago; therefore, the project is subject to the Department's historic preservation review. Planning Department preservation staff will review the Page & Turnbull 12/17/09 Historic Resource Study to determine whether the Department concurs with the report's conclusion that these buildings do not qualify as historic resources under CEQA. Preservation staff may request additional information to make a determination. If staff determines that either structure is a historic resource under CEQA, the proposed demolition will require preparation of an environmental impact report (EIR).
- b. *Archeology.* The project is subject to preliminary archeological review by Planning Department staff. This review will commence after submittal of an EEA identifying the depth

¹ <http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=8253>.

- of proposed ground disturbance and submittal of the geotechnical study. At that time, the Planning Department will determine whether additional reporting and research will be required to determine whether the project has the potential to adversely affect known or potential archeological resources.
- c. *Transportation*. The proposed project would add 338 units of senior housing to the project site, as well as retail and clinic uses that generate trips. Based on the Department's *Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines* (Table C-1), a transportation study is likely to be required for this project.² This determination is preliminary in nature, and the determination will be revisited upon submittal of the EEA. The Planning Department will provide additional guidance to the project sponsor related to the process for selecting a transportation consultant and assist in the development of the scope of work for the analysis. Please see the Planning Department's Environmental Planning webpage "Resources for Consultants" for further information on administration of the consultant pool.³
- d. *Air Quality – Article 38 Compliance*. The proposed project is located within a potential roadway exposure zone identified by the Department of Public Health (DPH). Given that the project proposes sensitive land uses in this potential exposure zone, the project requires an air quality assessment to determine if pollutant concentrations are above the threshold level of 0.2 micrograms per cubic meter. You may choose to have the air quality assessment prepared by a qualified firm and forwarded to DPH for review, or you may request that DPH conduct the assessment.

Should you choose to have the air quality assessment prepared by a qualified firm, please forward a description of the proposed project (including project location and a set of plans) and the results of the air quality assessment to Tom Rivard, San Francisco Department of Public Health, Air Quality Research, Planning and Policy, 1390 Market Street, Suite 210, San Francisco, CA 94102. A fee of \$520 in the form of a check payable to the Department of Public Health for four hours of project review and administrative handling must accompany the assessment.

Should you choose to have DPH prepare the air quality assessment for your proposed project, please forward a description of the project (including project location and a set of plans) to Tom Rivard at the address listed above and a fee of \$1,560 in the form of a check payable to the Department of Public Health. This fee covers 12 hours of preparation of the air quality assessment and administrative handling.

If additional work is necessary, you will be notified by DPH. You will be billed (by DPH) \$130 for each additional hour of work over the first four hours. These fees are charged pursuant to Section 31.47(c) of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

² <http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=6753>. For senior housing: $338 \times 5 = 1,690$ daily trips $\times 0.6 = 101$ PM peak-hour trips.

³ <http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1886>.

If the air quality assessment finds that concentrations of air pollutants on the site exceed action levels, mitigation measures, outlined in the guidance document, may be required to protect sensitive uses. If the project is subject to Article 38 of the San Francisco Health Code, the actions outlined within that article may be required.

- e. *Air Quality – Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) Requirements.* The proposed project includes sensitive land uses (senior care facilities and dwelling units) that may be affected by nearby roadway-related pollutants and other stationary sources that may emit toxic air contaminants. In addition, the proposed project’s construction and/or demolition activities would likely require the use of heavy-duty diesel equipment that emits diesel particulate matter, a known toxic air contaminant. This may affect sensitive receptors located up to and perhaps beyond 300 feet from the project site. During the environmental review process, an air quality screening analysis will be conducted by Environmental Planning. The results of the screening analysis will indicate whether an air quality technical report is required for additional air pollutant modeling. If an air quality technical report is required, the project sponsor must retain a consultant with experience in air quality modeling to prepare a scope of work that must be approved by Environmental Planning prior to the commencement of any required analysis and/or modeling.
- f. *Greenhouse Gases.* The City and County of San Francisco’s *Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions* presents a comprehensive assessment of policies, programs, and ordinances that represents San Francisco’s Qualified Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Reduction Strategy.⁴ Projects that are consistent with San Francisco’s Qualified GHG Reduction Strategy would result in less-than-significant impacts from GHG emissions. In order to facilitate a determination of compliance with San Francisco’s Qualified GHG Reduction Strategy, the Planning Department has prepared a Greenhouse Gas Analysis Compliance Checklist. The environmental planner assigned or CEQA consultant in coordination with the project sponsor will prepare this checklist in coordination with the project sponsor.
- g. *Geology, Soils, and Seismicity.* The project involves excavation beyond 10 feet below grade. A geotechnical study prepared by a qualified consultant should be submitted with the EEA. The study should address whether the site is subject to liquefaction and landslides, and should provide recommendations for addressing any geotechnical concerns identified in the study.
- h. *Tree Disclosure Affidavit.* The project site contains mature trees along its perimeter. The Department of Public Works Code Section 8.02-8.11 requires disclosure and protection of “landmark, significant, and street trees” located on private and public property. Please submit a Tree Disclosure Affidavit with the EEA.⁵ Any tree identified in the Tree Disclosure

⁴ San Francisco’s *Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions* and BAAQMD’s letter are available online at:

<http://www.sfplanning.org/index.aspx?page=1570>

⁵ <http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=8321>

Affidavit must be shown on the project site plans with size of the trunk diameter, tree height, and accurate canopy dripline.

- i. *Stormwater and Flooding.* The City and County of San Francisco Stormwater Management Ordinance became effective May 22, 2010. As addressed in Public Works Code Section 147.2, stormwater design guidelines have been instituted to minimize the disruption of natural hydrology. The ordinance requires preparation of a Stormwater Control Plan (SCP) for any project resulting in a ground disturbance of 5,000 square feet or greater prior to issuance of a building permit. Responsibility for review and approval of the SCP is with the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) Wastewater Enterprise, Urban Watershed Management Program (UWMP). The project's environmental evaluation would generally evaluate how and where the implementation of required stormwater management and low impact design approaches would reduce potential negative effects of stormwater runoff. Low impact design approaches may include a reduction of impervious cover, stormwater reuse, and increased infiltration. More information is available at <http://sfwater.org/index.aspx?page=446>.
- j. *Hazards.* Due to the presence of nearby leaking underground storage tank sites, please submit a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) for the project site when submitting the EEA. The ESA should investigate existing environmental conditions at the project site, which may include potential underground storage tanks, the potential for asbestos-containing building materials and lead-based paint in the buildings to be demolished, and any documented releases of hazardous substances within 0.5 miles of the proposed project site. The Phase I ESA should include professional recommendations as to whether further investigation (e.g., soils sampling) is warranted.
- k. *Shadow.* Planning Code Section 295 restricts new shadow upon public spaces under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Department by any structure exceeding 40 feet, unless the Planning Commission finds the impact to be less than significant. The proposed project includes buildings over 40 feet in height; thus, submittal of a Shadow Analysis Application is required.⁶ Please submit this application in coordination with the EEA, as shadow impacts will be considered and discussed as appropriate in the CEQA document.

The project as proposed would include the construction of buildings that would exceed the project site's existing height limit; thus, the project is not consistent with existing zoning designations and regulations. Furthermore, the project site is over 5 acres in size. For these reasons, the project is not eligible for exemption as an infill development project, under CEQA Guidelines Section 15332. Thus, an initial study must be prepared for CEQA review. The initial study may be prepared either by an environmental consultant from the Planning Department's environmental consultant pool or by Department staff.

If the initial study determines that the project would not have a significant effect on the environment, the Department would issue a preliminary negative declaration (PND). If the initial study finds that the project would have significant impacts that could be reduced to a less-than-significant level by mitigation

⁶ <http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=8442>

measures agreed to by the project sponsor, then the Department would issue a preliminary mitigated negative declaration (PMND). The PND or PMND would be circulated for public review for a period of 20 calendar days, during which time concerned parties may appeal the determination. If an appeal is filed, the Planning Commission would hold a hearing to decide the appeal. If no appeal is filed, the Planning Department would issue a final negative declaration (FND) or final mitigated negative declaration (FMND), and CEQA review is complete.

If the initial study indicates that the project would result in a significant impact that cannot be mitigated to below a significant level, an EIR must be prepared by an environmental consultant from the Planning Department's environmental consultant pool. For example, if the historic resource evaluation response determines that the building proposed for demolition is a historic resource (see item a, above), the Planning Department would require the preparation of an EIR focused on historical architectural resources. The Planning Department would provide more detail to the project sponsor regarding the EIR process should this level of environmental review be required.

To determine fees for environmental review, please refer to page 2 of the current fee schedule, "Environmental Applications – Studies for Projects outside of Adopted Plan Area."⁷

PLANNING DEPARTMENT APPROVALS:

The project requires the following Planning Department approvals. These approvals may be reviewed in conjunction with the required environmental review, but may not be granted until after the required environmental review is completed.

1. **Environmental Evaluation Application:** An Environmental Evaluation Application must be filed so that the CEQA-related issues of the project can be evaluated and assessed. For more information on what is required in this application, please refer to the Environmental Review section above.
2. **Shadow Study:** Planning Code Section 295 requires a shadow analysis for any building over 40 feet in height. The proposed project would result in construction of a building approximately 55 feet in height. Please submit a Section 295 Shadow Study application for the Department to analyze the shadow impacts. Note that the shadow study will be conducted simultaneously with the shadow analysis undertaken as a part of the CEQA review.
3. **Zoning Map Amendment:** The project site is located in an RH-2, 50-X Height and Bulk District, which permits a maximum building height of 50'. Based on the proposed project described in the PPA application, it appears that an amendment of the existing Zoning Map would be required in order to allow the construction of proposed new Buildings A, B, and C2 which would each measure approximately 60' in height, and Building D, which would measure approximately 72' in height.

⁷ <http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=513>.

4. As described in the submitted PPA application, the existing Jewish Home of San Francisco is authorized as a Planned Unit Development (PUD) (Motion No.13151, granted August 15, 1991; modified by Motion 16661, approved on September 18, 2003). Proposed modifications, including an expansion of the number of total residents, staff, and parking, as well as changes to the amount of usable open space and the proposed addition of retail uses in new buildings with frontage on Mission Street would require a modification to the PUD through a **Conditional Use Authorization** as described in Planning Code Section 304. Conditional Use Authorization applications are available at the Planning Department's Public Information Counter on the ground floor at 1660 Mission Street.
5. Depending on the full scope of the project proposal, a **Rezoning Application** would be required in order to create a Special Use District (SUD) that would permit the construction of new buildings that exceed the permitted height limit, as well as to provide flexibility in the definition of licensed "Continuing Care Retirement Community" (CCRC) based on the requirements for "Residential Care Facility for the Elderly" (RCFE).

Existing Planning Code Section 209.3(c) defines "Residential Care Facility" as a facility that provides round the clock lodging, board and care:

to persons in need of specialized aid by personnel licensed by the State of California. Such facility shall display nothing on or near the facility which gives an outward indication of the nature of the occupancy except for a sign as permitted by [Article 6](#) of this Code, shall not provide outpatient services and shall be located in a structure which remains residential in character. Such facilities shall include but not necessarily be limited to a board and care home, family care home, long-term nursery, orphanage, rest home or home for the treatment of addictive, contagious or other diseases or psychological disorders.⁸

The Project Sponsor may wish to clarify, through the creation of an RCFE SUD, that while the RCFE may qualify as a Residential Care Facility as defined by Section 209.3(c) of the Planning Code, the project proposal is to create a Continuing Care Retirement Community, which would provide facilities that allow people to age in place with the ability to vary the types and level of care that residents receive over time. Therefore, the proposed project includes a shift from the traditional skilled nursing facility (SNF), to a more comprehensive senior living model (licensed by the State), with 338 licensed RCFE residential living units of varying unit sizes and layouts, and providing a range of amenities. An RCFE SUD may provide for an evolving range of services and amenities as required by the RCFE state licensing, without necessitating a return to the Planning Commission to request modification of the Conditional Use Authorization for the PUD in the future.

⁸ Planning Code Section 209.3(c), available online at:

[http://www.amlegal.com/nxt/gateway.dll/California/planning/planningcode?f=templates\\$fn=default.htm\\$3.0\\$vid=amlegal:sanfrancisco_ca\\$sync=1](http://www.amlegal.com/nxt/gateway.dll/California/planning/planningcode?f=templates$fn=default.htm$3.0$vid=amlegal:sanfrancisco_ca$sync=1) (January 6, 2012).

6. **Building Permit Applications** are required for the demolition of the Main “B” Building and of the West Building. In addition, **Building Permit Applications** are required for the construction of the five new buildings, as well as for modifications to existing buildings. Building Permit applications are available at the Department of Building Inspections at 1660 Mission Street.

NEIGHBORHOOD NOTIFICATIONS AND PUBLIC OUTREACH:

Project Sponsors are encouraged to conduct public outreach with the surrounding community and neighborhood groups early in the development process. Additionally, many approvals require a public hearing with an associated neighborhood notification. Differing levels of neighborhood notification are mandatory for some or all of the reviews and approvals listed above.

This project is required to conduct a Pre-application meeting with surrounding neighbors and registered neighborhood groups before a development application may be filed with the Planning Department. The Pre-application packet, which includes instructions and template forms, is available at www.sfplanning.org under the “Applications” tab. All registered neighborhood group mailing lists are available online at www.sfplanning.org under the “Publications” tab.

PRELIMINARY PROJECT COMMENTS:

The following comments address specific Planning Code and other general issues that may significantly impact the proposed project:

1. **SFPUC Urban Watershed Management Program (UWMP):** Projects disturbing 5,000 sf or more of ground surface are subject to the Stormwater Management Ordinance and must meet the performance measures set within the *Stormwater Design Guidelines and Appendixes*. For more information, please refer to: <http://www.sfwater.org/sdg>. Please cite how the proposed project will meet this requirement.
2. **Recycled Water Ordinance:** For new construction of 40,000 sf or more or the addition of 10,000 sf or more of irrigated space, plumbing systems must recycled water. For more information, please contact the Department of Building Inspection.
3. **Front Setback:** The existing site is authorized as a Planned Unit Development (PUD). Therefore, Planning Code Section 132(g) applies regarding landscape and permeable paving within the required front setback. Specifically, all front setback areas required must be appropriately landscaped, meet any applicable water use requirements of Administrative Code [Chapter 63](#), and consist of a minimum of 20 percent unpaved area devoted to plant material, including the use of climate appropriate plant material as defined in Public Works Code Section [802.1](#). In addition, the front setback area must be at least 50% permeable so as to increase storm water infiltration. To allow for landscaping and street trees at street grade, below-grade parking shall be located at a depth below any surface of the setback to provide a minimum soil depth of 3 feet 6 inches.

4. **San Francisco Green Landscaping Ordinance:** The proposed project is subject to the San Francisco Green Landscaping Ordinance, which assists in articulating Planning Code Sections 138.1. This code section outlines a provision for adding street trees when adding gross floor area equal to 20 percent or more of the gross floor area of an existing building, the construction of new buildings, or the addition of parking. A 24-inch box size street tree would be required for each 20 feet of frontage of the property along each street or alley, with any remaining fraction of 10 feet or more of frontage requiring an additional tree. Based on the street frontage of the subject lot, it appears that a total of thirty-eight street trees would be required along Lisbon Street (with frontage that measures approximately 759'), twenty-four street trees would be required along Silver Avenue (with frontage that measures approximately 471') and twenty-three trees along Mission Street (with street frontage that measures approximately 466'). Thirty-four street trees would be required along Avalon Avenue (with approximately 688' of street frontage). Existing trees on the project site would apply towards the street tree requirement. Please ensure that the proposed project is in compliance with this code section by providing an updated site plan showing landscaping and street trees. Please also note that the project site is currently entitled as a Planned Unit Development (PUD), and therefore the required street trees are subject to the following additional criteria: required trees must have a minimum 2 inch caliper, measured at breast height; the branch height must be a minimum of 80 inches above sidewalk grade; trees must be planted in a sidewalk opening at least 16 square feet, with a minimum soil depth of 3 feet 6 inches; and street tree basins must be edged with decorative treatment.
5. **Standards for Bird Safe Buildings.** Adopted on July 14, 2011, the Standards for Bird Safe Buildings specify requirements for a bird safe building. Please review the standards and indicate the method of window treatments to comply with the requirements where applicable.

PRELIMINARY DESIGN COMMENTS:

The following comments address preliminary design issues that may significantly impact the proposed project:

- **Building Massing, Site Design, and Open Space**

Three buildings are sited along Silver and Mission re-inforce the street and re-establish the main axis from the corner to the historical entrance to the central main building. The five story buildings are massed, broken vertically with setbacks. The recesses of the street-facing 5-story buildings should be "bookended" to better define the street wall. Additional height at the corner of Silver and Mission would be appropriate. The 5-story development is sited away from the lower two-story residential buildings across Mission and Silver Avenue, and where the development turns up Avalon the buildings are set back from the street in a gesture to respect the lower scale residences.

- **Ground Floor Commercial Space and Street Frontage**

The ground floor proposes active uses such commercial spaces and an appropriate height relative to grade.

- **Architecture**

At this point the architecture is assumed to be preliminary and UDAT would provide further detailed design review on the subsequent submission with the formal Application.

- **Garage and Parking**

The Planning Department does not support the location of the parking entrance on Mission Street.

- **Street improvements.**

The project will be subject to the Better Streets Plan (Planning Code Section 138.1) which may include streetscape elements and sidewalk widening for the appropriate street type, including landscaping, site furnishings, and/or corner curb extensions (bulb-outs) at intersections (see Better Streets Plan Section 4 for Standard Improvements and Section 5.3 for bulb-out guidelines). The project sponsor is required to submit a Streetscape Plan illustrating these features, and the department will work with the project sponsor and other relevant departments to determine an appropriate streetscape design. Standard street improvement would be part of basic project approvals not count for as credit towards in-kind contributions.

PRELIMINARY PROJECT ASSESSMENT EXPIRATION:

This Preliminary Project Assessment is valid for a period of **18 months**. An Environmental Evaluation, Conditional Use Authorization, or Building Permit Application, as listed above, must be submitted no later than **August 13, 2013**. Otherwise, this determination is considered expired and a new Preliminary Project Assessment is required. Such applications and plans must be generally consistent with those found in this Preliminary Project Assessment.

Enclosure: Neighborhood Group Mailing List

Cc: Jeanie Polling, Environmental Planning
Kay Chang, Citywide Policy & Analysis
David Winslow, Citywide Policy & Analysis