



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Preliminary Project Assessment

Date: June 6, 2012
Case No.: **2012.0203U**
Project Address: 100 Hooper Street
Block/Lot: 3808/003
Zoning: PDR-1-D
58-X
Area Plan: Showplace Square/Potrero
Project Sponsor: Dan Murphy
650-642-0750
Staff Contact: Corey Teague – 415-575-9081
corey.teague@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 proposal is to remove the existing mini storage and truck rental use (d.b.a San Francisco Mini Storage) and construct two four-story buildings to a height of 58 feet that would be linked by two elevated walkways above an interior courtyard. The ground floors include approximately 60,000 gross square feet of PDR use and 59 off-street parking spaces. The floors above include approximately 333,000 gross square feet of "flexible commercial space," which may include a combination of PDR, office, IPDR, institutional, and retail uses.

The southern corner of the property is reserved as an approximately 10,000 square foot privately-owned public open space that would also connect to the interior courtyard. The southern half of Hooper Street on the block between 7th and 8th Streets is proposed to be converted to a "Living Street" that will not be accessible by automobiles. The northern portion of the subject property fronts on Channel Street, which is a 50-foot public right-of-way that is not accepted by the City for maintenance. The project may also improve the southern half of Channel Street to City standards.

The proposal also includes the adoption of a new Special Use District (SUD) on the subject property that would permit greater amounts of office, post-secondary educational, and retail uses than otherwise permitted in the underlying PDR-1-D Zoning District. Table 1 below shows the proposed uses as they are currently permitted and as they would be permitted in the proposed SUD.

| Table 1. Proposed Land Uses | | |
|------------------------------------|---|---|
| Proposed Land Uses | Permitted Under Current Planning Code | Permitted Under Proposed SUD |
| PDR | Permitted | Permitted |
| Office | Not Permitted | Permitted on all floors except the ground floor, and provided that at least 33% of the non-residential space in the building is PDR. |
| Retail | Permitted up to 5,000 gross square feet per lot | Permitted up to 25,000 gross square feet per lot. Permitted above 25,000 gross square feet per lot only if the ratio of other permitted uses to retail is at least 3:1. Permitted up to 3,999 gross square feet per use; Conditional Use Authorization required for retail uses over 4,000 gross square feet. |
| Post-Secondary Education | Permitted up to 20,000 gross square feet | Permitted with no size limitation |

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:

The project initially requires the following environmental review. This review may be done in conjunction with the required approvals listed below, but must be completed before any project approval may be granted.

Section 15183 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines states that projects that are consistent with the development density established by a community plan for which an environmental impact report (EIR) was certified do not require additional environmental review, except as necessary to determine the presence of peculiar, project- or site-specific significant effects not identified in the programmatic plan area EIR. The proposed project is located within the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan, which was evaluated in Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans Programmatic Final Environmental Impact Report EIR (EN FEIR), which was certified in 2008.¹ Because the proposed project would require adoption of a Special Use District in order to implement the development program as proposed, the project is considered inconsistent with the development density identified in the area plan.

¹ Available for review on the Planning Department’s Area Plan EIRs web page: <http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1893>.

Therefore, it is not eligible for environmental clearance in a community plan exemption (CPE). The EN FEIR may provide useful background environmental information for some CEQA topics, however this PPA assumes that at minimum a focused EIR will likely be required for this proposal.

Based on our preliminary review the following topic areas, organized alphabetically below, would require study as part of the project's environmental review:

- *Aesthetics.* The proposed project would result in demolition of the existing storage units and construction of up to a 58-foot-tall contemporary mixed-use office building with onsite open spaces and pedestrianized street spaces. The Planning Department recommends that at least two visual simulations be provided for inclusion in the environmental document. The viewpoint locations should be determined in advance, in consultation with the environmental coordinator.
- *Air Quality (AQ) Analysis.* The proposed project at 100 Hooper Street exceeds the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's (BAAQMD) construction and operational screening levels for criteria air pollutants. Therefore an analysis of the project's criteria air pollutant emissions is likely to be required. If the project would generate sources of toxic air contaminants including, but not limited to: diesel generators or boilers, or include any other stationary sources, the project would result in toxic air contaminants that may affect nearby off-site sensitive receptors. If the proposed project's construction and demolition activities require the use of heavy duty diesel equipment, emissions of diesel particulate matter (DPM), a known toxic air contaminate, may affect sensitive receptors (e.g., dwelling units) and may be evaluated for the applicability for construction air quality mitigation measures.
- *Archeological Study.* The project includes potential grading or foundation work to a depth of about three feet, and the project site does not lie within Archeological Mitigation Zones A and B (see Mitigation Measure J-2: Properties With No Previous Studies, Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans EIR, page S-47); therefore, a Preliminary Archeological Review (PAR) is required. The PAR would be conducted in-house by the Planning Department archeologist. During the PAR, it would first be determined what type of soils disturbance/modification would result from project development, such as, excavation, installation of foundations, soils improvement, site remediation, etc. Any available geotechnical/soils or Phase II hazardous materials report prepared for the project site will be reviewed at this time. Secondly, it would need to be determined if the project site is in an area that is archeologically sensitive. The results of this review will be provided in a memorandum to the Environmental Planner assigned to the project. If and when it is found that the project has the potential to affect an archeological resource, the PAR memorandum will identify appropriate additional actions to be taken. Such actions may include application of an appropriate archeological mitigation measure and/or requiring additional archeological studies as part of the environmental evaluation.
- *Geotechnical Study.* The applicant shall submit a geotechnical study that investigates the soils underlying the site and identifies any geotechnical concerns related to the construction and occupancy of the proposed building(s). The geotechnical study should determine whether the site is subject to liquefaction and landslides, and should highlight any recommendations for mitigating potential impacts, as applicable, associated with any of the geotechnical concerns identified in the study.

- *Greenhouse Gas Analysis.* The 2010 CEQA Air Quality Guidelines provide for the first time CEQA thresholds of significance for greenhouse gas emissions. On August 12, 2010, the San Francisco Planning Department submitted to the BAAQMD a draft of the City and County of San Francisco's Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions. This document presents a comprehensive assessment of policies, programs and ordinances that collectively represent San Francisco's Qualified Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy. The BAAQMD reviewed San Francisco's GHG reduction strategy and concluded that the strategy meets the criteria for a Qualified GHG Reduction Strategy as outlined in BAAQMD's CEQA Guidelines (2010). Therefore, projects that are consistent with San Francisco's GHG reduction strategy would result in less-than-significant GHG emissions.

In order to facilitate a determination of compliance with San Francisco's GHG reduction strategy, the Planning Department has prepared a Greenhouse Gas Analysis Compliance Checklist. Projects that are seeking a determination of CEQA GHG significance based on compliance with the City's GHG reduction strategy must complete the Greenhouse Gas Analysis Compliance Checklist. The planner or CEQA consultant in coordination with the project sponsor, can prepare the checklist.

- *Hazardous Materials.* The project site is located on a site with artificial fill, which indicates that hazardous materials may be associated with the site. The project area has historically accommodated many industrial facilities. As indicated in the PPA application, the site has historically been used for oil/asphalt refining, felt production, lumber milling, and bus maintenance. A database search was performed for a nearby project at 1000 16th Street for a one-mile radius that indicates the presence of numerous sites where hazardous materials and wastes are or have been stored, used, or contained or contaminated ground water. Within 1/8 mile of that site are three hazardous waste storage, disposal, or treatment facilities, six sites with groundwater contamination, seven sites with leaking underground storage tanks, one active or inactive underground storage tank site, and two historic underground storage tank sites. Additionally, 12 facilities generating large quantities of hazardous wastes exist within 1/8 mile of 1000 16th Street.

A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment should be prepared to determine the potential for site contamination and the level of exposure risk associated with the project, and submitted with the Environmental Evaluation Application (EEA). The Phase I will determine whether any additional analysis (e.g., a Phase II soil sampling) will be necessary. Review of the Phase I and any additional studies recommended by the Phase I would require oversight from the San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH), which may recommend that the project sponsor enroll in its Voluntary Remedial Action Program. Such recommendations would likely be instituted into the project as site-specific mitigation measures of "peculiar," site-specific impacts. Please note that the DPH charges a fee for their review. More information on DPH's Voluntary Remedial Action Program may be found at <http://www.sfdph.org/dph/EH/HazWaste/hazWasteVoluntaryRemedial.asp>.

- *Historic Architectural Resources.* The recently-completed Showplace Square Historic Resource Survey included an evaluation of over 500 buildings within a 736-acre survey area. The subject property was evaluated for historic significance and was given a rating of 6Z, meaning it was found ineligible for listing on the National or California Registers of Historic Resources. Further, the subject property does not contribute to nor is a part of any historic district. Therefore, this topic will not require further evaluation as part of the proposal's environmental review.

- *Shadow Study.* Planning Code Section 295 restricts new shadow on 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 would result in construction of a building(s) 40 feet or greater in height. The sponsor should therefore submit a "Proposition K" application for preparation of a preliminary shadow analysis to determine whether the proposed project could potentially shade parks under jurisdiction of the Recreation and Parks Department. If the shadow fan analysis prepared by Planning Department staff determines that the project could cast shadows on recreational resources, such as the nearby Jackson Playground, the applicant would be required to hire a qualified consultant to prepare a detailed shadow study. The consultant would be required to prepare a proposed scope of work for review and approval by the Environmental Planning case manager prior to preparing the analysis.
- *Transportation Study.* Based on the Planning Department's transportation impact analysis guidelines, the project would potentially add at least 50 PM peak hour person trips or more and thus would require additional transportation analysis. The transportation report would need to be prepared by a qualified consultant working at the direction of the Planning Department staff. Upon submittal of an EEA and initiation of environmental review, the Planning Department will issue a Preliminary Consultant List with three transportation consultants qualified in preparing Transportation Impact Analyses. Please see "Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines for Environmental Review" on the Planning Department's website and "Miscellaneous Fees" in the Planning Department's current *Fee Schedule for Applications* for more information. As noted on the *Fee Schedule*, there is a separate fee to SFMTA for review of the transportation report.
- *Wind Study.* The proposed project would involve construction of buildings up to 58 feet in height. Wind impacts are generally caused by large building masses extending substantially above their surroundings and by buildings oriented such that a large wall catches a prevailing wind, particularly if such a wall includes little or no articulation. Based on consideration of exposure, massing, height and orientation of the proposed buildings, the Planning Department does not anticipate this project creating or contributing to adverse wind effects and no further technical review of this topic appears warranted.

Note that the Planning Department will require the preparation of an Initial Study to determine the project's appropriate level of environmental review, which will likely be a focused EIR. The environmental documentation would need to be prepared by a consultant on the Planning Department's environmental consultant pool. (see: http://www.sfplanning.org/ftp/files/MEA/Environmental_consultant_pool.pdf). Please also refer to "Studies for Project inside of Adopted Plan Areas - Community Plan Fees" in the Planning Department's current *Fee Schedule for Applications*. Environmental evaluation applications are available at the Planning Information Center at 1660 Mission Street, and online at www.sfplanning.org.

Environmental Evaluation applications are available in the Planning Department lobby at 1650 Mission Street Suite 400, at the Planning Information Center at 1660 Mission Street, and online at www.sfplanning.org.

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. A **Legislative Amendment** application must be reviewed by the Planning Commission and approved by the Board of Supervisors per Planning Code Section 302 for the Planning Code and Zoning Map changes associated with the proposed Special Use District (SUD).
2. A **General Plan Referral** must be approved by the Board of Supervisors per San Francisco Charter Section 4.105 and Administrative Code Sections 2A.52 and 2A.53 for the proposed work in the public right-of-way on Hooper Street.
3. A **Shadow Analysis** application is required because the proposed building height is greater than 40 feet and there is potential shadow impact on nearby public open space within Mission Bay.
4. **Conditional Use Authorization** from the Planning Commission is required, as a matter of Planning Department and Planning Commission policy and per Section 303, for the development project if it is proposed for approval in conjunction with the proposed SUD.
5. If the SUD is approved by the Board of Supervisors as proposed, and office space is then permitted on this site, an **Office Allocation** from the Planning Commission is required per Planning Code Section 321 et seq. to establish more than 25,000 gross square feet of new office space.
6. A **Building Permit Application** is required for the proposed new construction on the subject property and may also be required for the removal and/or demolition of existing buildings on the subject property.

Legislative Amendment, General Plan Referral, Shadow Analysis, Conditional Use, and Office Allocation applications are available in the Planning Department lobby at 1650 Mission Street Suite 400, at the Planning Information Center at 1660 Mission Street, and online at www.sfplanning.org. 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. All registered neighborhood group mailing lists are available online at www.sfplanning.org under the "Resource Center" tab.

PRELIMINARY PROJECT COMMENTS:

The following comments address specific Planning Code and other general issues that may significantly impact the proposed project. For the purpose of providing these comments, the ground floor units along Clara Street are considered non-residential. Designation of these units as residential may alter some of the comments below.

1. **Existing and Proposed Zoning.** The proposed project is within a PDR-1-D Zoning District, a district that is intended to encourage and retain PDR businesses. It does not permit office, and restricts retail to 5,000 square feet per parcel and institutions to 20,000 square feet per parcel. PDR Districts were identified through the Eastern Neighborhoods process as areas that have been traditionally industrial, and that are lacking in amenities (such as transit and local retail) that could support the densities typical of office, retail, and institutions. Though the proposed project would encourage PDR businesses, it would also enable more than 300,000 square feet of some combination of office, retail, and institutional uses. Therefore, the project would not be permitted under current zoning, and would require a Code amendment or Special Use District (SUD) to allow.

The Planning Department generally does not support rezonings or SUDs on individual parcels. In addition, Policy 1.7.2 of the Showplace Square/Potrero Hill Area Plan states that the City should “ensure that any future rezoning of areas within PDR districts is proposed within the context of periodic evaluation of the city’s needs for PDR space or in the context of the redevelopment of nearby public housing in conjunction with the HopeSF program.”

2. **Potential In-Kind Agreement.** The proposed project would seek an In-Kind Agreement per Planning Code Section 423.3(d) to improve the northern half of Hooper Street into a “green” or “living” street. Improvements to Hooper Street are identified as a desired improvement by the Showplace Square Open Space Plan. Such an improvement would be eligible for an In-Kind Agreement, per Step 1 of the Planning Commission’s “Procedures for In-Kind Agreements.” To be approved, the In-Kind Agreement would need to complete the other steps in the process, up to and including approval by the Planning Commission.

At this time, the Department cannot know whether this improvement will be well received by recommending bodies to the Planning Commission, such as the community, the Eastern Neighborhoods Citizens Advisory Committee, and staff. Staff does recommend considering expanding the project (through coordination with CCA or other means) to create an entire green street, rather than only on the northern portion of Hooper.

3. **Demolition of PDR Buildings.** In order to preserve the existing stock of buildings suitable for industrial activities and to create new viable space for industrial operations in PDR Districts, Planning Code Section 230 requires that any industrial building that is not unsound and is proposed for demolition must be replaced by a new building that complies with the relevant criteria of that section. Per Section 203(b)(2), self-storage is considered an industrial use as listed in Section 225. Therefore, demolition of the existing self-storage buildings is subject to the relevant criteria of this Section.

4. **Interdepartmental Project Review.** This review is required for all proposed new construction in seismic hazard zones, in which the subject property falls. An application is enclosed.
5. **Streetscape Improvements.** Planning Code Section 138.1 requires one street tree for every 20 feet of frontage for new construction. It also requires a streetscape plan for large projects, which is discussed in more detail in the "Preliminary Design Comments" below.
6. **Bicycle Parking.** Planning Code Section 155.4 requires varying amounts of bicycle parking for new developments based on the types and amounts of non-residential uses. Additionally, the Planning Department introduced legislation in April 2012 (Case No. 2011.0397T) to update bicycle parking requirements for various project types in the City. Please be aware that some amount of bicycle parking will be required for this project, but exact numbers cannot be estimated until a final mix of uses is proposed.
7. **Car Sharing.** Based on the proposed 59 off-street parking spaces, Planning Code Section 166 requires this project to provide at least one car share space.
8. **Eastern Neighborhoods Impact Fees.** This project is subject to the applicable fees outlined in Section 423 et seq. as adjusted for construction cost inflation per Section 409.
9. **Jobs Housing Linkage Program Fees.** Based on a proposed combination of office, IPDR, and retail greater than 25,000 gross square feet, this project is subject to the applicable fees outlined in Section 413 et seq.
10. **Transit Impact Development Fee (TIDF).** This project is subject to the applicable fees outlined in Section 411 et seq.
11. **Child Care Requirements.** If this project provides more than 50,000 gross square feet of office space, then it will be subject to the applicable child care requirements, or the appropriate in-lieu fee, as outlined in Section 414 et seq.
12. **First Source Hiring Agreement.** A First Source Hiring Agreement is required for any project proposing to construct 25,000 gross square feet or more. For more information, please contact:

Ken Nim, Workforce Compliance Officer
CityBuild, Office of Economic and Workforce Development
City and County of San Francisco
50 Van Ness, San Francisco, CA 94102
(415)581-2303

13. **Stormwater.** Projects that disturb 5,000 square feet or more of the ground surface must comply with the Stormwater Design Guidelines and submit a Stormwater Control Plan to the SFPUC for review. To view the Guidelines and download instructions for preparing a Stormwater Control Plan, go to

<http://stormwater.sfwater.org/>. Applicants may contact stormwaterreview@sfwater.org for assistance.

14. **Recycled Water.** The City requires property owners to install dual-plumbing systems for recycled water use in accordance with Ordinances 390-91, 391-91, and 393-94, within the designated recycled water use areas for new construction projects larger than 40,000 square feet. Please see the attached SFPUC document for more information.
15. **Flood Notification.** The project site is located in a flood-prone area. Please see the attached bulletin regarding review of the project by the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission.
16. **Property Subdivision.** Although subdividing the subject property is not technically included in the project description, various materials included in the PPA application discuss a potential subdivision. Please be aware that Planning Code Section 121.9 requires a Conditional Use Authorization for the subdivision of any property larger than 10,000 square feet located in PDR zoning districts, and also includes specific criteria for Planning Commission consideration.

PRELIMINARY DESIGN COMMENTS:

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

1. **Building Massing, Site Design, and Open Space.** The scale of the building should be modulated to a finer grain especially along the Channel and Hooper Street facades. The Planning Department recommends breaking the long building frontage with two 30-foot wide mid-block alleys from Channel to Hooper (see Policy 3.2.7 of the Showplace Square/Potrero Area Plan).
2. **Ground Floor Street Frontage.** The entries are obscure, minimal and indistinguishable at the ground floor. They should be designed to be more prominent and closer to the street rather than accessed from an internal courtyard.
3. **Architecture.** Consider augmenting the size and massing of this development by creating separate designs for each building.
4. **Parking.** The internalized parking at the street frontage should be a minimum of 25' behind façade and screened, preferably with active ground floor uses (see Policy 3.2.3 and 3.2.4 of the Showplace Square/Potrero Area Plan).
5. **Streetscape 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 (as mentioned above), and the department will work with the project sponsor and other relevant departments to determine an appropriate streetscape design. Standard street improvements are a part of basic project approvals and do not count 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 **December 6, 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: Interdepartmental Project Review Application
 Flood Notification: Planning Bulletin
 SFPUC Recycled Water Information Sheet

cc: Ledlie, Inc., c/o Ray Bregante, Property Owner
 Corey Teague, Current Planning
 Michael Jacinto, Environmental Planning
 Steve Wertheim, Citywide Planning and Analysis