



# SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

---

## Preliminary Project Assessment

*Date:* May 21, 2012  
*Case No.:* **2012.0362U**  
*Project Address:* 2000 Marin Street  
*Block/Lot:* 4346/002, 4347/010, 4349/016  
*Zoning:* PDR-2 (Core Production, Distribution and Repair – Bayview)  
65-J Height and Bulk District  
*Project Sponsor:* Scott A Mommer  
559-978-1000  
*Staff Contact:* Diego R Sánchez – (415) 575 – 9082  
[diego.sanchez@sfgov.org](mailto:diego.sanchez@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 project site consists of three lots on three separate blocks within the PDR-2 zoning district. The site is located within the Bayview District, and is bounded by Cesar Chavez Street to the north, Evans Street to the west, Marin Street to the south and Interstate 280 to the east. An approximately 50,000 square foot industrial building is currently on the site along with surrounding off-street surface parking.

The proposal is to demolish the existing industrial building and construct an approximately 120,000 square foot hardware store (d.b.a. The Home Depot) and improve the surface parking area with landscaping, lighting and other permeable surfaces. An outdoor sales, seasonal sales and tool rental area is also planned.

**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:

1. An **Environmental Evaluation Application** is required for the full scope of the project (demolition and construction) and may include the following:

- a. *Transportation Study.* A Transportation Study will be required for the proposed project. The construction of up to 101,425 square feet of retail space with an 18,255 square foot garden center would generate over 10,000 new daily person trips of which more than 1,000 would be in the p.m. peak hour. More than 800 of the p.m. peak hour person trips would be automobile trips. The additional peak hour trip potential requires analysis.

*Cesar Chavez Street/Evans Avenue.* As planned, the access to project site would be via Marin Street for patrons, employees, and deliveries. Most trips to the project site would be by way of Evans Avenue southbound from Cesar Chavez Street, and all of these trips would pass through the intersection of Cesar Chavez Street and Evans Avenue; a three-way signal-controlled intersection. This intersection has recently been (May 12, 2012) restriped to better accommodate bicycle traffic. The restriping has changed the intersection geometry, resulting in two-through and one right turn eastbound lanes, and one through and one left-turn westbound lanes on Cesar Chavez. There are two southbound lanes on Evans Avenue, and two northbound lanes, with one left-turn only and one right-turn only lane (northbound) at Cesar Chavez Street. The restriping has also facilitated a bicycle lane in the eastbound and westbound directions on Cesar Chavez. The Transportation Study should reflect the current intersection geometry.

Additionally, the Planning Department has conducted an initial review of the proposed site circulation plan. The Department offers the following preliminary comments:

- i. *Driveways.* The current plan shows three driveways onto Marin Street. The westernmost driveway appears too close to the intersection of Marin Street and Evans Avenue. As a result, adequate turning radius may not be available for larger vehicles. Also, vehicles making a left into this driveway from Marin Street would have to wait for breaks in westbound traffic along Marin Street, to the extent that this creates queuing, adequate queuing space is not available and vehicles could potentially back up onto Evans Avenue. The Planning Department suggests either removing this driveway, or making it right-turn egress-only. Should the driveway be removed, traffic could be rerouted to the primary driveway, which runs along the front store façade. The primary ingress/egress for the parking lot would be via a consolidated driveway at this location. The Planning Department prefers a consolidated driveway. The easternmost driveway is addressed under 'Loading.'

- ii. *Loading.* The Planning Department recognizes the complexity of the loading demand for this retail use. The loading, which would occur at the northwest corner of the building while the store is closed to customers, appears feasible. However, the loading which would occur at the southeast corner of the building should be revisited. First, the proposed 110 foot curb cut does not meet the Department's driveway design criteria. The location of the curb cut should be considered relative to the trucks' turning radii and the location of the loading docks. To the extent that this driveway would be shared by delivery trucks and patrons picking up orders from the garden center, the possible conflicts between trucks and patrons should be considered. Loading for the garden center may be better handled from the front of the store to avoid these potential conflicts.
- iii. *Bicycle Access and Circulation.* Cesar Chavez Street is a Class II bicycle facility, and Evans Avenue is a Class III bicycle facility, therefore it is reasonable to anticipate that some trips to the project site will be made by cyclists. Although a bicycle rack is included at the front façade of the proposed project, no bicycle access from Cesar Chavez Street or from Evans Avenue is provided. Further, there is no delineated bicycle circulation within the project site. The Planning Department recommends that bicycle access be provided from Cesar Chavez Street or Evans Avenue. Ideally, access would be provided directly from Cesar Chavez via a staircase or ramp. Access could also be provided from Evans Avenue ideally at a location which is as close as possible to the intersection at Cesar Chavez Street, see 'Pedestrian Access.'
- iv. *Pedestrian Access and Circulation.* Pedestrian access should be provided to the site from Cesar Chavez Street and Evans Avenue. The Evans Avenue access would ideally be in a location that is as close as possible to the intersection at Cesar Chavez Street. These access points could serve both bicyclists and pedestrians. In addition, a pedestrian path through the parking lot should be provided. The Planning Department recommends a pedestrian aisle which bisects the parking lot from Evans Avenue to the front building façade.
- v. *Secondary Access from Cesar Chavez.* The plans delineate a PG&E easement along the eastern edge of the project site. The Planning Department recommends pursuing whether this easement could serve as a secondary right-in/right-out ingress/egress to the project site, which would connect with Marin Street.

Please refer to the requirements for Transportation Study applications on our website and submit the application with the other filings.

- b. *Phase II Study.* The proposed project would include excavation to accommodate the building foundation, which would likely include deep piles driven to a depth of 25 to 60 feet below the present site grades. The site was used as a secondary metals plant from 1939 to 1986 and for the San Francisco Newspaper Agency's (SFNA) newspaper production operations between 1987 and 2009. A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) was conducted by Environ in August 2011. Based on the findings of the Phase I ESA, there are several recognized environmental conditions on the site. Based on soil and groundwater

investigations conducted in the 1980s and 1990s there are areas of elevated metals in the soils in two areas of the site, the southeastern corner of the site and a small area along the northern boundary. Soil sampling in 2003 indicated the presence of petroleum hydrocarbons, as well. In lieu of remediation, the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) approved the installation of an asphalt concrete cap ranging from 4 to 12 inches in thickness across the site. To the extent that excavation would disturb this cap, the project sponsor would need to coordinate with DTSC to determine the appropriate handling of the contaminated soils beneath; soil remediation and/or replacement of the cap may be required.

In addition to the known contamination related to the metal plant use, it is possible that the SFNA's newspaper production operations may have resulted in further contamination related to the use of petroleum products, heavy metals, paints, printing inks, solvents, and other chemicals. Also, the existing petroleum hydrocarbon contamination should be addressed. Further, the extant serpentine soils contain naturally-occurring asbestos which requires special handling (and disposal). At a minimum, the project sponsor would be required to enter into the Department of Public Health (DPH) Voluntary Remedial Action Program (VRAP).

A Phase II study will likely be required by the Department of Public Health. If so, it must be completed before environmental clearance. Disturbance of the existing contaminated soils may involve specific mitigation requirements. The context of existing environmental hazards in the immediate setting must also be reviewed. Also, a pre-demolition survey of the existing on-site building should be conducted to facilitate the identification and removal of any hazardous building materials prior to demolition of the building.

- c. *Archeological Study.* The project includes grading or foundation work to a depth of up to 25 to 60 feet in some locations; therefore an archeology study is required. The proposed project would require a Preliminary Archeological Review (PAR) which 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 archeological mitigation measure and/or requiring additional archeological studies as part of the environmental evaluation.
- d. *Geotechnical Study.* The project site is largely underlain by artificial fill which may or may not have serpentine content. Serpentine soils underlie the western portion of the site. The center portion of the site includes alluvium (early Pleistocene) surface soils. The project sponsor prepared a geotechnical investigation in April 2012 which included seventy-six (76) test borings. According to the executive summary of the geotechnical investigation, the

- appropriate foundation for the proposed project would be a structural slab system supported by deep foundations (25 to 60 feet) such as driven piles or cast-in-drilled-hole pile foundations. The geotechnical investigation should be submitted, in its entirety, with the EE Application.
- e. *Historic Resource Evaluation Report (HREER)*. The project site is adjacent to, but not included in the Central Waterfront Historic Survey Area, in the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan. The building proposed for demolition is not currently on any known historic registry or survey, and it was constructed in 1989, therefore it is not considered a potential historic resource under CEQA and no HREER is required.
  - f. *Air Quality Screening*. The demolition, construction, and operations associated with the proposed project could have air quality impacts. In addition, a portion of the site is underlain by serpentine rock, a naturally-occurring form of asbestos, disturbance to which could result in potentially significant impacts to air quality. Therefore, the project sponsor will be responsible for compliance with the Toxic Control Measures for Construction, Grading, Quarrying, and Surface Mining Operations as enforced by the California Air Resources Board (CARB). In general, these measures would include submittal of an Asbestos Dust Mitigation Plan to the air district (BAAQMD) for approval prior to commencing ground disturbance activities on the site. The full scope of the air quality analysis will be determined when the EE application is submitted.
  - g. *Noise Measurements and Acoustical Analysis*. The demolition, construction, and operations of the proposed project could result in temporary or permanent increases in ambient noise levels. The Planning Department may require that some noise analysis be conducted as part of the environmental review. In addition construction noise mitigation measures will likely be identified.
  - h. *Aesthetics*. The proposed project would involve the demolition of the existing industrial building and the construction of a large, single-story retail building, with an at-grade parking lot covering the remainder of the project site. 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.
  - i. *Wind*. 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 wall includes little or no articulation. Typically, buildings that are less than 80 feet tall do not result in substantial changes to ground-level wind. The height of the proposed building ranges between 22 and 42 feet in height. The tower element at the northeast corner would be 48 feet. Given that entire building would be less than 80 feet in height, no additional analysis of wind impacts would be required.

- j. *Shadow*. Section 295 restricts new shadow on public spaces under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Parks Department (RPD) by any structure exceeding 40 feet, unless the Planning Commission finds the impact to be less than significant. To determine whether the project would conform with Section 295, a shadow fan analysis was prepared by the Planning Department (See "Planning Department Approvals" below).

However, the project site is located nearly adjacent to the Marin and Pennsylvania - Islais Creek Transport open space which is under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission as part of the Clean Water Program. Given that this open space is not under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Department, Section 295 would not apply. However, an in depth shadow fan analysis should be prepared to determine if the proposed project would cast shadow on the adjacent open space which would interfere with the use and enjoyment of the facility. The project sponsor should retain a qualified consultant to perform this analysis.

Please note that this project is not likely to qualify for a Categorical Exemption under CEQA. Additional analysis will determine if an Initial Study is required. If so, the Initial Study will help determine that either (1) the project is issued a Negative Declaration stating that the project would not have a significant effect on the environment, or (2) an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required to determine the project's significance on the environment.

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](http://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. **Conditional Use authorization** from the Planning Commission is required per Planning Code Sections 121.6 and 303 to establish a retail use in excess of 50,000 square feet in the PDR-2 zoning District. The request for Conditional Use authorization is subject to a public hearing before the Planning Commission and must meet the findings of Sections 101.1(b), 303(c) and 303(j) and be generally consistent with the General Plan.
2. A **Shadow Analysis** is required under Planning Code Section 295 as the project proposes a building height in excess of 40 feet. A shadow analysis, attached, indicated that no public space under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Department will be shadowed by the proposal, as represented in the plan set submitted with the Preliminary Project Assessment. (See Environmental Review Section).
3. A **Building Permit Application** is required for the demolition of the existing industrial building.

4. A **Building Permit Application** is required for the construction of the proposed hardware store and the improvements to the off-street surface parking area.

Conditional Use 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](http://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.

This project is not 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. However, you are encouraged to voluntarily conduct such a meeting. The Pre-application packet, which includes instructions and template forms, is available at [www.sfplanning.org](http://www.sfplanning.org) under the "Permits & Zoning" tab. All registered neighborhood group mailing lists are available online at [www.sfplanning.org](http://www.sfplanning.org) under the "Resource Center" tab.

The subject property is within the Bayview Hunters Point Project Area B ("Project Area") and is subject to the Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Plan ("Plan"). While the Plan delegated land-use jurisdiction to the Planning Department and Planning Code, it also included additional policies regarding workforce requirements, below market rate housing requirements, and review by the Project Area Committee ("PAC"), among others, that were implemented by the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency ("Agency"). While the Agency was dissolved on February 1 pursuant to AB 26, the Project Area and Plan, along with their various requirements, are still in effect. As a result, the City's procedures and regulations for projects affected by this change – such as yours - are being updated. You are advised to please keep abreast of these changes as you pursue required entitlements.

#### PRELIMINARY PROJECT COMMENTS:

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

1. *Large Scale Retail Uses.* Planning Code Section 121.6 requires Conditional Use authorization when a project proposes to establish a retail use in excess of 50,000 square feet.
2. *Subdivision of Large Lots, PDR Districts.* Planning Code Section 121.9 requires Conditional Use authorization when a project proposes to subdivide, resubdivide, or perform a lot line adjustment to a parcel that is equal to or greater than 10,000 square feet, into one or more smaller parcels. Should

the project propose adjust the current block and lot configuration it may be subject to Conditional Use authorization.

3. *Streetscape Improvements.* Planning Code Section 138.1 requires the addition of one street tree 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. Given the 830 feet of frontage along Marin and 290 feet of frontage along Evans, 57 street trees are required.
4. *Screening and Greening of Parking and Vehicle Use Areas.* Planning Code Section 142 requires all lots containing vehicular use areas where such area has more than 25 linear feet along any public right-of-way to provide screening in accordance with the requirements of Section 142 and the Ornamental Fencing Section 102.32. Screening shall add to the visual diversity of the use and need not be an opaque barrier.
5. *Off-Street Parking.* Planning Code Section 151 requires one off-street parking space for each 4,000 square feet of occupied floor area, where the occupied floor area exceeds 5,000 square feet for greenhouse/plant nursery uses and one off-street parking space for each 1,000 square feet of occupied floor area, where the occupied floor area exceeds 5,000 square feet for retail spaces devoted to the handling of bulky merchandise. Planning Code Section 204.5 allows up to 150% of the required parking to be considered accessory. Any amounts above the 150% of the required parking must seek Conditional Use authorization under Planning Code Sections 156 and 157 to establish a parking lot use. It is important to reinforce that the excess parking for this project will be viewed as a separate principal use and must obtain a Conditional Use authorization. In order to obtain such an authorization, the project must meet the criteria of Planning Code Section 157, which sets a high threshold for the approval of additional parking.
6. *Off-Street Freight Loading.* Planning Code Section 152 requires 3 off-street freight loading spaces for retail stores, wholesaling, manufacturing, and live/work units in newly constructed structures, and all other uses primarily engaged in the handling of goods when the area exceeds 100,000 square feet. The required off-street freight loading spaces must be clearly labeled on the plot plans.
7. *Shower Facilities and Lockers Required in New Commercial and Industrial Buildings and Existing Buildings Undergoing Major Renovations.* Planning Code Section 155.3 requires the installation of four showers and eight lockers for new buildings at the proposed square footage.
8. *Bicycle Parking Required in New and Renovated Commercial Buildings.* Planning Code Section 155.4 requires the installation of 12 bicycle parking spaces for new buildings with square foot areas of the proposed project.
9. *Car Sharing.* Planning Code Section 166 requires the provision of one Car Share space plus an additional Car Share Space for every 50 off-street parking spaces over 50.
10. *Demolition of Industrial Buildings in PDR Districts, Replacement Requirements.* Planning Code Section 230 requires that the demolition of structurally sound industrial buildings in PDR districts include



the replacement of varying amounts of new industrial space. Because the building proposed for demolition on Lot 010, Assessor Block 4347, has a Floor Area Ratio (FAR) less than 0.4, the replacement building shall include at least two square feet of industrial use for each square foot of industrial use in the building proposed for demolition. The building proposed for demolition is approximately 53,500 square feet. The minimum area of the replacement structure must be 107,000 square feet.

11. *Transit Development Impact Fee (TIDF)*. The proposal is subject to the TIDF, as indicated under Planning Code Section 411, under the Production / Distribution / Repair economic activity category.
12. *Stormwater Management*. 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](mailto:stormwaterreview@sfwater.org) for assistance.
13. *First Source Hiring Agreement*. Because the project proposes the addition of at least 25,000 square feet or more of new or additional gross floor area the project is subject to the First Source Hiring Program. Please contact the First Source Hiring Program Manager at (415) 401-4960 with the San Francisco Human Services Agency's Workforce Development Division to develop a contract to satisfy this requirement. For frequently asked questions, you may access First Source information at [www.onestopsf.org](http://www.onestopsf.org).
14. *Industrial Land Uses*. The parcel is zoned PDR-2 and was part of the Bayview Industrial District zoning effort completed in 2008. Central to this rezoning was establishing areas for industrial type uses and activities. In these areas industrial uses are promoted and non-industrial uses discouraged. While a Home Improvement Store is a permitted use per Planning Code Section 222 (k), maintaining and fostering industrial land uses is an important component of the Bayview Area Plan and vital to San Francisco's local and regional economy.
15. *Job Creation*. Providing long term employment opportunities is a primary objective of the Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Project Area and the Bayview Hunters Point Area Plan (Bayview Hunters Point Area Plan Objective 9). Because a Conditional Use is required, it will be necessary to make the case that the proposal is necessary and desirable, along with other findings. As a part of the application submittal, please provide the Department with information on the types of jobs that will be provided and why this is a worthwhile use for this location. Particularly, please demonstrate how a Home Improvement Store will create economic opportunities for the City and the Bayview Hunters Point neighborhood.

## PRELIMINARY DESIGN COMMENTS:

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

1. *Site Design and Open Space.* Although this is a car dominated environment, people can be expected to arrive on foot, transit, or bicycle. To enhance the pedestrian experience and accessibility the Planning Department recommends refining the parking lot with landscaped foot paths, including access from the Evans sidewalk, starting as close as possible to the Evans and Cesar Chavez intersection. Place the Garden Center in a more prominent location closer to Evans or Cesar Chavez to activate and add visual interest. The Planning Department recommends exploring an option to provide a pedestrian bridge connection from Cesar Chavez.
2. *Parking and Circulation.* Circulation should be clear and free of conflict as possible. Locating a parking entry close to the Evans and Marin intersection has the potential to cause back-ups. The Planning Department recommends eliminating the drive way curb cut closest to the intersection of Evans, and providing one main entry to the parking.
3. *Architecture.* Although the proposal is a big box formula retail, the façade should make an attempt to be visually articulated and interesting along Cesar Chavez.
4. *Public Realm Improvements.* Per Planning Code Section 138.1, the Planning Department will require standard streetscape elements and sidewalk widening for the appropriate street type per the Better Streets Plan, including landscaping, site furnishings, and/or corner curb extensions (bulb-outs) at intersections. The project sponsor is required to submit a Streetscape Plan illustrating these features, and the Department Staff 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 and would 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 **November 21, 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: Scott A Mommer, Project Sponsor  
Diego R Sánchez, Current Planning  
Rachel Schuett, Environmental Planning  
Lily Langlois, Citywide Planning