



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

MEMO

DATE: October 2, 2012
TO: Terry Todd, Perkowitz + Ruth
FROM: Devyani Jain, Planning Department
RE: PPA Case No. 2012.0536U for 345 Williams 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, Jessica Range, at (415) 575-9018 or Jessica.Range@sfgov.org, to answer any questions you may have, or to schedule a follow-up meeting.



Devyani Jain, Senior Planner



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Preliminary Project Assessment

Date: October 2, 2012
Case No.: 2012.0536U
Project Address: 345 Williams Avenue
Block/Lot: 5423A/009
Zoning: NC-3, Neighborhood Commercial Shopping Center District
65-J Height and Bulk District
Project Sponsor: Terry Todd, Perkowitz + Ruth
(562)-628-8000
Staff Contact: Jessica Range – (415) 575-9018
jessica.Range@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 is located at 345 Williams Avenue within the former Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Area (Assessor's Block 5423A, Lot 029). The project site has frontages along Phelps Street and Williams Avenue. The proposal is to demolish an existing 29,397 square foot (sf) FoodsCo Warehouse Supermarket and construct a new 47,134 sf FoodsCo Warehouse Supermarket reaching 26 feet tall and a maximum height of 35 feet tall with architectural features. The new building would be constructed in approximately the same location. The proposal would result in an increase of 17,737 sf of supermarket use on the site. The project sponsor proposes to vacate a 20-foot-wide portion of Williams Avenue, thereby removing on-street parking. The vacated portion of Williams Avenue would be used to accommodate the proposed supermarket as well as provide additional

off-street parking spaces. The project would add an additional 55 off-street parking spaces, resulting in a total of 150 parking spaces.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:

The project initially requires the following documentation as part of the environmental review process, which must be completed before any project approval may be granted:

1. **An Environmental Evaluation Application:** In order to facilitate environmental review and comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the applicant shall submit an Environmental Evaluation Application (EEA). The information in the EEA shall be supplemented with the following background studies:
 - a. **Aesthetics.** The project sponsor proposes demolition of the existing FoodsCo supermarket, construction of a new supermarket in approximately the same location, although with a larger footprint to accommodate the proposed 17,000 sf expansion. The expansion would require the vacation of a portion of Williams Avenue. Additionally, as discussed further below, the Department recommends a different configuration of the supermarket on the project site. Under both proposals, the project would result in a visual change to either the public right of way (as is the case with the current proposal) or street frontages along Phelps Street and Williams Avenue (as is the case with the Department recommendations). Although the project would not affect any scenic vista or streets that are visually important, as identified in the San Francisco General Plan, given the residential character of the surrounding neighborhood, the Planning Department may require photo simulations of the proposed project in the context of its surroundings from nearby public viewpoints. The Department would require, at a minimum, "before" and "after" photos of the project site.
 - b. **Archeological Study.** The project is subject to preliminary archeological review by Department staff. This review will commence after submittal of an EEA and geotechnical study/studies (see below). At that juncture, 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. **Historic Architectural Resources.** According to the Planning Department's records, the existing FoodsCo building on the subject property was constructed in 1964, making it 48 years old at the time of this review. The State of California Office of Historic Preservation recommends documenting and taking into consideration in the planning process, any cultural resource that is 50 years old. Because the existing building is 48 years old, it is not likely to be considered an historical resource for the purpose of environmental review.

However, should an EEA be submitted by the year 2014, the Planning Department would consider the existing building a potential historic resource and would require project sponsor to submit a Supplemental Historic Resource Evaluation form to determine whether the proposed project is a historic resource for the purposes of CEQA. The Department would determine, based on the information provided in the Supplemental Historic Resource Evaluation, whether an *Historic Resource Evaluation* (HRE) is required. If such a determination is made, the HRE shall be prepared by a qualified professional who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards in Historic Architecture or Architectural History. The qualified professional must be selected from one of three historic resource consultants assigned by Tina Tam, Senior Preservation Planner at the Planning Department. Please contact Tina Tam at (415) 558-6325 or at tina.tam@sfgov.org.

- d. **Transportation.** Based on a preliminary review of the plans submitted as part of this Preliminary Project Assessment, the Department has determined that a Transportation Study is not likely to be required. However, a final determination will be made upon submittal and review of an EEA. Irrespective of whether or not a Transportation Study is required, the Department will review the proposed circulation plans closely in order to ensure that loading activities are accommodated and any potential effects on MUNI are minimized.
- e. **Air Quality.** The project includes demolition of an existing supermarket and construction of a new 47,134 sf supermarket. Project-related excavation, grading and other construction activities may cause wind-blown dust that could contribute particulate matter into the local atmosphere. To reduce construction dust impacts, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors approved a series of amendments to the San Francisco Building and Health Codes generally referred hereto as the Construction Dust Control Ordinance (Ordinance 176-08, effective July 30, 2008) with the intent of reducing the quantity of dust generated during site preparation, demolition, and construction work in order to protect the health of the general public and of onsite workers, minimize public nuisance complaints, and to avoid orders to stop work by the Department of Building Inspection (DBI). Pursuant to the Construction Dust Ordinance, the proposed project would be required to comply with applicable dust control requirements outlined in the ordinance. The project, as proposed in this Preliminary Project Assessment application is not likely to require additional air quality studies.
- f. **Greenhouse Gas Compliance Checklist for Private Development Projects.** Potential environmental effects related to greenhouse gas emissions from the proposed project need to be addressed in a project's environmental evaluation. An electronic version of the

Greenhouse Gas Compliance Checklist Table 1 for Private Development Projects is available on the Planning Department's website at: <http://www.sfplanning.org/index.aspx?page=1886>. The project sponsor would be required to submit the completed table demonstrating project compliance with the identified regulations, as applicable, and provide project-level details in the discussion column. This information will be reviewed by the environmental planner during the environmental review process to determine if the project complies with San Francisco's Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy. Projects that do not comply with an ordinance or regulation may be determined to be inconsistent with San Francisco's Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy.

- g. **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 in height, unless the Planning Commission finds the impact to be less than significant. Based on a review of the preliminary plans, it appears that the tallest portion of the project building would be 35 feet. Therefore a shadow study is not required.
- h. **Stormwater Management Ordinance.** The City and County of San Francisco Stormwater Management Ordinance (SMO) became effective on May 22, 2010. This ordinance requires that any project resulting in ground disturbance of 5,000 square feet or greater prepare a Stormwater Control Plan (SCP), consistent with the November 2009 Stormwater Design Guidelines (SDG). Responsibility for review and approval of the SCP is with the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission Wastewater Enterprise, Urban Watershed Management Program (UWMP). The initial CEQA evaluation of a project will broadly discuss how the SMO will be implemented. The project's environmental evaluation would generally evaluate how and where the implementation of required stormwater management and Low Impact Design (LID) approaches would reduce potential negative effects of project-related stormwater runoff. This may include a discussion of environmental factors such as the natural hydrologic system, city sewer collection system, and receiving body water quality. The EEA and plans shall include sufficient information describing how the project has been designed to comply with the SMO.
- i. **Geotechnical Study.** The applicant shall submit a geotechnical study with the EEA that investigates the soils underlying the site and identifies any geotechnical concerns related to the proposed structural system. The soils investigation conducted as part of the Geotechnical Study shall also identify whether the site contains serpentine soils. The geotechnical study should determine whether the site is subject to liquefaction and landslides, and should highlight any recommendations for addressing potential project

impacts, as applicable, associated with any of the geotechnical concerns identified in the study. Additionally, if the geotechnical report completed for the existing FoodsCo is available, please also provide a copy as part of the submittal.

- j. **Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA).** The applicant shall submit an Environmental Site Assessment with the EEA. The ESA should investigate existing environmental conditions at the project site, which may include: potential leaking underground fuel tanks on the adjacent lot at 2540 Newhall Street, or other adjacent lots; the potential for asbestos-containing building materials (ACBM) and lead-based paint in the existing on-site building; possible soils contamination associated with the site's surface parking lot; and documented releases of hazardous substances within 0.5 miles of the project site, if any. The project site is also located within an area with known serpentine rock and soils, therefore it is likely that a Phase II ESA will be required to further investigate below-grade soils contamination and the presence of naturally occurring asbestos on-site. However, the Phase I ESA should include professional recommendations as to whether further investigation (e.g., soils sampling) is warranted. Based on Environmental Planning's initial review of the Phase I ESA, the project sponsor may be directed by Planning staff to provide copies of the Phase I and/or Phase II ESA(s) to the San Francisco Department of Public Health (SFDPH) for their review. If it is determined that the site requires soils remediation, SFDPH provides oversight of remediation activities through their Voluntary Remedial Action Plan Program (VRAP). Review of any Environmental Site Assessment and enrollment in the VRAP would be subject to SFDPH's standard fees effective at the time of SFDPH receipt of materials. For more information on the VRAP administered by SFDPH, please see: <http://www.sfdph.org/dph/EH/HazWaste/hazWasteSiteMitigation.asp>.
- k. **Tree Disclosure Affidavit.** 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. Any tree identified in the Disclosure Statement must be shown on the Site Plans with size of the trunk diameter, tree height, and accurate canopy drip line. Please submit an Affidavit with the Environmental Evaluation Application and ensure trees are appropriately shown on site plans.
- l. **Notification of a Project Receiving Environmental Review.** Notice is required to be sent to occupants of properties adjacent to the project site and owners of properties within 300 feet of the project site at the initiation of the environmental review process. Please provide these mailing labels at the time of submittal.

Based on a preliminary review of the information contained within the PPA application, the Planning Department requires the preparation of an Initial Study. The Initial Study contains all topics on the City's standardized CEQA checklist. Based on an initial evaluation of the proposed project it is likely that the project would require preparation of a Negative Declaration or Mitigated Negative Declaration (if mitigation measures are identified that would reduce potential adverse effects to less-than-significant levels). However, if based on the analysis conducted as part of the Initial Study, it is determined that the project could have a significant effect on the environment, the Department would then require the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report. The applicant may select an environmental consultant to prepare the requisite CEQA documentation. The selection of environmental consultants is subject to the Planning Department's *Consultant Selection Guidelines* and this process would be managed by an environmental planner that will be assigned to this case upon receipt of the EEA and documentation listed above.

Please submit an **Environmental Evaluation Application**. 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. **Conditional Use authorization** from the Planning Commission is required per Planning Code Sections 121.2 and 703.4 for the new construction of a building greater than 6,000 square feet within the NC-S (Neighborhood Commercial Shopping Center) zoning district and for establishing a formula retail use within the NC-S (Neighborhood Commercial Shopping Center) zoning district, respectively.
2. A **Building Permit Application** is required for the demolition of the existing building on the subject property.
3. A **Building Permit Application** is required for the proposed new construction on the subject property.

Conditional Use authorization 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 Inspection 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. Neighborhood group mailing lists can be found on the Planning Department website at:

<http://www.sfplanning.org/index.aspx?page=2471>.

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 "Permits & Zoning" tab. All registered neighborhood group mailing lists are available online at www.sfplanning.org under the "Resource Center" tab.

The project is also subject to Planning Code Section 312 Neighborhood Notification, as it seeks to establish a formula retail use within the NC-S (Neighborhood Commercial Shopping Center) zoning district.

PRELIMINARY PROJECT COMMENTS:

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

1. **Street trees.** Planning Code Section 138.1 requires that one street tree for every 20 feet of frontage on Phelps Street and Williams Avenue be planted. Please refer to Section 138.1(c)(1)(ii) for minimum specifications for each street tree. Further, Planning Code Section 138.1 requires a streetscape plan be submitted to the Planning Department showing the location, design, and dimensions of all existing and proposed streetscape elements in the public right-of-way directly adjacent to the fronting property, including street trees, sidewalk landscaping, street lighting, site furnishings, utilities, driveways, and curb lines, and the relation of such elements to proposed new construction and site work on the subject property.
2. **Off-Street Parking Screening and Greening.** Planning Code Section 142 requires that the perimeter of the off-street parking area provide a screening feature. Screening shall add to the visual diversity of the use and need not be an opaque barrier. It must conform to the features listed under Planning Code Section 142(c).
3. **Street Frontage Requirement in Neighborhood Commercial Districts.** Planning Code Section 145.1 requires that the project comply with the parking and loading entrances, ground floor ceiling height and the transparency and fenestration controls.
4. **Off-Street Parking.** Planning Code Section 151 requires one off-street parking space for each 500 square feet of occupied floor area up to 20,000 where the occupied floor area exceeds 5,000

square feet, plus one for each 250 square feet of occupied floor area in excess of 20,000. Please confirm and indicate the occupied floor area, as defined by Planning Code Section 102.10.

5. **Shower Facilities.** Planning Code Section 155.3 requires the project to provide a minimum of one shower facility with two clothes lockers.
6. **Bicycle Parking.** Planning Code Section 155.4 requires the project to provide a minimum of three bicycle parking spaces.
7. **Car sharing.** Planning Code Section 166 requires the project to provide at least three car share spaces given the number of proposed off-street parking spaces.
8. **Diaper Changing Stations.** Planning Code Section 168 requires the installation and maintenance of at least one Baby Diaper-Changing Accommodation that is accessible to women and one that is accessible to men, or a single Diaper-Changing Accommodation that is accessible to both, at each floor level containing restrooms accessible to the public. The project shall provide signage at or near its entrance indicating the location of the Baby Diaper-Changing Accommodations.
9. **Transit Impact Development Fee.** The proposal is subject to the Transit Impact Development Fee, as indicated under Planning Code Section 411, under the Retail/Entertainment economic activity category
10. **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
11. **Stormwater.** Projects that disturb 5,000 sf 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.
12. **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.

PRELIMINARY DESIGN COMMENTS:

The Planning Department supports the continued use of a grocery store at this location. The following comments address preliminary design issues that may significantly impact the proposed project:

1. **Site design.** The existing building is setback from the corner of Williams Avenue and Phelps Street and is fronted by surface parking that is highly visible from the street. While the Planning Department supports the use of a neighborhood-serving grocery store at this site, the Department recommends re-configuring the site plan by locating the grocery store at the corner of Phelps Street and Williams Avenue to reinforce the street corner and provide direct pedestrian access from these Streets. The Planning Department also recommends providing the parking in a less prominent location on-site. This configuration might also allow construction of the new building to occur while the existing store remains open.

To reinforce and animate the un-built perimeter of the site, the Planning Department recommends a green wall or decorated fencing as an effective means of screening a large parking lot. Surface parking should be wrapped by active uses. If this is not possible, surface parking should be screened by a minimum of 10 feet of heavy planting.

The Planning Department would like to see the proposed development exhibiting greater relation in terms of scale and use to the existing residential uses across the street. The Department recommends the project design include an articulation that would be more in keeping with the surrounding finer-grained neighborhood pattern, consistent with Fundamental Design Principles for Building Mass and Articulation.

2. **Vehicle Circulation, Parking, and Loading.** The size of the proposed two-way parking entrances should be a maximum of 24 feet wide.
3. **Public Realm Improvements.**
 - a. **Street Vacation.** The Planning Department does not support the vacation of a portion of Williams Avenue for the proposed commercial use and accessory parking, nor does it see an economic necessity or other overriding benefit. The proposal should be redesigned to accommodate on-street parking that serves the proposal without requiring the vacation of portions of Williams Avenue.
 - b. **Street Improvements.** Per Planning Code Section 138.1, the department may 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 (see Better Streets Plan Section 4 for Standard Improvements and Section 5.3 for bulb-out guidelines available at: <http://www.sf->

planning.org/ftp/BetterStreets/proposals.htm). 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 streetscape improvements would be 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 **March 3, 2014**. 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.

cc: Mark Salma, Property Owner
Diego Sanchez, Current Planning
David Winslow, Design
Kate McGee, Citywide Planning
Tina Tam, Preservation