



# SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

**MEMO**

**DATE:** February 6, 2013  
**TO:** Lawrence Lui, Cresleigh Development, Inc.  
**FROM:** Sarah B. Jones, Planning Department  
**RE:** PPA Case No. 2012.1384U for 400 Second Street


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, Rachel A. Schuett, at (415) 575-9030 or [Rachel.Schuett@sfgov.org](mailto:Rachel.Schuett@sfgov.org), to answer any questions you may have, or to schedule a follow-up meeting.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Sarah B. Jones, Senior Planner





# SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

---

## Preliminary Project Assessment

*Date:* February 6, 2013  
*Case No.:* **2012.1384U**  
*Project Address:* 400 Second Street, 645, 653, 657 and 665 Harrison Street  
*Block/Lot:* 3763/001, 078, 079, 080, 080A, 081, 099, 100, 101, 105, and 113  
*Zoning:* Service/Secondary Office District (SSO), Mixed-Use Office (MUO), and Light Industrial Districts (M-1)  
*Area Plan:* 40-X, 45-X, 65-X, and 85-X Height and Bulk Districts  
Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan (East SoMa Plan Area)  
Central Corridor Plan Area (In progress/Ongoing)  
*Project Sponsor:* Lawrence Lui, Cresleigh Development, Inc.  
415-982-7777  
*Staff Contact:* Rachel A. Schuett – (415) 575-9030  
[Rachel.Schuett@sfgov.org](mailto:Rachel.Schuett@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 demolish four of the five existing one- to four-story (approximately 12- to 48-foot buildings and construct three new buildings including: a 478,000 sq. ft. 28-story office building, a 300-room full service hotel, an up to 400-unit residential building, and 80,000 square feet of neighborhood retail and service stores, restaurants, and bars or lounges on the lower floors. There are five existing buildings on the project site: a 1-story 7,440 sq. ft. concrete office building constructed in 1946, a 1-story, 6,625 sq. ft. concrete industrial building constructed in 1946, a 1-story, 7,000 sq. ft. concrete industrial building constructed in 1955, a 4-story 65,150 sq. ft. brick office building constructed in 1917, and a 3-story 148,076 sq. ft. brick industrial building constructed in 1948. The 1948 brick industrial building (at 645 Harrison Street) is proposed for preservation and adaptive reuse as a podium for the proposed hotel building.

The project site is approximately 87,370 square feet (2.01 acres) and occupies the eastern two thirds of the block bounded by Harrison Street to the north, Third Street to the east, Perry Street (discontinuously) and the Caltrans parcel (under Interstate 80) to the south, and Second Street to the east. The project site is currently served by four public roads: Harrison, Second, and Perry Streets and Vassar Place. The proposed project could include closure of Vassar Place and conversion to a park for use by the public and the project's tenants. The proposed project could also include the extension of Perry Street to Vassar Place or to Second Street if an easement is available across the Caltrans parcel, a trapezoidal parcel bounded by Vassar Place to the east, Second Street to the west, and a vacant lot (Block 3763, Lot 113) to the north.

The proposed full service hotel would likely include a 10,000 square foot ballroom, 15,000 square feet of meeting space, and a roof top bar with a mostly glass retractable roof and temperature controlled environment. The office building would include a non-reflective curtain wall design with ceiling-to-floor windows and would be constructed with energy efficient systems , and exposed ceiling and structural steel members. The residential building would include up to 400 apartment units or condominiums (depending on the market at the time of construction), and a roof top club house for all residents. Ground floor retail uses would be included in all three buildings.

#### **PLANNING CONTEXT:**

The project site is located within the East SoMa area of the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan, as adopted in 2008. Based on the East SoMa Plan the 11 parcels which comprise the project site are currently zoned Service/Secondary Office (SSO), Mixed-Use Office (MUO), and Light Industrial (M-1). The current height and bulk limits for these parcels range from 40-X to 85-X.

The project site falls within the ongoing Central Corridor Plan study area, initiated in 2011. The Central Corridor Plan is currently in development, with a draft plan for public review to be released in early 2013. The draft plan will be evaluated in an Environmental Impact Report (EIR), which will commence in early 2013. The draft Plan will propose changes to the allowed land uses and building heights, and will include a strategy for improving the public realm in this area. The Plan and its rezoning are anticipated to be before decision-makers for approval in late 2014.

As part of the Central Corridor Plan, the Planning Department has developed preliminary recommendations for new land use controls as well as new height and bulk controls for the subject property, which we anticipate will be included in the draft Plan. The most recent plan concepts, which are available for download at <http://centralcorridor.sfplanning.org>, were presented at a public workshop on June 13, 2012. These concepts will form the basis of the draft Central Corridor Plan, though they are subject to change and refinement. Further comments in this PPA are based on the draft Central Corridor concepts published to date, which are contingent on the approval of the proposed Central Corridor Plan rezoning by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors.

The envisioned height and bulk designation for the project site in the proposed Central Corridor Plan Area ranges between 130 to 200 feet. The proposed project would be assessed based on the height districts in place at the time that the Planning Department entitlement is sought. The height of the

proposed project exceeds the height limits of both the current and proposed designations. In order for the project to proceed, the Board of Supervisors would need to approve a Height District Reclassification for the parcels which comprise the project site.

While the proposed project's height is greater than the proposed scenario, the Planning Department will analyze the project's proposed height as part of the higher height limit alternative in the Central Corridor Plan EIR. However, this analysis is not an indication of which height scenario will ultimately be adopted as part of the Plan and is not a guarantee that the Planning Commission or the Board of Supervisors will approve the proposed height. If the proposed project does not fit within the height and density identified for the project site in the *adopted* Central Corridor Plan and EIR, the proposed project will be precluded from a Community Plan Exemption (CPE) as discussed further, below.

Further, although the Central Corridor Plan EIR will include a programmatic analysis of the effects of higher height limits, the EIR will not include project-level analysis of private development projects; therefore, project-level analysis will be required, as discussed below.

#### **ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:**

The proposed project initially requires environmental review either individually, likely in a project-specific Environmental Impact Report (EIR), or in a Community Plan Exemption (CPE) under the Central Corridor Plan Environmental Impact Report (EIR). 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 project-specific significant effects not identified in the programmatic plan area EIR.

As stated above, the proposed project is located within the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan, which was evaluated in the *Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans Programmatic Final Environmental Impact Report EIR*, certified in 2008.<sup>1</sup> However, since the proposed project is not consistent with the development density identified in the area plan, it is not eligible for a community plan exemption (CPE) under the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan EIR. Given that the project site is within the geographic area evaluated in the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan EIR, any development on the project site would potentially be subject to the mitigation measures promulgated therein. Potentially significant project environmental impacts that were identified in and pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the area plan final EIR that may be applicable to the proposed project are included below, under the applicable environmental topic. However, it should also be noted that mitigation measures from the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan EIR (including those referenced below) could be refined, augmented or superseded under the Central Corridor Plan EIR.

As discussed above, the project site is located within the Central Corridor Plan study area, and will likely be included in the Central Corridor Plan and associated Environmental Impact Report (EIR). If the proposed project is determined to be consistent with the development density and building height and bulk limits ultimately adopted as part of the Central Corridor Plan, it may be determined to be eligible for

---

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

a community plan exemption (CPE) under the Central Corridor Plan EIR once the EIR is certified. Within the CPE process, there can be three different outcomes, as follows:

1. **CPE Only.** In this case, all potentially significant project-specific and cumulatively considerable environmental impacts are fully consistent with significant impacts identified in the underlying area plan EIR, meaning there would be no new “peculiar” significant impacts unique to the proposed project. In these situations, all pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the underlying area plan FEIR are applied to the proposed project, and a CPE checklist and certificate is prepared. With this outcome, the applicable fees, based on the current fee schedule, in addition to the Environmental Document Determination of \$13,004 are: (a) the \$ 7,216 CPE certificate fee; and (b) a proportionate share fee for recovery of costs incurred by the Planning Department for preparation of the underlying plan EIR. Fees for the preparation of the Central Corridor Plan EIR have yet to be determined.
2. **CPE and Focused Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration.** One or more new significant impacts of the proposed project specific to the site or the project proposal are identified that were not identified in the underlying plan area EIR. If any new significant impacts of the proposed project can be mitigated, then a focused Mitigated Negative Declaration to address these impacts is prepared together with a supporting CPE certificate to address all other impacts that were encompassed by the underlying plan area EIR, with all pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the underlying plan area EIR also applied to the proposed project. With this outcome, the applicable fees, based on the current fee schedule, in addition to the Environmental Document determination of \$13,004 are: (a) the standard environmental evaluation (EE) fee based on the cost of construction; and (b) a proportionate share fee for recovery for costs incurred by the Planning Department for preparation of the underlying plan EIR. Fees for the preparation of the Central Corridor Plan EIR have yet to be determined.
3. **CPE and Focused Environmental Impact Report (EIR).** One or more new significant impacts of the proposed project specific to the site or the project proposal are identified that was not identified in the underlying plan area EIR. If any new significant impacts of the proposed project cannot be mitigated, then a focused EIR to address these impacts is prepared together with a supporting CPE certificate to address all other impacts that were encompassed by the underlying plan area EIR, with all pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the underlying are plan EIR also applied to the proposed project. With this outcome, the applicable fees, based on the current fee schedule, in addition to the Environmental Document Determination of \$13,004 are: (a) the standard environmental evaluation (EE) fee based on the cost of construction; (b) one-half of the standard EIR fee; and (c) a proportionate share fee for recovery of costs incurred by the Planning Department for preparation of the underlying plan EIR. Fees for the preparation of the Central Corridor Plan EIR have yet to be determined.

Alternatively, the proposed project could be analyzed individually in a separate environmental review document. This would obviate the proposed project’s reliance on the certification of the Central Corridor Plan EIR, and potentially have beneficial effects to the environmental review schedule. In this case, the applicable fees would be (a) the standard environmental evaluation (EE) fee based on the cost of construction; and (b) the standard EIR fee, if an EIR is required.

In either case, based on our preliminary review the following topic areas would require additional study:

1. An **Environmental Evaluation Application** is required for the full scope of the project (demolition and expansion) and may include the following:
  - a. *Transportation Study.* Based on the Planning Department's Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines, the 28-story 478,000 sq. ft. office building, 300-room hotel, up to 400-unit residential building, and 80,000 square feet of neighborhood retail and service stores, restaurants, and bars or lounges would potentially add more than 2,000 PM peak hour person trips and thus would require additional transportation analysis. The Transportation Impact Study (TIS) would need to be prepared by a qualified consultant working at the direction of the Planning Department staff. The Planning Department's list of approved transportation consultants is available at [http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/MEA/Transportation\\_consultant\\_pool.pdf](http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/MEA/Transportation_consultant_pool.pdf). 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*. As noted on the *Fee Schedule*, there is a separate fee to SFMTA for review of the transportation report.
  - b. *Hazardous Materials.* The project site is not known to be underlain by artificial fill. However, given that some PDR uses have occurred on the site, and given that the proposed depth to excavation is 30 feet, a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) should be prepared to determine the potential for site contamination and the level of exposure risk associated with the project. The Phase I ESA should be submitted with the Environmental Evaluation Application. 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 (VRAP). Such recommendations would likely be included in the environmental review document as site-specific mitigation measures, under a CPE these would be referred to as "peculiar," site-specific impacts, unless the Central Corridor Plan EIR includes a programmatic mitigation measure regarding compliance with the VRAP. 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>.

Also, the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR identified *Mitigation Measure L-1 Hazardous Building Materials*, which required subsequent projects to properly dispose of any polychlorinated biphenols (PCB) such as florescent light ballasts or any other hazardous building materials in accordance with applicable local, state and federal laws.

- c. *Air Quality (AQ) Analysis.* The proposed project includes demolition of four of the five existing structures and the construction of three new buildings. Project-related demolition, excavation, grading and other construction activities may cause wind-blown dust that could contribute particulate matter into the local atmosphere. The Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR identified a significant impact related to construction air quality and included *Mitigation Measure G-1: Construction Air Quality*. Subsequently, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors approved a series of amendments to the San Francisco Building and Health Codes generally referred to 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 DBI. Pursuant to the Construction Dust Ordinance, the proposed project would

be required to prepare a *Construction Dust Control Plan* for review and approval by the San Francisco Department of Public Health.

The proposed project would introduce new residential land uses to the project site. Residential uses are considered sensitive for the purposes of air quality evaluation. The Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR identified a significant impact related to air quality for sensitive land uses and included *Mitigation Measure G-2: Air Quality for Sensitive Land Uses*. The project site is located within an air pollution hot spot, as identified by the City. Therefore, *Mitigation Measure G-2* of the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR would be applicable to the project site.

If the project would generate new sources of toxic air contaminants including, but not limited to: diesel generators or boilers, or any other stationary sources, the project would result in toxic air contaminants that may affect both on-site and off-site sensitive receptors. The Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR identified a significant impact related to uses that emit Diesel Particulate Matter (DPM) and included *Mitigation Measure G-3: Siting of Uses that Emit DPM* and *Mitigation Measure G-4: Siting of Uses that Emit other TACs (Toxic Air Contaminants)*.

During the environmental review process the project will be screened for potential air quality impacts to identify applicable mitigation measures from the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR and/or the Central Corridor Plan EIR.

- d. *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 regarding project compliance with the identified regulations 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 would comply 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.
- e. *Geotechnical*. Per the Planning Department GIS database, the project site is not located in a liquefaction or landslide hazard zone, and is likely underlain by Franciscan Complex sedimentary rocks. An investigation of geotechnical and soil conditions is required to make a determination as to whether the project would result in any environmental impacts related to structural damage, ground subsidence, liquefaction, landslides, and surface sediment. To assist our staff in their determination, it is recommended that you provide a copy of the geotechnical investigation with boring logs for the proposed project. This study will also help inform the archeological review.
- f. *Noise Study*. The Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR identified a number of noise mitigation measures applicable to construction as well as siting noise sensitive land uses (such as residential uses) in areas that are substantially affected by existing noise levels. The project site is located in an area where traffic-related noise exceeds 60 Ldn (a day-night averaged sound level). Application of *Noise Mitigation Measures F-1 and F-2 (Construction Noise)* are intended to reduce construction-related noise impacts. *Mitigation Measure F-1* applies to pile driving activities and would require that piles (if



included in foundation design) be pre-drilled. *Mitigation Measure F-2* would require construction projects near noise sensitive land uses implement noise attenuation measures. Project sponsors would be required to submit a plan that outlines the noise attenuation measures to be implemented during the construction phase. The plan must be submitted to the Department of Building Inspection (DBI), *Mitigation Measure F-4: Siting of Noise-Sensitive Uses* would apply as the project sponsor is proposing to site residential uses in an area that exceeds 60 Ldn. *Mitigation Measure F-4: Siting of Noise-Sensitive Uses* would require the sponsor to prepare an acoustical study that identifies potential noise-generating uses within 900 feet of, and having a direct line-of-sight to the project site and include at least one 24-hour noise measurement with maximum noise level readings taken at least every 15 minutes. The study should include any recommendations regarding the building design to ensure that the interior noise environment meets Title 24 Building Code acoustical requirements. This study must be completed during the environmental review process for inclusion in the environmental document. *Mitigation Measure F-6: Open Space in Noisy Environments* would also apply in order to protect the project's common open space from existing ambient noise levels. Compliance with this mitigation measure requires that site design consider elements that would shield on-site open space from the greatest noise sources and/or construction of noise barriers between noise sources and open space.

- g. *Historic Resource Evaluation Report (HREER)*. There are five existing buildings on the project site: a 1-story 7,440 sq.ft. concrete office building at 665 Harrison Street constructed in 1946 (Category A), a 1-story, 6,625 sq.ft. concrete industrial building at 657 Harrison Street constructed in 1946 (Category B), a 1-story, 7,000 sq. ft. concrete industrial building at 653 Harrison Street constructed in 1955 (Category B), a 3-story 148,076 sq. ft. brick industrial building at 645 Harrison Street constructed in 1948 (Category A), and a 4-story 65,150 sq. ft. brick office building at 400 Second Street constructed in 1917 (Category A). The building at 645 Harrison Street is proposed for preservation and adaptive reuse as a podium for the proposed hotel building. The other four buildings are proposed for demolition.

The existing buildings on site were identified in the South of Market Historic Resource Survey and assigned a rating of "3CS," which designates them as "appears eligible for California Register as an individual property through survey evaluation." As such, the existing buildings would be considered historic resources pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). To assist in the analysis of the proposed project, which includes demolition and new construction, the Planning Department requires a *Historic Resource Evaluation Report* to 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 to this project by the Planning Department during the submittal of the Environmental Evaluation Application. After submittal of the Environmental Evaluation Application, please contact the Senior Preservation Planner, Tina Tam, for the list of three historic resource consultants.

Instructions on completing this report are included in "San Francisco Preservation Bulletin No. 16: City and County of San Francisco Planning Department CEQA Review Procedures for Historic Resources." The preservation bulletin is available at [www.sfplanning.org](http://www.sfplanning.org) under: "Plans & Programs" "Historic Preservation" "Preservation Bulletins." Prior to initiating work on the *Historic Resource*

*Evaluation Report*, please have the selected consultant contact Planning Department Preservation Staff to scope the report.

- h. *Archeological Resources*. The proposed project includes demolition, excavation, grading, and foundation work to a depth of 30 feet below grade. The project site lies within the *Archeological Mitigation Zone J-1: Properties with Previous Studies* from the area plan EIR; therefore *Mitigation Measure J-1* would apply. *Mitigation Measure J-1* applies to properties for which a final archeological research design and treatment plan (ARDTP) is on file at the Northwest Information Center and the Planning Department. Given that the proposed project would result in soils-disturbance of more than 2.5 feet, the project sponsor is required to retain the services of a qualified archeological consultant with expertise in California prehistoric and urban historical archeology to prepare an addendum to the ARD/TP under the direction of Planning Department staff. The addendum to the ARD/TP shall evaluate the potential effects of the project on CEQA-significant archeological resources with respect to the site- and project-specific information absent in the ARD/TP.

The Planning Department's list of approved archeological consultants is available at:  
[http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/MEA/Archeological Review consultant pool.pdf](http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/MEA/Archeological%20Review%20consultant%20pool.pdf).

- i. *Shadow Study*. Planning Code Section 295 generally prohibits new buildings above 40 feet that would cast new shadow on open space that is under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Recreation and Park Commission between one hour after sunrise and one hour before sunset, at any time of the year, unless that shadow would not result in a significant adverse effect on the use of the open space. Please see Department comments below in the "Preliminary Project Comments" section.

The proposed project would result in construction of three buildings, each would be 40 feet or greater in height. A preliminary shadow fan analysis was prepared by Planning Department staff as part of this Preliminary Project Assessment. The preliminary shadow analysis indicates that the proposed project has the potential to cast new shadow on Yerba Buena Gardens, the Jessie Street Plaza (near the Contemporary Jewish Museum), and South Park. Of these, only South Park is subject to Section 295 analysis as discussed under 'Preliminary Project Comments.' Section 295 of the San Francisco Planning Code, the Sunlight Ordinance, was adopted to protect certain public open spaces from new shadow created by new structures. Section 295 prohibits the City from issuing building permits for structures or additions to structures greater than 40 feet in height that would shade property designated to be acquired by or under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Commission, during the period from one hour after sunrise to one hour before sunset. An exception can be made if the Planning Commission, in consultation with the Recreation and Park Commission, determines that such shade would not have an adverse impact on the use of such property. Shadow cast on other recreational resources, not subject to Section 295 requirements, is also evaluated as a potential environmental impact under CEQA.

Since the preliminary shadow fan analysis concluded that the proposed project could cast shadows on recreational resources, a detailed shadow study (prepared by a qualified consultant) is required. The consultant should prepare a proposed scope of work for review and approval by the Environmental Planning case manager prior to preparing the analysis.

- j. *Wind Study.* The proposed project would involve construction of a building(s) over 80 feet in height. The project therefore would require an initial review by a wind consultant, including a recommendation as to whether a wind tunnel analysis is needed. 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.
- 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 this 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. *Stormwater Management.* Prior to issuance of a building permit, the project sponsor is required to prepare and submit a Stormwater Control Plan (SCP) to the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) Wastewater Enterprise, Urban Watershed Management Program. The SCP shall demonstrate compliance with the City's Stormwater Design Guidelines. 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. This may include environmental factors such as the natural hydrologic system, city sewer collection system, and receiving body water quality. For more information on the SFPUC's stormwater management requirements, see <http://stormwater.sfwater.org>.
- m. *Notification of a Project Receiving Environmental Review.* If a Community Plan Exemption (CPE) is pursued for the proposed project 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 CPE process.

As described above, if any of the additional analyses determine that mitigation measures not identified in the area plan EIR are required to address peculiar impacts, the environmental document will be a community plan exemption plus a focused initial study/mitigated negative declaration. If the additional analyses identify impacts that cannot be mitigated, the environmental document will be a community plan exemption with a focused initial study/EIR. A community plan exemption and a community plan exemption plus a focused initial study/mitigated negative declaration can be prepared by Planning Department staff, but a community plan exemption with a focused initial study/EIR would need to be prepared by a consultant on the Planning Department's environmental consultant pool ([http://www.sfplanning.org/ftp/files/MEA/Environmental\\_consultant\\_pool.pdf](http://www.sfplanning.org/ftp/files/MEA/Environmental_consultant_pool.pdf)).

Please see "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](http://www.sfplanning.org).

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

**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. Note that the subject parcel is within the Central Corridor Plan area, with associated rezoning tentatively scheduled to be completed in mid- to late 2014. Please be advised that this review is based on the Central Corridor Plan rezoning concepts presented to the public at a public workshop on June 13, 2012, and is contingent on the approval of the proposed Central Corridor Plan rezoning by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors.

1. **Zoning.** The project site is located within SSO (Service/Secondary Office), MUO (Mixed Use Office and M-1 (Light Industrial) Districts. The draft zoning concepts published in June 2012 as part of the Central Corridor planning process indicate that a reclassification to MUO (Mixed-Use Office) is being considered for the site. The project would be assessed based on the zoning in place at the time that the Planning Department entitlement is sought.
2. **Height District.** The project site is located within the 40-X, 45-X, 65-X and 85-X height and bulk districts. The envisioned height and bulk designation for the project site in the proposed Central Corridor Plan Area ranges between 130 to 200 feet. The project would be assessed based on the height districts in place at the time that the Planning Department entitlement is sought. The height of the proposed project would exceed the height limit of the proposed designations. If these height districts are approved, in order for the project to proceed, the Board of Supervisors would need to approve a Height District Reclassification for the subject parcel.

While the proposed project's height is greater than the proposed Central Corridor Plan scenario, the Planning Department will analyze the project's proposed height as part of the higher height limit alternative in the Central Corridor Plan EIR. However, this analysis is not an indication of which height scenario will ultimately be adopted as part of the Plan and is not a guarantee that the Planning Commission or the Board of Supervisors will approve the proposed height.

3. **Large Project Authorization** from the Planning Commission is required per Planning Code Section 329 for the new construction of a building greater than 75 feet in height and greater than 25,000 gross square feet.
4. **Shadow Analysis.** A preliminary shadow fan analysis was conducted which indicated that the proposed project could potentially result in shadow impacts on nearby property owned by the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department (see "Preliminary Project Comments" below). As a result, the project must be approved by the Recreation and Park Commission. For more information, please contact:

Karen Mauney-Brodek  
Deputy Director for Park Planning  
Planning and Capital Division  
30 Van Ness, 4th Floor  
City of San Francisco  
Recreation and Parks

Karen.Mauney-Brodek@sfgov.org  
(415) 575-5601

5. **Office Allocation.** 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. Please be advised that as of the date of this letter, the Small Cap contains 1,215,167 square feet and the Large Cap contains 3,758,749 square feet. As proposed, your project would fall under the large cap.
6. A **Building Permit Application** is required for the demolition of the existing buildings on the subject property.
7. A **Building Permit Application** is required for the proposed new construction on the subject property.

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 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](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.

#### **PRELIMINARY PROJECT COMMENTS:**

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

1. **Existing Zoning.** The subject property is currently in the SSO, MUO, and M-1 districts, which permits the proposed office, residential, and hotel uses. However, the current 40-X, 45-X, 65-X and 85-X height and bulk districts do not permit the proposed height and bulk. Therefore, the project could not be approved under existing zoning.
2. **Central Corridor Plan.** As described above, the subject property falls within the ongoing Central Corridor Plan study area, initiated in 2011.

As part of the Central Corridor Plan, the Planning Department has developed preliminary recommendations for new land use controls as well as new height and bulk controls for the subject property. These concepts will form the basis of the draft Central Corridor Plan, though they are subject to change and refinement. Further comments in this section of the PPA are based on the most recent plan concepts (available at <http://centralcorridor.sfplanning.org>) which were presented at a public workshop on June 13, 2012.

In order for the project to proceed as proposed, the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors would need to approve new zoning controls for the subject parcel.

3. **Land Use.** The Central Corridor Plan concepts recommend rezoning the subject property to the MUO (Mixed Use-Office) zoning district. In the MUO, office, housing, hotel, and retail uses are currently allowed. The office use is generally consistent with key objectives of the Central Corridor Plan, which include providing support for substantial development in this transit-rich area, and favoring office development over other kinds of growth, particularly on large parcels. To implement the objective to favor office growth, the Central Corridor Plan concepts includes a new Special Use District south of Harrison Street that would limit new residential development to smaller parcels or, on larger parcels, as a component in a mixed-use project with major commercial development. The office component of the project would need to conform to FAR requirements on the parcel.
4. **Urban Form: Height and Bulk.** In recognition of the desire to accommodate more growth in the area, the draft Central Corridor Plan concepts recommend changing the height limits of the subject properties to 130 - 200 feet. Additionally, the draft concepts include a Higher Height Alternative, which would allow additional height, up to a maximum of 200 feet, on a portion of the subject property. In this alternative scenario, any portion of the building exceeding 85 feet in height would be subject to additional setback requirements and bulk restrictions. At minimum, 15-foot setbacks will be required above a height of 85 feet along all property lines. Please note that existing requirements in Eastern Neighborhoods districts for mid-block alleys and massing reduction for large projects would continue to apply.

The proposed building heights of 200 and 350 feet are above both the height limit and the Higher Height Alternative proposed in the Central Corridor Plan. The Planning Department will analyze the proposed height as part of the higher height limit alternative in the Central Corridor Plan EIR; however, this analysis is not an indication of which heights will ultimately be adopted as part of the Plan and is not a guarantee that the Planning Commission or the Board of Supervisors will approve the proposed height.

5. **Eco-District.** An Eco-district is a neighborhood or district where residents, community institutions, property owners, developers, and businesses join together with city leaders and utility providers to meet sustainability goals and co-develop innovative projects at a district or block-level. The Planning Department has identified the Central Corridor Plan area as a Type 2 Eco-District. All major new development in the Central Corridor Plan area will be expected to participate in the Eco-District program and the Sustainability Management Association set up to guide it. Please see <http://www.sfplanning.org/index.aspx?page=3051> or contact Kate McGee at 558-6367 for more information.

6. **Rear Yard.** Planning Code Section 134 requires the project to provide a rear yard of at least 25 percent of the lot depth at the lowest story containing a dwelling unit, and at each succeeding level or story of the building. The project does not propose any rear yard open space.
7. **Open Space – Residential.** Planning Code Section 135 requires that usable open space be located on the same lot as the dwelling units it serves. At least 80 square feet of usable open space per dwelling unit, or 54 square feet per dwelling unit of publicly accessible open space, is required. Up to 50 percent of the publicly accessible open space may be provided off-site. For a project on a sizeable lot, sufficient open space should be accommodated.
8. **Open Space – Non-Residential.** Planning Code Section 135.3 requires this project to provide one square foot of open space for every 250 occupied square feet of retail space, and one square foot of open space for every 50 occupied square feet of office space. No details regarding open space are provided. If the open space provided does not meet the minimum requirements, an in-lieu fee may be paid per Section 426. Please be aware that while under the current Planning Code, non-residential open space is not required to be open to the public in the MUO District, the Central Corridor planning process will most likely propose a change to require open space to be open to the public.
9. **Street trees.** Planning Code Section 138.1 requires one street tree for every 20 feet of frontage for new construction. No street trees are shown on the plans.
10. **Better Streets Plan.** In any district, streetscape and pedestrian elements in conformance with the Better Streets Plan shall be required per Planning Code Section 138.1(c)(2), if all the following conditions are present: (1) the project is on a lot that (a) is greater than ½-acre in total area, (b) contains 250 feet of total lot frontage on one or more publicly-accessible rights-of-way, or (c) the frontage encompasses the entire block face between the nearest two intersections with any other publicly-accessible rights-of-way, and (2) the project includes (a) new construction; (b) addition of 20% or more of gross floor area to an existing building; or (c) alteration to greater than 50% of the existing square footage of a building.

The project triggers requirement for the Better Streets Plan by meeting Conditions 1(a), (b) and 2(a). Project sponsors shall submit a streetscape plan 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.

11. **Standards for Bird Safe Buildings.** Planning Code Section 139 outlines bird-safe standards for new construction to reduce bird mortality from circumstances that are known to pose a high risk to birds and are considered to be "bird hazards." Feature-related hazards may create increased risk to birds and need to be mitigated. Any feature-related hazards, such as free-standing glass walls, wind barriers, or balconies must have broken glazed segments 24 square feet or smaller in size. Please review the standards and indicate the method of window treatments to comply with the requirements where applicable.

