



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

MEMO

DATE: June 7, 2013
TO: Drake Gardner, Zone Design
FROM: Lisa Gibson, Planning Department
RE: PPA Case No. 2013.0499U for 2249-2255 Taraval 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, Wade Wietgreffe, at (415) 575-9050 or wade.wietgreffe@sfgov.org, to answer any questions you may have, or to schedule a follow-up meeting.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Lisa Gibson", written over a horizontal line.

Lisa Gibson, Senior Planner



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Preliminary Project Assessment

Date: June 7, 2013
Case No.: **2013.0499U**
Project Address: 2249 – 2255 Taraval Street
Block/Lot: 2393/040
Zoning: Taraval Street Neighborhood Commercial District
Taraval Street Restaurant Subdistrict
50-X Height and Bulk District
Project Sponsor: Yalenn Company
415-812-7233
Staff Contact: Wade Wietgreffe, 415-575-9050
wade.wietgreffe@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 one lot at the northwest corner of the block bounded by Taraval Street to the north, 32nd Avenue to the east, Ulloa Street to the south, and 33rd Avenue to the west. The existing lot contains a 12.5-foot-tall, 960-square-foot auto repair facility with an undetermined amount of associated parking. The existing building was built in 1938. The proposed project involves the demolition of the existing building and construction of a new 52-foot-tall, 18,020-square-foot building consisting of seven dwelling units, 2,350 square feet of ground-floor retail space, and eight off-street parking spaces. The parking garage would be accessed from a 10-foot-wide curb cut along 33rd Avenue.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:

The project initially requires environmental review, which must be completed before any project approval may be granted. In order to facilitate environmental review and comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the applicant should submit an **Environmental Evaluation Application** (EEA).¹ The Planning Department will investigate the following issues as part of the environmental review process.

1. *Archeological Resources.* The application submitted for the Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) does not indicate the depth of below-ground surface excavation or type of proposed foundation. As part of the EEA, please indicate these items so Planning Department staff can evaluate the level of archeological review required. At that juncture, the Planning Department will address whether additional reporting and research will be required to determine whether the proposed project has the potential to adversely affect known or potential archeological resources.
2. *Historic Architectural Resources.* The proposed project consists of demolition of a building constructed in 1938. Under CEQA, evaluation of the potential for proposed projects to impact historical resources is a two-step process: the first is to determine whether the property is an historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5(a)(3) of CEQA; and, if it is determined to be an historical resource, the second is to evaluate whether the action or project proposed by the sponsor would cause a substantial adverse change. In this case, the project sponsor shall be required to submit a *Supplemental Information Form for Historic Resource Determination*² with the EEA. Based on the information provided in the *Supplementation Information Form for Historic Resource Determination*, the Planning Department will prepare a Historic Resource Evaluation Response to determine whether a consultant-prepared Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE) is required. If a HRE is required, the HRE would first determine if the building located on the project site is an eligible historic resource, and then, if applicable, analyze the impacts of the proposed project upon the resource. If a HRE is required, it must be prepared by a qualified consultant chosen from the Department's Historic Resources Consultant List (contact Tina Tam at 415-558-6325 for information about this list).³
3. *Air Quality.* The proposed project includes demolition of an existing building and construction of a new building. Project-related demolition, excavation, grading, and other construction activities may cause wind-blown dust and emissions from construction vehicles and equipment 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. Pursuant to the Construction Dust Control Ordinance, the

¹ Refer to <http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1886> for latest "Environmental Evaluation Application."

² Refer to <http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=5340>, Appendix B.

³ Refer to <http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1886> for "Administration of Historic Resources Consultant Pool."

proposed project will be required to comply with applicable dust control requirements outlined in the ordinance.

4. *Greenhouse Gas Emissions.* *The City and County of San Francisco's Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions* presents a comprehensive assessment of policies, programs, and ordinances that represents San Francisco's Qualified Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Reduction Strategy. Projects that are consistent with San Francisco's Qualified GHG Reduction Strategy would result in less-than-significant impacts from GHG emissions. In order to facilitate a determination of compliance with San Francisco's Qualified GHG Reduction Strategy, the Planning Department has prepared a Greenhouse Gas Analysis Compliance Checklist.⁴ If the Planning Department determines it necessary, the assigned environmental coordinator or CEQA consultant will prepare this checklist in coordination with the project sponsor.
5. *Shadow.* The proposed project would include a new building extending to 52 feet in height. Planning Code Section 295 requires that a shadow analysis must be performed to determine whether a new structure greater than 40 feet in height has the potential to cast shadow on properties under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Recreation and Park Commission. Department staff has prepared a shadow fan that indicates the proposed project would not cast new shadow on any properties under the jurisdiction of the Parks and Recreation Department, nor would it cast shadows on any other parks or open spaces. Please refer to attached shadow fan.
6. *Stormwater and Flooding.* The Stormwater Management Ordinance (SMO) requires that the project sponsor of any project resulting in a ground disturbance of 5,000 square feet or greater prepare a Stormwater Control Plan (SCP), consistent with the November 2009 Stormwater Design Guidelines. Responsibility for review and approval of the SCP is with the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) Wastewater Enterprise, Urban Watershed Management Program. The initial CEQA evaluation of a project will broadly discuss how the SMO will be implemented. The project's environmental evaluation will generally evaluate how and where the implementation of required stormwater management and Low Impact Design approaches would reduce potential negative effects of stormwater runoff related to the proposed project. This may include environmental factors such as the natural hydrologic system, city sewer collection system, and receiving body water quality.
7. *Hazards and Hazardous Materials.* The project site is the location of two, closed leaking underground storage tank (LUST) cases and the project site is currently used as an auto repair facility. Therefore, a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) shall be prepared to determine the potential for site contamination and the level of exposure risk associated with the project. The Phase I ESA shall be submitted with the EEA, along with any other information the applicant has in relation to the two LUST cases. Review of the Phase I ESA and any additional studies recommended by the Phase I ESA would require oversight from the San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH). If Planning staff, working with DPH, determines that there is a potential to release hazardous materials,

⁴ Refer to <http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1886> for latest "Greenhouse Gas Compliance Checklist for Private Development Projects."

including soils, measures would identified to reduce impacts and would be applicable to the proposed project. Please note that the DPH charges a fee for their review.⁵

Upon submitting an EEA, please submit the appropriate fees. Within the environmental review process, the potential environmental review documents and associated fees would be as follows:

- (i) **a Certificate of Determination of Exemption:** if the additional analysis performed after submittal of the EEA indicates that the project would not have a significant effect on the environment, the project may qualify for a Categorical Exemption, in which case the Planning Department would issue a Certificate of Determination of Exemption from Environmental Review. Categorical Exemptions may be appealed to the Board of Supervisors. Refer to page 12 of the current Fee Schedule⁶ for costs, which is based on construction cost. Based on the application submitted for the PPA and the construction cost of \$1,750,000, the fee would be \$12,989.
- (ii) **a Mitigated Negative Declaration:** if the additional analysis performed after submittal of the EEA indicates that the project may have a significant effect on the environment, Planning Department staff would prepare an Initial Study to determine whether an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is needed. If the Department determines that the project would not have a significant effect on the environment, the Department would issue a Preliminary Negative Declaration (PND). If the Department finds that the project would have significant impacts that can be reduced to a less-than-significant level by mitigation measures agreed to by the project sponsor, then the Department would issue a Preliminary Mitigated Negative Declaration (PMND).

The PND or PMND would be circulated for public review for a period of 20 calendar days, during which time concerned parties may appeal the determination. If an appeal is filed, the Planning Commission will hold a hearing to decide the appeal. If no appeal is filed, the Planning Department would issue a Final Negative Declaration (FND) or Final Mitigated Negative Declaration (FMND). The FMND can also be appealed to the Board of Supervisors, which would then hold a hearing to decide the appeal. Refer to page 8 of the current Fee Schedule for costs, which is based on construction cost. Based on the application submitted for the PPA and the construction cost of \$1,750,000, the fee would be \$31,616.

- (iii) **an Environmental Impact Report:** if the Initial Study process (step ii above) indicates that the project would result in a significant impact that cannot be mitigated to below a significant level, the Department would then require the preparation of an EIR. The applicant may select an environmental consultant to prepare the requisite CEQA documentation. The Planning Department will provide a list of three consultants from

⁵ Refer to <http://www.sfdph.org/dph/EH/HazWaste/hazWasteSiteMitigation.asp> for fees and more information about DPH's review of hazardous waste.

⁶ Refer to <http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=2611> for latest "Fee Schedule for Applications."

the environmental consultant pool⁷ that the project sponsor must choose from and this process would be managed by an environmental coordinator assigned to this case upon receipt of the EEA and documentation listed above. The Planning Department would provide more detail to the project sponsor regarding the EIR process should this level of environmental review be required. Please refer to page 9 of the current Fee Schedule for potential fees, which would be in addition to the Initial Study fees.

PLANNING DEPARTMENT APPROVALS:

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

1. A **Demolition Permit Application** is required for the demolition of the existing building on the subject property.
2. A **Building Permit Application** is required for the proposed new construction on the subject property.

Demolition and 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.

1. **Pre-Application.** The proposed project requires a Pre-Application meeting in accordance with the minimum standards of the Pre-Application Process as the project proposes new construction. 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 and then “Map Library”.
2. **Neighborhood Notification.** The proposed project includes new construction; therefore, owners and occupants within 150 feet of the project site must also be notified, in accordance with Planning Code Section 312. In addition, the Planning Department would send a neighborhood notice as part of environmental review to owners and occupants of properties within 300 feet of the project site. These mailing labels will be requested by the assigned environmental coordinator. Other notices may be required depending on the level of environmental review necessary.

⁷ Refer to http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/MEA/consultant_pool_admin_update_8-31-10.pdf for further information regarding the environmental consultant pool.

PRELIMINARY PROJECT COMMENTS:

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

1. **Priority-Planning Policies.** Section 101.1 establishes eight priority-planning policies and requires review of conditional use, variance, and change of use applications for consistency with said policies.
2. **Rear Yard.** Section 134 requires the project to provide a rear yard of at least 25 percent of the lot depth. The proposed rear yard complies with the rear yard requirement.
3. **Open Space – Residential.** Section 135 requires 100 square feet of private usable open space for each dwelling unit or 133 square feet of common usable open space for each dwelling unit. Additionally, any such open spaces must meet the dimensional requirements of Subsections (f) and (g). The proposed project appears to meet the open space requirement.
4. **Awnings.** When the width of all awnings exceeds 10 feet measured along the direction of the street, the horizontal projection of such awnings shall not exceed four feet from the face of the supporting building and the vertical distance from the top to the bottom of such awnings shall not exceed four feet, including any valance. Please present compliance on plans for future submitted applications, as it unclear from the plans submitted for the PPA if the proposed project meets this requirement.
5. **Street trees.** Planning Code Section 138.1 requires one street tree for every 20 feet of frontage for new construction. The proposed project appears to meet the street tree requirement.
6. **Residential Density.** Per Section 741.91 of the Planning Code, the residential density for the property is limited to one dwelling per every 800 square feet of lot area which equals seven dwelling units. The project meets this requirement.
7. **Bicycle Parking.** Planning Code Section 155.5 requires one Class 1 space for every 2 dwelling units for projects up to 50 dwelling units. Four Class 1 bicycle parking spaces are required for the proposed project, but none are provided. Refer to Preliminary Design Comments section below for additional comments.
8. **Height Limit.** The property is located within a 50-X Height and Bulk District. In order to encourage generous ground-floor ceiling heights for commercial and other active uses, encourage additional light and air into ground floor spaces, and create better building frontage on the public street, up to an additional 5 feet of height is allowed along major streets, pursuant to Section 263.20 of the Code. The project appears to take advantage of this requirement, but refer to Preliminary Design Comments section below.

9. **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.⁸

PRELIMINARY DESIGN COMMENTS:

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

1. **Site Design, Open Space, and Massing.** The Planning Department appreciates the high ground floor and predominance of active uses at the ground level. However, Planning Code Section 145.1 requires that all ground-level frontages, with certain exceptions, contain active uses. The proposed off-street parking screened by the green wall does not count as an “active” use and must be set back at least 25 feet.

The Planning Department recommends that the at-grade parking fronting 33rd Avenue be eliminated and restricted to the interior of the site or relocated below grade. The Planning Department recommends a ground-floor residential unit be located in the space currently proposed for the three parking spaces.

The Planning Department appreciates the attention to the design of the residential entrance and suggests more could be done with a few architectural and spatial refinements. The Planning Department recommends enlarging the width and better expressing the double height at the storefront. Also consider the roof form in best expressing this space.

Because of its lack of visibility and direct access, the Planning Department questions the use and viability of retail space #3.

2. **Vehicle Circulation, Access and Parking.** The Planning Department recommends that a single 10-foot-wide garage opening on 33rd Avenue be used for all parking ingress and egress. This should be sufficient for a limited number of parking spaces. The project sponsor may want to consider parking stackers as a means of minimizing the parking footprint.

Bike parking is not shown, but is required as discussed under Preliminary Project Comments, above. Such parking should be as close as possible to the lobby or garage entrance to minimize the travel distance through the garage and conflict with automobiles.

3. **Street Frontage.** The Planning Department recommends exploring the option of a ground-floor residential unit on 33rd Avenue with a raised and setback landscaped entry with direct access to the dwelling to provide a transition from the street. A setback terrace at the ground level may count toward open space.

⁸ Refer to <http://www.sfwater.org/modules/showdocument.aspx?documentid=1292>.

Refer to the draft Ground Floor Residential Design Guidelines for treatment of the building along the street if the project ultimately proposes residential uses on the ground floor.⁹

4. **Architecture.** Vinyl windows are discouraged. The Planning Department recommends windows with a deep recess and detailing at the jambs, sill and heads.

The Planning Department suggests simplification of the material palette by unifying the balcony guardrails with a material from the body of the building.

At this point, the architecture is assumed to be preliminary and the Planning Department would provide further detailed design review on the subsequent submission of materials and details to insure that the original design intent is achieved. The Planning Department encourages a simple palette of materials and details that work together.

It is expected that the architecture and quality of execution will be superior. High-quality materials combined with exceptional articulation and detailing on all visible facades will be essential to the success of approval of this project.

PRELIMINARY PROJECT ASSESSMENT EXPIRATION:

This Preliminary Project Assessment is valid for a period of **18 months**. An EEA or Building Permit Application, as listed above, must be submitted no later than **December 7, 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.

Enclosure: Shadow Fan

cc: Drake Gardner, Project Contact
Michael Smith, Current Planning
Neil Hrushowy, Citywide Planning
David Winslow, Citywide Planning
Susan Exline, Citywide Planning
Jorge Rivas, Mayor's Office of Economic & Workforce Development

⁹ Refer to <http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=2471> for "Guidelines for Ground Floor Residential Design."



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

June 3, 2013

Drake Gardner
Zone Design Development
10 Carlile Drive
Novato, CA 94945

CASE NO. **2013.0420K – Shadow Analysis**
ADDRESS: **2249-2255 Taraval Street**
BLOCK/ LOT: **2393/040**

Dear Mr. Gardner:

The Department has reviewed the proposed project for compliance with Section 295 of the San Francisco Planning Code, which restricts structures over 40 feet in height from casting a new shadow on properties under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Parks Department.

A shadow fan (attached) was prepared to determine the shadow impact of the proposed project. The shadow fan indicates that a project at this height will not cast a new shadow on any properties protected by Section 295.

The Planning Department hereby concludes that the proposed project complies with the provisions of Section 295.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (415) 575-9125 or casey.noel@sfgov.org.

Sincerely,

Casey Noel
Current Planning/Southwest Quadrant

Attachment:

Shadow Fan, depicting proposed building at 52 feet in height

cc: Wade Wietgreffe, Environmental Planning
 Stacy Bradley, San Francisco Recreation and Park Department (*via email*)

KMG G:\Documents\MEMOS\2249-2255 Taraval Street_Shadow Impact.doc

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

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377



Title: 2249-2255 Taraval Street - Shadow Analysis

Comments: Shadow generated by 52-foot tall building, occupying +/- 75% of parcel.

Printed: 3 June, 2013



The City and County of San Francisco (CCSF) does not guarantee the accuracy, adequacy, completeness or usefulness of any information. CCSF provides this information on an "as is" basis without warranty of any kind, including but not limited to warranties of merchantability or fitness for a particular purpose, and assumes no responsibility for anyone's use of the information.