



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Preliminary Project Assessment

Date: July 8, 2013
Case No.: **2013.0614U**
Project Address: 600 South Van Ness Avenue
Block/Lot: 3575/070
Zoning: UMU (Urban-Mixed Use) District
58-X Height and Bulk District
Project Sponsor: Michael Leavitt, Leavitt Architecture Inc.
(415) 674-9100
Staff Contact: Brett Bollinger – (415) 575-9024
brett.bollinger@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 a 9,496 square foot (sf) lot containing a one-story auto repair building, formerly used as a tow car operator, built circa 1945. The property is located at the southwest corner of 17th Street and South Van Ness Avenue on a block bounded by Capp and 18th Streets in the Mission District neighborhood. The proposed project includes demolition of the existing structure and construction of a new 58'-0" tall, five-story, 32,000 sf, 27-unit residential building with 2,540 sf of ground floor retail space. The proposed project would also provide 21 parking spaces within a ground floor garage.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:

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

Section 15183 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines states that projects that are consistent with the development density established by a community plan for which an environmental impact report (EIR) was certified do not require additional environmental review, except as necessary to determine the presence of project-specific significant effects not identified in the programmatic plan area EIR.

The proposed project is located within the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan, which was evaluated in *Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans Programmatic Final Environmental Impact Report EIR* (Eastern Neighborhoods Plan EIR), which was certified in 2008.¹ Because the proposed project is consistent with the development density identified in the area plan, it is eligible for community plan exemption (CPE). Potentially significant project environmental impacts that were identified in and pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the underlying area plan final EIR may be applicable to the proposed project.

Environmental evaluation is required for the full scope of the project. Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), this project is likely to qualify for a community plan exemption (CPE) under the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan EIR. Within the CPE process, there can be three different outcomes as follows:

1. **CPE Only.** All potentially significant project-specific and cumulatively considerable environmental impacts are fully consistent with significant impacts identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan Area EIR, and 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 Eastern Neighborhoods Plan Area EIR are applied to the proposed project, and a CPE checklist and certificate is prepared. With this outcome, the applicable fees are: (a) the CPE determination fee; (b) the CPE certificate fee; and (c) a proportionate share fee for recovery for costs incurred by the Planning Department for the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan Area EIR.
2. **CPE + Focused Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration.** If new site- or project-specific significant impacts are identified for the proposed project that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan Area EIR, and if these new significant impacts can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level, then a focused mitigated negative declaration is prepared to address these impacts, and a supporting CPE certificate is prepared to address all other impacts that were encompassed by the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan Area EIR, with all pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan Area EIR also applied to the proposed project. With this outcome, the applicable fees are: (a) the CPE determination fee; (b) the standard environmental evaluation fee (which is based on construction value); and (c) a proportionate share fee for recovery for costs incurred by the Planning Department for the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan Area EIR.

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

3. **CPE + Focused EIR.** If any new site- or project-specific impacts cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level, then a focused EIR is prepared to address these impacts, and a supporting CPE certificate is prepared to address all other impacts that were encompassed by the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan Area EIR, with all pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan Area EIR also applied to the proposed project. With this outcome, the applicable fees are: (a) the CPE determination fee; (b) the standard environmental evaluation fee (which is based on construction value); (c) one-half of the standard EIR fee (which is also based on construction value); and (d) a proportionate share fee for recovery for costs incurred by the Planning Department for the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan Area EIR.

Please submit an *Environmental Evaluation Application*. See pages 2, 10, and 11 of the current *Fee Schedule* for calculation of environmental fees inside adopted plan areas.²

Based on our preliminary review the following topic areas would require additional study to identify significant impacts not identified in area plan EIR:

1. **Historic Resources.** The project site has been included in the *Mission Reconstruction Historic District*. 600 South Van Ness Avenue was given a rating of 6Z ("Found ineligible for NR, CR or Local designation through survey evaluation."). As such, the subject property would not be considered a historic resource pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

The proposed project consists of demolition and new construction within the identified *Mission Reconstruction Historic District*, and therefore, the project is subject to the Department's Historic Preservation review. To assist in analysis of the proposed project, the Department requires a Historic Resource Evaluation Report (HRER), focused on evaluating impacts of the proposed project on identified historical resource(s), 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 HRER should focus on evaluation of the proposed project for conformance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation (Secretary's Standards), including assessing compatibility of the new design with adjacent historical resources, and assess potential impacts to historical resources.

In evaluating the proposed project, the architecture, massing, height, materials, and articulation of the proposed building should be considered. Additional design comments will be provided upon submittal of the Environmental Evaluation Application and HRER.

As the proposed project will create six or more dwelling units, and/or, construct an addition of 10,000 square feet or more, use of the Historic Resource consultant pool for identification of a preservation consultant to prepare the HRER shall be required. The Department will provide the project sponsor with a list of three consultants from the Historic Preservation Consultant Pool, which shall be known as the "potential consultant list" or "PCL," upon submittal of the Environmental Evaluation Application.

² Documents in italics in this PPA are available in the Planning Department lobby at 1650 Mission Street Suite 400, at the Planning Information Center at 1660 Mission, and can be accessed on the Planning Department's website, <http://sfplanning.org> via the website's search window.

- 2. Archeological Resources.** The proposed project consists of demolition, grading, and a new mat foundation, and lies within Archeological Mitigation Zones B (Mitigation Measure J-3: Mission Dolores Archeological District, Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans EIR, page S-48); therefore, preliminary archeology review is required.

In compliance with this mitigation measure, a Preliminary Archeological Sensitivity Study would be prepared by the Department upon submittal of an Environmental Evaluation Application. Based on the Sensitivity Study, the Environmental Review Officer (ERO) and the Department's Archeological Technical Specialist would determine if an Archeological Research Design/Treatment Plan (ARD/TP) would be required to more definitively identify the potential for archeological resources to be present within the project site and determine the appropriate action necessary to reduce the potential impact of the project on archeological resources to a less-than-significant level. If an ARD/TP is required, it must be prepared by an archeological consultant with expertise in California prehistoric and urban historical archeology. The qualified consultant must be selected from one of three archeology consultants assigned to this project by the Department during the environmental review process.

- 3. Noise.** The Eastern Neighborhoods EIR identified a number of noise mitigation measures applicable to construction, as well as, siting of noise-sensitive land uses (such as residential uses) in areas that are substantially effected by existing noise levels. The project site is located in an area where traffic-related noise exceeds 70 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 be pre-drilled. Since the Project proposes a mat foundation for construction of the new building, *Mitigation Measure F-1* may not apply to the project. *Mitigation Measure F-2* would require construction projects near noise sensitive land uses to 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), for review and approval, prior to the issuance of any construction or demolition permit.

Mitigation Measure F-4: Siting of Noise-Sensitive Uses would apply as the project sponsor is proposing to site residential uses within the UMU Use District in an area that exceeds 70 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 have 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 building design to ensure that the interior noise environment meets Title 24 Building Code acoustical requirements.

Mitigation Measure F-6: Open Space in Noisy Environments would also apply in order to protect the project's proposed 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.

4. **Transportation Study.** Based on the Planning Department's transportation impact analysis guidelines, the project would potentially add at least 75 PM peak hour person trips and thus could require additional transportation analysis. A determination of whether a transportation impact analysis would be required would be rendered after submittal of an Environmental Evaluation Application. If required, the scope of work and the transportation report 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

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. Please consult with the environmental planner assigned to the case prior to request the list of qualified consultants.

5. **Geotechnical Study.** The project site is located near or within an area subject to liquefaction potential, a Seismic Hazards Study Zone designated by the California Division of Mines and Geology. The investigation of geotechnical and soil conditions and the application of building codes for new development based on these conditions could reduce the project's potential for geological impacts related to structural damage and surface settlement to less-than-significant levels. To assist Department staff in their determination, it is recommended that you provide a preliminary geotechnical investigation with boring logs and foundation design recommendations for the proposed project.
6. **Hazardous Materials.** The proposed project would include the construction of a new 5-story building on a lot previously used for industrial purposes. An existing one-story industrial building structure on the project site would be demolished as part of the project. Given the proposed scope of work, including foundation reinforcement and excavation for elevator pits and car stacker pits, the proposed project is not expected to result in any peculiar impacts not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR, provided that Hazardous Materials Mitigation Measure L-1 is implemented. Application of the following mitigation measure would reduce any impacts related to hazardous materials to a less-than-significant level.

Mitigation Measure L-1: Hazardous Building Materials. Existing environmental hazards in the vicinity of the project site and the potential for hazards and hazardous materials contamination from past historic uses on the site need to be reviewed. The existing building on the project site was constructed in 1945. Pursuant to this mitigation measure, development proposals within the Eastern Neighborhoods require that the subsequent project sponsors ensure that any equipment containing PCBs or DEPH, such as fluorescent light ballasts, are removed and properly disposed of according to applicable federal, state, and local laws prior to the start of renovation, and that any fluorescent light tubes, which could contain mercury, are similarly removed and properly disposed of. Any other hazardous materials identified, either before or during work, shall be abated according to applicable federal, state, and local laws.

In addition, existing environmental hazards in the vicinity of the project site and the potential for hazards and hazardous materials contamination from past industrial uses on the site would need to

be reviewed. The project includes some ground disturbance for a new foundation, elevator pit and car stacker pit. It is therefore likely that the project will require a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment and other studies as determined necessary by the San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH).

A copy of the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment should be included with the project's Environmental Evaluation Application package, if available at the time of submittal. This study would be required prior to the completion of environmental review. The Phase I Environmental Site Assessment will be forwarded to DPH for their review and the project sponsor would be required to submit a fee to DPH for their review. If site remediation is required, the project sponsor would be required to implement site specific mitigation measures. DPH would provide oversight of remediation activities through their Voluntary Remediation Action Program. For more information regarding the Voluntary Remediation Action Plan Program and fees related to DPH review and oversight, please see: <http://www.sfdph.org/dph/EH/HazWaste/hazWasteVoluntaryRemedial.asp>

- 7. Air Quality (AQ) Analysis.** The project includes demolition of an existing 1,750-square-foot, one-story building, and the construction of a 32,000 square foot, five-story residential building with ground floor retail. 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 PEIR 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 Department of Building Inspection (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 (DPH).

In addition to construction dust, project-related demolition and construction activities would require the use of heavy-duty diesel equipment which emit diesel particulate matter (DPM). DPM is a designated toxic air contaminant, which may affect sensitive receptors located up to 1,000 feet from the project site. Additional measures may be required to reduce DPM emissions from construction vehicles and equipment.

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 PEIR identified a significant impact related to uses that emit 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 EIR and determine whether an Air Quality Technical Report is required for additional air pollutant modeling. If an Air

Quality Technical Report is required, the project sponsor must retain a consultant with experience in air quality modeling to prepare a scope of work that must be approved by Environmental Planning staff prior to the commencement of any required analysis and/or modeling determined necessary.

The proposed project also includes sensitive land uses (27 residential dwelling units) that may be affected by nearby roadway-related pollutants and other stationary sources that may emit toxic air contaminants. In addition, Health Code Article 38 applies to the proposed project. Health Code Article 38 requires that new residential development greater than 10 units located within the Potential Roadway Exposure Zone perform an Air Quality Assessment to determine whether PM_{2.5} concentrations from roadway sources exceed 0.2 micrograms per cubic meter (0.2 µg/m³). Sponsors of projects on sites exceeding this level are required to install ventilation systems or otherwise redesign the project to reduce the outdoor PM_{2.5} exposure indoors. The proposed project is located within the Potential Roadway Exposure Zone, therefore an analysis of annual exposure to roadway related particulate matter would be required. You may choose to have the air quality assessment prepared by a qualified firm and forwarded to DPH for review, or you may request that DPH conduct the assessment. For more information on Health Code Article 38 please see: <http://www.sfdph.org/dph/EH/Air/default.asp>

8. **Greenhouse Gas Analysis.** 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 Department's 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 GHG Reduction Strategy.
9. **Stormwater and Flooding Management.** The City and County of San Francisco Stormwater Management Ordinance became effective on May 22, 2010. This ordinance requires that any project resulting in a ground disturbance of 5,000 square feet or greater prepare a Stormwater Control Plan, consistent with the November 2009 Stormwater Design Guidelines. Responsibility for review and approval of the Stormwater Control Plan 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 Stormwater Management Ordinance will be implemented if the project triggers compliance with the 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. More information is available at: <http://sfwater.org/index.aspx?page=446>

10. **Shadow Study.** Section 295 restricts new shadow on public spaces under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Department by any structure exceeding 40 feet, unless the Planning Commission

finds the impact to be less than significant. To determine whether the project would conform to Section 295, a shadow fan analysis was prepared by the Planning Department. Based on the information provided by the applicant, the “shadow fan” diagram prepared by the Planning Department indicates the project shadow does not reach any property protected by the sunlight ordinance; no further review will be required.

11. **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 the Tree Disclosure Affidavit with the Environmental Evaluation Application and ensure trees are appropriately shown on site plans.
12. **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 Community Plan Exemption process. Please provide these mailing labels at the time of submittal.

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 at the Planning Department’s website: 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. **Large Project Authorization** from the Planning Commission is required per Planning Code Section 329 for the new construction of a building greater than 25,000 gross square feet.
2. **Shadow Analysis.** A Shadow Analysis is required under Planning Code Section 295 as the project proposes a building height in excess of 40 feet, as measured by the Planning Code. A shadow analysis, attached, indicated that no public space under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Parks Department will be shadowed.
3. A **Building Permit Application** is required for the demolition of the existing building.
4. A **Building Permit Application** is required for the new construction of the proposed building.

Large Project 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 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 Project requires a Pre-Application meeting in accordance with the minimum standards of the Pre-Application Process as the project proposes new construction. The Instruction Packet and Affidavit for the Pre-Application process may be accessed at: <http://www.sf-planning.org/modules/showdocument.aspx?documentid=533>.
2. **Neighborhood Notification.** The project proposes new construction; therefore, owners and occupants within 150 feet of the project site must also be notified, in accordance with Planning Code Section 312.
3. **Large Project Authorization.** The Large Project Authorization (LPA) requires notification to owners of property within a 300 foot radius of the project site.
4. **Notification of Project Receiving Environmental Review.** As stated above, 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 Community Plan Exemption process.

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 "Applications" tab. All registered neighborhood group mailing lists are available online at www.sfplanning.org under the "Publications" tab.

PRELIMINARY PROJECT COMMENTS:

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

Planning Code

1. **Interdepartmental Project Review.** This review is required for all proposed new construction in seismic hazard zones, in which the subject property falls.
2. **Rear Yard.** Planning Code Section 134(a)(1) requires the minimum rear yard to be equal to 25 percent of the total lot. For the purposes of determining the lot depth to calculate the required rear yard, the lot is considered to have a depth of approximately 95 feet. Given this lot depth, the rear yard must be at least 23 feet and 9 inches in depth, requiring an open area of approximately 2,375 square feet. Plans provided indicate a common open space deck area of 2,378 square feet. The proposed open space provides a comparable rear yard area, which can be modified through the LPA process. Future submissions should provide measurable dimensions of the rear yard.

3. **Open Space - Residential.** Planning Code Section 135 requires the project to provide at least 80 square feet of useable open space for each dwelling unit. The proposed 27 dwelling units require 2,160 square feet of useable open space that conforms to the additional standards for dimension and exposure. Please submit a plan set that clearly indicates the areas proposed as useable open space. Please note that while an exception to the useable open space requirement may be sought through the Large Project Authorization process under Planning Code Section 329, the Planning Department highly recommends that the requirement be met given that the proposal is for new construction
4. **Obstructions over Streets and Alleys.** Planning Code Section 136 provides the maximum dimensional limits for bay windows over streets and alleys. Subsequent plan submission should confirm that the proposed bay windows conform to the maximum dimensional limits and separation under Planning Code Section 136.
5. **Street Trees.** Planning Code Section 138.1 requires one street tree for every 20 feet of frontage for new construction. Along South Van Ness Avenue a total of five street trees are required and along 17th Street a total of five street trees are required. An "in-lieu" street tree fee pursuant to Section 428 can be paid as an alternative option. Please complete and submit the Tree Disclosure Form. In addition, a Tree Planting and Protection Checklist must be filled out and submitted with the Large Project Authorization application. The Tree Planting and Protection Checklist is available at: www.sf-planning.org.
6. **Standards for Bird Safe Buildings.** Planning Code Section 139 indicates that feature-related bird hazards include free-standing glass walls, wind barriers, skywalks, balconies, and greenhouses on rooftops that have unbroken glazed segments 24 square feet or larger in size. Please note that feature-related hazards can occur throughout the City and that any structure that contains these elements shall treat 100 percent of the glazing on such feature-specific hazards. Subsequent plan submissions should confirm that any feature-related hazards are appropriately treated to meet the requirements of Planning Code Section 139.
7. **Dwelling Unit Exposure.** Planning Code Section 140 requires that each dwelling unit have at least one room that meets the 120-square-foot minimum superficial floor area requirement of Section 503 of the Housing Code to face directly onto a street right-of-way, code-complying rear yard, or an appropriately sized courtyard. As proposed, only one unit on the second floor does not have proper exposure. An exception can be sought under the LPA process.
8. **Street Frontages in Mixed Use Districts.** Planning Code Section 145.1 does not allow more than one-third of the width or 20 feet, whichever is less, of any given street frontage of a new or altered structure parallel to and facing a street to be devoted to parking and loading ingress or egress. Subsequent plan submissions should confirm the width of the 17th Street off-street parking garage entrance.

Planning Code Section 145.1 also requires space for active uses as defined in Planning Code Section 145.1(b)(2) and permitted by the specific district in which it is located to be provided within the first 25 feet of building depth on the ground floor and 15 feet on floors above from any façade facing a

street at least 30 feet in width. Subsequent plan submissions should confirm that the 17th Street façade meets the requirements of Planning Code Section 145.1.

Additionally, Planning Code Section 145.1 requires ground floor non-residential uses in the UMU Zoning District to have a minimum floor-to-floor height of 17 feet, as measured from grade. The proposed project provides an insufficient ground floor height of 14 feet. Please revise plans to comply.

9. **Bicycle Parking-** Section 155.5 of the Planning Code provides requirements for bicycle parking in residential development. Please note that currently the bicycle parking requirements in the Code are under review for significant changes that would likely affect the requirements for this project. The Planning Commission approved these changes on May 16, 2013 and an adoption date at the Board of Supervisors is pending and is expected in summer 2013. For review of potential changes, please see: <http://commissions.sfplanning.org/cpcpackets/2011.0397M.pdf>. These proposals are currently under review and are subject to change.
10. **Transit Development Impact Fees.** The proposed retail space is subject to the applicable fees outlined in Section 411 et seq.
11. **Affordable Housing.** This project is subject to the affordable housing requirements outlined in Section 415 et seq. Please submit an affidavit indicating your intent on meeting this requirement.
12. **Eastern Neighborhoods Impact Fees.** The Eastern Neighborhoods Impact Fee applies to the Project. Fees shall be assessed per net new gross square footage on residential and non-residential uses within the Plan Area. Fees shall be assessed on mixed use projects according to the gross square feet of each use in the project. The Eastern Neighborhoods Impact Fee shall be paid before the City issues a first construction document, with an option for the project sponsor to defer payment to prior to issuance of the first certificate of occupancy upon agreeing to pay a deferral surcharge in accordance with Section [107A](#).13.3 of the San Francisco Building Code.
13. **Option for In-Kind Provision of Community Improvements and Fee Credits.** Project sponsors may propose to directly provide community improvements to the City. In such a case, the City may enter into an In-Kind Improvements Agreement with the sponsor and issue a fee waiver for the Eastern Neighborhoods Impact Fee from the Planning Commission, for an equivalent amount to the value of the improvements. This process is further explained in Section 412.3(d) of the Planning Code. More information on in-kind agreements can be found in the Application Packet for In-Kind Agreement on the Planning Department website.
14. **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

15. **Flood Notification.** The project site is located in a flood-prone area. Please see the attached bulletin regarding review of the project by the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission.
16. **Recycled Water.** The City requires property owners to install dual-plumbing systems for recycled water use in accordance with Ordinances 390-91, 391-91, and 393-94, within the designated recycled water use areas for new construction projects larger than 40,000 square feet. Please see the attached SFPUC document for more information.
17. **Stormwater.** As discussed above, projects that disturb 5,000 square feet or more of the ground surface must comply with the Stormwater Design Guidelines and submit a SCP to the SFPUC for review. To view the Guidelines and download instructions for preparing a SCP, go to <http://stormwater.sfwater.org/>. Applicants may contact stormwaterreview@sfwater.org for assistance.

Public Realm Improvements:

1. **Required Streetscape and Pedestrian Improvements.** Per Planning Code Section 138.1, the project sponsor will be required to submit a Streetscape Plan illustrating the location and design of streetscape improvements appropriate to the street type, including site furnishings, landscaping, corner curb extensions, and sidewalk widening as appropriate. The Planning Department may require these elements as part of conditions of approval. Required streetscape and pedestrian improvements are not eligible for in-kind fee credit.

If street improvements are being considered, project sponsors should contact DPW as early as possible to understand the process and requirements for permitting street improvements. For more information on process, guidelines, and requirements for street improvements, refer to www.sfbetterstreets.org.

2. **Mission Streetscape Plan.** The Planning Department has published a streetscape plan for the Mission District. In the Plan, South Van Ness Avenue was identified for pedestrian improvements such as greening and pedestrian bulb-outs. These improvements should be considered in the design of the Project's streetscape elements. The Plan is available here:
http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/CDG/docs/missionstreets/MDSP_FINAL_DRAFT_OCT2010.pdf

PRELIMINARY DESIGN COMMENTS:

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

1. **Site Design, Open Space, and Massing.** The proposed design seems to comply with the intent of the code for a rear yard area that preserves the mid-block open space, and provides exposure, access usability for the dwellings. The rear yard should be designed in such a manner as to be usable as open space for both residents at the immediate level and common to residents without compromising the privacy or use of either. The proposed design seems to accomplish these goals.
2. **Vehicle Circulation, Access and Parking.** The Planning Department recommends the garage opening on 17th Street be limited to 10 foot wide and recessed from the face of the building.

The Planning Department recommends exploring a parking strategy that minimizes the parking footprint by utilizing parking stackers, lifts, etc. or locating a below grade level, to make a more efficient and flexible use of the ground floor. Parking at-grade on 17th Street should be eliminated or relocated.

Ideally, bike Parking should be as close as possible to the lobby or garage entrance as possible to minimize the travel distance through the garage and conflict with automobiles.

3. **Street Frontage.** The frontage should provide a consistent and active relationship with the fronting streets, per the Draft Ground Floor Residential Design Guidelines.

The Planning Department appreciates the treatment of the residential lobby with a wide recessed and transparent front. Furthermore the visual access to the raised courtyard is a public and private amenity. As a means of augmenting this, The Planning Department requests that the designer consider means that might provide even greater visual access, such as pushing the stairs back. Additionally, please consider an in-ground planter, rather than a raised planter, that may augment the visual continuity of the public realm into the lobby. (Perhaps a similar feature could be located inside the lobby.)

The Planning Code requires active ground floor uses at all street frontages with minor exceptions for utilities and egress, etc. for a depth of 25'. Bike parking does not count as active use.

The Planning Department recommends exploring the option of ground floor residential units on 17th Street with raised and setback landscaped entries that provide direct access to dwellings and a transition from the street. A setback terrace at the ground level may count toward open space.

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. The draft guidelines are located on the Department website under "Resource Center/Department Publications/Guidelines for Ground Floor Residential Design."

4. **Architecture.** The corner bay may be combined to give a stronger anchor to the corner. Provide further clarity on the intent of storefront system. Typically, the Planning Department looks for a

slight recess from the property line to accommodate the potential for sidewalk activity to augment the retail spaces. Additionally, but depending on various conditions, the Planning Department recommends the storefront be set on a solid, durable base 18"-24" high.

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.

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 meeting the original conditions of approval of this project.

PRELIMINARY PROJECT ASSESSMENT EXPIRATION:

This Preliminary Project Assessment is valid for a period of **18 months**. An Environmental Evaluation, Conditional Use Authorization, or Building Permit Application, as listed above, must be submitted no later than **December 8, 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: Michael Leavitt, Project Sponsor
Danielle Harris, Current Planning
Brett Bollinger, Environmental Planning
Jon Swae, Citywide Policy & Analysis