



# SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

**MEMO**

**DATE:** June 24, 2013  
**TO:** Rick Millitello, Apple Inc.  
**FROM:** Mark Luellen, Planning Department  
**RE:** PPA Case No. 2013.0628U for 300 Post 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, Elizabeth Watty, at (415) 558-6620 or [Elizabeth.Watty@sfgov.org](mailto:Elizabeth.Watty@sfgov.org), to answer any questions you may have, or to schedule a follow-up meeting.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Mark Luellen", written over a horizontal line.

Mark Luellen, Senior Planner



# SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

---

## Preliminary Project Assessment

*Date:* June 24, 2013  
*Case No.:* **2013.0628U**  
*Project Address:* 300 Post Street  
*Block/Lot:* 0295/016  
*Zoning:* C-3-R  
80-130-F  
*Area Plan:* Downtown Plan  
*Project Sponsor:* Rick Millitello, Apple Inc.  
1 Infinite Loop  
Cupertino, CA 95014  
408-783-1977  
*Staff Contact:* Elizabeth Watty – (415) 558-6620  
[Elizabeth.Watty@sfgov.org](mailto:Elizabeth.Watty@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 alter the existing 550,599-square-foot Grand Hyatt/Levi's Store Building at 300 Post Street to accommodate a new Apple retail store. The alteration will result in a net reduction of square footage and a reduction in height along the southern portion of the site, at the northwest corner of Stockton and Post Streets, from approximately 63'-0" to 45'-0". The plaza fronting on Stockton Street is also proposed to be reconfigured, renovated, and expanded.

### 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:

An **Environmental Evaluation Application** is required for the full scope of the project. Below is a list of studies that would be required based on our preliminary review of the project as it is proposed in the Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) submittal dated May 15, 2013:

1. **Archeological Review.** According to the PPA submittal, the proposed project would involve excavation of up to 10 feet below ground surface for foundation work. The proposed project would require a Preliminary Archeological Review (PAR) which would be conducted in-house by the Planning Department archeologist. During the PAR it will be determined what type of soils disturbance/modification will result from the project, such as excavation, installation of foundations, soils improvement, site remediation, etc. Any available geotechnical/soils or phase II hazardous materials report prepared for the project site will be reviewed at this time. Secondly, it will be determined if the project site is in an area that is archeologically sensitive. The results of this review will be provided in a memorandum to the Environmental Planner assigned to the project. When it is found that the project has the potential to affect an archeological resource, the PAR memorandum will identify appropriate additional actions to be taken including the appropriate archeological measure and/or if additional archeological studies will be required as part of the environmental evaluation.
2. **Historical Resources.** The project sponsor proposes the alteration and renovation of an existing commercial structure built in 1972. The subject property is listed in the 1976 Architectural Survey with a 5 rating and is considered a "Category B – Properties Requiring Further Consultation and Review" property. The proposed project is also located within the Kearny-Market-Mason-Sutter (KMMS) Conservation District, pursuant to Article 11 of the Planning Code. Therefore the proposed project is subject to the Department's Historic Preservation review and would require a Permit to Alter.

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 an "historical resource," the second is to evaluate whether the action or project proposed by the sponsor would cause a "substantial adverse change" to the historical resource. The Department requires preparation of a full Historic Resources Evaluation (HRE). The HRE shall be prepared by a firm that meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards Professional Qualifications Standards. Please contact Tina Tam, Senior Preservation Planner, at (415) 558-6325 to coordinate the selection of a consultant. Prior to commencement of this report, the consultant shall schedule a scoping meeting with the Department preservation staff to discuss the final scope of work for this project.

3. **Air Quality.** The proposed retail project does not exceed the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's (BAAQMD) construction screening levels for criteria air pollutants. Therefore an analysis of the project's criteria air pollutant emissions is not required.

The proposed project includes the alteration and renovation of an existing 550,599-square-foot hotel/retail building. Project-related demolition, excavation, grading and other construction activities may cause wind-blown dust that could contribute particulate matter into the local atmosphere. To reduce construction dust impacts, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors

approved a series of amendments to the San Francisco Building and Health Codes generally referred hereto as the Construction Dust Control Ordinance (Ordinance 176-08, effective July 30, 2008) with the intent of reducing the quantity of dust generated during site preparation, demolition, and construction work in order to protect the health of the general public and of onsite workers, minimize public nuisance complaints, and to avoid orders to stop work by the Department of Building Inspection (DBI). Pursuant to the Construction Dust Ordinance, the proposed project would be required to comply with applicable dust control requirements outlined in the ordinance.

In addition to construction dust, 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 and perhaps beyond 300 feet from the project site. Additional measures may be required to reduce DPM emissions from construction vehicles and equipment.

The proposed project does not include sensitive land uses that may be affected by nearby roadway-related pollutants and other stationary sources that may emit toxic air contaminants.

During the environmental review process the proposed project will be reviewed to determine whether mitigation measures in the form of either construction emissions minimization measures or air filtration and ventilation mitigation measures will be required. Should the project include stationary sources of air pollutants including, but not limited to, diesel boilers or back-up generators, an Air Quality Technical Report may be 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 prior to the commencement of any required analysis and/or modeling determined necessary.

4. **Greenhouse Gas Compliance Checklist for Private Development Projects.** BAAQMD's San Francisco's *Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions* presents a comprehensive assessment of policies, programs and ordinances that collectively represent San Francisco's qualified greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction strategy.<sup>1</sup> Projects that are consistent with San Francisco's GHG reduction strategy would result in less-than-significant GHG emissions.

In order to facilitate a determination of compliance with San Francisco's GHG reduction strategy, the Planning Department has prepared a Greenhouse Gas Analysis Compliance Checklist. The environmental planner or CEQA consultant in coordination with the project sponsor would prepare this checklist.

5. **Transportation Impact Study.** Based on the PPA submittal, a transportation study is not anticipated. Please note that an official determination will be made subsequent to submittal of the Environmental Evaluation Application.

---

<sup>1</sup> San Francisco's *Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions* is available online at: <http://www.sfplanning.org/index.aspx?page=1570>.

6. **Compliance with Stormwater Management Ordinance.** 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.

7. **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 dripline. Please submit an Affidavit with the Environmental Evaluation Application and ensure trees are appropriately shown on site plans.
8. **Notification of a Project Receiving Environmental Review.** Notice may be required to be sent to occupants of properties adjacent to the project site and owners of properties within 300 feet of the project site. Please provide these mailing labels at the time of submittal.

Please note that this project may qualify for a Categorical Exemption under CEQA; however, additional analysis will determine the level of environmental review that is required. If an Initial Study is required, it will help determine that either (1) the project may be issued a Negative Declaration stating that the project would not have a significant effect on the environment, or (2) an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required to analyze one or more potentially significant physical environmental impacts.

The Environmental Evaluation Application is 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). To determine fees for environmental review, please refer to page one of our fee schedules, under "Studies for Projects outside of Adopted Plan Areas."

## PLANNING DEPARTMENT APPROVALS:

The project requires the following land use 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. **Rezoning.** As proposed, the project does not comply with the maximum FAR permitted in the C-3-R Zoning District. As such, you must request a legislative change to proceed with the proposed project. See #2 under the Preliminary Planning Code Concerns Section below.
2. **Downtown Project Authorization – Section 309.** Major alteration projects in the C-3-R District require a Downtown Project Authorization (Section 309 Review). A decision as to whether this authorization will be reviewed at a staff level or at a Planning Commission hearing will be made once the final design has been analyzed by the Planning Department, unless a hearing is otherwise necessitated by the need for a Section 309 Exception, as discussed below.
  - a. **309 Exceptions.** As a component of the Downtown Project Authorization process, projects may seek specific exceptions to the provisions of the Planning Code, as outlined in Planning Code Section 309. Based on the Department’s initial review of the plans, the following exception *may* be required:
    - i. **Wind (Section 148).** A wind analysis will be required for the proposed project. If the wind analysis determines that the project will result in, or does not eliminate pre-existing exceedances to the wind comfort levels outlined in Section 148 (ground-level winds exceeding 11mph for pedestrians and 7mph for public seating areas), an exception may be sought under Planning Code Section 309. Please note that you cannot seek an exception under Section 309 from any new exceedances to the hazardous wind levels of 26 mph.
3. **Permit to Alter Application.** Since the project includes a Major Alteration of an existing building within the KMMS Conservation District, it must be authorized by a Major Permit to Alter, which requires review and approval by the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC). Prior to the HPC hearing, review by the HPC Architectural Review Committee is also required.
4. **A Building Permit Application.** A Building Permit Application will be required for the alteration of the existing building on the subject property.

Downtown Project Authorization and Major Permit to Alter 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.

#### **PRELIMINARY PLANNING CODE COMPLIANCE COMMENTS:**

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

1. **Historic Preservation.** Section 1111.3 of the Planning Code requires that all local-decision making bodies find proposed new construction within a Conservation District to be compatible in scale and design with the District. While contemporary infill within the Conservation District is encouraged, a visual relationship between the new structure and the surrounding historic context must be demonstrated.
  - a. Sections 6 and 7 of Appendix E of the Planning Code outline standards and guidelines for new construction as well as the existing character of the KMMS Conservation District. In summary, buildings within the District are typically small to medium scale, vertically oriented, and have a two- or three-part vertical composition with an articulation pattern that breaks up the façade into smaller components, which often express the underlying structure on the exterior. The base of buildings is generally delineated from the rest of the building, giving the District an intimate scale at the street. Corner lots within the District are also encouraged to have features that emphasize the importance of the corner, such as entrances or storefront windows on each side of the building which provide visual interest to pedestrians. Materials within the District include terra cotta, brick, stone and stucco. The materials are generally colored light or medium earth tones, including white, cream, buff, yellow, and brown. Reflective metallic finishes are generally not characteristic with the District. See Preliminary Design Comments section for more information.
2. **Floor Area Ratio.** The project is considered legal noncomplying with respect to its Floor Area Ratio (FAR). The current FAR is 15.3:1, whereas the current Code allows for a base FAR of 6:1, and a maximum FAR of 9:1. A longstanding interpretation of the Planning Code has been that if a building is noncomplying, it – or more specifically, the noncomplying portion of it – cannot be voluntarily demolished and rebuilt, if the rebuilt portion does not fully comply with the Planning Code. Since the noncomplying issue relating to this project is the FAR, a portion of the building cannot be demolished and rebuilt, since the rebuilt portion of the building will still exceed the permitted FAR allowed under today’s Code, albeit to a lesser extent. In order for the project to move forward, a legislative change is needed. This would take the form of a Special Use District (SUD), a rezoning, or other legislative action. In many cases, such action will require approval by the Board of Supervisors and Mayor.
3. **Observation Tower FAR Bonus.** The existing property was approved with various floor area ratio (“FAR”) bonuses that allowed the development on the site to exceed the 10:1 FAR limit, which was the requirement at the time of approval. In exchange for the additional floor area, various public benefits were provided. One of those public benefits was the requirement to build an observation deck. The observation deck provided the property with an additional 10,000 sf of developable area. It appears that the observation deck within the Grant Hyatt hotel was never built, although the related development bonuses were used. However, since the proposed project results in a 24,024 sf reduction in floor area, the Department will not require they payment of an in-lieu fee, since the project effectively eliminates the development bonuses that were gained through the commitment of an observation deck.
4. **Mezzanine.** Please confirm that the proposed mezzanine qualifies as a mezzanine under the Building Code. If it does, it will be excluded from FAR; if it is not considered a mezzanine under the Building Code, it must be counted as gross floor area under the Planning Code.

5. **Bird Safe Glazing.** The property is located within 300 feet of Union Square, which may be considered an “Urban Bird Refuge”. According to Planning Code Section 139, buildings located within 300’-0” of an Urban Bird Refuge are considered “Location Related Hazards” for birds, and are thus required to comply with the City’s Bird-Safe Glazing requirements. If Union Square is determined to be an Urban Bird Refuge, the Bird-Safe Glazing Treatment for this project would require the Post Street façade to consist of no more than 10% “untreated” glazing. In addition, properties that are “Location Related Hazards” must only use minimal lighting on the building, all of which must be shielded, and uplighting or event searchlights are not allowed. The Department recommends that you comply with the Location Related Hazard Glazing Treatment requirements outlined in Planning Code Section 139.
6. **Street Frontage – Transparency.** Planning Code Section 145.1(c)(6) requires that a building’s street-facing facades be fenestrated with transparent windows and doorways for no less than 60% of the street frontage at the ground level and allow visibility to the inside of the building. The proposed project does not comply with the 60% transparency requirement of this Section along the Stockton Street façade.

Furthermore, Planning Code Section 212 requires at least half of the total width of any street frontage within the C-3-R District be devoted at the ground story to entrances, show windows, and other displays. The proposed project does not comply with this Code Section along the Stockton Street frontage. Please revise the design along the Stockton Street frontage to comply with these Code requirements, or seek and justify a variance.

7. **Loading Access.** Planning Code Section 155(s)(5) limits façade openings for off-street loading to 15’-0” wide in the C-3 Districts. The loading access is not dimensioned on the plans submitted as part of this PPA Application so it is unclear whether the proposal complies with this Code Section. Please ensure that the opening is no greater than 15’-0” wide, and include this dimension on future plans.
8. **Bicycle Parking.** Currently, there is no bicycle parking requirement for the proposed project. However, there is legislation pending with the Board of Supervisors (Board File No. 130528) that could result in a bicycle parking requirement for this project. Please verify your compliance with this Code Section prior to filing for any entitlements.
9. **Diaper Changing Stations.** Planning Code Section 168 requires that Substantially Renovated Public-Serving Establishment (which include retail uses over 5,000 sq. ft.) must install and maintain, at each floor level containing restrooms accessible to the public, at least one Baby Diaper-Changing Accommodation that is accessible to women and one that is accessible to men, or a single Diaper-Changing Accommodation that is accessible to both. Please make this notation on your plans to show compliance with this Planning Code Section.

#### **CITYWIDE POLICY & ANALYSIS COMMENTS:**

The proposed design raises several issues related to the City’s General Plan.

##### **1. Open Space Design**

The *Downtown Plan* encourages open spaces that are visible to pedestrians. The existing plaza along Stockton Street (between the existing Levi’s Store and Grand Hyatt Hotel) is currently sited above



eye-level for passing pedestrians. The high plaza elevation is tempered by the triangular shape of the plaza and wide, cascading staircase into the space that creates a generous entrance into the space, increasing the plaza's visibility to pedestrians. The plaza also features a sculptural water feature that acts as an invitation to pedestrians to climb the stairs and explore the plaza above. Please see the Department's comments about the proposed open space design and fountain in the "Preliminary Design Comments" section below.

**Related General Plan policies include:**

- The Downtown Plan: Policy 10.4; Policy 16.5

**2. Historic Preservation**

The General Plan, including the *Downtown Plan*, *Commerce and Industry Element*, and *Urban Design Element*, contains various policies intended to ensure that new development responds sensitively to the context of historic districts and adjacent historic buildings. The Plan encourages new developments in historic districts to echo "some uniformity of detail, scale, proportion, texture, materials, color and building form" in the design. Please see the Department's comments about the proposed design's compatibility with the KMMS Conservation District in the "Preliminary Design Comments" section below.

**Related General Plan policies include:**

- Commerce and Industry Element: Policy 6.8 - See Conservation Guidelines Bullets 7 and 8.
- The Downtown Plan: Policy 12.3
- The Urban Design Element: Objective 2 - See Fundamental Principles for Conservation No. 4, 6, and 8.

**3. Architecture**

Several areas of the City's General Plan speak to a desire for buildings to relate to their surrounding context and employ a design aesthetic that matches their relative position within the hierarchy of land uses found within the City. For example the *Urban Design Element* discourages buildings that stand-out relative to their civic importance; and the *Commerce and Industry Element* discourages buildings that follow "a standardized formula prescribed by a business with multiple locations". Please see the Department's comments about the proposed building design in the "Preliminary Design Comments" section below.

**Related General Plan policies include:**

- Commerce and Industry Element: Policy 6.7 - See Urban Design Guidelines on architectural design.
- Urban Design Element: Policy 3.2

**4. Street Frontage**

The General Plan seeks to ensure that active, transparent and well-articulated building façades with strong pedestrian entries are located on commercial streets. The Plan also encourages the use of materials that relate to the surrounding urban context and discourages blank facades in historic

districts. Please see the Department's comments about the proposed Post and Stockton Street frontages in the "Preliminary Design Comments" section below.

**Related General Plan policies include:**

- Commerce and Industry Element: Policy 6.7
- Urban Design Element: Policy 1.6; Objective 2 - See Fundamental Principles for Conservation numbers 2, 3 and 4; Policy 4.13
- The Downtown Plan: Policy 16.4

**5. Streetscape**

The *Downtown Plan* identifies both Post Street and Stockton Street as "Pedestrian Oriented Vehicular Streets" and "Second Level Streets". Second Level Streets form a network of significant pedestrian routes in highly-populated districts and between important destinations. The *Plan* calls for these streets to incorporate streetscape features such as:

- street trees with decorative lighting
- sidewalk paving variation
- benches
- bicycle racks
- sidewalk cafes
- kiosks
- sidewalk vendors

Figure Six of the *Downtown Plan* calls out specific improvements slated for Stockton and Post Streets, including widened sidewalks on Post Street next to Union Square. Please see the Department's comments about the proposed streetscape design in the "Preliminary Design Comments" section below.

**Related General Plan policies include:**

- The Downtown Plan: Pedestrian Network Classification of Elements; Figure 6; Map 7
- Downtown Streetscape Plan: Union Square Chapter (pp. 57-66)  
<http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=2053>

**6. Green Building**

The General Plan supports green building design that reduces energy consumption and carbon emissions from new construction, and promotes building designs that are responsive to San Francisco's unique climate. Please see the Department's comments about the proposed design as it relates to green building in the "Preliminary Design Comments" section below.

**Related General Plan policies include**

- Environmental Protection Element: Objective 14; Policy 14.4.

**PRELIMINARY DESIGN COMMENTS:**

The following comments summarize preliminary design issues that may significantly impact the proposed project as discussed above:

The challenge of this site is arriving at a design that must serve several objectives equally: first, it must respond to the desired identity of the heart of San Francisco as defined in the Downtown Plan and the Urban Design Element of the City's General Plan, and the KMMS Conservation District, while also answering to the desired identity of Apple Inc. In other words, it must be an integral part of San Francisco's historic Union Square district and Apple both at the same time. Second, the design must also respond to San Francisco's particular environment – its sun, wind, fog and the color of its light. Finally, the building should not be so purpose-built that it will look out of place in the future and not work for potential future tenants.

1. **Open Space Design.** The Planning Department has concerns about the relationship between the proposed plaza design and the adjacent sidewalk. The proposal would reduce public visibility from the street toward the plaza by providing only a narrow stairwell, rather than the current wide cascading stairs. It would also result in a broad blank wall along much of the Stockton Street the sidewalk. Specifically, the Planning Department would like to see the edge of the open space along Stockton Street more integrated with the sidewalk. The Planning Department recommends the following modifications to the plaza so that it feels open and inviting to the public:
  - a. Maintain as wide of a staircase as possible into the plaza, in order to create a more visible, inviting and usable edge along the sidewalk. Consider eliminating the walls at the sidewalk and extending the stairs the entire width of the plaza to enhance the invitation and quality of the plaza area fronting the street.
  - b. Reduce the riser height and extend the tread depth of the staircase leading into the plaza.
  - c. Consider the retention or relocation of the Ruth Asawa fountain as a part of the new reconfigured plaza, perhaps connecting it to, and integrating it with, another water theme within the plaza. If not feasible, the Department would like to work with the Sponsors to find an alternative location for its display within the City.
  - d. Include identifying signage for the open space, consistent with Planning Code Section 138(i).
2. **Historic Preservation.** The design as proposed requires modifications to demonstrate compatibility with the KMMS Conservation District. The Department encourages a contemporary design for this project; however, the overall design and detailing should relate to the established patterns, rhythm and architectural character found within the District. Please see the description of the District's character-defining features and design guidelines summarized in the Planning Code Compliance section of this letter, as well as Appendix E of Planning Code Article 11.

- 3. Architecture.** While it is understood that the large transparent façade along Post Street is integral to the design concept, the Planning Department believes that there are ways of achieving the desired design concept while still responding to the fine-grain scale found within the District.

**Post Street Façade:** The Post Street façade should feature increased modulation and definition, such as strengthening and defining the top and bottom of the building, incorporating vertical elements to break the contiguous plane of the glass wall, and/or adding color, pattern or texture to the glass wall. The Planning Department recommends creating a distinct and identifiable entry and articulating a base to create a usable edge of the building. The lack of articulation and the single-surface glazing wall of approximately 115' absent a defined pedestrian entry is a departure from the characteristic pattern of the District.

**Stockton Street Façade:** The Stockton Street façade should include a more active, transparent treatment, as required through Planning Code Section 145.1, and discussed in more detail under the Planning Code Compliance section of this letter. The lack of transparent fenestration and articulation proposed along the Stockton Street façade would create an approximately 80'-0" blank wall along an important commercial street with high pedestrian volumes in the heart of the City's premier retail district. While the slope and location of structural and programmatic building elements may preclude an ideal solution, possible means of achieving the intent may include a combination of the following: (a) fenestration that increases visibility into the store; (b) display windows; and (c) recessing the building wall from the street to allow for landscape, water and/or seating to generate an active zone, thereby tempering the otherwise minimally embellished Stockton Street façade.

**Service Tower:** The service tower should create a transition between the massing and detailing of the primary retail frontage and the adjacent historic fabric. Specifically, the service tower should use cladding material and fenestration patterns that are compatible with the surrounding context and serve as a transition between the more traditional Williams-Sonoma building and the new building.

- 4. Streetscape.** The Department recommends incorporating features recommended in the *Downtown Streetscape Plan* such as street trees and benches into the design, particularly along the Post and Stockton Street frontages.
- 5. Green Building.** Proposed design features for the Post Street façade, particularly the contiguous expansive glazing wall, may result in a significant increase in energy consumption. The Planning Department recommends modifying the design by incorporating passive shading structures or by employing advanced glazing systems to reduce thermal loading and demonstrate a net reduction in energy consumption within the new structure. The San Francisco Department of the Environment also expressed initial concerns to the Planning Department about the proposed building's energy performance, particularly given San Francisco's commitments to climate change mitigation and adaptation.

The Planning Department will provide further detailed design review on the subsequent submission of materials and details to insure that an acceptable and compatible design is achieved.

**PRELIMINARY PROJECT ASSESSMENT EXPIRATION:**

This Preliminary Project Assessment is valid for a period of **18 months**. An Environmental Evaluation, Downtown Authorization, or Building Permit Application, as listed above, must be submitted no later than **December 24, 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: Carl Kernodle, Grand Hyatt SF, LLC, Property Owner  
Elizabeth Watty, Current Planning  
Don Lewis, Environmental Planning  
Paul Chasan, Citywide Planning and Analysis  
David Winslow, Staff Architect  
Tina Tam, Preservation, Current Planning  
Tim Frye, Preservation, Current Planning  
Kelly Wong, Preservation, Current Planning  
Historic Preservation Commission  
Barry Hooper, SF Environment