



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Preliminary Project Assessment

Date: July 30, 2013
Case No.: **2013.0689U**
Project Address: 2 Henry Adams Street
Block/Lot: 3910/001
Zoning: PDR-1-D (Production, Distribution & Repair-Design) Use District
45-X Height and Bulk District
Area Plan: Showplace Square/Potrero Hill Area Plan
Project Sponsor: Lawrence Badiner – Badiner Urban Planning, Inc.
95 Brady Street
San Francisco, CA, 94103
Staff Contact: Monica Pereira – 415-575-9107
monica.pereira@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 (DBI), Department of Public Works (DPW), Department of Public Health (DPH), 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:

This project description is based on the Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) application submitted on May 28, 2013 and revised on June 26, 2013. If the project description changes, then the information in this PPA would need to be re-evaluated.

The project site consists of a 66,349-square foot (sf), irregularly shaped parcel located on a corner lot at the southwest corner of Henry Adams and Division Streets in the Showplace Square/Potrero Hill plan area of the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans. The site is currently occupied by a four-story plus penthouse, 311,363-sf masonry building housing the San Francisco Design Center which is zoned PDR-1-D.

The proposed project would retain 2,879-sf of existing retail space and 62,787-sf of existing showroom space and would convert 245,697-sf of existing showroom space into office use. Office use is only permitted within the PDR-1-D Zoning District if the subject property is a designated landmark; therefore,

the project sponsor proposes to apply for Landmark Designation for the subject building concurrently with the Office Allocation Application. Additionally, the proposed project includes interior alterations and seismic retrofit upgrades, the details of which are under development in consultation with a structural engineer and DBI.

Because project design details have not yet been developed, this PPA assumes the following:

- 20 bicycle parking spaces would be provided.
- Retrofit work would result in soil disturbance to an unknown depth.
- No new parking spaces would be provided.
- There will be no exterior physical changes at the site.
- None of the proposed building alterations would be visible from the public right-of-way.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:

The project initially requires the environmental review described herein. 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 Showplace Square/Potrero Hill Area Plan (Plan Area), which was evaluated in the *Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans Programmatic EIR* ("EN EIR").¹ Potentially significant project-related environmental impacts and pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the underlying area plan were identified in the final EN EIR; these may be applicable to the proposed project.

Environmental evaluation is required for the full scope of the project. Pursuant to CEQA, this project is likely to qualify for a Community Plan Exemption (CPE) under the EN 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 EN 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 EN 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 (currently \$13,004); (b) the CPE certificate fee (currently \$7,216); and (c) a

¹ Documents in italics in this PPA can be accessed on the Planning Department's website, <http://sfplanning.org> via the website's search window.

proportionate share fee for recovery of costs incurred by the Planning Department for preparation of EN 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 EN 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 EN EIR, with all pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the EN EIR also applied to the proposed project. With this outcome, the applicable fees are: (a) the CPE determination fee (currently \$13,004); (b) the standard environmental evaluation fee (which is based on the project's construction value); and (c) a proportionate share fee for recovery of costs incurred by the Planning Department for preparation of the EN EIR.
3. **CPE + Focused EIR.** If any new site- or project-specific significant impacts are identified that 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 EN EIR, with all pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the EN EIR also applied to the proposed project. With this outcome, the applicable fees are: (a) the CPE determination fee (currently \$13,004); (b) the standard environmental evaluation fee (which is based on the project's construction value); (c) one-half of the standard EIR fee (which is also based on the project's construction value); and (d) a proportionate share fee for recovery of costs incurred by the Planning Department for preparation of the EN EIR.

An Environmental Evaluation Application (EEA) is required for the full scope of the project. This review may be done in conjunction with the required approvals listed below, but must be completed before any project approval may be granted. The EEA should include the following additional information: 1) depth of excavation required for the retrofit work along with an estimate of cubic yards of soil to be excavated, 2) a description of any physical exterior changes, 3) identification of areas reserved for bicycle parking, 4) identification of areas reserved for trash, composting and recycling, 5) identification of existing off-street parking spaces, 6) a description and plans for streetscape and pedestrian improvements, and 7) additional information as requested in this letter.

Please submit an EEA. See pages 2, 10, and 11 of the current Fee Schedule for calculation of environmental fees inside adopted plan areas. Results of the studies, or analysis of environmental topics, below will determine which of the three different CPE outcomes described above are necessary for completion of CEQA review.

1. **Land Use.** The EN EIR evaluated three rezoning options for the Eastern Neighborhoods (EN) adopted area plans.² The three analyzed options varied in the amount of industrial land that would

² The Planning Department conducted a community planning process to develop area plans for the Central Waterfront, East SoMa, Mission, and Showplace Square/Potrero Hill neighborhoods. The resulting area plans rezoned a certain amount of land to retain and promote PDR business and rezoned other areas for increased housing production and mixed-use.

remain zoned for Production Development and Repair (PDR) uses: Option A (least conversion of PDR land), Option B (mid-range conversion of PDR land, and the Preferred Project), and Option C (most conversion of PDR land).

The EN EIR determined that the cumulative land use changes resulting from the EN rezoning would result in a significant and unavoidable cumulative impact on PDR land supply for which no feasible mitigation measures were identified. This impact was addressed in a Statement of Overriding Considerations with CEQA Findings and adopted as part of the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans approval on January 19, 2009. During the environmental review process, the proposed project will be evaluated to determine its contribution to the significant and unavoidable cumulative PDR land supply impact as identified in the EN EIR.

- 2. Historic Architectural Resources.** As adopted by the Historic Preservation Commission on August 17, 2011, the Showplace Square/Northeast Mission Historic Resource Survey assessed more than 600 individual properties, including the subject property at 2 Henry Adams Street.³ Based upon this survey, 2 Henry Adams Street was assigned a California Historic Resource Status Code (CHRSC) of "3CB," which defines the subject property as "appears eligible for CR (California Register) both individually and as a contributor to a CR eligible district through survey evaluation." Therefore, 2 Henry Adams Street is considered a historic resource for the purposes of CEQA.

Under CEQA, proposed projects are analyzed for their impact upon historic resources. Historic resource analysis is a two-step process: the first is to determine whether the subject property contains historical resource(s) as defined in Section 15064.5(a)(3) of CEQA; and, if it is determined to be a historical resource, the second is to evaluate whether the proposed project would cause a substantial adverse change to that resource.

Currently, the proposed project description does not include exterior alterations and does not provide detailed information on any potential interior alterations; therefore, no additional historic resources studies would be required at this time. However, if the project description evolves to include major interior alterations or exterior alterations, the Planning Department may require a Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE).

If the proposed project requires an HRE, the project sponsor is required to utilize one of three historic resource consultants provided to them by the Planning Department's Senior Preservation Planner, in accordance with the Planning Department's Environmental Planning Division's Environmental Review Guidelines. If an HRE is required, please contact Tina Tam, by email at tina.tam@sfgov.org or phone at (415) 558-6325, for a list of three historic resource consultants. Please ensure that the selected historic resource consultant receives approval from Planning Department Preservation staff regarding the scope and content of the HRE prior to commencement of any work.

³ San Francisco Historic Preservation Commission. *Meeting Minutes - Case No. 2010.0485U, Showplace Square – Northeast Mission Historic Survey*, August 17, 2011. Available online at: <http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=2923>

- 3. Archeological Resources.** The proposed project will likely include retrofit work that could result in soil disturbance at the site. The EN EIR noted that California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR)-eligible archeological resources are expected to be present within existing sub-grade soils of the Plan Area and that the proposed land use policies and controls within the Plan Area could adversely affect significant resources.

The project site is located within an area where no previous archeological survey has been prepared. Since there is potential for soils disturbance at the site, Planning Department staff has preliminarily determined that *Archeological Mitigation Measure J-2: Property with No Previous Studies* would be applicable to the proposed project. This mitigation measure requires the project to complete either a Preliminary Archeological Review (PAR), conducted in-house by the Planning Department archeologist, or a Preliminary Archeological Sensitivity Assessment (PASS) prepared by a Department Qualified Archeological Consultant and subject to the review and approval by the Department Archeologist.

The PAR will: (1) determine what type of soils disturbance/modifications would result from the proposed project, such as excavation, installation of foundations, soils improvements, site remediation, etc.; (2) determine whether or not the project site is located in an area of archeological sensitivity; and (3) determine what additional steps are necessary to identify and evaluate any potential archeological resources that may be affected by the project. Helpful to the PAR process is the availability of geotechnical or soils characterization studies prepared for the project along with the proposed foundation type and maximum depth of excavation.

Alternatively, preparation of a PASS requires the project sponsor to retain the services of a qualified archeological consultant from the Planning Department's rotational Qualified Archeological Consultants List (QACL). The project sponsor must contact the Department Archeologist to obtain the names and contact information for the next three archeological consultants on the QACL. The QACL is available at:

http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/MEA/Archeological_Review_consultant_pool.pdf.

Based on the results of either the PAR or the PASS, the Environmental Review Officer (ERO) would determine if an Archeological Research Design /Treatment Plan (ARD/TP) shall be required to more definitively identify the potential for CRHR-eligible archeological resources to be present within the project site and determine the appropriate action necessary to reduce the potential effect of the project on archeological resources to a less-than-significant level.

- 4. Transportation.** Based on the Department's Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines, a transportation study is not likely to be required for the proposed project. This determination is preliminary in nature and will be revisited upon submittal of the EEA. In the event a transportation study is required, the study should be prepared by one of three transportation consultants assigned to the project by the Planning Department during the environmental review process. Please see the Planning Department's Environmental Planning webpage "Resources for Consultants" for further information on administration of the consultant pool.

5. **Noise.** The EN EIR identified a number of noise mitigation measures applicable to construction as well as to the siting noise-generating land uses (such as office buildings with HVAC systems) in areas that are substantially affected by existing noise levels. The project site is located in an area where traffic-related noise exceeds 60 L_{dn} (a day-night averaged sound level). The proposed project would be subject to EN EIR *Noise Mitigation Measure F-2: Construction Noise*, which requires that a set of site-specific noise attenuation measures be developed under the supervision of a qualified acoustical consultant, and that a plan for such measures be submitted to DBI when the Planning Department determines that construction noise controls are necessary due to the nature of planned construction practices and the sensitivity of proximate uses. In addition, the proposed project would be subject to the San Francisco Noise Ordinance (Article 29 of the *Police Code*), amended in November 2008, which includes restrictions on noise levels of construction equipment and hours of construction activity. Detailed information related to construction equipment, phasing, and duration of each phase may be required as part of the environmental evaluation to assess construction noise levels and methods to reduce such noise, as feasible.

The proposed project may be subject to *Mitigation Measure F-5: Siting of Noise-Generating Uses*, if the proposed office uses include the installation of noise-generating equipment, such as HVAC systems. *Mitigation Measure F-5: Siting of Noise-Generating Uses*, would require the sponsor to prepare an acoustical study that identifies potential noise-sensitive uses within 900 feet of, and having a direct line-of-sight to, the project site and include at least one 24-hour noise measurement with maximum noise level readings taken at least every 15 minutes. The study should include any recommendations regarding building design to ensure that the proposed project meets Police Code 2909 and the General Plan acoustical requirements. This study must be completed during the environmental review process for inclusion in the environmental document.

6. **Air Quality.** The project proposes interior remodel and retrofit work that is not likely to be visible from the public right-of-way. Project-related demolition, excavation, grading and other construction activities may cause wind-blown dust that could contribute particulate matter into the local atmosphere. The EN EIR 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 DBI. Interior construction work, that is unlikely to result in visible dust, could seek a waiver from the requirements of the Construction Dust Control Ordinance. If a waiver is not granted, the proposed project would be required to comply with the requirements of the Ordinance.

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 EN EIR 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 EN EIR.

7. **Greenhouse Gases.** 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 (enclosed). The project sponsor would be required to submit the completed table regarding project compliance with the identified regulations and provide project-level details in the discussion column. This information will be reviewed by the environmental planner during the environmental review process to determine if the project would comply with San Francisco's Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy. Projects that do not comply with an ordinance or regulation may be determined to be inconsistent with the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy.
8. **Geology.** According to the Planning Department's GIS database, the project site is located in a liquefaction hazard zone. Should the project require ground disturbance, a geotechnical report prepared by a qualified consultant would be required. In the event a geotechnical report is required, the report should address whether the site is subject to liquefaction and provide recommendations for addressing any geotechnical concerns identified in the study. This study will also help inform the Planning Department Archeologist of the project site's subsurface geological conditions. In general, compliance with the State and San Francisco building codes would avoid the potential for significant impacts related to structural damage, ground subsidence, liquefaction, landslides, and surface settlement.
9. **Stormwater 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 ground disturbance of 5,000 square feet or greater prepare a Stormwater Control Plan (SCP) that is 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 Stormwater Management Ordinance is proposed to be implemented if the project triggers compliance with the Stormwater Design Guidelines. The project's environmental evaluation would generally assess 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.

10. **Hazardous Materials.** The Department's database indicates the presence of past industrial uses on the project site. The database also indicates that the site is underlain by fill materials. Should the project require ground disturbance, a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Phase I) will be required. The Phase I will determine if the site may contain contaminated soils, the potential for site contamination, the level of exposure risk associated with the project, and whether any additional analysis (e.g., a Phase II soil sampling) would be necessary. The Phase I must be submitted with the EEA. Review of the Phase I and any additional studies recommended by the Phase I would require oversight from the Department of Public Health (DPH). Additionally, depending on the scope of the project and its potential to disturb contaminated soils, the proposed project may be subject to the amended Maher Ordinance, which will become effective August 15, 2013. During environmental review of the proposed project, the Planning Department will coordinate with DPH to determine the appropriate course of action.

The existing industrial structure on the project site may contain hazardous building materials. In order to eliminate the potential for adverse impacts resulting from the handling of hazardous building materials, the EN EIR included *Mitigation Measure L-1: Hazardous Building Materials*, which would apply to the proposed project. This mitigation measure requires that the project sponsor ensure that any equipment containing Polychlorinated Biphenols (PCBs), such as fluorescent light ballasts and any fluorescent light tubes containing mercury be removed and properly disposed of in accordance with applicable federal, state, and local laws. Any other hazardous materials identified at the site, either before or during work, shall also be abated according to applicable federal, state, and local laws.

In addition, because the existing building was constructed prior to 1980, asbestos-containing materials, such as floor and wall coverings, may be found in the building. The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) is responsible for regulating airborne pollutants including asbestos. Please contact BAAQMD for the requirements related to demolition of buildings that may contain asbestos-containing materials.

11. **Tree Planting Protection Checklist.** The Department of Public Works Code Section 8.02-8.11 requires disclosure and protection of landmark, significant, and street trees located on private and public property. Any tree identified in the *Tree Planting and Protection Checklist* must be shown on site plans with size of the trunk diameter, tree height, and accurate canopy drip line. The project sponsor is required to submit a completed *Tree Planting and Protection Checklist*⁴ with the EEA.

EEA forms 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. The San Francisco Preservation Bulletin No. 16 is available at www.sfplanning.org under "Historic Preservation."

As applicable, the project sponsor will be required to use environmental, transportation, historic preservation, and archeological resources consultants from the Planning Department's consultant pools available at www.sfplanning.org under the "Consultant Resources" tab. Private projects sponsors will

⁴ San Francisco Planning Department Required Checklist for Tree Planting and Protection. Available online at: <http://www.sf-planning.org>.

have the opportunity to select a consultant from a subset of three consultants chosen by the Planning Department.

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 **Landmark Designation** from the Historic Preservation Commission and Board of Supervisors is required per Planning Code Section 1004.1. According to Planning Code Section 219, office use is only permitted within the PDR-1-D Zoning District if the subject property is a designated landmark, as listed in Article 10 of the Planning Code.
2. An **Office Allocation** from the Planning Commission is required per Planning Code Section 321, since the project would seek to authorize more than 25,000 gross square feet (gsf) of office space.
3. A **Building Permit Application** is required for the change of use from PDR to office use, and any proposed interior alterations.

Building Permit applications are available at the Department of Building Inspection, located 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.

Although not required, the Department recommends conducting a **pre-application** meeting with the surrounding neighbors and registered neighborhood groups before a development application may be filed with the Planning Department. The *Pre-application Packet*, which includes instructions and template forms, is available at www.sfplanning.org under the "Permits & Zoning" tab. All registered neighborhood group mailing lists are available online at www.sfplanning.org under the "Resource Center" tab.

A *Notification of a Project Receiving Environmental Review* is required to be sent to occupants of properties on and 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 EEA submittal.

PRELIMINARY PROJECT COMMENTS:

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

1. **Showplace Square/Potrero Hill Area Plan.** The proposed project is located within the Eastern Neighborhoods' Showplace Square/Potrero Hill Plan Area. This Plan contains a number of objectives and policies outlining a vision for the neighborhood. One such objective is to preserve space for core PDR uses. Another objective is to support the economic viability of historically significant buildings by allowing uses such as office in these buildings. For specific policy language and background, please see the Showplace Square/Potrero Hill Area Plan:
<http://www.sf-planning.org/modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=2545>

The proposed project exemplifies that two plan objectives, such as these, can be in conflict with one another. To determine whether such a project is in keeping with the Plan, it is useful to refer to the Plan's implementing document, which in this case is the Planning Code. Planning Code Section 219 conveys that, within a PDR-1-D Zoning District, new office space is only permissible if the building is a designated landmark – in other words, in only the most historic buildings is a loss of PDR space acceptable. Therefore, if this building receives landmark status, the conversion of PDR space to office space would be in conformance with the Plan. That being said, the loss of a substantial amount of PDR space is an important issue, and the applicant should consider ways to minimize the impact of that lost PDR space, including physical and economic strategies.

2. **Office Use in PDR-1-D Zoning District.** As noted above, per Planning Code Section 219, office use in the PDR-1-D Zoning District is not permitted unless the subject property is a designated landmark, as noted in Article 10 of the San Francisco Planning Code. To proceed with the proposed project's change in use from PDR to office, 2 Henry Adams Street must be designated a local landmark by the Historic Preservation Commission and Board of Supervisors. To apply for a landmark designation, please contact the Department's Preservation Coordinator, Tina Tam, at tina.tam@sfgov.org or (415) 558-6325. For any historic resource studies, please coordinate with the Department prior to undertaking any work in support of the landmark designation.
3. **Street Frontage:** Planning Code Section 145.1 outlines requirements for street frontages to ensure that they are pedestrian-oriented, fine-grained, and are appropriate and compatible with the buildings. Please ensure that the ground floor street frontage meets these requirements as related to use, height, transparency, fenestration, gates, railings and grillwork.
4. **Parking.** Since the proposed project is located within the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan, there is no required parking. Rather, the proposed project has a parking maximum, which is limited to one car per 500 square feet of gross floor area, as outlined within Planning Code Section 151.1. Please provide information on the number of existing off-street parking spaces.
5. **Bicycle Parking:** Based upon the current project description, the proposed project is required to provide at least twenty (20) Class 1 bicycle parking spaces. Please specify how the project will meet this requirement.

Please note that currently the bicycle parking requirements in the Planning 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 the Summer of 2013. For review of potential changes, please see: <http://commissions.sfplanning.org/cpcpackets/2011.0397M.pdf>. Please note that these proposals are currently under review and are subject to change.

6. **Office Development Authorization:** Since the proposed project involves the establishment of more than 25,000 gsf of office space, the proposed project would need to obtain an Office Development Authorization from the Planning Commission, as outlined in Planning Code Section 321.
7. **SFPUC Urban Watershed Management Program (UWMP):** Projects disturbing 5,000-sf or more of ground surface are subject to the Stormwater Management Ordinance and must meet the performance measures set within the *Stormwater Design Guidelines and Appendices*. For more information, please refer to: <http://www.sfwater.org/sdg>. Please cite how the proposed project will meet this requirement.
8. **Transit Impact Development Fee.** Since the project would construct more than 3,000 gsf of office space, the proposed project would be subject to development impact fees per Planning Code Section 411. Additional information is available in Planning Code Section 414.
9. **Jobs-Housing Linkage Program.** Since the project would construct more than 25,000 gsf of office space, the proposed project would be subject to a development impact fee per Planning Code Section 413, which also provides alternate options for fee payment.
10. **Child Care Requirement.** Since the project would construct more than 50,000 gsf of office space, the proposed project would be required to provide on-site child care or pay an in-lieu fee to the Child Care Capital Fund. Additional information is available in Planning Code Section 414.
11. **Eastern Neighborhoods Impact Fees.** The EN Impact Fee applies to the project. The proposed project is subject to Tier 1 EN Impact Fees. These fees shall be charged on conversion of gross square footage of PDR to office (Non-Residential), per Table 423.3(b) of the Planning Code. The EN Impact Fee shall be paid before the City issues the first construction document.
12. **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 EN 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's website:
<http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=8601>.

PRELIMINARY DESIGN COMMENTS:

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

1. **Required Streetscape and Pedestrian Improvements.** Assuming alterations to the site would be greater than fifty percent, the proposed project would be required to include streetscape and pedestrian improvements that are in keeping with the *Better Streets Plan*. 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. Please coordinate with the Department's Citywide Division and Urban Design Team to develop the streetscape and pedestrian improvements. The Planning Department may require these elements as part of conditions of approval.

The proposed project fronts onto a "Mixed Use" Street. For additional information, please refer to: <http://www.sfbetterstreets.org/design-guidelines/street-types/>

Street improvements may include upgrading the building's street frontages to City standards. If street improvements are being considered, the project sponsor 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.

Required streetscape and pedestrian improvements are not eligible for in-kind fee credit.

PRELIMINARY PROJECT ASSESSMENT EXPIRATION:

This Preliminary Project Assessment is valid for a period of **18 months**. An Environmental Evaluation, Landmark Designation Application, Office Allocation Application, or Building Permit Application, as listed above, must be submitted no later than **January 30, 2015**. 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: Greenhouse Gas Compliance Checklist

cc: Lawrence Badiner, Applicant
Sean Murphy, Bay West Development
Lisa Gibson, Environmental Planning
Jessica Range, Environmental Planning
Tina Tam, Current Planning
Monica Cristina Pereira, Environmental Planning
Rich Sucre, Current Planning
Steve Wertheim, Citywide Planning and Analysis