



# SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

---

## Preliminary Project Assessment

*Date:* August 5, 2013  
*Case No.:* **2013.0698U**  
*Project Address:* 1301 16<sup>th</sup> Street  
*Block/Lot:* 3954/016  
*Zoning:* UMU (Urban Mixed Use)  
68-X  
*Area Plan:* Showplace Square/Potrero  
*Project Sponsor:* Sixteenth Street Center, LLC  
415-793-3200  
*Staff Contact:* Corey Teague – 415-575-9081  
[corey.teague@sfgov.org](mailto:corey.teague@sfgov.org)

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

Reception:  
**415.558.6378**

Fax:  
**415.558.6409**

Planning  
Information:  
**415.558.6377**

### DISCLAIMERS:

Please be advised that this determination does not constitute an application for development with the Planning Department. It also does not represent a complete review of the proposed project, a project approval of any kind, or in any way supersede any required Planning Department approvals listed below. The Planning Department may provide additional comments regarding the proposed project once the required applications listed below are submitted. While some approvals are granted by the Planning Department, some are at the discretion of other bodies, such as the Planning Commission or Historic Preservation Commission. Additionally, it is likely that the project will require approvals from other City agencies such as the Department of Building Inspection, Department of Public Works, Department of Public Health, and others. The information included herein is based on plans and information provided for this assessment and the Planning Code, General Plan, Planning Department policies, and local/state/federal regulations as of the date of this document, all of which are subject to change.

### PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The proposal is to demolish the existing 38,600 square foot industrial building and construct a 7-story, 68-foot tall residential building. The existing building on the 38,600 square foot subject lot was constructed in 1971. The proposed new building would front Carolina, 16th, and Wisconsin Streets, and would include 278 dwelling units and up to 84 off-street residential parking spaces.

### ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:

The project requires environmental review that may be processed in conjunction with the land use approvals listed below, but must be completed prior to the granting of any project approvals.

An **Environmental Evaluation Application** (EEA) is required for the full scope of the project. 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 online at [www.sfplanning.org](http://www.sfplanning.org) under the "Publications" tab.

Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), this project may qualify for a Community Plan Exemption (CPE) under the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plan (EN Area Plan). Section 15183 of the CEQA Guidelines states that projects that are consistent with the development density established by a community plan for which an environmental impact report (EIR) has been certified, do not require additional environmental review, except as necessary to determine the presence of project-specific significant effects, also referred to as peculiar impacts, not identified in the programmatic plan area environmental impact report.

Within the CPE process, there can be three different outcomes as follows:

1. **CPE Only.** In this case, all potentially significant project-specific and cumulatively considerable environmental impacts are fully consistent with significant impacts identified in the underlying Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans Final Environmental Impact Report (Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR)<sup>1</sup>, meaning there would be no new peculiar significant impacts unique to the proposed project. In these situations, all pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR are applied to the proposed project, and a CPE checklist and certificate is prepared. With this outcome, the applicable fees, based on the current fee schedule<sup>2</sup>, are as follows: (a) \$13,004 Environmental Document Determination fee; (b) \$7,216 CPE certificate fee; and (c) \$10,000 proportionate share fee for recovery of costs incurred by the Planning Department for preparation of the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR.
2. **CPE and Focused Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration.** In this case, one or more new significant impacts of the proposed project specific to the site or the project proposal are identified that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR. If any new significant impacts of the proposed project can be mitigated, then a focused Mitigated Negative Declaration to address these impacts is prepared and a supporting CPE certificate is prepared to address all other impacts that were encompassed by the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR, with all pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR also applied to the proposed project. With this outcome, the applicable fees, based on the current fee schedule, are as follows: (a) \$13,004 Environmental Document Determination fee; (b) the standard environmental evaluation (EE) fee based on the cost of construction<sup>3</sup>; and (c) \$10,000 proportionate share fee for recovery of costs incurred by the Planning Department for preparation of the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR.
3. **CPE and Focused Environmental Impact Report (EIR).** In this case, one or more new significant impacts of the proposed project specific to the site or the project proposal are identified that was not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR. If any new significant impacts of the proposed project cannot be mitigated, then a focused EIR to address these impacts is prepared and a supporting CPE certificate is prepared to address all other impacts that were encompassed by the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR, with all pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR also applied to the proposed project. With this outcome, the

---

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

<sup>2</sup> Fees schedule effective 8/31/12, available at: <http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=513>

<sup>3</sup> See page 10 of the current fee schedule.

applicable fees, based on the current fee schedule, are as follows: (a) \$13,004 Environmental Document Determination fee; (b) the standard environmental evaluation (EE) fee based on the cost of construction<sup>4</sup>; (c) one-half of the standard EIR fee<sup>5</sup>; and (d) \$10,000 proportionate share fee for recovery of costs incurred by the Planning Department for preparation of the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR.

Based on the Department's preliminary review, the following topics would be analyzed during the environmental review process and any associated mitigation measures that were identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR would apply to the proposed project.

**Archeological Resources.** Archeological studies are generally not required unless the project includes grading or foundation work to a depth of eight feet or more. If the site is found to be sensitive, less ground disturbance may trigger mitigation requirements. The Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR was programmatic and did not analyze specific development projects in the project area; therefore, specific proposed projects, such as 1301 16th Street, would be required to undergo individual environmental review in accordance with **Mitigation Measure J-2: Properties with No Previous Studies**. Implementation of this prescribed mitigation measure would reduce the potential adverse effect on archeological resources of the project area to a less-than-significant level and would not prompt the need for a Negative Declaration or Focused EIR.

**Mitigation Measure J-2** applies to the entirety of the study area outside of Archeological Mitigation Zones A and B. Because the project site is outside Archeological Mitigation Zones A and B, a Preliminary Archeological Sensitivity Study must be prepared by an archeological consultant with expertise in California prehistoric and urban historical archeology. The archeological consultant must be selected from the Planning Department's Archeological Review Consultant Pool and in accordance with the Planning Department's consultant selection procedure. The Sensitivity Study should: 1) determine the historical use of the project site based on any previous archeological documentation and Sanborn maps; 2) determine types of archeological resources/properties that may have been located within the project site and whether the archeological resources/property types would potentially be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR); 3) determine if 19th or 20th century soils-disturbing activities may have adversely affected the identified potential archeological resources; 4) assess potential project effects in relation to the depth of any identified potential archeological resource; and 5) assess whether any CRHR-eligible archeological resources could be adversely affected by the proposed project and recommend appropriate further action.

Based on the Sensitivity Study, the Environmental Review Officer (ERO) shall determine if an Archeological Research Design/Treatment Plan (ARD/TP) shall be required to more definitively identify the potential of the project on archeological resources to a less than significant level. The scope of the ARD/TP shall be determined in consultation with the ERO and consistent with the standards for archeological documentation established by the Office of Historic Preservation for purposes of compliance with CEQA, in Preservation Planning Bulletin No. 5.

---

<sup>4</sup> See page 10 of the current fee schedule.

<sup>5</sup> See page 11 of the current fee schedule.

**Noise.** The proposed project would include the construction of a new 278-unit residential building which would add new noise-sensitive uses within the project area. Application of the following mitigation measures would reduce any noise-related impacts to a less-than-significant level.

**Mitigation Measure F-2: Construction Noise.** The area plan EIR noted that where environmental review of a development project undertaken subsequent to the adoption of the proposed zoning controls determines that construction noise controls are necessary due to the nature of planned construction practices and the sensitivity of proximate uses, the Planning Director shall require that the sponsors of the subsequent development project develop a set of site-specific noise attenuation measures under the supervision of a qualified acoustical consultant. Thus, Mitigation Measure F-2 from the area plan EIR may apply to the proposed project. Additional information regarding construction activities and the equipment to be used as well as the proximity of noise sensitive uses will be reviewed as part of the environmental review process. If deemed necessary based upon the proximity of sensitive receptors, this mitigation measure requires the sponsors of the subsequent development projects to develop a set of site-specific noise attenuation measures under the supervision of a qualified acoustical consultant. Prior to commencing construction, a plan for such measures shall be submitted to the Department of Building Inspection to ensure that maximum feasible noise attenuation will be achieved.

**Mitigation Measure F-3: Interior Noise Levels.** For new development including noise-sensitive uses located along streets with noise levels above 60 dBA (Ldn), as shown in EIR Figure 18, where such development is not already subject to the California Noise Insulation Standards in Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations, the project sponsor shall conduct a detailed analysis of noise reduction requirements. Such analysis shall be conducted by person(s) qualified in acoustical analysis and/or engineering. Noise insulation features identified and recommended by the analysis shall be included in the design, as specified in the San Francisco General Plan Land Use Compatibility Guidelines for Community Noise to reduce potential interior noise levels to the maximum certificate of extent feasible.

**Mitigation Measure F-4: Siting of Noise-Sensitive Uses.** The area plan EIR noted that where environmental review of a development project undertaken subsequent to the adoption of the proposed zoning controls determines that noise-sensitive uses may be in proximity to noise-generating uses, Mitigation Measure F-4 from the area plan EIR would apply. Mitigation Measure F-4 would reduce potential conflicts between existing noise-generating uses and new sensitive receptors, for new development including noise-sensitive uses. The Planning Department shall require the preparation of an analysis that includes, at a minimum, a site survey to identify potential noise-generating uses within 900 feet of, and that have a direct line-of-sight to, the project site, and including at least one 24-hour noise measurement (with maximum noise level readings taken at least every 15 minutes), prior to the first project approval action. The analysis shall be prepared by persons qualified in acoustical analysis and/or engineering prior to the first project approval action, in order to demonstrate that acceptable interior noise levels consistent with those in the Title 24 standards can be attained.

**Mitigation Measure F-6: Open Space in Noisy Environments.** To minimize effects on development in noisy areas, for new development including noise-sensitive uses, the Planning Department shall, through its building permit review process, in conjunction with noise analysis required pursuant to Mitigation Measure F-4, require that open space required under the Planning Code for such uses be protected, to the maximum feasible extent, from existing ambient noise levels that could prove annoying or disruptive to users of the open space. Implementation of this measure could involve, among other things, site design that uses the building itself to shield on-site open space from the greatest noise sources, construction of noise barriers between noise sources and open space, and appropriate use of both common and private open space in multi-family dwellings, and implementation would also be undertaken consistent with other principles of urban design.

With the implementation of **Mitigation Measures F-2, F-3, F-4, and F-6**, the project is not expected to result in any peculiar impacts not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR with respect to noise.

**Air Quality (AQ) Analysis.** The proposed project, which includes the construction of a new building at a total of 192,000 square feet and 278 dwelling units, exceeds 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 likely to be required.

The proposed project includes demolition of an existing commercial building, as well as grading and construction of a new 7-story building on a 0.88-acre project site. 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 prepare a Construction Dust Control Plan for review and approval by the San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH) or 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 emits 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 includes sensitive land uses (278 dwelling units) that may be 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<sub>2.5</sub> concentrations from roadway sources exceed 0.2 micrograms per cubic meter (0.2 µ/m<sup>3</sup>). Sponsors of projects on sites exceeding this level are required to

install ventilation systems or otherwise redesign the project to reduce the outdoor PM<sub>2.5</sub> exposure indoors. The propose 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: <https://www.sfdph.org/dph/EH/Air/default.asp>.

During the environmental review process the proposed project will be reviewed to determine whether measures in the form of either construction emissions minimization or air filtration and ventilation mitigation measures will be required and whether any additional mitigation measures identified in the underlying Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan EIR will be required. The project site is not within an identified air quality hotspot. 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.

**Greenhouse Gases.** The 2010 CEQA Air Quality Guidelines provide CEQA thresholds of significance for greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. On August 12, 2010, the San Francisco Planning Department submitted to the BAAQMD a draft of the City and County of San Francisco's Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions. This document presents a comprehensive assessment of policies, programs and ordinances that collectively represent San Francisco's Qualified Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy. The BAAQMD reviewed San Francisco's GHG reduction strategy and concluded that the strategy meets the criteria for a Qualified GHG Reduction Strategy as outlined in BAAQMD's CEQA Guidelines (2010).<sup>6</sup> Therefore, 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 project sponsor will be required to submit a completed checklist as part of the environmental review process.

**Liquefaction Zone.** Per the Planning Department GIS database, the project site is located in a liquefaction hazard zone. An investigation of geotechnical and soil conditions is required to make a determination as to whether the project would result in any environmental impacts related to structural damage, ground subsidence, liquefaction, and surface sediment. To assist our staff in their determination, please provide a copy of the geotechnical investigation with boring logs for the proposed project. This study will also help inform the archeological review.

---

<sup>6</sup> San Francisco's Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions and BAAQMD's letter are available online at: <http://www.sfplanning.org/index.aspx?page=1570>.

**Hazardous Materials.** The existing building may contain hazardous building materials that would need to be removed in compliance with all applicable regulations as stipulated in the following mitigation measure from the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR:

**Mitigation Measure L-1—Hazardous Building Materials**

The City shall condition future development approvals to 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.

The site is in an area of artificial fill known as the Maher area. Additionally, pursuant to preliminary information provided by the project sponsor, the former use of the site included some industrial use(s) that may have contaminated the soil on the project site. A Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) should be submitted with the EE application, along with any subsequent Phase 2 reports. If the Phase I ESA identifies likely soil contamination, a Phase II ESA (e.g., soil sampling) will be required if one has not already been prepared. Review of the Phase I and any additional studies recommended by the Phase I may require remediation with oversight from the San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH) and participation in its Voluntary Remedial Action Program (VRAP). Review of these documents during the environmental review process will determine whether site-specific mitigation measures for peculiar, site-specific impacts would be necessary, or whether any necessary action could be administered by DPH through the recently-amended Maher Ordinance. More information on DPH's Voluntary Remedial Action Program may be found at <http://www.sfdph.org/dph/EH/HazWaste/hazWasteVoluntaryRemedial.asp>.

**Transportation.** The Planning Department has made a preliminary determination that a transportation study would be required for the proposed project. The project includes the construction of 170,000 square feet of residential space in 278 residential units and would generate approximately 2,380 new daily person trips of which more than 412 would be in the PM Peak Hour. About 228 of the PM peak hour person trips would be automobile trips. The scope of work and subsequent 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](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 requesting the list of qualified consultants.

The site plan submitted with the EEA should clearly show the location of the bicycle parking and number of spaces, the vehicle parking and location of the stackers, and the trash collection areas. One entrance into the garage is preferred over two entrances. Also, please provide streetscape plans, showing the width of the sidewalks, the location of all driveways to be retained and removed, and details on how the requirements of the Better Streets Plan have been incorporated into the project's streetscape design.

**Historic Resources.** The existing building was constructed in 1971 and was given a “6Z” rating in the Showplace Square/ Northeast Mission Historic Survey. This rating means that the property was found to be ineligible for the National Register of Historic Places, California Register and local designation as a result of the survey evaluation. Therefore, the property is not a historic resource for purposes of CEQA. Also, the project site is not within or immediately adjacent to an identified historic district.

**Stormwater Management.** The project site is located on a block that has been identified by the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) as having the potential to flood during storms. Applicants for building permits for either new construction, change of use (Planning) or change of occupancy (Building Inspection), or for major alterations or enlargements shall be referred to the SFPUC at the beginning of the process, for a review to determine whether the project would result in ground level flooding during storms. The side sewer connection permits for such projects need to be reviewed and approved by the SFPUC at the beginning of the review process for all permit applications submitted to the Planning Department, the Department of Building Inspection, or the Successor Agency to the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency. Please see the attached information and contact Cliff Wong of the SFPUC at 415- 554-8339.

**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.

**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 application submittal.

If any of the additional analyses determine that mitigation measures not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods FEIR are required to address “peculiar” impacts of the proposed project, the environmental document would be a community plan exemption with a focused Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration. If the additional analyses identify impacts that cannot be mitigated, the environmental document would be a community plan exemption with a focused EIR. A Community Plan Exemption and a Community Plan Exemption plus a focused Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration can be prepared by Planning Department staff, but a Community Plan exemption with a focused EIR would need to be prepared by a consultant on the Planning Department’s environmental consultant pool list. If this is necessary, the project sponsor will be provided with three environmental consulting firms from which to choose to have the focused EIR prepared ([http://www.sfplanning.org/ftp/files/MEA/Environmental\\_consultant\\_pool.pdf](http://www.sfplanning.org/ftp/files/MEA/Environmental_consultant_pool.pdf)).

Please see “Studies for Project inside of Adopted Plan Areas - Community Plan Fees” in the Planning Department’s current *Fee Schedule for Applications*. Environmental evaluation applications are available at the Planning Information Center at 1660 Mission Street, and online at [www.sfplanning.org](http://www.sfplanning.org).

## 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 25,000 gross square feet.
2. **Shadow Analysis.** A Shadow Analysis is required under Planning Code Section 295 because the project proposes a building height in excess of 40 feet, as measured by the Planning Code. A shadow analysis 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 on the subject property.
4. A **Building Permit Application** is required for the proposed new construction on the subject property.

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](http://www.sfplanning.org). Building Permit applications are available at the Department of Building Inspections at 1660 Mission Street.

## NEIGHBORHOOD NOTIFICATIONS AND PUBLIC OUTREACH:

Project Sponsors are encouraged to conduct public outreach with the surrounding community and neighborhood groups early in the development process. Additionally, many approvals require a public hearing with an associated neighborhood notification. Differing levels of neighborhood notification are mandatory for some or all of the reviews and approvals listed above.

This project is required to conduct a **Pre-application** meeting with surrounding neighbors and registered neighborhood groups before a development application may be filed with the Planning Department. The Pre-application packet, which includes instructions and template forms, is available at [www.sfplanning.org](http://www.sfplanning.org) under the "Permits & Zoning" tab. All registered neighborhood group mailing lists are available online at [www.sfplanning.org](http://www.sfplanning.org) under the "Resource Center" tab.

## PRELIMINARY PROJECT COMMENTS:

The following comments address specific Planning Code and other general issues that may significantly impact the proposed project. For the purpose of providing these comments, the ground floor units along Clara Street are considered non-residential. Designation of these units as residential may alter some of the comments below.

1. **Interdepartmental Project Review.** This review is required for all proposed new construction in seismic hazard zones. The subject property is in a seismic hazard zone. Therefore, an Interdepartmental Project Review is required before the project may be heard by the Planning Commission. An application is enclosed.
2. **Rear Yard.** Planning Code Section 134 requires the project to provide a rear yard of at least 25 percent of the lot depth. Because this project is located on a corner site, one of the street frontages must be designated as the front of the property, and the rear yard would then be provided based on that determination. The interior court configuration proposed for the rear yard is not permitted in Eastern Neighborhood Mixed Use Districts, except as an approved modification through the Large Project Authorization process. While such configurations can be supported, a minimum of 25 percent of the lot area is preferred.

The proposal achieves the minimum 25 percent depth along the Carolina Street and Wisconsin Street frontages, the proposed rear yard in total only represents approximately 21 percent of the lot area. The project should provide a rear yard that is closer to 25 percent of the total property area.

3. **Dwelling Unit Mix.** Planning Code Section 207.6 requires at that least 40 percent of the dwelling units in this project have two or more bedrooms. While the proposed project provides 42.4 percent of its dwelling units with two bedrooms or more, it appears that many of the second bedrooms in these units do not meet the Planning Code requirement for a bedroom. More specifically, the Zoning Administrator interpretation of Section 102.29 states:

“The Eastern Neighborhoods Plan includes ‘minimum dwelling unit mix’ provisions in Section 207.6 which require a certain number of two- or three-bedroom units in new developments. In order to implement this requirement, it was necessary to define a ‘bedroom’. Section 102.29 defines bedroom as “a ‘sleeping room’, as defined in the Building Code”. However, the Building Code does not contain a single definition of “sleeping room”, rather it – along with the Housing Code – contains several varied definitions, many of which relate to technical issues traditionally dealt with by the Department of Building Inspection (DBI). Therefore, a bedroom shall be defined as any room which meets all of the following criteria and which is subsequently determined by DBI to meet applicable Building and Housing Code standards: (1) contains at least 70 square feet, exclusive of closets, bathrooms, or similar spaces (as approved by DBI under the San Francisco Building and Housing Codes and related Administrative Bulletins), (2) has at least one window opening to an area which leads either to a street, light well, courtyard or rear yard (as approved by DBI under the San Francisco Building and Housing Codes and related Administrative Bulletins), and (3) is clearly labeled as a ‘bedroom’ on submitted plans.”

Please ensure that any future development applications for this project meet the dwelling unit mix requirement with appropriately designed second bedrooms.

4. **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. See <http://www.sfbetterstreets.org/design-guidelines/street-types/> to identify relevant street types for the project frontage.

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](http://www.sfbetterstreets.org). Required streetscape and pedestrian improvements are not eligible for in-kind fee credit per Section 423.3(d).

5. **Shadow.** Projects over 40 feet in height require a Shadow Analysis Application per Section 295 to ensure that new buildings do not cast new shadows on properties that are under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department. A preliminary shadow analysis was conducted based on the plans submitted as part of the PPA Application. The analysis indicated there would be no new shadows cast on properties under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Department. Nonetheless, a Shadow Analysis Application must be filed in order to document that the project will not cast any shadows on Recreation and Park properties.
6. **Bicycle Parking.** Planning Code Sections 155.1-5 were recently amended by the Board of Supervisors (File No. 130528) to require projects with more than 100 dwelling units to provide 100 Class 1 bicycle parking spaces plus one Class 1 bicycle parking space for every four dwelling units over 100. Additionally, one Class 2 bicycle parking space is required for every 20 dwelling units. These Sections provide additional requirements about the design and placement of these bicycle parking spaces. No bicycle parking is proposed as part of this review. Please ensure any future development application clearly meets the requirements of these Sections.
7. **Car sharing.** Planning Code Section 166 requires this project to provide at least two car share spaces. The proposed project contains two car share spaces. However, the application states that these spaces will be for the “residents” convenience. Please be aware that the two required car share spaces must be made available to the public.
8. **Affordable Housing.** Projects within the UMU Zoning District are subject to the affordable housing requirements of Planning Code Section 415 and 419. The subject property is designated as Tier B for purposes of Section 419. The project is also eligible for Section 417 (the Eastern Neighborhoods Alternative Affordable Housing Fee).
9. **Eastern Neighborhoods Impact Fees.** The Eastern Neighborhoods Infrastructure 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. More specifically, this property is designated as Tier 1 for residential uses. The Eastern Neighborhoods Infrastructure Impact Fee shall be paid before the City issues a first construction document.

**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 Infrastructure 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.

10. **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

11. **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.
12. **Stormwater.** Projects that disturb 5,000 square feet or more of the ground surface must comply with the Stormwater Design Guidelines and submit a Stormwater Control Plan to the SFPUC for review. To view the Guidelines and download instructions for preparing a Stormwater Control Plan, go to <http://stormwater.sfwater.org/>. Applicants may contact [stormwaterreview@sfwater.org](mailto:stormwaterreview@sfwater.org) for assistance.
13. **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.

#### PRELIMINARY DESIGN COMMENTS:

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

#### Site Design, Open Space, and Massing

1. Each of the three facades presents a long, uninterrupted mass. Even though the frontage along 16<sup>th</sup> Street is not greater than 200 feet, and therefore does not trigger Section 270.1, the building should be broken into smaller components through substantial mass breaks to provide a more human-scaled appearance.
2. The open space should be designed in such a manner as to be usable by building occupants. Rather than dividing the two mirrored open spaces into long, narrow courtyards (as indicated in the building section), consider combining the two into a single, large open space.

**Street Frontage**

The frontage should provide a consistent and active relationship with the fronting street.

3. The setback and double-storied expression of the ground floor units on the Wisconsin and Carolina Street facades provide needed articulation of the building base, and should be continued on the 16<sup>th</sup> Street façade.
4. The Planning Department recommends that the ground floor residential units be raised three to five feet above grade with a front entry stoop, so as to provide a transition from the public street to the private residences.
5. If the project decides to provide at-grade entrances, more space is needed to provide a transition from the street. The Planning Department recommends a more substantial, landscaped setback on Wisconsin and Carolina Streets. Given the relatively narrow sidewalk combined with the heavy transit along 16<sup>th</sup> Street, a significant setback will be of particular importance on this side of the building. Gates, screens, and fences at the ground floor patios should be no higher than 3'-6" and should be transparent.
6. "Flex Space" is not a defined use in the Code, but expanded accessory use to a primary residential use may be justified in certain conditions. If the project defines the ground floor units as residential they shall comply with the Draft Ground Floor Residential Design Guidelines. The draft guidelines are located on the Department website under "Resource Center/Department Publications/Guidelines for Ground Floor Residential Design."

**Architecture**

At this point the architecture is assumed to be preliminary; the Planning Department will provide further detailed design review on the subsequent submission.

7. In addition to more substantial mass breaks as noted above, the façade should feature fine-grained articulation and texture to reduce the appearance of mass. This could be achieved through varied window sizes, bay windows, balconies, or three-dimensional detailing. Regular vertical articulation is recommended.
8. While it is appropriate to take cues from the industrial context, the building should clearly read as a residential structure.
9. The columns on the Wisconsin and Carolina facades appear narrow and flimsy relative to the mass of the upper stories. The Planning Department recommends more substantial columns to visually anchor the building at its base.
10. The entry to the residential lobby should be a celebrated, prominent part of the façade, distinguished in depth, width, and height. Consider locating the residential entry on Wisconsin for proximity to the nearby Jackson Playground.

11. If the project is developed as two separate buildings, their facades should be designed as such, and should not simply be mirror images of each other.
12. The Planning Department expects a high quality of design that responds to its context with a consistent composition of building components, materiality, and other architectural features that reference the scale and proportion of the surrounding building forms and components.
13. 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 a successful 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 **January 5, 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:      Neighborhood Group Mailing List  
                         Interdepartmental Project Review Application  
                         Flood Notification: Planning Bulletin  
                         SFPUC Recycled Water Information Sheet

cc:    Sixteenth Street Center, LLC, Property Owner  
         Corey Teague, Current Planning  
         Heidi Kline, Environmental Planning  
         Kay Cheng, Citywide Planning and Analysis  
         Jerry Robbins, MTA  
         Jerry Sanguinetti, DPW