



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Preliminary Project Assessment

Date: August 23, 2013
Case No.: **2013.0862U**
Project Address: 1530 Page Street & 1631-39 Oak Street
Block/Lot: 1223/088, 022, 023, 024 and a portion of lot 023
Zoning: RM-1 [Zoning District]
40-X [Height and Bulk District]
Project Sponsor: The Urban School of SF (Susan Munn/Diane Walters)
415-626-2919
Staff Contact: Paul Chasan | 415-575-9065
paul.chasan@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 St Agnes Catholic Church and the Urban School of San Francisco are co-sponsors proposing a two-phase campus improvement project that would develop the Church's existing parking lot at 1631 Oak Street into an approximately 67,900, square foot academics and athletics building and renovate the Church's existing gymnasium/theater building into a 10,750 square foot performing arts building. Both structures would be shared between the St Agnes Catholic Church and the Urban School of San Francisco. An existing single family residential building would be retained and relocated on-site, but the total area allocated to residential uses would be reduced from 3,100 square feet to 2,100 square feet. The project includes a two-level garage housing 57 parking spaces. One level of the garage is proposed below grade, while the other level is proposed at grade with Oak Street.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:

In compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the environmental review process must be completed before any project approval may be granted. This review may be done in conjunction with the required approvals listed below. In order to begin formal environmental review, please submit an Environmental Evaluation Application for the full scope of the project (demolition and construction). 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 under the "Publications" tab. See "Studies for Project outside of Adopted Plan Areas" on page 2 of the current Fee Schedule for calculation of environmental application fees.¹

The following environmental issues would likely be addressed as part of the project's environmental review based on our preliminary review of the proposed project as it is described in the Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) submittal dated June 26, 2013:

1. **Hazardous Materials.** The project sponsor has indicated that the proposed project would require excavation of a total of up to 8,204 cubic yards.² Based on this, the proposed project would be subject to the amended Maher Ordinance, which will become effective August 24, 2013. During environmental review of the proposed project, the Planning Department will coordinate with the San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH) to determine the appropriate course of action.

A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) has been prepared for the project site (Block No. 1223, Lots 008, 022, 023, and 024 and a portion of Block No. 1223, Lot 003).³ The Phase I ESA recommends that a limited subsurface assessment be conducted to assess the presence or absence of constituents of concern, including a soil vapor survey. After the Environmental Review Application is filed, review for the Phase I ESA and any additional studies recommended by the Phase I ESA would require oversight from DPH. Please contact Elise D. Heilshorn at DPH if you have any questions about DPH's requirements for the proposed project. Elise D. Heilshorn can be reached at (415) 252-3885. Any hazardous materials identified, either before or during work, shall be abated according to applicable federal, state, and local laws.

Because the existing buildings on the project site were constructed prior to 1980, asbestos-containing materials, such as floor and wall coverings, may be found in the buildings. The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) is responsible for regulating airborne pollutants including asbestos. Please contact BAAQMD for the requirements related to improvements to buildings that may contain asbestos-containing materials. In addition, because of their age, lead paint may be found in the existing buildings. Please contact the San Francisco Department of Building Inspection (DBI) for requirements related to improvements to buildings that may contain lead paint.

2. **Geology.** According to the Planning Department's records, Lot 023 contains slopes greater than 20 percent. Based on this, a geotechnical study prepared by a qualified consultant must be submitted with the Environmental Evaluation Application. The project involves excavation approximately 12

¹ San Francisco Planning Department. *Schedule for Application Fees*. Available online at:

<http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=513>.

² Diane Walters, Project Sponsor. *Email to Kei Zushi, San Francisco Planning Department, Excavation Depth: PPA 1631-39 Oak St & 1563 Page St*, August 8, 2013. This email is available for review as part of Case File No. 2013.0862U at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, California 94103.

³ Arthur C. Farkas, Krazan & Associates, Inc. *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, Proposed Urban School Property, 1530 Page Street, APNs 1223-008, -022, -023, and -024, and a portion of 1223-003, San Francisco, California 94117*. This document is available for review as part of Case File No. 2013.0862U at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, California 94103.

feet below the Oak Street sidewalk elevation.⁴ The study should address whether the site is subject to liquefaction, and should provide recommendations for 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.

3. **Archeological Resources.** Project implementation would entail soil-disturbing activities associated with building construction, including excavation that would reach a depth of approximately 12 feet below the Oak Street sidewalk elevation.⁵ Based on this, the project would require a Preliminary Archeological Review (PAR), which would be conducted in-house by the Planning Department Archeologist. The PAR would determine what type of soils disturbance/modification would result from the project, such as excavation, installation of foundations, soils improvement, site remediation, etc. Any available geotechnical report or Phase II ESA prepared for the project site would be reviewed as part of the archeological review for this project. In addition, it would also be determined if the project site is in an area that is archeologically sensitive. The result of this review would be provided in a memorandum to the environmental planner assigned to the project. If it is found that the project has the potential to affect an archeological resource, the PAR memorandum would identify any additional measures to be implemented. Such actions may include application of appropriate archeological mitigation measures and/or requiring additional archeological studies as part of the environmental evaluation. If an additional archeological study is required, it must be prepared by a qualified archeological consultant. The qualified consultant must be selected from a list of three archeological consultants from the Planning Department's archeological resources consultant file provided by the Planning Department during the environmental review process.⁶ The Planning Department Archeologist will be informed by the geotechnical study of the project site's subsurface geological conditions (see Item 2, Geology, above).
4. **Historic Architectural Resources.** According to the Planning Department's records, the existing residence on Lot 023, which is proposed to be relocated to a northern portion of Lot 003, was built in 1904. The existing church building on Lot 003 was constructed in 1926. The exiting 10,750-sf gymnasium and theater building on Lot 008, for which minor exterior modification (security and accessible upgrades) is proposed, was built in 1949. These three buildings are considered to be a potential historic resource, or a Category B property. Category B properties are properties that do not meet the criteria for listing in Categories A.1 (resources listed on or formally determined to be eligible for the California Register) or A.2 (resources listed on adopted local registers, and properties that have been determined to appear or may become eligible, for the California Register), but for which the City has information indicating that further consultation and review will be required for evaluation whether a property is an historical resource for the purposes of CEQA. Golden Gate Park, which is located north of the project site across Oak Street is a known historic resource. Therefore, as

⁴ Diane Walters, Project Sponsor. *Excavation Depth: PPA 1631-39 Oak St & 1563 Page St*, August 8, 2013. This document is available for review as part of Case File No. 2013.0862U at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, California 94103.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ San Francisco Planning Department. *Consultant Resources, Archeological Review Consultant Pool*. Available online at: <http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1886>.

part of the environmental review for the proposed project, further consultation and review would be required to evaluate whether the property is an historical resource for the purposes of CEQA, and whether the project would adversely affect any on- and off-site historic resources.

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 contains historical resource(s) as defined in Section 15064.5(a)(3) of CEQA; and, if it is determined to be an historical resource, the second is to evaluate whether the action or project proposed by the sponsor would cause a substantial adverse change to that resource. In this case, the project sponsor would be required to submit a *Supplemental Information for Historic Resource Determination* prepared by a qualified professional who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards in Historic Architecture or Architectural History. The historic consultant must be selected from the Planning Department's Historical Resources consultant pool, in accordance with the Planning Department's consultant selection procedures.^{7,8} Please submit this information with your Environmental Evaluation Application. Based on the information provided in the *Supplemental Information for Historic Resource Determination*, the Planning Department would prepare a Historic Resource Evaluation Response (HRER) to determine whether a Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE) is required. If an HRE is required, the HRE would first determine if the building located on the project site is an eligible historic resource, and analyze the impacts of the proposed project upon the resource. If an HRE is required, it must be prepared by a qualified consultant chosen from the Department's Historic Resources Consultant List (contact Tina Tam at 415-558-6325 for information about this list).

5. **Transportation and Circulation.** The project architect has indicated that the school would increase their enrollment from 380 to 420 students for Phase 1 of the proposed project, by adding 10 students per year over a 4 year period.⁹ However, due to lack of the information, a preliminary determination could not be made as to whether a Transportation Impact Study (TIS) would be required for the project.

A formal determination as to whether a TIS is required will be made after submittal of the Environmental Evaluation Application. If a TIS is required, the Planning Department will provide additional guidance related to the process for selecting a transportation consultant and assist in the development of the scope of work for the analysis. The consultant must be selected from a list of three transportation consultants from the Planning Department's transportation consultant file provided by the Planning Department during the environmental review process.¹⁰

⁷ Tina Tam, San Francisco Planning Department. *Addendum to the Planning Department's Memo Regarding Administration of MEA's Historic Resource Consultant Pool*, April 11, 2011. Available online at: http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/MEA/HP_consultant_pool_letter_4-6-11.pdf.

⁸ San Francisco Planning Department. *Consultant Resources, Historic Resources Consultant Pool*. Available online at: <http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1886>.

⁹ Kami Kinkaid, Pfau Long Architecture. *Email to Kei Zushi, San Francisco Planning Department, 1631-39 Oak Street & 1350 Page Street (Case No. 2013.0862U)*, July 24, 2013. This email is available for review as part of Case File No. 2013.0862U at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, California 94103.

¹⁰ San Francisco Planning Department. *Consultant Resources, Transportation Consultant Pool*. Available online at: <http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1886>.

At the time of filing of the Environmental Evaluation Application, please provide all of the following information:

- a. On-site circulation plan, if any;
 - b. Any proposed pick up/drop off plan, if any;
 - c. Description of how the traffic flow on the project site and in its vicinity would change, if applicable;
 - d. The general use of the theater (the number of events planned, timing of such events in relation to the PM peak hour [i.e., generally between 4:30 to 6:30 p.m.], and occupancy capacity of the theater building); and
 - e. The construction period for each of the two project phases.
6. **Air Quality.** 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, to minimize public nuisance complaints, and to avoid orders to stop work by DBI. Pursuant to the Construction Dust Ordinance, and because the project site is over a half-acre in area, the project sponsor would be required to prepare a Construction Dust Control Plan for review and approval by DPH.

In addition to construction dust, construction activities would require the use of heavy-duty diesel equipment that emits diesel particulate matter (DPM). DPM is a designated toxic air contaminant that 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 would expand an existing sensitive land use (school) that may be affected by nearby roadway-related pollutants and other stationary sources that may emit toxic air contaminants. 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. 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.

7. **Greenhouse Gases.** Potential environmental effects related to greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from the revised project need to be addressed in a project's environmental evaluation. The project sponsor

would be required to submit a completed GHG Compliance Checklist Table 1 for Private Development Projects¹¹ demonstrating that the project is in 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.¹² Projects that do not comply with a GHG-related regulation may be determined to be inconsistent with San Francisco's Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy.

8. **Noise.** Based on the City's GIS-based traffic noise model map, the project site is located along streets with noise levels above 75 dBA L_{dn} (a day-night averaged sound level). The Land Use Compatibility Chart for Community Noise in the San Francisco General Plan, Environmental Protection Element states that construction of new school classrooms should generally not be undertaken in an area with noise levels above 65 dBA L_{dn} and that construction of new school classrooms in an area with noise levels between 62 and 70 dBA L_{dn} should be undertaken only after a detailed analysis of the noise reduction requirements is made and needed noise insulation features included in the design.¹³ As part of this project, an approximately 315-seat theater would be added to the existing gymnasium/theater building located on Lot 008. As part of the environmental review for this project, potential operational noise generated by the new theater would likely be analyzed. Based on this, a noise analysis prepared by a qualified acoustic consultant would be required for the project. A formal determination as to whether a Noise Study is required and as to the scope of the Noise Study will be made after submittal of the Environmental Evaluation Application.

Construction noise would be subject to the San Francisco Noise Ordinance (Article 29 of the San Francisco Police Code), which includes restrictions on noise levels of construction equipment and hours of construction.

9. **Stormwater.** 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 sf or greater prepare a Stormwater Control Plan (SCP) that is consistent with the November 2009 Stormwater Design Guidelines.¹⁴ 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 evaluate how and where the implementation of required stormwater management and Low Impact Design (LID) approaches

¹¹ San Francisco Planning Department. *Consultant Resources. Greenhouse Gas Compliance Checklist for Private Development Projects*. Available online at: <http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1886>.

¹² City and County of San Francisco. *Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions*. Available online at: http://sfmea.sfplanning.org/GHG_Reduction_Strategy.pdf.

¹³ San Francisco Planning Department. *San Francisco General Plan, Environmental Protection Element*. Available online at: http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/general_plan/I6_Environmental_Protection.htm.

¹⁴ San Francisco Public Utilities Commission. *Storm Design Guidelines*. Available online at: <http://www.sfwater.org/index.aspx?page=446>.

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. **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.¹⁵ Any tree identified in the Affidavit for Tree Disclosure must be shown on the Site Plans with the size of trunk diameter, tree height, and accurate canopy drip line. Please submit an Affidavit along with the Environmental Evaluation Application and ensure that trees are appropriately shown on site plans.
11. **Bird-Safe Building Ordinance.** This property is within 300 feet of a possible urban bird refuge. The project would be subject to Planning Code Section 139, Standards for Bird-Safe Buildings, which addresses Location-Related Standards and Feature-Related Standards.¹⁶ The project's environmental evaluation would generally discuss how the implementation of bird-safe design standards would reduce potential adverse effects on birds due to the lighting, glazing, balconies, and so forth.
12. **Notification of a Project Receiving Environmental Review.** Notice is required to be sent to occupants of properties adjacent to the project site and owners of properties within 300 feet of the project site. Please be prepared to provide these mailing labels upon request during the environmental review process.

Based on the preliminary review of the proposed project, the project appears to be consistent with the existing zoning designation and regulations applicable to the project site with Conditional Use Authorization by the Planning Commission. In addition, the project site is located within the city limits and less than five acres in size. It also appears that the project can be adequately served by all required utilities and public services. For these reasons, if the project does not result in a significant impact on the environment, including traffic, noise, air quality, water quality, habitats for endangered, rare, or threatened species, the project could be eligible for a Class 32 infill development project under CEQA Guidelines Section 15332.

If it is determined that the project could result in a significant impact, an initial study would be prepared. The initial study may be prepared either by an environmental consultant from the Department's environmental consultant pool or by Department staff. If the initial study finds that the project would have a significant impact that could be reduced to a less-than-significant level by mitigation measures agreed to by the project sponsor, then the Department would issue a preliminary mitigated negative declaration (PMND). The PMND would be circulated for public review for a period of 20 calendar days, during which time concerned parties may comment on and/or appeal the determination. If an appeal is filed, the Planning Commission would hold a hearing to decide the appeal. If no appeal is filed, the Planning Department would issue a final mitigated negative declaration (FMND).

¹⁵ San Francisco Planning Department. *Affidavit for Tree Disclosure*. Available online at:
http://sfmea.sfplanning.org/Tree_Disclosure.pdf.

¹⁶ San Francisco Planning Department. *Standards for Bird-Safe Buildings*. Available online at:
<http://www.sfplanning.org/index.aspx?page=2506>.

If the initial study indicates that the project would result in a significant impact that cannot be mitigated to below a significant level, an EIR must be prepared by an environmental consultant from the Planning Department's environmental consultant pool. For example, if the HRER determines that the building proposed for relocation is a historic resource (see item 4, above) and the relocation of the building results in a significant impact on an on- or off-site historic resource, which cannot be reduced by mitigation measures agreed to by the project sponsor to a less-than-significant level, the Planning Department would require the preparation of an EIR focused on historical architectural resources. The Planning Department would provide more detail to the project sponsor regarding the EIR process should this level of environmental review be required.

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. Per Planning Code Sections 209.3 and 303, a **Conditional Use application** for expansion of an institutional use in a residential zoning district is required. **NOTE:** On January 15, 2004, pursuant to Motion No. 16709, the Planning Commission approved Case No. 2003.0451C for 1529-1565 Page Street to allow intensification of a secondary school (a.k.a. The Urban School). For the purposes of the subject project, review of the required Conditional Use application will take into account past Commission findings and Conditions of Approval with regard to further expansion of the Urban School.
2. Per Planning Code Section 305, a **Variance application** is required as the new construction project requires variances from the front setback and rear yard requirements of the Planning Code. The proposed relocation of the existing residential building may also require variances, if the relocated building does not meet the minimum Code requirements at its new location (*e.g.* provisions for front setback, rear yard depth, open space area.). Additional information regarding existing and proposed parking for the school and church uses is needed to determine if a variance is also needed for parking.
3. **Relocation of the Existing Residential Building.** Per Planning Code Section 317, relocation of an existing residential structure is not considered tantamount to a residential demolition or removal of a dwelling unit. However, if portions of the relocated building are removed and/or if existing residential uses within the building are converted to institutional use, demolition calculations and/or conversion of a residential unit may need to be reviewed under a Dwelling Unit Removal Application per Section 317. Additionally, if existing residential uses at the relocated building were to be converted to church use, a separate Conditional Use application would be necessary for the expansion of the church as an institutional use in a residential zoning district.
4. **Alteration and New Construction Building Permit Applications** are required for the alteration of the proposed Performing Arts Building and the new construction of the proposed Academic and Athletic Building. Alteration and New Construction Building Permit applications are available at the Department of Building Inspection at 1660 Mission Street. The Department of Building Inspection

would also be able to advise as to the type of Building Permit Application required for the relocation of the existing residential building.

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.

Pre-application Community Outreach Meeting. 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 in “Permit Forms” under “Permits/Zoning” tab. All registered neighborhood group mailing lists are available online at www.sfplanning.org under the “Publications” tab.

Hearing and Section 311 Notification. Public notification of the Building Permit Applications per Planning Code Section 311 is required and would be consolidated as part of the public notification for the public hearings required for the Conditional Use and Variance applications.

PRELIMINARY PROJECT COMMENTS:

General Plan & Policy

As proposed, this project appears largely in conformity with the City’s General Plan. However the policies contained within the City’s General Plan do address some issues that were raised in the initial project screening such as:

- **Oak Street Building Façade.** The proposed design shows a building façade that has a strong sense of horizontality set in a neighborhood context of narrow (roughly 25’ wide) residential parcels. The General Plan’s Urban Design Element encourages building facades that relate to the existing neighborhood pattern. See Urban Design Element, Policy 1.2, and Objective 2 – Fundamental Principles for Conservation (Principals: 2, 3 and 4). Also see Preliminary Design Comments below on building facade.
- **Oak Street Garage Entry.** The proposed design shows an approximately 20’-wide inactive façade on the eastern side of the Oak Street garage entrance. The General Plan encourages the creation of active building façades and limiting the impacts of curb cuts and garage entries. See Urban Design Element: Objective 2 – Fundamental Principles for Conservation (Principal: 11); Objective 4 – Fundamental Principles for Neighborhood Environment (Principal: 10)]. Also See Preliminary Design Comments below on building façade.

- **Encouraging cycling.** The General Plan encourages the creation of both on-street and off-street bicycle parking. While the PPA submission documentation discussed the applicant's desire to incorporate bicycle parking into the project design, the attached site plans do not show any space allocated for bicycle parking. See: Transportation Element: Policies 2.4 and 2.5. To learn more about the city's bicycle parking requirements, please see the discussion on bicycle parking below.

Planning Code

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

1. **Floor Area Ratio.** Per Planning Code Section 124, floor area ratio in the RM-1 Zoning District is limited to 1.8 square feet to 1 square foot of lot area.
2. **Height and Bulk.** Per Article 2 of the Planning Code and the 40-X Height and Bulk District, the maximum allowable building height for the lot is 40 feet. Per Planning Code Section 260, certain features, such as railings, parapets and windscreens may be permitted to a certain height above the 40-foot limit.
3. **Conditional Use.** Per Planning Code Section 303, the required Conditional Use application for intensification of the institutional use (The Urban School) will be reviewed in conjunction with previous Conditional Use decisions and Conditions of Approval issued for The Urban School, including Conditional Use Case No. 2003.0451C, Motion No. 16709 which previously allowed expansion of The Urban School. Additional information about St. Agnes Church and its related buildings will be needed to evaluate the relationship of the proposed uses between the church and the school, as the project is co-sponsored by both entities. This information may require that the Conditional Use application, or a separate Conditional Use application, also take into consideration the expansion of the institutional use operated by the church.
4. **Front Setback.** Per Planning Code Section 132, the required front setback from the front lot line shall be the average of the adjacent front setbacks. This setback requirement shall apply to the relocated residential building and the proposed Academic and Athletic Building.
5. **Rear Yard.** Per Planning Code Section 134, a 45-percent rear yard is required in the RM-1 District. As the relocated residential building and the proposed Academic and Athletic Building do not provide the required rear yard depth, the project may be revised to provide a Planning Code-complying rear yard depth or an application seeking a variance from the rear yard requirements may be submitted.
6. **Required Streetscape and Pedestrian Improvements.** Per Planning Code Section 138.1, the project shall provide pedestrian and streetscape improvements along Oak and Page Streets in accordance with the City's "Better Streets Plan." Per Planning Code Section 138.1, the project sponsor will be required to submit a Streetscape Plan illustrating the location and design of streetscape

improvements appropriate to the street type, including site furnishings, landscaping, corner curb extensions, and sidewalk widening as appropriate. The Planning Department may require these elements as part of conditions of approval. Required streetscape and pedestrian improvements are not eligible for in-kind fee credit for any required development fees.

The project site fronts two streets. Under the Better Streets Plan, Page Street is classified as a *Neighborhood Residential Street*. Oak Street is classified as a *Residential Thoroughway* with a special condition overlay as a *Park Edge Street*. See <http://www.sfbetterstreets.org/design-guidelines/street-types/> to identify relevant street types for the project frontage

Both the Page Street and Oak Street facades should include amenities like sidewalk landscaping and potential special paving treatments in the furnishing zone. The mid-block crossing on the Page Street façade can also be enhanced with mid-block bulb-outs that include sidewalk landscaping and/or street furniture.

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.

Included in Section 138.1 is the requirement for five, 24-inch-box-sized street trees along Oak Street (including the frontage of Lot 3 on Oak Street where the relocated residential building is proposed), and three, 24-inch-box-sized street trees along Page Street. Street trees to be retained may be counted toward this requirement. Permits for street tree removal and planting should be approved with the Department of Public Works (DPW), Bureau of Urban Forestry prior to the first Planning approval of the site permit. If DPW determines the required tree(s) cannot be planted, an in-lieu fee will be charged for each required street tree that cannot be planted.

7. **Bird-Safe Design.** Per Planning Code Section 139, the project shall be designed to reduce bird mortality from circumstances that are known to pose a high risk to birds and are considered to be "bird hazards." Section 139 establishes bird-safe standards and controls to ensure new construction projects are bird-safe.

8. **Street Frontage Design.** Per Planning Code Sections 144 and 144.1, street frontages shall be compatible with the scale, moderation/articulation and character of the existing street frontage, visually interesting and attractive in relation to the pattern of the neighborhood, including limiting garage doors to a width of 20 feet. The garage entry along Oak Street shall meet the provisions of Section 144.

9. **Off-Street Parking.** Per Planning Code Section 151, off-street parking is required for the project. To determine the number of parking spaces required, the existing number of parking spaces for the church use and the existing number of parking spaces for the school use will be required. For the school use, the existing school buildings (across Page Street) shall be included in the parking

calculation, so that that the entirety of The Urban School facilities is treated as one entity. Similarly, the nearby church uses shall be treated as one institutional entity to determine the off-street parking requirement. As part of the Conditional Use application, the parking arrangement between the school and church (days, hours, number of spaces available to each institution, etc.) shall be disclosed. If the proposed project results in an increase of required parking spaces that are not provided, a variance from the parking requirements of the Code may be requested.

10. Bicycle Parking. While the submission PPA letter made several references to a desire to include bicycle parking in the project, there was no bicycle parking space shown on the plans.

Please note Board of Supervisors recently passed a major revision to the bicycle parking requirements in the Planning Code that will affect the requirements for this project. The Board of Supervisors Land Use committee passed legislation in July and it is expected to become effective in early September.

While the new legislation does not require bicycle parking for religious institutions like churches, it does include bicycle parking requirements for Secondary Schools. The recently passed legislation will require four Class 1 bicycle spaces and one class 2 bicycle spaces for each classroom. Project sponsors should plan on accommodating the bicycle parking required for secondary schools under the new legislation into the design.

To view the recently passed legislation, please see:

<http://www.sfbos.org/ftp/uploadedfiles/bdsupvrs/ordinances13/o0183-13.pdf>

PRELIMINARY DESIGN COMMENTS:

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

- 1. Site Design, Open Space, and Massing.** The overall project massing is appropriate for the project site.
- 2. Vehicle Circulation, Access and Parking.** The double-length parking spaces should be replaced with standard spaces to make as efficient use as possible of the ground floor space devoted to vehicle parking and maneuvering.
- 3. Street Frontage.**
 - The Department appreciates the re-use of the existing building façade on Page Street.
 - The ground floor should feature active, engaging uses. While the west side of the Oak Street elevation is appropriately active, the east side features a wide garage door and a blank wall behind which is undefined vehicular space in the garage. The Department recommends minimizing the vehicle-oriented and inactive portion of the façade and incorporating additional active use space and ground-level articulation and fenestration.

- Consider moving the main pedestrian building entry along Oak Street further east, away from the quieter, residential portion of the block. Likewise, consider relocating the rooftop outdoor space to the northeast corner of the building, away from the residential core of the block.
4. **Architecture.** At this point the architecture is assumed to be preliminary; the Department will provide further detailed design review upon subsequent submission.
- The Department appreciates that the building is appropriately scaled in terms of height and bulk for a residential neighborhood, while at the same time clearly reads as an institutional structure. The façade texture of the Oak Street façade works well with the context of highly detailed Victorian residences.
 - While the overall scale of the project is appropriate, the façade should be better articulated and detailed in narrower, more vertical segments that reduce the horizontality of this long building and are related to the grain of the neighborhood. This neighborhood has a strong pattern of 25' wide lots. The Department is not expecting a traditional residential bay-window expression, but simply a more fine-grain vertical articulation of the façade appropriate for a contemporary institutional building in this setting. .
 - The Oak Street elevation appears to show projections or some other element highlighted above the garage and at the upper right corner of the building. While the Department appreciates variation in the façade, the location of this element over the garage could draw undue emphasis to the vehicle entry. Consider reconfiguring these elements so as to not call attention to the garage door.
 - The west side of the Oak Street elevation, which is articulated in a smaller bay and steps down to a lower height, successfully transitions to the adjacent residential structures. Consider employing similar techniques to create a smooth transition on the east side of the elevation as well.

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 **February 23, 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: Zack Zweber, St. Agnes Catholic Church, Property Owner
Glen Cabrerros, Current Planning

Key Zushi, Environmental Planning
Paul Chasan, Citywide Planning and Analysis
Alexis Smith and David Winslow, Urban Design
Jerry Robbins, MTA
Jerry Sanguinetti, DPW