



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

MEMO

DATE: October, 17, 2013

TO: Barbara Gualco, Mercy Housing
Joan McNamera, Mayor's Office of Housing

FROM: David Lindsay, Planning Department

RE: PPA Case No. 2013.1110U for Midtown Park Apartments

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

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

Please find the attached Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) for the project listed above. You may contact the staff contact, Sara Vellve, at (415) 558 - 6263 or sara.vellve@sfgov.org, to answer any questions you may have.

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

David Lindsay, Senior Planner



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Preliminary Project Assessment

Date: October 17, 2013
Case No.: 2013.1110U
Project Address: Midtown Park Apartments
2040 & 2060 O'Farrell Street
1415 Scott Street
1450 Divisadero Street
2121 – 2141 Geary Boulevard
Block/Lot: 1099/031
Zoning: RM-3 (Residential, Mixed, Medium Density)
50-X
Project Sponsors: Mercy Housing
Barbara Gualco
1360 Mission Street, #300
San Francisco, CA 94103
Mayor's Office of Housing
Joan McNamera
1 South Van Ness, 5th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94103
Staff Contact: Sara Vellve – (415) 558 - 6263
sara.vellve@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 existing site encompasses the entirety of Assessor's Block number 1099. The site was developed in the early 1960's with six separate buildings containing a total of 140 affordable dwelling units with 140 off-street, below grade parking spaces. The residential buildings are located around the perimeter of the site and open space is located in a central courtyard.

The proposal is to renovate four residential buildings containing 96 affordable units that front Scott, O'Farrell and Divisadero Streets. Two buildings containing 44 affordable units that front Geary Boulevard would be demolished. Two new residential buildings containing up to 114 affordable units would be constructed to replace those demolished. The project would add 70 units to the site and a

minimum of 188 units would be affordable. The Department understands that the location of affordable and market-rate housing within the development is not firm at this time.

Exterior alterations and expansion of the four buildings to be retained includes façade and building entry modifications, and the addition of three sets egress of stairs reaching a height of approximately 53 feet.

One proposed new building at the corner of Geary Boulevard and Divisadero Street would occupy a similar footprint to the existing building. This building would reach a height of approximately 56 feet at the corner. An active ground-floor use is contemplated for this building. This building would contain approximately 67 affordable senior units.

The second proposed new building fronting Geary Boulevard would occupy a similar footprint as the existing building, but it would be located approximately 10' – 15' closer to Geary Boulevard. This relocation would increase the amount of interior open space on the lot. Approximately 40 family units are proposed in this building. The Department notes that many of these proposed units contain one bedroom and some are studios without separate bedrooms.

The lot currently contains 140 off-street, below-grade parking spaces and the proposal includes 120 spaces of below-grade parking. Bicycle and car share spaces would be proposed. The driveway on Scott Street would not be altered, but those on Divisadero Street and Geary Boulevard would be slightly modified.

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 August 9, 2013:

1. **Hazardous Materials.** The proposed project would require excavation of a total of up to 9,260 cubic yards.² Therefore, the project is subject to Article 22A of the Health Code, also known as the Maher

¹ San Francisco Planning Department. *Schedule for Application Fees*. Available online at: <http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=513>.

² Michael Simmons, Project Sponsor. *Email to Kei Zushi, San Francisco Planning Department, Additional Information: 1415 Scott, 2040&2060 O'Farrell, 1450 Divisadero, 2121&2141 Geary (Case No. 2013.1110U)*, August 26, 2013. This email is

Ordinance. The Maher Ordinance, which is administered and overseen by the Department of Public Health (DPH), requires the project sponsor to retain the services of a qualified professional to prepare a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) that meets the requirements of Health Code Section 22.A.6. The Phase I would determine the potential for site contamination and level of exposure risk associated with the project. Based on that information, soil and/or groundwater sampling and analysis, as well as remediation of any site contamination, may be required. These steps are required to be completed prior to the issuance of any building permit.

DPH requires that projects subject to the Maher Ordinance complete a Maher Application, available at: <http://www.sfdph.org/dph/EH/HazWaste/hazWasteSiteMitigation.asp>. Fees for DPH review and oversight of projects subject to the ordinance would apply. Please refer to DPH's fee schedule, available at: <http://www.sfdph.org/dph/EH/Fees.asp#haz>. Please provide a copy of the submitted Maher Application and Phase I ESA with the Environmental Evaluation Application (EEA).

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 or demolition of 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 or demolition of buildings that may contain lead paint.

2. **Geology.** A geotechnical study prepared by a qualified consultant should be submitted with the Environmental Evaluation Application. The project involves excavation approximately 12 feet below ground surface (bgs). The geotechnical 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 bgs. 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

available for review as part of Case File No. 2013.1110U at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, California 94103.

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 pool provided by the Planning Department during the environmental review process.³ 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 buildings on the project site were built in 1963. The project site is 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 of whether a property is an historical resource for the purposes of CEQA. Therefore, as 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- or 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, a Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE) has been prepared.⁴ Please submit the HRE along with the Environmental Evaluation Application. After the Environmental Evaluation Application is filed, the Planning Department will prepare a Historic Resource Evaluation Response (HRER) to determine whether any of the buildings located on the project site is an eligible historic resource and analyze the impacts of the proposed project upon historic resources based on the HRE. Contact Tina Tam at (415) 558-6325 if you have any questions about the historic resources review required for this project.

- 5. Transportation and Circulation.** The project sponsor has indicated that the proposed project would increase the number of on-site dwelling units from 140 to 210. Based on this and the location of the proposed project, a Transportation Impact Study (TIS) would most likely be required for the

³ San Francisco Planning Department. *Consultant Resources, Archeological Review Consultant Pool*. Available online at: <http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1886>.

⁴ Page & Turnbull. *Midtown Park Apartments Historic Resource Evaluation, San Francisco, California [12202], Prepared for Mercy Housing*, January 16, 2013. This document is available for review as part of Case File No. 2013.1110U at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, California 94103.

proposed project. With the new Geary Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), the transportation analysis should assume center-running BRT.

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.⁵

The following recommendations are offered to reduce impacts on circulation based on our preliminary review of the proposed project: (1) concentrate vehicular access off of the existing access point on Scott Street; (2) reduce the width of the existing curb cut on Scott Street; (3) avoid curb cuts on Geary Boulevard and Divisadero Street; and (4) provide secondary access if needed on O'Farrell Street.

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

- a. Clearly show and label in the site plan the location of all existing and proposed curb cuts, vehicle access/driveways, sidewalks, on- and off-street parking spaces, bicycle parking spaces, on-site pedestrian circulation.
 - b. Show in the site plan the location of all adjacent bus stops (i.e., 24, 38, etc.)
 - c. Please clarify whether MTA requires that all of the existing buildings be brought up to code compliance concerning bike parking requirements as part of this project.
 - d. Provide more information (dimensions, design, etc.) regarding the proposed senior passenger loading/unloading area.
 - e. Please clarify if car share spaces are required for this project.
 - f. Consider providing no parking for affordable housing development.
6. **Air Quality.** The project site is located within an Air Quality Hot Spot.⁶ 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

⁵ San Francisco Planning Department. *Consultant Resources, Transportation Consultant Pool*. Available online at: <http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1886>.

⁶ In an effort to identify areas of San Francisco most adversely affected by sources of TACs, the San Francisco Planning Department and the San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH) have partnered with the BAAQMD to inventory and assess air pollution and exposures from mobile, stationary, and area sources within San Francisco. Areas with poor air quality, termed "air quality hot spots" were identified based on two health-protective criteria: 1) excess cancer risk from the contribution of emissions from all modeled sources > 100 per one million population; or 2) cumulative PM_{2.5} concentrations > 10 micrograms per cubic meter (µg/m³). Land use projects within these air quality hot spots require special consideration to determine whether the project's activities would expose sensitive receptors to substantial air pollutant concentrations.

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 (residential) 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 Projects⁷ 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.⁸ 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. **Shadow.** The proposed project would result in construction of a 56-foot-tall, five-story, 72,325-sf senior housing building and a 52.8-foot-tall, five-story, 55,137-sf family housing building. A shadow

⁷ 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>.

⁸ City and County of San Francisco. *Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions*. Available online at: http://sfmea.sfplanning.org/GHG_Reduction_Strategy.pdf.

fan analysis was prepared for this project.⁹ The shadow analysis found that the proposed project would cast shadow on nearby parks subject to the Planning Code Section 295, including Beideman and O'Farrell Mini Park and Hamilton Recreation Center. As a result, further shadow analysis would be required for this project.

Planning Code Section 295, the Sunlight Ordinance, mandates that new structures above 40 feet in height that would cast additional shadows on properties under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Parks Department can only be approved by the Planning Commission if the shadow is determined to be insignificant or not adverse to the use of the park. Also, a recommendation from the Recreation and Parks Commission is required prior to the Planning Commission hearing. Please refer to the Application Packet for Shadow Analysis available at: <http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=8442>.

9. **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). Therefore, the project would be subject to Mitigation Measure M-NO-1 of the San Francisco 2004 and 2009 Housing Element EIR.¹⁰ Mitigation Measure M-NO-1 requires that a Noise Analysis be prepared prior to completion of the environmental review. Such an analysis shall include, at a minimum: 1) a site survey to identify potential noise-generation uses within two blocks of the project site; and 2) one 24-hour noise measurement (with maximum noise level readings taken at least every 15 minutes). The analysis shall demonstrate with reasonable certainty that Title 24 standards, where applicable, can be met, and that there are no particular circumstances about the project site that appear to warrant heightened concern about noise levels in the vicinity. Should such concerns be present, the Planning Department may require the completion of a detailed noise assessment by person(s) qualified in acoustical analysis and/or engineering prior to the first project approval action.

In addition, Mitigation Measure M-NO-1 requires that open space required under the Planning Code be protected from existing ambient noise levels. 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. It is also recommended that implementation be undertaken consistent with other principles of urban design.

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.

⁹ Sara Vellve, San Francisco Planning Department. *Email to Kei Zushi, Shadow for 2013.1110U*, September 30, 2013. This email is available for review as part of Case File No. 2013.1110U at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, California 94103.

¹⁰ San Francisco Planning Department. *San Francisco 2004 and 2009 Housing Element EIR, Case No. 2007.1275E*, certified on March 24, 2001. Available online at: <http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1828>.

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.

10. **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 ground disturbance of 5,000 sf or greater prepare a Stormwater Control Plan (SCP) that is consistent with the November 2009 Stormwater Design Guidelines.¹¹ 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 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.

11. **Tree Disclosure Affidavit.** The Department of Public Works Code Section 8.02-8.11 requires disclosure and protection of landmark, significant, and street trees located on private and public property.¹² 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.
12. **Bird-Safe Building Ordinance.** The project would be subject to Planning Code Section 139, Standards for Bird-Safe Buildings, which addresses Location-Related Standards and Feature-Related Standards.¹³ 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.
13. **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.

¹¹ San Francisco Public Utilities Commission. *Storm Design Guidelines*. Available online at: <http://www.sfwater.org/index.aspx?page=446>.

¹² San Francisco Planning Department. *Affidavit for Tree Disclosure*. Available online at: http://sfmea.sfplanning.org/Tree_Disclosure.pdf.

¹³ San Francisco Planning Department. *Standards for Bird-Safe Buildings*. Available online at: <http://www.sfplanning.org/index.aspx?page=2506>.

14. **Potential Outcomes of the Environmental Review Process** - The project site is located within a 50-X Height and Bulk District, and the heights of two proposed buildings along Divisadero Street exceed the maximum height limit, which is 50 feet. These buildings include a senior housing building (56 feet) and a family housing building (52.8 feet). The proposed project involves a change in the height and bulk classification of the project site from 50-X to 65-X (for the two proposed buildings). Based on this, the project is inconsistent with the existing height and bulk district requirements. For this reason, the project would not be eligible for a Class 32 infill development exemption under CEQA Guidelines Section 15332(a), even if the project meets all other criteria for Class 32 infill development projects.

Based on this, an initial study would likely be prepared for the proposed project. 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).

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 one or more of the buildings proposed for demolition is a historic resource (see item 4, above) and the demolition 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. **Height Reclassification**– As the proposed buildings exceed the permitted height limit of 50', a height reclassification is necessary, which is a legislative action and must be approved by the Board of Supervisors (BOS). The legislation may be initiated by a Supervisor at the BOS, or by application through the Planning Department.
2. **Planned Unit Development (PUD)/Conditional Use Authorization (CU)** – As the property is more than ½ an acre and encompasses one city block where the existing development is constructed throughout the lot, a PUD is necessary to entitle the project and address any modifications to the Planning Code. The PUD is implemented through the CU process.

3. **General Plan Referral** - San Francisco Charter Section 4.105 and Sections 2A.52 and 2A.53 of the Administrative Code establish the requirement for General Plan Referrals to ensure consistency with the General Plan for several types of projects. As a publicly-assisted housing project plan on City and County property, this project requires a Referral. The Project Sponsor is encouraged to pursue the General Plan Referral in conjunction with all required entitlements. An application form can be found here: <http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=2611#g>
4. **Demolition of Dwelling Units** - As existing dwelling units are proposed to be demolished, Conditional Use authorization pursuant to Planning Code Section 317 is required. The application for *Dwelling Unit Removal Through Merger, Conversion, or Demolition* can be found on the Department's website.
5. **Building Height in RM District** - Pursuant to Planning Code Section 253 the proposal is subject to CU authorization for a building over 50' in height in an RM district. The CU application must specifically address the additional findings contained in Section 253(b).
6. **Shadow Analysis.** Due to potential shadow impacts on nearby property owned by the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department, the project must be approved by the Recreation and Park Commission. For more information, please contact:

Karen Mauney-Brodek
Deputy Director for Park Planning
Planning and Capital Division
30 Van Ness, 4th Floor
City of San Francisco
Recreation and Parks
Karen.Mauney-Brodek@sfgov.org
(415) 575-5601

7. **Building Permit Applications** are required for the demolition of the existing buildings on the subject property.
8. **Building Permit Applications** are required for the proposed new construction and alterations on the subject property.

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 under the "Permits & Zoning" tab. All registered neighborhood group mailing lists are available online at 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. **Transit** - San Francisco Charter Section 8A.115, San Francisco's Transit-First Policy, states that decisions regarding public streets and sidewalks space shall encourage the use of public rights of way by pedestrians, bicyclists, and public transit, and shall strive to reduce traffic and improve public health and safety. Geary Boulevard is one of the busiest transit corridors in San Francisco and Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) on this street is currently under environmental analysis. At this time, three design alternatives are under review and it cannot be said which one will be selected or where stops will be relative to intersections. All alternatives, however, are designed to lower BRT travel times, accelerate boarding, and dedicate street right-of-way to bus lanes. SFMTA has moved bus stops to the "far-side" of intersections on other corridors, and it is very possible the east-bound stop at Divisadero Street will move to the eastern, "far-side" of the intersection in front of the Midtown Park Apartments project. For all BRT scenarios, the Midtown Park Apartments project should create a safe pedestrian environment; minimize curb cuts and conflicts with transit and pedestrian travel; and support access to the future BRT stop at Divisadero Street. More information on the BRT project can be found at <http://www.gearybrt.org>
2. **Civic Design Review** - Pursuant to Charter Section 5.103, any new construction or exterior modification to a structure on this parcel is subject to Civic Design Review. The Planning Department shall not approve any permit until this requirement is fulfilled. More information including the Civic Design Review Committee Submission Guidelines can be found on the Arts Commission website www.sfartscommission.org or by calling (415) 252-2590.
3. **Notice of Special Restriction** - The Department's Parcel Information Database indicates that restrictions on the property have been established through NSR 2655; however, the Department does not have a copy of this document. Please ensure a copy is provided with the Conditional Use Application.
4. **Rear Yard Calculation** - Planning Code Section 134(a)(1) requires a 25% rear yard for the subject lot, which is approximately 25,000 square feet. The central courtyard should meet, or exceed 25% of the lot area. If not, the project must be modified or the deficit must be addressed. Either action is achievable through the PUD/CU process. Provide a site plan indicating the location, and area, of the rear yard.

5. **Parking** – The site currently contains 140 off-street parking spaces for the existing 140 affordable units. The proposal would demolish 44 off-street parking spaces and replace 24 of those spaces for a total of 120 spaces for 188 affordable units and 22 market rate units. Planning Code Section 150(d) does not permit the elimination of parking that partially, or wholly, meets the requirements of the Code. Planning Code Section 151 requires 1:1 parking for market rate units, no parking for senior units, and no parking for affordable units. One car share space is required. Under current Planning Code requirements the proposal only requires 22 off-street parking spaces for the market rate units and one car share space. Although the proposed amount of off-street parking is permitted, and does not constitute an accessory use, the Department *strongly encourages a reduction in the number of proposed off-street parking spaces* due to the robust public transportation system immediately available in the area, the proposed BRT system on Geary Boulevard, and the City's Transit-First policy. The amount of parking proposed for the project would be addressed through the PUD/CU process, and any required modification would be included in the entitlement.
6. **Open Space** – Planning Code Section 135 requires 80 square feet of common open space per unit and 60 square feet of private open space per unit. Senior units require one half of those amounts. Per Section 154(g)(1), any space credited as common usable open space shall be at least 15 feet in every horizontal dimension and shall have a minimum area of 300 square feet. The plans submitted with the PPA Application do not provide enough information to determine that this requirement has been satisfied. Plans submitted with the project entitlement application must specify which portions of the lot will satisfy the common open space requirement.
7. **Front Setback** – Planning Code Section 132 requires front setbacks to be based on buildings located on separate lots that front the same street as the subject property. As the project site contains one single lot, and there are no other buildings that front Geary Boulevard, the proposed buildings fronting Geary Boulevard are not required to provide a front setback.
8. **Exposure** – Based on the plans, it appears that approximately six units in the proposed building five do not meet the requirements of Section 140, as they do not look onto an open area between buildings of at least 25 feet apart. As a result, the project should be modified to meet the requirement, or this modification must be incorporated into the PUD.
9. **Off-street Loading** – Planning Code Section 152 requires one off-street loading space for the existing development and one additional off-street loading space for the proposed improvements as the overall development will exceed 200,000 GSF. Please provide evidence that the proposal meets this requirement or incorporate a modification into the PUD/CU.
10. **Car Share** – Planning Code Section 166 requires one car share space for the development. The proposal includes two car share spaces, which is permitted by Table 166A of the Code.
11. **Bicycle Parking** – Requirements for bicycle parking have recently been updated and are shown in Table 155.2 of the Planning Code. In addition, there are specific dimensional and signage requirements that are articulated in the *Zoning Administrator Bulletin No. 9, Bicycle Parking Requirements: Design and Layout*, which is available on the Department's website. The new bicycle

parking requirement will apply to units in the two newly proposed buildings only. Based on the information provided to the Department, the proposed Building 5 would require two Class 1 spaces and two Class 2 spaces, and the proposed Building 6 would require 22 Class 1 spaces and one Class 2 space. The project plans must demonstrate both the quantitative and qualitative requirements.

12. **Building Height** – Planning Code Section 260 allows a sponsor to determine how building height is calculated. At the time of entitlement submittal, please indicate how the height will be measured. The Planning Department must concur with your approach to measurement.
13. **Landscaping and Permeable Surfaces** – Planning Code Section 132(g), (h) and (i) requires permeable surfaces in all front setback areas. The plans must demonstrate how these requirements will be met.
14. **Street Trees** – Planning Code Section 138.1 requires one street tree for each 20 feet of street frontage to be located in a front setback or in the public right-of-way. Coordination with the Department of Public Works is necessary to determine the exact location, tree species and construction details. The Planning Department must hold building permit applications until approval for the planting has been granted by DPW, or a fee has been established. As DPW is typically backlogged it is advisable to work with DPW early in the permit approval process.
15. **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

16. **Recycled Water.** The City requires property owners to install dual-plumbing systems for recycled water use in accordance with Ordinances 390-91, 391-91, and 393-94, within the designated recycled water use areas for new construction projects larger than 40,000 square feet. Please see the attached SFPUC document for more information.

PRELIMINARY DESIGN COMMENTS:

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

1. **Vehicle Circulation, Access and Parking.** To reduce the number of garage entrances, particularly on Geary Boulevard where the BRT is proposed, consolidate the proposed new parking garages into one garage that can be accessed from the curb cut on Divisadero Street. The curb cut and parking entrance should be no wider than 18 feet. Bike parking is not shown and should be as close as possible to the lobby or garage entrance to minimize the travel distance through the garage, and conflict with automobiles.

