



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

MEMO

DATE: November 12, 2013
TO: Warner Schmalz, Forum Design
FROM: Nannie Turrell, Planning Department
RE: PPA Case No. 2013.1179U for 1700 Market Street

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

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

Please find the attached Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) for the address listed above. You may contact the staff contact, Elizabeth Purl, at (415) 575-9028 or elizabeth.purl@sfgov.org, to answer any questions you may have, or to schedule a follow-up meeting.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Nannie Turrell".

Nannie Turrell, Senior Planner



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Date: November 12, 2013
Case No.: **2013.1179U**
Project Address: 1700 Market Street
Block/Lot: 0855/016
Zoning: NCT-3 (Moderate Scale Neighborhood Commercial Transit) District
Market Octavia Plan Area
85-X Height and Bulk District
Project Sponsor: Warner Schmalz, Forum Design
415-252-7063
Staff Contact: Elizabeth Purl (415) 575-9028
elizabeth.purl@sgov.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 San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, 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 project site consists of Assessor's parcel 0855/016, located at the northeast corner of the intersection of Market and Gough Streets, and has frontages on Market, Gough, and Haight Streets. The project site has an area of 3,500 square feet (sf) and is developed with a two-story, 6,800-sf commercial building. The wood-framed building was constructed in 1890 and is currently occupied by a frame shop and offices. The proposed project would remove the existing building and construct a new 7-story, 75-foot-high, mixed-use concrete building. Uses would include 42 group housing (single room occupancy) units with a total area of 26,002 sf; 1,498 sf of ground floor retail use; communal kitchen and gathering areas; and rooftop common open space. Each room would have limited individual kitchen facilities. The project would include 25 Class I bicycle parking spaces, but no off-street parking is proposed.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:

Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), this project is likely to qualify for a community plan exemption (CPE) under the Market and Octavia Neighborhood 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) was certified do not require additional

environmental review, except as necessary to determine the presence of project-specific significant effects not identified in the programmatic plan area EIR. Within the CPE process, there can be three different outcomes as follows:

1. CPE Only

All potentially significant project-specific and cumulatively considerable environmental impacts are fully consistent with significant impacts identified in the Market and Octavia Neighborhood Plan programmatic EIR (Market and Octavia PEIR), and there would be no new "peculiar" significant impacts unique to the proposed project. In these situations, all pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the Market and Octavia PEIR are applied to the proposed project, and a CPE checklist and certificate is prepared. With this outcome, the applicable fees are: (a) the CPE determination fee (currently \$13,339); (b) the CPE certificate fee (currently \$7,402); and (c) a proportionate share fee for recovery for costs incurred by the Planning Department for the Market and Octavia PEIR.

2. CPE and Focused Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration

If new site- or project-specific significant impacts are identified for the proposed project that were not identified in the Market and Octavia PEIR, and if any of these new significant impacts can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level, then a focused mitigated negative declaration is prepared to address these impacts, and a supporting CPE certificate is prepared to address all other impacts that were encompassed by the Market and Octavia PEIR, with all pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the Market and Octavia PEIR also applied to the proposed project. With this outcome, the applicable fees are: (a) the CPE determination fee (currently \$13,339); (b) the standard environmental evaluation fee (which is based on construction value); and (c) a proportionate share fee for recovery for costs incurred by the Planning Department for the Market and Octavia PEIR.

3. CPE and Focused EIR

If any site- or project-specific impacts cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level, then a focused EIR is prepared to address these impacts, and a supporting CPE certificate is prepared to address all other impacts that were encompassed by the Market and Octavia PEIR, with all pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the Market and Octavia PEIR also applied to the proposed project. With this outcome, the applicable fees are: (a) the CPE determination fee (currently \$13,339); (b) the standard environmental evaluation fee (which is based on construction value); (c) one-half of the standard EIR fee (which is also based on construction value); and (d) a proportionate share fee for recovery for costs incurred by the Planning Department for the Market and Octavia PEIR.

An **Environmental Evaluation Application** 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. San Francisco Preservation Bulletin No. 16 is available at www.sfplanning.org under "Historic Preservation."

All privately-sponsored projects with Environmental Evaluation applications are required to use environmental, transportation, and historic preservation consultants from the Department's consultant pools. Private projects sponsors will have the opportunity to select a consultant from a subset of three consultants chosen by the Department.

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 area plan EIR would apply to the proposed project. This review may be done in conjunction with the required approvals listed below, but must be completed before any project approval may be granted. Results of the studies below will determine which of the three different CPE outcomes described above are necessary for completion of CEQA review.

- 1. Historical Resources:** The building on the project site is more than 50 years old (built circa 1890) and it is adjacent to the Market Street Masonry Buildings Historic District. The building at 1700 Market Street was included in the adopted Market and Octavia Area Plan Historic Resources Survey, completed in 2008. The survey concluded that the building at 1700 Market Street is not eligible for inclusion in the National Register or California Register, or for any local designation of historic resources, despite its age, because it has been extensively altered and does not retain historic features or characteristics. The Market and Octavia FEIR noted that more development would be allowed in the Plan Area, but the implementation of urban design guidelines and other rules, such as evaluation under CEQA, would reduce the overall impact on historic architectural resources to less than significant. During the environmental review process the project will be evaluated for potential impacts on historic architectural resources in the Plan Area.

The project includes demolition of the existing building, which is over 50 years old; therefore, the project is subject to the Department's Historic Preservation review, which would include preparation of an Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE) by a qualified professional who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards. The project site is adjacent to the Market Street Masonry Buildings Historic District, which is a local Landmark District designated pursuant to Article 10 of the Planning Code. As such, the adjacent Historic District, which includes properties on Market Street, opposite the proposed project site, would be considered a historical resource pursuant to CEQA. The HRE will need to determine the compatibility of the proposed new design and facade with the adjacent Market Street Masonry Buildings Historic District and to assess potential impacts to the Historic District. In evaluating compatibility with the Market Street Masonry Buildings Historic District, the architecture, massing, height, materials, and articulation of the proposed building and its neighboring buildings should be considered. Upon submittal of an EEA, the Department will provide the project sponsor with a list of three consultants from the Historic Preservation Consultant Pool. After submittal of the EEA, please contact Tina Tam, Senior Preservation Planner, via email (tina.tam@sfgov.org) for the list of three consultants. Upon selection of the historic resource consultant, the scope of the HRE shall be prepared in consultation with Department Preservation staff.

- 2. Archeological Resources.** The Market and Octavia FEIR anticipated that development on the project site would have the potential to disturb archeological deposits and *Mitigation Measure C2: General Soil Disturbing Activities* was determined to be applicable for any project involving any soils-disturbing activities beyond a depth of four feet for sites located within the Plan Area for which no archeological assessment report has been prepared.

This mitigation measure requires the project to complete either a Preliminary Archeological Review (PAR), conducted in-house by the Planning Department Archeologist, or a Preliminary Archeological

Sensitivity Assessment (PASS) prepared by a Department Qualified Archeological Consultant and subject to review and approval by the Department's Archeologist.

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

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

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

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

3. **Transportation.** The proposed project includes construction of a 75-foot tall building with 42 residential units and 1,498 sf of retail space. Based on the Department's Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines (Table C-1), a transportation study does not appear to be required for this project. This determination is preliminary in nature, and will be revisited upon submittal of the EEA. Should a transportation study be determined to be necessary at that time, the Planning Department will provide additional guidance to the project sponsor related to the process for selecting a transportation consultant and assist in the development of the scope of work for the analysis. As discussed further in the "Preliminary General Plan/Policy Comments" section below, Haight Street, between Laguna Street and Market Street, is undergoing a redesign to implement pedestrian and transit improvements. The project sponsor should coordinate with the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) regarding SFMTA's near-term plans for two-way traffic and a new transit stop along the project site frontage on Haight Street. The project sponsor should also coordinate with SFMTA regarding installation of on-sidewalk bicycle parking along the project's Market Street façade.
4. **Air Quality (AQ) Analysis.** The proposed project includes demolition of the existing two-story building and construction of a 75-foot tall building with 42 residential units and 1,498 sf of retail space. Project-related 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 to as the Construction Dust Control Ordinance (Ordinance 176-08, effective July 30, 2008) with the intent of reducing the quantity of dust

generated during site preparation, demolition, and construction work in order to protect the health of the general public and of onsite workers, minimize public nuisance complaints, and to avoid orders to stop work by the Department of Building Inspection (DBI). Pursuant to the Construction Dust Ordinance, the proposed project would be required to comply with applicable dust control requirements outlined in the ordinance.

In addition to construction dust, excavation and construction activities would require the use of heavy-duty diesel equipment, which emit diesel particulate matter (DPM). DPM is a designated toxic air contaminant, which may affect sensitive receptors located up to and perhaps beyond 300 feet from the project site. Additional measures may be required to reduce DPM emissions from construction vehicles and equipment.

The proposed project also includes sensitive land uses (42 residential dwelling units) that may be affected by 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_{2.5} concentrations from roadway sources exceed 0.2 micrograms per cubic meter (0.2 µg/m³). Sponsors of projects on sites exceeding this level are required to install ventilation systems or otherwise redesign the project to reduce the outdoor PM_{2.5} exposure indoors. The proposed project is located within the Potential Roadway Exposure Zone, and 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: <http://www.sfdph.org/dph/EH/Air/default.asp>.

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 staff prior to the commencement of any required analysis and/or modeling determined necessary.

5. **Greenhouse Gases.** The City and County of San Francisco's Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions presents a comprehensive assessment of policies, programs, and ordinances that represents San Francisco's Qualified Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Reduction Strategy. Projects that are consistent with San Francisco's Qualified GHG Reduction Strategy would result in less-than-significant impacts from GHG emissions. In order to facilitate a determination of compliance with San Francisco's Qualified GHG Reduction Strategy, the Planning Department has prepared a Greenhouse Gas Analysis Compliance Checklist. The environmental planner assigned or CEQA consultant in coordination with the project sponsor will prepare this checklist in coordination with the project sponsor.
6. **Geology, Soils, and Seismicity.** The project involves excavation below grade. A geotechnical study prepared by a qualified consultant should be submitted with the EEA. The study should address

whether the site is subject to liquefaction and landslides, and should provide recommendations for addressing any geotechnical concerns identified in the study.

7. **Shadow.** The proposed project would result in construction of a building approximately 75 feet in height. Planning Code Section 295 requires that a shadow analysis be performed to determine whether a project has the potential to cast shadow on properties under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Recreation and Park Commission. Department staff has prepared a shadow fan that indicates the project would not cast new shadow on any properties under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Department, nor would it cast shadows on any other parks or open spaces. In accordance with Planning Code Section 147, The Department will also review project's shadow on non-Rec/Park privately owned public open space (POPOS) as part of the environmental review process.
8. **Noise.** The proposed project site is located on Market Street at the corner of Gough and Haight Streets. The Planning Department's noise maps indicate that existing ambient noise levels on surrounding streets are at, or exceed 70 decibels. The project involves the siting of new noise-sensitive uses (e.g., residential uses) and therefore requires an acoustical analysis demonstrating that the building will meet Title 24 noise insulation standards. This analysis shall include at least one 24-hour noise measurement (with maximum noise level readings taken at least every 15 minutes). The analysis must be prepared by persons qualified in acoustical analysis and/or engineering and shall demonstrate with reasonable certainty that Title 24 noise insulation standards, where applicable, can be met, and that there are no particular circumstances about the project site that warrant heightened concern about noise levels in the vicinity. To the maximum extent feasible open space provided as per the Planning Code should be protected from existing ambient noise levels that could prove annoying or disruptive to users of the open space.
9. **Tree Planting and Protection Checklist.** The project site contains four mature trees along its perimeter. 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. Please submit a Tree Planting and Protection Checklist with the EEA. Any tree identified in the Tree Planting and Protection Checklist must be shown on the project site plans with size of the trunk diameter, tree height, and accurate canopy dripline.
10. **Stormwater and Flooding.** The City and County of San Francisco Stormwater Management Ordinance became effective on May 22, 2010. This ordinance requires that any project resulting in a ground disturbance of 5,000 square feet or greater prepare a Stormwater Control Plan, consistent with the November 2009 Stormwater Design Guidelines. Responsibility for review and approval of the Stormwater Control Plan is with the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) Wastewater Enterprise, Urban Watershed Management Program. The initial CEQA evaluation of a project will broadly discuss how the Stormwater Management Ordinance will be implemented if the project triggers compliance with the Stormwater Design Guidelines. The project's environmental evaluation would generally evaluate how and where the implementation of required stormwater management and Low Impact Design approaches would reduce potential negative effects of stormwater runoff. This may include environmental factors such as the natural hydrologic system, city sewer collection system, and receiving body water quality. To view the Stormwater Management

Ordinance, the Stormwater Design Guidelines, or download instructions for the Stormwater Control Plan, go to <http://sfwater.org/sdg>.

11. **Notification of a Project Receiving Environmental Review.** Notice is required to be sent to occupants of the project site and properties adjacent to the project site, as well as to owners and to the extent feasible occupants of properties within 300 feet of the project site at the initiation of the environmental review. Please be prepared to provide mailing labels upon request during the environmental review process.

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. **Variance.** The project as proposed requires the granting of variances for the following Code Sections:
 - a. **Street Frontages (Section 145.1).**
 - i. Active uses - §145.1(c)(3). With the exception of space allowed for building egress and access to mechanical systems, space for “active uses”, as defined in Section 145.1(b)(2) shall be provided within the first 25 feet of building depth on the ground floor and 15 feet on floors above. Building systems including mechanical, electrical, and plumbing features may be exempted from this requirement by the Zoning Administrator only in instances where those features are provided in such a fashion as to not negatively impact the quality of the ground floor space. As proposed, there are several spaces located within the first 25 feet of building depth on the ground floor and within the first 15 feet on the second floor that are not considered “active uses”. These spaces include the bicycle parking fronting Market Street and the tenant storage space on the second floor fronting Haight Street. In addition, the mechanical gas, and trash rooms can be exempted from the active use requirement by the Zoning Administrator, but as designed, the spaces result in a unarticulated, relatively blank façade along Haight Street. It is understandable that the irregular lot shape may necessitate some of these features extending into the first 25 feet on the ground floor or within the first 15 feet on the upper floors, but an effort should be made to improve the quality of these spaces for tenants of this building, and to improve the exterior design of the building along the ground and second floors. If non-active uses are provided within the first 25 feet of the building on the ground floor and within the first 15 feet on the second floor, please seek and justify a variance.
 - ii. Ground Floor Transparency – 145.1(c)(6). A minimum of 60 percent transparency is required along each of the project’s street frontages. It appears that the Haight Street frontage does not meet this requirement. However, if the restrooms are relocated toward the center of the commercial space, the Haight Street frontage will likely meet the 60 percent transparency requirement. Please revise the Haight Street ground floor design to meet this requirement, or seek and justify a variance.
 - iii. Ground Floor Ceiling Heights – 145.1(c)(4)(B). Ground floor spaces are required to have a minimum floor-to-floor height of 14 feet in the Neighborhood Commercial Districts. A portion of the ground floor along Market Street and Haight Street does not meet this

minimum floor-to-floor height. Please revise the design of the ground floor to meet this requirement, or seek and justify a variance.

b. Bay Windows (Section 136).

Several of the proposed bay windows do not comply with the bay window obstructions criteria outlined in Planning Code Section 136(c)(2), including maximum dimensions, glazing requirements for the side of the bays, and separation between bays and interior property lines. Please redesign the bay windows or seek and justify a variance.

2. A **Building Permit Application** and the related Section 312 Notification is required for the demolition and new construction proposed on the property.

Variance 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. 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 triggers the need for a Pre-application meeting with surrounding neighbors and registered neighborhood groups before the development applications are filed with the Planning Department. The Pre-application packet, which includes instructions and template forms, is available at www.sfplanning.org under the "Applications" tab. All registered neighborhood group mailing lists and maps are available online at www.sfplanning.org under the "Publications" tab.

PRELIMINARY PROJECT COMMENTS:

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

1. **Bicycle Parking.** Pursuant to recent amendments to Planning Code Section 155.2 (Board File No. 130528, which is now in effect), the project would require two Class 2 bicycle parking spaces for the retail tenant. Although there is more than the required amount of Class 1 bicycle parking including in the proposed project, the Department recommends providing the two Class 2 spaces through the installation of bicycle racks on the sidewalk for use by patrons of the commercial space.
2. **Street Trees.** Planning Code Section 138.1 requires one street tree for every 20 feet of frontage for new construction, with an additional tree required for every remaining 10 feet of street frontage. In total, the project site includes approximately 180 feet of frontage, which requires nine street trees. Four existing street trees are shown along Market Street, with four proposed street trees proposed along Haight Street. Based on street photos, it appears that there are only three existing street trees along Market Street. Please verify the existing number of street trees on Market Street, and propose additional street trees such that there will be a total of nine street trees along the property's frontage. Please note that the trees must be a 24-inch box size and meet the following additional requirements: (1) have a minimum 2 inch caliper, measured at breast height; (2) branch a minimum of 80 inches above sidewalk grade; (3) be planted in a sidewalk opening at least 16 square feet, and have a

minimum soil depth of 3 feet 6 inches; (4) include street tree basins edged with decorative treatment, such as pavers or cobbles; (5) be planted in a continuous soil-filled trench parallel to the curb, such that the basin for each tree is connected.

3. **Tree Planting and Protection Checklist.** Completion of this checklist is required. No permit will be approved by the Planning Department before satisfying all applicable tree-related requirements. Before any application is made to the Planning Department, you may choose to go directly to the Department of Public Works (DPW) to determine whether or not the required trees mentioned above can feasibly be planted. In order to do this, you should bring to DPW: (1) a completed Tree Planting and Protection Checklist [this need NOT be signed by Planning Dept. staff]; (2) project plans [11"x17" is acceptable]; and (3) a DPW tree planting application. Submittals can be made to DPW's offices at 1155 Market Street or electronically at www.sfdpw.org -> "Services A-Z" -> "Trees". After DPW does their analysis and fieldwork, DPW will provide you with a signed referral form with their determination which should then be provided to the Planning Department.
4. **Streetscape Plan (Section 138.1(c)(2)).** Since the Project has frontage that encompasses the entire block face between the two intersections (Gough Street between Market and Haight Street) and the project includes a proposal for new construction, submittal of a Streetscape Plan to the Planning Department is required in order to ensure that the new streetscape and pedestrian elements are in conformance with the Department's Better Street Plan. This Streetscape Plan shall be submitted to the Planning Department no later than 60 days prior to any Planning Department action, and will be considered for approval at the time of other project approval actions. The streetscape plan should show the location, design, and dimensions of all existing and proposed streetscape elements in the public right-of-way directly adjacent to the fronting property, including street trees, sidewalk landscaping, street lighting, site furnishings, utilities, driveways, and curb lines, and the relation of such elements to proposed new construction and site work on the property. Please see the Department's Better Streets Plan and Section 138.1(c)(2)(ii) for the additional elements that may be required as part of the project's streetscape plan.
5. **Shadow Analysis.** As discussed in the "Environmental Review" section of this document, projects over 40'-0" in height typically require a Shadow Analysis Application under Section 295 ("Proposition K") 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, which indicated that there would not be any shadows cast on properties under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Department. Should the project conditions change, resulting in a shadow fan analysis that indicates that the project would cast shadow on public open space, further shadow analysis, including the submittal of a Shadow Analysis Application, would be required.
6. **First Source Hiring.** Chapter 83 of the San Francisco Administrative Code, passed in 1998, established the First Source Hiring Program to identify available entry-level jobs in San Francisco and match them with unemployed and underemployed job-seekers. The intent is to provide a resource for local employers seeking qualified, job ready applicants for vacant positions while helping economically disadvantaged residents who have successfully completed training programs and job-readiness classes.

The ordinance applies to projects that will create 25,000 square feet or more of new or additional gross floor area. For further information or to receive a sample First Source Hiring Agreement, 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.

7. **Market Street Special Sign District.** Please note that this project is located within the Market Street Special Sign District, pursuant to Planning Code Section 608.8. The more stringent of these controls and those outlined in Planning Code Section 607.1 will apply to this project.

PRELIMINARY DESIGN COMMENTS:

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

1. **Building Massing, Site Design, and Open Space.** The irregular shape of the through-lot may lend itself to a variance for the location of rear yard, but the Planning Department encourages the design to explore providing an equivalent amount of rear yard space to relate to and transition between the adjacent building and its open space.

The gore corner is where the building should be most accentuated in terms of form, massing and architectural character or richness. The aggregated bay projection (for which a variance would need to be sought) on the Gough Street frontage, competes with adjacent bays and does not provide adequate accentuation, articulation, scale or modulation to the building corner.

2. **Ground Floor Street Frontage.** Market Street is San Francisco's premiere civic street—it is the focal point for the city's commercial, ceremonial, and cultural life. Market Street is the backbone of the city and regional transit systems and is also the City's busiest pedestrian and cycling street. Given its special role, buildings along Market Street, and the uses they support, should contribute to its vitality and life as a civic space. New buildings should have a human scale and character appropriate for a street of its scale and prominence. The height of the proposed ground floor retail is gracious, and served by enough entrances that enable flexibility of use. The storefront appears to be well designed and appropriate.

The ground floor residential component should be similarly scaled and detailed. The residential entry at Market Street should be a celebrated, prominent part of the façade, distinguished in depth, width, and height. The Planning Department recommends the residential portion of the ground floor should also have at minimum a 15-foot clear ceiling height, per the Draft Ground Floor Residential Design Guidelines. As currently proposed, the "mezzanine" limits the ceiling height of residential entry to 8' 4" high.

The Haight Street façade seems to be relegated to a mix of back of house utilities and circulation. Consider a providing an entrance and lobby or other common amenity that serves the group housing.

3. **Architecture.** Per the **Market & Octavia Area Plan Fundamental Principles for Design** the project should incorporate the following principles into the design:

- a. **Taller buildings should include a clearly defined base, middle, and top.** The middle of buildings should be clearly distinguished from the base and articulated with windows, projections, porches and/or balconies. The roof, cornice, or parapet area should be well integrated with the building's overall composition, visually distinctive, and include elements that create skyline interest.

Roof forms should be drawn from the best examples in the area. Above five stories, top floor(s) should be incorporated into an appropriately scaled expression of the building's top.

b. **Windows.** In most cases, a minimum window reveal of two inches should be incorporated into the visible facades.

c. **Ground Floor Treatment.** Horizontal architectural design articulation should be incorporated between the ground floor and second story levels. A minimum 6-inch projection is suggested. The human scale of the sidewalk is of paramount importance on neighborhood commercial streets. Architectural detailing, such as a belt course or cornice, at the ground floor ceiling height helps to frame the pedestrian space of the sidewalk.

The Planning Department has concerns about the proposed façade treatment for two contextual reasons: First, Market Street is arguably the City's most important and ceremonial street, and second, the proposal is adjacent to an historic district on Market Street, identified by masonry buildings with deep recessed windows, well defined tripartite facades, detailing, etc.

The proposed design appears to consist of a single, yet-to-be-defined material using "pixelated" patterning of different colors. Relying on a mutable surface treatment that neither relates to the historic qualities or other context seems arbitrary. Nor does it have any qualities that impart texture or craft of detail or material. This seems inadequate for a building on Market Street that neighbors other buildings of stature. The prominence of this location demands a building with attention to modulation, scale, texture and detailing that are compatible with surrounding buildings along Market Street. If the 'pixilation' is appropriate, it should be manifested three-dimensionally.

Due to the height of the adjacent building and the proposed building's height, the side facade will be visible and should be designed.

The Western-most bay on Market Street contains a bathroom, as expressed by a single, small horizontal window. This seems incongruous with the public interface of the building with Market Street.

The Planning Department recommends more be done to modulate and articulate the façade at both the building scale and an intermediate scale. At this point the architecture is assumed to be preliminary and the Planning Department will provide further detailed design review on the subsequent submission.

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.

Exceptions from code should be matched by a design and configuration of space and architecture that is exceptional.

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 existing building forms and components.

PRELIMINARY GENERAL PLAN / POLICY COMMENTS:

1. **Market-Octavia Area Plan.** The project is located within the boundary of the Market Octavia Area Plan ("Plan"). It has a diverse pattern of land uses that integrate various housing types, commercial activities, institutions, and open spaces. The Plan imagines a mixed use transit oriented neighborhood, especially in the highly transit accessible upper Market area.

New development should add to the rich mixture of uses in the area, and provide more housing, especially affordable units. New development should improve livability and be well designed, compatible with the scale of surrounding development, and consistent with neighborhood character. The project, as submitted, and the proposed uses are consistent with the plan's vision for the area, specifically with the principles below:

- Require infill development to enhance the area's established land use pattern and character. This kind of development should be...integrated into the prevailing pattern of uses, taking cues from existing development in the area.
- Concentrate new uses where access to transit and services best enables people to be less reliant on automobiles. To this end, the most intense new development should be linked directly to existing and proposed transit services, and concentrated where the area's mix of uses supports a lifestyle less dependent on cars.

As currently drafted, the project is generally consistent with the objectives and policies in the Plan. Please refer to the Market Octavia Area Plan for more guidance and to ensure general conformity with the policies of the Plan. Information on the Plan can be found on the Planning Department's website at: http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/General_Plan/Market_Octavia.htm

2. **Market Octavia Impact Fees.** The Market and Octavia Community Improvement Impact Fees, as outlined in Planning Code Section 421, applies to the Project. These fees shall be charged on net additions of gross square feet which result in a net new residential unit, contribute to a 20 percent increase of non-residential space in an existing structure, or create non-residential space in a new structure. Please refer to the following website for fee information <http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=513>. Fees shall be assessed on mixed use projects according to the gross square feet of each use in the project.

The Market and Octavia Plan Area Improvement Impact Fees shall be paid before the City issues a first construction document.

3. **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 Market and Octavia impact fees from the Planning Commission. This process is further explained in Section 412.3(d) of the Planning Code. More information on in-kind agreements can be found in the Application Packet for In-Kind Agreement on the Planning Department's website.
4. **Transportation – Increasing Trips by Transit, Bicycle and Foot.** The General Plan calls for sustainable development integrating housing with transportation in ways that increases travel by foot, bicycle and transit (Housing Element Policy 13.3, Transportation Element Pol. 28.1). The General Plan and Code also call for new residential development to provide safe and secure bicycle storage.

The project, located along Market Street and within blocks of several MUNI lines, proposes to provide 25 bicycle spaces with no additional proposed parking. The provision of bicycle parking spaces and no additional parking is consistent with encouraging more trips by transit, bike and foot and with the referenced policies.

5. **Haight Street Streetscape and Transit Improvements.** Please note that Haight Street, between Laguna Street and Market Street, is in the process of undergoing a redesign to implement pedestrian and transit improvements. The SFMTA plans to convert Haight Street between Octavia Blvd and Market Street from a one-way street traveling west into a two-way street to improve transit operations on the 71 Haight-Noriega, 71 Haight-Noriega limited (diesel) and 6 Parnassus and 7 Haight Trolley Coach Lines. The improvements include a dedicated transit priority lane as well as streetscape improvements. Construction is currently scheduled to begin in 2014. The 1700 Market Street project should not assume any curb-side loading on Haight Street, as this lane will be a transit-only lane, and should be aware of the new pedestrian improvements, including greening, to the street.

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 **May 15, 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.