



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

MEMO

DATE: November 18, 2013
TO: Marc Dimalanta, D-Scheme Studio
FROM: David Lindsay, Planning Department
RE: PPA Case No. 2013.1238U for 1238 Sutter 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, Christine Lamorena, at (415) 575-9085 or christine.lamorena@sfgov.org, to answer any questions you may have, or to schedule a follow-up meeting.

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: November 18, 2013
Case No.: **2013.1238U**
Project Address: 1238 Sutter Street
Block/Lot: 0670/011
Zoning: RC-4 (Residential-Commercial, High-Density)
Van Ness Special Use District
Automotive Special Use District
130-V Height and Bulk District
Area Plan: Van Ness Area Plan
Project Sponsor: Marc Dimalanta
D-Scheme Studio
222 8th Street
San Francisco, CA 94103
(415) 252-0888
Staff Contact: Christine Lamorena – (415) 575-9085
christine.lamorena@sfgov.org

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

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

DISCLAIMERS:

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

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The proposal is to demolish the existing 4,800 square foot one-story commercial building and construct a 9-story, 88-foot tall mixed-use building. The existing building was constructed in 1932 and is located on a 4,830 square foot through lot fronting on Sutter and Fern Streets. The proposed new building would include up to 40 dwelling units, 6 automobile parking spaces, 35 bicycle parking spaces, and 2,550 square feet of commercial space on the ground floor fronting Sutter Street.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:

The proposed project initially requires the following Environmental Review: please submit an *Environmental Evaluation Application*. Environmental Evaluation (EE) 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. See page 2 of the current *Schedule of Application Fees* for the calculation of environmental application fees. Review of the EE Application may be done in conjunction with the required approvals listed below, but must be completed before any project approval may be granted.

Below is a list of topic areas that would require additional study based on our preliminary review of the Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) Application.

1. **Historic Architectural Resources.** The existing building on the site was constructed in 1932 as a United States Post Office. As the structure is greater than 50 years of age, it is classified by the Planning Department as a potential historic resource.

The proposed project consists of demolition of a potential historic resource that is considered “Contributory” in the Van Ness Area Plan; therefore, the project is subject to the Department’s Historic Preservation review, which would include preparation of a Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE) by a qualified professional who meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards. Upon submittal of an EE Application, the Department will provide the project sponsor with a list of three consultants from the Historic Preservation Consultant Pool,¹ which shall be known as the potential consultant list or PCL. After submittal of the EE Application, 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. If the HRE determines that the existing building is an historic resource and Department Preservation staff concur, the proposed demolition would constitute an unavoidable significant impact on the environment and preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) would be required.

2. **Archeology.** The proposed project would require a Preliminary Archeological Review (PAR) which would be conducted in-house by the Planning Department archeologist. The PAR will determine what type of soils disturbance/modification will result from the project, such as excavation, installation of foundations, soils improvement, site remediation, etc. Any available geotechnical/soils or Phase II hazardous materials report prepared for the project site will be reviewed at this time. In addition, staff will determine if the project site is in an area that is archeologically sensitive. If staff finds that the project has the potential to effect an archeological resource, the PAR memorandum will identify appropriate additional actions to be taken including the appropriate archeological measure and/or if additional archeological studies will be required as part of the review.
3. **Aesthetics.** The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that a lead agency evaluate a project’s effect on a neighborhood’s visual quality and character, as well as effects on visual resources and scenic vistas within the area’s broader context. Given the degree of visual change anticipated, the

¹ http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/MEA/Historic_Resources_consultant_pool.pdf.

Department may require photomontages of the proposed project buildings from to-be-determined public viewpoints within its surroundings. If determined necessary, the Department will require “before” and “after” photos of the site from a number of near-, mid-, and long-range vantage points to illustrate the project’s effect on views, with a particular focus on the project’s potential to alter views from public areas including street view corridors identified in the General Plan. The environmental review would determine the adequacy of viewpoints, which may be revised based on the level of visual sensitivity as well as to evaluate the project’s potential effects on the skyline and urban form.

4. **Noise.** The proposed project would introduce residences—a noise-sensitive use—onto the project site. Based on the City’s GIS-based Traffic Noise Model map, Sutter Street, which abuts the project site, has noise levels above 75 dBA Ldn (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. 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-generating 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. 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. Should any 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. The noise analysis shall also examine the potential for the project to generate noise at levels that could conflict with the proposed and adjacent uses.

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. Detailed information related to construction equipment, phasing, and duration of each phase may be required as part of environmental evaluation to assess construction noise levels and methods to reduce such noise, as feasible.

5. **Transportation.** Based on a review of the PPA Application, Planning staff determined that a transportation study is not likely to be required. However, an official determination will be made subsequent to submittal of the EE Application. In order to facilitate that determination, the EE Application should include the following:
 - Specifications for the proposed parking lift;
 - Illustrations of the bicycle parking space configuration in the bicycle storage area on project plans; and
 - A project description that clarifies the proposed location of commercial loading.

1. **Air Quality.** The proposed project's 40 dwelling units are below the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's (BAAQMD) construction and operation screening levels for criteria air pollutants.² However, detailed information related to cubic yards of excavation shall be provided as part of the EE Application.

In addition, 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 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.

The proposed project includes sensitive land uses (40 residential dwelling units) that may be affected by nearby roadway-related pollutants and other stationary sources that emit toxic air contaminants. Health Code Article 38 applies to the proposed project and 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 (µg/m³). Sponsors of projects on sites exceeding this level are required to install ventilation systems or otherwise redesign the project to reduce the infiltration of outdoor PM_{2.5} concentrations indoors for all units by at least 80 percent. The proposed project is located within the Potential Roadway Exposure Zone and requires an analysis of annual exposure to roadway-related particulate matter. You may choose to have the air quality assessment prepared by a qualified firm and forwarded to the Department of Public Health (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>.

Lastly, 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.

6. **Greenhouse Gas Emissions.** 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 this 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 GHG Analysis Compliance Checklist.³

² BAAQMD, *CEQA Air Quality Guidelines*, May 2011, Chapter 3.

³ http://sfmea.sfplanning.org/GHG_Checklist_T1.doc. GHG Checklist Cover Sheet:
http://sfmea.sfplanning.org/GHG_Checklist.doc.

The project sponsor would be required to submit the completed table regarding project compliance with the identified regulations and provide project-level details in the discussion column. This information will be reviewed by the Environmental Planner during the environmental review process to determine if the project would comply with San Francisco's GHG Reduction Strategy. Projects that do not comply with an ordinance or regulation may be determined to be inconsistent with the GHG Reduction Strategy.

7. **Shadow Study.** The proposed project would result in construction of a building approximately 88 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. The shadow analysis would also address shadow impacts to other public open spaces not owned by the Recreation and Parks Department. An application for a shadow fan analysis should be submitted with the required fee at the time of submittal of the EE application.
8. **Wind Study.** The proposed project would involve construction of a building over 80 feet in height. The project therefore would require an initial review by a wind consultant, including a recommendation as to whether a wind tunnel analysis is needed. The consultant would be required to prepare a proposed scope of work for review and approval by the environmental coordinator prior to preparing the analysis.
9. **Stormwater.** The project proposes approximately 35,000 square feet of new construction, exceeding the 5,000 square-foot new construction or redevelopment threshold for preparation of a Stormwater Control Plan (SCP). Prior to issuance of a building permit, the project sponsor is required to prepare and submit an SCP to the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) Wastewater Enterprise, Urban Watershed Management Program; the SCP shall demonstrate compliance with the City's Stormwater Design Guidelines. The project's environmental review would generally evaluate how and where implementation of the 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. For more information on the SFPUC's stormwater management requirements see <http://stormwater.sfwater.org>.
10. **Tree Planting and Protection Checklist.** The Department of Public Works Code Section 8.02-8.11 requires disclosure and protection of landmark, significant, and street trees located on private and public property. Any tree identified in the Tree Planting and Protection Checklist⁴ must be shown on the site plans with size of the trunk diameter, tree height, and accurate canopy dripline. The project sponsor is required to submit a completed Tree Planting and Protection Checklist with the EE Application.
11. **Notification of a Project Receiving Environmental Review.** Notice is required to be sent to occupants of properties adjacent to the project site and owners of properties within 300 feet of the project site at the initiation of the environmental review process. Please provide these mailing labels at the time of the EE Application submittal.

⁴ <http://sf-planning.org/modules/showdocument.aspx?documentid=8321>

If the additional analysis outlined above indicates that the project would not have a significant effect on the environment, the project may qualify for a Class 32 Categorical Exemption, in which case the Planning Department would issue a Certificate of Determination of Exemption from Environmental Review.

If the additional analysis performed after submittal of the EE Application indicates that the project may have a significant effect on the environment, Planning Department staff would prepare an Initial Study to determine whether a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) or an EIR is required. If the Department determines that the project would have significant impacts that could be reduced to a less-than-significant level by mitigation measures agreed to by the project sponsor, then the Department would issue an MND.

If the Initial Study indicates that the project would result in a significant impact that could not be mitigated to a less-than-significant level, an EIR would be required. An EIR must be prepared by an environmental consultant from the Planning Department's environmental consultant pool.⁵ 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. A **Building Permit Application** is required for the demolition of the existing building on the subject property.
2. A **Building Permit Application** is required for the proposed new construction on the subject property.
3. **Shadow Analysis.** A shadow analysis is required pursuant to Planning Code Section 295 as the project proposes a building height in excess of 40 feet, as measured by the Planning Code. The attached shadow analysis indicates that no public space under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Parks Department will be shadowed by the proposal, as represented in the plan set submitted with the PPA Application. Therefore, a shadow analysis application should not be required.
4. **Conditional Use Authorization.** The project requires Conditional Use Authorization pursuant to Planning Code Section 253.2(a) for proposing a building with a height exceeding 50 feet. Planning Code Section 253.2(a)(3) states that when acting on any Conditional Use application pursuant to this section, the Planning Commission may require that the permitted bulk and required setbacks of a building be arranged to maintain appropriate scale and maximize sunlight to narrow streets (less

⁵ <http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=3458>

than 40-foot wide right-of-way). Conditional Use Authorization is also required pursuant to Planning Code Section 270 for deviation from the Bulk Limit.

5. **Variances.** The project as proposed requires variances from Planning Code Sections 134 – Rear Yard, 135 – Open Space, 136 – Permitted Obstructions (Bay Windows), 145.1 – Street Frontage and Active Uses, and 151 – Off-Street Parking.

Conditional Use and 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.

PRELIMINARY PROJECT COMMENTS:

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

1. **Rear Yard.** Planning Code Section 134 requires that the minimum rear yard depth shall be equal to 25 percent of the lot depth (approximately 30 feet) at all residential levels. The project proposes a rear yard of 12 feet in depth and a series of private decks at all residential levels. Planning Code Section 243(c)(7) allows the Zoning Administrator to modify or waive the rear yard requirement for properties in the Van Ness Special Use District pursuant to additional findings and through the procedures which are applicable to variances. Please revise the project to provide the Code-complying rear yard or seek and justify a rear yard variance.
2. **Usable Open Space.** Planning Code Section 135 requires 36 square feet of private usable open space or 48 square feet of common usable open space per dwelling unit. Additionally, any such open space must meet the dimensional requirements of Subsections (f) and (g). Please verify or revise the project such that the proposed private balconies meet the minimum horizontal dimension of six feet and a minimum area of 36 square feet with at least 30 percent of the perimeter being unobstructed except for necessary railings or seek and justify a usable open space variance.
3. **Permitted Obstructions.** Planning Code Section 136(c)(3) permits bay projections over the street; however, the proposed bay projection on Sutter Street appears to exceed the permitted width and does not propose the required side fenestration. Please revise the proposal to meet this code section or seek and justify a variance from Planning Code Section 136.

4. **Streetscape and Pedestrian Improvements - Street Trees.** Planning Code Section 138.1 requires at least one street tree for every 20 feet of frontage on each street front. Two street trees are shown on Sutter Street and two street trees are shown on Fern Street. The project appears to meet this requirement.
5. **Bird Safety.** Planning Code Section 139 requires Bird-Safe Glazing Treatment if the proposal includes unbroken glazed segments of 24 square feet or larger. Please verify whether the proposed glazing includes segments that are 24 square feet or larger and include information for glazing treatment that meet this requirement.
6. **Street Frontages in Residential-Commercial Zoning Districts.** Planning Code Section 145.1 requires that off-street parking at street grade on a development lot be set back at least 25 feet on the ground floor from any façade facing a street of at least 30 feet in width. A portion of the proposed parking is not set back 25 feet from Fern Street, which is a street of at least 30 feet in width. Please revise the project or seek and justify a street frontage variance.

Planning Code Section 145.1 also requires that space for active uses, as defined in Subsection (b)(2) and permitted by the specific district in which it is located, must be provided within the first 25 feet of building depth on the ground floor and from any facade facing a street at least 30 feet in width. The project includes parking on the ground floor within the required active use area along Fern Street. Automobile parking is not considered an active use. Please revise the project to include an active use in this location or seek and justify a street frontage variance.

Planning Code Section 145.1 also requires that ground floor non-residential uses have a minimum floor-to-floor height of 14 feet. The submitted drawings show a floor-to-floor height of approximately 11 feet. Please revise the proposal to meet this requirement or seek and justify a street frontage variance.

7. **Off-Street Parking.** Planning Code Section 151 requires one automobile parking space per dwelling unit. The project proposes five parking spaces. Planning Code Section 243(c)(9)(F) allows the Zoning Administrator to reduce the parking requirement for properties in the Van Ness Special Use District to not less than one space for each four dwelling units through the procedures which are applicable to variances. Please revise the project to provide the required number of parking spaces or seek and justify a parking variance.
8. **Bicycle Parking.** Planning Code Section 155.2 requires one Class 1 bicycle space per dwelling unit, one Class 2 bicycle space per 20 dwelling units, and a minimum of two Class 2 spaces for the commercial use. Alternatively, an in-lieu fee can be accepted for the required Class 2 spaces per Planning Code Section 430. The project proposes a bike room for 35 Class 1 spaces. Please review Zoning Administrator Bulletin No. 9 - Bicycle Parking Standards: Design and Layout (http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/publications_reports/ZAB_BicycleParking_9-7-13.pdf) and submit a detailed floor plan showing that the required number of Class 1 spaces meet the minimum clearances needed in the proposed bike room or revise the proposal to meet the requirement. Please also indicate in future submittals how the Class 2 requirement is being met.

9. **Unbundled Parking.** Planning Code Section 167 allows for off-street parking spaces with 10 dwelling units or more, to be leased or sold separately from the rental or purchase fees for dwelling units. In cases where there are fewer parking spaces than dwelling units, the parking spaces shall be offered first to the potential owners or renters of three-bedroom or more units, second to the owners or renters of two bedroom units, and then to the owners or renters of other units. Renters or buyers of on-site inclusionary affordable units provided pursuant to Planning Code Section 415 shall have an equal opportunity to rent or buy a parking space on the same terms and conditions as offered to renters or buyers of other dwelling units, and at a price determined by the Mayor's Office of Housing, subject to procedures adopted by the Planning Commission notwithstanding any other provision of Planning Code Section 415. Please indicate in future submittals if unbundled parking is being offered.
10. **Floor Area Ratio (FAR).** Planning Code Section 243(c)(1) requires that buildings within the Van Ness Special Use District have a basic FAR of 7.0 to 1 when located in a 130-foot height district, with the requirement applicable to dwellings notwithstanding Planning Code Section 124(b). Future submittals should provide a detailed calculation of the gross floor area of the project, including floor plans which clearly indicate those areas included within the calculation of "gross floor area" pursuant to the definition in Planning Code Section 102.9. Please indicate in future submittals how this FAR is accomplished.
11. **Dwelling Unit Density.** Planning Code Section 243(c)(3) removes any dwelling unit density restriction for properties in the Van Ness Special Use District. The submitted PPA application indicated a dwelling unit density of 35 units, while at the Introduction Meeting, the applicant indicated a density of 40 units. This comment is included to clarify the lack of density restriction.
12. **Bulk Limit.** Planning Code Sections 243(c)(3) and 270 allow a maximum building length of 110 feet and a maximum diagonal dimension of 120 feet. The project proposes a building length of 120 feet and a diagonal dimension of approximately 126 feet. Deviations from the bulk limit may be permitted through the Conditional Use review process pursuant to Planning Code Section 271. Please indicate in future submittals how this requirement is being met or seek Conditional Use authorization if it is not proposed to be met.
13. **Building Height.** Planning Code Section 253.2(a) requires Conditional Use authorization for buildings exceeding 50 feet in height in the Van Ness Special Use District. Planning Code Section 253.2(a)(3) states that when acting on any Conditional Use application pursuant to this section, the Planning Commission may require that the permitted bulk and required setbacks of a building be arranged to maintain appropriate scale and maximize sunlight to narrow streets (less than 40-foot wide right-of-way). The submitted drawings indicate a building height of approximately 87 feet with a frontage on Fern Street, which is approximately 35 feet wide. Therefore, please prepare and submit a Conditional Use Application.
14. **Shadow Analysis.** Planning Code Section 295 requires a shadow analysis for any building over 40 feet in height. The project proposes construction of a building approximately 87 feet in height

(approximately 96 feet in height, inclusive of the parapet). A preliminary shadow analysis, attached, indicates that no public space under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Department would be shadowed by the proposal, as represented in the plan set submitted with the Preliminary Project Assessment.

15. **Ground Level Wind Currents.** As discussed under the Environmental Review section (comment #9), the height of the proposed residential building would trigger an initial wind review. Planning Code Section 243(c)(10) establishes comfort criteria (ground level wind levels not to exceed 11 mph in areas of substantial pedestrian use or 7 mph in public seating areas) and a hazard criterion, which is a 26 mph equivalent. For new buildings, the buildings shall be shaped or other wind battling measures shall be adopted so that the development would not exceed the comfort criteria. When pre-existing ambient wind speeds exceed the comfort levels, the building shall be designed to reduce the ambient wind speeds in efforts to meet the goals of this requirement. Exceptions can be made pursuant to Planning Code Section 243(c)(10)(B). Please indicate in future submittals how this requirement is accomplished.
16. **Inclusionary Housing.** Affordable housing is required for a project proposing ten or more dwelling units. The Project Sponsor must submit an 'Affidavit for Compliance with the Inclusionary Affordable Housing Program: Planning Code Section 415' to the Planning Department identifying the method of compliance, on-site, off-site, or in-lieu fee. Any on-site affordable dwelling-units proposed as part of the project must be designated as owner-occupied units, not rental units. Affordable units designated as on-site units shall be sold as ownership units and will remain as ownership units for the life of the project.
17. **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

PRELIMINARY DESIGN COMMENTS:

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

The challenge of this site is arriving at a design of a tall slender building that is compatible with the existing context of lower masonry buildings.

1. **Massing, Site Design, and Open Space.** The proposed rear yard, consisting of a 12-foot setback on Fern Street, is less than the minimum required by Code. The Planning Department recommends a rear yard area that complies with the intent of the Planning Code in terms of area, exposure, access and usability. On through-lots, a courtyard solution may be appropriate in that it is possible to

design high quality double-aspect dwellings. If a courtyard is pursued, the Planning Department suggests that the minimum required 25 percent of the lot area be provided for an equivalent rear yard to augment access to light and air. The Planning Department suggests using the courtyard to provide common or public open space. The Planning Department also suggests the proposed building design include a side core in relation to the courtyard.

The Planning Department recommends that the massing of the upper floor be reduced. This should be achieved by setting back from the side lot lines. The Planning Department recommends redistributing the massing to place more height on Sutter Street and reduce the height at Fern Street.

The projecting bay on Sutter Street should be broken into smaller discrete projections to help articulate the façade and to meet Planning Code Section 136(c)(3).

2. **Street Frontage.** Both building frontages should provide a consistent and active relationship with the streets. The Planning Department recommends creating more active use and façade transparency along Fern Street per Planning Code Section 145.1. Acknowledging that the frontage of the new building is narrow and the existing site presents limitations in activating the frontage, another design challenge is to maximize a usable and active edge at the ground level.

The Planning Department appreciates the setback of the storefront on Sutter Street. The residential entry should be a celebrated, prominent part of the façade, distinguished in depth, width, and height from the storefront.

The Fern Street façade seems to be relegated to a mix of back of house utilities and circulation. The parking should be set back 25 feet from the street frontage. The Planning Department recommends the design explore activating a greater portion of the Fern Street façade. Minimize and consolidate the utility functions' frontage. It may be possible to internalize some uses. The trash room need not have its own door, but could use the garage door. The garage width for the number of parking spaces should be no wider than 8 feet 10 inches. Consider providing an entrance and lobby or other commercial use to activate Fern.

3. **Architecture.** The building design should incorporate detail, scale, proportion, texture, materials, color and building form in a harmonious composition that relates to a tri-partite composition that consists of a base, middle, and top, while also better modulating the building vertically. The generous ground floor height of the Sutter frontage and composition of the facade suggest there is some design intent given to the base. The Planning Department recommends that the compositional components be used to more clearly define the base and harmonize with the body of the building. The Planning Department recommends the upper two stories sculpted to define, add character, and provide a termination to the building while reducing the mass at the upper heights.

Façade: The Planning Department recommends articulation of the façade to impart variation of materials and texture. Due of the adjacent buildings and the proposed building's height, the side facades will be visible for some time to come, and should be designed as primary, not blind, facades.

The façade treatment of the third floor seems anomalous with the rest of the building design. Integrate the third floor compositionally with the main body of the building.

Entry: The Planning Department recommends exploring a visual and physical connection from the entry at the street to the courtyard, which may allow the courtyard to be used to access the lower units.

Materials: The Planning Department recommends cladding the building walls with durable and light colored material that impart scale and texture.

The Planning Department will provide further detailed design review on the subsequent submission of materials and details to insure that an acceptable and compatible design is achieved.

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 18, 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: PPA Shadow Analysis

cc: Phillip Reno, LLC, Property Owner
Christine Lamorena, Current Planning
Erik Jaszewski, Environmental Planning
Audrey Desmuke, Citywide Planning
Jerry Robbins, MTA
Jerry Sanguinetti, DPW



Title: 1238 Sutter Street - 2013.1238U

Comments: Building height modeled at 96 feet
Slopes taken into account

Printed: 18 October, 2013



The City and County of San Francisco (CCSF) does not guarantee the accuracy, adequacy, completeness or usefulness of any information. CCSF provides this information on an "as is" basis without warranty of any kind, including but not limited to warranties of merchantability or fitness for a particular purpose, and assumes no responsibility for anyone's use of the information.