



# SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

---

## Preliminary Project Assessment

*Date:* November 8, 2013  
*Case No.:* **2013.1281U**  
*Project Address:* 1335-1339 Folsom Street  
*Block/Lot:* 3519/063  
*Zoning:* Folsom Street NCT (Neighborhood Commercial Transit)  
65-X Height and Bulk District  
*Area Plan:* Western SoMa  
*Project Sponsor:* William Mollard & Tomas Janik  
415-409-9267  
*Staff Contact:* Jon Swae – 415-575-9069  
[Jon.Swae@sfgov.org](mailto:Jon.Swae@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:

This project description is based on the Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) Application submitted on September 10, 2013. It is also based on a discussion of the proposed project at the meeting between Planning Department staff and project sponsor's representatives that took place on September 30, 2013 at the Planning Department. If any of the underlying project description details change, then the information in this PPA would need to be re-evaluated.

The subject lot is approximately 5,700 sq ft in area currently occupied by a one story (~24 ft) commercial building (approximately 5,700 sq ft) with a partial basement (roughly 1,086 sq ft), constructed in 1923. The property is zoned as part of the Folsom Street Neighborhood Commercial Transit (NCT) district and is located in a 65-X height and bulk district. The property has two frontages on Folsom (60') and Dore Street (95').

The proposed project is a seven-story residential building consisting of 65 Single Room Occupancy (SRO) units over a partial basement. The design of the proposed building is 'L' shaped with a modified rear yard at grade. The average unit size will be 385 square feet with all units meeting the code required

maximum size for SROs of 350 square feet exclusive of the bathroom, and the Western SOMA required minimum of 275 square feet. Ten of the units (15%) will be Below Market Rate per Inclusionary Housing Policy. The size of the building will be approximately 32,255 gsf, of which 24,863 gsf will be residential units. The basement will consist of bicycle parking and individual storage units. The ground level will consist of residential lobby and a community room/lounge both on Folsom Street, various mechanical spaces, rear yard, and 5 residential units. These ground floor residential units will have recessed entries providing direct access to and from Dore Street. Levels two to five will have 11 residential units each. Level 6 will have 10 residential units as well as private outdoor spaces for 3 of the units at the 10' setback (required) along on Dore Street. Level seven will consist of six residential units as well as a private deck for one unit and a 1,313 sq ft terrace providing common useable outdoor open space.

The building will be made of concrete; Type I, fully-sprinklered construction. The floor to floor on each level is 9'-2", which makes for a finished ceiling height of approximately 8'-6". The existing basement will be expanded for secure bicycle parking, one space per residential unit, a bicycle repair station, and individual storage lockers for use by residents. The building will likely have an under-sidewalk transformer vault on Dore Street.

The building's useable open space requirements will be met through the provision of both private and common useable outdoor open space. Four of the building's units will have their met through the provision of private decks. These decks range in size from 63 to 175 square feet and are larger than the required 6' x 6' dimensions. The spaces take advantage of the setbacks required by zoning without encroaching on the clear space that is required. The remaining 61 units will be served by common useable open space in the Rear Yard and the 7<sup>th</sup> floor terrace (not a roof deck), which combined is 2,197 square feet in area. This is larger than the 2,163 gross sq ft required for 61 units.

Per the Draft Western SOMA Design Guidelines, the rear yard is located on the ground level of the building, which is also the first residential level. The rear yard is approximately 884 gross square feet in area, which is 15.5% of the lot area. Since the building is located on a corner lot the Rear Yard has been designed to meet the requirements of SROs and an administrative Rear Yard Modification. The dimensions of the Rear Yard are 26' x 34', which is greater than the minimum rear yard depth for SRO buildings of 15 feet, and greater than the modified requirement of 20' in each horizontal direction.

## ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:

### Community Plan Exemption

Section 15183 of the California Environmental Quality Act (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.

The proposed project is located within the Western SoMa Community Plan Area, which was evaluated in *Western SoMa Community Plan, Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels, and 350 Eighth Street Project Final*

*Environmental Impact Report (Western SoMa FEIR)*, which was certified in 2012.<sup>1</sup> Because the proposed project is consistent with the development density identified in the area plan, it is eligible for a community plan exemption (CPE). 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 *Western SoMa FEIR*, and there would be no new significant impacts that are peculiar to the proposed project or project site that were not identified in the *Western SoMa FEIR*. In these situations, all pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the *Western SoMa FEIR* 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 preparation of the *Western SoMa FEIR*.
2. **CPE + 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 *Western SoMa FEIR*, and if 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 checklist is prepared to address all other impacts that were encompassed by the *Western SoMa FEIR*, with all pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the *Western SoMa FEIR* 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 preparation of the *Western SoMa FEIR*.
3. **CPE + Focused EIR.** If any new site- or project-specific significant impacts cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level, then a focused EIR is prepared to address these impacts, and a supporting CPE checklist is prepared to address all other impacts that were encompassed by the *Western SoMa FEIR*, with all pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the *Western SoMa FEIR* 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 preparation of the *Western SoMa FEIR*.

In order to initiate formal environmental review, please submit an *Environmental Evaluation Application (EEA)*. See page 2 of the current *Fee Schedule* for calculation of environmental application fees. Below is a list of topic areas that would require additional study or may necessitate the implementation of mitigation measures from the *Western SoMa FEIR* based on our preliminary review of the project as it is proposed in the Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) submittal dated September 10, 2013.

---

<sup>1</sup> Available for review on the Planning Department's Area Plan EIRs web page: <http://www.sf-planning.org/modules/showdocument.aspx?documentid=9034>.

1. **Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE):** The existing building on the project site was constructed in 1923 and was previously evaluated in the Western SoMa Light Industrial and Residential Historic District survey<sup>2</sup> conducted by the Planning Department. Based on this survey, the site was assigned a Category "6Z" rating indicating that the site was found ineligible for national, California, and local listing. The site is within an area designated as an eligible or identified historic district, the Western SoMa Light Industrial and Residential Historic District. Therefore, while no further information is needed to establish that the project site does not contain an historic resource, the new building design will be reviewed by the Department's Preservation Planners to determine whether it would have a potential impact on surrounding historic resources as well as the potential historic district.

The project is within 25 feet of a known historic resource (1301 Folsom Street). The *Western SoMa FEIR* identified two mitigation measures to minimize construction impacts of new development projects on historic resources within 25 feet for non-pile driving activities and 100 feet for pile driving activities: *M-CP-7a: Protect Historical Resources from Adjacent Construction Activities* and *M-CP-7b: Construction Monitoring Program for Historical Resources*. These mitigation measures require an evaluation be made to determine whether special construction measures are necessary to protect nearby historic resources, as well as the implementation of a construction monitoring program for those historic resources.

2. **Archeological Resources.** Project implementation would include soil-disturbing activities associated with building construction, including excavation to a depth of approximately 12 feet below grade. The project site is located within an area where no previous archeological survey has been prepared. The *Western SoMa FEIR* noted that California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR)-eligible archeological resources are expected to be present within existing sub-grade soils of the Plan Area and the proposed land use policies and controls within the Plan Area could adversely affect significant archeological resources.

The Planning Department staff has preliminarily determined that *Western SoMa FEIR* Archeological Mitigation Measure *M-CP-4a: Project-Specific Preliminary Archeological Assessment* and *M-CP-4b: Procedures for Accidental Discovery of Archeological Resources* would be applicable to the proposed project. Mitigation Measure *M-CP-4a* requires that a Preliminary Archeological Sensitivity Study (PASS) be prepared by an archeological consultant with expertise in California prehistoric and urban historical archeology. Based on 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 CRHR-eligible archeological resources to be present within the project site and determine the appropriate action necessary to reduce the potential effects of the project on archeological resources to a less-than-significant level. The qualified consultant must be selected from a list of three archeological consultants from the Planning Department's archeological resources consultant file provided by the Planning Department during the environmental review process.<sup>3</sup> The Planning Department Archeologist will be informed by the geotechnical study of the project site's subsurface geological conditions. Mitigation Measure *M-CP-4b* outlines procedures for ensuring that

---

<sup>2</sup> Available for review on the Planning Department's web page: <http://sf-planning.org/ftp/files/gis/SouthSoMa/Docs/DPR523D-WesternSOMALightResidential.pdf>.

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

appropriate actions are taken in the event that an accidental discovery of archeological resources during the construction of the project.

3. **Transportation Study.** Based on the information provided in the PPA submittal, the preparation of a transportation study does not appear to be warranted. However, an official determination will be made subsequent to the submittal of the *EEA*.
4. **Hazardous Materials.** The project site contains artificial fill and was previously occupied by a warehouse and industrial uses. Therefore, the project is subject to Article 22A of the Health Code, also known as the Maher 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 ESA 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, and would need 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>. A copy of the submitted Maher Application and Phase I ESA must be submitted with the *EEA*.

In addition to compliance with the City's Maher Ordinance, the project would need to comply with two mitigation measures from the *Western SoMa FEIR*. *Mitigation Measure M-HZ-2: Hazardous Building Materials Abatement* would require that any hazardous building materials in the existing building be removed in compliance with applicable federal, state, and local regulations. The implementation of *Mitigation Measure M-HZ-3: Site Assessment and Corrective Action* would largely be replaced with compliance with the City's newly-amended Maher ordinance process. However, if the potential exists for any sensitive ecological receptors to be exposed, cleanup levels shall be determined according to accepted ecological risk assessment methodology of the lead agency in deference of protection of the on-site ecological receptors.

5. **Air Quality Analysis.** The project proposes the demolition of an existing single-story warehouse building and the construction of a 65-foot-high multi-family residential building with 65 dwelling units in its place. Project-related demolition, excavation, grading and other construction activities may cause wind-blown dust that could contribute particulate matter into the local atmosphere. To reduce construction dust impacts, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors approved a series of amendments to the San Francisco Building and Health Codes generally referred hereto as the Construction Dust Control Ordinance (Ordinance 176-08, effective July 30, 2008) with the intent of reducing the quantity of dust generated during site preparation, demolition, and construction work in order to protect the health of the general public and of onsite workers, minimize public nuisance complaints, and to avoid orders to stop work by the Department of Building Inspection (DBI). Pursuant to the Construction Dust Ordinance, the proposed project would be required to comply with applicable dust control requirements outlined in the ordinance.

In addition to construction dust, demolition and construction activities would require the use of heavy-duty diesel equipment which 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 includes 65 dwelling units which are sensitive land uses that may be affected by nearby roadway-related pollutants and other stationary sources that may emit toxic air contaminants. Health Code Article 38 requires that new residential development greater than 10 units located within the Potential Roadway Exposure Zone perform an Air Quality Assessment to determine whether PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentrations from roadway sources exceed 0.2 micrograms per cubic meter (0.2 µg/m<sup>3</sup>). Sponsors of projects on sites exceeding this level are required to install ventilation systems or otherwise redesign the project to reduce PM<sub>2.5</sub> exposure indoors. The proposed project is located within the Potential Roadway Exposure Zone, therefore an analysis of annual exposure to roadway related particulate matter would be required under Article 38. 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 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 and whether any additional mitigation measures identified in the underlying Western SoMa FEIR are applicable to the project. Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3: *Reduction in Exposure to Toxic Contaminants for New Sensitive Receptors from the Western SoMa FEIR* would be applicable to the proposed residential project. M-AQ-3 requires special building ventilation systems be put in place to reduce potentially significant air quality impacts on sensitive land use receptors. Implementation of this mitigation measure may be determined by DPH to fulfill the requirements of the above mentioned Article 38 Ordinance requirements.

6. **Greenhouse Gases.** The 2010 CEQA Air Quality Guidelines provide CEQA thresholds of significance for greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. On August 12, 2010, the San Francisco Planning Department submitted to the BAAQMD a draft of the City and County of San Francisco's Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions. This document presents a comprehensive assessment of policies, programs and ordinances that collectively represent San Francisco's Qualified Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy. The BAAQMD reviewed San Francisco's GHG reduction strategy and concluded that the strategy meets the criteria for a Qualified GHG Reduction Strategy as outlined in BAAQMD's CEQA Guidelines (2010).<sup>4</sup> Therefore, projects that are consistent with San Francisco's GHG reduction strategy would result in less-than-significant GHG emissions.

---

<sup>4</sup> San Francisco's Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions and BAAQMD's letter are available online at: <http://www.sfplanning.org/index.aspx?page=1570>.

In order to facilitate a determination of compliance with San Francisco's GHG reduction strategy, the Planning Department has prepared a Greenhouse Gas Analysis Compliance Checklist.<sup>5</sup> The project sponsor will be required to submit a completed checklist as part of the environmental review process.

- **Noise.** Construction of the proposed 65-unit residential project would generate noise. While construction noise is temporary in nature and regulated by the San Francisco Noise Ordinance, the *Western SoMa FEIR* evaluated significant construction noise impacts that would result from implementation of the Community Plan and identified two mitigation measures that when implemented, would reduce these impacts to a less-than-significant level. Mitigation Measure *M-NO-2a: General Construction Noise Control Measures* includes best practices for construction work, such as state-of-the-art noise shielding and muffling devices and the use of electrically- or hydraulically-powered construction equipment, to minimize construction noise levels. Mitigation Measure *NO-2b: Noise Control Measures During Pile Driving* includes a set of site-specific noise attenuation measures for construction projects involving pile driving. The project sponsor has indicated that the project would likely not involve pile driving, though the final determination would rely on recommendations of the geotechnical report for the project.

Residential land uses are categorized as sensitive noise receptors. Based on the *Western SoMa FEIR*, the project site is located in an area where traffic-related noise exceeds 60 dBA Ldn (a day-night averaged sound level). Mitigation Measure *M-NO-1a: Interior Noise Levels for Residential Uses* requires that the project sponsor conduct a detailed analysis of noise reduction requirements for new development including noise-sensitive uses located along streets with noise levels above 60 dBA (Ldn), where such development is not already subject to the California Noise Insulation Standards in Title 24 of the *California Code of Regulations*.

Mitigation Measure *M-NO-1b: Siting of Noise-Sensitive Uses* is intended to reduce potential conflicts between existing noise-generating uses and new sensitive receptors. This measure would apply to the proposed project because the project includes a noise-sensitive use. Mitigation Measure *M-NO-1b* requires that a noise analysis be prepared for new development including a noise-sensitive use, prior to the first project approval action. The mitigation measure requires that such an analysis include, at a minimum, a site survey to identify potential noise-generation uses within 900 feet of, and that have a direct line-of-sight to, the project site. At least one 24-hour noise measurement (with maximum noise level readings taken at least every 15 minutes) shall be included in the analysis. The analysis shall be prepared by person(s) qualified in acoustical analysis and/or engineering and 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.

Finally, Mitigation Measure *NO-1d: Open Space in Noisy Environments* would apply to the proposed project as it includes new development of a noise-sensitive use. This mitigation measure requires that open space required under the Planning Code be protected from existing ambient noise levels.

---

<sup>5</sup> Available for review on the Planning Department's web page: <http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1886>.

Implementation of this measure could involve, among other things, site design that uses the building itself to shield on-site open space from the greatest noise sources, construction of noise barriers between noise sources and open space, and appropriate use of both common and private open space in multi-family dwellings, and implementation would also be undertaken consistent with other principles or urban design.

7. **Biological Resources.** The project includes the demolition of a vacant structure which would trigger the need to implement two mitigations measures in the *Western SoMa FEIR* to eliminate potentially significant impacts on biological resources. *M-BI-1a: Pre-Construction Special-Status Bird Surveys* and *M-BI-1b: Pre-Construction Special-Status Bat Surveys* require pre-construction surveys be completed by a qualified biologist to determine whether protected bird or bat species are present and the appropriate action to be undertaken if they are. A pre-construction survey for protected bird species would only be required to be completed if demolition of the structure were to occur between February 1 through August 1, in accordance with M-BI-1a. Additionally, bird-safe lighting requirements are required to be implemented in order to minimize bird-strike impacts in compliance with *M-BI-2: Night Lighting Minimization*, and the proposed project would be subject to the City's Standards for Bird-Safe Buildings, which require the proposed building to incorporate bird-safe design features to reduce potential impacts on birds.
8. **Shadow Study.** The proposed project would result in construction of a building greater than 40 feet in height which is the height at which the preparation of a preliminary shadow fan analysis is triggered. Planning Department staff has prepared a preliminary analysis that indicates that the proposed 65-foot-high building would not have the potential to cast shadows on publically-maintained recreational resources. Therefore, a shadow study is not required for the project.
9. **Wind Study.** The proposed project would not involve construction of a building greater than 80 feet in height above which the *Western SoMa FEIR (Mitigation Measure M-WS-1: Screening-Level Wind Analysis and Wind Testing)* determined structures would have a potentially significant wind impact. Therefore, the project would not be required to prepare any subsequent analysis of wind impacts.

Please be advised that as part of the Planning Department's environmental analysis of the project, a copy of the *EEA* will be referred to the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) for its review of the project's potential impacts on utilities and water quality.

If any of the additional analyses determine that the proposed project would result in significant impacts that are not identified in the *Western SoMa FEIR*, the environmental document will be a community plan exemption plus either a focused initial study/mitigated negative declaration, or if the additional impacts cannot be mitigated, a focused initial study/EIR. A community plan exemption and a community plan exemption plus a focused initial study/mitigated negative declaration can be prepared by Planning Department staff, but a community plan exemption with a focused initial study/EIR would need to be prepared by a consultant on the Planning Department's environmental consultant pool ([http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/MEA/Environmental\\_consultant\\_pool.pdf](http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/MEA/Environmental_consultant_pool.pdf)).



## 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 **Rear Yard Modification** under Planning Code Sections 134(e), 307(h) and 823(c)(1) is required for the proposed rear yard. The Zoning Administrator will review the requested modification; the review will be conducted as part of, and incorporated into, the related building permit application(s) or other required project authorizations.
2. A **Variance** from the Dwelling Unit Exposure Requirement is required for the units that do not meet the minimum standards under Planning Code Section 140.
3. A **Building Permit Application** is required for the proposed demolition of the existing structure(s) on the subject property.
4. A **Building Permit Application** is required for the proposed new construction on the subject 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](http://www.sfplanning.org). Building Permit applications are available at the Department of Building Inspections at 1660 Mission Street.

## NEIGHBORHOOD NOTIFICATIONS AND PUBLIC OUTREACH:

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

1. **Pre-Application.** The Project requires a Pre-Application meeting in accordance with the minimum standards of the Pre-Application Process as the project proposes new construction. The Instruction Packet and Affidavit for the Pre-Application process may be accessed at: <http://www.sfplanning.org/modules/showdocument.aspx?documentid=533>.
2. **Neighborhood Notification.** The proposed project would result in a change of use to a residential use. Owners and occupants within 150 feet of the project site must be notified, in accordance with Planning Code Section 312.
3. **Variance.** The Variance requires notification to owners of property within a 300 foot radius of the project site.

## PRELIMINARY PROJECT COMMENTS:

The following comments address specific Planning Code and other general issues that may significantly impact the proposed project. Please note that the Planning Department encourages projects to minimize

the number of exceptions being sought. Please also note that the subject property is located within the Western SOMA Special Use District (Planning Code Section 823) and is subject to the additional controls under that Special Use District.

1. **Western SoMa Area Plan.** The proposed project is located within the Western SoMa Plan Area. The Western SoMa Plan supports and builds on the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan's vision for the traditionally industrial and mixed use areas in the eastern part of the City. The Plan complements the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan's patterns of land use, urban form, public space, circulation, and historic preservation, and makes adjustments to this specific area based on today's understanding of the issues and focused community outreach to the residents and workers in the area. The following Key Principles inform all the objectives and policies contained in the Plan:

- Encourage new housing at appropriate locations and make it as affordable as possible to a range of City residents;
- Reserve sufficient space for production, distribution and repair activities, in order to support the City's economy and provide good jobs for residents
- Generally maintain the existing scale and density of the neighborhood, allowing appropriate increases in strategic locations;
- Plan for transportation, open space, community facilities and other critical elements of complete neighborhoods;
- Protect and support the social heritage resources of the Filipino and LBGT communities within the plan area;
- Plan for new development that will serve the needs of existing residents and businesses; and
- Maintain and promote a diversity of land uses, and reserve new areas for arts activities and nighttime entertainment.

Further review of the Plan's policy language may be helpful for the project sponsor to ensure the project complies with the Plan's vision. For specific policy language and background, please see Western SoMa Area Plan: <http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=3545>

2. **Rear Yard.** Planning Code Section 134 requires a rear yard of at least 25% of lot depth at the ground floor, given the proposed units at the ground floor. A modification of this requirement may be requested pursuant to Planning Code Sections 134(e), 307(h) and 823(c)(1); please note that Planning Code Section 134(e) allows that the required rear yard be substituted with an open area equal to 25 percent of the lot area if the modified rear yard is located at the same levels as the required rear yard in an interior corner of the lot, an open area between two or more buildings on the lot, or an inner court. The proposed rear yard should be comparable in area to that of a code complying rear yard.
3. **Useable Open Space.** Planning Code Section 135 requires at least 26.67 square feet of useable open space for each unit. Please note the added restrictions on the location of useable open space as imposed by Planning Code Section 823, including the restriction on roof decks. Please demonstrate compliance in a subsequent submittal.

4. **Obstructions into Required Useable Open Space and Over Streets and Alleys.** Planning Code Section 136 outlines those obstructions allowed in required Useable Open Space and over streets and alleys. Please confirm that the proposed bay windows meet the dimensional requirements under Planning Code Section 136 for bay windows over streets and alleys. Should a subsequent plan submission include any obstructions that exceed the dimensional requirements for bay windows over streets and alleys a variance must be sought and justified. Should a subsequent plan submission include any obstructions into the required Useable Open Space, they must conform to the dimensional limits within Planning Code Section 136 or a variance from the Useable Open Space requirement must be sought and justified.
5. **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 frontage. Three street trees are required on Folsom Street and five street trees are required on Dore Street.
6. **Standards for Bird Safe Buildings.** Please note that the proposal will be subject to Planning Code Section 139, Standards for Bird Safe Buildings. Please note the Feature Related requirements, under subsection (c)(2).
7. **Dwelling Unit Exposure.** Planning Code Section 140 requires that each unit either face a public street or alley at least 25 feet in width, a code complying rear yard or an inner court no less than 25 feet in every horizontal dimension for the floor at which the dwelling unit in question is located and the floor immediately above it, with an increase of five feet in every horizontal dimension at each subsequent floor. The interior units on Floors 2, 3 and 4 that look onto the inner court are not provided with an open area that meets the minimum dimensions for dwelling unit exposure. Therefore a variance from this requirement must be sought and justified.
8. **Street Frontages in Neighborhood Commercial Districts.** Planning Code Section 145.1 specifies specific requirements for active uses on the ground floor, street-facing ground-level spaces, transparency and fenestration, and gates, railings, and grillwork. As the façade design evolves, please be cognizant of these requirements and demonstrate compliance.
9. **Bicycle Parking.** Planning Code Section 155.2 requires 65 Class 1 bicycle parking spaces and three Class 2 bicycle parking spaces. On subsequent plan sets please indicate the location of all required bicycle parking facilities.
10. **Affordable Housing Requirement.** Planning Code Section 415 requires at least 12% of all proposed units to be affordable inclusionary units located on-site. Section 415 also allows for the provision of an amount of inclusionary units equivalent to 20% of all proposed units to be located off-site. Should the on-site option be pursued, please label proposed units as such.
11. **Eastern Neighborhoods Impact Fee.** Planning Code Section 423 requires the proposed project pay the Eastern Neighborhoods Infrastructure Impact Fee at a Tier 2 rate for the conversion of existing space to residential use and for the proposed new residential spaces. The Tier 2 rate is subject to change and will be specified at time of building permit issuance. Fees shall be assessed per net new

gross square footage on residential and non-residential uses within the Plan Area. Fees shall be assessed on mixed use projects according to the gross square feet of each use in the project. For the most up-to-date schedule, please refer to the Department of Building Inspection (DBI) fee register: <http://sfdbi.org/index.aspx?page=617>. The Eastern Neighborhoods Impact Fee shall be paid before the City issues a first construction document, with an option for the project sponsor to defer payment to prior to issuance of the first certificate of occupancy upon agreeing to pay a deferral surcharge in accordance with Section 107A.13.3 of the San Francisco Building Code.

12. **Option for In-Kind Provision of Community Improvements and Fee Credits.** Project sponsors may propose to directly provide community improvements to the City. In such a case, the City may enter into an In-Kind Improvements Agreement with the sponsor and issue a fee waiver for the Eastern Neighborhoods Impact Fee from the Planning Commission, for an equivalent amount to the value of the improvements. This process is further explained in Section 412.3(d) of the Planning Code. More information on in-kind agreements can be found in the Application Packet for In-Kind Agreement on the Planning Department website.
13. **Stormwater Management.** Prior to issuance of a building permit, the project sponsor is required to prepare and submit a Stormwater Control Plan (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. To view the Guidelines and download instructions for preparing a SCP, go to <http://stormwater.sfwater.org/>. Applicants may contact [stormwaterreview@sflower.org](mailto:stormwaterreview@sflower.org) for assistance.
14. **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:

1. **General.** The proposed project is for a 7-story SRO building on a corner lot in an NCT Folsom / 65-X district.
2. **Site Design, Open Space, and Massing.** Overall, the Planning Department feels building massing is appropriate. However, the Department recommends raising the ground floor height to accomplish two goals: first, to provide a spacious and gracious, active street frontage and base

to the building; and second to enable a closer alignment with existing floor heights of adjacent buildings.

3. **Street Frontage.** The frontage should provide a consistent and active relationship with the fronting street. The entry to the residential lobby should be a celebrated, prominent part of the façade, distinguished in depth, width, and height.
  - The Department recommends that ground floor uses provide direct engagement with, and access from the street. Per the Draft Ground Floor Residential Design Guidelines, the Department prefers the ground floor residential units be raised three to five feet above grade and setback a minimum of 7 feet, providing landscape to soften the transition between the sidewalk and the ground floor dwellings.
  - If at-grade ground floor residential entries are proposed along Dore, the Department recommends they be set back at least 8 to 9 feet, landscaped and expressed as a two story volume to provide the transition from street to dwelling unit. They should also be landscaped and designed as usable space that visually and physically buffers the unit from the street.
  - Refer to the draft Ground Floor Residential Design Guidelines for treatment of the building along the street for residential uses on the ground floor. The draft guidelines are located on the Department website under “Resource Center/Department Publications/Guidelines for Ground Floor Residential Design.”
  
4. **Architecture.** The Department offers the following recommendations related to the proposed building’s design:
  - The Planning Department recommends more be done to modulate and articulate the façade in general and the ground floor in particular.
  - At this point the architecture is assumed to be preliminary and the Department would 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 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 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 **April 10, 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.

Cc:

Tomas Janik, Project Sponsor

William Mollard, Project Sponsor

Diego Sanchez, Current Planning

Heidi Kline, Environmental Planning

Jon Swae, Citywide Planning and Analysis

David Winslow, Architect, SF Planning Department