



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

MEMO

DATE: July 25, 2014
TO: Alfonso Orsini, Presidio Knolls School
FROM: Chris Townes, Planning Department
RE: PPA Case No. 2014.0831U for 250 10th 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, Brittany Bendix, at (415) 575-9114 or brittany.bendix@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 "Chris Townes", written over a horizontal line.

Chris Townes, Acting Team Leader, Southeast Quadrant



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Preliminary Project Assessment

Date: July 25, 2014
Case No.: **2014.0831U**
Project Address: 250 10th Street
Block/Lot: 3517/034, 036, 037 & 038
Zoning: Regional Commercial Zoning District
Western SoMa Mixed Use-General Zoning District
Western SoMa Special Use District
55-X & 55/65-X Height and Bulk Districts
Area Plan: Western SoMa Area Plan
Project Sponsor: Alfonso Orsini, Presido Knolls School
(415) 202-0770
Staff Contact: Brittany Bendix – (415) 575-9114
brittany.bendix@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 improve the existing 26,845 square-foot elementary school campus (d.b.a. Presidio Knolls School) by demolishing two two-story instructional buildings and a single-story garage, totaling approximately 15,549 square-feet, and constructing two new three-story buildings and one new single-story building for instructional and administrative activities, totaling approximately 61,000 square feet. The project will result in increasing the size of the school to approximately 72,296 square feet, which would accommodate approximately 22 classrooms and 500 students.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:

In compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the environmental review process must be completed before any project approval may be granted. This review may be done in conjunction with the required approvals listed below. In order to begin formal environmental review, please submit an Environmental Evaluation Application for the full scope of the project (demolition and construction).

Environmental Evaluation applications are available in the Planning Department lobby at 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, at the Planning Information Center at 1660 Mission Street, and online at www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1570. See “Studies for Project inside of Adopted Plan Areas – Community Plan Fees” on page 2 of the current Fee Schedule for calculation of environmental application fees.

The project site is located within the boundaries of the Western South of Market (SoMa) Community Plan area. Pursuant to CEQA, this project may qualify for a Community Plan Exemption (CPE) under the Western SoMa Community Plan, Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels and 350 Eighth Street Project Final EIR (“Western SoMa FEIR”).

Within the CPE process, there can be three different outcomes as follows:

- (i) CPE Only. A CPE only is appropriate when 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 unique to the proposed project. 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.
- (ii) 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. In addition, a supporting CPE certificate 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.
- (iii) 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 certificate 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.

The following environmental issues would likely be addressed as part of the project’s environmental review based on our preliminary review of the proposed project as it is described in the Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) application submittal dated May 27, 2014:

- 1. Historic Architectural Resources.** The SoMa Historic Resource Survey, which was adopted by the Historic Preservation Commission in February 2011, indicated that two buildings located on the project site are considered historic resources within the West SoMa Light Industrial and Residential Historic District. The St. Joseph's Convent building, located at 260 10th Street (3517/037), was constructed in 1913. The building was included in the SoMa Historical Informational Survey, and was given a rating of 1S, which defines the property as "Individual property listed in the National Register by the Keeper and listed in the California Register." The St. Joseph's Church Rectory building, located at 1415 Howard Street (3517/034), was constructed in 1908. The building was included in the South of Market Historical Informational Survey, and was given a rating of 1S, which defines the property as "Individual property listed in the National Register by the Keeper and listed in the California Register."

The SoMa Historic Resource Survey resulted in documentation and/or assessment of 2,142 individual properties, of which approximately 1,467 properties were constructed in or before 1962. The SoMa Survey area encompassed roughly Mission Street to Townsend Street, between 1st and 13th Streets. In addition, Figure 4.D-2, Western SoMa Historic Architectural Resources and Districts, on page 4.D-21 of the Western SoMa FEIR shows that the project site contains historic resources and is located within any proposed historic district.

As such, the subject properties listed above would be considered historic resources pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Therefore, the proposed project would be subject to additional historic resource review to assess whether the proposed demolition and new construction of adjacent elementary school buildings would have an impact on the historic resources on the project site, South of Market District and other nearby historic buildings. This review will require 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 the EEA, the Department will provide a list of three historic resource consultants from the Historic Resource Consultant Pool. Once the EEA is submitted and an environmental case number is assigned, 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 should be prepared in consultation with Department Preservation staff.

The Western SoMa FEIR found that the implementation of the Western SoMa Community Plan could indirectly result in the demolition of individual historic architectural resources or contributing resources to a historic district located in the Plan area. As a result, the Western SoMa FEIR included Mitigation Measures M-CP-1a: Documentation of a Historical Resource, M-CP-1b: Oral Histories and M-CP-1c: Interpretive Program, which apply to projects that would involve demolition of an historical resource. However, Mitigation Measures M-CP-1a, M-CP-1b, and M-CP-1c would not apply to the proposed project because the proposed project would not involve demolition of a historic resource.

Mitigation Measure M-CP-7a requires that the Planning Department determine whether adjacent or nearby buildings constitute historical resources that could be adversely affected by construction-generated vibration. For those historical resources identified in Mitigation Measure M-CP-7a and where heavy equipment would be used for a development project within the Western SoMa Community Plan area, Mitigation Measure M-CP-7b requires that the project sponsor undertake a

monitoring program to minimize damage to adjacent historic buildings and to ensure that any such damage is documented and repaired. Since demolition and construction would occur adjacent to identified historic resources Mitigation Measure M-CP-7a and Mitigation Measure M-CP-7b would apply to the project.

2. **Archeological Resources.** Project implementation would entail soil-disturbing activities associated with building demolition and construction including excavation, grading, and foundation work. The Western SoMa FEIR identified the potential for project-specific significant impacts on archeological resources resulting from ground-disturbing activities in the Plan area. Western SoMa FEIR Mitigation Measure M-CP-4a: Project-Specific Preliminary Archeological Assessment would apply to the proposed project. This measure applies to any project involving any soils-disturbing activities including excavation, utilities installation, grading, soils remediation, compaction/chemical grouting to a depth of five feet or greater below ground surface in the Western SoMa Community Plan area for which no archeological assessment report has been prepared. Projects to which this mitigation measure applies are subject to Preliminary Archeology Review (PAR) or a Preliminary Archeological Sensitivity Study (PASS) by the San Francisco Planning Department archeologist. Based on the PAR or PASS, the Environmental Review Officer (ERO) shall determine if an Archeological Research Design Treatment Plan (ARDTP) shall be required to more definitively identify the potential for California Register-eligible archeological resources to be present within the project site and determine the appropriate action necessary to reduce the potential effect of the project site on archeological resources to a less-than-significant level.

If required, the ARDTP shall be prepared by a qualified archeological consultant selected from a list of three archeological consultants from the Planning Department's archeological resources consultant pool provided by the Planning Department during the environmental review. The Planning Department Archeologist will be informed by the geotechnical study of the project site's subsurface geological conditions (see Item 8, Geology, below).

In addition, Western SoMa FEIR Mitigation Measure M-CP-4b: Procedures for Accidental Discovery of Archeological Resources would apply to the proposed project. This measure is intended to avoid any potential adverse effect on accidentally discovered buried or submerged historical resources as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a)(c). This mitigation measure requires the project sponsor to distribute the San Francisco Planning Department archeological resource "ALERT" sheet to on-site construction workers, suspend any project-related soils-disturbing activities when an archeological resource is encountered, and notify the ERO of an archeological resource encountered during soils-disturbing activities.

3. **Transportation and Circulation.** The project sponsor will be required to prepare a Transportation Memorandum using the methodology and requirements of the San Francisco Planning Department for the environmental review of projects within San Francisco. The memorandum will focus primarily on student pick-up/drop-off circulation and parking at the Presidio Knolls School. More specifically, the memorandum would be required to at least address the following:
 - Describe afterschool activities and programs;
 - Comment on potential student pick-up/drop-off overlap with other schools in the area;

- Provide information about trip generation, mode split, trip distribution, temporal distribution, and average vehicle occupancy for teachers/staff, and for student pick-up/drop-off;
- Describe the existing and proposed pick-up/drop-off operation plans, including during construction (both physical facilities and management of the plan);
- Identify construction staging areas and any temporary street or sidewalk closures or curb parking removal that would be needed;
- Address the loss of queuing space and off-street parking that would occur on the school site once the proposed building is constructed;
- Describe any new curb white zones that would be needed, and where queuing would occur if the existing on-site surface lot is no longer available due to construction of the new building. If applicable, recommend expansion, zone relocation or addition, or management strategies based on the project;
- Analyze neighborhood parking conditions and occupancy;
- Analyze and recommend potential transportation demand management (TDM) measures to reduce single-occupancy vehicle use;
- Analyze potential conflicts between project vehicle trips and pedestrians/bicycles;
- Analyze and recommend potential loading management strategies to reduce queuing and delays such as staggered pick-up times, carpools, school bus service, revisions to pick-up/drop-off plans, teachers to facilitate loading/unloading, etc.; and
- Determine whether significant impacts due to queuing or parking would occur.

The Western SoMa FEIR identified significant traffic, loading, and transit impacts resulting from implementation of the Western SoMa Community Plan. The transportation memo will determine whether the proposed project would contribute to these significant impacts.

4. **Noise.** Due to the proposed increase in the elementary student population at the project site, the proposed project would introduce additional noise-sensitive receptors (i.e., elementary students) to the project site and, therefore, would be subject to Western SoMa FEIR Mitigation Measure M-NO-1b: Siting of Noise-Sensitive Uses. The measure requires the Planning Department to require the preparation of a noise analysis, prepared by persons qualified in acoustical analysis and/or engineering, for projects that include residential and other noise-sensitive uses, including elementary school uses. The noise study shall include, at a minimum, a site survey to identify potential noise-generating uses within 900 feet of, and that have a direct line-of-sight to, the project site, and include at least one 24-hour noise measurement (with average and maximum noise level readings taken so as to be able to accurately describe maximum level reached during nighttime hours) prior to the first project approval action.

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 individual project site that appear to warrant heightened concern about noise levels in the vicinity. Should the Planning Department conclude that such concerns be present, the Planning Department would 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.

Western SoMa FEIR Mitigation Measures M-NO-1d: Open Space in Noisy Environments would apply to the proposed project because the project site is located adjacent to noise-generating uses and includes open space for the elementary school use which is required to be protected from adjacent noise generating uses. Western SoMa FEIR Mitigation Measure M-NO-2a: General Construction Noise Control Measures would apply to the proposed project. Mitigation Measure M-NO-2a: would require that development projects in the Western SoMa Community Plan area undertake noise attenuation measures to ensure that project noise from construction activities is minimized to the maximum extent feasible. In addition, Western SoMa FEIR Mitigation Measure M-NO-2b: Noise Control Measures During Pile Driving would apply to the proposed project if the project requires pile driving. Mitigation Measure M-NO-2b would require that a set of site-specific noise attenuation measures be completed under the supervision of a qualified acoustical consultant for projects that require pile driving.

5. **Air Quality.** The proposed project does not exceed the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's (BAAQMD) construction and operational screening levels for criteria air pollutants. Therefore, an analysis of the projects criteria air pollutant emissions is not required.

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, to minimize public nuisance complaints, and to avoid orders to stop work by DBI. Pursuant to the Construction Dust Control Ordinance, the proposed project would be required to prepare a Construction Dust Control Plan for review and approval by DPH. Please also note that Ordinance 175-91 requires that non-potable water be used for dust control activities.

In addition, San Francisco has partnered with the BAAQMD to inventory and assess air pollution and exposures from mobile, stationary, and area sources within San Francisco. Areas with poor air quality, termed the "Air Pollutant Exposure Zone," were identified. Land use projects within the Air Pollutant Exposure Zone require special consideration to determine whether the project's activities would expose sensitive receptors to substantial air pollutant concentrations. The proposed project is within an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone and includes sensitive land uses (i.e., elementary school). Therefore, exhaust measures during construction and enhanced ventilation measures as part of building design will likely be required. Enhanced ventilation measures will be the same as those required for projects, such as this project, subject to Article 38 of the Health Code. Detailed information related to construction equipment, phasing and duration of each phase, and cubic yards of excavation shall be provided as part of the EEA.

The Western SoMa FEIR identified a significant impact related to violation of an air quality standard and included Mitigation Measure M-AQ-2: Transportation Demand Management Strategies for Future Development Projects, which applies to projects that generate over 3,500 daily vehicle trips. Based on the project description details, the proposed project would not generate over 3,500 daily vehicle trips; therefore, Western SoMa FEIR Mitigation Measure M-AQ-2 would not be applicable to the proposed project.

Western SoMa FEIR Mitigation Measure M-AQ-3: Reduction in Exposure to Toxic Air Contaminants for New Sensitive Receptors would apply to the proposed project. This measure requires that the Planning Department require analysis of potential site-specific health risks for all projects that would include sensitive receptors, based on criteria as established by the Planning Department, as such criteria may be amended from time to time.

The Western SoMa FEIR also found significant impacts related to uses that emit toxic air contaminants and included Mitigation Measure M-AQ-4: Siting of Use(s) that Emit PM_{2.5} or DPM and other TACs (Toxic Air Contaminants). The Western SoMa FEIR also found significant impacts related to construction emissions and included Mitigation Measures M-AQ-6: Construction Emissions Minimization Plan for Criteria Air Pollutants and M-AQ-7: Construction Emissions Minimization Plan for Health Risks and Hazards. As part of the air quality analysis, the proposed project would be screened against air quality impacts identified in the Western SoMa FEIR and/or the ones described above, or similar measures, would be required for the proposed project.

6. **Greenhouse Gases.** Potential environmental effects related to greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from the proposed project need to be addressed in a project's environmental evaluation. The project sponsor would be required to submit a completed GHG Compliance Checklist Table 1 for Private Development Projects demonstrating that the project is in compliance with the identified regulations and provide project-level details in the discussion column. This information will be reviewed by the environmental planner during the environmental review process to determine if the project would comply with San Francisco's Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy. Projects that do not comply with a GHG-related regulation may be determined to be inconsistent with San Francisco's Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy.
7. **Biological Resources.** The Western SoMa FEIR identified a significant impact related to protected species and included Mitigation Measures M-BI-1a: Pre-Construction Special-Status Bird Surveys and M-BI-1b: Pre-Construction Special-Status Bat Surveys.

Mitigation Measure M-BI-1a requires that conditions of approval for building permits include a requirement for pre-construction special-status bird surveys when trees are to be removed or buildings demolished as part of the project. Mitigation Measure M-BI-1b requires that conditions of approval for building permits issued for construction of the proposed project include a requirement for pre-construction special-status bat surveys by a qualified bat biologist when large trees (those with trunks over 12 inches in diameter) are to be removed, or vacant buildings or buildings used seasonally or not occupied, especially in the upper stories, are to be demolished.

Mitigation Measure M-BI-1a would apply to the proposed project if the project would involve removal of existing trees or demolition of existing buildings. Mitigation Measure M-BI-1b would also apply to the project because the project entails demolition of an existing garage that is currently used for storage.

Although not required, Improvement Measure I-BI-2: Night Lighting Minimization would be recommended for proposed project.

8. **Geology.** The project site is located in a Seismic Hazard Zone, specifically a liquefaction hazard zone, as identified in the San Francisco General Plan. Any new construction on the project site is subject to a mandatory Interdepartmental Project Review because it is located within a Seismic Hazard Zone. A geotechnical study prepared by a qualified consultant must be submitted with the Environmental Evaluation Application. The study should address whether the site is subject to liquefaction, and should provide recommendations for any geotechnical concerns identified in the study. In general, compliance with the building codes would avoid the potential for significant impacts related to structural damage, ground subsidence, liquefaction, landslides, and surface settlement. This study will also help inform the Planning Department Archeologist of the project site's subsurface geological conditions.
9. **Hazardous Materials.** The Western SoMa FEIR identified a significant impact associated with accidental release of mercury or polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) that would create a significant hazard to the public or environment. As a result, the Western SoMa FEIR included Measure M-HZ-2: Hazardous Building Materials Abatement, which would apply to the proposed project. This measure requires projects within the Western SoMa Community Plan area to properly dispose of any polychlorinated biphenyls (PCB) such as fluorescent light ballasts or any other hazardous building materials in accordance with applicable local, state and federal laws.

The project site is located within an area subject to the Maher Ordinance, Article 22A of the San Francisco Health Code, which is administered and overseen by the San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH), and known to be underlain by artificial fill. The Western SoMa FEIR found that disturbance of potentially contaminated areas through grading or excavation operations could expose workers or other members of the public to health hazards from physical contact with contaminated materials or hazardous vapors and included Mitigation Measure M-HZ-3: Site Assessment and Corrective Action. Mitigation Measure M-HZ-3 would apply to the proposed project. This measure requires the project sponsor to ensure that a site-specific Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) be prepared to determine the potential for site contamination and the level of exposure risk associated with the project. The Phase I ESA and any related documentation should be submitted with the Environmental Evaluation Application. DPH will determine whether any additional analysis (e.g., a Phase II soil sampling) is required based on the Phase I ESA. If the level(s) of chemical(s) onsite would create an unacceptable risk to human health or the environment, appropriate cleanup levels for each chemical, based on current and planned land use, shall be determined in accordance with accepted procedures adopted by the lead regulatory agency providing oversight (e.g., the Department of Toxic Substances Control [DTSC], the Regional Water Quality Control Board [RWQCB], or DPH). A remedial action plan or similar plan for remediation may be required for review and approval by the appropriate regulatory agency. Upon determination that site remediation has been successfully completed the regulatory agency shall issue a closure letter to the responsible party. For sites that are cleaned to levels that do not allow unrestricted land use, or where containment measures were used to prevent exposure to hazardous materials, the DTSC may require a limitation on the future use of the property. These land use restrictions shall transfer to the new property owners in the event that the property is sold.

Review of the Phase I ESA and any additional studies recommended by the Phase I ESA would require oversight from DPH. Please note that DPH charges a fee for their review. Given that the project site is known to be underlain by artificial fill and that the proposed project involves

excavation, DPH would likely require that the project sponsor enroll in its Maher Ordinance Program. More information on DPH's Maher Ordinance Program may be found at:

http://www.sfdph.org/dph/files/EHSdocs/Maher/Process_Procedures.pdf.

10. **Stormwater Management.** If the project results in a ground surface disturbance of 5,000 sf or greater, it is subject to San Francisco's stormwater management requirements as outlined in the Stormwater Management Ordinance and the corresponding SFPUC Stormwater Design Guidelines (Guidelines). Projects that trigger the stormwater management requirements must prepare a Stormwater Control Plan demonstrating project adherence to the performance measures outlined in the Guidelines including: (a) reduction in total volume and peak flow rate of stormwater for areas in combined sewer systems OR (b) stormwater treatment for areas in separate sewer systems. Responsibility for review and approval of the Stormwater Control Plan is with the SFPUC, Wastewater Enterprise, Urban Watershed Management Program. Without SFPUC approval of a Stormwater Control Plan, no site or building permits can be issued. The Guidelines also require a signed maintenance agreement to ensure proper care of the necessary stormwater controls. The project's environmental evaluation should generally assess how and where the implementation of necessary stormwater controls would reduce the potential negative impacts of stormwater runoff. 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. **Tree Disclosure Affidavit.** The Department of Public Works Code Section 8.02-8.11 requires disclosure and protection of landmark, significant, and street trees located on private and public property. Any tree identified in the Affidavit for Tree Disclosure must be shown on the Site Plans with the size of trunk diameter, tree height, and accurate canopy drip line. Please submit an Affidavit along with the Environmental Evaluation Application and ensure that trees are appropriately shown on site plans.
12. **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 owners of properties within 300 feet of the project site. Please be prepared to provide two sets of these mailing labels upon request after application submittal.

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 **Conditional Use Authorization Application** is required for the project per Planning Code Section 303 and pursuant to the following Planning Code Sections:
 - a. **Large Institutional Use – Child Care Facility.** Planning Code Section 744.82a.
 - b. **Development of Large Lots.** Planning Code Section 121.1.
 - c. **Lot Merger in an RCD District.** Planning Code Section 121.7.
 - d. **Planned Unit Development.** Planning Code Section 304.

2. **Planned Unit Development.** Pursuant to Planning Code Section 304, a development lot area which exceeds 21,781 square feet (one half-acre) may seek certain modifications from the base zoning requirements of the Regional Commercial District (RCD) as a Planned Unit Development (PUD). As proposed, the project would require the following exceptions through the PUD review process:
 - a. **Use Size.** Planning Code Section 744.21.
 - b. **Rear Yard.** Planning Code Section 134.
 - c. **Street Frontage.** Planning Code Section 145.1.
 - d. **Bicycle Parking, Shower and Locker Facilities.** Planning Code Sections 155.2 and 155.4.
3. A **Building Permit Application** is required for the demolition of the existing buildings on the subject property.
4. A **Building Permit Application** is required for the proposed new construction on the subject property.

Conditional Use Authorization 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 is required to conduct a **Pre-application** meeting with surrounding neighbors and registered neighborhood groups before a development application may be filed with the Planning Department. The Pre-application packet, which includes instructions and template forms, is available at www.sfplanning.org under the "Permits & Zoning" tab. All registered neighborhood group mailing lists are available online at www.sfplanning.org under the "Resource Center" tab.

PRELIMINARY PROJECT COMMENTS:

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

1. **Other Institutions, Child Care.** The existing and proposed preschool is considered a child care activity which provides less than 24-hour care for children by licensed personnel and which meets the requirements of the State of California and other authorities. Per Planning Code Section 744.32a, the establishment of a child care facility in the RCD zoning district is principally permitted when providing care for 12 or fewer children, and conditionally permitted pursuant to the authorization of a Conditional Use Authorization for 13 or more children. Please be advised that a Conditional Use authorization may be required to expand the pre-school at this location.

2. **Elementary and Secondary Schools.** Per Planning Code Sections 744.82d and 744.82e, both elementary and secondary schools are principally permitted within the RCD zoning district.
3. **Development of Large Lots.** Pursuant to Planning Code Section 121.1 and 744.11 the project requires Conditional Use Authorization for new construction on a lot greater than 10,000 square feet. To grant this Conditional Use request, the Planning Commission must make the following findings:
 - a. The mass and façade of the proposed structure are compatible with the existing scale of the district; and,
 - b. The façade of the proposed structure is compatible with design features of adjacent facades that contribute to the positive visual quality of the district.

Please review the 'Preliminary Design Comments' below for direction relative to meeting these findings.

4. **Lot Merger.** Pursuant to Planning Code Section 121.7, a Conditional Use Authorization is required to merge the subject lots as the merger creates a lot frontage greater than 100 feet in the RCD zoning district. As part of the Conditional Use Authorization request, the Planning Commission must make one or more of the following findings:
 - a. The lot merger will enable a specific residential project that provides housing on-site at affordability levels significantly exceeding the requirements of Planning Code Section 415.
 - b. The lot merger will facilitate development of an underutilized site historically used as a single use and the new project is comprised of multiple individual buildings.
 - c. The lot merger serves a unique public interest that cannot be met by building a project on a smaller lot.

Please also be advised that if the contiguous lots have historically operated under one ownership and one use, a lot merger may not be required.

5. **Use Size.** Planning Code Section 744.21 does not permit uses greater than 25,000 gross square-feet in the RCD zoning district. As the proposal results in a use of approximately 72,296 gross square-feet, the project must seek an exemption from this requirement through a Planned Unit Development request.
6. **Rear Yard.** Planning Code Section 134 requires that the project provide a rear yard of at least 25 percent of the lot depth. The current proposal does not include a rear yard. Therefore, the project must seek an exemption from Planning Code Section 134 as part of the Planned Unit Development request. Please note that the project must account for any changes to existing rear yard conditions for the group housing units at 1415 Howard Street.
7. **Open Space – Residential.** It is unclear whether or not the landscaping for the school campus eliminates required open space for the group housing units at 1415 Howard Street. When submitting

an application, please identify the location, and ensure the maintenance of, open space for the residential building.

8. **Awnings.** Please be advised that Planning Code Section 136.1(a)(2) requires that any awning with a width greater than ten feet may only project four feet from the face of the building. At this time, it is unclear if the proposed awning complies with the projection limits of this requirement. If the awning extends beyond four feet, the project must seek an exception through a Planned Unit Development request.
9. **Street Trees.** Planning Code Section 138.1(c)(1) requires new construction projects to provide one street tree for every 20 feet of frontage. The proposal has approximately 65 feet of frontage on Howard Street, 262.3 feet of frontage on 10th Street and 35 feet of frontage on Kissling Street. Accordingly, the project must include three street trees on Howard Street, 13 street trees on 10th Street and two street trees on Kissling Street. Please note on the submitted plans that the project will comply with the following standards:
 - a. Comply with Public Works Code Article 16 and any other applicable ordinances;
 - b. Be suitable for the site;
 - c. Be a minimum of one tree of 24-inch box size for each 20 feet of frontage of the property along each street or alley, with any remaining fraction of 10 feet or more of frontage requiring an additional tree. Such trees shall be located either within a setback area on the lot or within the public right-of-way along such lot;
 - d. Provide a below-grade environment with nutrient-rich soils, free from overly-compacted soils, and generally conducive to tree root development;
 - e. Be watered, maintained and replaced if necessary by the property owner, in accordance with Sec. 174 and Article 16 of the Public Works Code and compliant with applicable water use requirements of Chapter 63 of the Administrative Code;
 - f. Have a minimum 2 inch caliper, measured at breast height;
 - g. Branch a minimum of 80 inches above sidewalk grade;
 - h. Be planted in a sidewalk opening at least 16 square feet, and have a minimum soil depth of three-feet six-inches;
 - i. Include street tree basins edged with decorative treatment, such as pavers or cobbles. Edging features may be counted toward the minimum sidewalk opening per (cc) if they are permeable surfaces per Planning Code Section 102.33.
10. **Streetscape Plan.** In addition to the street trees required above, the project must provide streetscape improvements consistent with Planning Code Section 138.1(c)(2). Please see the 'Preliminary Design Comments' for suggestions on how to meet this requirement.
11. **Street Frontage.** Pursuant to Planning Code Section 145.1, new buildings are required to provide a minimum floor to ceiling height of 14-feet on the ground floor. Additionally, ground floor active uses must be at least 60 percent transparent. The proposal requires an exception from both of these street frontage requirements. Given that the project seeks a number of exceptions, the Planning Department strongly encourages a redesign the ground floor along 10th Street to ensure an active and transparent

use is provided to promote a safe and active public realm. This request is also noted in the ‘Preliminary Design Comments’ below.

- 12. Bicycle Parking, Showers, and Lockers.** Planning Code Section 155.2 requires this project to provide a minimum of Class 1 and Class 2 bicycle parking spaces as indicated in the table below. Additionally, Planning Code Section 155.4 requires the project to provide four showers, and 24 lockers. Currently, the proposal contains none of these facilities and will, therefore, require an exemption for each requirement in its entirety. The Planning Department strongly encourages the project to at least partially meet these requirements and incorporate the Class 2 spaces into the required Streetscape Plan.

Use Category	Class 1 spaces required	Class 2 spaces required
Child Care	2 per every 20 children	1 per every 20 children
Elementary	2 per every classroom	1 per every classroom
Secondary	4 per every classroom	1 per every classroom

- 13. Transit Impact Development Fee (TIDF).** Pursuant to Planning Code Section 411 et seq., the Transit Impact Development Fee will apply to the non-residential uses of this project. Please be aware that an ongoing process, the Transportation Sustainability Program, may eventually replace the Transit Impact Development Fee. You can find more information about this program at: <http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=3035>
- 14. Eastern Neighborhood Area Plan Impact Fees.** Planning Code Section 423 outlines the requirements for development impact fees for projects located within the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan. For the purposes of impact fee calculation, all three parcels are classified as “Tier 1” (see San Francisco Planning Department’s Property Information Map). These fee amounts are subject to annual review by the City Controller, and may be subject to change. The Eastern Neighborhood Area Plan Impact Fee shall be paid before the City issues a first construction document. The impact fee register is regularly updated and can be found on DBI’s website at: <http://www.sfdbi.org/index.aspx?page=617>

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 Agreements on the Planning Department website.

- 15. First Source Hiring Agreement.** A First Source Hiring Agreement is required for any project proposing to construct 25,000 gross square feet or more. For more information, please contact:

Ken Nim, Workforce Compliance Officer
 CityBuild, Office of Economic and Workforce Development
 City and County of San Francisco

50 Van Ness, San Francisco, CA 94102
(415)581-2303

16. **Interdepartmental Project Review.** An Interdepartmental Project Review application is required for all proposed new construction in seismic hazard zones, in which the subject property falls. An application is enclosed.
17. **Western SoMa Community Plan.** The project is located within the Western SoMa Community Plan Area, part of the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans. In general, the project is consistent with the policies and objectives of the Western SoMa Community Plan (the Plan). The Plan supports the preservation and expansion of community facilities, including schools; the proposed project will expand the existing school use to include a broader age range. (Objective 9.1; Policy 9.1.3).

PRELIMINARY DESIGN COMMENTS:

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

1. **Site Design, Open Space, and Massing.** Overall, the site design, open space, and massing are appropriate. The Planning Department recommends that the design of the music building should explore means of becoming a hyphen between the church and the parish hall/ gymnasium with the goals of allowing those two buildings to be seen as independent and freestanding. This may be accomplished by providing more side space between the church to create a greater sense of detachment and designing greater transparency to the music building.
2. **Street Frontage.** Active uses which have the ability to maximize transparency should be located at the street.
3. **Architecture.** The buildings' exterior forms must better acknowledge and relate to the massing, proportions, scale and materials of the surrounding context. While the former church building may be an architectural anomaly, there is a pattern of existing buildings that provide a strong urban fabric, from which this design should look for cues. The sense of the better parts of the context is one of solidity and weight, which is offset by delicate detailing and large glazing systems. It is possible to design a contemporary building which incorporates that sensibility.

Specifically, the Planning Department suggests looking at, and incorporating, the local patterns that include vertical modulation and articulation, the scale and proportion of openings, the depth of façade "texture", and the range of materials in terms of scale and durability.

4. **Required Streetscape and Pedestrian Improvements.** Per Planning Code Section 138.1, the project sponsor will be required to submit a Streetscape Plan illustrating the location and design of streetscape improvements appropriate to the street type, including site furnishings, landscaping,

corner curb extensions, and sidewalk widening as appropriate. The Planning Department may require these elements as part of conditions of approval. See <http://www.sfbetterstreets.org/design-guidelines/street-types/> to identify relevant street types for the project frontage.

Given that the property's 10th Street frontage will serve as the school's pick up and drop off area, widening the sidewalk to the minimum width recommended by the Better Streets Plan would be appropriate.

If street improvements are being considered, project sponsors should contact DPW as early as possible to understand the process and requirements for permitting street improvements. For more information on process, guidelines, and requirements for street improvements, refer to www.sfbetterstreets.org. Required streetscape and pedestrian improvements are not eligible for in-kind fee credit.

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 **January 25, 2016**. Otherwise, this determination is considered expired and a new Preliminary Project Assessment is required. Such applications and plans must be generally consistent with those found in this Preliminary Project Assessment.

Enclosure: Neighborhood Group Mailing List
 Interdepartmental Project Review Application

cc: SF Rents, Property Owner
 Brittany Bendix, Current Planning
 Brett Bollinger, Environmental Planning
 Maia Small, Design Review
 Alexis Smith, Citywide Planning and Analysis
 Jonas Ionin, Planning Commission Secretary
 Jerry Robbins, MTA
 Jerry Sanguinetti, DPW

FIRST	LAST	TITLE	ORGANIZATION	ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP	TELEPHONE	EMAIL	NEIGHBORHOOD OF INTEREST
Angelica	Cabande	Organizational Director	South of Market Community Action Network (SOMCAN)	1110 Howard Street	San Francisco	CA	94103		0 acabande@somcan.org	South of Market
Antonio	Diaz	Project Director	People Organizing to Demand Environmental and Economic Rights (PODER)	474 Valencia Street #125	San Francisco	CA	94103	415-431-4210	podersf.org	Excelsior, Mission, South of Market
Carolyn	Diamond	Executive Director	Market Street Association	870 Market Street, Suite 456	San Francisco	CA	94102	415-362-2500	msadv@pacbell.net	South of Market
Corinne	Woods		0 Mission Creek Harbor Association	300 Channel Street, Box 10	San Francisco	CA	94158	415-902-7635	corinnewoods@cs.com	Potrero Hill, South of Market
Don	Falk	Executive Director	Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation	201 Eddy Street	San Francisco	CA	94102	415-776-2151	dfalk@tndc.org; ceddings@tndc.org	Downtown/Civic Center, South of Market
Ethan	Hough	Secretary	One Ecker Owners Association	16 Jessie Street Unit 301	San Francisco	CA	94105	415-847-3169	ethanhough@gmail.com	Financial District, South of Market
Gerald	Wolf	President	Hallam Street Homeowners Association	1 Brush Place	San Francisco	CA	94103	415-626-6650	wolfgk@earthlink.net	South of Market
Ian	Lewis		0 HERE Local 2	209 Golden Gate Avenue	San Francisco	CA	94102		0	0 Chinatown, Downtown/Civic Center, Marina, Mission, Nob Hill, North Beach, Pacific Heights, Presidio, South of Market
Jane	Kim	Supervisor, District 6	Board of Supervisors	1 Dr. Carlton B Goodlett Place, Room #244	San Francisco	CA	94102-4689	415-554-7970	jane.kim@sfgov.org; April.veneracion@sfgov.org; Sunny.Angulo@sfgov.org; Ivy.Lee@sfgov.org	0 Downtown/Civic Center, North Beach, South of Market, Treasure Island/YBI
Janet	Carpinelli	Board President	Dogpatch Neighborhood Association	934 Minnesota Street	San Francisco	CA	94107	415-282-5516	jc@jcarpinelli.com	Potrero Hill, South of Market
Jason	Henderson	Vice Chariman	Market/Octavia Community Advisory Comm.	300 Buchanan Street, Apt. 503	San Francisco	CA	94102	415-722-0617	jhenders@sbcglobal.net	Castro/Upper Market, Downtown/Civic Center, Mission, South of Market, Western Addition
Jim	Meko	Chair	SOMA Leadership Council	366 Tenth Street	San Francisco	CA	94103	415-552-2401	jim.meko@comcast.net	Mission, South of Market
Katy	Liddell	President	South Beach/Rincon/ Mission Bay Neighborhood Association	403 Main Street #813	San Francisco	CA	94105	415-412-2207	kliddell2001@yahoo.com	South of Market
Kaye	Griffin	Director	LMNOP Neighbors	1047 Minna Street	San Francisco	CA	94103	415-724-1953	LMNOP@yak.net	South of Market
Keith	Goldstein		0 Potrero-Dogpatch Merchants Association	800 Kansas Street	San Francisco	CA	94107		0 keith@everestsf.com	Mission, Potrero Hill, South of Market
Ken	Baxter	Director	Citizens for Change	355 11th Street, Suite 200	San Francisco	CA	94103	415-652-9330	kbaxter26@gmail.com	Downtown/Civic Center, Financial District, Marina, Nob Hill, Pacific Heights, Presidio Heights, Russian Hill, Seaciff, South of Market
Laura	Magnani		0 American Friends Service Committee	65 Ninth Street	San Francisco	CA	94103	415-565-0201	sfoffice@afsc.org	South of Market
Marvis	Phillips	Land Use Chair	Alliance for a Better District 6	230 Eddy Street #1206	San Francisco	CA	94102-6526	415-674-1935	marvisphillips@gmail.com	Downtown/Civic Center, Mission, South of Market, Western Addition
Patsy	Tito	Executive Director	Samoan Development Centre	2055 Sunnysdale Avenue #100	San Francisco	CA	94134-2611		0	0 Bayview, South of Market
Reed	Bement	President	Rincon Hill Residents Association	75 Folsom Street #1800	San Francisco	CA	94105	415-882-7871	rbement@sbcglobal.net	South of Market
Rodney	Minott	Chair	Potrero Hill Neighbors/Save the Hill	1206 Mariposa Street	San Francisco	CA	94107	415-553-5969	rodminott@hotmail.com	Potrero Hill, South of Market
Sonja	Kos	Community Advocate	TODCO Impact Group	230 Fourth Street	San Francisco	CA	94103	415-426-6819	sonja@todco.org	South of Market
Ted	Olsson	Chair	TJPA CAC	30 Sharon Street	San Francisco	CA	94114-1709	415-407-0094	olssonted@yahoo.com	Financial District, South of Market
Tiffany	Bohee	Executive Director	Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, City and County of San Francisco	1 South Van Ness Avenue, 5th Floor	San Francisco	CA	94103		0 tiffany.bohee@sfgov.org; mike.grisso@sfgov.org; courtney.pash@sfgov.org	Bayview, Downtown /Civic Center, South of Market, Visitation Valley
Tony	Kelly	President	Potrero Boosters Neighborhood Association	1459 - 18th Street, Suite 133	San Francisco	CA	94107	415-861-0345		0 Mission, Potrero Hill, South of Market
York	Loo		0 York Realty	243A Shipley Street	San Francisco	CA	94107-1010	415-751-8602	yorkloo@gmail.com	South of Market



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

INTERDEPARTMENTAL PROJECT REVIEW

Effective: August 30, 2013

Interdepartmental Project Reviews are **mandatory** for new construction projects that propose buildings eight stories or more and new construction on parcels identified by the State of California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology as Seismic Hazard Zones in the City and County of San Francisco. Projects identified as such, must request and participate in an interdepartmental project review prior to any application that requires a public hearing before the Planning Commission or new construction building permit.

Project Sponsors may elect to request an interdepartmental review for any project at any time, however, it is strongly recommended that the request is made prior to the submittal of the abovereferenced applications.

The Planning Department acts as the lead agency in collaboration with the Department of Building Inspection (DBI); the Department of Public Works (DPW); and the San Francisco Fire Department (SFFD). Staff from each of these disciplines will attend your meeting.

Interdepartmental Project Review fees:

1. \$1,164 for five or fewer residential units and all affordable housing projects.
2. \$1,702 for all other projects.

Please note that \$394 of these fees is non-refundable. If your project falls under the second type of fee, and you cancel your meeting, the difference will be refunded to you.

To avoid delays in scheduling your meeting, provide all information requested on this form and submit your request with a check in the appropriate amount payable to the San Francisco Planning Department. Requests may be mailed or delivered to **San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103-2414**. Those wishing more specific or more detailed information may contact the Project Review Meeting Coordinator at **(415) 575-9091**.

Please note: All returned checks are subject to a \$50.00 bank fee.

Interdepartmental Project Reviews are scheduled no sooner than two weeks from the receipt of the request form and check.

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

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

Submittal requirements:

Please submit four (4) copies/sets of all information for distribution to each department/agency.

All projects subject to the **mandatory** Interdepartmental Project Review shall be required to submit the following minimum information in addition to their request form:

1. Site Survey with topography lines;
2. Floor Plans with occupancy and/or use labeled of existing and proposed;
3. Existing and proposed elevations;
4. Roof Plan; and
5. Pictures of the subject property and street frontages.

Planned unit developments or projects with an acre or more of land area shall be required to submit the following additional information:

1. Existing and proposed street names and widths;
2. Location of any existing train tracks; and
3. Location of any existing and proposed easements.

In order for the Interdepartmental Project Review to be most effective and beneficial to you, it is strongly recommended that any issues, concerns and/or specific questions are submitted with this request directed to each discipline.

INTERDEPARTMENTAL PROJECT REVIEW APPLICATION FORM

APPLICATION DATE: _____

PROJECT CONTACT:

Name _____ Phone No. () _____

Address _____ FAX No. () _____

Owner _____

PROJECT INFORMATION:

Address _____

How many units does the subject property have? _____

Assessor's Block/Lot(s) _____ Zoning District _____

Height and Bulk Districts _____ Located within Geologic Hazard Zone? Y N

PROJECT DESCRIPTION / PURPOSE OF MEETING/SPECIFIC QUESTIONS:

(Use attachments if necessary)

Land Use Type	Existing	Proposed	Net Change
Number of Dwelling Units			
Commercial Square Footage:			
Retail			
Office			
Number of Hotel Rooms			
Industrial Square Footage			
Other Uses: _____			
Number of Parking Spaces			
Number of Stories			

Previously contacted staff _____

Will this project be publicly funded? (specify) _____

(Please submit four (4) copies/sets of the Application Form, Floor Plans, Pictures, etc.)