DATE: August 15, 2014
TO: Muhammad A. Nadhiri, Axis Development Group, LLC
FROM: Jessica Range, Planning Department
RE: PPA Case No. 2014.0948U for 344 14th Street/1463 Stevenson Street

Please find the attached Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) for the address listed above. You may contact the staff contact, Kansai Uchida, at (415) 575-9048 or kansai.uchida@sfgov.org, to answer any questions you may have, or to schedule a follow-up meeting.

Jessica Range, Senior Planner
Preliminary Project Assessment

Date: August 15, 2014
Case No.: 2014.0948U
Project Address: 344 14th Street/1463 Stevenson Street
Block/Lot: 3532/013, 021
Zoning: UMU (Urban Mixed Use) and PDR-1-G (Production, Distribution, and Repair – General) Use Districts
            58-X and 40-X Height and Bulk Districts
Area Plan: Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan
Project Sponsor: Muhammad A. Nadhiri, Axis Development Group, LLC
                (415) 992-6997
Staff Contact: Kansai Uchida – (415) 575-9048
                kansai.uchida@sfgov.org

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 (DBI), Department of Public Works (DPW), Department of Public Health (DPH), Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) and others. The information included herein is based on plans and information provided for this assessment and the Planning Code, General Plan, Planning Department policies, and local/state/federal regulations as of the date of this document, all of which are subject to change.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The project site consists of two adjacent lots located on the block bounded by 14th Street to the south, Stevenson Street to the west, Duboce Avenue to the north, and Woodward Street to the east. The project site occupies the entire 14th Street frontage of the subject block, and also has street frontages along Stevenson Street and Woodward Street. A fenced surface parking lot presently covers the entire project site.

The proposed project includes construction of two new buildings on the project site. The proposed five-story-over-basement, 55-foot-tall building at 344 14th Street (Block 3532, Lot 013) would contain about 47,970 square feet (sf) of residential space (29 two-bedroom units, 10 one-bedroom units, 24 studio units, and 6 studio-plus-mezzanine flex units), two ground floor retail spaces totaling about 2,490 sf, a landscaped courtyard, and a roof deck. The total square footage of the building, including circulation and ancillary spaces, would be about 75,480 sf.
The proposed three-story-over-basement, 37-foot-tall building at 1463 Stevenson Street (Block 3532, Lot 021) would contain approximately 6,090 sf of production/distribution/repair (PDR) space, about 8,200 sf of small enterprise workspace (SEW) uses, and a landscaped courtyard. The total square footage of the building, including circulation and ancillary spaces, would be approximately 28,300 sf. The two buildings would have a combined basement level containing 50 off-street parking spaces, with a vehicle entrance from Woodward Street.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:

The project initially requires the following environmental review. This review may be done in conjunction with the required approvals listed below, but must be completed before any project approval may be granted. Note that until an entitlement application is submitted to the Current Planning Division, only the proposed Project Description will be reviewed by the assigned environmental coordinator.

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 Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan, which was evaluated in Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans Programmatic Final EIR (Eastern Neighborhoods EIR), which was certified in 2008. Because the proposed project is not inconsistent with the development density identified in the area plan, it is likely eligible for community plan exemption (CPE). Potentially significant project environmental impacts that were identified in and pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the underlying area plan final EIR may be applicable to the proposed project. Within the CPE process, there can be three different outcomes as follows:

(i) **CPE Only.** In this case, all potentially significant project-specific and cumulatively considerable environmental impacts are fully consistent with significant impacts identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods EIR, and there would be no new significant impacts “peculiar” (unique) to the proposed project. In these situations, all pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the Eastern Neighborhoods EIR are applied to the proposed project, and a CPE checklist and certificate is prepared. With this outcome, the applicable fees are (a) the Environmental Document Determination fee of $13,659, (b) the CPE certificate fee of $7,580, and (c) a proportionate share fee for recovery of costs incurred by the Planning Department for preparation of the Eastern Neighborhoods EIR (currently $10,000).

(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 Eastern
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2 The Planning Department has adopted a new fee schedule, which will take effect on August 29, 2014. The environmental fees discussed in this section reflect the new fee schedule.
Neighborhoods EIR, and these new significant impacts can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level, then a Focused Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration is prepared to address these impacts. In addition, a supporting CPE checklist is prepared to address all other impacts that were encompassed by the Eastern Neighborhoods EIR, with all pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the Eastern Neighborhoods EIR also applied to the proposed project. With this outcome, the applicable fees are: (a) the Environmental Document Determination fee of $13,659, (b) the standard environmental evaluation fee (which is based on construction value), and (c) a proportionate share fee for recovery of costs incurred by the Planning Department for preparation of the Eastern Neighborhoods EIR (currently $10,000).

(iii) CPE + Focused EIR. If new site- or project-specific significant impacts are identified for the proposed project that were not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods EIR, and any of these new significant impacts cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level, then a Focused EIR is prepared to address these impacts. In addition, a supporting CPE checklist is prepared to address all other impacts that were encompassed by the Eastern Neighborhoods EIR, with all pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the Eastern Neighborhoods EIR also applied to the proposed project. Additional mitigation measures may also be applied in the Focused EIR. With this outcome, the applicable fees are: (a) the Environmental Document Determination fee of $13,659, (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 of costs incurred by the Planning Department for preparation of the Eastern Neighborhoods EIR (currently $10,000).

A “CPE Only” and a “CPE + Focused Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration” can be prepared by Planning Department staff, but a “CPE + Focused EIR” would need to be prepared by a consultant from the Planning Department’s environmental consultant pool (http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/MEA/Environmental_consultant_pool.pdf). Please see “Studies for Project inside of Adopted Plan Areas - Community Plan Fees” in the Planning Department’s current Fee Schedule for Applications for further detail regarding fees. In order to begin formal environmental review, please submit an Environmental Evaluation Application (EEA) for the full scope of the project (demolition and construction). EEA forms are available in the Planning Department lobby at 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, at the Planning Information Center (PIC) at 1660 Mission Street, and online at: http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1570

Below is a list of studies that would be required based on our preliminary review of the project as it is proposed in the Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) Application dated June 16, 2014:

1. **Historic Resources.** Currently, the project site contains a surface parking lot. As determined by the Inner Mission Historic Resource Survey, there are no historic resources on the project site. No additional historic resource review will be required.

2. **Archeological Resources.** The project site lies within the Archeological Mitigation Zone J-3: Mission Dolores Archeological District of the Eastern Neighborhoods EIR, an archeologically sensitive area, and
the proposed project would disturb soils greater than 2.5 feet (ft.) below existing grade. Based on the potential for archeological properties of a high level of historical, ethnic, and scientific significance within the Mission Dolores Archeological District, the following would likely be required to avoid any significant adverse effect from soils disturbing activities on buried archeological resources.

*Eastern Neighborhoods EIR Mitigation Measure J-3* requires a Preliminary Archeological Review (PAR) conducted in-house by the Planning Department archeologist in lieu of a Preliminary Archeological Sensitivity Assessment. The PAR will first determine what type of soils disturbance/modifications would result from the proposed project, such as excavation, installation of foundations, soils improvements, site remediation, etc., second, confirm that the project site is located in an area of archeological sensitivity and, third, what additional steps are necessary to identify and evaluate any potential archeological resources that may be affected by the project. The Planning Department Archeologist will be informed by the geotechnical study of the project site’s subsurface geological conditions (see “Geology” below). The results of this review will be provided in a memorandum to the Environmental Planner assigned to the project. Based on the PAR, the Planning Department Archeologist will determine whether an Archeological Research Design and Treatment Plan (ARDTP) and/or additional measures are necessary to address potential effects of the project on archeological resources. These measures may include provisions for accidental discovery, archeological monitoring, and/or archeological field investigations. Archeological monitoring and/or data recovery programs required by this measure could suspend construction for up to a maximum of four weeks. The suspension of construction can be extended beyond four weeks only if such a suspension is the only feasible means to reduce to a less-than-significant level potential effects on a significant archeological resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a)(c).

Given the archeological sensitivity of the area, the scope of the archeological services may include preparation of an Archeological Research Design and Treatment Plan (ARDTP) by an archeological consultant from the Qualified Archeological Consultants List (QACL). If an ARDTP is required, the project sponsor must contact the Department archeologist to obtain the names and contact information for the next three archeological consultants on the QACL. The whole QACL is available at [http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/MEA/Archeological_Review_consultant_pool.pdf](http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/MEA/Archeological_Review_consultant_pool.pdf). At the direction of the ERO, the archeology consultant may be required to have acceptable documented expertise in California Mission archeology.

3. **Transportation.** The PPA application indicates that the proposed project would include 29 two-bedroom residential units, 10 one-bedroom units, 24 studio units, 6 studio-plus-mezzanine flex units, about 2,490 sf of retail space, about 6,090 sf of PDR space, 8,200 sf of SEW space, and 50 off-street parking spaces. Based on the Planning Department’s *Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines*, the proposed project would potentially add approximately 154 PM peak-hour person trips.\(^3\) Based on preliminary analysis, a Transportation Impact Study (TIS) would not likely be required. A formal determination as to whether a TIS is required will be made after submittal of the EEA. At the time of filing of the EEA, please address all of the following:
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\(^3\) San Francisco Planning Department, Transportation Calculations, July 9, 2014. These calculations are available for review as part of Case File No. 2014.0948U at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400.
a. Due to the site’s proximity to local/regional transit and bicycle routes, planning staff recommend reducing the number of off-street parking spaces.
b. Planning staff recommend including the bicycle storage area on the ground floor for easier access.
c. Show the layout of the bicycle storage area on plans.
d. Narrow the curb cut width from 15 ft. to 10 ft.

4. **Hazardous Materials.** The proposed project includes construction of new buildings requiring greater than 50 cubic yards of excavation on a site with existing automotive parking use. 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 DPH, requires the project sponsor to retain the services of a qualified professional to prepare a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) that meets the requirements of Health Code Section 22.A.6. The Phase I would determine the potential for site contamination and level of exposure risk associated with the project. Based on that information, soil and/or groundwater sampling and analysis, as well as remediation of any site contamination, may be required. These steps are required to be completed prior to the issuance of any building permit.


Please provide a copy of the submitted Maher Application and Phase I ESA with the EEA.

5. **Noise.** The Eastern Neighborhoods EIR identified a number of noise mitigation measures applicable to construction activities, the siting of noise generating uses, and the siting of noise sensitive land uses (such as residential uses) in areas that are substantially affected by existing noise levels.

*Eastern Neighborhoods Mitigation Measure F-1: Construction Noise* requires that contractors use equipment with state-of-the-art noise shielding and muffling devices. To reduce noise and vibration impacts, sonic or vibratory sheetpile shielding, rather than impact drivers, shall be used wherever sheetpiles are needed. Project Sponsors shall also require that contractors schedule pile-driving activity for times of the day that would minimize disturbance to neighbors.

*Eastern Neighborhoods EIR Noise Mitigation Measure F-2: Construction Noise* requires that the project sponsor develop a set of site-specific noise attenuation measures under the supervision of a qualified acoustical consultant when the environmental review of a development project determines that construction noise controls are necessary due to the nature of planned construction practices and sensitivity of proximate uses. This mitigation measure requires that a plan for such measures be submitted to DBI prior to commencing construction to ensure that maximum feasible noise attenuation will be achieved.
Eastern Neighborhoods EIR Mitigation Measure F-4: Siting of Noise-Sensitive Uses would require the Project Sponsor to prepare an acoustical study that identifies potential noise-generating uses within 900 ft. of, and having a direct line-of-sight to, the project site. This study should include consideration of the proximity of the proposed project’s residential uses to its PDR and SEW uses. The study must include at least one 24-hour noise measurement with maximum noise level readings taken at least every 15 minutes. The study should include any recommendations regarding building design to ensure that the interior noise environment for noise-sensitive uses does not exceed 45 dBA Ldn. This study must be completed during the environmental review process for inclusion in the environmental document.

Since the proposed project includes new PDR and SEW uses that may generate noise levels in excess of ambient noise, Eastern Neighborhoods EIR Mitigation Measure F-5: Siting of Noise-Generating Uses would require the project sponsor to prepare a site survey that identifies potential noise-sensitive land uses within 900 ft. of, and having a direct line-of-sight to, the project site. Similar to Mitigation Measure F-4, the study must include at least one 24-hour noise measurement with maximum noise level readings taken at least every 15 minutes, and must consider the proximity of the proposed project’s residential uses to its PDR and SEW uses. The analysis should demonstrate with reasonable certainty that the proposed project would comply with Section 2909 of the San Francisco Police Code and the land use compatibility requirements of the General Plan.

Finally, Eastern Neighborhoods EIR Mitigation Measure F-6: Open Space in Noisy Environments would apply in order to protect the project’s common open space from existing ambient noise levels. Compliance with this mitigation measure requires that site design consider elements that would shield on-site open space from the greatest noise sources and/or construction of noise barrier between noise sources and open space. The site design should account for noise that would be generated by the proposed project’s PDR and SEW uses.

6. Air Quality. According to the PPA Application, the proposed project includes 69 dwelling units, about 2,490 sf of retail space, about 6,090 sf of PDR space, and about 8,200 sf of SEW space, which is below the Bay Area Air Quality Management District’s (BAAQMD) construction and operational screening levels for criteria air pollutants.4 Therefore an analysis of the project’s criteria air pollutant emissions is not likely to be required.

In addition, project-related demolition, excavation, grading and other construction activities may cause wind-blown dust that could contribute particulate matter into the local atmosphere. To reduce construction dust impacts, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors approved the Construction Dust Control Ordinance (Ordinance 176-08, effective July 30, 2008) with the intent of reducing the quantity of dust generated during site preparation, demolition, and construction work in order to protect the health of the general public and of onsite workers, minimize public nuisance complaints, and to avoid orders to stop work by DBI. Pursuant to the Construction Dust Ordinance, the proposed project would be required to prepare a Construction Dust Control Plan for review and approval by

4 BAAQMD, CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, May 2011, Chapter 3.
DPH. Dust control measures identified in *Eastern Neighborhoods EIR Mitigation Measure G-1: Construction Air Quality* would also apply.

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 (dwelling units). Therefore, exhaust measures during construction and enhanced ventilation measures during operation 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.

If the project would generate new sources of toxic air contaminants including, but not limited to: diesel generators or boilers, or any other stationary sources, the project would result in toxic air contaminants that may affect both on-site and off-site sensitive receptors. Given that the proposed project includes PDR (industrial) uses, *Eastern Neighborhoods EIR Mitigation Measure G-4 Siting of Uses that Emit Other Toxic Air Contaminants* may be necessary to reduce emissions from any on-site uses that would be expected to generate toxic air contaminants as part of everyday operations. If applicable, compliance with the mitigation measure would require a site survey to identify residential or other sensitive uses within 1,000 ft. of the project site, which should include the dwelling units proposed as part of the project. Detailed information related to any proposed stationary sources shall be provided with the EEA.

7. **Greenhouse Gases.** The *City and County of San Francisco’s Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions* presents a comprehensive assessment of policies, programs, and ordinances that represents San Francisco’s Qualified Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Reduction Strategy. Projects that are consistent with San Francisco’s Qualified GHG Reduction Strategy would result in less-than-significant impacts from GHG emissions. In order to facilitate a determination of compliance with San Francisco’s Qualified GHG Reduction Strategy, the Planning Department has prepared a GHG Analysis Compliance Checklist. The project sponsor is required to submit the completed table regarding project compliance with the identified regulations. Please be specific and provide detailed information in the discussion column to clarify how the proposed project would comply with each item. This information will be reviewed by the environmental planner during the environmental review process to determine if the project would comply with San Francisco’s GHG Reduction Strategy. Projects that do not comply with an ordinance or regulation may be determined to be inconsistent with the GHG Reduction Strategy.

8. **Shadow.** The proposed project would include construction of a building that is over 40 ft. in height, and would require a shadow fan analysis. Based upon a preliminary shadow analysis, the proposed
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5 Refer to http://www.sfdph.org/dph/eh/Air/default.asp for more information.
project would not result in shadow impacts on nearby recreational resources subject to Section 295 of the Planning Code or other parks/public open spaces not subject to Section 295.

9. **Geology.** Any new construction on the project site is subject to a mandatory Interdepartmental Project Review because it is located within a Seismic Hazard Zone (Liquefaction Hazard Zone). A geotechnical study prepared by a qualified consultant must be submitted with the EEA. 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. To assist Planning Department staff in determining whether the project would result in environmental impacts related to geology, it is recommended that you provide a copy of the geotechnical information with boring logs for the proposed project. This study will also help inform the Planning Department Archeologist of the project site’s subsurface geological conditions.

10. **Stormwater Management.** The proposed project would result in more than 5,000 sf of ground disturbance. Therefore, the proposed project 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 Guidelines, or download instructions for the Stormwater Control Plan, go to [http://sfwater.org/sgd](http://sfwater.org/sgd).

11. **Tree Planting and Protection Checklist.** The DPW Code Section 8.02-8.11 requires disclosure and protection of landmark, significant, and street trees located on private and public property. Any such trees must be shown on the Site Plans with the size of the trunk diameter, tree height, and accurate canopy drip line. Please submit a **Tree Planting and Protection Checklist** with the EEA and ensure that trees are appropriately shown on site plans.

12. **Bird-Safe Building Ordinance.** The proposed project would be subject to Planning Code Section 139, Standards for Bird-Safe Buildings, which addresses Location-Related Standards and Feature-Related Standards. The project’s environmental evaluation would generally discuss how the
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implementation of bird-safe design standards would reduce potential adverse effects on birds due to the lighting, glazing, balconies, and so forth.

13. **Notification of Project Receiving Environmental Review.** Notice is required to be sent to occupants of the project site and properties adjacent to the project site, as well as to owners and, to the extent feasible, occupants of properties within 300 ft. of the project site at the initiation of the environmental review. Please be prepared to provide mailing addresses on a CD upon request following submittal of the EEA.

14. **Disclosure Report for Developers of Major City Projects.** The San Francisco Ethics Commission S.F. Camp. & Govt. Conduct Code § 3.520 et seq. requires developers to provide the public with information about donations that developers make to nonprofit organizations that may communicate with the City and County regarding major development projects. This report must be completed and filed by the developer of any “major project.” A major project is a real estate development project located in the City and County of San Francisco with estimated construction costs exceeding $1,000,000 where either: (1) The Planning Commission or any other local lead agency certifies an EIR for the project; or (2) The project relies on a program EIR and the Planning Department, Planning Commission, or any other local lead agency adopts any final environmental determination under CEQA. A final environmental determination includes: the issuance of a CPE; certification of a CPE/EIR; adoption of a CPE/Final Mitigated Negative Declaration; or a project approval by the Planning Commission that adopts CEQA Findings. (In instances where more than one of the preceding determinations occur, the filing requirement shall be triggered by the earliest such determination.) A major project does not include a residential development project with four or fewer dwelling units. The first (or initial) report must be filed within 30 days of the date the Planning Commission (or any other local lead agency) certifies the EIR for that project or, for a major project relying on a program EIR, within 30 days of the date that the Planning Department, Planning Commission, or any other local lead agency adopts a final environmental determination under CEQA. Please submit a Disclosure Report for Developers of Major City Projects to the San Francisco Ethics Commission. This form can be found at the Planning Department or online at http://www.sfethics.org.

15. **Flex Unit Definition.** The PPA Application identifies six proposed studio-plus-mezzanine flex units. Please specify what uses the flex units could have in addition to residential in the EEA.

**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 Large Project Authorization** from the Planning Commission is required per Planning Code Section 329 for new construction over 25,000 gross square feet.

2. A **Building Permit Application** is required for the new construction of a five-story mixed-use development.
3. A **Building Permit Application** is required for the new construction of a three-story PDR development.

All applications are available in the Planning Department lobby at 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, at the PIC at 1660 Mission Street, and online at [www.sfplanning.org](http://www.sfplanning.org). Building Permit applications are available at DBI 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](http://www.sfplanning.org) under the “Permits & Zoning” tab. All registered neighborhood group mailing lists are available online at [www.sfplanning.org](http://www.sfplanning.org) under the “Resource Center” tab.

**PRELIMINARY PROJECT COMMENTS:**
The following comments address specific Planning Code and other general issues that may substantially impact the proposed project.

1. **Large Project Authorization:** Planning Code Section 329 outlines the requirements for a Large Project Authorization in Eastern Neighborhoods Mixed Use Zoning Districts. A Large Project Authorization is required of new construction of more than 25,000 gross square feet. All large projects within the UMU Zoning District are subject to review by the Planning Commission in an effort to achieve the objectives and policies of the General Plan, the applicable Design Guidelines and the Planning Code.

As determined by the Planning Commission, exceptions could be sought through the Large Project Authorization, as follows:

   - **Rear Yard:** Planning Code Section 134 outlines the requirements for a rear yard within the UMU Zoning District. The minimum rear yard depth shall be equal to 25 percent of the total depth of the lot and in no case less than 15 ft. The rear yard shall be provided at the lowest story containing a residential dwelling unit. Currently, the proposed project does not meet this requirement, but may seek an adjustment of the rear yard requirement under the Large Project Authorization. Generally, a comparable amount of open area in lieu of a rear yard is encouraged.

   - **Open Space:** Planning Code Section 135 outlines the requirements for usable open space per residential unit. Generally, at least 80 sf of useable open space is required for each residential unit. A reduction in useable open space may be allowed if publically accessible. Based upon the
number of dwelling units, the proposed project must provide at least 5,520 sf of open space for the 69 dwelling units. Currently, the project proposes approximately 5,880 sf of common open space; therefore, the proposed project appears to meet the numerical requirement. However, the design of the inner court does not meet the dimension requirements specified in Planning Code Section 135. The proposed project may seek a modification of this requirement under the Large Project Authorization process; however, the Department encourages Project Sponsors to comply with open space requirements by providing an equivalent amount of code-complying open space.

- **Accessory Use Provisions for Dwelling Units:** Planning Code Section 329(d)(10) and 803.3(b)(1)(c) outlines the requirements for accessory use provision for ground floor, street-facing dwelling units. Currently, the project appears to specify six ground floor dwelling units as “flex.” Please review the accessory use provisions identified in Planning Code Section 204, and identify the accessory use modifications. The proposed project may seek a modification of the accessory use requirements for dwelling units under the Large Project Authorization process; however, the Project Sponsor should be clear in the modifications being sought from the Planning Commission.

To the extent possible, the project should be designed to minimize deviations from Planning Code requirements.

2. **Small Enterprise Workspace (SEW):** Planning Code Sections 227(t) identifies the requirements associated with Small Enterprise Workspace (SEW). Currently, the project proposes to construct about 8,200 sf of SEW use. Per Planning Code Section 227(t), SEW use is subject to the following requirements:

   (A) Each unit may contain only uses principally or conditionally permitted in the subject zoning district, or office uses (as defined in Section 890.70);

   (B) Any non-accessory retail uses are subject to any per parcel size controls of the subject zoning district;

   (C) No residential uses shall be permitted;

   (D) Each of the units in the building must contain no more than 1,500 gross square feet; an exception to this rule applies for larger PDR spaces on the ground floor, as described in subsection below

   (E) An SEW building may contain units larger than 1,500 sf on the ground floor as long as each such unit contains a principal PDR use. For the purposes of this Section, a PDR use is one identified in Sections 220, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227(a), 227(b), and 227(p) of this Code. Such PDR units may be independently accessible from the street.

   (F) After the issuance of any certificate of occupancy or completion for the building, any merger, subdivision, expansion, or other change in gross floor area of any unit shall be permitted only as long as the provisions of this subsection (D) and (E) are met.

(2) SEW units may be established only in new buildings or in buildings for which a first certificate of occupancy or completion was issued after January 19, 2009.
(3) Where permitted, SEW Buildings are exempt from the controls in Section 230 limiting demolition of industrial buildings.

(4) SEW projects shall provide a PDR Business Plan in accordance with the requirements of Section 219.1(c)(9).

(5) In considering the approval of a SEW project, the Planning Commission should consider the likely viability of the new PDR space that the development creates, as influenced by such facts as the content of the project sponsor’s PDR Business Plan and whether the project sponsor has the commitments of established PDR tenants and/or a demonstrated relationship with organizations established in the PDR community.

3. **Floor Area Ratio and Floor Premiums:** Planning Code Section 124 identifies a floor area ratio of 3.0 to 1 for properties located in the PDR-1-G Zoning District in a 40-ft. Height District. Currently, the proposed project is located on a lot measuring 117.5 ft. by 65 ft.; therefore, a maximum of 22,911 sf of development may occur on the subject lot at 1463 Stevenson Street. However, Planning Code Section 125 provides a floor area premium for lots located outside of the NC, C-3 and Mixed-Use Zoning Districts. Per Planning Code Section 125(b), a floor area premium may be added to an interior lot, which adds an additional 10 ft. in depth to subject lot. Therefore, the project would be permitted to have a maximum development totaling 26,438 sf. Currently, the project specifies about 28,300 sf of developable area on the subject lot at 1463 Stevenson Street, which is in excess of the permitted floor area ratio. Please revise the project to address the floor area ratio requirements.

4. **Permitted Obstructions:** Planning Code Section 136 outlines the requirements for permitted obstructions over streets, setbacks, rear yards, and useable open space. Currently, the project proposes bay windows over the street. These elements must meet the dimensional requirements specified in Planning Code Section 136. Please provide additional information, including dimensions and spacing between bay windows, to determine whether these elements meet the requirements of the Planning Code.

5. **Street Trees:** The proposed project is subject to the San Francisco Green Landscaping Ordinance, which assists in articulating Planning Code Sections 138.1. This Planning Code section outlines a provision for adding street trees when undertaking new construction. A 24-inch box size street tree would be required for each 20 ft. of frontage of the property along each street or alley, with any remaining fraction of 10 ft. or more of frontage requiring an additional tree. Based on the street frontage, it appears that 12 street trees on Stevenson Street, 7 street trees would be required along 14th Street, and 6 street trees along Woodward Street would be required. Existing trees on the project site would apply towards the street tree requirement. Please ensure that the proposed project is in compliance with this Planning Code section by providing an updated site plan showing landscaping and street trees.

6. **Better Streets Plan-Streetscape Plan and Improvements.** Planning Code Section 138.1(2)(i) outlines the requirements for streetscape and pedestrian improvements for projects located on a lot that is greater than ½-acre in total area and encompasses new construction. The proposed project would be required to include streetscape and pedestrian improvements that are in keeping with the Better Streets Plan. 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. Please coordinate with the Department’s Citywide Division and Urban Design Team to develop the streetscape and pedestrian improvements. The Planning Department may require these elements as part of conditions of approval.

Street improvements may include upgrading the building’s street frontages up to the City’s standards. 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](http://www.sfbetterstreets.org).

Required streetscape and pedestrian improvements are not eligible for in-kind fee credit.

7. **Exposure:** Planning Code Section 140 outlines requirements for all dwelling units to face an open area. All dwelling units shall feature a window that directly faces an open area that is a minimum of 25 ft. in every horizontal dimension that increases five ft. in every horizontal dimension on each subsequent floor. Currently, the proposed project appears to meet this requirement.

8. **Parking Screening:** Planning Code Section 142 outlines screening requirements for off-street parking and “vehicle use areas.” Every off-street parking area within a building, where not enclosed by solid building walls, shall be screened from view from all streets and alleys through use of garage door or by some other means. Please ensure that the proposed project meets this requirement. In addition, please include dimensions for openings to vehicular use areas and new curb cuts.

9. **Street Frontage-Active Uses:** Planning Code Section 145.1 outlines requirements for street frontages to ensure that they are pedestrian-oriented, fine-grained, and are appropriate and compatible with the buildings. As the design of the proposed project is developed, please ensure that the ground floor street frontage meets these requirements as related to use, height, transparency, fenestration, gates, railings and grillwork. Residential uses are considered active uses if more than fifty percent of the linear residential street frontage at the ground floor level features walk-up dwelling units, which provide direct, individual pedestrian access to a public sidewalk. Currently, the proposed project appears to meet this section of the Planning Code, since it provides ground-floor walk-up dwelling units, a ground floor height of 17 ft, and a garage door measuring 12 ft. wide. Please ensure that the design of the ground floor units meet the guidelines in the Department’s Draft Guidelines for Ground Floor Residential Design available for download on the Department’s website.

10. **Shadow:** Planning Code Section 147 states that a shadow analysis is required for any project over 50 ft. in height in the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan Area. Similarly, Planning Code Section 295 requires a shadow analysis be conducted for any project greater than 40 ft. in height. The preliminary analysis for the proposed project indicates that it would not cast shadows on any nearby public parks. No further shadow studies are required.
11. **Parking:** Planning Code Section 151.1 outlines requirements for permitted off-street parking. As a project located within the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan, there are no minimum parking requirements; rather, the project is subject to a maximum allowance of parking spaces, which is defined as 0.75 parking spaces per unit for dwelling units in the UMU Zoning District (see Planning Code Section 151.1, Table 151.1). Similarly, within the PDR-1-G Zoning District, SEW uses and other manufacturing and industrial uses are subject to a maximum parking ratio of one off-street parking space for every 1,500 sf of occupied floor area.

The proposed project would construct 69 dwelling units and 29 off-street parking spaces. Therefore, the project meets the parking requirement for the residential portion at 344 14th Street.

The proposed project would construct about 28,300 sf of PDR and SEW uses; therefore, a maximum of 18 off-street parking spaces would be permitted on the subject lot. Currently, the proposed project does not meet this requirement since 21 off-street parking spaces are proposed. Please reduce the amount of off-street parking spaces at 1463 Stevenson Street and ensure that the dimension and configuration of the off-street parking spaces meet the requirements of Planning Code Sections 154 and 155.

12. **Bicycle Parking:** Planning Code Section 155.2 outlines requirements for bicycle parking for residential and PDR developments. The proposed project is required to provide 69 Class 1 bicycle parking spaces and two Class 2 bicycle parking spaces for the residential development, and two Class 1 bicycle parking spaces for the PDR use. Please specify how the project will meet this requirement.

13. **Car Share:** Planning Code Section 166 outlines the car-share requirement. For projects constructing between 50 and 200 dwelling units, one car-share parking space is required. Please update the basement level plan to specify the car-share parking space.

14. **Unbundled Parking:** Planning Code Section 167 outlines a requirement for unbundled parking spaces for newly constructed residential buildings of ten dwelling units or more. All off-street parking spaces accessory to residential uses shall be leased or sold separately from the rental or purchase fees for dwelling units for the life of the dwelling units, such that potential renters or buyers have the option of renting or buying a residential unit at a price lower than would be the case if there were a single price for both the residential unit and the parking space. The Planning Commission may grant an exception from this requirement for projects which include financing for affordable housing that requires that costs for parking and housing be bundled together.

15. **Dwelling Unit Mix:** Planning Code Section 207.6 outlines the requirements for minimum dwelling unit mix for new residential properties within an Eastern Neighborhoods Zoning District. The project must provide either: no less than 40 percent of the total number of proposed dwellings units as at least two bedroom units; or no less than 30 percent of the total number of proposed dwelling units as at least three bedroom units. The proposed project would provide 29 two-bedroom dwelling units out of 69 dwelling units and would meet this Planning Code requirement.
16. **Narrow Street Height Provisions**: For projects within an Eastern Neighborhoods Mixed Use Zoning District along a Narrow Street (a public right of way less than or equal to 40 ft. in width, or any mid-block passage or alley that is less than 40 ft. in width), Planning Code Section 261.1 specifies that all subject frontages shall have upper stories set back at least 10-ft. at the property line above a height equivalent to 1.25 times the width of the abutting narrow street for the portions of the building, which are more than 60 ft. from the corner. No part or feature of a building may penetrate the required setback plane.

Currently, Stevenson Street measures 35 ft., while Woodward Street measures 40 ft. Along Stevenson Street, the proposed project is required to provide a 10-ft. setback above a height of 43-ft. 9-in. for the portion of the building, which is more than 60 ft. from the corner. Along Woodward Street, the proposed project is required to provide a 10-ft. setback above a height of 50 ft. for the portion of the building, which is more than 60 ft. from the corner. Please revise the floor plans and building massing to meet this requirement. This requirement is not variable.

17. **Inclusionary Affordable Housing**: Planning Code Section 419.3 outlines the requirement for inclusionary affordable housing as part of any housing project constructing ten or more dwelling units within the UMU Zoning District. The project site is designated as Tier A for the purposes of evaluating inclusionary affordable housing. All project sites designated as Tier A within the UMU Zoning District shall dedicate 14.4 percent of the total units as affordable. Therefore, based upon the current number of dwelling units, if the on-site affordable housing option is elected, the proposed project would be required to provide a total of ten (10) on-site affordable housing units.

Based upon the submitted information it is unclear which program the Project Sponsor will elect to address this requirement. Please clarify how the proposed project would meet this requirement and submit “Inclusionary Affordable Housing Program: Affidavit of Compliance,” which may be downloaded from the Planning Department’s website under “Permits & Zoning” “Permit Forms.”

If rental units are proposed, additional requirements must be executed prior to Planning Commission approval, as outlined in Planning Code Sections 415 and 419.

18. **First Source Hiring**: Projects involving the new construction of 10 dwelling units or more than 25,000 sf of residential development are subject to the First Source Hiring Program. Please contact the First Source Hiring Program Manager with the San Francisco Human Services Agency’s Workforce Development Division (415-557-5000) and submit the **First Source Hiring Program Form**, which is available on the Planning Department’s website under “Permits & Zoning” “Permit Forms.” This form should be submitted to the Planning Department upon submittal of the first planning entitlement.

19. **Transit Impact Development Fee**: Pursuant to Planning Code Section 411 et seq., the Transit Impact Development Fee will apply to this project for the new non-residential and PDR square footage.

20. **Eastern Neighborhoods Impact Fees**: Planning Code Section 423 outlines the requirements for development impact fees for projects located within the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan. The
Eastern Neighborhoods Public Benefits Fund is implemented in part through district-specific Eastern Neighborhoods Impact Fee which applies to the Project Area. The proposed project is subject to Tier 1 Impact Fees. The proposed project includes new construction of residential units and new retail use. Please refer to the Citywide Development Fee Register for information on the most current fees. This register may be accessed on the DBI website at: http://sfdbi.org/index.aspx?page=617

These fee amounts are subject to annual review by the City Controller, and may be subject to change. Payment of these impact fees must be received prior to the issuance of the first site permit by DBI for a development project. Planning Code Section 423.3 also provides alternatives to satisfy this requirement.

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.

21. **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: http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=8601.

**Preliminary Design Comments:**

The project is located in the Mission District in the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan. The area is mixed in character but has a predominance of three to six story residential buildings and is in close proximity to two neighborhood commercial corridors. There are adjacent institutional and industrial uses to this property. It is also bounded by active 14th Street and two small streets, Stevenson which is more industrial in character, and Woodward, which is more residential. Woodward also contains potentially historic Romeo flat types. The following comments address preliminary design issues that may substantially impact the proposed project:

1. **Site Design, Open Space, and Massing.** The Planning Department recommends that the project reconsider the layout of the upper floors in the PDR component of the project so that the units are configured together without a courtyard offering the open space at the rear of the property. This is intended to help support some separation between the rear of the adjacent properties (that front Woodward Street) and perhaps align with the courtyard proposed for the residential portion of the project. This essentially would establish a midblock open space benefitting the block as a whole. At a minimum, the Planning Department recommends a matching rear setback with the adjacent buildings.
2. **Street Frontage.** The Planning Department recommends designing the designated “flex” spaces as either retail or residential units. If the latter, the project should follow the Ground Floor Residential Guidelines with either an elevated entry or landscaped buffer space.

To support Planning Code Section 138.1, the Better Streets provision, the Planning Department also encourages the development of an appropriate streetscape plan that celebrates the two alleys as pockets—more industrial/craft in nature on Stevenson Street and more residential on Woodward Street. This might involve either raised crosswalks or bulbouts.

The Planning Department recommends a maximum parking ramp entrance and curbcut width of 10 ft. The project sponsor might also consider swapping the garage ramp on Woodward Street and the courtyard street access on Stevenson Street so that there is easy pedestrian access to the more residential street.

3. **Parking.** The Planning Department recommends providing more bicycle parking at the ground level.

4. **Architecture.** The Planning Department recommends further architectural development on the residential portion of the project at ground level to increase solidity and variety in materials and detail to support the neighborhood character at the ground level. The Planning Department recommends developing a generous fenestration pattern at the ground floor of the PDR uses so that there is an active public realm engagement with the interior program.

**PRELIMINARY PROJECT ASSESSMENT EXPIRATION:**

This PPA 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 **Monday, February 15th, 2016.** Otherwise, this determination is considered expired and a new PPA is required. Such applications and plans must be generally consistent with those found in this PPA.

Enclosure: Mission, South of Market, and Citywide Neighborhood Group Mailing Lists
Interdepartmental Project Review Application
Shadow Fan Analysis
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>HERE Local 2</td>
<td>209 Golden Gate Avenue</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-282-5516</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jhenders@sbcglobal.net">jhenders@sbcglobal.net</a></td>
<td>Chinatown, Downtown/Civic Center, Marina, Mission, Nob Hill, Pacific Heights, Presidio, Seacliff, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim</td>
<td>Meko</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>SOMA Leadership Council</td>
<td>260 Baker Street, Suite 505</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>415-552-2400</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jim.meko@comcast.net">jim.meko@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>Mission, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katy</td>
<td>Liddell</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>South Beach/Rincon/Mission Bay Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>125 10th Street, Suite 456</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-412-2207</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kliddell2001@yahoo.com">kliddell2001@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaye</td>
<td>Griffin</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>LMNOP Neighbors</td>
<td>1047 Minna Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>415-724-1953</td>
<td><a href="mailto:LMNOP@yak.net">LMNOP@yak.net</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon</td>
<td>Minott</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Potrero Hill Neighbors/Save the Hill</td>
<td>1206 Mariposa Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94107</td>
<td>415-553-5969</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rodminott@hotmail.com">rodminott@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>Potrero Hill, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>Magnani</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>American Friends Service Committee</td>
<td>65 Ninth Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>415-565-0201</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sfoffice@afsc.org">sfoffice@afsc.org</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marvis</td>
<td>Phillips</td>
<td>Land Use Chair</td>
<td>Alliance for a Better District 6</td>
<td>250 Folsom Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94104</td>
<td>415-882-7871</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rhbement@sbcglobal.net">rhbement@sbcglobal.net</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patsy</td>
<td>Tito</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Samoan Development Centre</td>
<td>2055 Sunnydale Avenue</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94134</td>
<td>415-282-5516</td>
<td><a href="mailto:patstito@gmail.com">patstito@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Bayview, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed</td>
<td>Bement</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Rincon Hill Residents Association</td>
<td>196 Folsom Street, Suite 100</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-431-2205</td>
<td>podersf.org</td>
<td>Excelsior, Mission, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonja</td>
<td>Olsson</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>TJPA CAC</td>
<td>230 Fourth Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>415-426-6819</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sonja@todco.org">sonja@todco.org</a></td>
<td>Financial District, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiffany</td>
<td>Bohee</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, City and County of San Francisco</td>
<td>1 South Van Ness Avenue, 5th Floor</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>415-847-3169</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tiffany.bohee@sfgov.org">tiffany.bohee@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:mike.grisso@sfgov.org">mike.grisso@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:courtney.pash@sfgov.org">courtney.pash@sfgov.org</a></td>
<td>Civic Center, South of Market, Visitacion Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony</td>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Potrero Hill Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>1459 - 18th Street, Suite 133</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94107</td>
<td>415-431-2205</td>
<td><a href="mailto:akelly@pwhna.org">akelly@pwhna.org</a></td>
<td>Potrero Hill, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>Loo</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>York Realty</td>
<td>241 Shipley Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>415-724-1953</td>
<td><a href="mailto:yorklee@gmail.com">yorklee@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST</td>
<td>LAST</td>
<td>TITLE</td>
<td>ORGANIZATION</td>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
<td>CITY</td>
<td>STATE</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
<td>TELEPHONE</td>
<td>EMAIL</td>
<td>NEIGHBORHOOD OF INTEREST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron</td>
<td>Peskin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>470 Columbus Avenue, Ste. 211</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94133</td>
<td>415-566-7014</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aaron.peskin@earthlink.net">aaron.peskin@earthlink.net</a></td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrian</td>
<td>Simi</td>
<td>Local Field Representative</td>
<td>Carpenters Local 22</td>
<td>2065 Third Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94107</td>
<td>415-355-1322</td>
<td><a href="mailto:alantsberg@nccrc.org">alantsberg@nccrc.org</a></td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>Lantisberg</td>
<td>Research Analyst</td>
<td>Carpenters Local 22 cb NCCRC Research</td>
<td>285 Hegeman River, Ste. 230</td>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94621</td>
<td>510-430-9706 x109</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aaron.peskin@earthlink.net">aaron.peskin@earthlink.net</a></td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck</td>
<td>Tumer</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Community Design Center</td>
<td>5 Thomas Mellon Circle, #128</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>415-586-1235</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aaron.peskin@earthlink.net">aaron.peskin@earthlink.net</a></td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave</td>
<td>Villa-Lobos</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Community Leadership Alliance</td>
<td>P.O. Box 64201</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94109</td>
<td>415-925-4192</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aaron.peskin@earthlink.net">aaron.peskin@earthlink.net</a></td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diego</td>
<td>Hernandez</td>
<td>Organizer</td>
<td>Laborers Local 261</td>
<td>327 15th Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94110</td>
<td>415-826-4500</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aaron.peskin@earthlink.net">aaron.peskin@earthlink.net</a></td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace</td>
<td>Shanahan</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Residential Builders Association</td>
<td>1717 17th Street, Ste. 200</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>415-253-1900</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aaron.peskin@earthlink.net">aaron.peskin@earthlink.net</a></td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td>Sousa</td>
<td>Public Works Coordinator</td>
<td>AT&amp;T Construction and Engineering</td>
<td>750 Folsom Street, Rm.426</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94107-</td>
<td>415-644-7043</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aaron.peskin@earthlink.net">aaron.peskin@earthlink.net</a></td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsha</td>
<td>Garland</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 Gafand Public &amp; Community Relations</td>
<td>535 Green Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94107</td>
<td>415-535-2911</td>
<td><a href="mailto:marshall.garland@att.net">marshall.garland@att.net</a></td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 Coalition for Adequate Review Relations</td>
<td>364 Page Street, #56</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-345-9333</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mike@sfbdc.org">mike@sfbdc.org</a></td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Thneult</td>
<td>Secretary-Treasurer</td>
<td>SF Building and Construction Trades Council</td>
<td>1685 Franklin Street, Ste 203</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94109</td>
<td>415-500-1457</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sonja.traus@gmail.com">sonja.traus@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonja</td>
<td>Traus</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>SF Bay Area Association of Renters</td>
<td>1618 12th Street</td>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94607</td>
<td>415-500-1457</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sonja.traus@gmail.com">sonja.traus@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>Law Office of Stephen M. Williams</td>
<td>1834 Divisadero Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94115</td>
<td>415-292-3056</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sonja.traus@gmail.com">sonja.traus@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>Heator</td>
<td>Attorney at Law</td>
<td></td>
<td>830 Mariposa Street, #118</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-363-2778</td>
<td><a href="mailto:heator@earthlink.net">heator@earthlink.net</a></td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>Galli</td>
<td>Office Manager</td>
<td>San Francisco Tenants Union</td>
<td>558 Capp Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94110</td>
<td>415-285-9259</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ted@att.org">ted@att.org</a></td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 abovementioned 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). A representative from each of these City Agencies will attend your meeting.

Interdepartmental Project Review fees:

1. $1,308 for five or fewer residential units and all affordable housing projects.
2. $1,859 for all other projects.

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 (2) weeks from the receipt of the request form and check.
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.
APPLICATION DATE: ____________________________________________

PROJECT CONTACT:
Name ____________________________________ Phone No. (__ ) __________
Address _____________________________________________________________________________________________
City ___________________________________________ Zip Code _____________________________
FAX No. (__ ) ___________ E-Mail Address ______________________________________
Name of Property 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 separate sheet, if necessary)
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Type</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Net Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Dwelling Units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Square Footage:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Hotel Rooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Square Footage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Uses: _________________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Parking Spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Stories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Will this project be publicly funded? (specify) ____________________________________________
Previously contacted staff (if applicable) ____________________________________________
(Please submit four (4) copies/sets of the Application Form, Floor Plans, Pictures, etc.)
The City and County of San Francisco (CCSF) does not guarantee the accuracy, adequacy, completeness or usefulness of any information. CCSF provides this information on an "as is" basis without warranty of any kind, including but not limited to warranties of merchantability or fitness for a particular purpose, and assumes no responsibility for anyone's use of the information.

Title: Preliminary Shadow Analysis: 344 14th St
Comments: Proposed Height: 55-ft
Printed: 1 August, 2014
The City and County of San Francisco (CCSF) does not guarantee the accuracy, adequacy, completeness or usefulness of any information. CCSF provides this information on an "as is" basis without warranty of any kind, including but not limited to warranties of merchantability or fitness for a particular purpose, and assumes no responsibility for anyone's use of the information.

Title: Preliminary Shadow Analysis - 1463 Stevenson St
Comments: Proposed Height: 37-ft
Printed: 1 August, 2014