



# SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

**MEMO**

**DATE:** January 9, 2015  
**TO:** Ian Birchall  
**FROM:** Rick Cooper, Planning Department  
**RE:** PPA Case No. 2014.1573U for 1675 Pacific Avenue/  
2050 Van Ness Avenue

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

Reception:  
**415.558.6378**

Fax:  
**415.558.6409**

Planning  
Information:  
**415.558.6377**

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

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Rick Cooper".

---

Rick Cooper, Senior Planner





# SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

---

## Preliminary Project Assessment

*Date:* January 9, 2015  
*Case No.:* 2014.1573U  
*Project Address:* 1675 Pacific Avenue/2050 Van Ness Avenue  
*Block/Lot:* 0595/008  
*Zoning:* NC-4 (Residential-Commercial, High Density) District  
Van Ness Special Use District  
80-D Height and Bulk District  
*Area Plan:* Van Ness Avenue  
*Project Sponsor:* Ian Birchall  
Ian Birchall and Associates  
251 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 300  
San Francisco, CA 94103  
415-512-9660  
*Staff Contact:* Elizabeth Purl– 415-575-9028  
[elizabeth.purl@sfgov.org](mailto:elizabeth.purl@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 San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, Department of Building Inspection, Department of Public Works, Department of Public Health, and others. The information included herein is based on plans and information provided for this assessment and the Planning Code, General Plan, Planning Department policies, and local/state/federal regulations as of the date of this document, all of which are subject to change.

### PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

This project description is based on the Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) Application submitted on October 9, 2014. If any of the underlying project description details change, then the information in this PPA would need to be re-evaluated.

The project site consists of an approximately 10,268-square-foot (sf) parcel located at the southeast corner of Van Ness Avenue and Pacific Avenue, with two addresses: 1675 Pacific Avenue and 2050 Van Ness Avenue (Assessor's Block 0595, Lot 008), in the City's Nob Hill Neighborhood. The project site is nearly square and has street frontage on both Van Ness and Pacific avenues. The site is developed with a one-story commercial building of approximately 12,242 sf that is currently occupied by a vacant restaurant space (on the Van Ness Avenue side of the building) and an active auto repair use (on the Pacific Avenue

side). The building was constructed in 1913; it has different façades on the two street frontages that give the appearance of two separate buildings, although it is a single structure.

The proposal is to demolish the existing building and construct a new mixed-use building consisting of 44 residential units with ground-floor parking and retail space. The building would be eight stories (approximately 80 feet) high, with about 47,666 sf of residential space, 2,020 sf of retail space, and 4,630 sf of residential parking. The dwelling unit mix would consist of 34 one-bedroom units and 10 two-bedroom units. About 4,656 sf of open space would be provided through a mix of balconies, roof decks, and a courtyard. The ground-floor residential parking garage would include 25 vehicle spaces (one accessible and the rest in stackers) and 72 Class 1 bicycle spaces. Access would be via a driveway from Pacific Avenue. The main pedestrian entrance for residential uses would be on Pacific Avenue, with the retail entrance and a secondary residential entrance on Van Ness Avenue. Project construction would require excavation depths up to approximately 5 feet below ground surface to accommodate the necessary foundation work and vehicle parking stackers. The amount of soil to be excavated and the expected duration of project construction were not provided.

#### ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:

The proposed project would be subject to environmental review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) as described below. In order to begin formal environmental review, please submit an Environmental Evaluation Application (EEA). 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 approval application is submitted to the Current Planning Division, only the Project Description will be reviewed by the assigned Environmental Coordinator.**

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 <http://www.sfplanning.org> under the "Publications" tab. See "Studies for Project outside of Adopted Plan Areas" on page 2 of the current Fee Schedule for calculation of environmental application fees.<sup>1</sup>

#### Environmental Topics

Below is a discussion of the main topic areas that may be addressed in the environmental document, based on the preliminary review of the project as it is proposed in the PPA Application.

1. **Historic Resources.** The existing building on the project site was previously evaluated in a historical resources survey and found ineligible for national, state, or local listing; thus, no additional analysis of historical resources is required.
2. **Archeology.** Project implementation would entail soil-disturbing activities associated with building construction, including excavation in the area of the proposed private garage that could reach a depth of approximately 5 feet below grade. Depending on the depth of excavation, the proposed project may require Preliminary Archeological Review, which would be conducted in-house by Planning Department staff. This review requires documentation of potential project soils disturbance and the range of appropriate foundation types for the proposed structure. Such information is typically

---

<sup>1</sup> San Francisco Planning Department. *Schedule for Application Fees*. Available online at: <http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=513>

contained in the project's geotechnical study, and should be submitted with the EEA. The Preliminary Archeological Review will determine whether or not additional archeological studies will be required as part of the environmental evaluation.

3. **Transportation.** The proposed project would add approximately 88 PM peak hour person-trips. Based on the PPA submittal, a transportation study is not anticipated to be needed. However, an official determination will be made following submittal of the EEA. Planning Department staff have reviewed the proposed development plan and made the following comments and suggestions:
  - a. Please coordinate with the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency regarding the location of the proposed driveway and its proximity to the existing Muni stop. The purpose of this coordination is to ensure that the project's garage access does not interfere with Muni operations.
  - b. Please show the widths and dimensions of the existing and proposed curb cuts, as well as the length of the Muni bus stop, on future submittals.
4. **Air Quality.** According to the PPA Application, the proposed project includes demolition of the existing structure and construction of 44 dwelling units and approximately 2,000 sf of retail space, which is below the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's (BAAQMD) construction and operational screening levels for criteria air pollutants.<sup>2</sup> Therefore an analysis of the project's criteria air pollutant emissions is not likely to be required. However, detailed information related to the amount (in cubic yards) of excavation must be provided as part of the EEA.

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 avoid orders to stop work by the Department of Building Inspection (DBI). Pursuant to the Construction Dust Ordinance, the proposed project would be required to comply with applicable dust control requirements outlined in the ordinance.

The project site is not located within an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone, as mapped and defined by Health Code, Article 38. The Air Pollutant Exposure Zone identifies areas with poor air quality based on an inventory and modeling assessment of air pollution, exposures, and health vulnerability from mobile, stationary, and area source emissions within San Francisco. Given the project site is not within an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone, additional measures or analysis related to local health risks are not likely to be required. However, if the project would include new sources of toxic air contaminants including, but not limited to, emissions from 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. Detailed information related to any proposed stationary sources shall be

---

<sup>2</sup> BAAQMD, *CEQA Air Quality Guidelines*, May 2011, Chapter 3.

provided with the EEA. During the environmental review process, the project will be screened for potential air quality impacts.

5. **Greenhouse Gases.** *The City and County of San Francisco's Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions* presents a comprehensive assessment of policies, programs, and ordinances that represents San Francisco's Qualified Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Reduction Strategy. Projects that are consistent with San Francisco's Qualified GHG Reduction Strategy would result in less-than-significant impacts from GHG emissions. In order to facilitate a determination of compliance with San Francisco's Qualified GHG Reduction Strategy, the Planning Department has prepared a Greenhouse Gas Analysis Compliance Checklist.<sup>3</sup> The project sponsor may be required to submit the completed table regarding project compliance with the identified regulations and provide project-level details in the discussion column. This information will be reviewed by the environmental planner during the environmental review process to determine if the project would comply with San Francisco's Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy. Projects that do not comply with an ordinance or regulation may be determined to be inconsistent with the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy.
6. **Noise.** Based on the City's GIS-based traffic noise model map, the project site is located along a segment of Van Ness Avenue with noise levels above 75 dBA Ldn (a day-night averaged sound level). The Land Use Compatibility Chart for Community Noise in the San Francisco General Plan, Environmental Protection Element states that construction of new dwelling units should generally be discouraged in an area with noise levels above 65 dBA Ldn and that a detailed analysis of the noise reduction requirements must be made and needed noise insulation features included in the design of a building in such an area.

In addition, *Mitigation Measure M-NO-1: Interior and Exterior Noise* in the San Francisco 2004 and 2009 Housing Element EIR requires that the Planning Department require the preparation of a noise analysis for new residential development located along streets with noise levels above 75 dBA Ldn. The noise analysis shall include, at a minimum: 1) a site survey to identify potential noise-generating uses within two blocks of the project site and 2) at least one 24-hour noise measurement (with maximum noise level readings taken at least every 15 minutes) prior to completion of the environmental review. The analysis shall demonstrate with reasonable certainty that Title 24 standards, where applicable, can be met and there are no particular circumstances about the proposed project site that appear to warrant heightened concern about noise levels in the vicinity. Should such concerns be present, the department may require the completion of a detailed noise assessment by person(s) qualified in acoustical analysis and/or engineering prior to the first project approval action, in order to demonstrate that acceptable interior noise levels consistent with those in the Title 24 standards can be attained.

To minimize effects on development in noisy areas, *Mitigation Measure M-NO-1* also requires that the Planning Department require that open space required under the Planning Code for new residential uses be protected, in conjunction with noise analysis required by *Mitigation Measure M-NO-1*, to the maximum feasible extent, from existing ambient noise levels that could prove annoying or disruptive to users of the open space. Implementation of this measure could involve, among other things, site design that uses the building itself to shield on-site open space from the greatest noise sources,

---

<sup>3</sup> Refer to <http://sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1886> for latest "Greenhouse Gas Compliance Checklist for Private Development Projects."

construction of noise barriers between noise sources and open space, and appropriate use of both common and private open space in multi-family dwellings. Implementation of this measure should be undertaken consistent with other principles of urban design.

Based on these considerations, a noise analysis prepared by a qualified acoustic consultant may be required for the project. A formal determination as to whether a Noise Study is required and as to the scope of the Noise Study will be made after submittal of the EEA.

Construction noise would be subject to the San Francisco Noise Ordinance (Article 29 of the San Francisco Police Code), which includes restrictions on noise levels of construction equipment and hours of construction. If pile driving is to be used during the construction, measures to reduce construction noise may be required as part of the proposed project.

7. **Geology.** A geotechnical study should be prepared by a qualified consultant to identify the primary geotechnical concerns associated with the proposed project and the site. The geotechnical report would identify hazards and recommend minimization measures for potential issues regarding, but not limited to, soil preparation and foundation design. 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 report with boring logs for the proposed project with the EEA. This study will also help inform the Planning Department Archeologist of the project site's subsurface geological conditions.
8. **Hazardous Materials.** While the project site is not located within a Maher Zone, it is adjacent to sites that are within the Maher Zone due to previous industrial uses. Given the proximity of the project site to a Maher Zone and the unknown amount of excavation needed to accommodate foundations and off-street parking stacker pits, a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) prepared by a qualified consultant must be submitted with the EEA. The Phase I would determine the potential for site contamination and level of exposure risk associated with the project. Additionally, it will help the Planning Department determine whether the project would subject to Article 22A of the Health Code, also known as the Maher Ordinance. Based on information contained in the Phase I, soil 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.

Because the existing building was constructed prior to 1980, asbestos-containing materials, such as floor and wall coverings, may be found in the building. The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) is responsible for regulating airborne pollutants including asbestos. Please contact BAAQMD for requirements related to demolition of buildings that may contain asbestos-containing materials. In addition, because of its age, lead paint may be found in the existing building. Please contact the San Francisco Department of Building Inspection (DBI) for requirements related to demolition of buildings that may contain lead paint.

9. **Stormwater.** Because the proposed project would result in a ground surface disturbance of 5,000 sf or more, it is subject to San Francisco's stormwater management requirements as outlined in the Stormwater Management Ordinance and the corresponding San Francisco Public Utilities

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

10. **Wind.** The proposed project would include construction of a building that is approximately 80 feet in height. The project therefore would require an initial review by a wind consultant, including a recommendation as to whether a wind tunnel analysis is needed. If a detailed wind tunnel analysis is required, a wind consultant would be required to prepare a proposed scope of work for review and approval by the Environmental Planning case manager prior to preparing the analysis.
11. **Shadow.** The proposed project would result in construction of a building greater than 40 feet in height. A preliminary shadow fan analysis prepared by Planning Department staff (attached) indicates that shadow related to the proposed building as represented in the plan set submitted with the PPA Application could reach public space under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Parks Department (Helen Wills Park). The project therefore requires a shadow study, which must be prepared by a qualified consultant. The consultant would be required to submit a Shadow Study Application, which can be found on the Planning Department's website. A separate fee is required. The consultant would also be required to prepare a proposed scope of work for review and approval by the Environmental Planning case manager prior to preparing the analysis.
12. **Tree Planting and Protection.** 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 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.
13. **Notification of a Project Receiving Environmental Review.** Notice is required to be sent to occupants of the project site and properties adjacent to the project site, as well as to owners and to the extent feasible occupants of properties within 300 feet of the project site at the initiation of the environmental review. Please be prepared to provide mailing 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 Community Plan Exemption (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>.

If the additional analysis outlined above indicates that the project would not have a significant effect on the environment, the project could be eligible for a Class 32 infill development categorical exemption from environmental review under CEQA Guidelines Section 15332 based on the preliminary review of the proposed project. If a Class 32 exemption is appropriate, Environmental Planning staff will prepare a certificate of exemption.

If it is determined that the project could result in a significant impact, an initial study would be prepared. The initial study may be prepared either by an environmental consultant from the Department's environmental consultant pool or by Department staff. If the initial study finds that the project would have a significant impact that could be reduced to a less-than-significant level by mitigation measures agreed to by the project sponsor, then the Department would issue a preliminary mitigated negative declaration (PMND). The PMND would be circulated for public review for a period of 20 calendar days, during which time concerned parties may comment on and/or appeal the determination. If an appeal is filed, the Planning Commission would hold a hearing to decide the appeal. If no appeal is filed, the Planning Department would issue a final mitigated negative declaration (FMND).

If the initial study indicates that the project would result in a significant impact that cannot be mitigated to below a significant level, an EIR will be required. An EIR must be prepared by an environmental consultant from the Planning Department's environmental consultant pool ([http://www.sfplanning.org/ftp/files/MEA/Environmental\\_consultant\\_pool.pdf](http://www.sfplanning.org/ftp/files/MEA/Environmental_consultant_pool.pdf)). The Planning Department will provide more detail to the project sponsor regarding the EIR process should this level of environmental review be required.

#### **PLANNING DEPARTMENT APPROVALS:**

The Project requires the following Planning Department approvals. These approvals may be reviewed in conjunction with the required environmental review, but may not be granted until after the required environmental review is completed.

1. A **Building Permit Application** is required for the demolition of the existing buildings on the subject property.
2. A **Building Permit Application** is required for the proposed new construction on the subject property.
3. **Shadow Analysis.** As discussed above, a shadow analysis is required pursuant to Planning Code Section 295. Therefore, a Shadow Study Application will be required.
4. **Conditional Use Authorization.** The project as proposed requires Conditional Use Authorization pursuant to Planning Code Section 253.2(a) for building with a height exceeding 50 feet. In addition, the project requires Conditional Use Authorization pursuant to Planning Code Section 151.1 for off-street parking in excess of .50 spaces per dwelling unit.
5. **Variances.** The project as proposed requires variances from Planning Code Sections 134 – Rear Yard, 135 – Open Space, 136 – Permitted Obstructions (Bay Windows), 140 – Dwelling Unit Exposure, 145.1 – Street Frontage and Active Uses, and 155.2 – Bicycle Storage.

Building Permit applications are available at the Department of Building Inspections at 1660 Mission Street. The Conditional Use application is available at [sf.planning.org](http://sf.planning.org) – Permits & Zoning – Permit Forms.

#### **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 significantly impact the proposed project. Please be advised that additional comments may result following a formal submittal.

1. **Rear Yard.** Planning Code Section 134 requires that the minimum rear yard shall be equal to 25 percent of the total lot depth or 15 feet (whichever is greater) at the lowest story containing a dwelling unit, and at each succeeding level or story of the building. The plans do not provide dimensions to determine if the proposed project complies with this requirement. Planning Code Section 243(c)(7) allows the Zoning Administrator to modify or waive the rear yard requirement for properties in the Van Ness Special Use District pursuant to additional findings and through the

procedures which are applicable to variances. Please ensure that the project provides a Code-complying rear yard or seek and justify a rear yard variance.

2. **Usable Open Space.** Planning Code Section 135 requires 36 sf of private usable open space or 48 sf of common usable open space per dwelling unit. Additionally, any such open space must meet the dimensional requirements of Subsections (f) and (g). The plans should demonstrate how the open space requirement will be met and how the open spaces will meet the dimensional requirements, or seek and justify a usable open space variance.
3. **Permitted Obstructions.** Planning Code Section 136(c)(3) permits bay projections over the street and within open areas; however, the plans do not provide dimensions to determine if the bay windows comply with the dimensional requirements of the Code. The plans should demonstrate how the proposed project meets the Code requirement or a variance must be sought and justified. Note that Caltrans may not allow projections over the Van Ness Avenue right-of-way.
4. **Streetscape and Pedestrian Improvements - Street Trees.** Planning Code Section 138.1 requires at least one street tree for every 20 feet of street frontage for a total of 10 trees for the proposed project. Four existing street trees are shown on Van Ness Avenue and none is shown on Pacific Avenue. The project must meet this Code requirement. Please note the additional requirements per Section 138.1(c)(i)(B).
5. **Bird Safety.** Planning Code Section 139 requires Bird-Safe Glazing Treatment if the proposed project includes unbroken glazed segments of 24 sf or larger. Please verify whether the proposed glazing includes segments that are 24 sf or larger and include information for proposed glazing treatment that meets this requirement.
6. **Dwelling Unit Exposure.** Planning Code Section 140 requires all dwelling units to face a public street, public alley at least 25 feet in width, side yard at least 25 feet in width, or rear yard meeting the requirements of this Code. Should the rear yard requirement not be met, a variance from the exposure requirement must be sought and justified.
7. **Street Frontages in Residential-Commercial Zoning Districts.** Planning Code Section 145.1 requires that off-street parking at street grade on a development lot be set back at least 25 feet on the ground floor from any façade facing a street of at least 30 feet in width. The bicycle parking on Van Ness Avenue and a portion of the proposed vehicular parking on Pacific Avenue are not set back 25 feet. Please revise the project or seek and justify a street frontage variance.

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

8. **Off-Street Parking.** The Planning Code has recently been updated and parking maximums are now in effect for the project site; Planning Code Section 151.1 for RC Districts is the controlling language.

Planning Code Section 151.1 permits up to one car for each two dwelling units, or 0.5 space per unit; requires Conditional Use Authorization for up to 0.75 space for each dwelling unit, subject to the criteria and procedures of Section 151.1(g); and does not permit more than 0.75 space for each dwelling unit. Therefore, at 24 off-street parking spaces for 44 units, the current proposed design would provide 0.58 space per unit and requires Conditional Use Authorization for the amount of parking provided. In addition, please consider the street frontage design comments regarding the parking entrance below.

9. **Bicycle Parking.** Planning Code Section 155.2 requires one Class 1 bicycle space per dwelling unit, one Class 2 bicycle space per 20 dwelling units, and a minimum of two Class 2 spaces for the commercial use. Alternatively, an in-lieu fee can be accepted for the required Class 2 spaces per Planning Code Section 430. The project proposes a bicycle room for 72 Class 1 spaces. Please review Zoning Administrator Bulletin No. 9 - Bicycle Parking Standards: Design and Layout ([http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/publications\\_reports/ZAB\\_BicycleParking\\_9-7-13.pdf](http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/publications_reports/ZAB_BicycleParking_9-7-13.pdf)) and submit a detailed floor plan showing that the required number of Class 1 spaces meet the minimum clearances needed in the proposed bicycle room or revise the proposed project to meet the requirement. Please also indicate in future submittals how the Class 2 requirement is being met.
10. **Parking Dimensions and Arrangement.** Planning Code Sections 154 and 155 provide direction on the dimensional requirements and arrangement of parking. Please ensure future plans provide information on how the proposed project meets these requirements.
11. **Curb Cut.** Planning Code Section 155(l) requires curb cuts and driveways to be as narrow as possible to decrease conflicts with pedestrians and retain on-street parking. In future submittals, please include dimensions for the width of the curb cut and indicate existing and proposed on-street parking spaces along Pacific Avenue. Note that the Department may request narrowing of the curb cut for consistency with the Code.
12. **Unbundled Parking.** Planning Code Section 167 allows for off-street parking spaces with 10 dwelling units or more to be leased or sold separately from the rental or purchase fees for dwelling units. In cases where there are fewer parking spaces than dwelling units, the parking spaces shall be offered first to the potential owners or renters of three-bedroom or more units, second to the owners or renters of two-bedroom units, and then to the owners or renters of other units. Renters or buyers of on-site inclusionary affordable units provided pursuant to Planning Code Section 415 shall have an equal opportunity to rent or buy a parking space on the same terms and conditions as offered to renters or buyers of other dwelling units, and at a price determined by the Mayor's Office of Housing, subject to procedures adopted by the Planning Commission notwithstanding any other provision of Planning Code Section 415. Please indicate in future submittals if unbundled parking is being offered.
13. **Floor Area Ratio (FAR).** Planning Code Section 243(c)(1) requires that buildings within the Van Ness Special Use District have a basic FAR of no greater than 4.8 to 1 when located in an 80-foot height district, with the requirement applicable to dwellings notwithstanding Planning Code Section 124(b). Future submittals should provide a detailed calculation of the gross floor area of the project, including floor plans which clearly indicate those areas included within the calculation of "gross floor area" pursuant to the definition in Planning Code Section 102.9. Please indicate in future submittals how this FAR is accomplished.

14. **Ground Level Wind Currents.** As discussed under the Environmental Review section above (comment 10), the height of the proposed residential building would trigger an initial wind review. Planning Code Section 243(c)(10) establishes comfort criteria (ground level wind levels not to exceed 11 miles per hour [mph] in areas of substantial pedestrian use or 7 mph in public seating areas) and a hazard criterion, which is a 26-mph equivalent. For new buildings in the Van Ness Special Use District, the buildings shall be shaped or other wind-baffling measures shall be adopted so that the development would not exceed the comfort criteria. When pre-existing ambient wind speeds exceed the comfort levels, the building shall be designed to reduce the ambient wind speeds in efforts to meet the goals of this requirement. Exceptions can be made pursuant to Planning Code Section 243(c)(10)(B). Please indicate in future submittals how this requirement is accomplished.
15. **Building Height.** Planning Code Section 253.2(a) requires Conditional Use authorization for buildings exceeding 50 feet in height in the Van Ness Special Use District. Planning Code Section 253.2(a)(1) states that when acting on any Conditional Use application pursuant to this section, the Planning Commission may require a setback of up to 20 feet at a height of 50 feet or above for all or portions of a building if it determines that this requirement is necessary in order to maintain the continuity of the prevailing street wall height established by the existing buildings along Van Ness Avenue within two blocks of the proposed building. Therefore, please prepare and submit a Conditional Use Application.
16. **Height Exemptions.** Planning Code Section 260(b) allows certain features to exceed the height limit so long as they do not exceed 20 percent of the roof area. Please provide dimensions for the proposed building height to the top of any feature proposed, note the use of the projections above a height of 80 feet, and calculate the overall roof area of the projections. The Planning Code does not provide a means for exemptions from the height limit.
17. **Shadow Analysis.** Planning Code Section 295 requires a shadow analysis for any building over 40 feet in height. The project proposes construction of a building approximately 80 feet in height with mechanical equipment and penthouses reaching to a greater height. As the plans submitted with the PPA Application do not provide dimensions for the overall building height including the mechanical equipment, the Department used a height of 96 feet (80 feet plus 16 feet for permitted mechanical over the building height pursuant to Planning Code Section 260(b)(1)(B)) to determine potential shadow cast by the proposed project. As discussed under the Environmental Review section above (comment 11), shadow related to the proposed building could reach Helen Wills Park, a public space under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Parks Department, and further shadow analysis will be required.
18. **Transit Impact Development Fee.** Under Planning Code Section 411, the ground-floor retail/commercial space will be subject to this fee, which will be calculated at the time of issuance of the first construction document.
19. **Inclusionary Housing.** Planning Code Section 415 requires affordable housing for projects proposing ten or more dwelling units. The Project Sponsor must submit an 'Affidavit for Compliance with the Inclusionary Affordable Housing Program: Planning Code Section 415' to the Planning Department identifying the method of compliance (on-site, off-site, or in-lieu fee). Any on-site affordable

dwelling-units proposed as part of the project must be designated as owner-occupied units, not rental units, shall be sold as ownership units, and will remain as ownership units for the life of the project.

20. **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

#### CITYWIDE POLICY ANALYSIS:

1. **Van Ness Avenue Area Plan.** The subject property falls within the area covered by the Van Ness Avenue Area Plan in the General Plan. As proposed, the project is generally consistent with the overarching objectives of the Plan, although the project design comments below discuss any items where more information is needed to assess conformity with either specific policies or Code standards or where the project requires minor modification to achieve consistency. The project sponsor is encouraged to read the full plan, which can be viewed at <http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/General Plan/Van Ness Ave.htm>.

#### PRELIMINARY DESIGN COMMENTS:

1. **Site Design, Open Space, and Massing.** The Planning Department recommends that the project designers slim the "1B-B" Unit on the second floor to make a more gracious rear yard space.
2. **Street Frontage.** The Planning Department recommends reconfiguring the parking to provide active use within the first 25 feet of the building edge along Pacific Avenue. This would require moving the parking more interior to the block and the curb cut farther east, and adding retail along more of the frontage. Bicycle parking proposed along Van Ness Avenue is also not considered an active use and should be located more interior to the block as well.
3. **Architecture.** The design makes a clear articulated setback along both the Van Ness Avenue and Pacific Avenue sides. The Planning Department supports the relationship to Pacific Avenue where the buildings are similar in scale, but would prefer to see the Van Ness Avenue elevation be more prominent and civic in nature to offer a hierarchy between the two prominent façades. The Planning Department encourages the project sponsor to use high quality materials and detailing to provide increased visual interest and depth in the façade elements.

#### PRELIMINARY PROJECT ASSESSMENT EXPIRATION:

This Preliminary Project Assessment is valid for a period of **18 months**, and an Environmental Evaluation, Large Project Authorization, or Building Permit Application, as listed above, must be submitted no later than **July 8, 2016**. Otherwise, this determination is considered expired and a new Preliminary Project Assessment is required. Such applications and plans must be generally consistent with the recommendations found in this Preliminary Project Assessment.

Attachment: Preliminary Shadow Fan

cc: Sara Velve, Current Planning  
Jeremy Shaw, Citywide Planning and Analysis  
Maia Small, Design Review  
Jerry Robbins, SFMTA  
Jerry Sanguinetti, DPW

