



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

MEMO

DATE: June 29, 2016
TO: Derek Vinh, ICE Design
FROM: Chris Kern, Planning Department
RE: PPA Case No. 2015-001171PPA for 1524-1532 Ocean 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 attached the 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, to answer any questions you may have, or to schedule a follow-up meeting.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "Chris Kern", written over a horizontal line.

Chris Kern, Senior Planner



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Preliminary Project Assessment

Date: June 29, 2016
Case No.: **2015.001171PPA**
Project Address: 1524 and 1532 Ocean Avenue
Block/Lot: 3196/006 and 3196/028
Zoning: NCT - Ocean Avenue Neighborhood Commercial Transit District
45-X Height and Bulk District
Area Plan: Balboa Park Area Plan
Project Sponsor: Derek Vinh, ICE Design, Inc.
650-741-6968
Staff Contact: Elizabeth Purl – 415-575-9028
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:

This Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) letter provides feedback to the project sponsor from the Planning Department regarding the proposed project described in the PPA application submitted on March 31, 2016 and revised on April 23, 2016, as summarized below. This PPA letter identifies Planning Department review requirements for the proposed project, including those related to environmental review, approvals, neighborhood notification and public outreach, the Planning Code, project design, and other general issues of concern for the project. Please be advised that the PPA application does not constitute an application for development with the Planning Department. The PPA letter also does not represent a complete review of the proposed project, does not grant a project approval of any kind, and does not 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, Public Works, the Municipal Transportation Agency, Department of Public Health, San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, and others. The information included herein is based on the PPA application and plans, 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 sites are adjacent parcels on the north side of Ocean Avenue between Miramar and Faxon Avenues. The property at 1524 Ocean Avenue (3196/006) has an area of 2,591 square feet (sf) and is developed with a 2,000-sf, one-story commercial building built in 1917. The property at 1534 Ocean Avenue (3196/028) has an area of 1,995 sf and is developed with a 1,778-sf, two-story commercial building

built in 1919. Both buildings include ground-floor retail space occupied by a grocery store; 1524 Ocean Avenue also includes one dwelling unit on the second floor.

The proposal is to construct vertical and horizontal additions to the existing buildings. The proposed addition to 1524 Ocean Avenue would retain the existing building, expand the first floor, and construct three new floors to create a four-story, 45-foot-high building. The ground floor would be extended to cover the entire lot and would be developed as retail space. The second, third, and fourth floors would each include three apartments. The proposed addition to 1532 Ocean Avenue would retain the existing building, expand the first and second floors, and construct two new floors to create a four-story, 45-foot-high building. The ground floor would be extended to cover the entire lot and would be developed as a restaurant. The second floor would include three apartments and a new 434-sf roof deck that would provide common open space. The third and fourth floors would each include three apartments. The project would include a total of 18 dwelling units (a net increase of 17 units) and 13,332 sf. No car or bicycle parking would be provided. No curb cuts are present or would be created; pedestrian access to both the residential and retail/restaurant uses would be from Ocean Avenue. Minor excavation would be needed to extend the building foundations.

BACKGROUND:

The project sites are within the Balboa Park Station Area Plan. On December 4, 2008, the Planning Commission certified the *Balboa Park Station Area Plan Environmental Impact Report (Balboa Park PEIR)* by Motion 17774 and adopted the Preferred Project for final recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.^{1,2} The Balboa Park Station Area Plan and its associated rezoning became effective April 7, 2009.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:

Community Plan Exemption

Section 15183 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines states that projects that are consistent with the development density established by a community plan for which an environmental impact report (EIR) was certified do not require additional environmental review, except as necessary to determine the presence of project-specific significant effects not identified in the programmatic plan area EIR.

As discussed above, the proposed project is located within the Balboa Park Station Area Plan, which was evaluated in the *Balboa Park PEIR*. If the proposed project is consistent with the development density identified in the area plan, it would be eligible for a community plan exemption (CPE). Please note that a CPE is a type of exemption from environmental review, and cannot be modified to reflect changes to a project after approval. Proposed increases beyond the CPE project description in project size or intensity after project approval will require reconsideration of environmental impacts and issuance of a new CEQA determination.

¹ San Francisco Planning Department. Balboa Park Station Area Plan Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR), Planning Department Case No. 2004.1059E, certified December 4, 2008. Available online at: <http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1893>, accessed June 23, 2016.

² San Francisco Planning Department. San Francisco Planning Commission Motion 17774, December 4, 2008. Available online at: <http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1893>, accessed June 23, 2016.

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

1. **CPE Only.** All potentially significant project-specific and cumulatively considerable environmental impacts are fully consistent with significant impacts identified in *Balboa Park PEIR*, and there would be no new significant impacts "peculiar" to the proposed project. In these situations, all pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the *Balboa Park PEIR* are applied to the proposed project, and a CPE checklist and certificate is prepared. With this outcome, the applicable fees are: (a) the CPE determination fee (currently \$14,017) and (b) the CPE certificate fee (currently \$7,779).
2. **Mitigated Negative Declaration.** If new site- or project-specific significant impacts are identified for the proposed project that were not identified in the *Balboa Park PEIR*, and if these new significant impacts can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level, then a focused mitigated negative declaration is prepared to address these impacts, and a supporting CPE checklist is prepared to address all other impacts that were encompassed by the *Balboa Park PEIR*, with all pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the *Balboa Park PEIR* also applied to the proposed project. With this outcome, the applicable fees are: (a) the CPE determination fee (currently \$14,017) and (b) the standard environmental evaluation fee (which is based on construction value).
3. **Focused EIR.** If any new site- or project-specific significant impacts cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level, then a focused EIR is prepared to address these impacts, and a supporting CPE checklist is prepared to address all other impacts that were encompassed by the *Balboa Park PEIR*, with all pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the *Balboa Park PEIR* also applied to the proposed project. With this outcome, the applicable fees are: (a) the CPE determination fee (currently \$14,017); (b) the standard environmental evaluation fee (which is based on construction value); and (c) one-half of the standard EIR fee (which is also based on construction value). An EIR must be prepared by an environmental consultant from the Planning Department's environmental consultant pool (<http://sf-planning.org/environmental-consultant-pool>). The Planning Department will provide more detail to the project sponsor regarding the EIR process should this level of environmental review be required.

Formal environmental review begins with Planning Department review of the **Environmental Evaluation Application (EEA)** filed by the project sponsor. The EEA can be submitted at the same time as the PPA application or subsequent to issuance of the PPA letter.

We received an EEA for the proposed project on April 10, 2015; this application should be amended as needed to incorporate input provided in this PPA letter and to include the proposed development on both site addresses. A detailed and accurate description of the proposed project is essential for adequate environmental review. Furthermore, please include the depth of excavation and the quantity of soil that would be removed from (or brought to) the site. The environmental 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.** See "Environmental Applications" on page 2 of the [current Fee Schedule](#) for a calculation of environmental

application fees.³ In addition, please see page 4 of the Fee Schedule for monitoring fees applicable to projects that require active monitoring of mitigation measures.

Below is a list of topic areas addressed through the environmental review process. Based on a preliminary review of the project as it is proposed in the PPA application, some of these topics will require additional study.

1. **Historic Resources.** The project proposes major alteration of age-eligible buildings located in the Balboa Park Area Plan Historic Resources Survey. Both properties were recorded but not evaluated and are therefore considered potential historic resources. The proposed project is subject to review by the Department's Historic Preservation staff. To assist in this review, the project sponsor must hire a qualified professional to prepare a Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE) report. The qualified professional must be selected from the Planning Department's Historic Resource Consultant Pool. Please contact Tina Tam, Senior Preservation Planner, via email (tina.tam@sfgov.org) for a list of three consultants from which to choose. The selected consultant must scope the HRE in consultation with Department Historic Preservation staff. Please contact the HRE scoping team at HRE@sfgov.org to arrange the HRE scoping. Following an approved scope, the historic resource consultant should submit the draft HRE report for review to Environmental Planning after the project sponsor has filed the EEA and updated it as necessary to reflect feedback received in the PPA letter. The HRE should be submitted directly to the Department and copied to the project sponsor. Project sponsors should not receive or review advance drafts of consultant reports per the Environmental Review Guidelines. Historic Preservation staff will not begin reviewing your project until a complete HRE is received.
2. **Archeological Resources.** The project site lies within Archeological Mitigation Zone AM-1 of the *Balboa Park PEIR*. The proposed project will require Preliminary Archeological Review (PAR) by a Planning Department archeologist. The PAR will assess the archeological sensitivity of the project site based on in-house source material and will consider the potential for archeological impacts resulting from proposed soils disturbance. Please provide detailed information, including sections, proposed soils-disturbing activities, such as grading, excavation, installation of foundations, soils improvement, and site remediation in the EEA, and submit any available geotechnical/soils or phase II hazardous materials reports prepared for the project to assist in this review. If the Department archeologist determines that the project has a potential to adversely affect archeological resources, the PAR will identify additional measures needed to address the potential effect. These measures may include preparation of an archeological research design and treatment plan, implementation of one of the Planning Department's three standard archeological mitigation measures (archeological testing, monitoring, or accidental discovery), or other appropriate measures.
3. **Transportation.** Based on the PPA submittal, a transportation impact study is not anticipated; an official determination will be made subsequent to submittal of the EEA. However, the project site is located on a high injury corridor as mapped by Vision Zero.⁴ Planning staff have reviewed the

³ San Francisco Planning Department. *Schedule for Application Fees*. Available online at: <http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=513>.

⁴ This document is available at: <http://www.sfmta.com/sites/default/files/projects/2015/vision-zero-san-francisco.pdf>.

proposed site plans and offer the following recommendations, some of which address the safety of persons walking and cycling to and from project site and vicinity:

- Please show the following on a combined plan set:
 - the existing and proposed sidewalk widths;
 - the streetscape plan and internal pedestrian circulation;
 - proposed bicycle parking; and
 - street names.
- A site visit is recommended to assess safety concerns.

Transportation Demand Management Program. On April 28, 2016, the Planning Commission adopted a resolution to initiate Planning Code amendments that would require development projects to comply with a proposed Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program. The intent of the proposed TDM Program is to reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and to make it easier for people to get around by sustainable travel modes such as transit, walking, and biking.

Under the proposed TDM Program, land uses are grouped into four categories, A through D. For each land use category that is subject to the TDM Program, the City would set a target based on the number of accessory vehicle parking spaces that the project intends to provide for that land use category. To meet each target, the project sponsor must select TDM measures—each worth a specified number of points—from a menu of options. In general, if a project sponsor proposes more parking, the target for that land use category—and thus, the number of TDM measures that the sponsor must implement to meet it—would increase. Some of the TDM measures included in the menu are already required by the Planning Code. Points earned from implementing these measures would be applied towards achieving a project’s target. Project sponsors would be required to implement and maintain TDM measures for the life of the project.

The proposed project includes 18 dwelling units, and thus would be subject to the proposed TDM Program. The project does not propose to provide any parking for the residential use, and would therefore be required to meet or exceed the base target of 14 points for land use Category C. However, because it includes no parking, the project as proposed would achieve most of this target. The Planning Code would currently require the project, as described in the PPA, to provide the following TDM measure:

- Bicycle Parking (Planning Code Section [155.2](#); TDM Menu ACTIVE-2 – option a)

The project may be required to select and incorporate additional TDM measures to meet the target listed above. A full list of the TDM measures included in the menu of options is available online at: <http://sf-planning.org/shift-encourage-sustainable-travel>.

4. **Noise.** *Balboa Park PEIR Noise Mitigation Measure N-2* requires that the project sponsor conduct a detailed vibration analysis for any residential or vibration-sensitive land use proposed within critical distances of existing or planned BART or Muni facilities, and incorporate measures into the design as

necessary to reduce the potential for vibration disturbance. The proposed land use at the project site (Federal Transit Administration Noise Category 2: residential land uses) would require a vibration study if located within 120 feet of BART right-of-way and/or within 100 feet of Muni light rail right-of-way. The project site is located less than 100 feet from the KT-Ingleside Muni light rail right-of-way on Ocean Avenue, and the proposed project would therefore require a vibration analysis pursuant to *Noise Mitigation Measure N-2*. Vibration attenuation features recommended by the analysis to reduce interior vibration levels must be included in the project's design. The vibration analysis should be prepared by a qualified consultant, and the scope of work should be reviewed by the assigned Environmental Planner before work on the analysis begins.

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. The EEA application should indicate whether pile driving or other particularly noisy construction methods are required.

5. **Air Quality.** The proposed project, at 18 dwelling units, is below the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's (BAAQMD) construction screening levels for criteria air pollutants.⁵ Therefore, an analysis of the project's criteria air pollutant emissions is not likely to be required. However, detailed information related to construction equipment, phasing and duration of each phase, and volume of excavation should 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 proposed project will be required to adhere to the dust control requirements set forth in the Construction Dust Ordinance contained in San Francisco Health Code Article 22B and San Francisco Building Code Section 106.A.3.2.6. In addition, equipment exhaust measures during construction, such as those listed in *Balboa Park PEIR Air Quality Mitigation Measure AQ-1*, will likely be required.

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 modeling of air pollution, exposures, and health vulnerability from mobile, stationary, and area source emissions within San Francisco. Given that the project site is not within an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone, no additional measures or analysis related to local health risks are anticipated. 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. Please provide detailed information related to any proposed stationary sources with the EEA.

6. **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

⁵ BAAQMD, *CEQA Air Quality Guidelines*, May 2011, Chapter 3.

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.⁶ 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.

7. **Wind.** The proposed project would not involve construction of a building over 80 feet in height. Therefore, a consultant-prepared wind analysis is not anticipated to be required.
8. **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 indicates that the project would not cast new shadow on recreational resources. Therefore, no shadow study is required.
9. **Geology.** Please submit documentation, such as a geotechnical or engineering study prepared by a qualified consultant, demonstrating that the existing and proposed building foundations and structural systems are sufficient to support the proposed additions. The geotechnical or other study should provide recommendations to address any identified geotechnical concerns. 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 geological hazards, it is recommended that you provide a copy of any geotechnical information you may have, along with any boring logs for the proposed project, with the revised EEA. This information will also help inform the Planning Department Archeologist of the project site's subsurface geological conditions.
10. **Hazardous Materials.** If the proposed project requires excavation, it will be subject to *Balboa Park PEIR Hazardous Materials Mitigation Measure HM-1*, which requires preparation of a site-specific Phase I Environmental Site Assessment. If required, a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment should be submitted with the revised EEA.

The proposed project will also be subject to *Balboa Park PEIR Hazardous Materials Mitigation Measure HM-2*, which requires that projects that include demolition ensure that any equipment containing PCBs or DEHP, such as fluorescent light ballasts, are removed and properly disposed of according to applicable federal, state, and local laws prior to the start of renovation or demolition, and that any fluorescent light tubes, which could contain mercury, are similarly removed and properly disposed. Any other hazardous materials identified either before or during work, such as asbestos-containing building materials, must be abated according to applicable federal, state, and local laws. The existing

⁶ Refer to <http://sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1886> for latest "Greenhouse Gas Compliance Checklist for Private Development Projects."

buildings were constructed prior to 1980, and may therefore contain asbestos-containing materials such as floor and wall coverings. The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) is responsible for regulating airborne pollutants including asbestos. Please contact BAAQMD for the requirements related to demolition of buildings with asbestos-containing materials. In addition, because of their age (constructed prior to 1978), lead paint may be found in the existing buildings. Please contact the San Francisco Department of Building Inspection (DBI) for requirements related to the demolition of buildings that may contain lead paint.

11. **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 occurs, 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>.

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 proposed new construction on the subject properties.
2. **Variance.** Pursuant to Planning Code Sections 305, 134, 135, 136.1, 140, 145.1, 155.2, a Variance Application may be required as the proposed development appears to have issues with respect to: rear yard setback encroachment, open space, ground floor ceiling height, awning/marquee dimensions, exposure, and bicycle parking.

NEIGHBORHOOD NOTIFICATIONS AND PUBLIC OUTREACH:

This project is required to conduct a **Pre-Application** meeting with surrounding neighbors and registered neighborhood groups before a development application may be filed with the Planning Department. The Pre-Application packet, which includes instructions and template forms, is available at www.sfplanning.org under the “Permits & Zoning” tab. All registered neighborhood group mailing lists are available online at www.sfplanning.org under the “Resource Center” tab. Project Sponsors are encouraged to conduct public outreach with the surrounding community and neighborhood groups early in the development process.

Notification of a Project Receiving Environmental Review. Notice may be 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 process. Please be prepared to provide mailing addresses on a CD upon request during the environmental review process.

PRELIMINARY PROJECT COMMENTS:

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

1. **Rear Yard.** Section 134 requires the project to provide a rear yard of at least 25 percent of the lot depth. The proposed fire escapes exceed the maximum dimensions permitted to be considered a projection into the rear yards under Section 136. The proposed rear yards represent only approximately 19 percent of the lot area.
2. **Open Space – Residential.** Section 135 requires properties within Neighborhood Commercial Districts to provide open space in the amount based on the nearest Residential District (i.e., RH-1[D]). A minimum of 300 sf of open space is required for each dwelling unit if the open space is private and 399 sf if common. Additionally, any such open spaces must meet the access and dimensional requirements of Subsections (b), (f), and (g). The proposed project requires revision to meet the minimum open space requirement.
3. **Street Frontage.** Planning Code Section 145.1 requires a minimum 14-foot ground floor ceiling height, as measured from grade, for non-residential uses. Both buildings propose only a 12-foot ground floor ceiling height.
4. **Awnings and Marquees.** Planning Code Section 136.1 sets minimum/maximum dimensions for awnings and marquees. Both buildings do not meet the dimensions prescribed.
5. **Street Trees.** Planning Code Section 138.1 requires one street tree for every 20 feet of frontage for new construction. No street trees are shown on the plans.
6. **Vision Zero.** The project is located on a “high-injury corridor”, identified through the City’s [Vision Zero Program](#). The Sponsor is encouraged to incorporate pedestrian safety streetscape measures into the project.

7. **Exposure.** Planning Code Section 140 requires that each dwelling unit have at least one room that meets the 120-sf minimum superficial floor area requirement of Section 503 of the Housing Code facing directly on a street right-of-way, a code-complying rear yard, or an appropriately sized courtyard. A number of units do not meet the minimum floor area or face an adequate open area. Therefore, the proposed project requires revision to meet the minimum exposure requirement.
8. **Bicycle Parking.** Planning Code Section 155.2 requires this project to provide at least 20 bicycle parking spaces. The project as proposed contains no bicycle parking.
9. **First Source Hiring Agreement.** A First Source Hiring Agreement is required for any project proposing to construct over 10 units. 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 Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 581-2303

10. **Inclusionary Affordable Housing.** Inclusionary Affordable Housing is required for a project proposing ten or more dwelling units. The Project Sponsor must submit an 'Affidavit of 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 through the affordable housing fee. Any on-site affordable dwelling-units proposed as part of the project must be designated as owner-occupied units, not rental units, unless a Costa Hawkins agreement is possible. Affordable units designated as on-site units shall be sold as ownership units and must remain as ownership units for the life of the project. The minimum Affordable Housing Percentages are payment of a 20 percent affordable housing fee, provision of 12 percent affordable units on-site, or provision of 20 percent affordable units off-site. Therefore, as proposed, the project would have a minimum requirement of two units if provided on-site and four units if provided off-site.

For your information, if a project proposes rental units, it may be eligible for an On-site Alternative to the Affordable Housing Fee if it has demonstrated to the Planning Department that the affordable units are either: 1) ownership only or 2) not subject to the Costa Hawkins Rental Housing Act (a Costa Hawkins exception). Affordable units are not subject to the Costa Hawkins Rental Housing Act under the exception provided in Civil Code Sections 1954.50 through one of the following methods:

- o direct financial construction from a public entity, or
- o development bonus or other form of public assistance.

A Costa Hawkins exception agreement is drafted by the City Attorney. You must state in your submittal how the project qualifies for a Costa Hawkins exception. The request should be addressed to the Director of Current Planning. If the project is deemed eligible, we may start working with the City Attorney on the agreement.

11. **Impact Fees.** This project will be subject to various impact fees. Please refer to the [Planning Director's Bulletin No. 1](#) for an overview of Development Impact Fees, and to the Department of Building Inspection's [Development Impact Fee webpage](#) for more information about current rates.

Based on an initial review of the proposed project, the following impact fees, which are assessed by the Planning Department, will be required:

- a. Child-Care (Planning Code Section 414)
 - b. Inclusionary Affordable Housing Fee (Planning Code Section 415)
 - c. Balboa Park Infrastructure Impact Fee (Planning Code Section 422)
 - d. Transit Impact Development Fee (Planning Code Section 411, TIDF)
12. **Balboa Park Station Area Plan.** The subject property falls within the area covered by the Balboa Park Station Area Plan in the General Plan. As proposed, the project is generally consistent with the overarching objectives of the Plan. The project sponsor is encouraged to review the full plan, which can be viewed at: http://generalplan.sfplanning.org/Balboa_Park_Station.htm.

PRELIMINARY DESIGN COMMENTS:

The project is located in the Ocean Avenue Neighborhood Commercial Transit zoning district in the West of Twin Peaks neighborhood. It appears that the proposed buildings are located within Westwood Park boundaries and are also subject to Planning Code Section 244.1. The Department recommends outreach with the Westwood Park Association for design input and review of the project in the context of the [Westwood Park Association Residential Design Guidelines](#). The area is characterized by buildings one to three stories in height along a transit corridor. The following comments address preliminary design issues that may significantly impact the proposed project:

1. **Site Design, Open Space, and Massing.** The Planning Department supports the diagrammatic site design and open space as proposed. The open space should have further development with appropriate landscaping elements and amenities. The exterior stair should not obstruct the use of the overall space by residents.
2. **Street Frontage.** The Department supports the street frontage as proposed in the site layout. See the following architectural comments for more detail. In a future application, please show bicycle parking locations and access.
3. **Architecture.** The Planning Department encourages the project sponsor to continue to develop the façade so that it has a stronger and clearer logic for the placement and proportion of elements. Currently, the ground floor and upper stories work as separate compositions. There should also be a more distinguished building termination feature—either a cornice or other intentional top. The Department further requests the use of high-quality materials and the inclusion of significant depth in the fenestration in street-facing facades. In further applications, please provide more detail and show adjacent facades.

PRELIMINARY PROJECT ASSESSMENT EXPIRATION:

This Preliminary Project Assessment is valid for a period of **18 months**. A Building Permit Application, as listed above, must be submitted no later than **December 22, 2017**. Such applications and plans must be generally consistent with those found in this Preliminary Project Assessment. Otherwise, this determination is considered expired and a new Preliminary Project Assessment is required.

Enclosure: Neighborhood Group Mailing List

cc: Tom Hua, Maxstone Investments, Property Owner
 Nancy Tran, Current Planning
 Chris Kern, Environmental Planning
 Jon Swae, Citywide Planning and Analysis
 Maia Small, Design Review
 Jonas Ionin, Planning Commission Secretary
 Charles Rivasplata, SFMTA
 Jerry Sanguinetti, Public Works
 Planning Department Webmaster (planning.webmaster@sfgov.org)



Title: Preliminary Shadow Analysis:1524-1532 Ocean Avenue (ref: 2015-001250PPA)

Comments: Proposed bldg height: 45 feet

Printed: 14 June, 2016



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.

FIRST	LAST	TITLE	ORGANIZATION	ADDRESS	CITY	STATE/ZIP	TELEPHONE	EMAIL	NEIGHBORHOOD OF INTEREST
Marc	Christensen	President	Merced Extension Triangle Neighborhood Association (METNA)	60 Kempton Avenue	San Francisco	CA 94132-3221	415-585-2465	christensen.marc.metna@gmail.com; ragtime217@gmail.com	Lakeshore, Ocean View
Mark	Scardina	President	Ingleside Terraces Homes Association	P.O. Box 27304	San Francisco	CA 94127-0304	415-469-9815	President@ithasf.org	Lakeshore, Ocean View, West of Twin Peaks
Norman	Yee	Supervisor, District 7	Board of Supervisors	1 Dr. Carlton B Goodlett Place, Room #244	San Francisco	CA 94102-4689	415-554-6516	Norman.Yee@sfgov.org; Matthias.Mormino@sfgov.org; Olivia.Scanlon@sfgov.org	Inner Sunset, Lakeshore, Ocean View, Parkside, Twin Peaks, West of Twin Peaks
Peter	Vaernet	0	OMI Neighbors in Action	335 Shields Street	San Francisco	CA 94132		0 vaernetpeter@yahoo.com	Lakeshore, Ocean View
Daniel	Weaver		Ocean Avenue Association	1728 Ocean Avenue, PMB 154	San Francisco	CA 94112	650-273-6223	info.oacbd@gmail.com	Ocean View, Outer Mission, West of Twin Peaks
			President	P.O. Box 27116	San Francisco	CA 94127	415-501-0394	info@gwpna.org	Diamond Heights, Inner Sunset, Outer Sunset, Parkside, Twin Peaks, West of Twin Peaks
			Zoning & Planning	Miraloma Park Improvement Club	San Francisco	CA 94127			West of Twin Peaks
Anita	Theoharis	Planning and Zoning Chair	Westwood Park Association	P.O. Box 27901, No. 770	San Francisco	CA 94127	415-334-4373	atheoharis@sbcglobal.net	West of Twin Peaks
Bill	Chionsini	President	Lakeshore Acres Improvement Club	P.O. Box 320222	San Francisco	CA 94132-0222	415-664-7463	bill-barbara@sbcglobal.net	Lakeshore
Claudia	Chamberlain		Neighbors of Ardenwood	2690 16th Avenue	San Francisco	CA 94116-3052	415-753-0620	claudia@sfchamberlain.us	West of Twin Peaks
David	Bisho	President	Westwood Highlands Association	120 Brentwood Avenue	San Francisco	CA 94127	415-397-0767	bisho@bisho.com	West of Twin Peaks
Diana	Wara		Forest Hill Association	381 Magellan Avenue	San Francisco	CA 94116	415-664-0542	foresthillch@aol.com DianeW@foresthill-sf.org	West of Twin Peaks
Gary	Weiss	President	Corbett Heights Neighbors	78 Mars Street	San Francisco	CA 94114	415-279-5570	gary@corbettheights.org	Castro/Upper Market, Noe Valley, West of Twin Peaks
Gordon	Canepa	Association Manager	St. Francis Homes Association	101 Santa Clara Ave.	San Francisco	CA 94127	415-681-0493	stfrancishomes@gmail.com	West of Twin Peaks
Karen	Breslin		Miraloma Park Improvement Club	839 Foerster Street	San Francisco	CA 94127		0 kbmail@sbcglobal.net	West of Twin Peaks
Kimber	Blackburn	President	Monterey Heights Homeowners Association	P.O. Box 27125	San Francisco	CA 94127-0125		0 info@montereyheights.org	West of Twin Peaks
Mark	Scardina	President	Ingleside Terraces Homes Association	P.O. Box 27304	San Francisco	CA 94127-0304	415-469-9815	President@ithasf.org	Lakeshore, Ocean View, West of Twin Peaks
Matt	Chamberlain	President	West of Twin Peaks Central Council	P.O. Box 27112	San Francisco	CA 94127		0 info@WestOfTwinPeaks.org President@WestOfTwinPeaks.org	Diamond Heights, Lakeshore, Parkside, Twin Peaks, West of Twin Peaks

Norman	Yee	Supervisor, District 7	Board of Supervisors	1 Dr. Carlton B Goodlett Place, Room #244	San Francisco	CA	94102- 4689	415-554-6516	Norman.Yee@sfgov.org; Matthias.Mormino@sfgov.org; Olivia.Scanlon@sfgov.org	Inner Sunset, Lakeshore, Ocean View, Parkside, Twin Peaks, West of Twin Peaks
Sophie	Breall	President	Balboa Terrace Homes Association	P.O. Box 27642	San Francisco	CA	94127	415-279-9530	board@balboaterrace.org	West of Twin Peaks
Sally	Stephens	President	Golden Gate Heights Neighborhood Association	P.O. Box 27608	San Francisco	CA	94127	415-379-0577	president@goldengateheights.org	Inner Sunset, Parkside, West of Twin Peaks
Tim	Armour		Miraloma Park Improvement Club	439 Myra Way	San Francisco	CA	94127	415-841-9488	nocatim@sbcglobal.net	West of Twin Peaks
Daniel	Weaver	0	Ocean Avenue Association	1728 Ocean Avenue, PMB 154	San Francisco	CA	94112	650-273-6223	info.oacbd@gmail.com	Ocean View, Outer Mission, West of Twin Peaks
Francesca	Panullo	Manager	Sherwin Williams	1415 Ocean Ave	San Francisco	CA	94112	203-376-6868	sw8644@sherwin.com	Bayview, Bernal Heights, Crocker Amazon, Diamond Heights, Excelsior, Glen Park, Inner Sunset, Lakeshore, Noe Valley, Ocean View, Outer Mission, Outer Sunset, Parkside, Potrero Hill, South Bayshore, Twin Peaks, Visitacion Valley, West of Twin Peaks
Francesca	Panullo	Manager	Sherwin Williams	1415 Ocean Ave	San Francisco	CA	94112	203-376-6868	sw8644@sherwin.com	Bayview, Bernal Heights, Crocker Amazon, Diamond Heights, Excelsior, Glen Park, Inner Sunset, Lakeshore, Noe Valley, Ocean View, Outer Mission, Outer Sunset, Parkside, Potrero Hill, South Bayshore, Twin Peaks, Visitacion Valley, West of Twin Peaks