



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

MEMO

DATE: June 3, 2015
TO: Kim Nash, Equity Community Builders
FROM: Julian J. Bañales, Planning Department
RE: PPA Case No. 2015-002600PPA for 915-935 Minna Street

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

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

Please find the attached Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) for the address listed above. You may reach the staff contact, Doug Vu, at (415) 575-9120 or Doug.Vu@sfgov.org to answer any questions you may have, or to schedule a follow-up meeting.

pp. 

Julian J. Bañales Senior Planner



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Preliminary Project Assessment

Date: June 3, 2015
Case No.: **2015-002600PPA**
Project Address: 915-938 Minna Street
Block/Lot: 3510/058
Zoning: Residential Enclave – Mixed (RED-MX)
Western SoMa Special Use District
45-X
Area Plan: Western SoMa
Project Sponsor: Kim Nash, Equity Community Builders
(415) 561-6200
Staff Contact: Doug Vu – (415) 575-9120
Doug.Vu@sfgov.org

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

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

DISCLAIMERS:

Please be advised that this determination does not constitute an application for development with the Planning Department. It also does not represent a complete review of the proposed project, a project approval of any kind, or in any way supersede any required Planning Department approvals listed below. The Planning Department may provide additional comments regarding the proposed project once the required applications listed below are submitted. While some approvals are granted by the Planning Department, some are at the discretion of other bodies, such as the Planning Commission or Historic Preservation Commission. Additionally, it is likely that the project will require approvals from other City agencies such as the Department of Building Inspection, Department of Public Works, Department of Public Health, San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, and others. The information included herein is based on plans and information provided for this assessment and the Planning Code, General Plan, Planning Department policies, and local/state/federal regulations as of the date of this document, all of which are subject to change.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The proposal is to construct a 45-ft. tall four-story, 28,017 gross sq. ft. residential building with 37 dwelling units and 22 off-street parking spaces at the northern portion of the property fronting Minna Street, and construction of a smaller 43-ft. 9-in. tall four-story, 5,697 gross sq. ft. residential building with 6 dwelling units at the southern portion of the property fronting Natoma Street. The entire project would include a total of 43 dwelling units and 22 off-street underground parking spaces on the existing unimproved 11,617 sq. ft. parcel located within the Western SoMa Community Plan Area.

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 Western SoMa Community Plan Area, which was evaluated in *Western SoMa Community Plan, Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels, and 350 Eighth Street Project Final Environmental Impact Report ("Western SoMa FEIR")*,¹ which was certified in 2012. Because the proposed project is consistent with the development density identified in the Western SoMa Plan Area, it is 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. Within the CPE process, there can be three different outcomes as follows:

1. **CPE Only.** All potentially significant project-specific and cumulatively considerable environmental impacts are fully consistent with significant impacts identified in the *Western SoMa FEIR*, and there would be no new "peculiar" significant impacts unique to the proposed project. In these situations, all pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the *Western SoMa FEIR* are applied to the proposed project, and a CPE checklist and certificate is prepared. With this outcome, the applicable fees are: (a) the CPE determination fee (currently \$13,659) and (b) the CPE certificate fee (currently \$7,580).
2. **Mitigated Negative Declaration.** If new site- or project-specific significant impacts are identified for the proposed project that were not identified in the *Western SoMa FEIR*, and if these new significant impacts can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level, then a focused mitigated negative declaration is prepared to address these impacts, and a supporting CPE checklist is prepared to address all other impacts that were encompassed by the *Western SoMa FEIR*, with all pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the *Western SoMa FEIR* also applied to the proposed project. With this outcome, the applicable fees are: (a) the CPE determination fee (currently \$13,659) 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 *Western SoMa FEIR*, with all pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the *Western SoMa FEIR* also applied to the proposed project. With this outcome, the applicable fees are: (a) the CPE determination fee (currently \$13,659); (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).

The Project Sponsor submitted an **Environmental Evaluation Application (EEA)** to the Planning Department on March 18, 2015. 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**

¹ Available for review on the Planning Department's Area Plan EIRs web page: <http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1893>.

until an approval 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.² Below is a list of topic areas that would require additional study based on the preliminary review of the project as it is proposed in the Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) submittal dated March 2, 2015.

- **Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE).** The project site is a vacant lot that was previously evaluated in a historical resources survey which concluded that the site does not contain any building considered individually eligible for national, state, or local listing as a historic resource. The project site, however, is located within an eligible or identified historic district. Therefore, the proposed construction is subject to review by the Department’s Historic Preservation staff for compatibility with the district. To assist in this review, the project sponsor must hire a qualified professional to prepare a Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE) report. The 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. Please contact the HRE scoping team at HRE@sfgov.org to arrange the HRE scoping. The historic resource consultant may submit the draft HRE report for review to Environmental Planning after the project sponsor has filed the EE Application and update it as necessary to reflect feedback received in the PPA letter. Historic Preservation staff will not begin reviewing your project until a complete HRE is received.
- **Archeological Resources.** The proposed project would include soil-disturbing activities associated with building construction, including excavation that would reach a depth of approximately seven feet below grade (deeper if a pile foundation is required). The project site is also located within an area where no previous archeological survey has been prepared. As such, the proposed project would be subject to *Western SoMa FEIR Cultural and Paleontological Resources Mitigation Measure M-CP-4a: Project-Specific Preliminary Archeological Assessment*. The project requires either a Preliminary Archeological Review (PAR), conducted in-house by the Planning Department archeologist, or the preparation of a Preliminary Archeological Sensitivity Assessment (PASS) prepared by a Department Qualified Archeological Consultant subject to review and approval by the Department archeologist. In almost all cases, the project sponsor would choose the PAR process. 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, whether or not 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. Helpful to the PAR process is the availability of geotechnical or soils characterization studies prepared for the project. The results of this review will be provided in a memorandum to the Environmental Planner assigned to the project.

Alternatively, preparation of a PASS would require the project sponsor to retain the services of a qualified archeological consultant from the Planning Department’s rotational Qualified Archeological

² San Francisco Planning Department. *Schedule for Application Fees*. Available online at: <http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=513>.

Consultants List (QACL). 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.

The Preliminary Archeological Sensitivity Study (PASS) should contain the following:

- 1) The historical uses of the project site based on any previous archeological documentation and Sanborn maps;
- 2) The types of archeological resources/properties that may have been located within the project site and whether the archeological resources/property types would potentially be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR);
- 3) Whether 19th or 20th century soils-disturbing activities may have adversely affected the identified potential archeological resources;
- 4) Potential project effects in relation to the depth of any identified potential archeological resources;
- 5) A conclusion that assesses whether any CRHR-eligible archeological resources could be adversely affected by the proposed project and recommendation as to appropriate further action.

Based on the PAR or the PASS, the Environmental Review Officer (ERO) shall determine if and what additional measures are necessary to address potential effects of the project to archeological resources. In cases of higher archeological sensitivity, these measures may include preparation of an Archeological Research Design Treatment Plan (ARDTP) by an archeological consultant from the QACL to more definitively identify the potential for California Register-eligible archeological resources to be present within the project site and determine the appropriate action necessary to reduce the potential effect of the project site on archeological resources to a less-than-significant level.

In addition, *Western SoMa FEIR Cultural and Paleontological Resources Mitigation Measure M-CP-4b: Procedures for Accidental Discovery of Archeological Resources* would apply to the proposed project. This measure is intended to avoid any potential adverse effect on accidentally discovered buried or submerged historical resources. This mitigation measure requires that the project sponsor distribute the Planning Department archeological resource "ALERT" sheet to on-site construction workers. Should an archeological resource be encountered on the project site, the project sponsor must immediately suspend any project-related soil-disturbing activities and notify the ERO of the discovery.

- **Transportation Study.** Based on the information provided in the Preliminary Project Assessment application, a transportation study is not likely required. However, an official determination will be made upon review of the EEA. In order to facilitate that determination, Planning staff recommend the following:
 - Label sheets on project plans.
 - Identify existing and proposed curb cuts on plans, including curb cut dimensions.
 - Show sidewalks and adjacent sheets on plans; demonstrate project compliance with the Better Streets Plan by including sidewalk widths.

- Show layout of bicycle parking on plans.
- **Noise and Vibration.** The proposed project would be located on a site where, based on Planning Department data, traffic-related noise along the project site's street frontages is 55-60 dBA Ldn (a day-night averaged sound level). Therefore, Western SoMa FEIR Noise and Vibration Mitigation Measure M-NO-1a: Interior Noise Levels for Residential Uses is not likely required. *Western SoMa FEIR Noise and Vibration Mitigation Measure M-NO-1c: Siting of Noise-Generating Uses* would not apply to the proposed project because the project would not include commercial, industrial, or other uses that would be expected to generate noise levels in excess of ambient noise, either short term, at nighttime, or as a 24-hour average, in the project site vicinity.

The proposed project would include locating new residential development on the project site, therefore *Western SoMa FEIR Noise and Vibration Mitigation Measure M-NO-1b: Siting of Noise-Sensitive Uses* would be required for the proposed project. *Noise and Vibration Mitigation Measure M-NO-1b*, which is intended to reduce potential conflicts between existing noise-generating uses and new sensitive receptors, requires that a noise analysis be prepared for new development including a noise-sensitive use, prior to the first project approval action. The analysis must include, at a minimum, a site survey to identify potential noise-generation uses within 900 feet of, and that have a direct line-of-sight to, the project site. At least one 24-hour noise measurement (with average and maximum noise level readings taken so as to be able to accurately describe maximum levels reached during nighttime hours) shall be included in the analysis. The analysis shall be prepared by person(s) qualified in acoustical analysis and/or engineering and shall demonstrate with reasonable certainty that Title 24 standards, where applicable, can be met, and that there are no particular circumstances about the project site that appear to warrant heightened concern about noise levels in the vicinity. Should such concerns be present, the Planning Department may require the completion of a detailed noise assessment by person(s) qualified in acoustical analysis and/or engineering prior to the first project approval action.

As the proposed project would include private outdoor space and shared outdoor space, *Western SoMa FEIR Noise and Vibration Mitigation Measure M-NO-1d: Open Space in Noisy Environments* would apply to the project. This mitigation measure requires that open space required under the Planning Code be protected from existing ambient noise levels. Implementation of this measure could involve, among other things, site design that uses the building itself to shield on-site open space from the greatest noise sources, construction of noise barriers between noise sources and open space, and appropriate use of both common and private open space in multi-family dwellings, and implementation would also be undertaken consistent with other principles or urban design.

Western SoMa FEIR Noise and Vibration Mitigation Measure M-NO-2a: Construction Noise Control Measures 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 the Department of Building Inspection (DBI) prior to commencing construction to ensure that maximum feasible noise attenuation will be achieved. The project sponsor has indicated that the project may involve pile driving. Therefore, *Western SoMa Noise*

and *Vibration Mitigation Measure M-NO-2b: Noise Control Measures During Pile Driving* may apply to the proposed project. This mitigation measure 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 drivers, 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.

Noise generated by construction-related activities would be regulated by the San Francisco Noise Ordinance (San Francisco Police Code, Article 29), which includes restrictions on the type of construction equipment used and the hours during which construction may occur. Detailed information on construction equipment, phasing, and duration of each construction phase may be required as part of the environmental evaluation to assess the project's construction noise levels and methods to reduce such noise, as feasible.

- **Air Quality (AQ) Analysis.** The proposed 43-unit residential development project is below the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's (BAAQMD) construction and operation screening levels for criteria air pollutants.³ 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 amount (in cubic yards) of excavation must be provided as part of the EEA.

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). The intent of the Ordinance is to reduce 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 comply with the applicable dust control requirements outlined in the ordinance.

The project site is not located within an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone (APZ), as mapped and defined by Health Code Article 38. The APZ 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 that the project site is not within an APZ, additional measures or analysis related to local health risks are not likely to be required. However, equipment exhaust measures during construction, such as those listed in *Western SoMa FEIR Air Quality Mitigation Measure M-AQ-6: Construction Emissions Minimization Plan for Criteria Air Pollutants* will likely be required.

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

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

in toxic air contaminants that may affect both on-site and off-site sensitive receptors. Detailed information related to any proposed stationary sources must be provided with the EEA.

- **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.⁴ The project sponsor is 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.
- **Shadow Study.** The proposed project would result in construction of a building greater than 40 feet in height. Planning Code Section 295 requires that a shadow fan analysis be performed to determine whether a project has the potential to cast shadow on properties under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Recreation and Park Commission. Planning Department staff prepared a preliminary shadow fan analysis that indicates the project would not cast new shadow on properties on recreational resources.
- **Biological Resources.** The proposed project would demolish a vacant surface parking lot, therefore measures such as those described in *Western SoMa FEIR Air Quality Mitigation Measure M-BI-1a: Pre-Construction Special-Status Bird Surveys and Mitigation Measure M-BI-1b: Pre-Construction Special-Status Bat Surveys* would not likely apply to this project.
- **Geology and Soils.** Seismic Hazard Zones (SHZ) are areas where, due to potentially weak soil and rock, the land is susceptible to liquefaction and earthquake-induced landslides, as identified by the San Francisco General Plan Community Safety Element. The Planning Department requires a geotechnical study for projects located in SHZs that would involve excavation of 50 cubic yards or more and/or floor area expansion greater than 1,000 square feet (sq. ft.) outside of the existing building footprint. The project site is located in a liquefaction SHZ and, in order to accommodate the proposed underground parking garage, would include more than 50 cubic yards of excavation; therefore, a geotechnical report is required for the project. The geotechnical report must be prepared by a qualified geotechnical consultant and should identify and analyze potential risks of implementing the project due to geological and geotechnical factors, and provide recommendations for appropriate geotechnical measures and structural design features. The geotechnical report would also assist the Planning Department's archeological review of the proposed project (see Archeological Resources section).

⁴ Refer to <http://sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1886> for latest "Greenhouse Gas Compliance Checklist for Private Development Projects."

- **Hazardous Materials.** The proposed project would result in ground disturbance of greater than 50 cubic yards in order to construct a one-level, below-grade parking garage on a project site located in the Maher Zone. 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.

The DPH requires that projects subject to the Maher Ordinance complete a Maher Application, available at: <http://www.sfdph.org/dph/EH/HazWaste/hazWasteSiteMitigation.asp>. Fees for DPH review and oversight of projects subject to the ordinance would apply. Please refer to DPH's fee schedule, available at: <http://www.sfdph.org/dph/EH/Fees.asp#haz>. Please provide a copy of the submitted Maher Application and Phase I ESA with the EEA.

- **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.
- **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.
- **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 any of the additional analyses determine that mitigation measures not identified in the area plan EIR are required to address peculiar impacts, the environmental document will be a focused initial study/mitigated negative declaration with a supporting CPE checklist. If the additional analyses identify impacts that cannot be mitigated, the environmental document will be a focused EIR with a supporting CPE checklist. A community plan exemption and a focused initial study/mitigated negative declaration can be prepared by Planning Department staff, but focused EIR with supporting CPE checklist would need to be prepared by a consultant on the Planning Department's environmental consultant pool list (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*.

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** is required for the project because the property is located in an Eastern Neighborhoods Mixed Use District and the proposed development exceeds 25,000 gross square feet. Large Project Authorization applications are available in the Planning Department lobby at 1650 Mission Street Suite 400, at the Planning Information Center at 1660 Mission Street, and online at www.sfplanning.org.
2. **Building Permit Applications** are required for the construction of each of the two proposed buildings on the subject property. Building permit applications are available at the Department of Building Inspection 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. Please note the following notices are separate than those required for environmental review.

1. **Pre-Application.** The proposed project requires 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.

2. **Neighborhood Notification.** The proposed project also requires that owners and occupants within 150 feet of the project site be notified prior to approval of a development application in accordance with Planning Code Section 312. However, this requirement can be combined into a single notification that includes the Large Project Authorization.

PRELIMINARY PROJECT COMMENTS:

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

1. **Western SoMa Area Plan.** The subject property falls within the area covered by the Western SoMa Area Plan in the General Plan. As proposed, the project is generally consistent with the overarching objectives of the Plan, though the project and 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.sfplanning.org/ftp/general_plan/Western_SoMa_Area_Plan.pdf.
2. **Interdepartmental Project Review.** An Interdepartmental Project Review is mandatory for this project because it includes new construction on a parcel that is identified by the State of California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology as Seismic Hazard Zone in the City and County of San Francisco. The Planning Department acts as the lead agency in collaboration with the Department of Building Inspection; the Department of Public Works; and the San Francisco Fire Department (SFFD). Staff from each of these disciplines will attend your meeting.
3. **Rear Yard.** Section 134 requires the project to provide a rear yard of at least 25 percent of the lot depth, or 20'. The project proposes a 17' rear yard for a portion of the building that has a 3' front setback and a 20' rear yard for a portion of the building that does not provide a front setback. Code Section 823(c)(1)(A) allows the rear yard to be reduced by the distance of any provided front setback, therefore the project is consistent with this requirement.
4. **Open Space – Residential.** Section 135 requires 80 square feet of open space (private or common) for each dwelling unit. Additionally, any such open spaces must meet the dimensional requirements of Subsections (f) and (g). When submitting your development application, please provide scaled plans that clearly identify the location of the 4,018 sq. ft. of usable open space currently proposed in your application.
5. **Permitted Obstructions.** When submitting your development application, please provide scaled plans to determine if the proposed bay windows that extend beyond the property lines along Minna and Natoma Streets comply with the dimensional requirements of Section 136(c)(2).

6. **Street Trees.** The subject property has a combined frontage of 146'-10" that requires a total of seven street trees; one along Natoma Street and six along Minna Street that are spaced approximately 20' apart. Please include these trees in your development application plans.
7. **Ground Floor Frontages.** Please submit revised plans with your entitlement application that accurately illustrates the building elevation along Natoma Street consistent with the revised scheme for 43 dwelling units with 22 parking spaces that was submitted subsequent to the original PPA application to determine if the project's ground floor frontages are compliant with Section 145.1.
8. **Bicycle Parking.** Planning Code Section 155.5 requires the proposed project to provide at least 43 Class 1 and two Class 2 bicycle parking spaces. Please ensure these spaces are identified in your development application.
9. **Parking and Housing Costs Separation.** Please be advised that all off-street parking spaces accessory to residential uses in new structures of ten dwelling units or more 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. 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 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.
10. **Inclusionary Housing.** 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, (available at <http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=8422>)' 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. Affordable units designated as on-site units shall be sold as ownership units and will remain as ownership units for the life of the project. The minimum Affordable Housing Percentages are 20% fee, 12% on-site, or 20% off-site. Therefore, as proposed, the project would have a minimum requirement of five units if provided on-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:

- a. direct financial construction from a public entity

- b. 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. **Eastern Neighborhoods Impact Fees.** As fully described under PC Section 423, the Eastern Neighborhoods Impact Fee is dedicated to infrastructure improvements in the plan area, directing benefits of the fund clearly to those who pay into the fund by providing necessary infrastructure improvements and housing needed to serve new development. The subject lot is within Tier 1 of the plan area, and the project will be required to pay \$9.71 for each gross square foot of residential development. Any replacement or change of use shall also be calculated pursuant to Table 423.3A. Be advised the fees per gross square foot indicated above are current as of the date of this letter, and are indexed each January 1st.

The Eastern Neighborhoods Impact Fee is due and payable to the Development Fee Collection Unit at the Department of Building Inspection prior to issuance of the first construction document, with an option for the project sponsor to defer payment prior to issuance of the first certificate of occupancy pursuant to Section 107A.13.3.1 of the San Francisco Building Code.

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, subject to the rules and requirements under Section 423.3(d).

12. **First Source Hiring Agreement.** Chapter 83 of the San Francisco Administrative Code, passed in 1998, established the First Source Hiring Program to identify available entry-level jobs in San Francisco and match them with unemployed and underemployed job seekers. The intent is to provide a resource for local employers seeking qualified, job-ready applicants for vacant positions while helping economically disadvantaged residents who have successfully completed training programs and job-readiness classes.

The ordinance applies to (1) any permit application for commercial development exceeding 25,000 square feet in floor area involving new construction, an addition or a substantial alteration which results in the addition of entry level positions for a commercial activity; or (2) any application which requires discretionary action by the Planning Commission relating to a commercial activity over 25,000 square feet, but not limited to conditional use; or (3) any permit application for a residential development of ten units or more involving new construction, an addition, a conversion, or substantial rehabilitation.

The project proposes more than ten dwelling units and therefore is subject to the requirement. For further information, or to receive a sample First Source Hiring Agreement, please see the contact information below:

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

13. **Stormwater.** Projects that disturb 5,000 square feet or more of the ground surface must comply with the Stormwater Design Guidelines and submit a Stormwater Control Plan to the SFPUC for review. To view the Guidelines and download instructions for preparing a Stormwater Control Plan, go to <http://stormwater.sfwater.org/>. Applicants may contact stormwaterreview@sfwater.org for assistance.
14. **Recycled Water.** Projects located in San Francisco's designated recycled water use areas are required to install recycled water systems for irrigation, cooling, and/or toilet and urinal flushing in accordance with the Recycled (or Reclaimed) Water Use Ordinance, adopted as Article 22 of the San Francisco Public Works Code. New construction or major alterations with a total cumulative area of 40,000 square feet or more; any new, modified, or existing irrigated areas of 10,000 square feet or more; and all subdivisions are required to comply. To determine if the proposed project is in a designated recycled water use area, and for more information about the recycled water requirements, please visit sfwater.org/index.aspx?page=687.

PRELIMINARY DESIGN COMMENTS:

The project is located in the Western SoMa Special Use District. The area is mixed in height and use with residential, industrial and commercial buildings that range between one and eight stories. The character of the area is also mixed with a predominance of masonry structures although bays are common. 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 project as shown.
2. **Street Frontage.** The Planning Department recommends relocating the manager's office and potentially the bike workshop so that another residential unit with a stoop could be added along the street frontage.

The Planning Department recommends reducing or eliminating the proposed parking. This would also allow a residential unit to be placed at the street level on Natoma.

3. **Architecture.** The Planning Department supports the architectural intent as presently shown and encourages more refinement in detailing at residential entries to make them more gracious and defined as a place to be rather than just a place to enter. The Planning Department's Residential Ground Floor Design Guidelines might be a helpful tool as it has numerous examples.

The Planning Department encourages the use of high quality materials and detailing in the facades including significant depth at the fenestration to provide character and visual interest to pedestrians.

PRELIMINARY PROJECT ASSESSMENT EXPIRATION:

This Preliminary Project Assessment is valid for a period of **18 months**. An Environmental Evaluation or Building Permit Application, as listed above, must be submitted no later than **December 3, 2016**. Otherwise, this determination is considered expired and a new Preliminary Project Assessment is required. Such applications and plans must be generally consistent with those found in this Preliminary Project Assessment.

Enclosures: Neighborhood Group Mailing List
Interdepartmental Project Review Application
Flood Notification: Planning Bulletin
SFPUC Recycled Water Information Sheet

cc: Alta Investors, Property Owner
Doug Vu, Current Planning
Jenny Delumo, Environmental Planning
Maia Small, Design Review
Jerry Robbins, MTA
Jerry Sanguinetti, DPW
Jerry Sanguinetti, DPW
Planning Department Webmaster (webmaster.planning@sfgov.org)

FIRST	LAST	TITLE	ORGANIZATION	ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP	TELEPHONE	EMAIL	NEIGHBORHOOD OF INTEREST
Angelica	Cabande	Organizational Director	South of Market Community Action Network (SOMCAN)	1110 Howard Street	San Francisco	CA	94103		0 acabande@somcan.org	South of Market
Antonio	Diaz	Project Director	People Organizing to Demand Environmental and Economic Rights (PODER)	474 Valencia Street #125	San Francisco	CA	94103	415-431-4210	podersf.org	Excelsior, Mission, South of Market
Carolyn	Diamond	Executive Director	Market Street Association	870 Market Street, Suite 456	San Francisco	CA	94102	415-362-2500	msadv@pacbell.net	South of Market
Corinne	Woods		Mission Creek Harbor Association	300 Channel Street, Box 10	San Francisco	CA	94158	415-902-7635	corinnewoods@cs.com	Potrero Hill, South of Market
Alexandra	Goldman	Community Planner	Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation - CO Department	215 Taylor Street	San Francisco	CA	94102	415-358-3920	agoldman@tndc.org	Downtown/Civic Center, South of Market
Eric	Lopez	President	SoMaBend Neighborhood Association	P.O. Box 410805	San Francisco	CA		94141 415-669-0916	somabend.na@gmail.com	Downtown/Civic Center, Mission, South of Market
Ethan	Hough	Secretary	One Ecker Owners Association	16 Jessie Street Unit 301	San Francisco	CA	94105	415-847-3169	ethanhough@gmail.com	Financial District, South of Market
Gerald	Wolf	President	Hallam Street Homeowners Association	1 Brush Place	San Francisco	CA	94103	415-626-6650	wolfgk@earthlink.net	South of Market
Ian	Lewis		0 HERE Local 2	209 Golden Gate Avenue	San Francisco	CA	94102		0	0 Chinatown, Downtown/Civic Center, Marina, Mission, Nob Hill, North Beach, Pacific Heights, Presidio, South of Market
Jane	Kim	Supervisor, District 6	Board of Supervisors	1 Dr. Carlton B Goodlett Place, Room #244	San Francisco	CA	94102-4689	415-554-7970	jane.kim@sfgov.org; April.veneracion@sfgov.org; Sunny.Angulo@sfgov.org; lvy.lee@sfgov.org jc@jcarpinelli.com	Downtown/Civic Center, North Beach, South of Market, Treasure Island/YBI
Janet	Carpinelli	Board President	Dogpatch Neighborhood Association	934 Minnesota Street	San Francisco	CA	94107	415-282-5516		Potrero Hill, South of Market
Jason	Henderson	Vice Chariman	Market/Octavia Community Advisory Comm.	300 Buchanan Street, Apt. 503	San Francisco	CA	94102	415-722-0617	jhenders@sbcglobal.net	Castro/Upper Market, Downtown/Civic Center, Mission, South of Market, Western Addition
Jim	Meko	Chair	SOMA Leadership Council	366 Tenth Street	San Francisco	CA	94103	415-552-2401	jim.meko@comcast.net	Mission, South of Market
Katy	Liddell	President	South Beach/Rincon/ Mission Bay Neighborhood Association	403 Main Street #813	San Francisco	CA	94105	415-412-2207	cliddell@me.com	South of Market
Kaye	Griffin	Director	LMNOP Neighbors	1047 Minna Street	San Francisco	CA	94103	415-724-1953	LMNOP@yak.net	South of Market
Keith	Goldstein		0 Potrero-Dogpatch Merchants Association	800 Kansas Street	San Francisco	CA	94107		0 keith@everestsf.com	Mission, Potrero Hill, South of Market
Ken	Baxter	Director	Citizens for Change	355 11th Street, Suite 200	San Francisco	CA	94103	415-652-9330	kbaxter26@gmail.com	Downtown/Civic Center, Financial District, Marina, Nob Hill, Pacific Heights, Presidio Heights, Russian Hill, Seacliff, South of Market
Laura	Magnani		0 American Friends Service Committee	65 Ninth Street	San Francisco	CA	94103	415-565-0201	sffice@afsc.org	South of Market
Marvis	Phillips	Land Use Chair	Alliance for a Better District 6	230 Eddy Street #1206	San Francisco	CA	94102-6526	415-674-1935	marvisphillips@gmail.com	Downtown/Civic Center, Mission, South of Market, Western Addition
Patsy	Tito	Executive Director	Samoan Development Centre	2055 Sunnydale Avenue #100	San Francisco	CA	94134-2611		0	0 Bayview, South of Market
Reed	Bement	President	Rincon Hill Residents Association	75 Folsom Street #1800	San Francisco	CA	94105	415-882-7871	rbement@sbcglobal.net	South of Market
Rodney	Minott	Chair	Potrero Hill Neighbors/Save the Hill	1206 Mariposa Street	San Francisco	CA	94107	415-553-5969	rodminott@hotmail.com	Potrero Hill, South of Market
Sonja	Kos	Community Advocate	TODCO Impact Group	230 Fourth Street	San Francisco	CA	94103	415-426-6819	sonja@todco.org	South of Market
Ted	Olsson	Chair	TJPA CAC	30 Sharon Street	San Francisco	CA	94114-1709	415-407-0094	olssonted@yahoo.com	Financial District, South of Market
Tiffany	Bohee	Executive Director	Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, City and County of San Francisco	1 South Van Ness Avenue, 5th Floor	San Francisco	CA	94103		0 tiffany.bohee@sfgov.org; mike.grisso@sfgov.org; courtney.pash@sfgov.org	Bayview, Downtown /Civic Center, South of Market, Visitation Valley
Tony	Kelly	President	Potrero Boosters Neighborhood Association	1459 - 18th Street, Suite 133	San Francisco	CA	94107	415-861-0345		0 Mission, Potrero Hill, South of Market
York	Loo		0 York Realty	243A Shipley Street	San Francisco	CA	94107-1010	415-751-8602	yorkloo@gmail.com	South of Market