



# SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

**MEMO**

**DATE:** July 12, 2015  
**TO:** Jim Kelly  
**FROM:** Joy Navarrete, Planning Department  
**RE:** PPA Case No. 2015-002604PPA for 667 Folsom and 120-126 Hawthorne

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

Reception:  
**415.558.6378**

Fax:  
**415.558.6409**

Planning  
Information:  
**415.558.6377**

Please find the attached Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) for the address listed above. You may contact the staff contact, Chris Thomas, at (415) 575-9036 or [christopher.thomas@sfgov.org](mailto:christopher.thomas@sfgov.org), to answer any questions you may have, or to schedule a follow-up meeting.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Joy Navarrete", written over a horizontal line.

Joy Navarrete, Senior Planner



# SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

---

## Preliminary Project Assessment

*Date:* July 10, 2015  
*Case No.:* **2015-002604PPA**  
*Project Address:* 667 Folsom Street & 120-126 Hawthorne Street  
*Block/Lot:* 3750/078, 081 and 082  
*Zoning:* Mixed Use-Residential (MUR)  
130-G Height and Bulk District  
*Area Plan:* Eastern SoMa Community Plan  
(Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan)  
Draft Central SoMa Plan  
*Project Sponsor:* Jim Kelly – EQR SOMA II LP  
415-767-7188  
*Staff Contact:* Chris Thomas – 415-575-9036  
[christopher.thomas@sfgov.org](mailto:christopher.thomas@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 proposed project site encompasses three lots near the corner of Folsom and Hawthorne Streets totaling 19,589 sf. 667 Folsom Street and 126 Hawthorne Street are currently occupied by one two-story building each (the former an office rebuilt in 1951 and the latter a printing plant built in 1963); the 9,281-sf middle lot (120 Hawthorne Street) is occupied by a 26-space parking lot. The proposed project would include (1) merging the three lots, (2) demolition of the two existing buildings, and (3) construction of a 130-foot-tall, 13-story mixed use building, with a total area of 199,910 gsf containing 250 dwelling units and 11,179-sf of ground-floor commercial retail space. (The PPA Application Item 3 Project Description states the proposed project includes 250 units while the Project Summary Table states 240 units. Please resolve this discrepancy at the time of submittal of an Environmental Evaluation Application or EEA.)

The proposed building would require approximately five feet of below-grade excavation totaling about 3,600 cubic yards. The dwelling units would consist of 60 micro, 48 studio, 36 one-bedroom, 72 two-bedroom and 24 three-bedroom units. No vehicular parking and 136 first class and 17 second class bicycle spaces are proposed.

#### PLANNING CONTEXT:

The proposed project is located within the Eastern SoMa Community Plan area, within the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan, which was evaluated in the *Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans Programmatic Final Environmental Impact Report (Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR)*, certified in 2008.<sup>1</sup> The project site also lies within the proposed Central SoMa Plan area, a community planning process initiated in 2011 under what was formerly called the “Central Corridor Plan.” The Central Corridor (now the Central SoMa) Draft Plan for Public Review<sup>2</sup> (Draft Plan) was released in April 2013, with proposed changes to the allowed land uses and building heights, and a strategy for improving the public realm within the Draft Plan area and vicinity. The Central SoMa Draft Plan is available for download at <http://centralsoma.sfplanning.org>. The Central SoMa Plan will be evaluated in an Environmental Impact Report (EIR), which is currently underway. The Central SoMa Plan, its proposed rezoning and EIR are anticipated to be before decision-makers for approval in mid-2016.

The existing zoning for the project site is MUR (Mixed Use Residential), which allows residential uses as proposed under the project. The zoning for the project proposed by the Central SoMa Plan is Mixed Use Office or MUO, which also allows residential uses as proposed under the project. The Central SoMa Plan EIR will evaluate both the Mid-Rise Height Alternative and a modified High-Rise Height Alternative that are proposed by the Draft Plan. The proposed height limit for the project site of 130 feet is the same for both alternatives. At this point, it is unknown which alternative, if any, would ultimately be approved by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors. Further comments in this Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) are based on the Draft Plan concepts published to date, which are contingent on the approval of the proposed Central SoMa Plan rezoning by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors.

#### ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:

The proposed project requires environmental review either individually, with a project-specific Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration or Environmental Impact Report (EIR), or in a Community Plan Exemption (CPE) if the project is consistent with an adopted community plan. Section 15183 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines states that projects that are consistent with the

---

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

<sup>2</sup> The Central SoMa Plan was formerly called the Central Corridor Plan. To avoid ambiguity, this letter uses the current “Central SoMa Plan” when referring to the ongoing planning process, while “Draft Plan” refers to the document published in April 2013 under the name “Central Corridor Plan Draft for Public Review.”

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 noted above, the proposed project is located within the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan, which was evaluated in the *Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR*. As the proposed project is consistent with the development density identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan, it is eligible for a community plan exemption (CPE).

The proposed project would be consistent with the MUO zoning designation and the two height limit alternatives currently being studied in the Central SoMa Plan EIR. Thus, it is possible that the proposal, as currently presented, would qualify for a CPE under the proposed Central SoMa Plan EIR once that EIR is certified and the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors have adopted new zoning controls. Note that the proposed project's height would be evaluated based on the height limits for the project site in place at the time that the Planning Department entitlements for the proposed project are sought.

Due to the project's location within the geographic area evaluated in the *Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR*, any development on the project site would be subject to mitigation measures identified in that document if they are determined to be applicable. Potentially significant project environmental impacts, pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings identified in the *Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR* that may be applicable to the proposed project are discussed below under the applicable environmental topic. Note, however, that mitigation measures from the *Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR* that are applicable to the proposed project area could be refined, augmented, or superseded under the future Central SoMa Plan EIR, which would become applicable to the proposed project if the Draft Plan is approved.

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 *Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR*, 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 *Eastern Neighborhoods 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 \$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 *Eastern Neighborhoods 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 *Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR*, with all pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the *Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR* 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 *Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR*, with all pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the *Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR* 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). An EIR must be prepared by an environmental consultant from the Planning Department's environmental consultant pool ([http://www.sfplanning.org/ftp/files/MEA/Environmental\\_consultant\\_pool.pdf](http://www.sfplanning.org/ftp/files/MEA/Environmental_consultant_pool.pdf)). The Planning Department will provide more detail to the project sponsor regarding the EIR process should this level of environmental review be required.

The proposed project would be precluded from qualifying for a CPE under the adopted Central SoMa Plan if it is not consistent with the height and density identified for the project site under the Plan. The proposed project would be analyzed in a separate environmental document that would not rely on the environmental analysis undertaken for the Central SoMa Plan. In this case, the applicable fees would be (a) the standard environmental evaluation (EE) fee based on the cost of construction; and (b) the standard EIR fee, if an EIR is required.

In order to begin formal environmental review, please submit an **Environmental Evaluation Application (EEA)**. The EEA can be submitted at the same time as the PPA Application. 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.** EEAs 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](http://www.sfplanning.org) under the "Publications" tab. See "Environmental Applications" on page 2 of the current Fee Schedule for a calculation of environmental application fees.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> San Francisco Planning Department. *Schedule for Application Fees*. Available online at:

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 3, 2015.

- **Aesthetics.** The proposed project would likely qualify as a “Transit-Oriented Infill Project” pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21099(d), which eliminates the need to evaluate aesthetics as a potential physical environmental impact of the proposed project. Therefore, preparation of photo simulations for purposes of aesthetic analysis as part of the CEQA review would not be required. However, depending upon the degree of visual change anticipated as a result of the proposed project, the Planning Department may, for informational, project description purposes, recommend photo simulations of the proposed project in the context of its surroundings from nearby public viewpoints.
- **Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE).** The project site contains one building (120-126 Hawthorne Street) considered to be a potential historic resource (building constructed 45 or more years ago). 120-126 Hawthorne was not previously evaluated in the South of Market Historic Resources Survey. 667 Folsom Street was previously evaluated in the survey and determined not to be an eligible historic resource. No historic district was identified in the survey in this area. The proposed demolition of 120-126 Hawthorne Street 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 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](mailto:tina.tam@sfgov.org)) for a list of three consultants from which to choose. Please contact the HRE scoping team at [HRE@sfgov.org](mailto:HRE@sfgov.org) to arrange the HRE scoping. The historic resource consultant should submit the draft HRE report for review to Environmental Planning after the project sponsor has filed the EE Application and updated 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.** Project implementation would entail soil-disturbing activities associated with building construction, including excavation that would reach a depth of approximately five feet below grade. The *Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR* noted that California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR)-eligible archeological resources are expected to be present within existing sub-grade soils of the Plan Area and the proposed land use policies and controls within the Plan Area could adversely affect significant archeological resources.

The project site lies within the *Archeological Mitigation Zone J-2: Properties with No Previous Studies* of the Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans PEIR that would require for the proposed project either Preliminary Archeological Review (PAR) conducted in-house by the Planning Department archeologist or the preparation of a Preliminary Archeological Sensitivity Assessment

---

<http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=513>.

(PASS) prepared by a Department Qualified Archeological Consultant subject to the 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 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](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) Determine 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 CRHR;
  - 3) Determine if the 19<sup>th</sup> or 20<sup>th</sup> century soils-disturbing activities may have adversely affected the identified the potential archeological resources;
  - 4) Assess potential project effects in relation to the depth of any identified potential archeological resources;
  - 5) Conclusion: assessment of whether any CRHP-eligible archeological resources could be adversely affected by the proposed project and recommendation as to appropriate further action.
- **Transportation Study.** Based on the Planning Department's transportation impact analysis guidelines, the project would require additional transportation analysis to determine whether the project may result in a significant impact. Therefore, the Planning Department requires that a consultant listed on the Planning Department's Transportation Consultant Pool prepare a Transportation Study. You are required to pay special fees for the Study; please contact Vernaliza Byrd at 415-575-9025 to arrange payment. Once you pay the fees, please contact Andrea Contreras at 415-575-9044 or [andrea.contreras@sfgov.org](mailto:andrea.contreras@sfgov.org) so that she can provide you with a list of three consultants from the Transportation Pool, and direct the scope of the study. In order to assist the

Planning Department in evaluating potential transportation and circulation impacts of the proposed project, please show the following information on plans submitted with the EEA:

- Existing and proposed (if applicable) curb cuts and loading spaces with dimensions;
  - Sidewalk widths and streetscape elements (trees, shrubbery, furniture, hydrants, etc.);
  - Bicycle parking spaces and how they will be accessed (please consider moving bicycle spaces and storage areas closer to Folsom Street);
  - Trash rooms and how they will be accessed.
- **Hazardous Materials.** The proposed project would be built on a site that was previously zoned for industrial use and would also entail conversion of existing non-residential uses to a residential use. The project site is also identified on the City's Maher Map as an area with a potential for on-site contamination. 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 the Department of Public Health (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 ESA 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.

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 Environmental Evaluation Application (EEA).

- **Air Quality.** The 250 dwelling units proposed for the project exceeds the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's (BAAQMD) construction screening level for criteria air pollutants.<sup>4</sup> Therefore, an analysis of the project's criteria air pollutant emissions is likely to be required. Please provide detailed information related to construction equipment, phasing and duration of each phase, and the volume of excavation 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 proposed project will be required to adhere to the dust control

---

<sup>4</sup> Please see Table 3-1, BAAQMD, CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, May 2011, Chapter 3.



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. The proposed project would also be required to prepare a Construction Dust Control Plan for review and approval by the San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH).

The project site is not located within an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone, as mapped and defined by Health Code Article 38. The Air Pollutant Exposure Zone identifies areas with poor air quality based on an inventory and modeling assessment of air pollution, exposures, and health vulnerability from mobile, stationary, and area source emissions within San Francisco. Given that the project site is not within an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone, additional measures or analysis related to local health risks are not likely to be required. However, if the project would include new sources of toxic air contaminants including, but not limited to, emissions from diesel generators or boilers, or any other stationary sources, the project would result in toxic air contaminants that may affect both on-site and off-site sensitive receptors. Detailed information related to any proposed stationary sources 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.<sup>5</sup> 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.
- **Noise.** *Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Noise Mitigation Measure F-1: Construction Noise* addresses requirements related to the use of pile-driving. Foundation construction methods are not known at this time. If the project involves pile driving, Noise Mitigation Measure F-1 would 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.

---

<sup>5</sup> Refer to <http://sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1886> for latest "Greenhouse Gas Compliance Checklist for Private Development Projects."

*Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Noise Mitigation Measure F-2: Construction Noise* requires that the project sponsor develop a set of site-specific noise attenuation measures under the supervision of a qualified acoustical consultant when the environmental review of a development project determines that construction noise controls are necessary due to the nature of planned construction practices and sensitivity of proximate uses. This mitigation measure requires that a plan for such measures be submitted to DBI prior to commencing construction to ensure that maximum feasible noise attenuation will be achieved.

Based on the *Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR*, the project site is located in an area where traffic-related noise exceeds 60 dBA Ldn (a day-night averaged sound level). *Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Noise Mitigation Measure F-3: Interior Noise Levels* requires that the project sponsor conduct a detail analysis of noise reduction requirements for new development including noise-sensitive uses located along streets with noise levels above 60 dBA (Ldn), where such development is not already subject to the California Noise Insulation Standards in Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations. However, as the project would be subject to the Title 24 California Noise Insulation Standards, *Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Noise Mitigation Measure F-3* would not apply.

*Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Noise Mitigation Measure F-4: Siting of Noise-Sensitive Uses* is intended to reduce potential conflicts between existing noise-generating uses and new sensitive receptors. This measure would apply to the proposed project because the project's residential function is a noise-sensitive use. *Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Noise Mitigation Measure F-4* requires that a noise analysis be prepared for new development including a noise-sensitive use, prior to the first project approval action. The mitigation measure requires that such an analysis 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 maximum noise level readings taken at least every 15 minutes) 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.

*Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Noise Mitigation Measure F-5: 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.

Finally, *Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Noise Mitigation Measure F-6: Open Space in Noisy Environments* requires that open space required under the Planning Code be protected from existing ambient noise levels. This mitigation measure would apply to the proposed project as the plans submitted with the

PPA indicate the presence of open space for project residents in four locations. Implementation of this measure could involve, among other things, site design that uses the building itself and/or noise barriers to shield on-site common and private open space from the greatest noise sources. Design solutions to protect open spaces from ambient noise should be undertaken consistent with principles of urban design.

- **Shadow Study.** 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 proposed project would not cast shadows on properties under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Recreation and Park Commission, but could cast shadows on the Children's Playground at Yerba Buena Gardens, in addition to several privately-owned public open spaces (POPOS). The project therefore requires a shadow study, and the sponsor is required to hire a qualified consultant to prepare a detailed shadow study. The consultant would be required to submit a Shadow Study Application, which can be found on the Planning Department's website:

<http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=539>

A separate fee is required. The consultant would be required to prepare a proposed scope of work for review and approval by the Environmental Planning case manager prior to preparing the analysis.

- **Geology and Soils.** The project site is located within a Liquefaction Hazard Zone likely underlain by artificial fill. Any new construction on the site is therefore subject to a mandatory Interdepartmental Project Review.<sup>6</sup> A geotechnical study prepared by a qualified consultant must be submitted with the EEA. The study should address whether the site is subject to liquefaction, and should provide recommendations for any geotechnical concerns identified in the study. In general, compliance with the building codes would avoid the potential for significant impacts related to structural damage, ground subsidence, liquefaction, landslides, and surface settlement. To assist Planning Department staff in determining whether the project would result in environmental impacts related to geological hazards, it is recommended that you provide a copy of the geotechnical information with boring logs for the proposed project. This study will also help inform the Planning Department Archeologist of the project site's subsurface geological conditions.
- **Wind Study.** The proposed project would involve construction of a building over 80 feet in height. The project therefore would require an initial review by a wind consultant, including a recommendation as to whether a wind tunnel analysis is needed. The consultant would be required

---

<sup>6</sup> San Francisco Planning Department. *Interdepartmental Project Review*. Available online at:

<http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=522>.

to prepare a proposed scope of work for review and approval by the Environmental Planning case manager prior to preparing the analysis.

- **Stormwater.** Because the proposed project would result in a ground surface disturbance of 5,000 square feet or more, it is subject to San Francisco's stormwater management requirements as outlined in the Stormwater Management Ordinance and the corresponding SFPUC Stormwater Design Guidelines (Guidelines). Projects that trigger the stormwater management requirements must prepare a Stormwater Control Plan demonstrating project adherence to the performance measures outlined in the Guidelines, including: (a) reduction in total volume and peak flow rate of stormwater for areas served by combined sewer systems OR (b) stormwater treatment for areas served by separate sewer systems. Responsibility for review and approval of the Stormwater Control Plan is with the SFPUC, Wastewater Enterprise, Urban Watershed Management Program. Without SFPUC approval of a Stormwater Control Plan, no site or building permits can be issued. The Guidelines also require a signed maintenance agreement to ensure proper care of the necessary stormwater controls. The project's environmental evaluation should generally assess how and where the implementation of necessary stormwater controls would reduce the potential negative impacts of stormwater runoff. To view the Stormwater Management Ordinance or the Stormwater Design Guidelines, or to download instructions for the Stormwater Control Plan, go to <http://sfwater.org/sdg>.
- **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 an canopy drip line. Please submit a *Tree Planting and Protection Checklist* with the Environmental Evaluation Application 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 Environmental Evaluation Application.
- **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 a focused EIR with supporting CPE checklist would need to be prepared by a consultant on the Planning Department's environmental consultant pool ([http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/MEA/Environmental\\_consultant\\_pool.pdf](http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/MEA/Environmental_consultant_pool.pdf)).

#### 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.

Note that the subject parcel is within the Central SoMa Plan area. The Central Corridor Draft Plan for Public Review was published in April 2013. The Central SoMa Plan process is anticipated to be completed in mid-2016. The proposals in the Draft Plan are subject to change and are contingent on the eventual approval by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors.

1. **Large Project Authorization** from the Planning Commission is required per Planning Code Section 329 for the new construction of a building greater than 75 feet in height and greater than 25,000 gross square feet. In addition, you may request modification from strict compliance with certain Planning Code requirements through the Large Project Authorization process (see discussion under "Preliminary Project Comments" below).
2. **Building Permit Applications** are required for the demolition of the existing buildings on the subject property, and for the proposed new construction on the subject property.

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](http://www.sfplanning.org). Building Permit applications are available at the Department of Building Inspections at 1660 Mission Street.

#### NEIGHBORHOOD NOTIFICATIONS AND PUBLIC OUTREACH:

Project Sponsors are encouraged to conduct public outreach with the surrounding community and neighborhood groups early in the development process. Additionally, many approvals require a public hearing with an associated neighborhood notification. Differing levels of neighborhood notification are mandatory for some or all of the reviews and approvals listed above.

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

#### PRELIMINARY PROJECT COMMENTS:

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

1. **East South of Market (SoMa) Area Plan.** The subject property falls within the area covered by the East 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/East\\_SoMa.htm](http://www.sfplanning.org/ftp/general_plan/East_SoMa.htm).
2. **Central SoMa Plan.** The subject property falls within the ongoing Central SoMa Plan study area generally bounded by 2nd, 6th, Townsend and Market Streets. The Central SoMa Draft Plan was published in April 2013 (at the time it was called the "Central Corridor Plan"). The Draft Plan is being evaluated in an Environmental Impact Report (EIR). The Draft Plan proposes changes to the allowed land uses and building heights, and includes a strategy for improving the public realm in this area. The EIR, the Plan, and the proposed rezoning and affiliated Code changes are anticipated to be before decision-makers for approval in 2016.

The Central SoMa Draft Plan includes recommendations for new land use controls as well as new height and bulk controls for the subject property. The Draft Plan is available for download at <http://centralsoma.sfplanning.org>. Further comments in this section of the PPA are based on the Draft Plan.

3. **Land Use and Zoning.** The subject property is currently within the Mixed-Use Residential (MUR) zoning district, and is proposed by the Central SoMa Draft Plan to be in the Mixed-Use Office (MUO) zoning district. Both zoning districts support residential development over ground-floor commercial uses. The project sponsor is encouraged to further explore inclusion of a variety of uses for these ground floor spaces that will serve future residents and larger neighborhood.
4. **Eco-District.** An Eco-district is a neighborhood or district where residents, community institutions, property owners, developers, and businesses join together with city leaders and utility providers to meet sustainability goals beneficial to the stakeholders, the district, and the City by formulating a portfolio of innovative projects at a district or block-level. The Planning Department has identified the Central SoMa Plan area as a Type 2 Eco-District—an area composed of many smaller parcels and property owners. Benefits to the district include greater resilience, economic prosperity, higher quality built environment, and community cohesion and capacity. The volunteer Central SoMa Task Force produced a set of Recommendations in November of 2013 (<http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=3051>). All major new development in the Central SoMa Plan Area will be expected to participate in some capacity in the Eco-District program and the Sustainability Management Association set up to guide it once the program is formulated in parallel with the Area Plan process. For more information please see: <http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=3051>.
5. **Vision Zero Program.** 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. If the project is required to submit a streetscape plan per Section 138.1 of the Planning Code, planners should refer the project to the Department's Streetscape Design Advisory Team for consideration of additional pedestrian safety streetscape measures.
6. **Interdepartmental Project Review.** This review is required for all proposed new construction in seismic hazard zones, in which the subject property falls. An application is enclosed.
7. **Height.** The subject property is within a 130 foot height district, which is also the height recommended by the draft Central SoMa Plan. The proposed project conforms to these height districts. During review of future submittals, staff will verify that all parapets, mechanical equipment, and other rooftop features comply with the allowances for additional height specified in Section 260(b).
8. **Bulk.** The subject property is located within the 130-G Height and Bulk District. Within this District, at all points of the proposed project above 80 feet in height, the building is limited to a maximum horizontal length dimension of 170 feet, and a maximum diagonal dimension of 200 feet. The upper portions of the project appear to comply with the maximum horizontal dimension, but exceed the maximum diagonal by approximately 20.5 feet. The project should either be redesigned to comply

with the bulk limitations, or should seek and justify a modification of the bulk requirements through the Large Project Authorization process.

9. **Rear Yard.** Section 134 requires the project to provide a rear yard of at least 25 percent of the lot depth. Because this project is located on a corner site, one of the street frontages (Folsom or Hawthorne Street) would be designated as the front of the property, and a code-complying rear yard would then be provided based on that determination. The program of dispersed open spaces to substitute for a code-complying rear yard is not permitted in Eastern Neighborhood Mixed Use Districts, except as an approved modification through the Large Project Authorization process. While such configurations can be supported, a minimum of 25 percent of the lot area is preferred. Future submittals should include lot coverage calculations.
10. **Open Space – Residential.** Section 135 requires 80 square feet of open space (private or common) for each dwelling unit, or 54 square feet of open space for each dwelling unit if the open space is publicly-accessible. Additionally, any such open spaces must meet the dimensional requirements of Subsections (f) and (g). With 240 dwelling units, the project would need to provide 19,200 square feet of private and/or common open space. From the submitted plans, it is unclear how many of the units would have private balconies that meet the specified standards. Staff would review future submittals to ensure compliance with the quantitative and qualitative standards of Section 135.
11. **Open Space – Non-Residential.** Section 135.3 requires this project to provide one foot of open space for every 250 occupied square feet of retail (and similar) uses. The proposal includes 11,179 square feet of commercial space. Therefore, up to 45 square feet of open space would be required. Alternatively, per Section 426, an in-lieu fee may be paid instead of providing the open space on site.
12. **Exposure.** Section 140 requires that each dwelling unit have at least one room that meets the 120-square-foot minimum superficial floor area requirement of Section 503 of the Housing Code face directly on a street right-of-way, code-complying rear yard, or an appropriately sized courtyard. The project does not include a code-complying rear yard, and the proposed courtyards are not large enough to meet the exposure requirement for those units that only have windows fronting on these areas. Therefore, the vast majority of dwelling units do not comply with the exposure requirements. You may request and seek to justify a modification of the exposure requirements through the Large Project Authorization process, however, the Department strongly encourages the project to minimize the number of units needing an exposure modification.
13. **Shadows on Public Open Spaces (non-Recreation and Park Commission Properties).** Section 147 seeks to reduce substantial shadow impacts on public plazas and other publicly accessible open spaces other than those protected under Section 295. Potential shadow from the subject property was modeled based on the roof height of the proposed project, plus an additional 20' allowance for rooftop mechanical equipment. This analysis indicates that the project could potentially cast shadow on the Yerba Buena Gardens Childrens' Playground, as well as several privately-owned public open spaces (POPOS) in the vicinity.



Consistent with the dictates of good design and without unduly restricting development potential, buildings taller than 50 feet should be shaped to reduce substantial shadow impacts on open spaces subject to Section 147. In determining whether a shadow is substantial, the following factors shall be taken into account: the area shaded, the shadow's duration, and the importance of sunlight to the area in question. The project would be required to demonstrate how the buildings have been designed to reduce substantial shadow impacts on open spaces subject to Section 147.

14. **Shadows Recreation and Park Commission Properties.** Section 295 requires that a shadow analysis must be performed to determine whether the project has the potential to cast shadow on properties under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Recreation and Park Commission. Department staff has prepared a shadow fan that indicates the project would not cast new shadows on any properties subject to Section 295. However, the project may cast shadow on several other publicly-accessible open spaces regulated by Section 147, and subject to review under the California Environmental Quality Act (see discussions above).
15. **Off-Street Loading.** Per Section 152.1, two off-street loading spaces would be required to serve the retail and residential uses in the project. One of the loading spaces must have a minimum width of 12 feet, a minimum length of 35 feet, and a minimum vertical clearance of 14 feet. The other loading space must have a minimum width of 10 feet, a minimum length of 25 feet, and a minimum vertical clearance of 12 feet. No new off-street loading spaces are proposed. The project must either be redesigned to provide a compliant loading space, or will require a modification of these requirements through the Large Project Authorization process.
16. **Bicycle Parking.** Per Section 155.2, 135 Class 1 bicycle parking spaces and 12 Class 2 bicycle parking spaces would need to be provided to serve the residential uses in the project. In addition, one Class 1 bicycle parking space and four Class 2 bicycle parking spaces would need to be provided to serve the retail uses in the project. Class 1 bicycle parking spaces should meet the locational and access criteria in Section 155.1, and should be located to be conveniently accessible to the public right-of-way, with minimal use of elevators and doors by bicyclists. The Class 2 spaces could be accommodated within the sidewalk fronting the project, with the specific locations identified as streetscape plans are developed for the project at building permit stage.
17. **Street Trees.** Section 138.1 requires one street tree for every 20 feet of frontage for new construction. No street trees are shown on the plans.
18. **Standards for Bird Safe Buildings.** Section 139 outlines bird-safe standards for new construction to reduce bird-strike mortality from circumstances that are known to pose a high risk to birds and are considered to be "bird hazards." Bird hazards include "feature-related hazards" such as free-standing glass walls, wind barriers, or balconies. Feature-related hazards must have broken glazed segments 24 square feet or smaller in size. Please review the standards and indicate the method of window treatments to comply with the requirements where applicable.
19. **Affordable Housing Requirements.** Per Section 415 et seq, all projects with 10 or more units must participate in the Inclusionary Housing Program. The project sponsor is encouraged to read through

the documents governing and explaining the Inclusionary Housing Program requirements: <http://sf-moh.org/index.aspx?page=295>.

20. **Impact Fees.** This project is subject to the applicable fees outlined in Article 4 of the Planning Code:

- a. **Eastern Neighborhoods Infrastructure Impact Fees – Tier 1.** The Eastern Neighborhoods Impact Fee applies to the Project. These fees shall be charged on all changes of use within existing structures. Fees shall be assessed per net new gross square footage on residential and non-residential uses within the Plan Area. Fees shall be assessed on mixed use projects according to the gross square feet of each use in the project. For the most up-to-date schedule, please refer to the Department of Building Inspection (DBI) fee register: <http://sfdbi.org/index.aspx?page=617>.

The Eastern Neighborhoods Infrastructure Impact Fee shall be paid before the City issues a first construction document.

- b. **Transit Impact Development Fee.** Pursuant to Planning Code Section (“Section”) 411 et seq., the Transit Impact Development Fee will apply to this project. Please be aware that an ongoing process – the Transportation Sustainability Program – may eventually replace the Transit Impact Development Fee. You can find more information about this program here: <http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=3035>

21. **Option for In-Kind Provision of Community Improvements and Fee Credits.** Project sponsors may propose to directly provide community improvements to the City. In such a case, the City may enter into an In-Kind Improvements Agreement with the sponsor and issue a fee waiver for the Eastern Neighborhoods Impact Fee from the Planning Commission. This process is further explained in Section 412.3(d) of the Planning Code.

As part of the Eastern Neighborhoods public benefits program, Folsom Street improvements (through DPW’s Folsom Street resurfacing project) were identified as a community and capital priority project for impact fee funding. The draft Central SoMa Plan is evaluating plans for improving Folsom, including both one-way and two-way alternatives. The City will provide guidance and specifications for any improvements. If any additional in-kind agreement is feasible and pursued, improvements should be directed towards improving pedestrian and transit connections and may include any of the following: street tree plantings, tree grates, curb bulb-outs, special paving, pedestrian lighting, widened sidewalks, street restriping and transit shelters (above what the project would be required to provide without an in-kind agreement).

More information on in-kind agreements can be found in the Application Packet for In-Kind Agreements on the Planning Department website:

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

- a. **Folsom Street Alternatives:** A vision of the Eastern Neighborhoods Transportation Implementation Planning Study (ENTRIPS) is to transform Folsom Street into a civic boulevard. As a part of the Central SoMa planning process, two scenarios were formed for the draft plan's street network:

The first scenario keeps one-way operations on both Howard and Folsom Streets, while the second scenario converts both streets to two-way operations. In both scenarios, the pedestrian realm is strengthened with wider sidewalks, shorter and more frequent crossings, landscaping, and sidewalk furnishings. Both scenarios include features that increase transit speed and reliability, as well as upgraded cycling facilities. As mentioned before, these two scenarios are being analyzed in the Environmental Impact Report.

More information about the alternatives can be found on our website: [http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/Citywide/Central\\_Corridor/Central-Corridor-Plan-DRAFT-FINAL-web.pdf#page=64](http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/Citywide/Central_Corridor/Central-Corridor-Plan-DRAFT-FINAL-web.pdf#page=64)

22. **First Source Hiring Agreement.** A First Source Hiring Agreement is required for any project proposing to construct 25,000 gross square feet or more. For more information, please contact:  
Ken Nim, Workforce Compliance Officer  
CityBuild, Office of Economic and Workforce Development  
City and County of San Francisco  
50 Van Ness, San Francisco, CA 94102  
(415)581-2303
23. **Flood Notification.** The project site is in a block that has the potential to flood during storms. The SFPUC will review the permit application to comment on the proposed application and the potential for flooding during wet weather. Applicants for building permits for either new construction, change of use or change of occupancy, or for major alterations or enlargements shall contact the SFPUC at the beginning of the process to determine whether the project would result in ground-level flooding during storms. Requirements may include provision of measures to ensure positive sewage flow, raised elevation of entryways, and/or special sidewalk construction and the provision of deep gutters. The side sewer connection permits for such projects need to be reviewed and approved by the SFPUC at the beginning of the review process for all permit applications submitted to the Planning Department, DBI, or the Successor Agency to the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency. For information required for the review of projects in flood-prone areas, the permit applicant shall refer to Bulletin No. 4: [http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/publications\\_reports/DB\\_04\\_Flood\\_Zones.pdf](http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/publications_reports/DB_04_Flood_Zones.pdf).
24. **Stormwater.** If the project results in a ground surface disturbance of 5,000 ft<sup>2</sup> or greater, it is subject to San Francisco's stormwater management requirements as outlined in the Stormwater Management Ordinance and the corresponding SFPUC Stormwater Design Guidelines (Guidelines). Projects that trigger the stormwater management requirements must prepare of a Stormwater Control Plan demonstrating project adherence to the performance measures outlined in the Guidelines including:
  - (a) reduction in *total volume* and *peak flow rate* of stormwater for areas in combined sewer systems OR
  - (b) *stormwater treatment* for areas in separate sewer systems. Responsibility for review and approval

of the Stormwater Control Plan is with the SFPUC, Wastewater Enterprise, Urban Watershed Management Program. Without SFPUC approval of a Stormwater Control Plan, no site or building permits can be issued. The Guidelines also require a signed maintenance agreement to ensure proper care of the necessary stormwater controls. To view the Stormwater Management Ordinance, the Stormwater Design Guidelines, or download instructions for the Stormwater Control Plan, go to <http://sfwater.org/sdg>. Applicants may contact [stormwaterreview@sfwater.org](mailto:stormwaterreview@sfwater.org) for assistance.

25. **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](http://sfwater.org/index.aspx?page=687).

#### PRELIMINARY DESIGN COMMENTS:

The project is located in the Central SoMa Plan Area currently in progress, however the plan does not propose changing the height or zoning for this property. The area is mixed in use but is more in the character of downtown and higher density than the southern portions of the plan area. The following comments address preliminary design issues that may significantly impact the proposed project:

1. **Open Space and Massing.** The Planning Department recommends providing code complying exposure to the residential units. This would require re-massing the project and might encourage the design to consolidate the open space to the southeastern side of the lot. The Planning Department encourages the design to complete a streetwall along Hawthorne and Folsom with a more organized rear yard towards the interior of the block. Additionally, in the event that the project will be entitled after the plans adoption, the Central SoMa Area Plan calls for a 15' setback at a maximum of 85' and an apparent mass reduction above 85' – more information can be found in the PDFs linked to “Urban Form: Bulk Policy Paper | Storyboard” about three-quarters of the way down this page: <http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=2557>.
2. **Street Frontage.** The Planning Department supports the project as shown, although it is very diagrammatic and suggests delicately articulating the retail bays as well as enhancing the pedestrian qualities of the bottom four levels.
3. **Architecture.** As the architecture is diagrammatic, the Planning Department does not have comments at this time. The Planning Department more generally suggests articulating the architecture to express its residential nature, the quality of the bottom seven floors, and further studying the Central SoMa plan to highlight the intent of the urban design goals: a mid-rise district (with occasional spire-

like towers), projects the defer to the street above 85' to provide greater sense of sky and light to the streets below, and a consistent streetwall.

**PRELIMINARY PROJECT ASSESSMENT EXPIRATION:**

This Preliminary Project Assessment is valid for a period of **18 months**. An Environmental Evaluation, Conditional Use Authorization, or Building Permit Application, as listed above, must be submitted no later than **January 12, 2017**. Otherwise, this determination is considered expired and a new Preliminary Project Assessment is required. Such applications and plans must be generally consistent with those found in this Preliminary Project Assessment.

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

cc: Meyers Trust, Property Owner  
     Maia Small, Design Review  
     Chris Thomas, Environmental Planning  
     Audrey Desmuke, Citywide Planning and Analysis  
     Jonas Ionin, Planning Commission Secretary  
     Charles Rivasplata, MTA  
     Jerry Sanguinetti, DPW  
     Pauline Perkins, PUC (tentative, pending email response)  
     Planning Department Webmaster  
(webmaster.planning@sfgov.org)