



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

MEMO

DATE: August 17, 2015
TO: Michael Cohen, Strada Brady, LLC
FROM: Julian J. Bañales, Planning Department
RE: PPA Case No. 2015-005848PPA
1601-1637 Market Street & 53 Colton 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 contact the staff contact, Richard Sucre, at (415) 575-9108 or richard.sucre@sfgov.org, to answer any questions you may have, or to schedule a follow-up meeting.



Julian J. Bañales, Senior Planner



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Preliminary Project Assessment

Date: August 17, 2015
Case No.: **2015-005848PPA**
Project Address: 1601-1637 Market Street & 53 Colton Street
Block/Lot: 3505/001, 028, 029, 031, 031A, 032, 032A, 033, 033A, 034, 035
Zoning: NCT-3 (Moderate Scale Neighborhood Commercial Transit District) & P (Public) Zoning Districts
45-X & 85-X Height and Bulk Districts
Area Plan: Market and Octavia Plan Area
Project Sponsor: Michael Cohen, Strada Brady, LLC
415-272-4387
Staff Contact: Richard Sucre – 415-575-9108
richard.sucre@sfgov.org

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

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

DISCLAIMERS:

This Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) letter provides feedback to the Project Sponsor from the Planning Department regarding the proposed project described in the PPA application submitted on April 17, 2015, as summarized below. This PPA letter identifies Planning Department review requirements for the proposed project, including those related to environmental review, approvals, neighborhood notification and public outreach, the Planning Code, project design, and other general issues of concern for the project. Please be advised that the PPA application does not constitute an application for development with the Planning Department. The PPA letter also does not represent a complete review of the proposed project, does not grant a project approval of any kind, and does not in any way supersede any required Planning Department approvals listed below.

The Planning Department may provide additional comments regarding the proposed project once the required applications listed below are submitted. While some approvals are granted by the Planning Department, some are at the discretion of other bodies, such as the Planning Commission or Historic Preservation Commission. Additionally, it is likely that the project will require approvals from other City agencies such as the Department of Building Inspection, Public Works, the Municipal Transportation Agency, Department of Public Health, San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, and others. The information included herein is based on the PPA application and plans, the Planning Code, General Plan, Planning Department policies, and local/state/federal regulations as of the date of this document, all of which are subject to change.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The proposed project site is located on a block bordered by Market Street, 12th Street, Brady Street, and Otis Street within the Market and Octavia Area Plan. The project site is approximately 100,000 square feet and currently contains the Local 38 Plumbers and Pipefitters Union assembly hall and offices (1621 Market Street), retail space (1629-1637 Market Street) and the Civic Center Hotel, a five-story single room occupancy hotel (1601 Market Street). The proposed project would demolish the three existing buildings and construct six new buildings containing 477 market-rate residential units, 107 affordable supportive

housing units, 9,275 square feet of active ground-floor commercial uses, 27,296 square feet of space for the Local 38 Plumbers and Pipefitters Union, 264 below grade parking spaces and 22,395 square feet of publicly accessible open space in accordance with the Market and Octavia Area Plan. The proposed project would preserve the exterior elements of the Civic Center Hotel and existing two-story retail building along Market Street. The project would be constructed in two phases with priority given to the construction of the new affordable housing units and the Plumbers Union Hall.

BACKGROUND:

The project site is located within the Market and Octavia Area Plan, which was evaluated in the *Market and Octavia Area Plan Programmatic Final Environmental Impact Report* (Market and Octavia PEIR). On April 5, 2007, the Planning Commission certified the *Market and Octavia PEIR* for the Market and Octavia Area Plan by Motion 17406.¹ The certification of the PEIR was upheld on appeal to the Board of Supervisors at a public hearing on June 19, 2007. Subsequent to the certification of the PEIR, on May 30, 2008, the Board of Supervisors approved, and the Mayor signed into law, amendments to the Planning Code, Zoning Maps, and General Plan.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:

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

The proposed project is located within the Market and Octavia Plan area, which was evaluated in the *Market and Octavia Neighborhood Plan Area Programmatic Final Environmental Impact Report EIR (Market and Octavia FEIR)*, and certified on April 5, 2007.² The proposed project is located within the Market and Octavia Plan area, which was evaluated in the *Market and Octavia Neighborhood Plan Area Programmatic Final Environmental Impact Report EIR (Market and Octavia FEIR)*, and certified on April 5, 2007.³ The proposed project would be analyzed for conformance to the analysis conducted under the *Market and Octavia FEIR*. The Planning Department would determine if the analysis in the *Market and Octavia FEIR* sufficiently addresses all potential environmental impacts of the project as proposed. Any pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the *Market and Octavia FEIR* would remain applicable to the project and mitigation measures would be implemented as part of the project's approvals (entitlements).

Since the portions of the project exceed the height limit and also include uses not consistent with the existing zoning districts, the proposed project would not be consistent with the development density and height limits identified in the Market and Octavia Area Plan. However, as proposed, the new Plumbers Union building along Market Street would be constructed below the existing height limit of 85 feet.

¹ San Francisco Planning Department. San Francisco Planning Commission Motion 17406, April 5, 2007. Available online at: <http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1714>, accessed December 3, 2014.

² Available for review on the Planning Department's Area Plan EIRs web page: <http://www.sfplanning.org/index.aspx?page=1893>.

³ Available for review on the Planning Department's Area Plan EIRs web page: <http://www.sfplanning.org/index.aspx?page=1893>.

Therefore, the proposed project may not be eligible for a community plan exemption (CPE) under the Market and Octavia Area Plan FEIR. A final determination will be made during the scoping of the environmental document.

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 under the "Publications" tab. See "Environmental Applications" on page 2 of the current Fee Schedule for a calculation of environmental application fees.⁴

To comply with CEQA the environmental review may take one of two approaches, which will be determined by an environmental case coordinator after filing the EEA.

1. The environmental analysis will consist of an Initial Study to determine whether a MND or EIR would be required and the standard environmental evaluation fee would apply.
2. Since portions of the proposed project may be considered consistent with the development density identified in the area plan, it could be eligible for a community plan exemption (CPE). Please note that a CPE is a type of exemption from environmental review, and cannot be modified to reflect changes to a project after approval. Proposed increases beyond the CPE project description in project size or intensity after project approval will require reconsideration of environmental impacts and issuance of a new CEQA determination. Potentially significant project environmental impacts that were identified in and pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the underlying area plan final EIR may be applicable to the proposed project. Within the CPE process, there can be three different outcomes as follows:
 - a) **CPE Only.** All potentially significant project-specific and cumulatively considerable environmental impacts are fully consistent with significant impacts identified in the *Market and Octavia 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 *Market and Octavia 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).
 - b) **Mitigated Negative Declaration.** If new site- or project-specific significant impacts are identified for the proposed project that were not identified in the *Market and Octavia FEIR*, and if these new significant impacts can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level, then a focused initial study/mitigated negative declaration (IS/MND) is prepared to address these impacts, and a supporting CPE certificate is prepared to address all other impacts that were encompassed by the

⁴ San Francisco Planning Department. *Schedule for Application Fees*. Available online at: <http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=513>.

Market and Octavia FEIR, with all pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the *Market and Octavia 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).

- c) **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 certificate is prepared to address all other impacts that were encompassed by the *Market and Octavia FEIR*, with all pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the *Market and Octavia 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).

Below is a list of topic areas addressed through the environmental review process. Some of these would require additional study based on the preliminary review of the project as it is proposed in the PPA application. Note: This assumes the project meets the development density in Market and Octavia Plan FEIR. If the project does not meet the development density in the Market and Octavia Plan FEIR, it is anticipated the topics would still be addressed through the environmental review process, but mitigation measures from the Market and Octavia FEIR would not apply.

1. **Historic Resources.** The project site contains one or more structures considered to be a potential historic resource (building constructed 45 or more years ago); therefore, the proposed demolition 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) 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. Following an approved scope, the historic resource consultant should submit the draft HRE report for review to Environmental Planning after the Project Sponsor has filed the 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 draft HRE is received.
2. **Archeological Resources.** Project implementation would entail soil-disturbing activities associated with building construction, including excavation that would reach a depth of approximately 20 feet below grade. The proposed project would be subject to the Market and Octavia FEIR Mitigation Measure 5.6.A2 – General Soils Disturbing Activities, which applies to any project involving any soils-disturbing activities including excavation, installation of foundations, or utilities or soils remediation beyond a depth of four feet and located within those properties for which no archaeological assessment report has been prepared.

The proposed project would require Preliminary Archeological Review (PAR) by a Planning Department archeologist. The Department archeologist will determine the potential for the proposed project to affect archeological deposits. This determination will be based on the archeological sensitivity of the project site based on in-house source material and on potential soils disturbance/modification that may result from the project, such as, excavation, installation of

foundations, soils improvement, site remediation, etc. The Department archeologist will need to review any available geotechnical/soils or Phase II hazardous materials report prepared for the project. In those instances where the Department archeologist determines that the project has a potential to adversely affect an archeological resource, the PAR will state what additional measures are needed to address the potential effect. These measures may include preparation of an archeological research design and treatment plan, implementation of one of the Planning Department's three standard archeological mitigation measures (archeological testing, monitoring, or accidental discovery), or other appropriate measures.

3. **Transportation.** Based on the Planning Department's Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines for Environmental Review,⁵ 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 in the Planning Department's Transportation Consultant Pool prepare a Transportation Impact Study. You are required to pay additional fees for the study; please contact Vinaliza Byrd at (415) 575-9025 to arrange payment. Once you pay the fees, please contact Manoj Madhavan at (415) 575-9095 or manoj.madhavan@sfgov.org so that he can provide you with a list of three consultants from the pre-qualified Transportation Consultant Pool. Upon selection of a transportation consultant, the Department will assign a transportation planner who will direct the scope of the consultant-prepared study.
4. **Noise.** Based on the Market and Octavia FEIR, the project site is located in an area where traffic related noise exceeds 75 dBA (a day-night averaged sound level). The proposed project involves the siting of new sensitive uses (i.e., residential uses) at the project site and, therefore, would need an acoustical analysis demonstrating how the building would meet Title 24 insulation standards. This analysis should include at least one 24-hour noise measurement (with maximum noise level readings taken at least every 15 minutes). The analysis must be prepared by persons qualified in acoustical analysis and/or engineering and shall demonstrate with reasonable certainty that Title 24 noise insulation standards, where applicable, can be met and that there are no particular circumstances about the project site that warrant heightened concern about noise levels in the vicinity. All required common open space should be designed in a manner that minimizes noise annoyance for users of the open space. As the proposed project includes ground-floor retail space, the analysis should also demonstrate with reasonable certainty that the proposed project would comply with Section 2909 of the San Francisco Police Code and the land use compatibility requirements of the General Plan.
5. **Air Quality.** The proposed project's 584 dwelling units exceed the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's (BAAQMD) construction screening levels for criteria air pollutants.⁶ 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 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

⁵ This document is available at: <http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1886>.

⁶ 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 is also required to prepare a Construction Dust Control Plan for review and approval by DPH.

The project site is also located within an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone, as mapped and defined by Health Code, Article 38. The Air Pollutant Exposure Zone identifies areas with poor air quality based on modeling of air pollution, exposures, and health vulnerability from mobile, stationary, and area source emissions within San Francisco. The project proposes to construct new sensitive land uses (i.e., residential), which are subject to enhanced ventilation measures pursuant to Health Code Article 38. The Project Sponsor will be required to submit an Article 38 application to DPH prior to the issuance of any environmental determination. Please provide a copy of the Article 38 application with the EEA.⁷ In addition, equipment exhaust measures during construction, such as those listed in *Market and Octavia FEIR Mitigation Measure 5.8 Air Quality* will likely be required.

If the project would generate new sources of toxic air contaminants including, but not limited to: diesel generators or boilers, or any other stationary sources, the project would result in toxic air contaminants that may affect both on-site and off-site sensitive receptors. Given the proposed project's height of 85 feet, the proposed project would likely require a backup diesel generator and additional measures will likely be necessary to reduce its emissions. Please provide detailed information related to any proposed stationary sources with the EEA.

6. **Greenhouse Gases.** *The City and County of San Francisco's Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions* presents a comprehensive assessment of policies, programs, and ordinances that represents San Francisco's Qualified Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Reduction Strategy. Projects that are consistent 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.⁸ 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.
7. **Wind.** The proposed project would involve construction of a building over 80 feet in height on portions of the project site. Therefore, the proposed project 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 to prepare a proposed scope of work for review and approval by the Environmental Planner prior to preparing the analysis.
8. **Shadow.** The proposed project would result in construction of a six buildings greater than 40 feet in height. A preliminary shadow fan analysis prepared by Planning Department staff indicates that the

⁷ Refer to <http://www.sfdph.org/dph/eh/Air/default.asp> for more information.

⁸ Refer to <http://sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1886> for latest "Greenhouse Gas Compliance Checklist for Private Development Projects."

proposed project would not cast shadows on nearby properties owned by the Recreation and Parks Department. However, given the scale of the proposal, the Project Sponsor will be required to hire a qualified consultant to prepare a detailed shadow study to examine the impacts of shadow on nearby public open spaces and the potential park. The consultant must submit a Shadow Study Application, which can be found on the Planning Department's website at:

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

A separate fee is required. The consultant must also prepare a proposed scope of work for review and approval by Environmental Planning staff prior to preparing the analysis.

9. **Geology.** The proposed project involves new construction that would require new foundations, excavation, and/or foundation improvements. The project site is located within a Seismic Hazard Zone (Liquefaction Hazard Zone likely underlain by artificial fill) and above the BART system line. A BART ventilation shaft currently exist on the project site adjacent to Colton Street. Any new construction on the site is therefore subject to a mandatory Interdepartmental Project Review.⁹ 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.

The *Market and Octavia Neighborhood FEIR* identified a potentially significant impact related to soil erosion during construction. Therefore, *Market and Octavia Neighborhood FEIR Mitigation Measure 5.11.A Construction Related Soils* would be applicable to the proposed project. This mitigation measure consists of construction best management practices to prevent erosion and discharge of soil sediments to the storm drain system, which would reduce any potential impacts related to geology soils to less than significant levels. This mitigation measure would be included in the CPE, if one is required, and would not require additional analysis in a focused IS or EIR.

10. **Hazardous Materials.** The proposed project would likely disturb 50 cubic yards of soil or more located on a site with known or suspected soil and/or groundwater 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 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

⁹ San Francisco Planning Department. *Interdepartmental Project Review*. Available online at: <http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=522>.

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 EEA.

11. **Water Supply Assessment.** The California Water Code Sections 10910-10915 require that a Water Supply Assessment be prepared for any proposed project that meets the definition of a "water demand project" under Section 10912(a). The assessment determines whether available water supplies are sufficient to serve the demand generated by projects of a specified size, as well as the reasonably foreseeable cumulative demand in the service area over the next 20 years under a range of hydrologic conditions. Please coordinate with Environmental Planning staff and visit sfwater.org/index.aspx?page=75 for more information.
12. **Tree Planting and Protection.** The Department of Public Works Code Section 8.02-8.11 requires disclosure and protection of landmark, significant, and street trees located on private and public property. Any such trees must be shown on the site plans with the size of the trunk diameter, tree height, and accurate canopy drip line. Please submit the *Tree Planting and Protection Checklist* with the EEA and ensure that trees are appropriately shown on site plans. Also see the comments below under "Street Trees."
13. **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>.

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. **Rezoning.** The project site is located within the NCT-3 (Moderate-Scale Neighborhood Commercial Transit) and P (Public) Zoning Districts. Currently, the project includes new construction within the P Zoning District, which would not be permitted. Therefore, in order for the project to proceed, the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors would need to approve new zoning controls for the subject parcel. As currently anticipated, the boundaries of the P and NCT-3 Zoning Districts on the project site would be adjusted to conform with the proposed development.
2. **Height District Reclassification.** The project site is located across a 40-X, 85-X and OS Height and Bulk District. The height of the proposed project would exceed the existing height and bulk designation, since the project includes new construction of a 65-ft tall building in the 40-X Height and Bulk District and a 85-ft tall building in the OS Height and Bulk District. Therefore, in order for the project to proceed, the Board of Supervisors would need to approve a Height District Reclassification for the subject parcel. As currently anticipated, the height and bulk designations would be refined to conform with the proposed development.
3. **Conditional Use Authorization-Planned Unit Development (PUD)** from the Planning Commission is required per Planning Code Section 121.1, 121.2, 303 and 304 for the new construction on project sites within the NCT-3 Zoning District, which are larger than one half acre (approximately 21,780 square feet), for development of a large lot in the NCT-3 Zoning District larger than 10,000 square feet, and for establish of a non-residential use larger than 6,000 square feet in the NCT-3 Zoning District. Under the PUD, the project may request certain modifications to requirements of the Planning Code.
4. A **Shadow Application** must be submitted, per Planning Code Sections 147 and 295. Due to potential shadow impacts on nearby public open spaces (see "Preliminary Project Comments" below), the project must be approved by the Recreation and Park Commission, if there is a shadow impact upon a property owned and operated by the Recreation and Parks Commission.
5. A **Building Permit Application** is required for the demolition of the existing buildings on the project site.
6. A **Building Permit Application** is required for the proposed new construction on the project site.

All 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. Building Permit applications are available at the Department of Building Inspection at 1660 Mission Street.

NEIGHBORHOOD NOTIFICATIONS AND PUBLIC OUTREACH:

Project Sponsors are encouraged, and in some cases required, 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 under the "Permits & Zoning" tab. All registered neighborhood group mailing lists are available online at www.sfplanning.org under the "Resource Center" tab.

Notification of a Project Receiving Environmental Review. Notice may be required to be sent to occupants of the project site and properties adjacent to the project site, as well as to owners and, to the extent feasible, occupants of properties within 300 feet of the project site at the initiation of the environmental review process. Please be prepared to provide mailing addresses on a CD upon request during the environmental review process.

PRELIMINARY PROJECT COMMENTS:

The following analysis examines the proposed project under the proposed zoning outlined within the Market & Octavia Area Plan.

1. **Market and Octavia Area Plan.** The subject property falls within the area covered by the Market and Octavia Area Plan in the General Plan. As proposed, the project includes uses that are generally consistent with the overarching objectives of the Plan. However the proposed project is not consistent with key policies related to built form, housing, and open space. See below for further explanation where the project requires modification to achieve consistency. The Project Sponsor is encouraged to read the full plan, which can be viewed at:

<http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1713>

2. **Housing.** The Market and Octavia Area Plan defers to larger citywide policies and programs of housing affordability. Creating housing for a diverse population is paramount, as is the protection of existing populations. The Plan prohibits residential demolitions unless it would result in sufficient replacement of existing housing units. Where replacement housing is provided, demolitions should further be restricted to ensure affordable housing and historic resources are maintained. Demolitions would be permitted only through conditional use authorization in the event that the project serves the public interest by giving consideration to affordability, soundness, maintenance history, historic resource assessment, number of units, superb architectural and urban design, rental housing opportunities, number of family-sized units, supportive housing/serves a special/underserved population, and a public interest or public use that cannot be met without the proposed demolition.

The project is proposing to demolish (but retain the Market Street façade) of the Civic Center Hotel, which currently houses residents in 71 Protected Units and 81 unrestricted Tourist Units as defined

by the San Francisco Residential Hotel Unit Conversion and Demolition Ordinance. The City will need to verify the number of protected and unrestricted units. The San Francisco Administrative Code requires a one-to-one replacement of the 71 protected units (Ch. 41.13). The project would construct 107 affordable supportive rental units for very low-income residents as replacement units for those lost in the removal of the SRO hotel. Current SRO residents will have the right to move into the new supportive housing units prior to new construction on the hotel site. Note: The SRO Replacement and Inclusionary Affordable Housing requirements are separate and must be met with distinct unit allocation – units cannot be double-counted to meet both requirements.

The project outlines two strategies by which the inclusionary housing requirement is addressed:

- The first involves paying a 20% Affordable Housing Fee on the 477 market-rate units, with up to 50% of the Affordable Housing fee being directed back to help finance the 107-unit supportive housing project on the site. However, directing a fee back into any specific project is not explicitly allowed unless the Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD) agrees to do so. Additionally, directing the Affordable Housing Fee back to fund a portion of SRO replacement is not allowed. The fee shall apply only to Below Market Rate (BMR) units independent of the SRO replacement requirement.
- The second strategy involves the Project Sponsor providing all necessary funding directly to the supportive housing project while also providing 12% inclusionary affordable housing on-site, in lieu of paying the 20% Affordable Housing Fee. However, to adequately address the 12% inclusionary housing requirement, the project would need to supply 57 BMR units in addition to the 71 SRO replacement units. The project is currently 21 units short of meeting this requirement on-site.

3. Market & Octavia Built Form. The Market and Octavia Area Plan establishes an overall built form in which heights contribute positively to the urban form of the neighborhood. The block, as envisioned by the Plan, will maintain the narrow alleyway network and will incorporate a mid-block public park. The Plan calls for sculpted building height and bulk in order to maintain appropriate sunlight exposure and building scale in relation to surrounding alleys and public spaces. Building heights should relate to the width of facing streets as defined by 261.1 of the Planning Code. The project does not comply with upper story setback requirements along narrow streets or mid-block passages. The project also does not comply with established 40-foot height limits of the block bounded by Brady Street, Colton Street, and Colusa Place. The project is proposing 65 feet at this location. The project must revise the design to reflect the existing height and bulk limits as well as the sculpting requirements set forth by the Plan and Planning Code. Any exceptions will require a height reclassification. Any changes to height and zoning would need to demonstrate meeting the design intent of the Plan, and provide equal or superior performance and public benefit (Policies 1.2.1, 1.2.3, and Map 3). Additional information on the height limitation and current code requirements is provided below.

4. Market & Octavia Open Space. The Market and Octavia Area Plan identifies the center of the “Brady Block” as the primary opportunity to create a signature public park that would serve as a focal point

for the area and serve this burgeoning neighborhood, which is significantly deficient in public open space. The Plan proposes that the park occupy the existing BART property and extend onto portions of adjacent private properties. The Plan also identifies alley extensions and active ground floor uses as key ways to provide activation and encourage physical and visual connection to the public space. Several of these parcels, currently in use as surface parking, are zoned Public with an OS Height and Bulk designation. The project currently proposes rezoning these parcels from P to NCT-3 to allow for additional development and reconfigured open space. The proposed design is not consistent with the vision of the Plan which calls for these parcels to become a public park fronted by public alleys facing active frontages/uses – similar in design to South Park in SOMA. The proposal is problematic in that the reconfigured open space is internalized and narrow, would be shaded throughout the day by the project's buildings, is surrounded by non-active uses, is not readily exposed and visible to surrounding streets, is redundant with Brady Street as a north/south access-way, and is inconsistent with the Plan's vision overall. The project should revise the design to be consistent with current zoning and intent of the Community Improvements identified by the Plan. Any changes to zoning would need to demonstrate meeting the design intent of the Plan, and provide equal or superior performance (eg in terms of sunlight, activation, access) and public benefit. Due to the proximity of the BART tunnel and vent structure, the sponsor should collaborate with BART as soon as possible. Planning has been in contact with BART and is available to facilitate coordination if desired (Policy 4.1.5, 4.1.6, 7.2.5 and Section 4: Parks, Plazas and Open Spaces). Additional information on the open space requirements is provided below.

5. **Market and Octavia Impact Fees.** This project is subject to two development impact fees specific to the Market and Octavia Area Plan: the Community Improvement Fund and the Affordable Housing Fee (pursuant to Planning Code Section 421 and 416 respectively). The project 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 Market and Octavia Area Plan Impact Fees shall be paid before the City issues a first construction document.

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 Market and Octavia Area Plan Impact Fee from the Planning Commission, for an equivalent amount to the value of the improvements. The project site has substantial opportunities for In-Kind improvements. All proposed In-Kind improvements will need to be reviewed and endorsed by the Market Octavia Community Advisory Committee (CAC). Any proposed In-Kind improvements must go above and beyond baseline Streetscape and Pedestrian Improvements as required by Planning Code Sec. 138.1. Required streetscape and pedestrian improvements are not eligible for in-kind fee credit.

The following improvements are recommendations for in-kind improvements and speak directly to the Plan's vision for creating a signature public park that would serve as a focal point for the area and would serve this burgeoning neighborhood. Due to proximity of the BART tunnel and ventilation

shaft, coordination with BART should occur before any improvements are designed. The Planning Department is able to facilitate this coordination, if desired.

- Extend Stevenson Street and Colusa Place to form a distinct public open space bounded on all sides by public right of way. The extension of these alleys will also provide complete and unencumbered visual and physical connection through the core of the block.
- Create a public open space bounded by Brady Street, Colton Street, Colusa Place, and Stevenson Street that will serve the public, be fronted by active uses such as retail, and become a signature neighborhood space. The design of the public open space shall be guided by the CAC and shall reflect the values and policies envisioned by the Plan.
- Create a living alley on one or multiple alleys bordering the public open space. Using the Market Octavia Living Alleys toolkit as a guide, these alleys should be fronted by active uses and provide opportunities for community and social activation.

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

6. **Required Streetscape and Pedestrian Improvements.** Per Planning Code Section 138.1, the Project Sponsor will be required to submit a Streetscape Plan illustrating the location and design of streetscape improvements appropriate to the street type, including site furnishing, landscaping, corner curb extensions, and sidewalk widening as appropriate. The Planning Department may require these elements as part of conditions of approval.

The project includes frontages on Market and 12th Streets, as well as alleys including Brady Street, Colton Street, Colusa Place, and Chase Court. To identify relevant street types for the project frontage, please refer:

<http://www.sfbetterstreets.org/design-guidelines/street-types/>.

Project Sponsors should contact DPW as early as possible to understand the process and requirements for permitting street improvements. For more information on process, guidelines, and requirements for street improvements, refer to www.sfbetterstreets.org. Required streetscape and pedestrian improvements are not eligible for in-kind fee credit.

The following comments address specific Planning Code and other general issues that may substantially impact the proposed project. Please note that these comments reflect current Planning Code requirements for this property. Please see the comments above and the Preliminary Design Comments for more information.

7. **Interdepartmental Project Review.** This review is required for all proposed new construction in seismic hazard zones, in which the subject property falls. Please refer to the Department's website for the application. This meeting is required prior to scheduling any public hearings.

8. **Conditional Use Authorization-Planned Unit Development.** Planning Code Sections 303 and 304 outline the requirements for a Planned Unit Development (PUD), which may be authorized as conditional uses within zoning districts outside of C-3, Eastern Neighborhoods Mixed Use Districts, DTR Districts, and South of Market Mixed Use Districts. Under this requirement, a project site must be under one ownership or jointly filed and be larger than one half acre in size. All PUD projects are subject to review by the Planning Commission in an effort to achieve the objectives and policies of the General Plan, the applicable Design Guidelines and the Planning Code. Under the PUD, the Commission may be granted certain modifications, including:
- **Rear Yard.** Planning Code Section 134 outlines the rear yard requirements within the NCT-3 Zoning District. The minimum rear yard depth shall be equal to 25 percent of the total depth of the lot at the lowest level with a residential use. Currently, the proposed project does not meet this requirement, since the rear yard is provided within an inner court and the rear yard does not extend the width of the lot. Therefore, the proposed project must seek a modification of this requirement under the PUD. The Department recommends open space, which is equivalent to the area that would have been provided in the rear yard.
 - **Dwelling Unit Exposure.** Planning Code Section 140 requires all dwelling units to face a street or qualifying open area. All dwelling units shall feature a window that directly faces a street or open area that is a minimum of 25 ft in width. Currently, the proposed project does not meet the exposure requirements for the dwelling units facing the inner court, since the proposed inner court does not meet the dimensional requirements of the Planning Code. Therefore, the proposed project may seek a modification of this requirement under the PUD. The Department recommends minimizing the number of dwelling units, which would require a modification to the exposure requirements.
9. **Conditional Use Authorization-Large Lot Development & Use Size.** Planning Code Section 121.1 outlines the requirements for conditional use authorization from the Planning Commission for new construction on lots larger than 10,000 square feet in the NCT-3 Zoning District. Planning Code Section 121.2 outlines the requirements for conditional use authorization from the Planning Commission for establishing a non-residential use larger than 6,000 square feet in the NCT-3 Zoning District. The project would be required to obtain conditional use authorization to address the requirements for large lot development and non-residential use size in the NCT-3 Zoning District. Additional clarification of the proposed uses and tenants will be required.
10. **Open Space – Residential.** Planning Code Section 135 requires 80 square feet of private open space or 100 square feet of common open space for each dwelling unit. Additionally, any such open spaces must meet the dimensional requirements of Planning Code Section 135(f) and (g). Overall, the project provides approximately 51,398 square feet of open space for the 584 new dwelling units. The total amount of open space appears to exceed the required amount. However, the Department will have to verify the size and dimension of the proposed open space after the architectural drawings are further developed.

11. **Permitted Obstructions:** Planning Code Section 136 outlines the requirements for permitted obstructions over streets, setbacks, rear yards, and useable open space. Please review these requirements and ensure conformance.
12. **Street Frontage.** Planning Code Section 145.1 outlines requirements for street frontages to ensure that they are pedestrian-oriented, fine-grained, and are appropriate and compatible with the buildings in NCT-3 District. Please ensure that the ground floor street frontage meets all of these requirements as related to use, ground floor ceiling height, transparency, fenestration, gates, railings and grillwork.
13. **Required Ground Floor Commercial Uses.** Per Planning Code Section 145.4, the project is required to provide ground floor commercial use along Market Street. Currently, the project appears to meet this requirement.
14. **Off-Street Parking:** Planning Code Section 151.1 outlines requirements for permitted off-street parking. As a project located within the NCT-3 Zoning District, there are no minimum parking requirements; rather, the project is subject to a maximum allowance of parking spaces, which is defined as one parking spaces per two dwelling units (see Planning Code Section 151.1, Table 151.1). For retail uses, the proposed project may provide a maximum of one space per 1,500 sf (see Planning Code Section 151.1, Table 151.1). For the assembly use, the proposed project may provide

The proposed project would construct 584 new residential units; therefore, 292 off-street residential parking spaces are allowed for the residential units. The proposed project would construct 9,275 sq ft of new retail space; therefore, 6 off-street retail parking spaces would be allowed. The project would also construct approximately 27,000 square feet for the Plumber's Union; therefore,

The project includes 263 off-street parking spaces. Please update the basement plan to specify the parking spaces intended for the residential use versus the retail use. In addition, off-street parking is required to be space-efficient. Please provide additional detail on the parking layout.

15. **Bicycle Parking.** Planning Code Section 155.2 outlines the requirement for bicycle parking in new development. The number of required Class 1 and Class 2 bicycle parking spaces shall be dependent on the amount of new dwelling units and retail space. Currently, the project anticipates 324 bicycle parking spaces, which would exceed the bicycle parking requirement for 584 dwelling units.
16. **Car-Sharing.** Planning Code Section 166 outlines the requirements for car-share parking spaces, which are dependent on the amount of off-street parking provided within each new building. Please ensure conformance with this requirement.
17. **Unbundled Parking:** Planning Code Section 167 outlines a requirement for unbundled parking spaces for newly constructed residential buildings of ten dwelling units or more. All off-street parking spaces accessory to residential uses shall be leased or sold separately from the rental or purchase fees for dwelling units for the life of the dwelling units, such that potential renters or buyers have the option of renting or buying a residential unit at a price lower than would be the case if there were a single price for both the residential unit and the parking space. The Planning Commission

may grant an exception from this requirement for projects which include financing for affordable housing that requires that costs for parking and housing be bundled together.

18. **Dwelling Unit Mix:** Planning Code Section 207.6 outlines the requirements for minimum dwelling unit mix for new residential properties within the NCT-3 Zoning District. The project must provide either: no less than 40 percent of the total number of proposed dwelling units as at least two bedroom units; or no less than 30 percent of the total number of proposed dwelling units as at least three bedroom units. Currently, the project appears to meet this requirement, since it provides 193 two-bedroom dwelling units, which is more than 40 percent of the total number of proposed dwelling units.
19. **Narrow Street Height Provisions:** For projects within the NCT-3 Zoning District along a Narrow Street (a public right of way less than or equal to 40 feet in width, or any mid-block passage or alley that is less than 40 feet in width), Planning Code Section 261.1 specifies that all subject frontages shall have upper stories set back at least 10 feet at the property line above a height equivalent to 1.25 times the width of the abutting narrow street. No part or feature of a building may penetrate the required setback plane. Brady Street, Colton Street, Colusa Place appear to be considered narrow streets, since they are all less than 40-ft wide. Portions of the proposed project appear to exceed the limits provided in the narrow street height provisions and must be reduced. The Planning Code does not provide exceptions to the height limitations of Planning Code Section 261.1.
20. **Height-Exempted Features:** Planning Code Section 260(b) outlines features, which are exempted from the height limited established by the Planning Code. As noted in Planning Code Section 260(b)(1)(B), elevator, stair and mechanical penthouses, fire towers, skylights and dormer windows are considered exempted features. This exemption is limited to the top 10-ft of such feature where the height limit is 65-ft or less. Please provide additional information, including dimensions, on the new elevator penthouse and enclosure. This elevator penthouse is limited to 10-ft in height, and must not include any habitable area.
21. **Transit Impact Development Fee.** Pursuant to Planning Code Section 411 et seq., the Transit Impact Development Fee (TIDF) will apply to this project. Please be aware that under the ongoing Transportation Sustainability Program (TSP), a proposed new transportation impact fee (the Transportation Sustainability Fee, or TSF) may replace the TIDF. Additional information on this program is available on the Department's website at:
<http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=3035>
22. **Inclusionary Affordable Housing.** Inclusionary Affordable Housing is required for a project proposing ten or more dwelling units. The Project Sponsor must submit an 'Affidavit of Compliance with the Inclusionary Affordable Housing Program: Planning Code Section 415,' to the Planning Department identifying the method of compliance, on-site, off-site, or affordable housing fee. Any on-site affordable dwelling-units proposed as part of the project must be designated as owner-occupied units, not rental units; unless a Costa Hawkins agreement is possible. Affordable units designated as on-site units shall be sold as ownership units and will remain as ownership units for the life of the project. The minimum Affordable Housing Percentages are 20% affordable housing fee,

12% on-site, or 20% off-site. Therefore, as proposed, the project would have a minimum requirement of 58 units if provided on-site, and 95 units if provided off-site.

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

- direct financial construction from a public entity
- 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.

As noted above, the Department requires clarification of the project's compliance with the Inclusionary Affordable Housing requirements given the replacement of the Protected SRO units and the construction of new on-site affordable housing units.

23. **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 Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 581-2303

24. **Vision Zero.** The project is located on a "high-injury corridor", identified through the City's [Vision Zero Program](#). The Sponsor is encouraged to incorporate pedestrian safety streetscape measures into the project.

25. **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 must 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.

26. **Stormwater.** If the project results in a ground surface disturbance of 5,000 sf 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 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. The SFPUC Wastewater Enterprise, Urban Watershed Management Program is responsible for review and approval of the Stormwater Control Plan. 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 for assistance.
27. **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 Market Octavia Area Plan and more specifically, the southeast corner being re-identified as "the Hub." The area is expected to grow significantly in residential density in the next decade with several high-rise developments in the pipeline. The area is well-served by transit as it is adjacent to an intersection of the Market underground MUNI station and the Van Ness BRT project expected to break ground shortly. The current architectural character is primarily masonry with one-to-six story buildings and the anticipated nearby high-rise character will be contemporary in design. The following comments address preliminary design issues that may significantly impact the proposed project:

1. **Site Design, Open Space, and Massing.** The Department does not support the reconfiguration of the development that internalizes the public courtyard but instead recommends more directly conforming to the Market Octavia Plan's public realm design and zoning. In the former, the Brady Block Park is clearly delineated by the adjacent alleys as a public park supported by pedestrian-dominant smaller streets. With an anticipated significant increase of residential units in the area, this open space is important not only for the block but for the larger southeast corner of the Market and Octavia neighborhood and should be easily accessible and overtly public. In the latter, which

establishes higher heights along Market Street and lower heights to the interior, increased development would both minimize the height and shadow impacts along the open space in keeping with the South of Market block pattern and importantly re-establish the civic street wall of Market Street. The current proposal does not reflect these goals including reconnecting Stevenson as a through street.

2. **Street Frontage and Parking.** The Department generally supports the intent of the ground floor uses but suggests including elevated ground floor residential units along Brady Street, thus reducing the extensive common space and lobby space. The Department also supports the potential for community space and active programming within the ground level of the Plumber's Union.

The Planning Department recommends reducing parking as this site is located in close proximity to several transit lines along both Market Street and Van Ness Avenue.

Per Planning Code Section 138.1, the Project Sponsor will be required to submit a Streetscape Plan illustrating the location and design of streetscape improvements appropriate to the street type, including site furnishings, landscaping, corner curb extensions, and sidewalk widening as appropriate. The Planning Department may require these elements as part of conditions of approval. To identify relevant street types for the project frontage, please refer to:

<http://www.sfbetterstreets.org/design-guidelines/street-types>

3. **Architecture.** As the project is diagrammatic, the Department does not have specific comments at this time. The Department requests the use of high quality materials and significant façade depth, in particular along the Market Street critically reforming the street wall along San Francisco's premier civic thoroughfare.

The Department appreciates the integration of the existing historic resources into the new development and recommends further work with Department Preservation Staff to ensure that the project respects historic fabric and highlights the new construction.

PRELIMINARY PROJECT ASSESSMENT EXPIRATION:

This Preliminary Project Assessment is valid for a period of **18 months**. An Environmental Evaluation and/or Conditional Use Authorization, as listed above, must be submitted no later than **February 17, 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

cc: Rich Sucre, Current Planning
Brett Bollinger, Environmental Planning
Patrick Race, Citywide Planning and Analysis
Maia Small, Design Review
Jonas Ionin, Planning Commission Secretary

Charles Rivasplata, SFMTA

Jerry Sanguinetti, Public Works

Pauline Perkins, SFPUC

June Weintraub and Jonathan Piakis, DPH

Planning Department Webmaster (webmaster.planning@sfgov.org)

FIRST	LAST	TITLE	ORGANIZATION	ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP	TELEPHONE	EMAIL	NEIGHBORHOOD OF INTEREST
Aaron	Peskin		-	470 Columbus Avenue, Ste. 211	San Francisco	CA	94133	415-986-7014	aaron.peskin@earthlink.net	Citywide
Adrian	Simi	Local Field Representative	Carpenters Local 22	2085 Third Street	San Francisco	CA	94107	415-355-1322	ASimi@nccrc.org	Citywide
Alex	Lantsberg	Research Analyst	Carpenters Local 22 c/o NCCRC Research	265 Hegenberger Road, Ste. 220	Oakland	CA	94621	510-430-9706 x109	alantsberg@nccrc.org	Citywide
Chuck	Turner	Director	Community Design Center	5 Thomas Mellon Circle, #128	San Francisco	CA	94134	415-586-1235	hn3782@earthlink.net	Citywide
David	Villa-Lobos	Executive Director	Community Leadership Alliance	P.O. Box 642201	San Francisco	CA	94109	415-921-4192	admin@communityleadershipalliance.net	Citywide
Diego	Hernandez	Organizer	Laborers Local 261	3271 18th Street	San Francisco	CA	94110	415-826-4550	dhernandez@ncdcliu.org	Citywide
Grace	Shanahan	President	Residential Builders Association	1717 17th Street, Ste. 200	San Francisco	CA	94103	415-252-1900	grace@rbsaf.com	Citywide
Lynn	Sousa	Public Works Coordinator	AT&T Construction and Engineering	795 Folsom Street, Rm.426	San Francisco	CA	94107-1243	415-644-7043	1s4524@att.com	Citywide
Mary	Miles		0 Coalition for Adequate Review	364 Page Street, #36	San Francisco	CA	94102		0	0 Citywide
Matthew	Rodgers	Chair	Alabama Street Pioneers	1014 Alabama Street	San Francisco	CA	94110	415-826-4854	a1zealot@sonic.net	Citywide, Mission
Michael	Therault	Secretary-Treasurer	SF Building and Construction Trades Council	1188 Franklin Street, Ste.203	San Francisco	CA	94109	415-345-9333	mike@sfbctc.org	Citywide
Sona	Trauss	President	SF Bay Area Association of Renters	1618 12th Street	Oakland	CA	94607	215-900-1457	sonja.trauss@gmail.com	Citywide
Stephen	Williams	Attorney	Law Office of Stephen M. Williams	1934 Divisadero Street	San Francisco	CA	94115	415-292-3656	SMW@stevewilliamslaw.com	Citywide
Sue	Hestor	Attorney at Law	-	870 Market Street, #1128	San Francisco	CA	94102	415-362-2778	hestor@earthlink.net	Citywide
Ted	Gullicksen	Office Manager	San Francisco Tenants Union	558 Capp Street	San Francisco	CA	94110	415-282-5525	ted@sftu.org	Citywide

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		0 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;	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	lvy.Lee@sfgov.org jc@jcarpinelli.com	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	jhenderson@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
Laura	Magnani		0 American Friends Service Committee	65 Ninth Street	San Francisco	CA	94103	415-565-0201	sfoffice@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 Sunnyside 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	rhbement@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, Visitacion Valley
J.R.	Eppler	President	Potrero Boosters Neighborhood Association	1459 - 18th Street, Suite 133	San Francisco	CA	94107	650-704-7775	president@potreroboosters.org	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