



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

MEMO

DATE: September 21, 2016
TO: Michael Leavitt
FROM: Mark Luellen, Planning Department
RE: PPA Case No. 2015-005983PPA for 850 Bush 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, Nicholas Foster, at (415) 575-9167 or nicholas.foster@sfgov.org, to answer any questions you may have, or to schedule a follow-up meeting.


Mark Luellen, Senior Planner



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Preliminary Project Assessment

Date: September 21, 2016
Case No.: **2015-005983PPA**
Project Address: 850 Bush Street
Block/Lot: 0274/008
Zoning: RC-4 (Residential-Commercial, High Density) Zoning District
65-A Height and Bulk District
Area Plan: N/A
Project Sponsor: Michael Leavitt
415-674-9100
Staff Contact: Nicholas Foster – 415-575-9167
nicholas.foster@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 June 8, 2016, as summarized below. This PPA letter identifies Planning Department review requirements for the proposed project, including those related to environmental review, approvals, neighborhood notification and public outreach, the Planning Code, project design, and other general issues of concern for the project. Please be advised that the PPA application does not constitute an application for development with the Planning Department. The PPA letter also does not represent a complete review of the proposed project, does not grant a project approval of any kind, and does not in any way supersede any required Planning Department approvals listed below.

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

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The proposal is a five-story vertical addition to an existing one-story-plus-mezzanine commercial building. The existing building on the 4,125 square foot subject lot measuring 30 feet wide at a depth of 137.5 feet was constructed in 1922. The proposal would add approximately 11,890 square feet of residential uses to the existing 2,200 square foot ground-floor retail space, resulting in a 65-foot-tall mixed use building totaling 14,690 square feet. The proposed new building would include 20 dwelling units,

residential storage lockers for each dwelling unit, and 20 Class I and 2 Class II bicycle parking spaces. The proposal does not include any off-street vehicular parking. Excavation, to a maximum depth of approximately 2.5 feet below grade, is proposed in order to accommodate the new foundation.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:

In compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the environmental review process must be completed before any project approval may be granted. This review may be done in conjunction with the required approvals listed below. In order to begin formal environmental review, please submit an **Environmental Evaluation Application (EEA)** for the full scope of the project. 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 calculation of environmental application fees.¹ **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.**

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

If it is determined that the project could result in a significant impact, an initial study would be prepared. The initial study may be prepared either by an environmental consultant from the Department's environmental consultant pool or by Department staff. Should you choose to have the initial study prepared by an environmental consultant, contact Jessica Range at (415) 575-9018 for a list of three eligible consultants. If the initial study finds that the project would have a significant impact that could be reduced to a less-than-significant level by mitigation measures agreed to by the project sponsor, then the Department would issue a preliminary mitigated negative declaration (PMND). The PMND would be circulated for public review, during which time concerned parties may comment on and/or appeal the determination. If no appeal is filed, the Planning Department would issue a final mitigated negative declaration (FMND). Additional information regarding the environmental review process can be found at: <http://www.sf-planning.org/modules/showdocument.aspx?documentid=8631>.

If the initial study indicates that the project would result in a significant impact that cannot be mitigated to below a significant level, an EIR will be required. An EIR must be prepared by an environmental consultant from the Planning Department's environmental consultant pool (<http://www.sf-planning.org/Environmental-consultant-pool>). The Planning Department will provide more detail to the project sponsor regarding the EIR process should this level of environmental review be required.

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.

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

- 1. Historic Resources.** The project proposes an alteration of a contributor to the Lower Nob Hill Apartment Hotel National Register Historic District; therefore, the proposed project is subject to review by the Department's Historic Preservation staff. To assist in this review, the project sponsor must hire a qualified professional to prepare a Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE) report. The HRE scope will require an individual evaluation of the subject building and a project analysis. The qualified professional must be selected from the Planning Department's Historic Resource Consultant Pool. Please contact Tina Tam, Senior Preservation Planner, via email (tina.tam@sfgov.org) for a list of three consultants from which to choose. The selected consultant must scope the HRE in consultation with Department Historic Preservation staff. Please contact the HRE scoping team at HRE@sfgov.org to arrange the HRE scoping. Following an approved scope, the historic resource consultant should submit the draft HRE report for review to Environmental Planning after the project sponsor has filed the EE Application and updated it as necessary to reflect feedback received in the PPA letter. The HRE should be submitted directly to the Department and copied to the project sponsor. Project sponsors should not receive and/or review advance drafts of consultant reports per the Environmental Review Guidelines. Historic Preservation staff will not begin reviewing your project until a complete HRE is received.
- 2. Archeological Resources.** The proposed project includes excavation and ground disturbance and therefore may require Preliminary Archeological Review (PAR) by a Planning Department archeologist; an official determination will be made subsequent to submittal of the EEA.

A PAR assesses the archeological sensitivity of the project site based on in-house source material and considers the potential for archeological impacts resulting from proposed soils disturbance. If available, please provide with the EEA any detailed information, including sections, proposed soils-disturbing activities, such as grading, excavation, installation of foundations, soils improvement, and site remediation, and submit any available geotechnical/soils or phase II hazardous materials reports prepared for the project to assist in any required review. If the Department archeologist determines that the project has a potential to adversely affect archeological resources, the PAR will identify additional measures needed to address the potential effect. These measures may include preparation of an archeological research design and treatment plan, implementation of one of the Planning Department's three standard archeological mitigation measures (archeological testing, monitoring, or accidental discovery), or other appropriate measures.

To aid this review the Department archeologist may request a Preliminary Archeological Sensitivity Assessment (PASS) by a Department Qualified Archeological Consultant, subject to the review and approval by the Department archeologist. The Department archeologist will provide three names from the Qualified Archeological Consultant list if the PASS is required.

- 3. Tribal Cultural Resources.** Tribal cultural resources (TCRs) are a class of resource established under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in 2015. TCRs are defined as a site, feature, place, cultural landscape, sacred place or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, that is either included on or eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources or a local historic register, or is a resource that the lead agency, at its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, determines is a TCR. Planning Department staff will review the proposed project to determine if it may cause an adverse effect to a TCR; this will occur in tandem with

preliminary archeological review. No additional information is needed from the project sponsor at this time. Consultation with California Native American tribes regarding TCRs may be required at the request of the tribes. If staff determines that the proposed project may have a potential significant adverse impact on a TCR, mitigation measures will be identified and required. Mitigation measures may include avoidance, protection, or preservation of the TCR and development of interpretation and public education and artistic programs.

4. **Transportation.** Based on the PPA submittal, a transportation impact study is not anticipated; an official determination will be made subsequent to submittal of the EEA. In order to facilitate that determination, please provide the following on revised plans for submission with the EEA:
 - The proposed project site plan, with street names included;
 - Locations of proposed bike parking;
 - Proposed streetscape plan with existing and proposed sidewalk widths and the location of the Class II bike parking.

5. **Noise.** Construction noise is subject to the San Francisco Noise Ordinance (Article 29 of the San Francisco Police Code), which includes restrictions on noise levels of construction equipment and hours of construction. If the proposed project includes noisy construction methods, a construction schedule should be included with the EEA and should indicate what particularly noisy construction methods are required.

Additionally, noise studies may be required for particularly noisy uses or noisy mechanical equipment. As the proposed project is a residential use, such a study is not anticipated. However, if there are any expected events, equipment, amplification or other sources that may generate noise in excess of that expected from the operation of a typical residential building, please include information about those sources with the EEA. If such uses are included in the proposed project, a noise study may be required. Such a study would include at a minimum: measurements of the existing noise environment, discussion of applicable noise regulations, analysis of the project's noise effects and the ability of noise sources to meet applicable noise standards.

6. **Air Quality.** The proposed project, with 20 dwelling units and 2,300 sf of retail space, is below the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's (BAAQMD) construction and operation screening levels for criteria air pollutants.² Therefore, an analysis of the project's criteria air pollutant emissions is not likely to be required. However, please provide updated information related to the volume of any excavation as part of the EEA.

In addition, project-related excavation and other construction activities may cause wind-blown dust that could contribute particulate matter into the local atmosphere. To reduce construction dust impacts, the proposed project will be required to adhere to the dust control requirements set forth in the Construction Dust Ordinance contained in San Francisco Health Code Article 22B and San Francisco Building Code Section 106.A.3.2.6.

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

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 and modeling of air pollution, exposures, and health vulnerability from mobile, stationary, and area source emissions within San Francisco. Given that the project site is not within an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone, no additional measures or analysis related to local health risks are anticipated. As the proposed project is residential in nature, it is not anticipated that it would include new sources of toxic air contaminants including, but not limited to, emissions from diesel generators or boilers, or any other stationary sources. If, however, the project would include such new sources, please provide detailed information about them with the EEA.

7. **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.³ The project sponsor may be required to submit the completed table regarding project compliance with the identified regulations and provide project-level details in the discussion column. This information will be reviewed by the environmental planner during the environmental review process to determine if the project would comply with San Francisco's Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy. Projects that do not comply with an ordinance or regulation may be determined to be inconsistent with the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy.
8. **Wind.** The proposed project would not involve construction of a new building over 80 feet in height. Therefore, a consultant prepared wind analysis is not anticipated.
9. **Shadow.** The proposed project would result in construction of a building greater than 40 feet in height. A preliminary shadow fan analysis prepared by Planning Department staff indicates that the proposed project could possibly cast shadow on Hooker Alley Community Garden, although it is likely that a more detailed analysis, which would include existing intervening buildings, may show no net new shadow. Final determination of the need for a shadow study will be made subsequent to submission of the EEA. Please provide detailed elevations and total height measurements (roof height plus penthouses or other appurtenances) on plans submitted with the EEA.

If a shadow study is necessary, the project sponsor would be required to hire a qualified consultant to prepare a detailed shadow study. The consultant would have 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 also prepare a proposed scope of work for review and approval by Environmental Planning staff prior to preparing the analysis.

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

10. **Geology.** The project site is not located within a Seismic Hazard Zone (Liquefaction Hazard Zone likely underlain by artificial fill or landslide area). 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.
11. **Hazardous Materials.** As the proposed project would not excavate more than 50 cubic yards, the proposed project is not 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 a 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.

If the proposed project description changes to require excavation of more than 50 cubic yards, 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.

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

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. **Conditional Use Authorization** from the Planning Commission is required per Planning Code Section 253 for the new construction of a building exceeding 50 feet in height in a RC Zoning District.
2. A **Variance** from Planning Code Section 134 (Rear Yard) is required.
3. A **Variance** from Planning Code Section 140 (Exposure) is required.
4. A **Shadow Analysis Application** is required to conduct additional analysis on the proposed shadow from the new development.
5. A **Building Permit Application** is required for the proposed alteration to the existing structure located on the subject property (Block/Lot 0274/008).

Conditional Use Authorization and Variance 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 comments address specific Planning Code and other general issues that may substantially impact the proposed project.

1. **Rear Yard.** Section 134 requires the project to provide a rear yard of at least 25 percent of the lot depth, at the lowest story containing a Dwelling Unit, and at each succeeding level or story of the building. On the subject lot, the rear yard requirement is 34'-3/8" inches. The proposal would extend the existing building to a total depth of 117'-6", leaving a rear yard of 20 feet. Given the new building would encroach into the required rear yard by 14'-3/8", a variance is required.
2. **Open Space.** Section 135 requires useable open space for each dwelling unit in the following amounts: 36 square feet space if private, or 48 square feet if common. Additionally, any such open spaces must meet the dimensional requirements of Subsections (f) and (g). Specifically, any space credited as private usable open space shall have a minimum horizontal dimension of six feet and a minimum area of 36 square feet if located on a deck, balcony, porch or roof, and shall have a minimum horizontal dimension of 10 feet and a minimum area of 100 square feet if located on open ground, a terrace or the surface of an inner or outer court. The proposed rear balconies located on floors 2-5, each at approximately 28 square feet, do not meet the dimensional requirements of Subsection (f). Therefore, the proposed project requires revision to meet the dimensional requirements of Code Section 135, or you may request relief from the open space requirements of the Code through the variance process.
3. **Street Trees.** Planning Code Section 138.1 requires one street tree for every 20 feet of frontage for new construction. With 30 feet of frontage on Bush Street, 2 street trees would be required. No street trees are shown on the plans.
4. **Standards for Bird-Safe Buildings.** Planning Code Section 139 requires new building construction to reduce bird mortality from circumstances that are known to pose a high risk to birds and are considered to be "bird hazards." The two circumstances regulated by this Section are 1) location-related hazards, where the siting of a structure creates increased risk to birds and 2) feature-related

hazards, which may create increased risk to birds regardless of where the structure is located. Given that the property is not located within 300 feet of a possible urban bird refuge, feature-related standards would apply to the project. For more information please consult Code Section 139 ('Standards for Bird-Safe Buildings'), and refer to the following document for: http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/publications_reports/bird_safe_bldgs/Standards%20for%20Bird%20Safe%20Buildings%20-%202011-30-11.pdf.

5. **Exposure.** Planning Code 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 proposed rear yard is not code-complying and does not provide a large enough courtyard to meet the exposure requirement for those units (10 units) that only have windows fronting the rear yard area. Therefore, the proposed project requires revision to meet the minimum exposure requirement, or you may request relief from the exposure requirement of the Code through the variance process. The Department generally encourages projects to minimize the number of units needing an exposure exception.
6. **Active Uses.** Planning Code Section 145.1 outlines requirements for development lots to promote street frontages that are pedestrian-oriented, fine-grained, and which are appropriate and compatible with the buildings and uses in NC Districts (including Residential-Commercial (RC) Zoning Districts). Code requires active uses be provided within the first 25 feet of building depth on the ground floor and 15 feet on floors above from any facade facing a street at least 30 feet in width. Building lobbies are considered active uses so long as they do not exceed 40 feet or 25 percent of building frontage, whichever is larger. Given that the existing ground floor of the subject building contains a commercial retail space, the Department supports the continuation of a ground floor retail use as a means of compliance with Code Section 145.1.
7. **Bicycle Parking.** Planning Code Section 155.5 requires this project to provide at least 20 Class I bicycle parking spaces and 1 Class II bicycle parking spaces. The proposed project contains the required amount of Class II bicycle parking, however, the required Class II bicycle parking needs to be shown on future plan submittals.
8. **Dwelling Unit Density.** Planning Code Section 209.3 establishes the maximum dwelling unit density for Residential-Commercial (RC) Zoning Districts. Within the RC-4 Zoning District, up to one dwelling unit per 200 square feet of lot area is permitted. With 4,125 square feet of lot area, the subject lot is permitted up to a maximum of 21 dwelling units. The proposal calls for 20 dwelling units, which, is under the maximum dwelling unit density for the subject lot.
9. **Height.** Planning Code Section 253 requires that wherever a height limit of more than 50 feet in a RM or RC District, is prescribed by the height and bulk district in which the property is located, any building or structure exceeding 50 feet in height in a RM or RC District, shall be permitted only upon approval by the Planning Commission according to the procedures for conditional use approval in Section 303 of the Code. The Project would exceed a height of 50 feet in the RM Zoning District, therefore the project requires Conditional Use Authorization. Even though the underlying Bulk and

Height District (65-A) would allow for a taller structure, the Code requires approval by the Planning Commission according to the procedures for conditional use approval in Section 303 of this Code.

10. **Bulk.** Planning Code Section 270 establishes limits upon the bulk of buildings and structures. The subject property is located within a 65-A Height and Bulk District. Bulk limits for structures located within the "A" District are as follows: above 40 feet, a maximum length of 110 feet and a maximum diagonal dimension of 125 feet is permitted. The plan submittal illustrates that the proposed structure would have a maximum length of 112'-6", which exceeds the bulk controls by approximately 2'-6". The maximum diagonal dimension is not shown, but it is assumed that the maximum diagonal would not exceed 125. Nevertheless, the maximum length of the proposed structure exceeds the bulk allowance; therefore, the proposed project requires revision to meet bulk limits.
11. **Shadow Analysis (Section 295).** 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 may cast new shadow on Hooker Alley (Nob Hill) Community Garden. Therefore, a detailed shadow analysis would need to be prepared to determine if the project would create new shadow in that results in an adverse impact to Hooker Alley (Nob Hill) Community Garden, pursuant to Section 295. If this detailed shadow analysis finds that the project would cast shadow on Hooker Alley (Nob Hill) Community Garden, the sponsor should explore sculpting of portions of the project to avoid casting new shadows on the park.
12. **First Source Hiring Agreement.** A First Source Hiring Agreement is required for any project proposing to construct 25,000 gross square feet or more, or, add ten (10) or more dwelling units. For more information, please contact:

Ken Nim, Workforce Compliance Officer
CityBuild, Office of Economic and Workforce Development
City and County of San Francisco
50 Van Ness Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 581-2303

13. **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. The following Inclusionary Affordable Housing requirements are those in effect at the time as of issuance of this letter. In the event that the requirements change, the Project Sponsor shall comply with requirements in place at the time of the issuance of first construction document. 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 exception agreement is secured by the project sponsor. Affordable units designated as on-site units shall be affordable units for the life of the project. The applicable percentage is dependent on the number of units in the project, the zoning of the property, and the date that the project submitted a complete Environmental Evaluation Application. A

complete Environmental Evaluation Application has not been submitted; therefore, pursuant to Planning Code Section 415.3 and 415.6 the Inclusionary Affordable Housing Program requirement for the On-site Affordable Housing Alternative is to provide 12% of the proposed dwelling units as affordable to low-income households as defined by the Planning Code and Procedures Manual.

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

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

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

14. **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.

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

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

- a. Transportation Sustainability Fee (TSF) (formally Transit Impact Development Fee (TIDF)) (Planning Code Section 411A)
- b. Child-Care Fee—Residential (414A)
- c. Affordable Housing Fee (415)

PRELIMINARY DESIGN COMMENTS:

The following comments address preliminary design issues that may substantially affect the proposed project:

1. **Site Design, Open Space, and Massing.** The Planning Department recommends providing a rear yard that is a minimum of 25' from the rear property line. Furthermore, the Department requests that the rear yard be used as open space and connected at grade to the adjacent units or commonly accessible circulation of the building and not simply sit below the first level of residential unit balconies. Any balconies that protrude into the rear yard should be at least 8' above the rear yard grade.

Note that the project site contains one or more structures considered to be an historic resource; therefore, the proposed project is subject to further design review by the Department's Historic Preservation staff. Please refer to the Environmental Planning Review – Historic Resources section of the Preliminary Project Assessment for further instruction. This property is also located in the Lower Nob Hill National Register Historic District. Due to the subject property's historic status, the Department requests that the project provide a more substantial setback of the five-story addition from the existing one-story commercial building at the front property line. The addition should read as a separate building, not complete the streetwall and be compatibly designed (materials, fenestration, etc.) with the Historic District. Subject to further study, the Department may request a setback of up to 35' from the front property line.

2. **Street Frontage.** As the street frontage is minimal, the Planning Department recommends that the project seek the use of a sidewalk transformer vault. Intrusion of the transformer into the façade would be a significant diminishment of active use along the ground floor, and would remove a significant amount of character-defining features. Consider minimizing the lobby width where not actively programmed and instead offer the maximum space to the adjacent retail area.
3. **Architecture.** As fire escapes and balconies are not character-defining features within the Lower Nob Hill NRHD, the Planning Department recommends that the project instead explore the inclusion of bay windows. Additionally, contextual primary exterior cladding materials include painted brick, pressed brick, stucco cladding, painted terra cotta, and granite bases; these materials are typically used in these configurations: brick, stucco and galvanized iron cladding.

More generally architecturally, the Department recommends that the project's front façade include more solidity and a lighter material palette to better reflect the neighborhood pattern and context. The Department also requests the use of high-quality materials and the inclusion of significant depth in the fenestration in street-facing facades.

PRELIMINARY PROJECT ASSESSMENT EXPIRATION:

This Preliminary Project Assessment is valid for a period of **18 months**. An Environmental Evaluation, Conditional Use Authorization, Variance Application, Shadow Analysis Application, or Building Permit Application), as listed above, must be submitted no later than **March 21, 2018**. 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: Shadow Fan Analysis
 Neighborhood Group Mailing List
 Interdepartmental Project Review Application

cc: 850 Bush Street, LLC, Property Owner
 Marcelle Boudreaux, Current Planning
 Nicholas Foster, Current Planning
 Justin Horner, Environmental Planning
 Maia Small, Citywide Planning and Analysis
 Jonas Ionin, Planning Commission Secretary
 Charles Rivasplata, SFMTA
 Jerry Sanguinetti, Public Works
 Pauline Perkins, SFPUC
 Planning Department Webmaster (planning.webmaster@sfgov.org)



Legend

- 850 Bush Street
- Shadow Fan @ 65'
- Shadow Fan @ 75'
- RPD Properties

Open Spaces

- Public
- Private

Schools Public - Dec 2015

CCSF_ENTITY

- SFCCD
- SFUSD

Title: 850 Bush Street PPA
 Comments: Shadow cast on Hooker Alley Community Garden (Rec&Park)
 Printed: 9 August, 2016



The City and County of San Francisco (CCSF) does not guarantee the accuracy, adequacy, completeness or usefulness of any information. CCSF provides this information on an "as is" basis without warranty of any kind, including but not limited to warranties of merchantability or fitness for a particular purpose, and assumes no responsibility for anyone's use of the information.

FIRST	LAST	TITLE	ORGANIZATION	ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP	TELEPHONE	EMAIL	NEIGHBORHOOD OF INTEREST
Andrew	Chandler		0 Lower Polk Neighbors	PO BOX 642428	San Francisco	CA	94164-2428		0	0 Downtown/Civic Center, Nob Hill
Aaron	Peskin	Supervisor, District 3	Board of Supervisors	1 Dr. Carlton B Goodlett Place, Room #244	San Francisco	CA	94102-4689	415-554-7450	aaron.peskin@sfgov.org; sunny.angulo@sfgov.org; connie.chan@sfgov.org; lee.hepner@sfgov.org	0 Chinatown, Financial District, Nob Hill, North Beach, Russian Hill
David	Villa-Lobos	Chair	Lower Polk Business Collaborative	P.O. Box 642201	San Francisco	CA	94164	415-559-6627	david_villalobos@sbcglobal.net	Nob Hill, Russian Hill
Moe	Jamil	Chair	Middle Polk Neighborhood Association	PO Box 640918	San Francisco	CA	94164		0 moe@middlepolk.org	Nob Hill, Russian Hill
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
Jaime	Whitaker	Administrator	SOMA Leadership Council	201 Harrison Street Apt. 229	San Francisco	CA	94105	415-935-5810	somajournal@yahoo.com	Mission, South of Market
Kathleen	Courtney	Chair of Housing and Zoning	Russian Hill Community Association	1158 Green Street	San Francisco	CA	94109	510-928-8243	kcourtney@rhcasf.com	Nob Hill, Russian Hill
Marlayne	Morgan	President	Cathedral Hill Neighbors Association	1200 Gough Street	San Francisco	CA	94109	415-572-8093	marlayne16@gmail.com	Downtown/Civic Center, Nob Hill
Robyn	Tucker	Co-Chair	Pacific Avenue Neighborhood Association (PANA)	7 McCormick	San Francisco	CA	94109	415-609-5607	venturesv@aol.com	Nob Hill, Russian Hill
Billy	Lee		0 Oak Grove Group	2505 Oak Street	Napa	CA		94559 415-310-6706	leeway_e@yahoo.com	Pacific Heights, Russian Hill, Marina, Nob Hill, Presidio, Presidio Heights, Sea Cliff, Noe Valley, Western Addition
Marc	Bruno	Treasurer	St. Vincent de Paul Society, North Beach	666 Filbert Street	San Francisco	CA		94133 415-421-0809	marcabruno@yahoo.com	Chinatown, Financial District, Nob Hill, North Beach, Russian Hill
Brian	Basinger	Executive Director	Q Foundation - AIDS Housing Alliance/SF	350 Golden Gate Ave. Suite A	San Francisco	CA		94102 415-552-3242	info@ahasf.org	Castro/Upper Market, Downtown/Civic Center, Financial District, Haight Ashbury, Mission, Nob Hill, South of

FIRST	LAST	TITLE	ORGANIZATION	ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP	TELEPHONE	EMAIL	NEIGHBORHOOD OF INTEREST
Andrew	Chandler		Lower Polk Neighbors	PO BOX 642428	San Francisco	CA	94164-			Downtown/Civic Center, Nob Hill
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
Donald	Savoie	Executive Director	Civic Center Community Benefit District	234 Van Ness Avenue	San Francisco	CA	94102	415-626-1819	info@sfciviccenter.org	Downtown/Civic Center
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
Ian	Lewis		HERE Local 2	209 Golden Gate Avenue	San Francisco	CA	94102			Chinatown, Downtown/Civic Center, Marina, Mission, Nob Hill, North Beach, Pacific Heights, Presidio, South of Market
James	Haas	Chairman	Civic Center Stakeholder Group	100 Van Ness Avenue	San Francisco	CA	94102	415-285-5048	JWHaasESQ@AOL.com	Downtown/Civic Center
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; Ivy.Lee@sfgov.org	Downtown/Civic Center, North Beach, South of Market, Treasure Island/YBI
Jason	Henderson	Vice Chariman	Market/Octavia Community Advisory Comm.	300 Buchanan Street, Apt. 503	San Francisco	CA	94102	415-722-0617	jhenders@sbcglobal.net	Castro/Upper Market, Downtown/Civic Center, Mission, South of Market, Western Addition
London	Breed	Supervisor, District 5	Board of Supervisors	1 Dr. Carlton B Goodlett Place, Room #244	San Francisco	CA	94102-4689	415-554-7630	London.Breed@sfgov.org; conor.johnston@sfgov.org; vallie.brown@sfgov.org; Ahmad.Elnajjar@sfgov.org	Bernal Heights, Downtown/Civic Center, Haight Ashbury, Inner Sunset, Western Addition
Marlayne	Morgan	President	Cathedral Hill Neighbors Association	1200 Gough Street	San Francisco	CA	94109	415-572-8093	marlayne16@gmail.com	Downtown/Civic Center, Nob Hill
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
Randy	Shaw	Director	Tenderloin Housing Clinic	126 Hyde Street	San Francisco	CA	94102	415-771-9850	randy@thclinic.org	Downtown/Civic Center
Ted	Olsson	Member	Market/Octavia Community Advisory Comm.	30 Sharon Street	San Francisco	CA	94114-1709	415-407-0094	olssonted@yahoo.com	Castro/Upper Market, Downtown/Civic Center, Mission
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		tiffany.bohee@sfgov.org; mike.grisso@sfgov.org; courtney.pash@sfgov.org	Bayview, Downtown /Civic Center, South of Market, Visitacion Valley
Gail	Baugh	President	Hayes Valley Neighborhood Association	700 Hayes Street	San Francisco	CA	94102	415-265-0546	president@hayesvalleysf.org	Castro/Upper Market, Downtown/Civic Center, Mission, South of Market, Western Addition
Claude	Imbault	Director of Strategic Initiatives	Union Square Business Improvement District	323 Geary Street, Suite 203	San Francisco	CA	94102	415-781-7880	claud@unionsquarebid.com	Downtown/Civic Center
Mark	Moreno	Co-Director	Market/Van Ness Neighborhood Association	77 Van Ness Avenue	San Francisco	CA	94102	415-286-3492	mmoreno@citiscapesf.com	Downton/Civic Center
Brian	Basinger	Executive Director	Q Foundation - AIDS Housing Alliance/SF	350 Golden Gate Ave. Suite A	San Francisco	CA	94102	415-552-3242	info@ahasf.org	Castro/Upper Market, Downtown/Civic Center, Financial District, Haight Ashbury, Mission, Nob Hill,



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

INTERDEPARTMENTAL PROJECT REVIEW

Effective: August 31, 2015

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

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

Interdepartmental Project Reviews are **mandatory** for new construction projects that propose buildings eight (8) stories or more and new construction on parcels identified by the State of California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology as Seismic Hazard Zones in the City and County of San Francisco. Projects identified as such, must request and participate in an interdepartmental project review prior to any application that requires a public hearing before the Planning Commission or new construction building permit.

Project Sponsors may elect to request an interdepartmental review for any project at any time, however, it is strongly recommended that the request is made prior to the submittal of the above referenced applications.

The Planning Department acts as the lead agency in collaboration with the Department of Building Inspection (DBI); the Department of Public Works (DPW); and the San Francisco Fire Department (SFFD). A representative from each of these City Agencies will attend your meeting.

Interdepartmental Project Review fees:

Please refer to the Planning Department Fee Schedule for fees related to this application. The Fee Schedule may be obtained from the Planning Department's [website](http://www.sf-planning.org) at www.sf-planning.org or in person at the Public Information Counter (PIC) located at 1660 Mission Street, San Francisco, CA 94103. For questions related to the Fee Schedule, please call the PIC at (415) 558-6377.

To avoid delays in scheduling your meeting, provide all information requested on this form and submit your request with a check in the appropriate amount payable to the San Francisco Planning Department. Requests may be mailed or delivered to **San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103-2414**. Those wishing more specific or more detailed information may contact the Project Review Meeting Coordinator at **(415) 575-9091**.

Please note: All returned checks are subject to a \$50.00 bank fee.

Interdepartmental Project Reviews are scheduled no sooner than two (2) weeks from the receipt of the request form and check.

Submittal requirements:

Please submit four (4) copies/sets of all information for distribution to each department/agency.

Note: No documents or plans should exceed 11" x 17" page size.

All projects subject to the **mandatory** Interdepartmental Project Review shall be required to submit the following minimum information in addition to their request form:

1. Site Survey with topography lines;
2. Floor Plans with occupancy and/or use labeled of existing and proposed;
3. Existing and proposed elevations;
4. Roof Plan; and
5. Pictures of the subject property and street frontages.

Planned unit developments or projects with an acre or more of land area shall be required to submit the following additional information:

1. Existing and proposed street names and widths;
2. Location of any existing train tracks; and
3. Location of any existing and proposed easements.

In order for the Interdepartmental Project Review to be most effective and beneficial to you, it is strongly recommended that any issues, concerns and/or specific questions are submitted with this request directed to each discipline.

INTERDEPARTMENTAL PROJECT REVIEW MEETING APPLICATION FORM

APPLICATION DATE: _____

PROJECT CONTACT: (Please complete all data fields)

Name _____ Phone No. () _____

Address _____

City _____ Zip Code _____

FAX No. () _____ E-Mail Address _____

Name of Property Owner _____

PROJECT INFORMATION:

Property Address _____

How many units does the subject property have? _____

Assessor's Block/Lot(s) _____ Zoning District _____

Height and Bulk Districts _____

PROJECT DESCRIPTION / PURPOSE OF MEETING: (Use a separate sheet, if necessary)

Land Use Type	Existing	Proposed	Net Change
Number of Dwelling Units			
Commercial Square Footage:			
Retail			
Office			
Number of Hotel Rooms			
Industrial Square Footage			
Other Uses: _____			
Number of Parking Spaces			
Number of Stories			

Previously contacted Planning Department staff _____

Will this project be publicly funded? (specify) _____

Please submit four (4) copies/sets of all information for distribution to each department/agency.

Note: No documents or plans should exceed 11" x 17" page size.