



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

DATE: October 20, 2015
TO: Jody Knight
FROM: Julian J. Bañales, Planning Department
RE: PPA Case No. 2015.009917PPA for 200 Potrero Avenue

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

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

Please find the attached Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) for the address listed above. You may contact the staff contact, Shaunn Mendrin, at (415) 575-9178 or shaunn.mendrin@sfgov.org to answer any questions you may have, or to schedule a follow-up meeting.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Julian J. Bañales".

Julian J. Bañales, Southeast Team Manager



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Preliminary Project Assessment

Date: October 22, 2015
Case No.: **2015.009917PPA**
Project Address: 200 Potrero Avenue
Block/Lot: 3931A/001
Zoning: PDR-1-G (Production, Distribution & Repair – 1 General)
68-X Height and Bulk District
Area Plan: Mission Area Plan, Eastern Neighborhoods Plans
Project Sponsor: Jody Knight
415-567-9000
Staff Contact: Shaunn Mendrin – 415-575-9178
shaunn.mendrin@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 July 31, 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 (200 Potrero Avenue) is a corner lot located in the Mission neighborhood at the intersection of Potrero Avenue and 15th Street. The project sponsor proposes to modify an existing 38-foot tall, 27,716 square foot building to accommodate a new 30,034 square foot gym. The existing building was constructed in 1928 and is a Category A Historical Resource that currently houses a clothing manufacturing company. The proposed project would not alter historic elements of the building façade;

however, it would result in the loss of approximately 28,000 square feet devoted to production, distribution, and repair uses. The project would not include any parking.

On the ground floor, the proposed gym would have a pool, a spa, sauna and steam room, a locker room, and an open gym area. On the second floor, there would be a group exercise area, a children's area, a pro shop, more open gym area, and administrative areas. The gym would have equipment and spaces designated for weightlifting and cardiovascular activities.

The proposed project site is located on a high-injury corridor. The existing building has four doors on Potrero Avenue and one door on 15th Street. The project sponsor proposes to locate the main entrance on Potrero Avenue which is a two-way, five-lane street with parking on both sides of the street and a bike lane in the southbound direction. Several Muni lines stop within a quarter mile of the proposed project.

BACKGROUND:

The project site is within the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans. The Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans cover the Mission (location of project site), East South of Market (SoMa), Showplace Square/Potrero Hill, and Central Waterfront neighborhoods. On August 7, 2008, the Planning Commission certified the *Eastern Neighborhoods Programmatic Final Environmental Impact Report (Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR)* by Motion 17659 and adopted the Preferred Project for final recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.^{1,2} The Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans and its associated rezoning became effective December 19, 2008.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:

Community Plan Exemption

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

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

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

¹ San Francisco Planning Department. Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR), Planning Department Case No. 2004.0160E, certified August 7, 2008. Available online at: <http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1893>, accessed August 17, 2012.

² San Francisco Planning Department. San Francisco Planning Commission Motion 17659, August 7, 2008. Available online at: <http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=1268>, accessed August 17, 2012.

- 1. CPE Only.** All potentially significant project-specific and cumulatively considerable environmental impacts are fully consistent with significant impacts identified in the *Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR*, and there would be no new "peculiar" significant impacts unique to the proposed project. In these situations, all pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the *Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR* are applied to the proposed project, and a CPE checklist and certificate is prepared. With this outcome, the applicable fees are: (a) the CPE determination fee (currently \$13,659) and (b) the CPE certificate fee (currently \$7,580).
- 2. Mitigated Negative Declaration.** If new site- or project-specific significant impacts are identified for the proposed project that were not identified in the *Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR*, and if these new significant impacts can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level, then a focused mitigated negative declaration is prepared to address these impacts, and a supporting CPE checklist is prepared to address all other impacts that were encompassed by the *Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR*, with all pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the *Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR* also applied to the proposed project. With this outcome, the applicable fees are: (a) the CPE determination fee (currently \$13,659) and (b) the standard environmental evaluation fee (which is based on construction value).
- 3. Focused EIR.** If any new site- or project-specific significant impacts cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level, then a focused EIR is prepared to address these impacts, and a supporting CPE checklist is prepared to address all other impacts that were encompassed by the *Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR*, with all pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the *Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR* also applied to the proposed project. With this outcome, the applicable fees are: (a) the CPE determination fee (currently \$13,659); (b) the standard environmental evaluation fee (which is based on construction value); and (c) one-half of the standard EIR fee (which is also based on construction value). An EIR must be prepared by an environmental consultant from the Planning Department's environmental consultant pool (http://www.sfplanning.org/ftp/files/MEA/Environmental_consultant_pool.pdf). The Planning Department will provide more detail to the project sponsor regarding the EIR process should this level of environmental review be required.

In order to begin formal environmental review, please submit an **Environmental Evaluation Application (EEA)**. The EEA can be submitted at the same time as the PPA Application. The environmental review may be done in conjunction with the required approvals listed below, but must be completed before any project approval may be granted. **Note that until an entitlement application is submitted to the Current Planning Division, only the proposed Project Description will be reviewed by the assigned Environmental Coordinator.** EEAs are available in the Planning Department lobby at 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, at the Planning Information Center at 1660 Mission Street, and online at www.sfplanning.org under the "Publications" tab. See "Environmental Applications" on page 2 of the current Fee Schedule for a calculation of environmental application fees.³ 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.

³ 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 site contains one or more buildings previously determined to be eligible for national, state, or local listing as a historic resource. The property was surveyed as part of the Showplace Square/Northeast Mission Historic Resources Survey. Due to the limited scope of exterior work involving ground floor storefront alterations, the Department's Historic Preservation staff will review the proposed project and a Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE) report is not required.
2. **Archeological Resources.** The project site lies within the Archeological Mitigation Zone J-2: Properties with No Previous Studies of the *Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR*. The PPA narrative indicates that the project will not involve any excavation. However, the plans show a pool on the ground floor. If any excavation is necessary, the proposed project will require Preliminary Archeological Review (PAR) by a Planning Department archeologist. 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. The PAR will assess the archeological sensitivity of the project site based on in-house source material and will consider the potential for archeological impacts resulting from proposed soils disturbance. If excavation is required, please provide detailed information, including sections, proposed soils-disturbing activities, such as grading, excavation, installation of foundations, soils improvement, and site remediation in the EEA, and submit any available geotechnical/soils or phase II hazardous materials reports prepared for the project to assist in this review. If the Department archeologist determines that the project has a potential to adversely affect archeological resources, the PAR will identify additional measures needed to address the potential effect. These measures may include preparation of an archeological research design and treatment plan, implementation of project mitigation measures (such as archeological testing, monitoring, or accidental discovery), or other appropriate measures.
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 determine 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 Planning Department's Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines for Environmental Review,⁴ the project would require additional transportation analysis to determine

⁴This document is available at: <http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1886>.

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 Technical Memorandum. You are required to pay additional fees for the Memorandum; please contact Vernaliza 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 memorandum.

Additionally, the proposed project is located on a high injury corridor as mapped by Vision Zero.⁵ Planning staff have reviewed the proposed site plans recommend that following the submittal of the Environmental Evaluation Application (EEA), the assigned environmental planner and project sponsor conduct a site visit to determine how patrons will access the gym and where passenger loading will occur.

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

Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Noise Mitigation Measure F-5: Siting of Noise-Generating Uses would apply to the proposed project because the project would include commercial uses that may generate noise levels in excess of ambient noise, either short term, at nighttime, or as a 24-hour average, in the project site vicinity. To reduce potential conflicts between existing sensitive receptors and new noise-generating uses, for new development including commercial, industrial or other uses that would be expected to generate noise levels in excess of ambient noise, either short-term, at nighttime, or as a 24-hour average, in the proposed project site vicinity, the Planning Department requires the preparation of an analysis that includes, at a minimum, a site survey to identify potential noise-sensitive uses within 900 feet of, and that have a direct line-of-sight to, the project site, and including at least one 24-hour noise measurement (with maximum noise level readings taken at least every 15 minutes), prior to the first project approval action. The analysis shall be prepared by persons qualified in acoustical analysis and/or engineering and shall demonstrate with reasonable certainty that the proposed use would comply with the use compatibility requirements in the General Plan and in Police Code Section 2909I, would not adversely affect nearby noise-sensitive uses, and that there are no particular circumstances about the proposed project site that appear to warrant heightened concern about noise levels that would be generated by the proposed use. Should such concerns be present, the Department may require the completion of a detailed noise assessment by person(s) qualified in acoustical analysis and/or engineering prior to the first project approval action.

⁵This document is available at: <http://www.sfmta.com/sites/default/files/projects/2015/vision-zero-san-francisco.pdf>.

6. **Air Quality.** 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.

Project-related demolition 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. The proposed project is also required to prepare a Construction Dust Control Plan for review and approval by DPH. Additionally, equipment exhaust measures during construction, such as those listed in *Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Air Quality Mitigation Measure G-1: Construction Air Quality (from Initial Study)* will likely be required.

If the project would include new sources of toxic air contaminants including, but not limited to, emissions from diesel generators or boilers, or any other stationary sources, the project would result in toxic air contaminants that may affect both on-site and off-site sensitive receptors. Additional measures, such as those described in *Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Air Quality Mitigation Measure G-3: Siting of Uses that Emit DPM* and *Mitigation Measure G-4: Siting of Uses that Emit Other TACs*, may be necessary to reduce the project's emissions or impact on sensitive receptors. Please provide detailed information related to any proposed stationary sources 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.⁶ The project sponsor will 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. **Hazardous Materials.** The Department of Public Health mapped the proposed project site as an area that may be contaminated due to previous industrial uses. While the proposed project does not currently require any excavation, it would involve a change in use from industrial to commercial uses with children using the proposed commercial facility. To assess the potential for site contamination and level of exposure risk associated with the project, the project sponsor should 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. Based on the information in the Phase I ESA, the project

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

may be subject to Article 22A of the Health Code, also known as the Maher Ordinance. Please provide a copy of the Phase I ESA with the EEA to assist the Planning Department in determining if enrollment in the Maher Program and/or further remediation is necessary.

Eastern Neighborhoods EIR Hazardous Materials Mitigation Measure L-1: Hazardous Building Materials would be applicable to the proposed project. The mitigation measure requires that the project sponsor ensure that any equipment containing polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) or di(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate (DEPH), such as fluorescent light ballasts, and any fluorescent light tubes containing mercury be removed and properly disposed of in accordance with applicable federal, state, and local laws. In addition, any other hazardous materials identified, either before or during work, must be abated according to applicable federal, state, and local laws.

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.

9. **Naturally Occurring Asbestos.** Based on mapping conducted by the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) the project site may be underlain by serpentine rock.⁷ If the project sponsor must revise the project to include excavation, construction activities could release serpentinite into the atmosphere. Serpentinite commonly contains naturally occurring chrysotile asbestos (NOA) or tremolite-actinolite, a fibrous mineral that can be hazardous to human health if airborne emissions are inhaled. In the absence of proper controls, NOA could become airborne during excavation and handling of excavated materials. On-site workers and the public could be exposed to airborne asbestos unless appropriate control measures are implemented. To address health concerns from exposure to NOA, ARB enacted an Asbestos Airborne Toxic Control Measure (ATCM) for Construction, Grading, Quarrying, and Surface Mining Operations in July 2001. The requirements established by the Asbestos ATCM are contained in California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 17, Section 93105,⁸ and are enforced by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). The proposed project would be required to comply with the requirements of the Asbestos ATCM, which include measures to control fugitive dust from construction activities, in addition to the requirements of the Construction Dust Control Ordinance discussed above.
10. **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

⁷ Planning Department, GIS Layer, "Areas Affected by Serpentine Rocks." Created February 25, 2010 from United States Geological Survey and San Francisco Department of Public Health data.

⁸ California Air Resources Board, Regulatory Advisory, Asbestos Airborne Toxic Control Measure for Construction, Grading, Quarrying, and Surface Mining Operations, July 29, 2002.

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."

11. **Disclosure Report for Developers of Major City Projects.** The San Francisco Ethics Commission S.F. Camp. & Govt. Conduct Code § 3.520 et seq. requires developers to provide the public with information about donations that developers make to nonprofit organizations that may communicate with the City and County regarding major development projects. This report must be completed and filed by the developer of any "major project." A major project is a real estate development project located in the City and County of San Francisco with estimated construction costs exceeding \$1,000,000 where either: (1) The Planning Commission or any other local lead agency certifies an EIR for the project; or (2) The project relies on a program EIR and the Planning Department, Planning Commission, or any other local lead agency adopts any final environmental determination under CEQA. A final environmental determination includes: the issuance of a Community Plan Exemption (CPE); certification of a CPE/EIR; adoption of a CPE/Final Mitigated Negative Declaration; or a project approval by the Planning Commission that adopts CEQA Findings. (In instances where more than one of the preceding determinations 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 210.3 for gyms over 2,500 gross square feet.
2. **Variance** from the Zoning Administrator from the Off-Street Loading requirements of Planning Code Section 152.
3. A **Building Permit Application** is required for the proposed alteration for the new gym on the subject property.

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 not 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. It is recommended that the project Sponsor conduct a Pre-Application meeting and an outreach effort due to the loss of PDR. The Pre-Application packet, which includes instructions and template forms, is available at www.sfplanning.org under the "Permits & Zoning" tab and 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. **Mission Area Plan.** The subject property falls within the area covered by the Mission Area Plan in the General Plan. The project falls within the "Production, Distribution and Repair" (PDR) zoning district, meant to encourage and retain these types of uses. While the proposed land use is allowed through a Conditional Use Authorization, it is resulting in the loss of a PDR use. The proposed project may require further evaluation to assure it sufficiently meets Mission District Area Plan policies and objectives. Some of the objectives for which the current design will need further evaluation include:
 - Objective 1.7: Retain the mission's role as an important location for Production, Distribution, and Repair (PDR) activities.
 - Objective 1.8: Maintain and strengthen the mission's neighborhood commercial areas.
 - Objective 3.2: Promote an urban form and architectural character that supports walking and sustains a diverse, active and safe public realm.
 - Objective 4.5: Consider the street network in the Mission District as a city resource essential to multi-modal movement and public open space.
 - Objective 6.2: Increase economic security for workers by providing access to sought-after job skills.
 - Objective 7.1: Provide essential community services and facilities.
 - Objective 8.6: Foster public awareness and appreciation of historic and cultural resources within the Mission Plan Area.

The project sponsor is encouraged to read the full plan, which can be viewed at: <http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=2321>. These should be address in the formal plan set submittal and the required findings for the Conditional Use Authorization and Variance Application. Staff notes that the Planning Commission has expressed a preference to maintain PDR uses on past projects.

2. **Mission Moratorium.** The Mission Neighborhood may be subject to a potential Voter Ballot Initiative (Measure I) that will be on the November Ballot this year. As proposed it would put a hold on residential development of more than 5 units and the loss of PDR uses for 18 months with a possible extension. This project would be subject to the moratorium if approved by the voters.
3. **Mission Action Plan 2020.** The Planning Department is currently working on the Mission Action Plan 2020 (MAP2020), which the subject site is located within. The plan will identify programs, policies, funding and potentially some changes to affordable housing options in the neighborhood and stabilize affordable residential opportunities and businesses. The plan is also exploring some height/zoning changes, through tools such as the affordable housing bonus program, to encourage additional affordability by generally contributing positively to the neighborhood by meeting their affordable housing obligations and providing other benefits to the community (as conditioned). Most solutions will be coordinated other City and County agencies (MOHCD, OWED, DCYF, HSA, Mayor's Office) identifying funding, support and programs to help stabilize the neighborhood. For more information regarding MAP2020 you may contact the project planner Claudia Flores at (415) 575-6473 or claudia.flores@sfgov.org. You may also view the following webpage for additional information regarding MAP2020: <http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=4184>
4. **Street Trees.** Planning Code Section 138.1 requires one street tree for every 20 feet of frontage for new construction. The proposed project does not trigger tree planting; however, the plans include tree planting consistent with the requirements.
5. **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.
6. **Off-Street Parking.** The current Zoning Designation of PDR-1-G does not require off-street parking for the proposed use. Please provide additional information regarding the lease agreement for the existing shopping center and how parking will be used/provided. Please provide information regarding the recorded Notice of Restrictions (including the Conditions of Approval) for the existing shopping center.
7. **Off-Street Loading.** Planning Code Section 152 requires loading spaces based on the type and size of a use. The proposed gym requires 1 loading space. The existing site contains an off-street loading space, which is proposed to be filled in. As noted above, a Variance will be required to allow the proposed project to move forward without a loading space.
8. **Bicycle Parking.** Planning Code Section 155.5 requires the project to provide at least 5 Class I and 12 Class II bicycle parking spaces. The proposed project appears to be consistent with this requirement.

9. **Diaper Changing.** Planning Code Section 168 requires diaper changing facilities for the proposed use based on the size of the use. The plans submitted with the Conditional Use Authorization include diaper changing stations consistent with the requirements of the Planning Code.
10. **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. Transit Impact Development Fee (TIDF)
- b. Eastern Neighborhoods Impact Fees (423), based on the 30,034 gross square feet.

PRELIMINARY PROJECT ASSESSMENT EXPIRATION:

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

Enclosure: Neighborhood Group Mailing List

cc: Equity One Investments, Property Owner
Shaunn Mendrin, Current Planning
Heather Jones, Environmental Planning
Jeremy Shaw, 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)

Antonio Diaz
Project Director
People Organizing to Demand Environmental
and Economic Rights (PODER)
474 Valencia Street #125
San Francisco, CA 94103

David Campos
Supervisor, District 9
Board of Supervisors
1 Dr. Carlton B Goodlett Place, Room #244
San Francisco, CA 94102-4689

Erick Arguello
President
Calle 24 Merchants and Neighbors
Association
1065 A Hampshire Street
San Francisco, CA 94110

Jeff Parker
Steering Committee Member
Friends of Upper Douglass Dog Park
750 27th Street
San Francisco, CA 94131

Judith Berkowitz
President
East Mission Improvement Association
(EMIA)
1322 Florida Street
San Francisco, CA 94110

Luis Grandados
Executive Director
Mission Economic Development Association
2301 Mission Street #301
San Francisco, CA 94110

Planning and Land Use Committee 0
0
Dolores Heights Improvement Club-DRC
P.O. Box 14426
San Francisco, CA 94114

Philip Lesser
President
Mission Merchants Association
555 Laurel Avenue #501
San Mateo, CA 94401

Sean Quigley
President
Valencia Corridor Merchant Association
1038 Valencia Street
San Francisco, CA 94110

Brent Plater
0
Wild Equity Institute
474 Valencia Street Suite 295
San Francisco, CA 94103

Edward Stiel
0
2887 Folsom Street Concerned Residents
2887 Folsom Street
San Francisco, CA 94110

Ian Lewis
0
HERE Local 2
209 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102

Jaime Whitaker
Administrator
SOMA Leadership Council
201 Harrison Street Apt. 229
San Francisco, CA 94105

Keith Goldstein
0
Potrero-Dogpatch Merchants Association
800 Kansas Street
San Francisco, CA 94107

Marvis Phillips
Land Use Chair
Alliance for a Better District 6
230 Eddy Street #1206
San Francisco, CA 94102-6526

Peter Heinecke
President
Liberty Hill Neighborhood Associaton
30 Hill Street
San Francisco, CA 94110

Podge Thomas
Site Manager
Native American Health Center
333 Valencia Street, Suite 240
San Francisco, CA 94103

Spike Kahn
Director
Pacific Felt Factory
2830 - 20th Street
San Francisco, CA 94110

Buddy Choy
President
Coleridge St. Neighbors
157 Coleridge Street
San Francisco, CA 94110

Eric Lopez
President
SoMaBend Neighborhood Association
P.O. Box 410805
San Francisco, CA 94141

Jason Henderson
Vice Chariman
Market/Octavia Community Advisory
Comm.
300 Buchanan Street, Apt. 503
San Francisco, CA 94102

John Barbey
Chairperson
Liberty Hill Resident Association
50 Liberty Street
San Francisco, CA 94110

Lucia Bogatay
Board Member
Mission Dolores Neighborhood Association
3676 20th Street
San Francisco, CA 94110

Matthew Rodgers
Chair
Alabama Street Pioneers
1014 Alabama Street
San Francisco, CA 94110

Peter Cohen
0
Noe Street Neighbors
33 Noe Street
San Francisco, CA 94114

Robert Hernandez
0
-
1333 Florida Street
San Francisco, CA 94110

Ted Olsson
Member
Market/Octavia Community Advisory
Comm.
30 Sharon Street
San Francisco, CA 94114-1709

Mission

P16

Tisha Kenny
President
19th Street/Oakwood Neighborhood
Association
3642 19th Street
San Francisco, CA 94110

J.R. Eppler
President
Potrero Boosters Neighborhood Association
1459 - 18th Street, Suite 133
San Francisco, CA 94107

Zoe Astrachen
Principal
Central 26th Street Neighborhood Coalition
3443 26th Street
San Francisco, CA 94114

Aaron Peskin
-
470 Columbus Avenue, Ste. 211
San Francisco, CA 94133

Chuck Turner
Director
Community Design Center
5 Thomas Mellon Circle, #128
San Francisco, CA 94134

Dyan Ruiz
Co-Founder
People Power Media
366 10th Ave
San Francisco, CA 94118

Mary Miles
0
Coalition for Adequate Review
364 Page Street, #36
San Francisco, CA 94102

Sona Trauss
President
SF Bay Area Association of Renters
1618 12th Street
Oakland, CA 94607

Ted Gullicksen
Office Manager
San Francisco Tenants Union
558 Capp Street
San Francisco, CA 94110

Adrian Simi
Local Field Representative
Carpenters Local 22
2085 Third Street
San Francisco, CA 94107

David Villa-Lobos
Executive Director
Community Leadership Alliance
P.O. Box 642201
San Francisco, CA 94109

Grace Shanahan
President
Residential Builders Association
1717 17th Street, Ste. 200
San Francisco, CA 94103

Matthew Rodgers
Chair
Alabama Street Pioneers
1014 Alabama Street
San Francisco, CA 94110

Stephen Williams
Attorney
Law Office of Stephen M. Williams
1934 Divisadero Street
San Francisco, CA 94115

Rebecca Schuetz
0
-
95 Minna Street
San Francisco, CA 94105

Alex Lantsberg
Research Analyst
Carpenters Local 22 c/o NCCRC Research
265 Hegenberger Road, Ste. 220
Oakland, CA 94621

Diego Hernandez
Organizer
Laborers Local 261
3271 18th Street
San Francisco, CA 94110

Lynn Sousa
Public Works Coordinator
AT&T Construction and Engineering
795 Folsom Street, Rm.426
San Francisco, CA 94107-1243

Michael Theriault
Secretary-Treasurer
SF Building and Construction Trades
Council
1188 Franklin Street, Ste.203
San Francisco, CA 94109

Sue Hestor
Attorney at Law
-
870 Market Street, #1128
San Francisco, CA 94102