



# SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

**MEMO**

**DATE:** January 5, 2017  
**TO:** Jeremy Schaub, Gabriel Ng + Associates  
**FROM:** Chelsea Fordham, Planning Department  
**RE:** PPA Case No. 2016-013012PPA for 478-484 Haight 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, Chelsea Fordham, at (415) 575-9071 or [Chelsea.Fordham@sfgov.org](mailto:Chelsea.Fordham@sfgov.org), to answer any questions you may have, or to schedule a follow-up meeting.

  
Chelsea Fordham  
Senior Planner



# SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

---

## Preliminary Project Assessment

*Date:* January 5, 2017  
*Case No.:* **2016-013012PPA**  
*Project Address:* 478-484 Haight Street  
*Block/Lot:* 0849/019  
*Zoning:* Neighborhood Commercial, Small Scale (NC-2)  
40-X Height and Bulk District  
*Area Plan:* N/A  
*Project Sponsor:* Jeremy Schaub, Gabriel Ng + Architects, Inc.  
415-682-8060  
*Staff Contact:* Chelsea Fordham – 415-575-9071  
[Chelsea.Fordham@sfgov.org](mailto:Chelsea.Fordham@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 October 3, 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 proposed project would demolish an existing approximately 8,246 gross-square-foot (gsf) mixed-use building with one residential unit and ground-floor retail, and construct an approximately 22,700 gsf, 40-foot-tall, mixed-use buildings with 1,800 square-feet (sf) of ground-floor retail, three office spaces totaling 2,903 sf, and nine residential units. The existing building on the 7,125-sf subject lot was constructed in

1900 or earlier. The ground-floor would also contain nine off-street parking spaces, nine Class 1 bicycle parking spaces that would be accessed from a proposed 10-foot curb-cut accessed from Haight Street. Additionally, streetscape changes would include one Class 2 bicycle parking space and three street trees on the sidewalk adjacent to the project site. The proposed foundation would be a mat-foundation that would require excavation to a depth of 3-feet and require removal of 7,125 cubic yards of soil removal.

## 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](http://www.sfplanning.org) under the "Publications" tab. See "Environmental Applications" on page 2 of the current Fee Schedule for calculation of environmental application fees.<sup>1</sup> **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 Devyani Jain at (415) 575-9051 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.sfplanning.org/ftp/files/MEA/Environmental\\_consultant\\_pool.pdf](http://www.sfplanning.org/ftp/files/MEA/Environmental_consultant_pool.pdf)). The Planning Department will provide more detail to the project sponsor regarding the EIR process should this level of environmental review be required.

---

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

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. Historic Resources.** The project site contains one or more buildings or structures considered to be a potential historic resource (constructed 45 or more years ago); 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 professional must be selected from the Planning Department's Historic Resource Consultant Pool. Please contact Tina Tam, Senior Preservation Planner, via email ([tina.tam@sfgov.org](mailto:tina.tam@sfgov.org)) for a list of three consultants from which to choose. Please contact the HRE scoping team at [HRE@sfgov.org](mailto:HRE@sfgov.org) to arrange the HRE scoping. 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 draft HRE is received.
- 2. Archeological Resources.** 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. 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 one of the Planning Department's three standard archeological mitigation measures (archeological testing, monitoring, or accidental discovery), or other appropriate measures.

*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.

3. **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. Planning staff have reviewed the proposed site plans and offer the following recommendations, some of which address the safety of persons walking and cycling to and from project site and vicinity.
  - Include dimensions of existing and proposed sidewalks on plans.
  - Include dimensions of existing and proposed curb cuts on plans.
  - Show existing and proposed curb cuts to be removed.

4. **Noise.** The Planning Department's noise maps indicate that existing ambient noise levels where residential units would be built are at or below 60 decibels Ldn (day/night weighted noise levels). The Land Use Compatibility Chart for Community Noise in the San Francisco General Plan, Environmental Protection Element, states that new construction or development for residential uses in areas where the ambient noise level exceeds 60 decibels should only be undertaken after a detailed analysis of noise reduction requirements is made and needed noise insulation features are included in the design. Given that existing noise levels at the location of the proposed residential units are at or below 60 decibels, a detailed analysis of noise reduction requirements would not be required for purposes of CEQA review. Nevertheless, the project would be subject to compliance with the California Noise Insulation Standards found in Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations (Title 24), as administered by the Department of Building Inspection (DBI) as part of the Building Permit Application process.

The Planning Department requires that residential open space required under the Planning Code be protected, to the maximum feasible extent, from existing ambient noise levels that could prove annoying or disruptive to users of the open space. Measures to protect required open space from noise include site design that uses the building itself to shield on-site open space from the greatest noise sources, construction of noise barriers between noise sources and open space, and appropriate use of both common and private open space in multi-family dwellings.

Construction noise would be 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 pile driving is to be used during the construction, measures to reduce construction noise may be required as part of the proposed project. The EEA application should indicate whether pile driving or other particularly noisy construction methods are required.

5. **Air Quality.** The proposed project's nine dwelling units and three office spaces, is below the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's (BAAQMD) construction and operation screening levels for

criteria air pollutants.<sup>2</sup> Therefore, an analysis of the project's criteria air pollutant emissions is not likely to be required. However, please provide detailed information related to the volume of excavation as part of the EEA.

In addition, project-related demolition, excavation, grading and other construction activities may cause wind-blown dust that could contribute particulate matter into the local atmosphere. To reduce construction dust impacts, the proposed project will be required to adhere to the dust control 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.

In addition, 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. However, if the project would include new sources of toxic air contaminants including, but not limited to, emissions from diesel generators or boilers, or any other stationary sources, the project would result in toxic air contaminants that may affect both on-site and off-site sensitive receptors. Please provide detailed information related to any proposed stationary sources with the EEA.

6. **Greenhouse Gases.** *The City and County of San Francisco's Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions* presents a comprehensive assessment of policies, programs, and ordinances that represents San Francisco's Qualified Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Reduction Strategy. Projects that are consistent with San Francisco's Qualified GHG Reduction Strategy would result in less-than-significant impacts from GHG emissions. In order to facilitate a determination of compliance with San Francisco's Qualified GHG Reduction Strategy, the Planning Department has prepared a Greenhouse Gas Analysis Compliance Checklist.<sup>3</sup> 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.
7. **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
8. **Shadow.** The proposed project would not result in construction of a building greater than 40 feet in height. Therefore, a consultant prepared shadow analysis is not anticipated

---

<sup>2</sup> BAAQMD, *CEQA Air Quality Guidelines*, May 2011, Chapter 3.

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

9. **Geology.** The project site is located within a Seismic Hazard Zone (Liquefaction Hazard Zone). Any new construction on the site is therefore subject to a mandatory Interdepartmental Project Review.<sup>4</sup> A geotechnical study prepared by a qualified consultant must be submitted with the EEA. The study should address whether the site is subject to liquefaction, and should provide recommendations for any geotechnical concerns identified in the study. In general, compliance with the building codes would avoid the potential for significant impacts related to structural damage, ground subsidence, liquefaction, landslides, and surface settlement. To assist Planning Department staff in determining whether the project would result in environmental impacts related to geological hazards, it is recommended that you provide a copy of the geotechnical information with boring logs for the proposed project. This study will also help inform the Planning Department Archeologist of the project site's subsurface geological conditions.
10. **Hazardous Materials.** The proposed project would excavate more than 50 cubic yards of soil and would introduce residential uses to the project site. Therefore, the project is subject to Article 22A of the Health Code, also known as the Maher Ordinance. The Maher Ordinance, which is administered and overseen by the Department of Public Health (DPH), requires the project sponsor to retain the services of a qualified professional to prepare a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) that meets the requirements of Health Code Section 22.A.6. The Phase I ESA would determine the potential for site contamination and level of exposure risk associated with the project. Based on that information, soil and/or groundwater sampling and analysis, as well as remediation of any site contamination, may be required. These steps are required to be completed prior to the issuance of any building permit.

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

11. **Disclosure Report for Developers of Major 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

---

<sup>4</sup> San Francisco Planning Department. *Interdepartmental Project Review*. Available online at: <http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=522>.

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 Sections 317 and 711.97 for the removal of housing at the second floor of the subject building in an NC-2 zoning district.
2. A **Dwelling Unit Removal Application** per Planning Code Section 317 is required as the project proposes to demolish a residential unit.
3. A **Building Permit Application** is required for the demolition of the existing building on the subject property.
4. A **Building Permit Application** is required for the proposed new construction on the subject property.

Dwelling Unit Removal (Section 317) and Conditional Use Authorization applications are available in the Planning Department lobby at 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, at the Planning Information Center at 1660 Mission Street, and online at [www.sfplanning.org](http://www.sfplanning.org). Building Permit applications are available at the Department of Building 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.

1. This project is required to conduct a **Pre-Application** meeting with surrounding neighbors and registered neighborhood groups before a development application may be filed with the Planning Department. The Pre-Application packet, which includes instructions and template forms, is available at [www.sfplanning.org](http://www.sfplanning.org) under the "Permits & Zoning" tab. All registered neighborhood group mailing lists are available online at [www.sfplanning.org](http://www.sfplanning.org) under the "Resource Center" tab.
2. **Neighborhood Outreach.** This project is required to undertake additional public outreach in advance of the Planning Commission hearing on the Conditional Use authorization. The developer is required to conduct an additional outreach meeting, notifying owners and tenants who live within 300' of the project as well as all registered neighborhood organizations for the Western Addition neighborhood, after initial design comments have been provided from the Planning Department and prior to the scheduling of the aforementioned Planning Commission hearing. The purpose of this meeting is to keep the community abreast of the project's evolution, presenting the latest design of the project – including the Department's requested changes – to the community in advance of the Commission taking action on the hearing.
3. **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. **Transit Preferential Streets.** The project adds potential conflict points with pedestrians and transit, as well as encourages vehicle traffic with off-street parking. As Haight Street is a transit preferential street, the proposal runs counter to San Francisco's Transit First Policy and the General Plan. It is City Policy (General Plan, Transportation Element, 20.2) to reduce, relocate or prohibit automobile facility features, such as driveways, to avoid traffic conflicts and congestion along transit preferential streets. In addition, several Muni Forward routes travel along Haight Street and within walking distance of the site (6,7,7x,22, N-Judah). The Transportation Element of the General plan requires the City to give priority to public transit and other alternatives to the private automobile as a means of meeting San Francisco's transportation needs (Policy 1.3); and it prioritizes mass transit in areas where it is most appropriate, such as pedestrian-oriented neighborhood commercial districts along major transit routes like the NC-2 district in the Lower Haight.

The Planning Department does not support maintaining the existing curb cut at this location on Haight Street. The current design would substantially increase traffic and usage of the curb cut, creating substantially greater new pedestrian and traffic conflicts where few, if any, currently exist.

To comply with policy and transit priorities on this street, the Planning Department recommends filling in the curb cut and restoring the sidewalk to comply with the above policies.

- 2. Parking.** The introduction of 1:1 off-street parking spaces in a pedestrian-oriented, neighborhood-commercial also conflicts with the General Plan, which requires the City to relate the amount of parking in residential areas and neighborhood commercial districts to the capacity of the city's street system and land use patterns. Streets in the area are already facing capacity challenges; and the land use pattern of the Lower Haight is supportive of transit, walking and biking. In addition, the General Plan Transportation Element (Policy 34.1) states that off-street parking should encourage low auto ownership in neighborhoods well served by transit and convenient for neighborhood shopping. The Lower Haight neighborhood is a notable example of such a neighborhood. Policy 34.3 also permits minimal parking for new residential buildings along transit preferential streets, such as Haight Street.

As per Planning Code section 307(i), the proposed project fulfills at least four of the five criteria to be considered for the reduction or modification of off-street parking: (2) the reduction in the parking requirement will not be detrimental to the health, safety, convenience, or general welfare of persons residing in or working in the vicinity; (3) the minimization of conflict of vehicular and pedestrian movements; (4) the availability of transportation modes other than the automobile; (5) the pattern of land use and character of development in the vicinity. The fifth consideration in determining parking supply is "reasonably anticipated automobile usage by residents and visitors to the project." Considering the number of nearby transit options, the pedestrian-orientation of the Lower Haight and Haight Street, and the units designed most likely for single, working adults or roommates, it is reasonable to anticipate low automobile usage by residents and visitors.

Given the transit-oriented, walkable nature of Haight Street and its proximity to additional transit routes with downtown and regional destinations, the Planning Department strongly recommends eliminating parking, which would also enable more commercial space and active frontage along Haight, a policy encouraged by the Department.

- 3. Affordable Housing Preservation.** The City's policy is to preserve existing housing, unless the demolition results in a net increase in affordable housing (Housing Element, 2.1). The General Plan also calls for the preservation of "naturally affordable" housing types, such as smaller and older ownership units (Housing Element, 3.4). Whether the existing housing on the site is rental or ownership, the building's construction date suggests it is part of the city's affordable housing stock, the demolition of which would be counter to City policy without a net increase in affordable units (i.e. two units).

City policy also calls for the development of affordable housing, especially for families, in all neighborhoods (Housing Element Policies 4.1 and 4.5). The project proposes to add 9 residential units, just short of the 10 units that trigger Section 415.6 of the Planning Code, which requires 12% of units be Below Market Rate (BMR) units. The plans also demonstrate that additional housing units, including affordable units, could be developed in lieu of office space and/or by utilizing the State Density Bonus: [https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill\\_id=201520160AB2501](https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201520160AB2501)

The Department strongly encourages the development of affordable housing on the site, while maintaining quality of life, following urban design guidelines, and adhering to Planning Code standards.

4. **Public Realm and Street Frontage.** The Lower Haight Public Realm Plan aims to develop a community-based vision for the neighborhood's public realm: its streets, sidewalks, parks, and public places. The Lower Haight Public Realm Plan is inspired by a proposal from the Lower Haight Merchants and Neighbors Association (LoHaMNA) and through support of District 5 Supervisor London Breed. Based on this vision, the Plan will propose recommendations that would complement and enhance the area's public realm. To date there have been ongoing stakeholder meetings and two public open houses. The following community design core principles were vetted during the public outreach effort:

- Vibrant Public Realm: Promote active and clean sidewalks, encourage active street facades and public gathering spaces, encourage the installation of pedestrian lighting
- More Mobility: Increase safety and comfort for pedestrians and bicyclists
- Innovative Streets: Explore special streets/green connections
- Green Spaces: More street trees + sidewalk landscaping everywhere
- Celebrate Identity: Enhance the Lower Haight's character and support for a "neighborhood center"

As the project evolves and seeks entitlements, please check in on status of this public realm plan at <http://sf-planning.org/lower-haight-public-realm-plan>.

5. **Awnings, Canopies & Marquees** – the proposed canopy appears to be an awning as it does not include support structures from grade as defined in Section 102. Section 136.1(a)(2) does not permit an awning in excess of 10 feet in width. Please review this section and include all the relevant dimensions to demonstrate compliance on all future drawings.
6. **Off-street Vehicular Parking** - Planning Code Section 150(e) permits off-street vehicular parking to be replaced by bicycle parking that complies with Planning Code Sections 155.1- 155.3.
7. **Bicycle Parking** – Section 155.1 – 155.5 and *Zoning Administrator Bulletin Number 9: Bicycle Parking Standards: Design and Layout*, specify the dimensional requirements for all bike parking. Please review the requirements for the Class I & II spaces, and provide the necessary information on all future drawings. Specific dimensioned drawings must be provided that demonstrate compliance with clearance from walls, ceilings, aisles and signage.
8. **SFPUC Requirements & Project Review.** The SFPUC administers San Francisco's various water, sewer, and stormwater requirements such as the Stormwater Design Guidelines, construction site runoff, sewer connections, recycled water and onsite water reuse, water efficient irrigation, and hydraulic analysis for fire suppression systems. To assist developers and property owners in meeting these requirements, the SFPUC provides project plan review, technical assistance, and incentives. The SFPUC also has a separate project review process for projects that propose to use land owned by the SFPUC or are subject to an easement held by the SFPUC; or projects that propose to be constructed above, under, or adjacent to major SFPUC infrastructure. For projects meeting these criteria, please

contact [SFPProjectReview@sfgwater.org](mailto:SFPProjectReview@sfgwater.org) for a SFPUC Project Review and Land Use Application. For more information regarding SFPUC Project Review or any of the SFPUC requirements, please visit [www.sfgwater.org/reqs](http://www.sfgwater.org/reqs).

9. **Noise Regulations Relating to Residential Uses Near Places of Entertainment (POE).** New residential development within 300 feet of a Place of Entertainment must go through an Entertainment Commission outreach process ([Ordinance Number 070-015](#)). In addition, new residential development will also be required to record a Notice of Special Restrictions (NSR) on the site. The subject site is located within 300 feet of an existing POE. Please note that the Planning Department will not consider an entitlement application complete until the following are completed:
- (A) The Entertainment Commission has provided written notification to the Planning Department indicating that it either did not wish to hold a hearing, or that it held a hearing and the Project Sponsor attended; and
  - (B) The Project Sponsor has included a copy of any comments and/or recommendations provided by the Entertainment Commission regarding the proposed Project as well as the date(s) when the those comments were provided. This shall be done as an additional sheet in any plan set submitted to the Planning Department and as an attachment in an entitlement application.

You may contact Entertainment Commission staff at (415) 554-6678 or visit their webpage at <http://www.sfgov2.org/index.aspx?page=338> for additional information regarding the outreach process.

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. Transportation Sustainability Fee (TSF), (§411A)
- b. Child-Care (§414)

#### PRELIMINARY DESIGN COMMENTS:

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

1. **Site Design, Open Space, and Massing.** Please match the adjacent property's light well. Please be aware that electrical transformers should be included within the building, and should be designed accordingly, as it may affect the building program.

Additionally, explore the opportunity to provide a spacious interior amenity and connection to the common rear yard.

**2. Parking and Circulation.** Because this site on Haight Street (a transit preferential street) is served by MUNI transit by both the Fillmore and Haight Street bus lines, as well as within a ¼ mile of rich transit options along Market Street and Church Streets, the Planning Department strongly recommends the proposed parking be eliminated and that the existing abandoned curb cut be filled. Elimination of parking would enable more commercial space and active frontage along Haight, a policy encouraged by the Department.

**3. Architecture.** There is a strong rhythm of angled bays and 25'-30' wide buildings along Haight Street. UDAT recommends modulating the façade into 25' wide sections, while acknowledging and responding to other forms, materials, and proportions of features in the context. In particular staff encourages adding depth to details, including the windows, that adds a fine-grain, humans-scale level of interest and craft, as is evident in the adjacent properties. Consider dividing the window to a similar vertical proportion as found in surrounding properties. Staff supports the break in cornice to modulate the facade.

Particular attention should be placed on the storefront details. Generally, the better storefronts on this section of Haight street feature small-scale, finely articulated storefronts with deeply recessed entries. Any new storefront should augment this storefront texture attempt by emulating the scale and craft. Please consider providing storefront with multiple recessed entries, a 12"-18" high solid base composed of durable materials, transom windows, and signage band and or awnings.

The Planning Department requests that the office balconies be enlarged to be useful or otherwise eliminated. Please consider bringing down the center bay window to the office level to reinforce the vertical modulation of the façade. If the balconies are to remain then the guard rail detail is an opportunity for a well-detailed and highly-crafted architectural accent.

At this point the architecture is assumed to be preliminary and the Planning Department will provide further detailed design review on the subsequent submission. The Department recommends that the project express significant façade depth, provide high-quality materials, and meet the architectural detailing and character of the neighborhood.

#### PRELIMINARY PROJECT ASSESSMENT EXPIRATION:

This Preliminary Project Assessment is valid for a period of **18 months**. An Environmental Evaluation Application, as listed above, must be submitted no later than July 5, 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: Neighborhood Group Mailing List  
Interdepartmental Project Review Application

cc: Tommy Ki Lee, Property Owner  
Sara Vellve, Current Planning

Chelsea Fordham, 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 ([webmaster.planning@sfgov.org](mailto:webmaster.planning@sfgov.org))  
BBN Requestor: Azam Khan, 473A Haight Street, San Francisco, CA 94117

FIRST	LAST	TITLE	ORGANIZATION	ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP	TELEPHONE	EMAIL	NEIGHBORHOOD OF INTEREST
Adrienne	Shiozaki	President Board Chair	Japantown Merchants Association Nihonmachi Little Friends	1581 Webster Street 2031 Bush Street	San Francisco San Francisco	CA CA	94115 94115	415-202-0365 415-922-8898	nlfchildcare@yahoo.com	0 Western Addition Western Addition
Al	Sodini		0 Anza Vista Civic Improvement Club	140 Terra Vista Avenue	San Francisco	CA	94115	415-921-5131	ducha931@aol.com	Western Addition
Barry	Perkins		0 -	2140 Pine Street	San Francisco	CA	94115	415-990-0234	barry_perkins@yahoo.com	Western Addition
Bob	Hamaguchi	Executive Director	Japantown Task Force	1765 Sutter Street, 2nd floor	San Francisco	CA	94115	(415) 346-1239	info@japantowntaskforce.org	Western Addition
Gus	Hernandez	President	Alamo Square Neighborhood Association	530 Divisadero Street #176	San Francisco	CA	94117	415-271-5691	president@alamosq.org	Western Addition
Jan	Bolaffi	President	Western Addition Neighborhood Association	2331 Bush Street	San Francisco	CA	94115	415-931-1091	bolaffi@pacbell.net	Western Addition
Jason	Henderson	Vice Chariman	Market/Octavia Community Advisory Comm.	300 Buchanan Street, Apt. 503	San Francisco	CA	94102	415-722-0617	jhenderson@sbcglobal.net	Castro/Upper Market, Downtown/Civic Center, Mission, South of Market, Western Addition
Lawrence	Li	Land-Use & Transportation Committee Chair	Lower Haight Merchant & Neighbors Association	498 Waller Street, Apt. 9	San Francisco	CA	94117	415-644-4290	lawrence@bureausf.com	Western Addition
Tim	Hickey	President	North of Panhandle Neighborhood Association (NOPNA)	732 Lyon Street	San Francisco	CA	94115		0 board@nopana.org	Haight Ashbury, 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; valie.brown@sfgov.org; Ahmad.Elnajjar@sfgov.org	Bernal Heights, Downtown/Civic Center, Haight Ashbury, Inner Sunset, Western Addition
Mark	Farrell	Supervisor, District 2	Board of Supervisors	1 Dr. Carlton B Goodlett Place, Room #244	San Francisco	CA	94102-4689	415-554-5942	Mark.Farrell@sfgov.org; Catherine.Stefani@sfgov.org; Margaux.Kelly@sfgov.org; Jess.Montejano@sfgov.org	Marina, Pacific Heights, Presidio, Presidio Heights, Russian Hill, Seacliff, Western Addition
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
David	Troup	President	Duboce Triangle Neighborhood Association	2261 Market Street PMB #301	San Francisco	CA	94114	415-295-1530	president@dtna.org	Castro/Upper Market, Western Addition
Patricia	Vaughey		0 Marina/Cow Hollow Neighbors & Merchants Association	2742 Baker Street	San Francisco,	CA	94123	415-567-7152		0 Marina, Pacific Heights, Western Addition
Peter	Cohen		0 Noe Street Neighbors	33 Noe Street	San Francisco	CA	94114	415-722-0617	pcohensf@gmail.com	Castro/Upper Market, Mission, Western Addition
Richard	Rabbitt	President	Temescal Terrace Association	55 Temescal Terrace	San Francisco	CA	94118	415-954-4959	richard.rabbitt@stanfordalumni.org	Haight Ashbury, Inner Richmond, Presidio Heights, Western Addition
Russell	Pritchard	Coordinator	Hayes Valley Merchants Association	568 Hayes Street	San Francisco	CA	94102	415-255-9307	russell@zonahome.com	Western Addition
Vas	Kiriiris	President	Fillmore Merchants & Improvement Association	2443 Fillmore Street, #198	San Francisco	CA	94115	415-776-2700	vas@zincdetails.com	Pacific Heights, Western Addition
Gail	Baugh	President	Hayes Valley Neighborhood Association	700 Hayes Street	San Francisco	CA	94102	415-265-0546	president@hayesvalleystf.org	Castro/Upper Market, Downtown/Civic Center, Mission, South of Market, Western Addition
James	Fisher		0 -	10495 N De Anza Blvd MS 74-2RC	Cupertino	CA	95014	262-352-9498	j.benjamin.fisher@gmail.com	Western Addition
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
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 Market, Western Addition
Moe	Jamil	Chair	Middle Polk Neighborhood Association	PO Box 640918	San Francisco	CA	94164		0 moe@middlepolk.org	Chinatown, Downtown/Civic Center, Financial District, Marina, Nob Hill, North Beach, Pacific Heights, Russian Hill, South of Market, 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, Marina, Nob Hill, Pacific Heights, South of Market, Western Addition



# SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

---

## INTERDEPARTMENTAL PROJECT REVIEW

*Effective: February 1, 2009*

Interdepartmental Project Reviews are **mandatory** for new construction projects that propose buildings eight 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 abovereferenced 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). Staff from each of these disciplines will attend your meeting.

### **Interdepartmental Project Review fees:**

1. \$1,059 for five or fewer residential units and all affordable housing projects.
2. \$1,530 for all other projects.

*Please note that \$345 of these fees are non-refundable. If your project falls under the second type of fee, and you cancel your meeting, \$1,185 will be refunded to you.*

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, Ste. 400, San Francisco, CA 94103-2414**. Those wishing more specific or more detailed information may contact the Project Review Meeting Coordinator at **(415) 575-6926**.

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

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

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

Reception:  
**415.558.6378**

Fax:  
**415.558.6409**

Planning  
Information:  
**415.558.6377**

**Submittal requirements:**

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 APPLICATION FORM

APPLICATION DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

**PROJECT CONTACT:**

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Phone No. ( ) \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_ FAX No. ( ) \_\_\_\_\_

Owner \_\_\_\_\_

**PROJECT INFORMATION:**

Address \_\_\_\_\_

How many units does the subject property have?  
\_\_\_\_\_

Assessor's Block/Lot(s) \_\_\_\_\_ Zoning District \_\_\_\_\_

Height and Bulk Districts \_\_\_\_\_ Located within Geologic Hazard Zone? Y   
N

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION / PURPOSE OF MEETING/SPECIFIC QUESTIONS:**

(Use attachments if necessary)

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Land Use Type	Existing	<i>Proposed</i>	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 staff \_\_\_\_\_

Will this project be publicly funded? (specify) \_\_\_\_\_