



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

MEMO

DATE: February 7, 2016
TO: Toby Morris, Kerman Morris Architects
FROM: Mark Luellen, Planning Department
RE: PPA Case No. 2016-014870PPA for 736 Hyde 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, Claudine Asbagh, at (415) 575-9165 or claudine.asbagh@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 "Mark Luellen", written over a horizontal line.

Mark Luellen, Senior Planner



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Preliminary Project Assessment

Date: February 7, 2017
Case No.: **2016-014870PPA**
Project Address: 736 Hyde Street
Block/Lot: 0300/010
Zoning: RC-4 (Residential – Commercial, High Density) Use District
80-A Height and Bulk District
Area Plan: N/A
Project Sponsor: Toby Morris
Kerman Morris Architects
415-749-50302
Staff Contact: Claudine Asbagh – 415-575-9165
claudine.asbagh@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 November 9, 2016, as summarized below. This PPA letter identifies Planning Department review requirements for the proposed project, including those related to environmental review, approvals, neighborhood notification and public outreach, the Planning Code, project design, and other general issues of concern for the project. Please be advised that the PPA application does not constitute an application for development with the Planning Department. The PPA letter also does not represent a complete review of the proposed project, does not grant a project approval of any kind, and does not in any way supersede any required Planning Department approvals listed below.

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

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The proposal is to construct a five-story, 50 foot-tall, multi-family residential building. The proposed new building would include 9 dwelling units, 9 Class 1 bicycle spaces, 1 Class 2 bicycle space, and 670 square feet of open space in the form of private balconies and a rear yard.

PRELIMINARY PROJECT COMMENTS:

The following comments address general issues that may substantially impact the proposed project.

1. **Density.** The project proposes to construct 9 units on a site with the capacity to support 11 units. The project would require Variances for rear yard, exposure and possibly open space. At the density proposed, the Department would not be able to support the Variances.

If the project does not increase the number of units, the project should be revised to be code-compliant.

2. **Usable Open Space.** The proposal provides two areas of private open space for the top units and common open space at the rear to satisfy the requirement for the remaining units. The Department does not support either of the private spaces and suggests that providing common open space at the roof level with perhaps private space at the rear for lower units.

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.

NEIGHBORHOOD NOTIFICATIONS AND 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 under the "Permits & Zoning" tab. All registered neighborhood group mailing lists are available online at www.sfplanning.org under the "Resource Center" tab.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:

In compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the environmental review process must be completed before any project approval may be granted. This review may be done in conjunction with the required approvals listed below. In order to begin formal environmental review, please submit an **Environmental Evaluation Application (EEA)** for the full scope of the project. EEAs are available in the Planning Department lobby at 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, at the Planning Information Center at 1660 Mission Street, and online at www.sfplanning.org under the "Publications" tab. See "Environmental Applications" on page 2 of the current Fee Schedule for calculation of environmental application fees.¹

¹ San Francisco Planning Department. *Schedule for Application Fees*. Available online at:

Note that until an entitlement application is submitted to the Current Planning Division, only the proposed Project Description will be reviewed by the assigned Environmental Coordinator.

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

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

If the initial study indicates that the project would result in a significant impact that cannot be mitigated to below a significant level, an EIR will be required. An EIR must be prepared by an environmental consultant from the Planning Department's environmental consultant pool (http://www.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.

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 is a vacant lot that is located within an identified historic district, the Lower Nob Hill Apartment Hotel National Register District. Therefore, the proposed construction is subject to review by the Department's Historic Preservation staff for compatibility with the district. To assist in this review, the project sponsor must hire a qualified professional to prepare a Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE) report to analyze the project for district compatibility. The professional must be selected from the Planning Department's Historic Resource Consultant Pool. Please contact Tina Tam, Senior Preservation Planner, via email (tina.tam@sfgov.org) for a list of three consultants from which to choose. Please contact the HRE scoping team at HRE@sfgov.org to arrange the HRE scoping. Following an approved scope, the historic resource consultant may submit the draft HRE report for review to Environmental Planning after the project sponsor has filed the EEA 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

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

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.
3. **Tribal Cultural Resources.** Tribal cultural resources (TCRs) are a class of resource established under the CEQA in 2015. TCRs are defined as a site, feature, place, cultural landscape, sacred place or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, that is either included on or eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources or a local historic register, or is a resource that the lead agency, at its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, determines is a TCR. Planning Department staff will review the proposed project to determine if it may cause an adverse effect to a TCR; this will occur in tandem with preliminary archeological review. No additional information is needed from the project sponsor at this time. Consultation with California Native American tribes regarding TCRs may be required at the request of the tribes. If staff determines that the proposed project may have a potential significant adverse impact on a TCR, mitigation measures will be identified and required. Mitigation measures may include avoidance, protection, or preservation of the TCR and development of interpretation and public education and artistic programs.
4. **Transportation.** Based on the PPA submittal, a transportation impact study is not anticipated; an official determination will be made subsequent to submittal of the EEA. However, the project site is located on a high injury corridor (Hyde Street) as mapped by Vision Zero.² 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 street names clearly on the plans;
 - Include dimensions of the existing and proposed sidewalk on the plans;
 - Include dimensions of the existing curb cut on the plans; and

² This document is available at: <http://www.sfmta.com/sites/default/files/projects/2015/vision-zero-san-francisco.pdf>.

- Show the existing curb cut to be removed.
5. **Noise.** Construction noise is subject to the San Francisco Noise Ordinance (Article 29 of the San Francisco Police Code), which includes restrictions on noise levels of construction equipment and hours of construction. If pile driving is to be used during construction, measures to reduce construction noise may be required as part of the proposed project. The EEA should provide a construction schedule and indicate whether pile driving or other particularly noisy construction methods are required.

6. **Air Quality.**

Criteria Air Pollutants. The proposed project at nine dwelling units is below the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's (BAAQMD) construction and operational screening levels for criteria air pollutants.³ 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.

Local Health Risks and Hazards. 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 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.

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.⁴ The project sponsor may be required to submit the completed table

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

⁴ Refer to <http://sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1886> for latest "Greenhouse Gas Compliance Checklist for Private Development Projects."

regarding project compliance with the identified regulations and provide project-level details in the discussion column. This information will be reviewed by the environmental planner during the environmental review process to determine if the project would comply with San Francisco's Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy. Projects that do not comply with an ordinance or regulation may be determined to be inconsistent with the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy.

8. **Wind.** The proposed project would not be taller than 80 feet, therefore a consultant-prepared wind analysis is not likely to be required.
9. **Shadow.** The proposed project would result in construction of a building greater than 40 feet in height. A preliminary shadow fan analysis prepared by Planning Department staff indicates that the proposed project is not likely to cast shadows on any parks or recreational resources. Therefore, a consultant-prepared shadow study is not likely to be required.
10. **Geology.** The project site is not located within a Seismic Hazard Zone or on a slope greater than 20 percent. However, a geotechnical study is likely required to determine whether the proposed construction methods would result in adverse environmental effects. Planning Department archeology staff may use the geotechnical study, including boring logs, as part of the PAR process described in the Archeological Resources comment above.
11. **Hazardous Materials.** The proposed project would be located on a site with an existing automotive use (surface parking lot). 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.

12. **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 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); EIR; Final Mitigated Negative Declaration; or a project approval by the Planning Commission that adopts CEQA Findings. 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>.

PRELIMINARY PLANNING CODE COMMENTS:

The following comments address preliminary Planning Code issues that may substantially affect the design and massing of the proposed project:

1. **Rear Yard.** The project is required to provide a minimum rear yard equal to 25 percent of total lot depth, at the lowest level of residential occupancy and at each succeeding level. With a lot depth of 87.5 feet, the required rear yard would be 21.8 feet. The project proposes a rear yard of 15 feet and would therefore need seek and justify a Variance.
2. **Open Space – Residential.** The residential portion of the project may comply with the requirements of Section 135 in the form of "private usable open space" and/or in the form of "common usable open space." For private open space, a minimum of 36 square feet must be provided, individually, for each dwelling unit, with a minimum horizontal dimension of 6 feet. For common space, 48 square feet per unit must be provided. If provided as common open space, the area must be accessible to all dwelling units, with additional standards applying per Section 135. Both private and common open space must meet standards for location, dimensions, usability, and access to sunlight.

The project satisfies the minimum requirements however the department is not supportive of stair penthouses for access to private roof decks. Additionally, please note that because the Department would prefer the project to increase the proposed density, additional open space would be needed. As noted in Preliminary Project Comments above, the Department recommends reconfiguring the open space so that common space is provided at the roof level.

3. **Exposure.** Section 140 requires that each dwelling unit have at least one room that meets the 120-square-foot minimum superficial floor area requirement of Section 503 of the Housing Code face directly on a street right-of-way, code-complying rear yard, or an appropriately sized courtyard. The rear yard provided is not code-compliant, and therefore the units at the rear of the building do not meet the exposure requirements. The Project should be redesigned to meet the exposure requirement. As an alternative, the sponsor may request and justify a Variance from this requirement.
4. **Active uses - 145.1(c)(3).** With the exception of space allowed for building egress and access to mechanical systems, space for "active uses" shall be provided within the first 25 feet of building depth on the ground floor and 15 feet on floors above. Building systems including mechanical,

electrical, and plumbing features may be exempted from this requirement by the Zoning Administrator only in instances where those features are provided in such a fashion as to not negatively impact the quality of the ground floor space. As proposed, there are several spaces located within the first 25 feet of building depth on the ground floor that are not considered "active uses". These spaces include the bicycle parking and storage space. If non-active uses are provided within the first 25 feet of the building on the ground floor and within the first 15 feet on the second floor, please seek and justify a variance. Please note that it is unlikely that the Department would support such a Variance request.

5. **Vision Zero.** In 2014, the City adopted the [Vision Zero Policy](#) which seeks to eliminate all traffic deaths in the City by 2024. The City subsequently established a network of Vision Zero Corridors which have higher rates of traffic-related injuries and fatalities compared to most San Francisco Streets. The City has determined that streets on the Vision Zero network should be prioritized for safety improvements especially those that improve the safety of vulnerable users like people walking and people on bikes.

This project is located on a pedestrian and vehicular high-injury corridor, and is encouraged to incorporate safety measures into the project.

6. **Bicycle Parking (Class I).** Planning Code Section 155.5 requires this project to provide at least 9 Class 1 bicycle parking spaces. The proposed project should reconfigure the ground floor so that bicycle parking is not located within the first 25 feet of the building depth.
7. **Density.** The site is located in the RC-4 Zoning District that allows for one dwelling unit per every 200 square feet of lot area. With a lot measuring 2,187.5 square feet, up to 11 dwelling units would be permitted. The Department recommends the project be revised to provide additional dwelling units so that the project reaches an appropriate density.
8. **Height.** The site is located in an 80-A Height and Bulk District that allows for buildings to be 80 feet in height. As proposed, the project would have a height of 50 feet. The Department recommends that the building's height be increased so that more dwelling units can be accommodated. Please also refer to the preliminary design comments located below.
9. **Shadow Analysis.** Section 295 requires that a shadow analysis must be performed to determine whether the project has the potential to cast shadow on properties under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Recreation and Park Commission. Department staff has prepared a shadow fan that indicates the project does not cast new shadow on properties under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Recreation and Park Commission. Please note that even if a shadow fan shows no Section 295 impacts, Environmental Planning may still require a shadow analysis (and K application) for non-Rec Park properties.
10. **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@sfwater.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.sfwater.org/reqs.

11. **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, see enclosed map. 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 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.

PRELIMINARY DESIGN COMMENTS:

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

Historic District

The project site is located within an identified historic district (Lower Nob Hill Apartment Hotel National Register Historic District); therefore, the proposed project is subject to further design review by the department's Historic Preservation staff. Please refer to the Environmental Planning Review – Historic Resources section of the Preliminary Project Assessment for further instruction.

1. **Site Design, Open Space, and Massing.** The Planning Department recommends revising the proposal to include a code-compliant rear yard to increase the amount of common open space as well as eliminate the need for a Variance. The Department does not support the penthouse for access to a private roof deck. The penthouse should be eliminated, or the roof deck made available to all units as common space.

The Department further encourages the project sponsor to increase the proposed height so as to facilitate additional units to maximize density.

2. **Street Frontage.** As noted above, the project includes “non-active uses” within the first 25 feet of building depth along Hyde Street that would require a Variance. The ground floor should be reconfigured to eliminate any non-active uses along Hyde Street. The Department recommends the addition of a residential unit at the ground floor facing Hyde Street.

Buildings located within the Lower Nob Hill Apartment Hotel Historic District are characterized by continuous street wall with entries often defined by gracious openings and rich architectural detail. The Department recommends that the entry align with the windows above. In addition, the entry should be made into a more prominent feature of the façade (this can be achieved through the use of architectural details, projections, or other contextual ways that mark the hierarchy of façade elements). Please place all landscaping in the ground rather than in elevated planters.

3. **Architecture.** The Lower Nob Hill Apartment Hotel Historic District is characterized by many of the following architectural details: significant depth at the glazing, masonry façade materials (brick, terra cotta upper levels set atop strong bases defined by rusticated masonry, granite), and shaped bays.

Many of the bay types within the vicinity are more shallow than the maximum depth allowed by code. Additionally, balconies are generally not a compatible feature in this District. The Department recommends that the size of the bays be reduced and that the 5th floor balcony be modified into a bay. While the above design criteria may be satisfied through a contemporary architecture, the overall facade has to offer a compatible presence with the District. Continue to work with preservation and design review staff upon future applications to achieve this balance.

PLANNING DEPARTMENT 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:

1. Transportation Sustainability Fee (TSF), (§411A)
2. Child Care for Residential Projects (§414A)

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) **Environmental Application.**
- 2) **Variance.** The project as proposed requires the granting of variances for the following Planning Code sections:
 - a) Rear Yard (Section 134).
 - b) Exposure (Section 140).
 - c) Street Frontages (Section 145.1(c)(3)).
- 3) A **Building Permit Application** is required for the proposed demolition and new construction on the subject property.
- 4) **Interdepartmental Project Review.** This review is required for all proposed new construction in seismic hazard zones, in which the subject property falls. An application may be found on the Planning Department's website via the following link:
http://forms.sfplanning.org/ProjectReview_ApplicationInterdepartmental.pdf

NEIGHBORHOOD NOTIFICATIONS AND 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 under the "Permits & Zoning" tab. All registered neighborhood group mailing lists are available online at www.sfplanning.org under the "Resource Center" tab.
2. **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 ASSESSMENT EXPIRATION:

This Preliminary Project Assessment is valid for a period of **18 months**. An Environmental Evaluation, Variance, or Building Permit Application, as listed above, must be submitted no later than **August 7, 2018**. Otherwise, this determination is considered expired and a new Preliminary Project Assessment is

required. Such applications and plans must be generally consistent with those found in this Preliminary Project Assessment.

Enclosure: Shadow Fan
 Places of Entertainment Map

cc: Toby Morris, Property Owner's Representative
 Claudine Asbagh, Current Planning
 Kansai Uchida, Environmental Planning
 Steve Wertheim, Citywide Planning and Analysis
 Maia Small, Design Review
 Jonas Ionin, Planning Commission Secretary
 Charles Rivasplata, SFMTA
 Jerry Sanguinetti, Public Works
 Pauline Perkins, SFPUC
 Planning Department Webmaster (webmaster.planning@sfgov.org)



Title: 736 Hyde Street Preliminary Shadow Fan


Comments: Height of 50 feet

Printed: 20 January, 2017




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

736 Hyde Street: Places of Entertainment



The City and County of San Francisco (CCSF) does not guarantee the accuracy, timeliness, completeness or usefulness of any information. CCSF provides this information on an "as is" basis with no warranty of any kind, including but not limited to warranties of merchantability or fitness for a particular purpose, and assumes no responsibility for anyone's use of the information.



FIRST	LAST	TITLE	ORGANIZATION	ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP	TELEPHONE	EMAIL	NEIGHBORHOOD OF INTEREST
Andrew	Chandler		0 Lower Polk Neighbors	PO BOX 642428	San Francisco	CA	94164-		0	0 Downtown/Civic Center, Nob Hill
Alexandra	Goldman	Community Planner	Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation - CO Department	201 Eddy Street	San Francisco	CA	94102	415-358-3920	agoldman@tndc.org	Downtown/Civic Center, South of Market
Donald	Savoie	Executive Director	Civic Center Community Benefit District	234 Van Ness Avenue	San Francisco	CA		94102 415-626-1819	info@sfciviccenter.org	Downtown/Civic Center
Eric	Lopez	President	SoMaBend Neighborhood Association	P.O. Box 410805	San Francisco	CA		94141 415-669-0916	somabend.na@gmail.com	Downtown/Civic Center, Mission, South of Market
Ian	Lewis		0 HERE Local 2	209 Golden Gate Avenue	San Francisco	CA		94102	0	0 Chinatown, Downtown/Civic Center, Marina, Mission, Nob Hill, North Beach, Pacific Heights, Presidio, South of Market
James	Haas	Chairman	Civic Center Stakeholder Group	100 Van Ness Avenue	San Francisco	CA	94102	415-285-5048	JWHaasESQ@AOL.com	Downtown/Civic Center
Jane	Kim	Supervisor, District 6	Board of Supervisors	1 Dr. Carlton B Goodlett Place, Room #244	San Francisco	CA	94102-	415-554-7970 4689	jane.kim@sfgov.org; April.veneracion@sfgov.org; Sunny.Angulo@sfgov.org; Ivy.Lee@sfgov.org	Downtown/Civic Center, North Beach, South of Market, Treasure Island/YBI
Jason	Henderson	Vice Chariman	Market/Octavia Community Advisory Comm.	300 Buchanan Street, Apt. 503	San Francisco	CA	94102	415-722-0617	jhenderson@sbcglobal.net	Castro/Upper Market, Downtown/Civic Center, Mission, South of Market, Western Addition
London	Breed	Supervisor, District 5	Board of Supervisors	1 Dr. Carlton B Goodlett Place, Room #244		CA	94102-	415-554-7630 4689	London.Breed@sfgov.org; conor.johnston@sfgov.org; vallie.brown@sfgov.org; Ahmad.Elnajjar@sfgov.org	Bernal Heights, Downtown/Civic Center, Haight Ashbury, Inner Sunset, Western Addition
Marlayne	Morgan	President	Cathedral Hill Neighbors Association	1200 Gough Street	San Francisco	CA	94109	415-572-8093	marlayne16@gmail.com	Downtown/Civic Center, Russian Hill
Marvis	Phillips	Land Use Chair	Alliance for a Better District 6	230 Eddy Street #1206	San Francisco	CA	94102-	415-674-1935 6526	marvisphillips@gmail.com	Downtown/Civic Center, Mission, South of Market, Western Addition
Randy	Shaw	Director	Tenderloin Housing Clinic	126 Hyde Street	San Francisco	CA	94102	415-771-9850	randy@thclinic.org	Downtown/Civic Center
Ted	Olsson	Member	Market/Octavia Community Advisory Comm.	30 Sharon Street	San Francisco	CA	94114-	415-407-0094 1709	olssorted@yahoo.com	Castro/Upper Market, Downtown/Civic Center, Mission
Tiffany	Bohee	Executive Director	Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, City and County of San Francisco	1 South Van Ness Avenue, 5th Floor	San Francisco	CA	94103		0 tiffany.bohee@sfgov.org; mike.grisso@sfgov.org; courtney.pash@sfgov.org	Bayview, Downtown /Civic Center, South of Market, Visitacion Valley
Gail	Baugh	President	Hayes Valley Neighborhood Association	700 Hayes Street	San Francisco	CA	94102	415-265-0546	president@hayesvalleysf.org	Castro/Upper Market, Downtown/Civic Center, Mission, South of Market, Western Addition
Claude	Imbault	Director of Strategic Initiatives	Union Square Business Improvement District	323 Geary Street, Suite 203	San Francisco	CA		94102 415-781-7880	claud@unionsquarebid.com	Downtown/Civic Center
Mark	Moreno	Co-Director	Market/Van Ness Neighborhood Association	77 Van Ness Avenue	San Francisco	CA		94102 415-286-3492	mmoreno@citiscapesf.com	Downtown/Civic Center
Brian	Basinger	Executive Director	Q Foundation - AIDS Housing Alliance/SF	350 Golden Gate Ave. Suite A	San Francisco	CA		94102 415-552-3242	info@ahasf.org	Castro/Upper Market, Downtown/Civic Center, Financial District, Haight Ashbury, Mission, Nob Hill, Downtown/Civic Center, Financial District, South of Chinatown, Downtown/Civic Center, Financial District, Marina, Nob Hill, North Beach, Pacific Heights, Russian Hill, South of Market, Western Addition
David	Lal	Executive Director	SF CityWide	870 Market Street, #815	San Francisco	CA	94102	415-735-4609	info@sfcitywide.org	Chinatown, Downtown Civic Center, Financial District, Nob Hill, North Beach
Moe	Jamil	Chair	Middle Polk Neighborhood Association	PO Box 640918	San Francisco	CA	94164		0 moe@middlepolk.org	Russian Hill, South of Market, Western Addition
Jeffrey	Kwong	Organizer	874 Sacramento Street Tenants Association	874 Sacramento Street, Apt. 42	San Francisco	CA		94108 415-290-5595	cardinals@gmail.com	Chinatown, Downtown Civic Center, Financial District, Nob Hill, North Beach
Ramon	Quintero	Community Planner	Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation	149 Taylor Street	San Francisco	CA		94102 415-358-3900	rquintero@tndc.org	Downtown/Civic Center, South of Market

San Francisco

FIRST	LAST	TITLE	ORGANIZATION	ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP	TELEPHONE	EMAIL	NEIGHBORHOOD OF INTEREST
Aaron	Peskin		-	470 Columbus Avenue, Ste. 211	San Francisco	CA	94133	415-986-7014	aaron.peskin@earthlink.net	Citywide
Adrian	Simi	Local Field Representative	Carpenters Local 22	2085 Third Street	San Francisco	CA	94107	415-355-1322	ASimi@nccrc.org	Citywide
Alex	Lantsberg	Research Analyst	Carpenters Local 22 c/o NCCRC Research	265 Hegenberger Road, Ste. 220	Oakland	CA	94621	510-430-9706 x109	alantsberg@nccrc.org	Citywide
Chuck	Turner	Director	Community Design Center	5 Thomas Mellon Circle, #128	San Francisco	CA	94134	415-586-1235	hn3782@earthlink.net	Citywide
David	Villa-Lobos	Executive Director	Community Leadership Alliance	P.O. Box 642201	San Francisco	CA	94109	415-921-4192	admin@communityleadershipallia nce.net	Citywide
Lynn	Sousa	Public Works Coordinator	AT&T Construction and Engineering	795 Folsom Street, Rm.426	San Francisco	CA	94107-1243	415-644-7043	1s4524@att.com	Citywide
Mary	Miles		0 Coalition for Adequate Review	364 Page Street, #36	San Francisco	CA	94102		0	0 Citywide
Michael	Theriault	Secretary-Treasurer	SF Building and Construction Trades Council	1188 Franklin Street, Ste.203	San Francisco	CA	94109	415-345-9333	mike@sfbctc.org	Citywide
Stephen	Williams	Attorney	Law Office of Stephen M. Williams	1934 Divisadero Street	San Francisco	CA	94115	415-292-3656	SMW@stevewilliamsllaw.com	Citywide
Sue	Hestor	Attorney at Law	-	870 Market Street, #1128	San Francisco	CA	94102	415-362-2778	hestor@earthlink.net	Citywide
Ted	Gullicksen	Office Manager	San Francisco Tenants Union	558 Capp Street	San Francisco	CA	94110	415-282-5525	ted@sftu.org	Citywide