DATE: October 4, 2013
TO: John Bickford
FROM: Julian J. Bañales, Planning Department
RE: PPA Case No. 2013.0986U for 1140 Folsom Street

Please find the attached Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) for the address listed above. You may contact the staff contact, Corey Teague, at (415) 575-9081 or corey.teague@sfgov.org, to answer any questions you may have, or to schedule a follow-up meeting.

Julian J. Bañales, Senior Planner
Preliminary Project Assessment

Date: October 4, 2013
Case No.: 2013.0986U
Project Address: 1140 Folsom Street
Block/Lot: 3730/015, 075, 077, 078, and 080
Zoning: Folsom Street NCT
Residential Enclave District (RED)
Western SoMa SUD
65-X and 40-X
Area Plan: Western SoMa
Project Sponsor: John Bickford
415-675-2169
Staff Contact: Corey Teague – 415-575-9081
corey.teague@sfgov.org

DISCLAIMERS:

Please be advised that this determination does not constitute an application for development with the Planning Department. It also does not represent a complete review of the proposed project, a project approval of any kind, or 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, Department of Public Works, Department of Public Health, and others. The information included herein is based on plans and information provided for this assessment and 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 demolish the existing 14,581 square foot industrial/retail building and construct a 4-to-6 story mixed use building with heights up to 40 feet along Rausch Street and up to 65 feet along Folsom Street. The proposed new building would include 128 dwelling units, 85 basement level parking spaces, and 5,500 square feet of commercial space along Folsom Street.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:

Community Plan Exemption

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

The proposed project is located within the Western SoMa Community Plan area, which was evaluated in *Western SoMa Community Plan, Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels, and 350 Eight Street Project Final Environmental Impact Report EIR* (“Western SoMa FEIR”), which was certified in December 6, 2012.¹ Because the proposed project is consistent with the development density identified in the area plan, it is eligible for a community plan exemption (CPE). Within the CPE process, there can be three different outcomes as follows:

1. **CPE Only.** All potentially significant project-specific and cumulatively considerable environmental impacts are fully consistent with significant impacts identified in *Western SoMa FEIR* and there would be no new ‘peculiar’ significant impacts unique to the proposed project. In these situations, all pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from *Western SoMa FEIR* are applied to the proposed project, and a CPE checklist and certificate is prepared. With this outcome, the applicable fees are: (a) the CPE determination fee (currently $13,339); (b) the CPE certificate fee (currently $7,402); and (c) a proportionate share fee for recovery for costs incurred by the Planning Department for preparation of the *Western SoMa FEIR*.

2. **CPE + Focused Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration.** If new site- or project-specific significant impacts are identified for the proposed project that were not identified in the *Western SoMa FEIR*, and if these new significant impacts can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level, then a focused mitigated negative declaration is prepared to address these impacts, and a supporting CPE certificate is prepared to address all other impacts that were encompassed by the *Western SoMa FEIR*, with all pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the *Western SoMa FEIR* also applied to the proposed project. With this outcome, the applicable fees are: (a) the CPE determination fee (currently $13,339); (b) the standard environmental evaluation fee (which is based on construction value); and (c) a proportionate share fee for recovery for costs incurred by the Planning Department for preparation of the *Western SoMa FEIR*.

3. **CPE + Focused EIR.** If any new site- or project-specific significant impacts cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level, then a focused EIR is prepared to address these impacts, and a supporting CPE certificate is prepared to address all other impacts that were encompassed by the *Western SoMa FEIR*, with all pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the *Western SoMa FEIR* also applied to the proposed project. With this outcome, the applicable fees are: (a) the CPE determination fee (currently $13,339); (b) one-half of the standard EIR fee (which is also based on construction value); and (d) a proportionate share fee for recovery for costs incurred by the Planning Department for preparation of the *Western SoMa FEIR*.

In order to begin formal environmental review, please submit an *Environmental Evaluation Application*. See page 2 of the current *Fee Schedule* for calculation of environmental application fees. Below is a list of topic

---

areas that would require additional study based on our preliminary review of the project as it is proposed in the Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) submittal dated July 24, 2013.

a. **Archeological Review.** Project implementation would entail soil-disturbing activities associated with building construction, including excavation that would reach a depth of approximately 10 feet below grade. Western SoMa FEIR Archeological Mitigation Measure M-CP-4a: Project-Specific Preliminary Archeological Assessment would be applicable to the proposed project. This mitigation measure would require a Preliminary Archeological Review (PAR) which would be conducted in-house by the Planning Department archeologist. During the PAR it will be determined what type of soils disturbance/ modification will result from the project, such as excavation, installation of foundations, soils improvement, site remediation, etc. Any available geotechnical/soils or Phase II hazardous materials report prepared for the project site will be reviewed at this time. Secondly, it will be determined if the project site is in an area that is archeologically sensitive. The results of this review will be provided in a memorandum to the Environmental Planner assigned to the project. If it is found that the project has the potential to affect an archeological resource, the PAR memorandum will identify appropriate additional actions to be taken, which would include the appropriate archeological measure and/or if additional archeological studies would be required as part of the environmental evaluation.

b. **Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE):** The proposed project consists of demolition of a potential historic resource (building constructed 50 or more years ago); therefore, the project is subject to the Department’s Historic Preservation review, which would include preparation of an Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE) by a qualified professional who meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards. The department will provide the project sponsor with a list of three consultants from the Historic Resource Consultant Pool, which shall be known as the potential consultant list or PCL. Once the Environmental Evaluation Application is submitted, please contact Tina Tam, Senior Preservation Planner, via email (tina.tam@sfgov.org) for the list of three consultants. Upon selection of the historic resource consultant, the scope of the Historic Resource Evaluation shall be prepared in consultation with Department Preservation staff.

c. **Shadow.** The proposed project would result in construction of a building greater than 40 feet in height. A preliminary shadow fan analysis has been prepared by Planning Department staff, and indicates that the proposed project could cast shadows on recreational resources. The project therefore requires a detailed shadow study to be prepared by a qualified consultant. The consultant would be required to submit a Shadow Study Application, which can be found on the Planning Department’s website. A separate fee is required.

d. **Geotechnical Investigation.** The site is located in a liquefaction hazard zone. A Geotechnical Study is required to be conducted for the site to identify site-specific geologic conditions and potential hazards. The Geotechnical Study should evaluate or make recommendations for the design of the building foundation.

e. **Hazardous Materials.** The project site is located on artificial fill, which indicates that hazardous materials may be associated with the 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 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.


Please provide a copy of the submitted Maher Application and Phase I ESA with the Environmental Evaluation Application (EEA).

f. **Air Quality.** The project proposes the demolition of an existing two-story industrial building. 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 San Francisco Board of Supervisors approved a series of amendments to the San Francisco Building and Health Codes generally referred hereto as the Construction Dust Control Ordinance (Ordinance 176-08, effective July 30, 2008) with the intent of reducing the quantity of dust generated during site preparation, demolition, and construction work in order to protect the health of the general public and of onsite workers, minimize public nuisance complaints, and to avoid orders to stop work by the Department of Building Inspection (DBI). Pursuant to the Construction Dust Ordinance, the proposed project would be required to prepare a Construction Dust Control Plan for review and approval by the San Francisco Department of Public Health.

In addition to construction dust, demolition and construction activities would require the use of heavy-duty diesel equipment which emits diesel particulate matter (DPM). DPM is a designated toxic air contaminant, which may affect sensitive receptors located up to and perhaps beyond 300 feet from the project site. Additional measures may be required to reduce DPM emissions from construction vehicles and equipment. The proposed project includes sensitive land uses (128 dwelling units) that may be affected by nearby roadway-related pollutants and other stationary sources that may emit toxic air contaminants.

Health Code Article 38, which applies to the proposed project, requires that new residential development greater than 10 units located within the Potential Roadway Exposure Zone perform an Air Quality Assessment to determine whether PM$_{2.5}$ concentrations from roadway sources exceed 0.2 micrograms per cubic meter (0.2 µg/m$^3$). Sponsors of projects on sites exceeding this level are required to install ventilation systems or otherwise redesign the project to reduce the outdoor PM$_{2.5}$ exposure indoors. The proposed project is located within the Potential Roadway Exposure Zone, therefore an analysis of annual exposure to roadway related particulate matter would be required. You may choose to have the air quality assessment prepared by a qualified firm and forwarded to DPH for review, or you may
request that DPH conduct the assessment. For more information on Health Code Article 38 see: http://www.sfdph.org/dph/EH/Air/default.asp.

During the environmental review process the proposed project will be reviewed to determine whether mitigation measures in the form of either construction emissions minimization measures or air filtration and ventilation mitigation measures will be required and whether any additional mitigation measures identified in the underlying Western SoMo Programmatic EIR will be required.

g. **Greenhouse Gas Compliance Checklist for Private Development Projects.** The 2010 CEQA Air Quality Guidelines provide CEQA thresholds of significance for greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. On August 12, 2010, the San Francisco Planning Department submitted to the BAAQMD a draft of the City and County of San Francisco’s Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions. This document presents a comprehensive assessment of policies, programs and ordinances that collectively represent San Francisco’s Qualified Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy. The BAAQMD reviewed San Francisco’s GHG reduction strategy and concluded that the strategy meets the criteria for a Qualified GHG Reduction Strategy as outlined in BAAQMD’s CEQA Guidelines (2010). Therefore, projects that are consistent with San Francisco’s GHG reduction strategy would result in less-than-significant GHG emissions.

In order to facilitate a determination of compliance with San Francisco’s GHG reduction strategy, the Planning Department has prepared a Greenhouse Gas Analysis Compliance Checklist. The project sponsor will be required to submit a completed checklist as part of the environmental review process.

h. **Noise.** The project site is located in an area where traffic-related noise exceeds 60 dBA Ldn (a day-night averaged sound level). *Western SoMa FEIR Noise Mitigation Measure M-NO-1a: Interior Noise Levels for Residential Uses* requires that the project sponsor conduct a detailed analysis of noise reduction requirements for new development including noise-sensitive uses located along streets with noise levels above 60 dBA (Ldn).

*Western SoMA FEIR Noise Mitigation Measure M-NO-1b: Siting of Noise-Sensitive Uses* is intended to reduce potential conflicts between existing noise-generating uses and new sensitive receptors. This measure would apply to the proposed project because the project includes a noise-sensitive use. This mitigation measure requires that a noise analysis be prepared for new development including a noise-sensitive use, prior to the first project approval action. The mitigation measure requires that such an analysis include, at a minimum, a site survey to identify potential noise-generation uses within 900 feet of, and that have a direct line-of-sight to, the project site. At least one 24-hour noise measurement (with maximum noise level readings taken at least every 15 minutes) shall be included in the analysis. The analysis shall be prepared by person(s) qualified in acoustical analysis and/or engineering and shall demonstrate with reasonable certainty that Title 24 standards, where

---

applicable, can be met, and that there are no particular circumstances about the project site that appear to warrant heightened concern about noise levels in the vicinity. Should such concerns be present, the Planning Department may require the completion of a detailed noise assessment by person(s) qualified in acoustical analysis and/or engineering prior to the first project approval action.

*Western SoMa FEIR Noise Mitigation Measure M-NO-1c: Siting of Noise-Generating Uses* would not apply to the proposed project because the project would not include commercial, industrial, or other uses that would be expected to generate noise levels in excess of ambient noise, either short term, at nighttime, or as a 24-hour average, in the project site vicinity.

*Western SoMa FEIR Noise Mitigation Measure M-NO-1d: Open Space in Noisy Environments* would apply to the proposed project as it includes new development of a noise-sensitive use. This mitigation measure requires that open space required under the Planning Code be protected from existing ambient noise levels. Implementation of this measure could involve, among other things, 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. Implementation would also be undertaken consistent with other principles of urban design.

*Western SoMa FEIR Mitigation Measure M-NO-2a: General Construction Noise Control Measure* would apply to the proposed project to ensure that project noise from construction activities is minimized to the maximum extent feasible. *Western SoMa FEIR Mitigation Measure M-NO-2b: Noise Control Measures During Pile Driving* would not be applicable since the project sponsor has indicated that construction of the proposed project would not require pile driving.3

i. **Transportation Impact Study.** Based on the Planning Department’s transportation impact analysis guidelines, the project would require additional transportation analysis to determine whether the project may result in a significant impact. Therefore, the Planning Department requires that a consultant listed on the Planning Department’s Transportation Consultant Pool prepare a Transportation Study. You are required to pay special fees for the study; please contact Chelsea Fordham at (415) 575-9071 to arrange payment. Once the fees are paid, a Planning Department Transportation Planner will provide you with a list of three consultants from the Transportation Pool, and will direct the scope of the study.

At this time, the Planning Department has the following comments. Please clarify width of existing and proposed curb cut for garage access/driveways. Existing curb cut to be removed on Rausch Street should be included in the plans. Site plan should include width of proposed sidewalks. Please clarify if there will be retail access on Folsom Street and if there will be access to common open space on ground floor. Add more car-share spaces if possible. Add garage circulation dimensions on plans. Based on location, project could propose fewer

---

3 John Bickford, Project Sponsor. Email to Don Lewis, San Francisco Planning Department, Pile Driving: PPA: 1140 Folsom Street (Case No. 2013.0986U), September 9, 2013. This email is available for review as part of Case File No. 2013.0986U at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, California 94103.
parking spaces. Please clarify the number of bicycle parking spaces. It is also unclear how bicycle parking and electric charging and maintenance facility would be included in 550 square feet. Planning supports the bike entry on Rausch Street and at ground level. There is some concern regarding the proximity of the bike storage to the project garage entry.

j. **Tree Disclosure Affidavit.** The Department of Public Works Code Section 8.02-8.11 requires disclosure and protection of landmark, significant, and street trees located on private and public property. Any tree identified in this Disclosure Statement must be shown on the Site Plans with size of the trunk diameter, tree height, and accurate canopy dripline. Please submit an Affidavit with the Environmental Evaluation Application and ensure trees are appropriately shown on site plans.

k. **Compliance with Stormwater Management Ordinance.** The City and County of San Francisco Stormwater Management Ordinance became effective on May 22, 2010. This ordinance requires that any project resulting in a ground disturbance of 5,000 square feet or greater prepare a Stormwater Control Plan, consistent with the November 2009 Stormwater Design Guidelines. Responsibility for review and approval of the Stormwater Control Plan is with the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) Wastewater Enterprise, Urban Watershed Management Program.

The initial CEQA evaluation of a project will broadly discuss how the Stormwater Management Ordinance will be implemented if the project triggers compliance with the Stormwater Design Guidelines. The project’s environmental evaluation would generally evaluate how and where the implementation of required stormwater management and Low Impact Design approaches would reduce potential negative effects of stormwater runoff. This may include environmental factors such as the natural hydrologic system, city sewer collection system, and receiving body water quality.

l. **Notification of a Project Receiving Environmental Review.** Notice is required to be sent to occupants of the project site and of adjacent properties as well as owners of properties within 300 feet of the project site. Please provide these mailing labels at the time of submittal.

If any of the additional analyses determine that mitigation measures not identified in the area plan EIR are required to address peculiar impacts, the environmental document will be a community plan exemption plus a focused initial study/mitigated negative declaration. If the additional analyses identify impacts that cannot be mitigated, the environmental document will be a community plan exemption with a focused initial study/EIR. A community plan exemption and a community plan exemption plus a focused initial study/mitigated negative declaration can be prepared by Planning Department staff, but a community plan exemption with a focused initial study/EIR would need to be prepared by a consultant on the Planning Department’s environmental consultant pool (http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/MEA/Environmental_consultant_pool.pdf).
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. **Large Project Authorization** from the Planning Commission is required per Planning Code Section 329 for the new construction of the portion of the proposed building located within the RED Zoning District, which is greater than 25,000 gross square feet.

2. **Conditional Use Authorization** from the Planning Commission is required per Planning Code Sections 121.1, 121.2, and 304 for:
   
   a. Development on a lot greater than 10,000 square feet within a Neighborhood Commercial District; and
   
   b. The creation of a commercial space greater than 4,000 square feet within the Folsom Street NCT Zoning District; and
   
   c. A Planned Unit Development (PUD) for new construction of the portion of the proposed building located within the Folsom Street NCT Zoning District, which is part of a project site greater than ¼ acre and requires certain exceptions to Planning Code controls.

3. **Shadow Analysis**. A Shadow Analysis is required under Planning Code Section 295 because the project proposes a building height in excess of 40 feet, as measured by the Planning Code. A preliminary shadow fan indicated that the project may cast additional shadow on the Howard and Langton Mini Park to the north of the project site.

4. A **Building Permit Application** is required for the demolition of the existing building on the subject property.

5. A **Building Permit Application** is required for the proposed new construction on the subject property.

Large Project Authorization, Conditional Use, and Shadow Analysis 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 to conduct public outreach with the surrounding community and neighborhood groups early in the development process. Additionally, many approvals require a public hearing with an associated neighborhood notification. Differing levels of neighborhood notification are mandatory for some or all of the reviews and approvals listed above.
This project is required to conduct a **Pre-application** meeting with surrounding neighbors and registered neighborhood groups before a development application may be filed with the Planning Department. The Pre-application packet, which includes instructions and template forms, is available at [www.sfplanning.org](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.

**PRELIMINARY PROJECT COMMENTS:**

The following comments address specific Planning Code and other general issues that may significantly impact the proposed project. For the purpose of providing these comments, the ground floor units along Clara Street are considered non-residential. Designation of these units as residential may alter some of the comments below.

1. **Interdepartmental Project Review.** This review is required for all proposed new construction in seismic hazard zones, in which the subject property falls. An application is enclosed.

2. **Split Zoning.** The subject project site is split by the Folsom Street NCT and RED Zoning Districts. As such, different Planning Code controls may apply to different portion of the proposed project. Therefore, any submitted plans must include a clear delineation of the zoning district boundaries on every sheet.

3. **Rear Yard.** Section 134 requires the project to provide a rear yard of at least 25 percent of the lot depth in the RED and Folsom Street NCT Zoning Districts. Within RED, the rear yard must be provided at grade. Within the Folsom Street NCT, the rear yard must be provided at the second floor and above. The portion of the proposed building along Rausch Street in the RED Zoning District appears to meet these requirements. However, the portion of the proposed building along Folsom Street in the Folsom Street NCT Zoning District does not provide the required 25 percent rear yard. Alternative rear yard configurations may be supported, but it is preferred and recommended that the project provide as close to the required 25 percent of the lot area as possible. The proposed rear yard only represents approximately 16.6 percent of the lot area.

4. **Open Space – Residential.** Section 135 requires 80 square feet of open space (private or common) for each dwelling unit within the RED Zoning District. It appears that the combination of private and common open space within the rear yard of the RED portion of the proposed building meets the minimum residential open space requirements.

Section 135 requires 80 square feet of private open space per dwelling unit, 106.4 square feet of common open space per dwelling unit, or some combination of the two within the Folsom Street NCT Zoning District. Additionally, the Western SoMa SUD (Sec. 823) does not permit roof decks to count towards the required residential open space requirement of Section 135. Therefore, the two large roof decks may not count toward the required residential open space requirement.

And while any excess common open space within the RED portion of the project may be used to satisfy the open space requirements for dwelling units within the Folsom Street NCT portion of the
project, it appears that space is too small to do so. Therefore, the project does not meet the minimum required residential open space per Section 135. The project will need to either provide more code-complying open space and/or request an open space exception from the Planning Commission through the Large Project Authorization and/or the Planned Unit Development authorization. The Department recommends that the project be revised to more closely comply with the residential open space requirement.

5. **Required Streetscape and Pedestrian Improvements.** Per Planning Code Section 138.1, the project sponsor will be required to submit a Streetscape Plan illustrating the location and design of streetscape improvements appropriate to the street type, including street trees, site furnishings, landscaping, corner curb extensions, and sidewalk widening as appropriate. The Planning Department may require these elements as part of conditions of approval. See [http://www.sfbetterstreets.org/design-guidelines/street-types/] to identify relevant street types for the project frontage.

If street improvements are being considered, project sponsors should contact DPW as early as possible to understand the process and requirements for permitting street improvements. For more information on process, guidelines, and requirements for street improvements, refer to [www.sfbetterstreets.org](http://www.sfbetterstreets.org). Required streetscape and pedestrian improvements are not eligible for in-kind fee credit per Section 423.3(d).

6. **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 proposed rear yard is not code-complying and does not provide a large enough courtyard to meet the exposure requirement for those units that only have windows fronting the rear yard area.

It appears that some of the interior-facing units in the Folsom NCT portion of the proposed building do not meet this minimum requirement. Therefore, the proposed project requires revision to meet the minimum exposure requirement, or you may request and justify an exposure exception from the Planning Commission through the Large Project Authorization or Planned Unit Development authorization. The Department generally encourages projects to minimize the number of units needing an exposure exception.

7. **Dwelling Unit Mix.** Section 207.6 requires that at least 40 percent of the dwelling units in this project have two or more bedrooms. While the proposed project provides 40 percent of its dwelling units with two bedrooms or more, it is important to note that the Zoning Administrator interpretation of Section 102.29 states:

“The Eastern Neighborhoods Plan includes ‘minimum dwelling unit mix’ provisions in Section 207.6 which require a certain number of two- or three-bedroom units in new developments. In order to implement this requirement, it was necessary to define a ‘bedroom’. Section 102.29 defines bedroom as “a ‘sleeping room’, as defined in the Building Code”. However, the Building Code does not contain a single definition of “sleeping room”. Rather it – along with the Housing
Code – contains several varied definitions, many of which relate to technical issues traditionally dealt with by the Department of Building Inspection (DBI). Therefore, a bedroom shall be defined as any room which meets all of the following criteria and which is subsequently determined by DBI to meet applicable Building and Housing Code standards: (1) contains at least 70 square feet, exclusive of closets, bathrooms, or similar spaces (as approved by DBI under the San Francisco Building and Housing Codes and related Administrative Bulletins), (2) has at least one window opening to an area which leads either to a street, light well, courtyard or rear yard (as approved by DBI under the San Francisco Building and Housing Codes and related Administrative Bulletins), and (3) is clearly labeled as a ‘bedroom’ on submitted plans.”

8. **Parking.** Section 151.1 permits up to one parking space for every two dwelling units within the Folsom Street NCT Zoning District, with the option to provide up to .75 spaces per dwelling unit if the project meets the criteria of Section 151.1(g). Parking greater than .75 spaces per dwelling unit is not permitted.

Section 151.1 permits up to 0.75 parking spaces per dwelling unit within the RED Zoning District, with the option to provide up to one space per dwelling unit if the project meets the criteria of Section 151.1(g). Parking greater than one space per dwelling unit is not permitted.

The project overall proposes 85 parking spaces for 128 dwelling units, resulting in a parking ratio of 0.66 parking spaces per dwelling unit. The proposed parking should meet the criteria set forth in Section 151.1(g). One of these criteria states that “For projects with 50 dwelling units or more, all residential accessory parking in excess of 0.5 spaces per unit shall be stored and accessed by mechanical stackers or lifts, valet, or other space-efficient means that reduces space used for parking and maneuvering, and maximizes other uses.” While several of the proposed parking spaces are tandem spaces, more spaces should be converted to space-efficient spaces to meet the 0.5 threshold.

9. **Loading.** Section 152.1 requires this project to provide at least one off-street loading space for the residential component (greater than 100,000 square feet). The proposal includes no off-street loading spaces. Therefore, the proposed project requires revision to meet the minimum loading requirement, or you may request and justify a loading exception from the Planning Commission through the Large Project Authorization or Planned Unit Development authorization.

10. **Bicycle Parking.** Section 155.1 et seq. requires this project to provide at one Class 1 bicycle parking space for each dwelling unit, and one Class 2 bicycle parking space for every 20 dwelling units. Additionally, Zoning Administrator Bulletin No. 9 provides supplemental guidance on locating and designing bicycle parking to meet Planning Code Requirements, and can be viewed or downloaded online here: [http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/publications_reports/ZAB_BicycleParking_9-7-13.pdf](http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/publications_reports/ZAB_BicycleParking_9-7-13.pdf).

Class 1 and 2 bicycle parking spaces are also required for the proposed ground floor commercial space. However, the exact amount cannot be determined until a specific use(s) is proposed for that space (i.e. restaurant, retail, etc.). The number of Class 1 bicycle parking spaces is not clear on the plans provided. However, it appears that the area proposed for bicycle parking will not be adequate.
Additionally, having the bicycle parking area front the street does not meet the active use requirements of Section 145.1.

Please note that a variance or exception may not be granted to reduce the overall number of required bicycle parking spaces. Please revise the project to meet the bicycle parking requirements of Section 155.1 et seq.

11. **Baby Diaper-Changing Accommodations.** Please be aware that Section 168 requires every Public-Serving Establishment, as defined in this Section, to provide and maintain Baby Diaper-Changing Accommodations in accordance with the requirements of this Section.

12. **Formula Retail Uses.** While no specific business or tenant is identified for the proposed ground floor commercial space, please be aware that Formula Retail uses require a Conditional Use Authorization in the Folsom Street NCT Zoning District. Additionally, the Western SoMa Special Use District requires additional approval criteria for any Formula Retail use that is required to obtain a Conditional Use Authorization (Sec. 823(c)(10).

13. **Horizontal Mass Reduction.** Section 270.1 requires proposed buildings within Eastern Neighborhood Mixed Use District with a frontage greater than 200 feet to incorporate one or more mass reduction breaks in the building that reduce the horizontal scale of the building into discrete sections not more than 200 feet in length. The project’s frontage along Rausch Street is greater than 200 feet. Therefore, the proposed project requires revision to meet the horizontal mass reduction requirement. While you may request and justify an exception from the Planning Commission through the Large Project Authorization or Planned Unit Development authorization, the Department recommends the project either meet the code requirement, or clearly meet the intent of the requirement.

14. **Affordable Housing.** This project will create more than 10 new dwelling units and is therefore subject to the affordable housing requirements of Section 415 et seq.

15. **Eastern Neighborhoods Impact Fees.** The Eastern Neighborhoods Infrastructure Impact Fee applies to the project. Fees shall be assessed per net new gross square footage on residential and non-residential uses within the Plan Area. More specifically, this property is designated as Tier 1 for residential uses. The Eastern Neighborhoods Infrastructure Impact Fee shall be paid before the City issues a first construction document.

**Option for In-Kind Provision of Community Improvements and Fee Credits.** Project sponsors may propose to directly provide community improvements to the City. In such a case, the City may enter into an In-Kind Improvements Agreement with the sponsor and issue a fee waiver for the Eastern Neighborhoods Infrastructure Impact Fee from the Planning Commission, for an equivalent amount to the value of the improvements. This process is further explained in Section 412.3(d) of the Planning Code. More information on in-kind agreements can be found in the Application Packet for In-Kind Agreement on the Planning Department website.
16. **First Source Hiring Agreement.** A First Source Hiring Agreement is required for any project proposing to construct 25,000 gross square feet or more. For more information, please contact:

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

17. **Flood Notification.** The project site is located in a flood-prone area. Please see the attached bulletin regarding review of the project by the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission.

18. **Recycled Water.** The City requires property owners to install dual-plumbing systems for recycled water use in accordance with Ordinances 390-91, 391-91, and 393-94, within the designated recycled water use areas for new construction projects larger than 40,000 square feet. Please see the attached SFPUC document for more information.

**PRELIMINARY DESIGN COMMENTS:**

The following comments address preliminary design issues that may significantly impact the proposed project:

1. **Site Design, Open Space, and Massing.** The Planning Department recommends locating and using the lobby where the massing along Folsom Street transitions to Rausch Street as a building massing break between the two heights.

2. **Street Frontage.** The frontage should provide a consistent and active relationship with the fronting streets, per the Draft Ground Floor Residential Design Guidelines.

    *Individual unit stoops.* The Planning Department expects ground floor residential units to be set back with raised landscaped entries that range from three to five feet above grade, to provide direct access from the street (these landings/porches may also count toward the required open space per Section 135, depending on size and dimensions). The setbacks should be at least 6 feet deep along the majority of the front of the units. If accessed at grade they should be setback 9 feet at the first and second floors. Per the Draft Ground Floor Residential Design Guidelines, vertically modulate the façade so that residential units are individually legible.

3. **Architecture.** The lobby should be as transparent as possible, expressed with a wider and higher recess, and should include landscaping. At this point the architecture is assumed to be preliminary and the Planning Department will provide further detailed design review on the subsequent submission. Requested exceptions to the Planning Code should be responded to by exceptional design. The Planning Department expects a high quality of design that responds to its context with a consistent composition of building components and materiality.
PRELIMINARY PROJECT ASSESSMENT EXPIRATION:

This Preliminary Project Assessment is valid for a period of 18 months. An Environmental Evaluation, Conditional Use Authorization, or Building Permit Application, as listed above, must be submitted no later than April 4, 2015. 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
Flood Notification: Planning Bulletin
SFPUC Recycled Water Information Sheet

cc: Platt Leland, LLC, Property Owner
    Corey Teague, Current Planning
    Don Lewis, Environmental Planning
    Kate McGee, Citywide Planning and Analysis
    Jerry Robbins, MTA
    Jerry Sanguinetti, DPW
INTERDEPARTMENTAL PROJECT REVIEW
Effective: August 30, 2013

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 aboverefereed 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. $1,164 for five or fewer residential units and all affordable housing projects.
2. $1,702 for all other projects.

Please note that $394 of these fees is non-refundable. If your project falls under the second type of fee, and you cancel your meeting, the difference 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, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103-2414. Those wishing more specific or more detailed information may contact the Project Review Meeting Coordinator at (415) 575-9091.

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

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

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

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)

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Type</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Net Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Dwelling Units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Square Footage:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Hotel Rooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Square Footage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Uses: _________________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Parking Spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Stories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Previously contacted staff _______________________________________________________________

Will this project be publicly funded? (specify) ____________________________________________

(Please submit four (4) copies/sets of the Application Form, Floor Plans, Pictures, etc.)
DATE: April 1, 2007 (V1.3)

TITLE: Review of Projects in Identified Areas Prone to Flooding

PURPOSE: This bulletin alerts project sponsors to City and County review procedures and requirements for certain properties where flooding may occur.

BACKGROUND:
Development in the City and County of San Francisco must account for flooding potential. Areas located on fill or bay mud can subside to a point at which the sewers do not drain freely during a storm (and sometimes during dry weather) and there can be backups or flooding near these streets and sewers. The attached graphic illustrates areas in the City prone to flooding, especially where ground stories are located below an elevation of 0.0 City Datum or, more importantly, below the hydraulic grade line or water level of the sewer. The City is implementing a review process to avoid flooding problems caused by the relative elevation of the structure to the hydraulic grade line in the sewers.

PERMIT APPLICATION PROCESS:
Applicants for building permits for either new construction, change of use (Planning) or change of occupancy (Building Inspection), or for major alterations or enlargements shall be referred to the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) at the beginning of the process, for a review to determine whether the project would result in ground level flooding during storms. The side sewer connection permits for such projects need to be reviewed and approved by the PUC at the beginning of the review process for all permit applications submitted to the Planning Department, the Department of Building Inspection, or the Redevelopment Agency.

The SFPUC and/or its delegate (SFDPW, Hydraulics Section) will review the permit application and comment on the proposed application and the potential for flooding during wet weather. The SFPUC will receive and return the application within a two-week period from date of receipt.

The permit applicant shall refer to PUC requirements for information required for the review of projects in flood prone areas. Requirements may include provision of a pump station for the sewage flow, raised elevation of entryways, and/or special sidewalk construction and the provision of deep gutters.
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Recycled Water Installation Procedures for Developers

The City and County of San Francisco (CCSF) requires property owners to install dual-plumbing systems for recycled water use in accordance with Ordinances 390-91, 391-91, and 393-94, within the designated recycled water use areas under the following circumstances:

- New or remodeled buildings and all subdivisions (except condominium conversions) with a total cumulative area of 40,000 square feet or more
- New and existing irrigated areas of 10,000 square feet or more

The following are procedures to guide developers and property owners with the installation of recycled water service lines. The diagram on the reverse, shows how and where the lines are to be installed, and the required backflow prevention.

Number of Water Lines Coming onto a Property
Three to four lines:
1) Fire
2) Potable water domestic
3) Recycled water domestic
4) Recycled water irrigation (if property has landscaping)

Number of Water Meters
One water meter required for each water line.

Required Backflow Prevention
Fire line – reduced pressure principle backflow preventer
Potable water domestic – reduced pressure principle backflow preventer
Recycled water domestic – reduced pressure principle backflow preventer
Recycled water irrigation line – reduced pressure principle backflow preventer

All backflow preventers must be approved by the SFPUC’s Water Quality Bureau.

The backflow preventer for domestic water plumbing inside the building, and the recycled water system must meet the CCSF’s Plumbing Code and Health Code.

Pipe Separation
California Department of Public Health regulations require new water mains and new supply lines to be installed at least 4-foot horizontally from, and one foot vertically above a parallel pipeline conveying recycled water.

Pipe Type
- Transmission lines and mains – ductile iron
- Distribution and service lines – purple PVC or equivalent
- Irrigation lines – purple PVC or equivalent
- Dual-plumbing – piping described in Chapter 3, Appendix J of the City and County of San Francisco Plumbing Codes

**SFPUC must sign off on pipe type prior to installation. Contact the City Distribution Division at (415) 550-4952.

Temporary Potable Water Use Until Recycled Water Becomes Available
The potable water line will be used to feed the recycled water lines(s) until such time that recycled water becomes available. When recycled water becomes available, the cross-connection will be broken by the SFPUC, and the potable and recycled water lines will be totally separated. Before recycled water is delivered to the property, cross-connection and backflow testing will take place to assure separation.

Under no circumstances are developers or property owners to "t-off" of the potable water line to the recycled water lines(s).

If you have questions, or would like additional information:

Recycled Water Ordinances
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Water Resources Planning
(415) 554-3271

Recycled Water Plumbing Codes
Department of Building Inspection
Plumbing Inspection Services
(415) 558-6054

Backflow Prevention
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Water Quality Bureau
(650) 652-3100

New Service Line Permits
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Customer Service Bureau
(415) 551-3000
NOTE:
1. ALL BACKFLOW PREVENTERS MUST APPROVED BY SFPUC WATER QUALITY BUREAU.

2. BACKFLOW PREVENTION FOR DOMESTIC WATER PLUMBING INSIDE THE BUILDING MUST MEET CCSF PLUMBING CODE AND PUBLIC HEALTH CODE REQUIREMENTS.

3. BACKFLOW PREVENTER FOR RECYCLED WATER SYSTEM MUST MEET CCSF PLUMBING CODE AND PUBLIC HEALTH CODE REQUIREMENTS.

RESPONSIBILITY OF INSTALLATION OF

HEAVY LINES:
PROPERTY OWNER PAYS FOR NEW SERVICE INSTALLATION. SFPUC RETAINS OWNERSHIP OF NEW SERVICE UP TO THE END OF METER ASSEMBLY.

LIGHT LINES: & 
PROPERTY OWNER PAYS FOR NEW SERVICE INSTALLATION. OWNERSHIP REMAINS WITH THE PROPERTY OWNER.