DATE:    October 22, 2013
TO:      Joy Ou
FROM:    Josh Switzky, Planning Department
RE:      PPA Case No. 2013.1049U for 970 Market 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.

Josh Switzky, Acting Director of Citywide Policy and Analysis
Preliminary Project Assessment

Date: October 22, 2013
Case No.: 2013.1049U
Project Address: 970 Market Street
Block/Lot: 0342/001, 002, 004, and 014
Zoning: C-3-G 120-X
Area Plan: Downtown
Project Sponsor: Group I, c/o Joy Ou 415-394-7027
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 five existing structures and construct a new mixed use development in a building up to 180 feet in height containing approximately 316 dwelling units, approximately 250 hotel rooms, approximately 15,000 square feet of ground floor retail space, approximately 75,000 square feet of various arts activities, and up to 198 basement-level parking spaces. The arts activities would include four theatres, rehearsal and education space, and administrative office space for arts organizations.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:
The proposed project initially requires the following Environmental Review: Please submit an Environmental Evaluation Application. Environmental Evaluation (EE) 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. See page 2 of the current Fee Schedule for the calculation of environmental application fees. Review of the EE Application may be done in conjunction with the required approvals listed below, but must be completed before any project approval may be granted.
The proposed project is likely to require an Environmental Impact Report (EIR). However, a formal determination would be made based on results of the following additional analyses and findings from an Initial Study. If the Initial Study indicates that the project would result in a significant impact that cannot be mitigated to a less than significant level, an EIR would be required. If an EIR is required, it must be prepared by an environmental consultant from the Planning Department’s environmental consultant pool. The Planning Department would 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 that would require additional study based on our preliminary review of the project as it is proposed in the Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) submittal.

1. **Historic Resource Evaluation.** The project site is occupied by four buildings that are all greater than 50 years of age. Viewing the site from east to west, the first structure at 950-964 Market Street—called the Dean Building—was constructed in 1907 and later remodeled in 1940. Identified in a reconnaissance-level survey completed by Anne Bloomfield in 1997, the building was previously occupied by the The Old Crow, San Francisco’s first gay bar. The survey determined that the building appears individually eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places at the local level of significance under Criterion A for its association with a pattern of events. The Mid-Market Redevelopment Survey, conducted in 2011, confirmed the determination that 950-964 Market Street (Dean Building) is an eligible historic district. The 2011 survey identified and analyzed the remaining structures on the project site: the second building at 966-970 Market Street was constructed in 1907 and remodeled in 1920 and in subsequent years; the third building at 972 Market Street was constructed in 1912; and the fourth building at 974 Market Street was constructed in 1909. All three remaining structures were found to not be eligible for the California Register under any criteria.

The proposed project involves demolition of the aforementioned Dean Building/Old Crow Bar at the corner of Turk and Market Streets, which has been determined to be an eligible historic resource through survey evaluation. The project is subject to the Department’s Historic Preservation review, which would include preparation of a Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE) by a qualified professional who meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards. The historic status of the subject property would be categorized according to the previous survey determinations unless new information is presented in the HRE constituting a fair argument that the building’s historic resource status should be reconsidered. Upon submittal of an EE Application, the department will provide the project sponsor with a list of three consultants from the Historic Preservation Consultant Pool, which shall be known as the potential consultant list or PCL. After submittal of the EE Application, 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 HRE shall be prepared in consultation with Department Preservation staff.

2. **Archeology.** The proposed project 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 is usually in the form of a memorandum to the Environmental Planner assigned to the project. If it is found that the project has the potential to effect an archeological resource, the PAR memorandum will identify appropriate additional actions to be taken including the appropriate archeological measure and/or if additional archeological studies will be required as part of the EE.

3. **Aesthetics.** The proposed project consists of demolition of five two-story buildings and construction of a new mixed-use structure reaching between 120 and 180 feet in height (12 to 16 stories). The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that a lead agency evaluate a project’s effect on a neighborhood’s visual quality and character, as well as effects on visual resources and scenic vistas within the area’s broader context. Given the degree of visual change anticipated, the Department would require photomontages of the proposed project buildings from to-be-determined public viewpoints within its surroundings. At minimum, the Department requires “before” and “after” photos of the site from a number of near-, mid-, and long-range vantage points to illustrate the project’s effect on views, with a particular focus on the project’s potential to alter views from public areas including street view corridors identified in the General Plan. The environmental review would determine the adequacy of viewpoints, which may be revised based on the level of visual sensitivity as well as to evaluate the project’s potential effects on the skyline and urban form.

4. **Noise.** Based on the City’s GIS-based Traffic Noise Model map, the project would site sensitive land uses such as residential adjacent to streets with noise levels above 75 dBA Ldn (a day-night averaged sound level). Therefore, the project would be subject to Mitigation Measure M-NO-1 of the San Francisco 2004 and 2009 Housing Element EIR. Mitigation Measure M-NO-1 requires that a Noise Analysis be prepared prior to completion of the environmental review. Such an analysis shall include, at a minimum: 1) a site survey to identify potential noise-generating uses within two blocks of the project site; and 2) one 24-hour noise measurement (with maximum noise level readings taken at least every 15 minutes). The analysis 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. In addition, Mitigation Measure M-NO-1 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. It is also recommended that implementation be undertaken consistent with other principles of urban design. Should any 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. The noise analysis shall also examine the potential for the project to generate noise at levels that could conflict with the proposed and adjacent uses.

Construction noise would be subject to the San Francisco Noise Ordinance (Article 29 of the San Francisco Police Code), which includes restrictions on noise levels of construction equipment and hours of construction. Detailed information related to construction equipment, phasing, and duration of each phase may be required as part of environmental evaluation to assess construction noise levels and methods to reduce such noise, as feasible.

5. **Geotechnical Study.** The project site is located in a seismic hazard zone and is subject to liquefaction hazards. A Geotechnical Study should be conducted for the site to identify site-specific geologic
conditions and potential hazards and should be submitted with the EE Application. The Geotechnical Study should evaluate or make recommendations for the design of the building foundations. If potential geological impacts are identified, design recommendations to ameliorate these issues should be included.

6. Transportation Study. Based on a preliminary review of the project proposal, a Transportation Impact Study (TIS) is likely to be required. The TIS would determine whether the project may result in a significant impact to the transportation and circulation network. In addition, the Department offers the following feedback with regards to the proposed project’s effect on the transportation and circulation system: (1) There is a considerable amount of sidewalk on Market Street proposed for removal, which may not be consistent with the Better Streets Plan or the Better Market Street planning efforts; (2) Passenger loading activity should be concentrated on Turk Street and away from Market Street; (3) Service loading activity could be underground by moving the loading dock to the basement, especially for loading by the hotel. As proposed, the loading dock cuts off the corner retail and workshop space. Relocating loading underground would promote a more active street frontage; (4) As currently shown on the plans, it is not clear how the loading dock connects to the rest of the uses; (5) Consider reducing the roadway to a single lane on Turk Street for one block north of Market Street; (6) The hotel should include bicycle parking and bicycle rental for guests; (7) Include the garage and basement-level plans with submittal of the EE Application; (8) Plans should show the truck turning movements (radii) into the dock and/or garage.

The Planning Department requires that a consultant be selected from one of three transportation consultants assigned to this project by the Department during the environmental review process. The Planning Department’s list of approved transportation consultants is available at: [http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/MEA/Transportation_consultant_pool.pdf](http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/MEA/Transportation_consultant_pool.pdf). Additional fees are required; please refer to “Miscellaneous Fees” in the Planning Department’s current Fee Schedule for Applications, available on the Planning Department’s website. As noted on the Fee Schedule, there is a separate fee required for San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) review of the TIS. Please contact Chelsea Fordham at (415) 575-9071 to arrange payment. Once 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.

7. Air Quality. The proposed project consists of 316 residential units, 15,000 square feet of retail use, 25,000 square feet of office use, 165,000 square feet of hotel and arts uses with 250 hotel rooms included. As proposed, the project exceeds the Bay Area Air Quality Management District’s (BAAQMD) screening levels for criteria air pollutants. Therefore an analysis of the project’s criteria air pollutant emissions is likely to be required.

The project includes demolition of several existing structures and construction of a 180 foot tall 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 hereo 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 Control Ordinance,
The proposed project would be required to comply with applicable dust control requirements outlined in the ordinance.

In addition to construction dust, demolition and construction activities would require the use of heavy-duty diesel equipment which emit 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 analysis and/or measures may be required to reduce DPM emissions from construction vehicles and equipment.

The proposed project includes sensitive land uses (316 residential dwelling units) that may be affected by nearby roadway-related pollutants and other stationary sources that emit toxic air contaminants. Health Code Article 38 applies to the proposed project and 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 (µg/m³). Sponsors of projects on sites exceeding this level are required to install ventilation systems or otherwise redesign the project to reduce the infiltration of outdoor PM_{2.5} concentrations indoors for all units by at least 80 percent. The proposed project is located within the Potential Roadway Exposure Zone and requires an analysis of annual exposure to roadway-related particulate matter. You may choose to have the air quality assessment prepared by a qualified firm and forwarded to the Department of Public Health (DPH) for review, or you may request that DPH conduct the assessment. For more information on Health Code Article 38 please see: http://www.sfdph.org/dph/EH/Air/default.asp.

Lastly, should the project include stationary sources of air pollutants including, but not limited to, diesel boilers or back-up generators, an Air Quality Technical Report may be required for additional air pollutant modeling. If an Air Quality Technical Report is required, the project sponsor must retain a consultant with experience in air quality modeling to prepare a scope of work that must be approved by Environmental Planning prior to the commencement of any required analysis and/or modeling determined necessary.

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

9. Shadow. Section 295 restricts new shadow on public spaces under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Department by any structure exceeding 40 feet, unless the Planning Commission finds the

---

impact to be less than significant. To determine whether the project would conform to Section 295, a shadow fan analysis is typically prepared by the Planning Department. The proposed project at 180 feet would require a shadow analysis assessing potential shadow impacts to properties protected under Section 295, in addition to other public open spaces not owned by the Recreation and Parks Department. An application for a shadow analysis should be submitted with the required fee at the time of submittal of the EE Application.

10. **Wind Study.** The proposed project would involve construction of a building over 80 feet in height. The project therefore would require an initial review by a wind consultant, including a recommendation as to whether a wind tunnel analysis is needed. The consultant would be required to prepare a proposed scope of work for review and approval by the Environmental Planning case manager prior to preparing the analysis.

11. **Stormwater Management.** Prior to issuance of a building permit, the project sponsor is required to prepare and submit a Stormwater Control Plan (SCP) to the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) Wastewater Enterprise, Urban Watershed Management Program. The SCP shall demonstrate compliance with the City’s Stormwater Design Guidelines. The project’s environmental review would generally evaluate how and where implementation of the 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. For more information on the SFPUC’s stormwater management requirements see [http://stormwater.sfwater.org](http://stormwater.sfwater.org).

12. **Water Supply Assessment.** CEQA Guidelines Section 15155 and Section 10910 through 10915 of the California Water Code (often referred to as Senate Bill 610) require the preparation of a Water Supply Assessment (WSA) for certain large projects that meet the definition of a water-demand project to determine whether projected water supplies will be sufficient to satisfy the demands of the project in addition to the existing and planned future uses. If the project is served by a public water system, the governing body of the public water system, in this case the SFPUC is required to: (1) Determine if the projected water demand of the project was considered in the most recently adopted urban water management plan, and (2) Prepare a project-specific Water Supply Assessment. The SFPUC is required to provide the WSA to decision-makers before consideration of project approval. The proposed project may be considered a water demand project and therefore, a project-specific water demand analysis is needed to determine if a subsequent WSA is required. The proposed project will require a Water Demand Memorandum. As part of this memorandum, the project sponsor shall provide a complete accounting for all proposed water uses, including but not limited to indoor uses (e.g. toilets, sinks, showers, etc.), cooling applications, outdoor uses (e.g. irrigation, fountains) and process water or industrial uses. If a WSA is required, the SFPUC will complete the WSA within approximately 90 days of receipt of a Water Demand Memorandum. Upon completion of the WSA, the SFPUC will submit the WSA to its commission for consideration. Commission meetings are held twice a month. If the requested memo is not provided by the project sponsor in a timely manner, the SFPUC may request a 30-day extension to complete preparation and adoption of the WSA.

13. **Hazardous Materials.** Portions of the project site are located on the Maher Map, indicating the presence of contaminated soil and/or groundwater. 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 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.

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 the 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 EE Application.

14. **Tree Planting and Protection Checklist.** 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 the Tree Planting and Protection Checklist must be shown on the site plans with size of the trunk diameter, tree height, and accurate canopy dripline. The project sponsor is required to submit a completed Tree Planting and Protection Checklist with the EE Application.

15. **Notification of a Project Receiving Environmental Review.** Notice is required to be sent to occupants of properties adjacent to the project site and owners of properties within 300 feet of the project site at the initiation of the environmental review process. If an EIR is determined to be necessary, this noticing requirement would be met by distributing a Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an EIR. Please be prepared to provide mailing labels at least one week in advance of distribution of any required public notice.

Upon submittal of an EE Application, Planning Department staff would prepare an Initial Study. If theInitial Study indicates that the project would result in a significant impact that could not be reduced to a less-than-significant level by requiring various mitigation measures, an EIR would be required. An EIR must be prepared by an environmental consultant from the Planning Department’s environmental consultant pool. It is recommended that an environmental consultant prepare the requisite environmental document. Upon submittal of an EE Application, please contact Devyani Jain at (415) 575-9051 for a list of three environmental consultants assigned to this project from the Planning Department’s pool of qualified environmental firms. You may choose one of the three assigned consultants to prepare the project’s environmental document.

**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. **Downtown Project Authorization.** In order for the project to proceed, the Planning Commission would need to determine that the project complies with Planning Code Section 309. This Section establishes a framework for review of project within C-3 Districts to ensure conformity with the Planning Code and the General Plan, and modifications may be imposed on various aspects of the
project to achieve this conformity. These aspects include overall building form, impacts to public views, shadows and wind levels on sidewalks and open spaces, traffic circulation, relationship of the project to the streetscape, design of open space features, improvements to adjacent sidewalks (including street trees, landscaping, paving material, and street furniture), quality of residential units, preservation of on-site and off-site historic resources, and minimizing significant adverse environmental effects. Through the Section 309 Review process, the project sponsor may also request exceptions from certain requirements of the Planning Code, as described below.

The application form for a "Downtown Project Authorization" is available from 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.

2. **Conditional Use Authorization.** In order for the project to proceed, the Planning Commission would need to approve a Conditional Use Authorization to allow residential density exceeding one dwelling unit for each 125 square feet of lot area within a C-3 District, per Section 218(b). The Planning Commission would consider the findings which apply to all Conditional Use authorizations in Section 303(c).

The application form for Conditional Use authorization is available from 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.

3. **Zoning Map Amendment/General Plan Amendment.** As discussed below, the Project exceeds the 120-foot height limitation that currently applies to the property. In order for the project to proceed, the Board of Supervisors, upon the recommendation of the Planning Commission, would need to approve a zoning map amendment to change the height and bulk designation for the property. A zoning map amendment would also be required to create a Special Use District, as discussed below. In addition, a General Plan Amendment would be required, in order to amend Map 5 ("Proposed Height and Bulk Districts") of the Downtown Plan.

The application form for a Legislative Amendment is available from 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.

4. **Planning Code Amendment: Special Use District.** As discussed in the PPA application, a Special Use District (SUD) may be proposed that would apply to this property, and may apply to other properties in the Central Market area. Such an SUD would require that the Board of Supervisors, upon the recommendation of the Planning Commission, approve a zoning map amendment and a Planning Code amendment.

The application form for a Legislative Amendment is available from 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.

5. **Variances.** As currently proposed, and as discussed under 'Preliminary Project Comments' below, several aspects of the project may not comply with the requirements of the Planning Code. Therefore,
the project must be revised to comply with the Planning Code, or Variances must be sought for those aspects of the project.

The application form for a Variance is available from 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.

6. **Building Permit Applications.** Permit application and notification are required for the proposed demolition and new construction.

Building Permit applications are available at the Department of Building Inspections 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.

**PRELIMINARY PROJECT COMMENTS:**

The following comments address specific Planning Code and other general issues that may significantly impact the proposed project:

1. **Special Use District.** The Planning Department is currently working with the Mayor’s Office of Economic and Workforce Development to create a new Mid-Market Special Use District (SUD) designed to encourage and incentivize additional arts activities, as well as achieve other related land use objectives in the area. This SUD will likely include, but not be limited to, height and Floor Area Ratio (FAR) bonuses or exemptions for projects that include significant amounts of new space dedicated for arts uses. Other likely provisions of the SUD include restrictions on uses such as liquor stores, pawn shops, fringe financial, and adult uses. Specific incentives and controls for the SUD, as well as potential boundaries and other parameters, are still being analyzed at this time. For more information on this effort, please contact Marlo Isaac at marlo.isaac@sfgov.org or 415-575-6835. The preliminary comments below are based on the current Planning Code. However, the proposed project will need a Zoning Map Amendment, General Plan Amendment, and/or the referenced SUD to be adopted in order to be approved with the proposed height and FAR.

2. **Floor Area Ratio/TDR.** Planning Code Section 124 establishes basic floor area ratio (FAR) limits for all zoning districts. As set forth in Section 124(a), the base FAR limit for the C-3-G District is 6.0 to 1. Under Sections 123 and 128, the FAR can be increased to 9.0 to 1 with the purchase of transferable development rights (TDR). Because the Project proposes an FAR which exceeds 9.0 to 1, an amendment to the Planning Code would be required in order for the project to proceed as currently proposed. Under the existing definition of Gross Floor Area (GFA) in Section 102.9, certain types of cultural and arts uses may be excluded from the calculation of GFA, provided that the spaces in question are accessible to the general public and are operated by a non-profit institution. Some of the spaces proposed within the Project would serve office and administrative functions for arts
organizations. Because such spaces would not be accessible to the general public, these areas would be included in the calculation of GFA under the existing Planning Code. As described in the application, the project sponsor has specifically requested that the Planning Code be amended to exclude the floor area of all arts-related uses (including those areas which are not publically-accessible theater spaces) from the calculation of GFA.

3. **Upper Level Setbacks.** In order to preserve the openness of the street to the sky, to avoid the overwhelming mass of clusters of tall buildings, and to maintain the continuity of the predominant streetwall, Section 132.1 specifies that setbacks may be required at the upper stories of buildings. This requirement would be considered as part of the overall design review process, in consideration of the massing, articulation, and urban form issues described under “Preliminary Design Comments” below.

4. **Rear Yard.** Planning Code Section 134 requires the project to provide a rear yard of at least 25 percent of the lot depth at the lowest story containing a dwelling unit, and at each story above. The Planning Code makes no provision for the proposed courtyard facing Turk Street at the 5th floor as a method of complying with rear yard requirements. Therefore, an approved exception through the Downtown Project Authorization process is required. While such a configuration may be supported, a formal submittal should demonstrate how the Project complies with the criteria of Section 134(d).

5. **Residential Open Space.** Planning Code Section 135 requires that a minimum amount of usable open space be provided for the residential portion of the Project. At least 36 square feet of private usable open space per dwelling unit, or 47.9 square feet of common usable open space per dwelling unit. The submitted plans appear to demonstrate a sufficient amount of open space to meet these requirements. Both private and common open space must meet certain requirements for minimum dimensions, minimum area, usability, accessibility, and exposure to sunlight. Staff would assess conformance with these detailed design criteria for usable open space in future submittals.

6. **Non-Residential Open Space.** Planning Code Section 138 requires the provision of one square foot of publicly-accessible open space for each 50 square feet of retail space. This area would need to include seating and other amenities. The submitted plans called out areas of open space for the hotel use at multiple floors. If these areas are intended to count toward meeting the requirements of Section 138, these spaces would need to be publicly accessible. In addition, if portions of the lobby area are intended to count toward meeting the requirements of Section 138, the spaces would need to incorporate seating, food service, and other amenities which, through their design, clearly express the public nature of the space.

7. **Streetscape/Street Trees.** Section 138.1 requires the planting of one 24-inch box street tree for each 20 feet of property frontage. This Section includes specific requirements for larger properties (exceeding 250 feet of frontage), including minimum branching height, minimum trunk caliper, specific dimensions and treatments for planting basins, and the provision of a continuous permeable trench connecting each tree basin. Section 138.1 further requires the submission of a Streetscape Plan and provision of amenities and public realm improvements in accordance with the Better Streets Plan.

8. **Standards for Bird Safe Buildings.** Planning Code Section 139 outlines bird-safe standards for new construction to reduce bird mortality from circumstances that are known to pose a high risk to birds.
and are considered to be "bird hazards." Feature-related hazards may create increased risk to birds and need to be mitigated. Any feature-related hazards, such as free-standing glass walls, wind barriers, or balconies must have broken glazed segments 24 square feet or smaller in size. Future submittals should include an analysis of whether the project includes such feature-related hazards. If so, the submittals should demonstrate indicate the method of window treatments to comply with the requirements.

9. **Exposure.** Planning Code Section 140 requires that each dwelling unit have at least one room that meets the 120-square-foot minimum superficial floor area requirement of Section 503 of the Housing Code, which requires that each dwelling unit face directly on a public street at least 25 feet in width, a code-complying rear yard, or an appropriately sized open area. The Project proposes some units that face solely onto the interior open spaces, which do not appear to meet the dimensional requirements at all levels. The project should be reconfigured so that the dwelling units meet the exposure requirements. Alternatively, the project may seek a Variance from these requirements through the process identified in Planning Code Section 305.

10. **Ground Floor Frontages.** Planning Code Section 145.1 includes regulations intended to provide active, transparent, and vibrant ground floor frontages. The project as currently designed does not comply with several aspects of these regulations:
    a. Section 145.1 requires that the ground floor frontages be occupied by active uses, with certain exceptions for parking and loading access, building egress, and access to mechanical systems. Several of the uses along the Turk and Taylor Street frontages (the workshop, storage room, recording studio, digital lab, and management offices) may not be considered active uses. In addition, building lobbies are considered active uses only if they do not exceed 40 feet or 25% of building frontage, whichever is larger. The aggregate width of the lobbies on the Market Street frontage exceeds 40 feet. The ground floor should be redesigned to reduce the lobby widths along the Market Street frontage, increase the frontage of active uses and public spaces, and to reorient non-active uses toward the interior of the building. Alternatively, the Project may seek a Variance from these requirements through the process identified in Planning Code Section 305.
    b. Section 145.1 limits the width of vehicular entries to no more than one-third of the width of a given frontage, or 20 feet, whichever is less. The garage entry on Taylor Street, and the loading entries on Turk Street exceed these limits. The Project should be redesigned to reduce the width of these opening to the greatest extent feasible. If these entries cannot be sufficiently reduced to comply with these limitations, the project may seek a Variance from these requirements through the process identified in Planning Code Section 305.
    c. Section 145.1 requires that ground floor non-residential uses have a minimum floor-to-floor height of 14 feet. It appears that portions of the ground floor do not comply with the required heights. The project should be redesigned to incorporate taller floor-to-floor heights. Alternatively, the project may seek a Variance from these requirements through the process identified in Planning Code Section 305.

11. **Shadows on Public Sidewalks.** Planning Code Section 146(a) establishes design requirements for buildings on certain specifically-identified streets in order to maintain direct sunlight on public
sidewalks in certain downtown areas during critical use periods. Section 146(c) requires that other buildings, not located on the specific streets identified in Section 146(a), shall be shaped to reduce substantial shadow impacts on public sidewalks, if it can be done without unduly creating an unattractive design and without unduly restricting development potential. The project is not located on a street specifically identified by Section 146(a), however, the project will need to demonstrate how the buildings have been designed to reduce substantial shadow impacts on public sidewalks.

12. **Shadows on Public Open Spaces (non-Recreation and Park Commission Properties).** Planning Code Section 147 seeks to reduce substantial shadow impacts on public plazas and other publicly accessible open spaces other than those protected under Section 295 (see discussion below). Consistent with the dictates of good design and without unduly restricting development potential, buildings taller than 50 feet should be shaped to reduce substantial shadow impacts on open spaces subject to Section 147. In determining whether a shadow is substantial, the following factors shall be taken into account: the area shaded, the shadow’s duration, and the importance of sunlight to the area in question. The Project will need to demonstrate how the buildings have been designed to reduce substantial shadow impacts on open spaces subject to Section 147.

13. **Residential Off-Street Parking.** Planning Code Section 151.1 permits up to one car for each four dwelling units in C-3 Districts. For the proposed 316 dwelling units, a maximum of 79 spaces are allowed. The Project proposes between 136 to 158 residential parking spaces, exceeding the principally permitted amount of parking. Requests for parking in excess of .25 car for each dwelling unit must seek an exception through the Downtown Project Authorization process and must demonstrate compliance with the criteria of Section 151.1(f). Because of the Market Street location and very high transit-accessibility of the project, the Department encourages minimizing off-street parking for all uses on the site.

14. **Off-Street Loading.** Planning Code Section 152 requires a total of four off-street loading spaces to serve the various uses in the project. The submitted plans show three loading spaces. The project should be revised to meet the off-street loading requirements. As an alternative, the project may substitute two service vehicle spaces in lieu of one full sized loading spaces, or four service vehicle spaces in lieu of two full-sized loading spaces. However, a minimum of two full-sized loading spaces must be provided if using this substitution. In addition, the project must comply with the standards of Section 155 for access and design of the loading spaces. The project may request an exception to certain access and design standards through the Downtown Project Authorization process.

15. **Bicycle Parking.** Planning Code Section 155.2, requires a total of 186 Class 1 bicycle parking spaces and 30 Class 2 bicycle parking spaces to serve the various uses in the project. Future submittals should identify the locations of the required spaces, which must meet the access and design criteria of Section 155.1. Please note that Class 1 parking for residents should be separate from that for workers of the non-residential uses on site.

16. **Showers and Lockers.** Planning Code Section 155.4 requires a total of four showers and 24 clothes lockers to serve the project. Please identify the location of these facilities in future submittals.

17. **Tour Bus Parking.** Pursuant to Planning Code Section 162, one parking space for a tour bus must be provided for the hotel portion of the project, with minimum dimensions of 45 feet by nine feet, and a
minimum vertical clearance of 14 feet. If such a space cannot be provided, an exception may be requested through the Downtown Project Authorization process. In considering such a request, the Planning Commission would consider the criteria of Section 162(b).

18. **Car Share Parking.** Pursuant to Planning Code Section 166, three parking space dedicated to carshare vehicles will need to be provided for the project. Access to these vehicles must be provided to carshare service members at all times. Therefore, the early design of the project should consider access and security issues associated with providing these spaces. Please identify the location of these spaces in future submittals.

19. **Residential Density.** As indicated under “Planning Department Approvals” above, the project will require Conditional Use Authorization to exceed a residential density of one dwelling unit for each 125 square feet of lot area.

20. **Height.** As indicated under “Planning Department Approvals” above, the project will require a zoning map amendment and general plan amendment to exceed the existing 120-foot height limit for the property.

21. **Shadows on Recreation and Park Commission Properties.** Section 295 generally prohibits new buildings that would cast new shadow on open space that is under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Recreation and Park Commission between one hour after sunrise and one hour before sunset, at any time of the year, unless that shadow would not result in an adverse effect on the use of the open space. An initial shadow fan prepared for the project (attached) indicates that the project could potentially cast shadow on Boeddeker Park. It should be noted that this fan does not account for shadows cast by other buildings, or for the varied heights of the proposed project. Future submittals should provide a detailed analysis of potential shadow impacts to properties subject to Section 295.

22. **Inclusionary Housing.** Affordable housing is required for a project proposing ten or more dwelling units. The Project Sponsor must submit an ‘Affidavit of Compliance with the Inclusionary Affordable Housing Program: Planning Code Section 415,’ to the Planning Department identifying the method of compliance, on-site, off-site, or in-lieu fee. Any on-site affordable dwelling-units proposed as part of the project must be designated as owner-occupied units, not rental units. Affordable units designated as on-site units shall be sold as ownership units and will remain as ownership units for the life of the project.

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

a. direct financial construction from a public entity
b. development bonus or other form of public assistance
A Costa Hawkins exception agreement is drafted by the City Attorney. You must state in your submittal how the project qualifies for a Costa Hawkins exception. The request should be addressed to the Director of Current Planning. If the project is deemed eligible, we may start working with the City Attorney on the agreement.

23. **Public Art.** The Project is subject to the public art requirements of Planning Code Section 429. For the non-residential portion of the Project, the requirement shall be satisfied by providing art works on-site valued at 1% of the construction cost of the Project, up to a value of $750,000. If the required valuation exceeds $750,000, the sponsor may elect to provide the balance of the requirement through the provision of artwork on-site, payment of a fee into the Public Artwork Trust Fund, or through some combination of these options. For the residential portion of the Project, the requirement may be satisfied through the provision of artwork on-site, payment of a fee into the Public Artwork Trust Fund, or through some combination of these options (with no minimum valuation of artwork that must be provided on-site).

24. **Fees.** This project is subject to several categories of impact fees, as specified in Article 4 of the Planning Code, including:
   a. Transit Impact Development Fee (Section 411)
   b. Jobs-Housing Linkage Program (Section 413)
   c. Child Care Requirements for Office and Hotel Development Project (Section 414)

   The rate, applicability by land use, and calculation methodology varies by fee, and the fees would be calculated by staff during review of entitlement applications and building permits. For certain fee categories, credits may be applied to existing uses on the site. As discussed above, the Project exceeds an FAR of 9.0 to 1, and is therefore subject to participation in the Transit Center District Mello-Roos Community Facilities District pursuant to Section 424.8.

25. **Interdepartmental Project Review.** 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. 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 Planning Department approval of the first construction building permit. 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 agencies will attend your meeting.

26. **First Source Hiring.** Chapter 83 of the San Francisco Administrative Code, passed in 1998, established the First Source Hiring Program to identify available entry-level jobs in San Francisco and match them with unemployed and underemployed job-seekers. The intent is to provide a resource for local employers seeking qualified, job ready applicants for vacant positions while helping economically disadvantaged residents who have successfully completed training programs and job-readiness classes.

   The ordinance applies to (1) any permit application for commercial development exceeding 25,000 square feet in floor area involving new construction, an addition or a substantial alteration which
results in the addition of entry level positions for a commercial activity; or (2) any application which requires discretionary action by the Planning Commission relating to a commercial activity over 25,000 square feet, but not limited to conditional use; or (3) any permit application for a residential development of ten units or more involving new construction, an addition, a conversion or substantial rehabilitation.

The project proposes more than ten dwelling units and therefore, is subject to the requirement. For further information or to receive a sample First Source Hiring Agreement, please see contact information below:

Ken Nim, Workforce Compliance Officer
CityBuild, Office of Economic and Workforce Development
City and County of San Francisco
1 South Van Ness, San Francisco, CA 94102
Direct: 415.701.4853, Email: ken.nim@sfgov.org
Fax: 415.701.4897
Website: http://oewd.org/Workforce-Development.aspx

27. **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 attached the SFPUC document for more information.

**PRELIMINARY DESIGN COMMENTS:**

The following design comments address preliminary design issues that may significantly impact the proposed project, and assume the eventual adoption of an SUD that will include the ability for a project to obtain additional height and FAR than the current zoning permits.

1. **Market Street Frontage.** Generally, the proposed Market Street frontage is overwhelming and does not relate well to Market Street or the surrounding building context. It should be revised as follows:

   a. Market Street between 5th and 10th Streets is defined by a fairly consistent streetwall of 85 to 120 feet, with most major buildings falling in this range and taller buildings stepping back above this height. Market Street is the City’s major ceremonial street and this strong relationship of building scale is important, and the Mid-Market area is characterized by many historic buildings of this scale. As discussed above, the south side of Market has a legislated step-back of 25 feet above a height of 90 feet. While the north side does not have a legislated setback, the entire Market Street frontage should not be 180 feet in height. At least 1/3 of the frontage should be no higher than 160 feet. The 2/3 frontage width at 180 feet in height responds to the similar frontage/height for the nearby Flood Building, which has approximately 180 feet of frontage on Market Street and is 170’ in height (160’ to the roof). A building of 180’ for the full breadth of the Market Street frontage (over 260’) may also appear overwhelming on the skyline when viewed from the south. The appropriate arrangement of heights along Market Street will be subject to further design review.
b. The Market Street frontage should also be divided into distinctly separate architectural contexts (texture, materials, etc.).

c. This portion of Market Street is still being analyzed by the Better Market Street Project regarding the location of the new curbside transit stops. However, this analysis will not be completed before the second half of 2014 and new loading zones are generally prohibited along Market Street because of the conflict they introduce with transit operations and bicycle safety, as well as the resulting narrowed sidewalk.

2. **Turk Street Frontage.** The scale of the Turk Street frontage is a concern in relation to the surrounding context and the breadth and height of the building extended over the length of the block as related to the street width. The massing should be broken down on this frontage to reduce the overall impact when connected to the mass along Market Street. Based on our analysis, we recommend one of the following massing strategies:

a. Option 1. Reduce the height at the corner of Turk and Taylor Streets to 120 feet and gradually step up to connect to the Market Street mass.

b. Option 2. Make the tower element at the corner of Turk and Taylor Streets more distinct by keeping it at 160 feet and lowering the height of the building portion connecting the tower to Market Street. This may be a preferred option from a design perspective, as well as for avoiding shadow impacts.

3. **Transportation.** Please see Item 6 under in the Environmental Review section above for specific comments related to transportation and circulation.

**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 22, 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: Kevin Guy, Current Planning
    Erik Jaszewski, Environmental Planning
    Corey Teague, Citywide Planning and Analysis
    Marlo Isaac, Citywide Planning and Analysis
    Jerry Robbins, MTA
    Jerry Sanguinetti, DPW
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRST</th>
<th>LAST</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>TELEPHON</th>
<th>EMAIL</th>
<th>NEIGHBORHOOD OF INTEREST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td>Abst</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>Lower Polk Neighbors</td>
<td>1033 Polk Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94109</td>
<td>415-351-2151</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ca@CaseAbst-Architects.com">ca@CaseAbst-Architects.com</a></td>
<td>Downtown/Civic Center, Nob Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don</td>
<td>Falk</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation</td>
<td>201 Eddy Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-776-2151</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dfalk@tndc.org">dfalk@tndc.org</a>; <a href="mailto:ceddings@tndc.org">ceddings@tndc.org</a></td>
<td>Downtown/Civic Center, Haight Ashbury, Inner Sunset, Mission, Outer Sunset, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian</td>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td>HERE Local 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>209 Golden Gate Avenue</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 Chinatown, Downtown/Civic Center, Marina, Mission, Nob Hill, North Beach, Pacific Heights, Presidio, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Haas</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Civic Center Stakeholder Group</td>
<td>163 Prospect Avenue</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94110</td>
<td>415-285-4689</td>
<td><a href="mailto:JWhaaAESQ@AOL.com">JWhaaAESQ@AOL.com</a>; <a href="mailto:jane.kim@sfgov.org">jane.kim@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:April.veneracion@sfgov.org">April.veneracion@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:Sunny.Angulo@sfgov.org">Sunny.Angulo@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:Ivy.Lee@sfgov.org">Ivy.Lee@sfgov.org</a></td>
<td>Downtown/Civic Center, North Beach, South of Market, Treasure Island/YBI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian</td>
<td>Haas</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Civic Center Stakeholder Group</td>
<td>1 Dr. Carlton B Goodlett Place, Room #244</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94110</td>
<td>415-554-7970</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jwhaasESQ@AOL.com">jwhaasESQ@AOL.com</a>; <a href="mailto:jane.kim@sfgov.org">jane.kim@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:April.veneracion@sfgov.org">April.veneracion@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:Sunny.Angulo@sfgov.org">Sunny.Angulo@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:Ivy.Lee@sfgov.org">Ivy.Lee@sfgov.org</a></td>
<td>Downtown/Civic Center, North Beach, South of Market, Treasure Island/YBI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>Henderson</td>
<td>Vice Chairman</td>
<td>Market/Octavia Community Advisory Comm.</td>
<td>300 Buchanan Street, Apt. 503</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-722-0617</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jhenders@sbcglobal.net">jhenders@sbcglobal.net</a></td>
<td>Castro/Upper Market, Downtown/Civic Center, Mission, South of Market, Western Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>Breed</td>
<td>Supervisor, District 5</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>1 Dr. Carlton B Goodlett Place, Room #244</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-554-7630</td>
<td><a href="mailto:London.Breed@sfgov.org">London.Breed@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:conor.johnston@sfgov.org">conor.johnston@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:vallie.brown@sfgov.org">vallie.brown@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:Ahmad.Elnajjar@sfgov.org">Ahmad.Elnajjar@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:marlayne16@gmail.com">marlayne16@gmail.com</a>; <a href="mailto:marvasphillips@gmail.com">marvasphillips@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Bernal Heights, Downtown/Civic Center, Haight Ashbury, Inner Sunset, Western Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlayne</td>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Cathedral Hill Neighbors</td>
<td>1450 Sutter Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94109</td>
<td>415-572-6526</td>
<td><a href="mailto:marlayne16@gmail.com">marlayne16@gmail.com</a>; <a href="mailto:marvasphillips@gmail.com">marvasphillips@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Downtown/Civic Center, Nob Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marvis</td>
<td>Phillips</td>
<td>Land Use Chair</td>
<td>Alliance for a Better District 6</td>
<td>230 Eddy Street #1206</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-674-1935</td>
<td><a href="mailto:randy@thclinic.org">randy@thclinic.org</a></td>
<td>Downtown/Civic Center, Mission, South of Market, Western Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy</td>
<td>Shaw</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Tenderloin Housing Clinic</td>
<td>126 Hyde Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-771-0000</td>
<td><a href="mailto:r10ffany.bohee@sfgov.org">r10ffany.bohee@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:mike.grisso@sfgov.org">mike.grisso@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:courtney.pash@sfgov.org">courtney.pash@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:president@hayesvalleysf.org">president@hayesvalleysf.org</a></td>
<td>Downtown/Civic Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiffany</td>
<td>Bohee</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, City and County of San Francisco</td>
<td>1 South Van Ness Avenue, 5th Floor</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>415-503-1970</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tiffany.bohee@sfgov.org">tiffany.bohee@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:mike.grisso@sfgov.org">mike.grisso@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:courtney.pash@sfgov.org">courtney.pash@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:president@hayesvalleysf.org">president@hayesvalleysf.org</a></td>
<td>Downtown/Civic Center, Western Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Bulkley</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Hayes Valley Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>1600 Market St., PMB #104</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-503-1970</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tiffany.bohee@sfgov.org">tiffany.bohee@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:mike.grisso@sfgov.org">mike.grisso@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:courtney.pash@sfgov.org">courtney.pash@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:president@hayesvalleysf.org">president@hayesvalleysf.org</a></td>
<td>Downtown/Civic Center</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interdepartmental Project Reviews are mandatory for new construction projects that propose buildings eight stories or more and new construction on parcels identified by the State of California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology as Seismic Hazard Zones in the City and County of San Francisco. Projects identified as such, must request and participate in an interdepartmental project review prior to any application that requires a public hearing before the Planning Commission or new construction building permit.

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

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

Interdepartmental Project Review fees:

1. $1,164 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 (SFPW, 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

**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 and Technical Assistance**
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
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NOTE:
1. ALL BACKFLOW PREVENTERS MUST BE 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.