Preliminary Project Assessment

Date: December 20, 2013
Case No.: 2013.1535U
Project Address: 450 O’Farrell St.
Block/Lot: 0317/007, 009
Zoning: RC-4 (Residential-Commercial, High Density North of Market Residential Special Use District 80-T-130-T Height and Bulk District
Project Sponsor: Richard Hannum
Fifth Church of Christ, Scientist
(415) 215-8702
Staff Contact: Steve Wertheim – (415) 558-6612
steve.wertheim@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 an existing two-story, 18,000 square foot church with four parking spaces and a one-story 4,500 square feet retail building. In their place, the proposal is to construct a 12-story, 130-foot tall mixed use building containing a 10,000 square foot church, 6,000 square feet of retail, 97 dwelling units, 74 group housing units, and 100 parking spaces.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:

The project initially requires environmental review, which must be completed before any project approval may be granted. 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.
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) Application.

1. **Historic Resource Evaluation.** The project site is located in the Uptown Tenderloin Historic District, as identified in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), and is occupied by two buildings that are all greater than 50 years of age. Viewing the site from west to east, the first structure at 474-480 O’Farrell Street, consisting of wood frame construction reaching one story in height, was constructed in 1913. The second structure further to the east at 450 O’Farrell Street, called the Fifth Church of Christ, Scientist, was constructed in 1923 and consists of brick construction reaching 40 feet in height. Both buildings were identified as contributing resources to the Uptown Tenderloin Historic District, which was listed on the NRHP on February 5, 2009. Properties designated to the NRHP are also listed on the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR). Therefore, both structures are considered historic resources for purposes of CEQA and 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.

The HRE should assess potential impacts of demolition and new construction on the Historic District and adjacent historic resources. In general, demolition of contributing resources to a designated historic district is considered a significant unavoidable impact under CEQA. The Department encourages the project sponsor to avoid this impact by preserving the subject properties and/or seeking meaningful alternatives to demolition. Should the project be determined to result in significant impacts to historic resources, development of at least one feasible preservation alternative for analysis in the environmental document will be required.

The HRE should also focus on evaluation of the compatibility of the proposed design of the new construction with the adjacent Historic District and adjacent historic resources. In evaluating compatibility with the Historic District and resources, the architecture, massing, height, materials and articulation of the proposed building and its neighboring buildings should be considered.

2. **Aesthetics.** The proposed project consists of demolition of a one- and two-story building, and construction of a new mixed-use structure reaching 130 feet in height (12 stories). 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.
3. **Archeological Resources.** 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 would 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 result of this review is usually in the form of a memorandum to the Environmental Case Manager 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 incorporation of archeological measures and/or preparation of additional archeological studies.

4. **Geology.** A geotechnical study is required for this project. Please submit the geotechnical study 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.

5. **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.


Please provide a copy of the submitted Maher Application and Phase I ESA with the EE Application.

6. **Noise.** Based on the City’s GIS-based Traffic Noise Model Map, the project would site sensitive land uses such as residences 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 Environmental Impact Report (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.

7. **Transportation.** Based on a review of the PPA Application, the Department has determined that a transportation study is likely to be required. However, an official determination will be made subsequent to submittal of the EE Application. In order to facilitate that determination, Planning staff propose the following recommendations:

- Show existing curb cut(s) on site plan;
- Explain the need for off-street passenger drop-off area instead of an on-street loading zone;
- Show widths of proposed curb cuts, driveways, and adjacent sidewalks;
- Consider reducing the amount of off-street parking;
- Clarify average Sunday and weekday daily and evening peak potential trips, as well as number of employees and programming/attendance schedule;
- If known, provide the number of anticipated vehicles for the weekend peak period (including quantification of those traveling by other modes).

8. **Air Quality.** The proposed project’s 171 residential dwelling units are below the Bay Area Air Quality Management District’s (BAAQMD) construction and operational screening levels for criteria air pollutants. Therefore an analysis of the project’s criteria air pollutant emissions is not likely to be required.

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 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 comply with applicable dust control requirements outlined in the ordinance.

In addition, San Francisco has partnered with the BAAQMD to inventory and assess air pollution and exposures from mobile, stationary, and area sources within San Francisco. Areas with poor air

---

quality, termed “Air Pollutant Exposure Zones,” were identified. Land use projects within these Air Pollutant Exposure Zones require special consideration to determine whether the project’s activities would expose sensitive receptors to substantial air pollutant concentrations. Although the proposed project is not within an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone, improvement measures may be recommended for consideration by City decision makers such as exhaust measures during construction and enhanced ventilation measures as part of building design. Enhanced ventilation measures will be the same as those required for projects, such as this project, subject to Article 38 of the Health Code.

If the project would generate new sources of toxic air contaminants including, but not limited to: diesel generators or boilers, or any other stationary sources, the project would result in toxic air contaminants that may affect both on-site and off-site sensitive receptors. Given the proposed project’s height of 130 feet, the proposed project would likely require a backup diesel generator and additional measures will likely be necessary to reduce its emissions. Detailed information related to any proposed stationary sources shall be provided with the EE Application.

9. **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 scope of work for review and approval by the Environmental Planning Case Manager prior to preparing the analysis.

10. **Shadow Study.** The proposed project would result in construction of a building approximately 88 feet in height. Planning Code Section 295 requires that a shadow analysis be performed to determine whether a project has the potential to cast shadow on properties under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Recreation and Park Commission. The shadow analysis would also address shadow impacts to other public open spaces not owned by the Recreation and Parks Department. An application for a shadow fan analysis should be submitted with the required fee at the time of submittal of the EE application.

11. **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. In order to facilitate a determination of compliance with San Francisco’s Qualified GHG Reduction Strategy, the Planning Department has prepared a GHG 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 Case Manager 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.

12. **Stormwater.** The project proposes approximately 166,000 square feet of new construction, exceeding the 5,000 square-foot new construction or redevelopment requirement for preparation of a

---

Stormwater Control Plan (SCP). Prior to issuance of a building permit, the project sponsor is required to prepare and submit a 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.

13. **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.

14. **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. Please provide these mailing labels at the time of the EE Application submittal.

Given the proposed project would demolish historic resources listed as eligible contributors to a NRHP designated historic district, the project may require preparation of an EIR. Upon submittal of an EE Application, Planning Department staff would prepare an Initial Study. If the Initial 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. **Conditional Use Authorization** from the Planning Commission is required for the proposed project per the following Planning Code Sections:

a. **New Construction over 50 feet in height (Section 253).** Conditional Use Authorization is required for new construction of a building greater than 50 feet in height in a RC District. In reviewing any such proposal, the Planning Commission shall consider the expressed purposes of the RC Districts, and of the height and bulk districts, as well as the criteria stated in Section 303(c) of this Code and the objectives, policies and principles of the City’s General Plan, and may permit a height of such building or structure up to but not exceeding the height limit prescribed by the height and bulk district in which the property is located. For properties within the North of Market Residential Special Use District, a setback requirement above a certain base height may be imposed as a condition of approval of the Conditional Use Authorization under this section. If the applicant can demonstrate that the prevailing streetwall height on the block on which the proposed project is located, as established by existing cornice lines, is in excess of 50 feet, then the Commission may impose a maximum setback of up to 20 feet applicable to the portion of the building which exceeds the established prevailing streetwall height; provided, however, that if the applicant demonstrates that the prevailing streetwall height is in excess of 68 feet, the maximum setback requirement which may be imposed is 16 feet. If the applicant can demonstrate that a building without a setback would not disrupt the continuity of the prevailing streetwall along the street, then the Planning Commission may grant approval of the conditional use authorization without imposing a setback requirement as a condition thereof.

b. **Height (Section 263.7).** As the subject properties are located in the North of Market Residential Special Use District and 80-130-T Height and Bulk District, special exceptions to the 80-foot base height limit may be granted pursuant to the provisions of this Code section. A height exception may be approved by the Planning Commission from the base height of 80 feet up to 130 feet in the 80-130-T District. Because development at heights greater than 80 feet may create pressures on existing affordable housing in the area, a portion of the value added to the new development resulting from the granting of a height exception must be contributed to a fund established for the purpose of stabilizing, rehabilitating, and retaining existing affordable units in the area. Therefore, this exception shall be granted with the condition that the applicant pay a fee to the City Controller which shall be deposited in the North of Market Affordable Housing Fund. The fee required shall be equal to the sum of $5 times the total gross square footage of floor space located above 80 feet in height as shown on the building plans.

c. **Bulk (Section 270).** The project site is located in the 80-130-T Height and Bulk district. Based on this designation, the bulk of the building above a base height of no more than 80 feet must be sculpted as prescribed by the Code. Above the base height, buildings with a “T” bulk designation shall have a maximum length of 110 feet and maximum diagonal dimension of 125 feet. Although no dimensions are provided on the project application plans, the solid building mass over the entire height of the proposed building suggests that the project does not meet the bulk limits outlined in this Code section. Deviations from bulk limits shall require Conditional Use Authorization by the Planning Commission. In making this determination, the Planning Commission must consider the numerous design criteria of Section 271(c) and make findings that the proposed building achieves a distinctly better design, in both a public and a private sense, than would be possible with strict adherence to
the bulk limits, and that the building has widespread public service benefits and significance to the community at large, where compelling functional requirements of the specific building or structure make necessary such a deviation. As currently proposed, the design of the building does not appear to meet the criteria outlined in Section 271(c).

2. **Variances.** As proposed, the project will require variances from the following Planning Code Sections. Please note that there are five variance criteria outlined in Planning Code Section 305, that must be met for each requested variance:

   a. **Rear Yard (Section 134).** The project requires a rear yard of at least 25 percent of the lot depth beginning at the lowest story containing a dwelling unit. Because this project is located on a corner site, one of the street frontages (O'Farrell Street or Shannon Alley) must be designated as the front of the property, and the rear yard would then be provided based on that determination. If Shannon Alley is designated as the front of the property for purposes of the rear yard calculation, then 25 percent of the (merged) lot depth necessary to meet the rear yard requirement would be approximately 38.5 feet. Although no dimension is provided on the plans with the project application, the project team noted that the proposed rear yard is approximately 35 feet deep. As the proposed depth is less than 38.5 feet, and as the rear yard begins at the third floor rather than the second floor where the first dwelling units occur, the proposal does not meet the Code requirement.

   Pursuant to the North of Market Residential Special Use District (Section 249.5), the rear yard requirement may be substituted with an equivalent amount of open space situated anywhere on the site, provided that the Zoning Administrator determines that all of the following criteria are met:

   - The substituted open space will improve the access of light and air to and views from existing abutting properties; and
   - The proposed new or expanding structure will not adversely affect the interior block open space formed by the rear yards of existing abutting properties.

   b. **Exposure (Section 140).** Planning Code Section 140 requires that all dwelling-units face directly onto an open area. The open area must face either a public street, alley, or side yard measuring at least 25 feet in width; a Code-complying rear yard; or an open area that is no less than 25 feet in every horizontal dimension for the floor of the dwelling unit and the floor above it, with an increase of five feet in every horizontal dimension at each subsequent floor. It appears that the 29 units (including dwelling units and Group Housing rooms) that face into the rear yard and courtyard will not meet this requirement. Please revise the project or seek and justify a variance. The Department generally encourages projects to minimize the number of units needing an exposure variance.

   c. **Street Frontages - Parking and Loading Entrances (Section 145.1(g)(2)).** No more than one-third of the width or 20 feet, whichever is less, of any given street frontage of a new or altered structure parallel to and facing a street shall be devoted to parking and loading ingress or egress. The proposed driveway and valet drop-off drive-aisle appears to exceed the allowed
width for auto entrances. Please revise the project or seek and justify a variance. The Department would generally recommend that building area and street frontage dedicated to parking and automobile access be limited to only what is necessary for ingress and egress.

3. **A Shadow Study Application** per Planning Code Section 295 is required for the project, as the proposed building exceeds 40 feet in height. Staff has prepared a preliminary shadow fan analysis that indicates potential shadow impacts from the project to the northern portion of the Tenderloin Children’s Playground (see the enclosed PPA Shadow Analysis). However, this shadow fan does not account for the presence of intervening buildings. The location of the project in relation to intervening buildings would suggest that any potential shadow on the Tenderloin Children’s Playground would be blocked by intervening buildings, or subsumed by shadows cast by other buildings in the area. To determine the extent of potential shadow impacts, a detailed shadow analysis would need to be prepared to determine if the project would create new shadow that results in an adverse impact to the Tenderloin Children’s Playground, pursuant to Section 295. If the project would create new shadow in a manner that substantially affects property under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Parks Commission, a joint hearing between the Recreation and Parks Commission and Planning Commission would be required.

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

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

Conditional Use Authorization, Variance, and Shadow Study 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 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. Differing levels of neighborhood notification are mandatory for some or all of the reviews and approvals listed above.

**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 Group Housing rooms noted in the proposed plans are considered as such and are not considered dwelling units as defined by the Planning Code. Designation of these rooms as dwelling units may alter some of the comments below.
1. **Uptown Tenderloin Historic District.** The Uptown Tenderloin Historic District is a largely intact, visually consistent, inner-city high-density residential area constructed during the years between the earthquake and fire of 1906 and the Great Depression. The District was listed on the National Register of Historic Place in 2009 for its association with the development of hotel and apartment life in San Francisco during a critical period of change in San Francisco and for its distinctive mix of building types that served a new urban population of office and retail workers. Predominantly hotels and apartments, the district also includes non-residential building types associated with life in the neighborhood. The Department encourages the project sponsor, despite their mission, to seek meaningful alternatives to demolition to avoid removing two contributing resources to the District.

2. **North of Market Residential Special Use District (Section 249.5).** The North of Market Residential Special Use District imposes a number of controls that are intended to protect and enhance important housing resources in an area near downtown, conserve and upgrade existing low and moderate income housing stock, preserve buildings of architectural and historic importance and preserve the existing scale of development, maintain sunlight in public spaces, encourage new infill housing at a compatible density, limit the development of tourist hotels and other commercial uses that could adversely impact the residential nature of the area, and limit the number of commercial establishments which are not intended primarily for customers who are residents of the area. The following controls are relevant to the proposed project:

   a. **Density.** In the North of Market Residential Special Use District #1, the density ratio shall be one dwelling unit for each 125 square feet of lot area. The density limitations for Group Housing shall be one bedroom for every 70 square feet of lot area as noted in Section 208. Pursuant to Section 207.1(b), where dwelling units and other housing (Group Housing) are proposed on the same parcel, the maximum density for each shall be prorated to the total lot area. The current proposal appears to meet density limitations of the Code. However, given the number of Group Housing rooms proposed, the Department is concerned with the limited amount of common space (kitchen, laundry, et cetera) provided in the proposal. In order to ensure the quality, and livability, of the proposed Group Housing rooms, the Department would recommend an increased amount, and improved quality, of the common space provided within the building.

   b. **Parking.** There are no minimum off-street parking requirements in the North of Market Residential Special Use District for any use. Further, per Section 161(e), no off-street parking shall be required for any principal use in an RC-4 District for which the form of measurement is occupied floor area, where the occupied floor area of such use does not exceed 10,000 square feet. Where there is no required minimum parking, Section 204.5 allows accessory parking in the amount of 15 spaces or seven percent of the total gross floor area of the structure or development, whichever is greater. Any parking in excess of permitted accessory amounts would be considered a Parking Garage use, which requires Conditional Use Authorization in the RC-4 Zoning District. Given the provisions of the SUD, there does not appear to be a strong justification that parking in in excess of accessory amounts would be necessary and desirable in this district.

3. **Open Space (Section 135).** The project requires 36 square feet (sf) of private usable open space or 47.88 sf of common usable open space for each of the proposed 97 dwelling units and 12 sf of private
usable open space or 15.96 sf of common usable open space for each of the proposed 74 Group Housing rooms. This results in a requirement of 4,380 sf of private usable open space, 5,825 sf of common usable open space, or a combination of the two. In addition to the square footage requirements, open spaces must meet the dimensional requirements of Subsections (f) and (g). The project application contains no calculation of proposed open space but the plans indicate the provision of a roof deck, rear yard, two courtyards, and private balconies. The balconies proposed for this project do not appear to meet the minimum six foot horizontal dimension, so cannot be utilized to meet private open space requirements. The inner courtyards do not appear to meet the sun access dimensions outlined in Section 135(g)(2). The rear yard and rooftop garden should provide adequate common open space to meet the requirement.

4. **Street trees.** Planning Code Section 138.1 requires one street tree for every 20 feet of frontage for new construction. No street trees are shown on the plans.

5. **Pedestrian Streetscape Plan (Section 138.1(c)(2)).** For any new construction project on a lot (or merged lots) that contain 250 feet of total lot frontage on one or more publicly-accessible rights-of-way, the project sponsor shall submit a streetscape plan showing the location, design, and dimensions of all existing and proposed streetscape elements in the public right-of-way directly adjacent to the fronting property, including street trees, sidewalk landscaping, street lighting, site furnishings, utilities, driveways, and curb lines, and the relation of such elements to proposed new construction and site work on the subject property.

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).

6. **Bird Safe Glazing.** New construction is subject to the Bird Safe Glazing Standards outlined in Planning Code Section 139. The project may include “feature-related hazards”, such as free-standing glass walls, wind barriers, and greenhouses on rooftops that have unbroken glazed segments that are 24 sf and larger in size. If any such feature is proposed, the entire feature must be treated with bird-safe glazing.

7. **Street Frontages (Section 145.1).** Per Section 145.1(g)(4), ground floor non-residential uses in all RC districts shall have a minimum floor-to-floor height of 14 feet, as measured from grade.

8. **Loading (Section 152).** This project is required to provide at least one loading space.

9. **Bicycle Parking (Section 155.5).** This project is required to provide at least 121 Class One bicycle parking spaces and 7 Class Two bicycle parking spaces. It is not clear whether the bicycle parking in proposed project meets these requirements.

10. **Car sharing (Section 166).** This project is required to provide at least two car share spaces.

11. **Unbundled Parking (Section 167).** All off-street parking spaces accessory to residential uses in new structures of 10 dwelling units or more shall be leased or sold separately from the rental or purchase fees for dwelling units for the life of the dwelling units.
12. **Diaper-Changing Accommodations (Section 168).** This project requires at least one Baby Diaper-Changing Accommodation that is accessible to women and one that is accessible to men, or a single Diaper-Changing Accommodation that is accessible to both, as there is a new retail sales use that is 5,000 square feet or more in size. Signage at or near the retail entrance will be provided indicating the location of the Baby Diaper-Changing Accommodations.

13. **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 419,’ 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.

14. **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.

15. **First Source Hiring Agreement.** A First Source Hiring Agreement is required for any project proposing to construct 10 or more dwelling units. 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

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

17. **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.
18. **Impact Fees.** This project will be subject to various impact fees. An initial review indicates the Transit Impact Development Fee (TIDF), which is assessed by the Planning Department, will be required. Any new construction that cumulatively results in at least 800 gsf or more of a use covered by the TIDF chart in Section 411.3 is required to pay TIDF impact fees. Residential is excluded, and there is a credit for the gross square feet of uses being eliminated, but institutions and retail are currently charged at a rate of $13.30/gsf.

**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 retention of the existing building - a known historic resource - and encourages a scheme that re-uses all or most of the original building. If the project proceeds as proposed, the design will need to be found compatible with the surrounding context of the Historic District per the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. The Urban Design Guidelines are also the basis of the Planning Department’s review and comments. As currently proposed, the Planning Department has some fundamental concerns about the building’s compatibility with the existing context. In particular, the massing, materials, and articulation of the proposed building in relation to its neighboring buildings should be considered more carefully.

   - The massing should more appropriately address the consistent street wall, by eliminating the setbacks at both street frontages. The Planning Department recommends pulling the lower stories out to the property lines.
   - The articulation of the massing should also reflect the vertically proportioned nearby buildings. As currently proposed, the main massing of the tower reads on balance as horizontal in contrast to the predominately vertically massed and articulated surrounding buildings. One opportunity to vertically modulate the massing may be to push a greater distinction of the corner building element. Another may be an outer court scheme that switches the location of the 2 one-bedroom units for the courtyard which may help attain a composition of vertically massed building elements. The Planning Department encourages exploration of other opportunities that may help articulate the massing into intermediate vertical masses.
   - Common open space should be designed in such a manner as to be usable as for both residents at the immediate level, and common to residents without compromising the privacy or use of either.

2. **Vehicle Circulation, Access and Parking.** The proposed passenger porte-cochere significantly erodes the pedestrian right-of-way on Shannon, and has the effect of forcing a pedestrian to walk across two vehicular zones. Furthermore, a required accessible path of travel on the West side of Shannon would need to be provided. The quality of public right of way should be enhanced to reduce conflicts
between pedestrians and auto traffic. See Public Realm Improvements below. The Planning Department recommends eliminating the porte-cochere.

In addition, the Planning Department recommends reducing the garage entrance to a 12 foot wide opening which should be sufficient for the limited number of parking spaces. A building mounted signal and a queuing bay may be incorporated on the interior.

The Bike Storage, as shown, does not appear to be large enough to accommodate the required amount of bike parking, and should be as close as possible to the lobby or garage entrance to minimize the travel distance through the garage and conflict with automobiles.

3. **Street Frontage.** All frontages should provide a consistent and active relationship with the fronting streets. All ground level frontages should front the street and contain active uses 25 feet deep. In addition to eliminating the setback for the parking entrance and porte-cochere, the Planning Department recommends programming active uses along Shannon Street. See Vehicle Circulation, Access and Parking above.

4. **Architecture.** The existing context consists mainly of masonry buildings of varying heights that form a consistent street wall and are characterized by deep inset windows and tripartite compositions. The Planning Department recommends that the proposed project respect the context, with particular attention to the massing, scale, proportions, and materials of the prevalent built form on O’Farrell. An architectural approach that presents a more solid and vertically articulated mass abutting the street may help achieve that aim. As proposed, the slab tower set back from the street wall does not adequately address this consistent part of the context. The glass facade may also be tempered by more solid materials.

The corner bay may be the opportunity to introduce a mass combined to give a stronger anchor to the corner.

At this point the architecture is assumed to be schematic and the Planning Department would provide further detailed design review on the subsequent submission of materials and details to insure that the original design intent is achieved.

It is expected that the architecture and quality of execution will be superior. High quality materials combined with exceptional articulation and detailing on all visible facades will be essential to the success of meeting the original conditions of approval of this project.

6. **Public Realm Improvements.** Per Planning Code Section 138.1, the project sponsor may be required to submit a Streetscape Plan illustrating the location and design of streetscape improvements appropriate to the street type, including 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/](http://www.sfbetterstreets.org/design-guidelines/street-types/) to identify relevant street types for the project frontage.

The department will work with the project sponsor and other relevant departments to determine an appropriate streetscape design. Standard street improvement would be part of basic project approvals not count for as credit towards in-kind contributions.

The Planning Department recommends that basic streetscape improvements be provided on both frontages and that the sponsor should consider public realm features in relation to the proposed uses and activities as well as the current uses and context.

The Planning Department recommends the project explore extensive improvements along Shannon Street, such as a “shared street” and other opportunities to widen the pedestrian realm where is possible.

**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 June 20, 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.

Enclosures:  
PPA Shadow Fan Analysis  
SFPUC Recycled Water Handout  
Interdepartmental Project Review Handout  
Floor Bulletin
The City and County of San Francisco (CCSF) does not guarantee the accuracy, adequacy, completeness or usefulness of any information. CCSF provides this information on an "as is" basis without warranty of any kind, including but not limited to warranties of merchantability or fitness for a particular purpose, and assumes no responsibility for anyone's use of the information.

Title: 450 O'Farrell Street PPA - Shadow Fan
Comments: Block 0317, Lots 007 and 009
Printed: 10 December, 2013
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
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 and Technical Assistance**
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Water Resources Planning
(415) 554-3271

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

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

**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.

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

OWNERSHIP REMAINS WITH THE PROPERTY OWNER.

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
SAN FRANCISCO WATER DEPARTMENT

INSTALLATION OF RECYCLED WATER SERVICE LINES

APPROVED BY:

SCALE: NTS

DESIGNED BY: Cheryl Munoz

DRAWN: W. Villasica

DRAWS: A. 1290.2

DATE: 05/28/08

CHECKED: M. Gardiner

REV. NO. 2
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 aboverereferenced 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.)
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.

www.sfplanning.org