Please find the attached Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) for the address listed above. You may contact the staff contact, Kanishka Burns at (415) 575-9112 or kanishka.burns@sfgov.org with any questions you may have, or to schedule a follow-up meeting.

Mark Luellen, Senior Planner
Preliminary Project Assessment

Date: May 17, 2014
Case No.: 2014.0409U
Project Address: 1740 Market Street
Block/Lot: 0855/040
Zoning: NCT-3 (Moderate Scale Neighborhood Commercial Transit) District
85-X Height and Bulk District
Area Plan: Market Octavia Area Plan
Project Sponsor: Warner Schmalz, Forum Design
415-252-7063
Staff Contact: Kanishka Burns (415) 575-9112
kanishka.burns@sfgov.org

DISCLAIMERS:

Please be advised that this determination does not constitute an application for development with the Planning Department. It also does not represent a complete review of the proposed project, a project approval of any kind, or in any way supersede any required Planning Department approvals listed below. The Planning Department may provide additional comments regarding the proposed project once the required applications listed below are submitted. While some approvals are granted by the Planning Department, some are at the discretion of other bodies, such as the Planning Commission or Historic Preservation Commission. Additionally, it is likely that the project will require approvals from other City agencies such as the Department of Building Inspection, Department of Public Works, Department of Public Health, and others. The information included herein is based on plans and information provided for this assessment and the Planning Code, General Plan, Planning Department policies, and local/state/federal regulations as of the date of this document, all of which are subject to change.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The proposal is to demolish the existing 25,108 square foot commercial building and construct an 9-story, 85-foot tall mixed use building. The existing building on the 13,642 square foot subject lot was constructed in 1940. The proposed new building would include 110 group housing units, 110 bicycle parking spaces, and 7,630 square feet of commercial space along Market Street.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:

The project initially requires the following environmental review. This review may be done in conjunction with the required approvals listed below, but must be completed before any project approval may be granted:

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

The proposed project is located within the Market and Octavia Area Plan, which was evaluated in the Market and Octavia Neighborhood Plan Area Programmatic Final Environmental Impact Report EIR, which was certified on April 5, 2007.1 Because the proposed project is consistent with the development density identified in the area plan, it is eligible for community plan exemption (CPE). Potentially significant project environmental impacts that were identified in and pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the underlying area plan final EIR may be applicable to the proposed project.

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

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

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

---

In order to begin formal environmental review, please submit an Environmental Evaluation Application. This review may be done in conjunction with the required approvals listed below, but must be completed before any project approval may be granted. See page 2 of the current Fee Schedule for calculation of environmental application fees. **Note that until an approval application is submitted to the Current Planning Division, only the proposed Project Description will be reviewed by the assigned Environmental Coordinator.** Below is a list of topic areas that would require additional study based on our preliminary review of the project as it is proposed in the Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) submittal dated May 17, 2014.

1. **Shadow:** Planning Code 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 a significant adverse effect on the use of the open space. Department staff has prepared a preliminary shadow fan analysis and determined that the proposed 85-foot tall building would not cast shadow on Recreation and Park Department public open space. The proposed project would not require a shadow study.

   In addition, **Market and Octavia FEIR Mitigation Measure 5.5.A2 Shadow Mitigation Measure - Parks and Open Space not Subject to Section 295** would apply to the proposed project. This measure applies to new buildings and additions to existing buildings in the Project Area where the building height exceeds 50 feet shall be shaped, consistent with the dictates of good design and without unduly restricting the development potential of the site in question, to reduce substantial shadow impacts on public plazas and other publicly accessible spaces other than those protected under Section 295 of the Planning Code.

   In determining the impact of shadows, the following factors shall be taken into account: the amount of area shaded, the duration of the shadow, and the importance of sunlight to the type of open space being shaded.

2. **Wind Study.** The proposed project would involve construction of a building 85 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. **Market and Octavia FEIR 5.5.B1 Wind Mitigation Measure - Buildings in Excess of 85 feet in Height** would apply to the proposed project because the proposed building would be 85 feet tall. To minimize adverse wind impacts related to new development, the following design guidelines shall be required as part of the proposed Plan for buildings in excess of 85 feet in height:

   - Where possible, align long axis or faces of the buildings along a west-east alignment to reduce exposure of the wide faces of the building to westerly winds. Utilize wind shelter offered by existing upwind structures as much as possible. Avoid continuous western building faces.

   - Articulate and modulate southwest, west and northwest building faces through the use of architectural techniques such as surface articulation, variation of planes, wall surfaces and heights, as well as the placement of step backs and other features. Substantial setbacks in west-
facing facades (at lower levels) are an effective means of reducing the amount of ground-level wind induced by a building.

- Utilize properly located landscaping to mitigate winds in all pedestrian open spaces. Porous materials (vegetation, hedges, screens, latticework, perforated or expanded metal) offer superior wind shelter compared to a solid surface.

- Avoid narrow gaps between buildings, which may accelerate westerly winds.

- Avoid "breezeways" or notches at the upwind corners of the building, which may focus wind energy at pedestrian levels.

Furthermore, Market and Octavia FEIR 5.5.B2 Wind Mitigation Measure - All New Construction would apply to the proposed project. The following standards for reduction of ground-level wind currents shall be applied to all new construction in the Project Area:

- New building and additions to existing buildings shall be shaped, or other wind baffling measures shall be adopted, so that the development will not cause year-round ground-level wind currents to exceed, more than 10 percent of the time between 7:00AM and 6:00PM, the comfort level of 11 mph equivalent wind speed in areas of pedestrian use and seven mph equivalent wind speed in public seating areas. When pre-existing ambient wind speeds exceed the comfort levels specified above, the building shall be designed to reduce the ambient wind speeds in efforts to meet the goals of this requirement.

- An exception to this requirement may be permitted, but only if and to the extent that the project sponsor demonstrates that the building or addition cannot be shaped or wind baffling measures cannot be adopted without unduly restricting the development potential of the building site in question.

- The exception may permit the building or addition to increase the time that the comfort level is exceeded, but only to the extent necessary to avoid undue restriction of the development potential of the site.

- Notwithstanding the above, no exception shall be allowed and no building or addition shall be permitted that causes equivalent wind speeds to reach or exceed the hazard level of 26 mph for a single hour of the year.

- For the purpose of this Section, the term "equivalent wind speed" shall mean an hourly wind speed adjusted to incorporate the effects of gustiness or turbulence on pedestrians.

3. **Historical Resources.** The proposed project consists of the demolition of a building constructed 45 or more years ago. The subject building was surveyed and determined to not be a historic resource by the San Francisco Planning Department (rated as "6Y-not a resource") so the subject building is ineligible for national, state, or local listing. In addition, the project site is not located within an eligible or designated historic district. Therefore, the proposed project would not require further historic resource evaluation.
4. **Archeological Resources.** *The Market and Octavia FEIR* anticipated that development would result in ground disturbing activities. The proposed project would require 1,500 cubic yards of soil disturbance. As such, 5.6.A1 *Archaeological Mitigation Measure - Soil Disturbing Activities in Archaeologically Documented Properties* from the area plan EIR would apply to the proposed project because the project site is in an archeologically sensitive area located on block 855, which is one of the twelve blocks specifically mentioned in the mitigation measure. This mitigation measure requires the project sponsor to retain the services of a qualified archeological consultant to submit an addendum to the respective ARD /TP prepared by a qualified archeological consultant with expertise in California prehistoric and urban historical archaeology to the Environmental Review Officer (ERO) for review and approval. The Planning Department's list of approved archeological consultants is available at [http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/MEA/Archeological_Review_consultant_pool.pdf](http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/MEA/Archeological_Review_consultant_pool.pdf). The addendum to the ARD /TP shall evaluate the potential effects of the project on legally-significant archaeological resources with respect to the site- and project-specific information absent in the ARD/TP. The addendum report to the ARD /TP shall have the following content:

1. **Summary:** Description of subsurface effect of the proposed project and of previous soils disturbing activities;
2. **Historical Development:** If demographic data for the project site is absent in the discussion in the ARD/TP, the addendum shall include new demographic data regarding former site occupants;
3. **Identification of potential archeological resources:** Discussion of any identified potential prehistoric or historical archeological resources;
4. **Integrity and Significance:** Eligibility of identified expected resources for listing to the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR); Identification of Applicable Research Themes/Questions (in the ARD/TP) that would be addressed by the expected archeological resources that are identified;
5. **Impacts of Proposed Project;**
6. **Potential Soils Hazards:** Update discussion for proposed project;
7. **Archaeological Testing Plan** (if archaeological testing is determined warranted): the Archaeological Testing Plan (ATP) shall include:
   A. Proposed archaeological testing strategies and their justification
   B. Expected archaeological resources
   C. For historic archaeological resources
      1. Historic address or other location identification
      2. Archaeological property type
   D. For all archaeological resources
      1. Estimate depth below the surface
      2. Expected integrity
      3. Preliminary assessment of eligibility to the CRHR
   E. **ATP Map**
      1. Location of expected archaeological resources
      2. Location of expected project sub-grade impacts
      3. Areas of prior soils disturbance
      4. Archaeological testing locations by type of testing
      5. Base map: 1886/7 Sanborn Fire Insurance Company map
5. **Transportation Study.** Based on the Planning Department’s transportation impact analysis guidelines, the project would potentially add approximately 246 PM peak hour person trips and thus would require additional transportation analysis. The transportation report would need to be prepared by a qualified consultants working at the direction of the Planning Department staff. The Planning Department’s list of approved transportation consultants is available at [http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/MEA/Transportation
transportation consultant pool.pdf](http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/MEA/Transportation
transportation consultant pool.pdf). Please see “Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines for Environmental Review” on the Planning Department’s website and “Miscellaneous Fees” in the Planning Department’s current Fee Schedule for Applications. As noted on the Fee Schedule, there is a separate fee to SFMTA for review of the transportation report. In order to facilitate that determination, the EE Application should include the following:

- Additional Class II bicycle parking may be required and should be shown on the plans; and
- Consider including the removing the existing curb cut and showing it on the plans.

6. **Air Quality.** The proposed project at 1740-1770 Market Street includes 110 group housing units with 15,760 sf of commercial space is 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. Detailed information related to construction equipment, phasing and duration of each phase, and cubic yards of excavation shall be provided as part of the EEA.

In addition, project-related demolition, excavation, grading and other construction activities may cause wind-blown dust that could contribute particulate matter into the local atmosphere. To reduce construction dust impacts, the 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 the “Air Pollutant Exposure Zone,” were identified. Land use projects within the Air Pollutant Exposure Zone 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 85 feet, the proposed project would likely require a backup diesel generator and
7. **Noise.** The proposed project site is located on Market Street at Octavia Street. The Planning Department's noise maps indicate that existing ambient noise levels on surrounding streets are at, or exceed 65 decibels. The project involves the siting of new noise-sensitive uses (e.g., residential uses) and therefore requires an acoustical analysis demonstrating that the building will meet Title 24 noise insulation standards. This analysis shall include at least one 24-hour noise measurement (with maximum noise level readings taken at least every 15 minutes). The analysis must be prepared by persons qualified in acoustical analysis and/or engineering and shall demonstrate with reasonable certainty that Title 24 noise insulation standards, where applicable, can be met, and that there are no particular circumstances about the project site that warrant heightened concern about noise levels in the vicinity. To the maximum extent feasible open space provided per the Planning Code should be protected from existing ambient noise levels that could prove annoying or disruptive to users of the open space.

8. **Hazardous Materials.** The project site is currently used for commercial uses, and would change to residential and commercial uses. Given that sensitive receptors would be introduced at the project site, a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment should be prepared to determine the potential for site contamination and the level of exposure risk associated with the project, and submitted with the Environmental Evaluation Application. The Phase I will determine whether any additional analysis (e.g., a Phase II soil sampling) will be necessary.

9. **Geology and Soils.** The Market and Octavia FEIR did not identify any significant operational impacts related to geology, soils, and seismicity. The proposed project is located on a site with liquefaction potential. Therefore, the applicant shall submit a geotechnical study with the submittal of an EEA that investigates the soils underlying the site and identifies any geotechnical concerns related to the proposed project's foundation. The geotechnical study should determine whether the site is subject to liquefaction, and should provide recommendations for addressing any geotechnical concerns identified in the study. The investigation of geotechnical and soil conditions and the application of the building codes for new development based on these conditions would reduce the potential for impacts related to structural damage; ground subsidence, liquefaction, and landslides; and surface settlement to a less-than-significant level. The geotechnical study will also help inform the archeological resources review mentioned above.

The Market and Octavia Neighborhood FEIR identified a potentially significant impact related to soil erosion during construction. Mitigation measure 5.11.A Construction Related Soils consists of construction best management practices to prevent erosion and discharge of soil sediments to the storm drain system, which would reduce any potential impacts to less than significant. This mitigation measure would be included in the CPE and would not require additional analysis in a focused IS or EIR.

10. **Stormwater Management.** Prior to issuance of a building permit, the project sponsor is required to submit a stormwater control plan to the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission Wastewater Enterprise, Urban Watershed Management Program that demonstrates compliance with the City's Stormwater Design Guidelines. The proposed project's environmental evaluation would generally
evaluate how and where the implementation of required stormwater management and low-impact design approaches would reduce potential negative effects of stormwater runoff. This may include environmental factors such as the natural hydrologic system, city sewer collection system, and receiving body water quality. For more information on the SFPUC’s stormwater management requirements, see http://stormwater.sfwater.org. It is likely this analysis would be included in the CPE and would not require additional analysis in a focused initial study or EIR.

11. **Greenhouse Gas Compliance Checklist for Private Development Project.** Potential environmental effects related to greenhouse gas emissions from the proposed project need to be addressed in a project’s environmental evaluation. An electronic version of the Greenhouse Gas Compliance Checklist Table 1 for Private Development Projects is available on the Planning Department’s website at http://www.sfplanning.org/index.aspx?page=1886. 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 Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy. Projects that do not comply with an ordinance or regulation may be determined to be inconsistent with San Francisco’s GHG Reduction Strategy.

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

13. **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 Community Plan Exemption process. Please provide these mailing labels at the time of submittal.

If any of the additional analyses determine that mitigation measures not identified in the area plan EIR are required to address peculiar impacts, the environmental document will be a CPE plus a focused IS/MND. If the additional analyses identify impacts that cannot be mitigated, the environmental document will be a CPE with a focused IS/EIR. A CPE and a CPE plus a focused IS/MND can be prepared by Planning Department staff, but a CPE with a focused IS/EIR would need to be prepared by a consultant on the Planning Department’s environmental consultant pool (http://www.sfplanning.org/ftp/files/MEA/Environmental_consultant_pool.pdf).

Please see “Studies for Project inside of Adopted Plan Areas - Community Plan Fees” in the Planning Department’s current Fee Schedule for Applications. Environmental evaluation applications are available at the Planning Information Center at 1660 Mission Street, and online at www.sfplanning.org.

---

PLANNING DEPARTMENT APPROVALS:

The project requires the following Planning Department approvals. These approvals may be reviewed in conjunction with the required environmental review, but may not be granted until after the required environmental review is completed.

1. Conditional Use Authorization. The project as proposed requires conditional use authorization for the following items:

   a. Non-Residential Use Size (731.21/121.2). Non-residential uses sizes up to 5,999 square feet are principally permitted in the NCT-3 Zoning District. The proposed commercial use size is approximately 7,343 square feet and requires a conditional use authorization. In addition to the conditional use criteria pursuant to Planning Code Section 303, the Commission will consider the extent to which the following criteria are met:
      i. The intensity of activity in the district is not such that allowing the larger use will be likely to foreclose the location of other needed neighborhood-serving uses in the area.
      ii. The proposed use will serve the neighborhood, in whole or in significant part, and the nature of the use requires a larger size in order to function.
      iii. The building in which the use is to be located is designed in discrete elements which respect the scale of development in the district.

   b. Required Ground Floor Commercial Use (145.4). Active commercial uses are located at the ground floor. However, an individual ground floor nonresidential use may not occupy more than 75 contiguous linear feet for the first 25 feet of depth along a street-facing façade. Separate individual storefronts shall wrap large ground floor uses for the first 25 feet of depth. This requirement may be modified through a Conditional Use. If the use size as discussed in item 1a above is reduced by dividing the commercial space into two uses, neither of these conditional use authorizations would be required.

2. Variance. The project as proposed requires the granting of variances for the following Code Sections:

   a. Street Frontages (Section 145.1).
      i. Active uses - §145.1(c)(3). With the exception of space allowed for building egress and access to mechanical systems, space for “active uses”, as defined in Section 145.1(b)(2) shall be provided within the first 25 feet of building depth on the ground floor and 15 feet on floors above. Building systems including mechanical, electrical, and plumbing features may be exempted from this requirement by the Zoning Administrator only in instances where those features are provided in such a fashion as to not negatively impact the quality of the ground floor space. As proposed, there are several spaces located within the first 25 feet of building depth on the ground floor and within the first 15 feet on the second floor that are not considered “active uses”. These spaces include the transformer room, the electrical room and a storage room at the second floor, all of which front on Market Street. If non-active uses are provided within the first 25 feet of the building on the ground floor and within the first 15 feet on the second floor, please seek and justify a variance.
ii. **Ground Floor Transparency – 145.1(c)(6).** A minimum of 60 percent transparency is required along each of the project’s street frontages. It appears that the Market Street frontage may not meet this requirement. However, if the transformer room is relocated, the frontage will likely meet the 60 percent transparency requirement. Please revise the ground floor design to meet this requirement, or seek and justify a variance.

iii. **Ground Floor Ceiling Heights – 145.1(c)(4)(B).** Ground floor spaces are required to have a minimum floor-to-floor height of 14 feet in the Neighborhood Commercial Districts. A portion of the ground floor along Market Street does not meet this minimum floor-to-floor height. Please revise the design of the ground floor to meet this requirement, or seek and justify a variance.

b. **Bay Windows (Section 136).** Several of the proposed bay windows may not be in compliance with the bay window obstructions criteria outlined in Planning Code Section136(c)(2), including maximum dimensions, glazing requirements for the side of the bays, and separation between bays and interior property lines. Please redesign the bay windows or seek and justify a variance.

c. **Rear Yard (Section 134).** The project is required to provide a minimum rear yard equal to 25 percent of total lot depth, at the lowest level of residential occupancy and at each succeeding level. The 25 percent rear yard and minimum 15 foot rear yard shall be calculated from the average lot depth, drawn as a line from the midpoint of the lot frontage on Market Street and extending to rear where the two side lot lines meet. As proposed, the building is situated in the rear yard, however it likely provides an excess amount of rear yard space. The lot configuration and arrangement of rear yard space requires a Variance from Planning Code Section 134.

3. **A Building Permit Application** and the related Section 312 Notification is required for the demolition and new construction proposed on the property.

Conditional Use and Variance 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.

This project is required to conduct a **Pre-application meeting** with surrounding neighbors and registered neighborhood groups before a development application may be filed with the Planning Department. According to the instructions in the Pre-Application Meeting packet, all relevant neighborhood organizations must be noticed.

---


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 project was evaluated as a group housing facility. Designation of the project as residential dwelling units may alter some of the comments below.

1. **Street Trees.** Planning Code Section 138.1 requires one street tree for every 20 feet of frontage for new construction, with an additional tree required for every remaining 10 feet of street frontage. In total, the project site includes approximately 176 feet of frontage, which requires nine street trees. Six existing street trees are shown along Market Street, with no proposed street trees shown. Please verify the existing number of street trees on Market Street, and propose additional street trees such that there will be a total of nine street trees along the property's frontage.

Please note that the trees must be a 24-inch box size and meet the following additional requirements: (1) have a minimum 2 inch caliper, measured at breast height; (2) branch a minimum of 80 inches above sidewalk grade; (3) be planted in a sidewalk opening at least 16 square feet, and have a minimum soil depth of 3 feet 6 inches; (4) include street tree basins edged with decorative treatment, such as pavers or cobbles; (5) be planted in a continuous soil-filled trench parallel to the curb, such that the basin for each tree is connected.

2. **Tree Planting and Protection Checklist.** Completion of this checklist is required. No permit will be approved by the Planning Department before satisfying all applicable tree-related requirements. Before any application is made to the Planning Department, you may choose to go directly to the Department of Public Works (DPW) to determine whether or not the required trees mentioned above can feasibly be planted. In order to do this, you should bring to DPW: (1) a completed Tree Planting and Protection Checklist [this need NOT be signed by Planning Dept. staff]; (2) project plans [11”x17” is acceptable]; and (3) a DPW tree planting application. Submittals can be made to DPW’s offices at 1155 Market Street or electronically at www.sfdpw.org -> “Services A-Z” -> “Trees”. After DPW does their analysis and fieldwork, DPW will provide you with a signed referral form with their determination which should then be provided to the Planning Department.

3. **Bird Safety.** 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. Please review the standards and indicate the method of window treatments to comply with the requirements where applicable.

4. **Parking.** The project is not required to provide off-street parking. Market Street from the Embarcadero to Castro Street is a protected pedestrian, cycling and transit-oriented street frontage per Planning Code Section 155. Subsection 155(r)(4) specifies that no curb cuts shall be utilized on any protected street frontage. Therefore, restoration of the existing curb cut will be required for the project to proceed.

---

5. **Bicycle Parking.** Pursuant to Planning Code Section 155.2, a group housing project would require 27 Class 1 bicycle parking spaces and two Class 2 bicycle parking spaces. The retail space requires one Class 1 bicycle parking space and six Class 2 bicycle parking spaces. Although there is more than the required amount of Class 1 bicycle parking including in the proposed project, the Planning Code requires the additional eight Class 2 spaces, six of which should be accessible to patrons of the commercial space. Please see Zoning Administrator Bulletin No. 9 for additional information on providing requiring bicycle parking spaces.

6. **Baby Diaper-Changing Accommodations.** A new retail sales and personal service use or assembly and entertainment use that is 5,000 square feet or more in size is required to install and maintain, at each floor level containing restrooms accessible to the public, 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, pursuant to Planning Code Section 168. There are currently no publicly accessible restrooms for the ground and second floor commercial spaces.

7. **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 projects that will create 25,000 square feet or more of new or additional gross floor area. For further information or to receive a sample First Source Hiring Agreement, 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.

8. **Market Octavia Community Improvement Fund.** The project is located within the Market and Octavia Plan Area and is subject to the Market Octavia Community Improvement Fund due to the addition of at least one net new group housing facility. Fees will be calculated and collected prior to issuance of the first construction document, with the option to defer payment to prior to issuance of the first certificate of occupancy. Current fees can be found in the San Francisco Citywide Development Impact Fee Register maintained by the Department of Building Inspection.

9. **Market Street Special Sign District.** Please note that this project is located within the Market Street Special Sign District, pursuant to Planning Code Section 608.8. The more stringent of these controls and those outlined in Planning Code Section 607.1 will apply to this project.

**PRELIMINARY DESIGN COMMENTS:**

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

1. **Program.** The Planning Department and the Market Octavia Plan appreciates innovative means of providing affordable housing. However, the common understanding of group housing is a facility that provides communal or shared programmatic functions. Spatially, these are expected to be significant and evident at each level of the building, as well as central to the daily function of the residents. This project provides minimal common program or space and falls below the expectations...
group housing. Please provide either significant program area dedicated to common space at each floor, or comply with the required unit mix and affordability through traditional mechanisms per the Market Octavia Plan.

2. Building Massing, Site Design, and Open Space. The irregular shape of the lot lends itself to a variance request for the location of rear yard. The design provides in excess of the equivalent area of rear yard space, and is located to relate to adjacent the adjacent building and its open space.

3. Ground Floor Street Frontage. The height of the proposed ground floor retail appears gracious, and is served by enough entrances that enable flexibility of use. The storefront appears to be primarily glazing. Please ensure that it the ground floor height and transparency meet the code requirements. The Planning Department would like to see more of a balance of solid to transparent that is a continuation of façade elements from the building body above. This should serve to unify and ‘ground’ the building. The residential entry should be a celebrated, prominent part of the façade, distinguished in depth, width, and height, but also integrated with the same architectural vocabulary.

Consider providing the entrance lobby with other common amenities to serve the group housing.

4. Architecture. Per the Market & Octavia Area Plan Fundamental Principles for Design the project should incorporate the following principles into the design:

a. Taller buildings should include a clearly defined base, middle, and top. The middle of buildings should be clearly distinguished from the base and articulated with windows, projections, porches and/or balconies. The roof, cornice, or parapet area should be well integrated with the building’s overall composition, visually distinctive, and include elements that create skyline interest. Roof forms should be drawn from the best examples in the area. Above five stories, top floor(s) should be incorporated into an appropriately scaled expression of the building’s top.

b. Windows. In most cases, a minimum window reveal of two inches should be incorporated into the visible facades.

c. Ground Floor Treatment. Horizontal architectural design articulation should be incorporated between the ground floor and second story levels. A minimum 6-inch projection is suggested. The human scale of the sidewalk is of paramount importance on neighborhood commercial streets. Architectural detailing, such as a belt course or cornice, at the ground floor ceiling height helps to frame the pedestrian space of the sidewalk.

The Planning Department recommends establishing a primary body of consistent material and plane that serves to unify and order the more ‘random’ textured elements—bays and recesses—of the façade. Extend and integrate the body to the top floor, yet devise a variant or detail to create a distinguished top to the building.

Due of the adjacent building and the proposed building’s height, the east facade will be visible and should be designed. Exceptions from code should be matched by a design and configuration of space and architecture that is exceptional.
The Planning Department expects a high quality of design that responds to its context with a consistent composition of building components, materiality, and other architectural features that reference the scale and proportion of the existing building forms and components.

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 **November 19, 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

cc: Divoco Group, LLC Property Owner
    Kanishka Burns, Current Planning
    Craig Jung, Environmental Planning
    Kearstin Dishinger, 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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adrienne</td>
<td>Shiozaki Woo</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Japantown Merchants Association</td>
<td>1581 Webster Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al</td>
<td>Sodini</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Anza Vista Civic Improvement Club</td>
<td>140 Terra Vista Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gus</td>
<td>Hernandez</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Alamo Square Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>P.O. Box 15372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Bolaffi</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Western Addition Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>2331 Bush Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>Henderson</td>
<td>Vice Chariman</td>
<td>Market/Octavia Community Advisory Comm.</td>
<td>300 Buchanan Street, Apt. 503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>Li</td>
<td>Land-Use &amp; Transportation Committee Chair</td>
<td>Lower Haight Merchant &amp; Neighbors Association</td>
<td>498 Waller Street, Apt. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leela</td>
<td>Gill</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>North of Panhandle Neighborhood Association (NOPNA)</td>
<td>850 Baker Street</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Farrell</td>
<td>Supervisor, District 2</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>1 Dr. Carlton B Goodlett Place, Room #244</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat</td>
<td>Tura</td>
<td>Board President</td>
<td>Duboce Triangle Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>2261 Market Street PMB #301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Vaughey</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Marina/Cow Hollow Neighbors &amp; Merchants</td>
<td>2742 Baker Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Cohen</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Noe Street Neighbors</td>
<td>33 Noe Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Rabbitt</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Temescal Terrace Association</td>
<td>55 Temescal Terrace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell</td>
<td>Pritchard</td>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>Hayes Valley Merchants Association</td>
<td>568 Hayes Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Reynolds</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Fillmore Merchants &amp; Improvement Association</td>
<td>2184 Sutter Street #155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Bulkley</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Hayes Valley Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>1800 Market St., PMB #104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY</td>
<td>STATE</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
<td>TELEPHONE</td>
<td>EMAIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94115</td>
<td>415-202-0365</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94115</td>
<td>415-922-8898</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nlfchildcare@yahoo.com">nlfchildcare@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94115</td>
<td>415-921-5131</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ducha931@aol.com">ducha931@aol.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94115</td>
<td>415-271-5691</td>
<td><a href="mailto:president@alamosq.org">president@alamosq.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94115</td>
<td>415-931-1091</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bolaffi@pacbell.net">bolaffi@pacbell.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94115</td>
<td>415-722-0617</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jhenders@sbcglobal.net">jhenders@sbcglobal.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94117</td>
<td>415-644-4290</td>
<td>lawrence@bureau@com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94115</td>
<td>415-806-6282</td>
<td><a href="mailto:leela@NOPNA.org">leela@NOPNA.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-554-5942</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Mark.Farrell@sfgov.org">Mark.Farrell@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:Catherine.Stefani@sfgov.org">Catherine.Stefani@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:Margaux.Kelly@sfgov.org">Margaux.Kelly@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:Jess.Montejano@sfgov.org">Jess.Montejano@sfgov.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-674-1935</td>
<td><a href="mailto:marvisphillips@gmail.com">marvisphillips@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94114</td>
<td>415-267-1821</td>
<td><a href="mailto:patriciatura@me.com">patriciatura@me.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94123</td>
<td>415-776-3191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94114</td>
<td>415-722-0617</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pcohensf@gmail.com">pcohensf@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94118</td>
<td>415-954-4959</td>
<td><a href="mailto:richard.rabbitt@stanfordalumni.org">richard.rabbitt@stanfordalumni.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-255-9307</td>
<td><a href="mailto:russell@zonalhome.com">russell@zonalhome.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94115</td>
<td>415-441-4093</td>
<td><a href="mailto:trr@newfillmore.com">trr@newfillmore.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-503-1970</td>
<td><a href="mailto:president@hayesvalleysf.org">president@hayesvalleysf.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.
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: 1740 Market Street
Comments: Preliminary Shadow fan based on 90' height to account for stair penthouse
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