DATE:       June 13, 2014
TO:         Aoife Gallagher (SIA Consulting)
FROM:       David Lindsay, Planning Department
RE:         PPA Case No. 2014.0569U for 4334 Geary Boulevard

Please find the attached Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) for the address listed above. You may contact the staff contact, Sharon Lai, at (415) 75-9087 or sharon.w.lai@sfgov.org, to answer any questions you may have, or to schedule a follow-up meeting.

David Lindsay, Senior Planner
Preliminary Project Assessment

Date: June 13, 2014
Case No.: 2014.0569U
Project Address: 4334 Geary Boulevard
Block/Lot: 1439/021
Zoning: NC-3, 40-X
Project Sponsor: Aoife Gallagher (SIA Consulting)

Staff Contact: Sharon Lai – 415-575-9087
sharon.w.lai@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:
4334 Geary Boulevard is an approximately 3,000 square foot (sf), one-story commercial building constructed in 1922. The proposed project would demolish the existing building and construct a new four-story approximately 11,845 square foot mixed use building with commercial use on the first story and six residential units on the upper stories. No off-street parking is proposed.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:
In compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the environmental review process must be completed before any project approval may be granted. This review may be done in conjunction with the required approvals listed below. In order to begin formal environmental review, please submit an Environmental Evaluation Application for the full scope of the project (demolition and construction). Environmental Evaluation 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 under the “Publications” tab. See “Studies for Project outside of Adopted Plan Areas” on page 2 of the current Fee Schedule for calculation of environmental application fees.¹

The following environmental issues would likely be addressed as part of the project’s environmental review based on our preliminary review of the proposed project as it is described in the Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) submittal dated April 17, 2014:

1. **Historic Architectural Resources.** An Historic Resource Evaluation Response (HRER) was prepared as part of a previous project (Case No. 2010.1011E).² The HRER found that the existing building on the project site, which was constructed in 1922, is not an historical resource for purposes of CEQA. The HRER also found that there do not appear to be any off-site historical resources in the immediate vicinity that could be affected by the project previously proposed in 2011. No historic preservation review would be required for the proposed project.³

2. **Archeological Resources.** Project implementation would entail soil-disturbing activities associated with building construction, including excavation that would reach a depth of approximately 11 feet, 4 inches below grade.⁴ Based on this, the project would require a Preliminary Archeological Review (PAR), which would be conducted in-house by the Planning Department Archeologist. The PAR would determine 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 report or Phase II ESA prepared for the project site would be reviewed as part of the archeological review for this project. In addition, it would also be determined if the project site is in an area that is archeologically sensitive. The result of this review would be provided in a memorandum to the environmental planner assigned to the project. If it is found that the project has the potential to affect an archeological resource, the PAR memorandum would identify any additional measures to be implemented. Such actions may include application of appropriate archeological mitigation measures and/or requiring additional archeological studies as part of the environmental evaluation. If an additional archeological study is required, it must be prepared by a qualified archeological consultant. The qualified consultant must be selected from a list of three archeological consultants from the Planning Department’s archeological resources consultant file provided by the Planning Department during the environmental review process.⁵ The Planning

---


³ Tina Tam, San Francisco Planning Department. Email to Kei Zushi, San Francisco Planning Department, PPA: 4334 Geary Blvd (2014.0569U), May 22, 2014. This email is available for review as part of Case File No. 2014.0569U at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, California 94103.

⁴ Aoife Gallagher, Project Sponsor. Email to Kei Zushi, San Francisco Planning Department, Soil Disturbing: 4334 Geary Blvd (Case No. 2014.0569U), May 15, 2014. This email is available for review as part of Case File No. 2014.0569U at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, California 94103.

Department Archeologist will be informed by the geotechnical study of the project site's subsurface geological conditions (see Item 8, Geology, below).

3. **Transportation and Circulation.** The proposed project would generate approximately 551 daily persons-trips and 55 P.M. peak-hour persons-trips based on the Transportation Trip Generation Calculations developed by the Planning Department. Based on this, a Transportation Impact Study (TIS) would likely not be required for the proposed project.

A formal determination as to whether a TIS is required will be made after submittal of the Environmental Evaluation Application. If a TIS is required, the Planning Department will provide additional guidance related to the process for selecting a transportation consultant and assist in the development of the scope of work for the analysis. The consultant must be selected from a list of three transportation consultants from the Planning Department's transportation consultant file provided by the Planning Department during the environmental review process.6

At the time of filing of the Environmental Evaluation Application, please ensure that the project description responds to the following comments:

a. Clarify the location of six Class 1 bicycle parking spaces and two Class 2 bicycle spaces on the proposed site plan; and

b. Clarify the location of trash room (MTA would like to ensure that trash pickup does not conflict with Muni operation)

4. **Noise.** Based on the City's GIS-based traffic noise model map, the project site is located along a segment of Geary Boulevard with noise levels above 75 dBA Ldn (a day-night averaged sound level). The Land Use Compatibility Chart for Community Noise in the San Francisco General Plan, Environmental Protection Element states that construction of new dwelling units should generally be discouraged in an area with noise levels above 65 dBA Ldn and that a detailed analysis of the noise reduction requirements must be made and needed noise insulation features included in the design of the building.7

In addition, Mitigation Measure M-NO-1: Interior and Exterior Noise in the San Francisco 2004 and 2009 Housing Element EIR requires that the Planning Department require the preparation of a noise analysis for new residential development located along streets with noise levels above 75 dBA Ldn in accordance with the requirements outlined in Mitigation Measure M-NO-1. The noise 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) at least one 24-hour noise measurement (with maximum noise level readings taken at least every 15 minutes) prior to completion of the environmental review. The analysis shall demonstrate with reasonable certainty that Title 24 standards, where applicable, can be met and there are no particular circumstances about the proposed project site that appear to warrant

---


7 San Francisco Planning Department. San Francisco General Plan, Environmental Protection Element. Available online at: [http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/general_plan/16_Environmental_Protection.htm](http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/general_plan/16_Environmental_Protection.htm)
heightened concern about noise levels in the vicinity. Should such concerns be present, the department may require the completion of a detailed noise assessment by person(s) qualified in acoustical analysis and/or engineering prior to the first project approval action, in order to demonstrate that acceptable interior noise levels consistent with those in the Title 24 standards can be attained.

To minimize effects on development in noisy areas, Mitigation Measure M-NO-1 also requires that the Planning Department require that open space required under the Planning Code for new residential uses be protected, in conjunction with noise analysis required by Mitigation Measure M-NO-1, to maximum feasible extent, from existing ambient noise levels that could prove annoying or disruptive to users of the open space. Implementation of this measure could involve, among other things, site design that uses the building itself to shield on-site open space from the greatest noise sources, construction of noise barriers between noise sources and open space, and appropriate use of both common and private open space in multi-family dwellings. Implementation of this measure should be undertaken consistent with other principles of urban design.

Based on this, a noise analysis prepared by a qualified acoustic consultant may be required for the project. A formal determination as to whether a Noise Study is required and as to the scope of the Noise Study will be made after submittal of the Environmental Evaluation Application.

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. If pile driving is to be used during the construction, measures to reduce construction noise may be required as part of the proposed project.

Air Quality.

Criteria Air Pollutants

The proposed project at six dwelling units and 3,270 sf of retail use is below the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's (BAAQMD) construction or operational screening level for criteria air pollutants. Therefore, an analysis of the project's criteria air pollutant emissions is not likely to be required.

The proposed project would involve excavation of up to 611 cubic yards of soil. 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 public.
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.

Local Health Risks and Hazards

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.

5. Greenhouse Gases. Potential environmental effects related to greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from the proposed project need to be addressed in a project’s environmental evaluation. The project sponsor would be required to submit a completed GHG Compliance Checklist Table 1 for Private Development Projects demonstrating that the project is in 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 a GHG-related regulation may be determined to be inconsistent with San Francisco’s Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy.

6. Wind. Wind impacts are generally caused by large building masses extending substantially above their surroundings. The proposed project would result in construction of a 45-foot-tall, four-story-over-basement, 11,845-sf building. The project vicinity primarily includes three-story buildings. Therefore, no further wind analyses would be required for the proposed project.

7. Shadow. The proposed project would result in construction of a 45-foot-tall, four-story-over-basement, 11,845-sf building. A shadow fan analysis was prepared for this project. The shadow analysis found that the proposed project would not cast shadows on any nearby parks subject to the Planning Code Section 295. Therefore, no further shadow analysis would be required for the proposed project.

8. Geology. According to the Planning Department records, a northeastern portion of the project site includes slopes greater than 20 percent. A geotechnical study prepared by a qualified consultant should be submitted with the Environmental Evaluation Application. The study should address

12 Sharon Lai, San Francisco Planning Department. 4334 Geary Blvd - Shadow Fan, May 16, 2014. Attachment
whether the site is subject to liquefaction, and should provide recommendations for any geotechnical
cornerstone identified in the study. In general, compliance with the building codes, as assured through
DBI’s permit review process, would avoid the potential for significant impacts related to structural
damage, ground subsidence, liquefaction, landslides, and surface settlement. This study will also
help inform the Planning Department Archeologist of the project site’s subsurface geological
conditions.

9. **Hazardous Materials.** The proposed project would involve excavation of up to 611 cubic yards of
soil\(^\text{13}\) and a northeastern portion of the project site is located within the Maher zone according to the
Planning Department’s GIS records. Therefore, the project may be subject to Article 22A of the Health
Code, also known as the Maher Ordinance. The Maher Ordinance, which is administered and
overseen by the San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH), requires the project sponsor to
retain the services of a qualified professional to prepare a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment
(ESA) that meets the requirements of Health Code Section 22.A.6. The Phase I would determine the
potential for site contamination and level of exposure risk associated with the project. Based on that
information, soil and/or groundwater sampling and analysis, as well as remediation of any site
contamination, may be required. These steps are required to be completed prior to the issuance of
any building permit.

DPH requires that projects subject to the Maher Ordinance complete a Maher Application, available
oversight of projects subject to the ordinance would apply. Please refer to DPH’s fee schedule,
available at: [http://www.sfdph.org/dph/EH/Fees.asp#haz](http://www.sfdph.org/dph/EH/Fees.asp#haz).

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

Because the existing building on the project site was constructed prior to 1980, asbestos-containing
materials, such as floor and wall coverings, may be found in the building. BAAQMD is responsible
for regulating airborne pollutants including asbestos. Please contact BAAQMD for the requirements
related to demolition of buildings that may contain asbestos-containing materials. In addition,
because of their age, lead paint may be found in the existing building. Please contact DBI for
requirements related to demolition of buildings that may contain lead paint.

10. **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.\(^\text{14}\) Any tree identified in the Affidavit for Tree Disclosure must be shown on the Site
Plans with the size of trunk diameter, tree height, and accurate canopy drip line. Please submit the

---

\(^{\text{13}}\) Aoife Gallagher, Project Sponsor. Email to Kei Zushi, San Francisco Planning Department, Soil Disturbing: 4334 Geary Blvd (Case No. 2014.0569U), May 15, 2014. This email is available for review as part of Case File No. 2014.0569U at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, California 94103.

form along with the Environmental Evaluation Application and ensure that trees are appropriately shown on site plans.

11. **Bird-Safe Building Ordinance.** The project would be subject to Planning Code Section 139, Standards for Bird-Safe Buildings, which addresses Location-Related Standards and Feature-Related Standards. The project’s environmental evaluation would generally discuss how the implementation of bird-safe design standards would reduce potential adverse effects on birds due to the lighting, glazing, balconies, and so forth.

12. **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. Please be prepared to provide these mailing labels upon request during the environmental review process.

13. **San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) Project Review.** The SFPUC has a separate project review process for projects that propose to use land owned by the SFPUC or subject to an easement held by the SFPUC; or projects that propose to be constructed above, under, or adjacent to major SFPUC infrastructure. For projects meeting the above criteria, please contact SFProjectReview@sfwater.org for a SFPUC Project Review and Land Use Application. For more information regarding the SFPUC's water, sewer, and storm water requirements, please visit the For Developers webpage at http://www.sfwater.org/index.aspx?page=574.

A categorical exemption is likely to be prepared for the project, provided the project would not result in a significant impact on the environment. The project could be eligible for a Class 3 existing facilities categorical exemption from environmental review under CEQA Guidelines Section 15303 based on the preliminary review of the proposed project. If a Class 3 exemption is appropriate, Environmental Planning staff will prepare a certificate of exemption.

If it is determined that the project could result in a significant impact, an initial study would be prepared. The initial study may be prepared either by an environmental consultant from the Department’s environmental consultant pool or by Department staff. If the initial study indicates that the project would result in a significant impact that cannot be mitigated to below a significant level, an EIR must be prepared by an environmental consultant from the Planning Department’s environmental consultant pool. For example, if it is determined that the proposed project would result in a significant impact on archeological resources, which cannot be reduced by mitigation measures agreed to by the project sponsor to a less-than-significant level, the Planning Department would require the preparation of an EIR focused on archeological resources. The Planning Department would provide more detail to the project sponsor regarding the EIR process should this level of environmental review be required.

If the initial study finds that the project would have a significant impact that could be reduced to a less-than-significant level by mitigation measures agreed to by the project sponsor, then the Department would issue a preliminary mitigated negative declaration (PMND). The PMND would be circulated for

---

public review for a period of 20 calendar days, during which time concerned parties may comment on and/or appeal the determination. If an appeal is filed, the Planning Commission would hold a hearing to decide the appeal. If no appeal is filed, the Planning Department would issue a final mitigated negative declaration (FMND).

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. **Building Permits.** Building Permit applications are available at the Department of Building Inspections at 1660 Mission Street.
   - A **Building Permit Application** is required for the demolition of the existing building on the subject property.
   - A **Building Permit Application** is required for the proposed new construction on the subject property.

2. **Variances.** The proposed project as designed may not meet Planning Code Section 134 for rear yard requirements, Section 140 for dwelling unit exposure and Section 155 for bicycle parking requirements. Please refer to the discussion under Preliminary Project Comments below. 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.

3. **Parking Reduction.** The proposed project does not comply with Planning Code Section 151 for required off-street parking. Please refer to the discussion under Preliminary Project Comments below. The Parking Reduction application is 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.

NEIGHBORHOOD NOTIFICATIONS AND PUBLIC OUTREACH:

Project Sponsors are encouraged to conduct public outreach with the surrounding community and neighborhood groups early in the development process. Additionally, many approvals require a public hearing with an associated neighborhood notification. Differing levels of neighborhood notification are mandatory for some or all of the reviews and approvals listed above.

This project is required to conduct a **Pre-application** meeting with surrounding neighbors and registered neighborhood groups before a development application may be filed with the Planning Department. The Pre-application packet, which includes instructions and template forms, is available at www.sfplanning.org under the “Permits & Zoning” tab. All registered neighborhood group mailing lists are available online at www.sfplanning.org under the “Resource Center” tab.
PRELIMINARY PROJECT COMMENTS:

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

1. Rear Yard Requirement. Planning Code Section 134 requires the subject NC-3 property to provide a rear yard of 25% of the lot depth at the lowest story containing a dwelling unit, and at each succeeding level or story of the building, which is approximately 30 feet, 1-1/2 inches. Please correct the plans to consistently provide the full rear yard requirement or submit and justify for a rear yard variance.
   
   a. Please note that the rear yard requirement for the irregular "flag" portion of the lot is 15 feet.

2. Exposure. All dwelling units must have at least one room that meets the 120-square-foot minimum superficial floor area requirement of Section 503 of the Housing Code that face directly onto a street right-of-way, Code-complying rear yard, or an appropriately sized courtyard. Please provide a Code complying rear yard to satisfy the exposure requirements per Planning Code Section 140. You may also meet exposure requirements by providing a sufficient open area that is unobstructed and is no less than 25 feet in every horizontal dimension for the floor at which the dwelling unit in question is located and the floor immediately above it, with an increase of five feet in every horizontal dimension at each subsequent floor. It appears that Unit #2, 4 and 6 do not meet the exposure requirement. Please provide the required exposure for all dwelling units, or alternatively, you may request and justify an exposure variance from Planning Code Section 140.

3. Street trees. Planning Code Section 138.1 requires one street tree of a minimum size for every 20 feet of frontage for new construction. Please specify the size of the proposed street tree. All proposed street trees must be verified by the Bureau of Urban Forestry regarding planting feasibility. Please contact the Department of Public Works to obtain written verification of the feasibility of planting. If it is determined that a new street tree cannot be planted, an in-lieu fee of $1,715 per tree will be required.

4. Off-Street Parking. Planning Code Section 151 requires one off-street parking space for each dwelling unit. The Project proposes no off-street parking. Planning Code Sections 161, 307(g) and (i) allows the Zoning Administrator to reduce the off-street parking requirements in NC Districts if certain criteria are met. Alternatively, you may provide additional bicycle parking spaces to satisfy the off-street parking requirement as set forth in Section 150(e) and 155.1(d).

5. Bicycle Parking. Planning Code Section 155.2 requires this project to provide at least six Class 1 bicycle parking spaces and one Class 2 bicycle parking space. The proposed project contains no bicycle parking. Bicycle parking shall be provided regardless of whether off-street car parking is available and shall be provided at no cost or fee to building occupants and tenants. Section 155.1 defines bicycle parking as follows:
   "Class 1 Bicycle Parking Space(s)." Spaces in secure, weather-protected facilities intended for use as long-term, overnight, and work-day bicycle storage by dwelling unit residents, non-residential occupants, and Employees.
   "Class 2 Bicycle Parking Space(s)." Bicycle racks located in a publicly-accessible, highly visible location intended for transient or short-term use by visitors, guests, and patrons to the building or use.

Furthermore, Class 1 bicycle parking spaces shall be located with direct access for bicycles without requiring use of stairs. Such spaces shall be located on the ground floor within 100 feet of
the major entrance to the lobby unless lot configurations or other limitations do not allow such location. For further details on locations and design of bicycle parking spaces, refer to Section 155.1 of the Code and Zoning Administrator Bulletin No.9. Please also note that the permit application for this project should contain plans indicating the location, and details of bicycle parking spaces including the type of bicycle racks proposed.

6. **Street Frontage.** The proposed project is subject to street frontage requirements as defined in Planning Code Section 145.1.

7. **Height.**
   a. **Height Bonus.** The height limit for the subject property is 40 feet. Please note that Planning Code Section 263.20(b)(2)(F) allows that one additional foot of height, up to a total of five feet, shall be permitted above the designated height limit for each additional foot of ground floor clear ceiling height in excess of 10 feet from sidewalk grade, or in the case of residential units, for each foot the unit is raised above sidewalk grade. The proposed ground floor commercial space appears to have less than 15 feet of clear ceiling height and the project is therefore not permitted to have an overall building height of 45 feet.
   b. **Height Exempted Features.** Planning Code Section 260 permits certain rooftop features above the prescribed height limit. Stair penthouses are permitted up to 10 feet above the height limit and elevator penthouses are permitted up to 16 feet above the height limit, as long as all height exempted features occupy no more than 20 percent of the roof area. Please note that stair and elevator penthouses should be clearly shown on elevations and are subject to design review. Please refer to the Preliminary Design Comments below for additional guidance.

8. **Transit Impact Development Fees.** This project is subject to the applicable fees outlined in Section 411.

9. **Previous Planning Commission Action.** On August 16, 2012, the Planning Commission took Discretionary Review on a previous new construction proposal under Case No. 2010.10111313, proposing to construct a new three-story office building. The associated Building Permit Application #2010.10.04.2197 was approved subject to modifications to provide two light wells along the east side façade in order to preserve light and air for the adjacent building’s property line windows and light wells. Please refer to the Planning Commission’s past action and strongly consider incorporating the modifications into the Proposed Project by introducing two light wells beginning at the second floor along the east property line. The Commission’s comments were as follows:
   a. The proposed project will provide a light well on the upper two floors adjacent to the DR Requestor’s northernmost property line windows. The light well will extend two feet below the lowest property line window, measure no less than three feet nine inches deep, and extend two feet beyond the DR Requestor’s rear wall at its northern end and two feet beyond the property line windows at its southern end.
   b. The proposed project will provide a light well on the upper two floors adjacent to the DR Requestor’s light wells. The light well will extend two feet below the southernmost property line window, measure no less than four feet six inches deep, and extend from the DR Requestor’s northernmost light well to two feet past the DR Requestor’s southernmost property line window.

**PRELIMINARY DESIGN COMMENTS:**

The following comments address preliminary design issues that may significantly impact the proposed project:
1. **Site Design, Open Space, and Massing**
   a. Please consider providing a Code complying rear yard that is 25% of the lot depth and provides exposure, access to and preservation of the mid-block open space, and usability. The rear yard should be designed in such a manner as to be usable as open space for both residents at the immediate level and common to residents without compromising the privacy or use of either.

2. **Frontage.**
   a. The Department suggests reducing the ground floor setback to 3 feet to provide a better relationship with the street wall but to also allow for entrances and storefront activity such as seating.

3. **Architecture.**
   a. Please ground and punctuate the glass storefront base of the building with some solid architectural elements that relate to the body of the building. The Department urges the storefront be set on a solid, durable base 18"-24" high.
   b. Please differentiate the residential entry from the commercial storefront.
   c. Please consider providing an overhang above the upper balcony to balance the façade composition.
   d. The two-lite window and door proportions at the balconies appear successful. Please consider applying the same pattern to all windows to better unify the façade.
   e. Due to the existing adjacent building setbacks from the side lot lines, the side walls of the proposed building will be visible from the public right-of-way. The building should be designed to take this into account and to treat the blind wall as a second elevation, by utilizing high quality materials, detailing and perhaps fire rated fenestration where feasible.
   f. At this point the architecture is assumed to be preliminary and the Department may provide further design review on the subsequent submission of materials and details to insure that the original design intent is achieved.
   g. 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 this project.

**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 December 13, 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.
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<td>NEIGHBORHOOD OF INTEREST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>universityterraceassociation @yahoo.com</td>
<td>Inner Richmond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:annic@selfhelpelderly.org">annic@selfhelpelderly.org</a></td>
<td>Chinatown, Inner Richmond, Inner Sunset, Outer Richmond, Outer Sunset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:dmbaroni@me.com">dmbaroni@me.com</a>; <a href="mailto:daniel_baroni@gensler.com">daniel_baroni@gensler.com</a></td>
<td>Inner Richmond, Outer Richmond, Seacliff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:eric.l.mar@sfgov.org">eric.l.mar@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:Nickolas.Pagoulatos@sfgov.org">Nickolas.Pagoulatos@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:Victor.Lim@sfgov.org">Victor.Lim@sfgov.org</a></td>
<td>Inner Richmond, Outer Richmond, Seacliff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:sulliblums@earthlink.net">sulliblums@earthlink.net</a></td>
<td>Inner Richmond, Outer Richmond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:pwinkelstein@gmail.com">pwinkelstein@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Inner Richmond, Outer Richmond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>richard.rabbitt@stanfordalu mni.org</td>
<td>Haight Ashbury, Inner Richmond, Presidio Heights, Western Addition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:gumby5@att.net">gumby5@att.net</a></td>
<td>Inner Richmond, Pacific Heights, Presidio Heights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Title: 4334 Geary Blvd - 2014.0569U
Comments: Shadow Fan based on full lot development
with a 55' building (45' building and 10' rooftop features)
Printed: 16 May, 2014