Please find the attached Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) for the address listed above. You may contact the staff contact, Rachel A. Schuett, at (415) 575-9030 or Rachel.Schuett@sfgov.org, to answer any questions you may have, or to schedule a follow-up meeting.
Preliminary Project Assessment

Date: September 30, 2014
Case No.: 2014.1205U
Project Address: 727-731 Natoma Street
Block/Lot: 3728/032
Zoning: RED-MX

Western SoMa
45-X

Area Plan: South of Market Area Plan/Western SoMa Community Plan
Project Sponsor: Matthew and Jessica Diamond
(415) 509.0312

Staff Contact: Rachel A. Schuett – (415) 575.9030
Rachel.Schuett@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 project site is approximately 1,875 square feet, and includes Assessor’s Block 3728, Lot 032, which is located on the south side of Natoma Street between 8th and 9th Streets, in the western portion of the South of Market (SoMa) neighborhood. The site is currently occupied by a two-story (over basement), four-unit apartment building, which is approximately 25 feet 9 ½ inches tall.

The existing 4,795 square foot building was constructed in 1906, and is a known historic resource. The proposal is to retain the existing building, add a two-story vertical addition above the existing roof, set back approximately eight feet from the front façade, and to remodel the existing basement, ground floor and second floor levels, which would result in an additional 2,330 square feet of residential uses.

The proposed project would result in six new residential units; three one-bedroom units in the basement, two one-bedroom units on the third floor, and one three-bedroom unit on the fourth floor. The existing two two-bedroom units on the ground floor would be remodeled, but would remain two-bedroom units.
The existing two one-bedroom units on the second floor would be remodeled into two-bedroom units. The resulting 45-foot-tall building would include 10 dwelling units, for a total of 7,125 square feet of residential uses. No off-street parking spaces are currently provided, and none are proposed as part of the project. No excavation and/or foundation work is currently proposed. No details on the scope of construction activities and/or the duration of the construction period were provided.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:

The proposed project requires environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) either individually, such as in a project specific Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) or Environmental Impact Report (EIR), or in a Community Plan Exemption (CPE) under the Western SoMa Community Plan, Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels and 350 Eighth Street Project Final EIR (Western SoMa EIR). Environmental review may be done in conjunction with the required Planning Department approvals listed in this letter, 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. Environmental Review for such projects is documented in a CPE.

The proposed project is located within the Western SoMa Community Plan, which was evaluated in the Western SoMa Community Plan, Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels and 350 Eighth Street Project Final EIR (Western SoMa EIR), certified in 2012. Pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines, the project is likely to qualify for a CPE under the Western SoMa EIR, given that the proposed project is consistent with the development density identified in the area plan. 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.

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.

Based on our preliminary review of the project as it is proposed in the Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) submittal dated August 1, 2014 the following topic areas would require additional study to identify significant impacts not identified in area plan EIR:

- **Archeological Resources.** As proposed, the project would not involve any excavation. Therefore, no archeological review would be required.

- **Geotechnical Study.** Based on the City's GIS-based map the project site is located in an area designated as a liquefaction hazard zone. As proposed, the project does not include any grading and/or
foundation work. If it is determined that grading and/or foundation work would be required, the project sponsor would be required to prepare a geotechnical investigation report to identify the primary geotechnical concerns associated with the proposed project and the project site; including the hazards associated with the liquefaction hazard area, and recommend hazards minimization measures including, but not limited to, soil preparation and foundation design. If excavation is required, this report will also help inform the Planning Department Archeologist of the project site's subsurface geological conditions. If needed, the geotechnical report should be prepared by a qualified consultant and submitted with the EE Application.

- **Transportation Study.** Based on a preliminary review of the PPA submittal, the preparation of a transportation study is not likely required for the project. However, an official determination will be made subsequent to the submittal of the Environmental Evaluation Application (EEA). As proposed, the project would only result in a total of 15 PM peak hour person-trips, or three PM peak hour vehicle trips, from all ten proposed units, only six of which would be new. In order to comply with Planning Code Section 155.2, the proposed project is required to provide a total of six (6) Class 1 bicycle parking spaces. Please demonstrate on the project plans how the proposed project will meet this requirement.

As with all land use development projects in San Francisco, the Planning Department is in support of all features of a project that work to support and encourage trips made by sustainable modes such as transit, bicycle and pedestrian trips. For example, the project sponsor is encouraged to consider offering secure bicycle parking facilities for residents and guests outside of the residential units and/or ensuring that there is a clear and convenient ingress/egress between the public right-of-way and the individual residential units for residents and guests and their bicycles.

- **Hazardous Materials.** The project site is located within an area subject to Article 22A of the Health Code, also known as the Maher Ordinance, which indicates there is a possibility that some soils and/or groundwater contamination could be associated with the site. However, the Maher Ordinance, which is administered and overseen by the Department of Public Health (DPH), is only applicable if the proposed project would involve the excavation of more than 50 cubic yards of soil. As proposed, the project would not involve any soils excavation; therefore, the Maher Ordinance would not apply.

- **Air Quality (AQ) Analysis.** As proposed, the project includes up to 10 residential units, of which only six would be new. The size of the proposed project 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.

However, 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.

- **Greenhouse Gases.** The City and County of San Francisco’s Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions presents a comprehensive assessment of policies, programs, and ordinances that represents San Francisco’s Qualified Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Reduction Strategy. Projects that are consistent with San Francisco’s Qualified GHG Reduction Strategy would result in less-than-significant impacts from GHG emissions. In order to facilitate a determination of compliance with San Francisco’s Qualified GHG Reduction Strategy, the Planning Department has prepared a Greenhouse Gas Analysis Compliance Checklist. The project sponsor is 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 the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy.

- **Noise.** 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.

Based on the City’s GIS-based traffic noise model map, the project site is not located in an area with noise levels above 70 dBA $L_{dn}$ (a day-night averaged sound level). Therefore, a detailed noise analysis is not likely to be required.

- **Shadow Analysis.** The proposed project would result in construction of a building greater than 40 feet in height. Projects over 40 feet in height typically require a Shadow Analysis Application under Planning Code Section 295 (“Proposition K”) to ensure that new buildings do not cast new shadows on properties that are under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Recreation and Park Commission. The analysis is for a period between one hour after sunrise and one hour before sunset, at any time of the year. However, a preliminary shadow fan prepared by the Planning Department using the proposed building design (PPA submittal dated August 1, 2014) indicates that the project would not cast new shadows on properties under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Commission. Therefore, no shadow analysis would be required.

- **Wind Study.** The proposed project would not involve the construction of a building over 80 feet in height. Therefore, no wind study would be required.

- **Historic Resources.** Constructed circa 1906, the existing building at 727-731 Natoma Street was surveyed and evaluated as part of the South of Market (SoMa) Historic Resource Survey, which was adopted by the Historic Preservation Commission in July 2010. 727-731 Natoma Street was given a
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California Historic Resource Status Code (CHRSC) of “3D,” which defines the existing building as “appears eligible for NR as a contributor to a NR eligible district through survey evaluation.” As such, the subject property listed above would be considered an historic resource pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), since the existing building is a contributing resource to the Western SoMa Light Industrial and Residential District.

Therefore, the proposed project would be subject to additional historic resource review to assess the impact of the new vertical addition and its compatibility with the surrounding eligible historic district. This review will require preparation of a Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE) by a qualified professional who meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards. Upon submittal of the EEA, the Department will provide a list of three historic resource consultants from the Historic Resource Consultant Pool. Once the EEA is submitted and an environmental case number is assigned, please contact Tina Tam, Senior Preservation Planner, via email (tina.tam@sfgov.org) for the list of three consultants. Upon selection of the historic resource consultant, the scope of the HRE should be prepared in consultation with Department Preservation staff.

- **Flood Notification.** The project site is in a block that has the potential to flood during storms. The SFPUC will review the permit application to comment on the proposed application and the potential for flooding during wet weather. Applicants for building permits for either new construction, change of use or change of occupancy, or for major alterations or enlargements shall contact the SFPUC at the beginning of the process to determine whether the project would result in ground-level flooding during storms. Requirements may include provision of measures to ensure positive sewage flow, raised elevation of entryways, and/or special sidewalk construction and the provision of deep gutters. The side sewer connection permits for such projects need to be reviewed and approved by the SFPUC at the beginning of the review process for all permit applications submitted to the Planning Department, DBI, or the Successor Agency to the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency. For information required for the review of projects in flood-prone areas, the permit applicant shall refer to Bulletin No. 4: [http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/publications_reports/DB_04_Flood_Zones.pdf](http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/publications_reports/DB_04_Flood_Zones.pdf).

- **Tree Planting and Protection.** 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 such trees must be shown on the Site Plans with the size of the trunk diameter, tree height, and accurate canopy drip line. Please submit a Tree Planting and Protection Checklist with the Environmental Evaluation Application and ensure that trees are appropriately shown on site plans.

- **Notification of a Project Receiving Environmental Review.** Notice is required to be sent to occupants of the project site and properties adjacent to the project site, as well as to owners and to the extent feasible occupants of properties within 300 feet of the project site at the initiation of the environmental review. Please be prepared to provide mailing addresses on a CD upon request following submittal of the Environmental Evaluation Application.

- **Disclosure Report for Developers of Major City Projects.** The San Francisco Ethics Commission S.F. Camp. & Govt. Conduct Code § 3.520 et seq. requires developers to provide the public with information about donations that developers make to nonprofit organizations that may communicate with the City and County regarding major development projects. This report must be completed and filed by
the developer of any “major project.” A major project is a real estate development project located in the City and County of San Francisco with estimated construction costs exceeding $1,000,000 where either: (1) The Planning Commission or any other local lead agency certifies an EIR for the project; or (2) The project relies on a program EIR and the Planning Department, Planning Commission, or any other local lead agency adopts any final environmental determination under CEQA. A final environmental determination includes: the issuance of a Community Plan Exemption (CPE); certification of a CPE/EIR; adoption of a CPE/Final Mitigated Negative Declaration; or a project approval by the Planning Commission that adopts CEQA Findings. (In instances where more than one of the preceding determinations occur, the filing requirement shall be triggered by the earliest such determination.) A major project does not include a residential development project with four or fewer dwelling units. The first (or initial) report must be filed within 30 days of the date the Planning Commission (or any other local lead agency) certifies the EIR for that project or, for a major project relying on a program EIR, within 30 days of the date that the Planning Department, Planning Commission, or any other local lead agency adopts a final environmental determination under CEQA. Please submit a Disclosure Report for Developers of Major City Projects to the San Francisco Ethics Commission. This form can be found at the Planning Department or online at http://www.sfethics.org.

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

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 proposed project requires the following approvals from the Planning Department:

1. A Variance from the Zoning Administrator would be required:
   a. Pursuant to Planning Code Section 134 (rear yard), since the project does not provide the required rear yard for the two new floor levels;
   b. Pursuant to Planning Code Sections 135 and 823(c)(2)(open space), since the project does not provide code-complying open space for the six new dwelling units; and
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c. Pursuant to Planning Code Section 140 (exposure), since the project would construct two new dwelling units at the basement level without code-complying exposure to a public street; and,

2. A Building Permit Application would be required for alterations to the existing building on the project site.

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.

All applications are available in the Planning Department lobby at 1650 Mission Street Suite 400, at the Planning Information Center at 1660 Mission Street, or online at www.sfplanning.org. Building Permit applications are available at the Department of Building Inspection (DBI) 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 notified.

PRELIMINARY PROJECT COMMENTS:

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

1. Western SoMa Community Plan & Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan. The subject property falls within the area covered by the Western SoMa Special Use District and Western SoMa Community Plan Area within the Eastern Neighborhoods. As proposed, the project is generally consistent with the overarching objectives of the Plan, though the project and design comments below discuss any items where more information is needed to assess conformity with either specific policies or Code standards or where the project requires minor modification to achieve consistency. The project sponsor is encouraged to read the full plan, which can be viewed at http://www.sfplanning.org/index.aspx?page=3545.

2. Rear Yard. Planning Code Section 134 outlines the rear yard requirements within the RED-MX Zoning District. The minimum rear yard depth shall be equal to 25 percent of the total depth of the lot. The
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rear yard requirement would only apply to the two new floor levels. Currently, the proposed project does not meet this requirement, and would require a variance from the Zoning Administrator. To the extent possible, the new vertical addition should seek to comply with the rear yard requirement.

3. Open Space. Planning Code Section 135 outlines the requirements for usable open space per residential unit. Generally, at least 80 square feet of private or common open space (per dwelling unit) is required for each residential unit. Per Planning Code Section 135, common open usable space must be at least 15-ft in every horizontal dimension, and a minimum area of 300 sq ft. Further, Planning Code Section 823(c)(2)(B) states that roof decks shall not qualify as required private or common useable open space. Please include the square footage calculations and dimensions for all of the provided open space.

Currently, the proposed project includes open space via a second-story balcony and a roof deck; therefore, the project would require a variance from the Zoning Administrator. The project should strive to provide as much code-complying open space, as possible. The Western SoMa Special Use District does not allow rooftop open space to be counted as code-complying open space; therefore, alternate design solutions must be sought to address the open space requirement.

4. San Francisco Green Landscaping Ordinance. The proposed project is subject to the San Francisco Green Landscaping Ordinance, which is described in Planning Code Section 138.1. This Planning Code section outlines a provision for adding street trees when adding gross floor area equal to 20 percent or more of the gross floor area of an existing building. A 24-inch box size street tree would be required for each 20 feet of frontage of the property along each street or alley, with any remaining fraction of 10 feet or more of frontage requiring an additional tree. Based on the street frontage, it appears that one street tree would be required along Natoma Street. Existing trees, if they were present on the project site, would apply towards the street tree requirement. Please comply with this code section by providing an updated site plan showing landscaping and street trees with the EEA, as the project site does not specify whether any trees are part of the subject lot. Also, please check with the Department of Public Works and obtain an “Interdepartmental Referral for Feasibility of Tree Planting or Removal.”

5. Exposure. Planning Code Section 140 outlines requirements for all dwelling units to face an open area. All dwelling units shall feature a window that directly faces onto a public street or an open area that is a minimum of 25 ft in width. Currently, the project includes new dwelling units on the basement level, which have a narrow window facing onto a public street. This window does not provide sufficient frontage for the new dwelling units; therefore, the proposed project will require a variance from the Zoning Administrator. To the extent possible, the project should seek to minimize exposure variances for new dwelling units.

6. Street Frontage. Planning Code Section 145.1 outlines requirements for street frontages to ensure that they are pedestrian-oriented, fine-grained, and are appropriate and compatible with the buildings in WMUG District. Currently, the proposed project appears to meet most of these requirements; however, as part of the EEA, please ensure that the ground floor street frontage meets all of these requirements as related to active use, height, transparency, fenestration, gates, railings and grillwork.
7. Bicycle Parking. Planning Code Section 155.2 outlines requirements for Class 1 and Class 2 bicycle parking spaces for residential developments. The proposed project is required to provide one Class 1 bicycle parking space for each new dwelling unit. Therefore, the proposed project is required to provide a total of six (6) Class 1 bicycle parking spaces. Please demonstrate how the project will meet this requirement.

8. Dwelling Unit Mix. Planning Code Section 207.6 outlines the requirements for minimum dwelling unit mix for new residential properties within an Eastern Neighborhoods Zoning District. The project must provide either: no less than 40 percent of the total number of proposed dwellings units as at least two bedroom units; or no less than 30 percent of the total number of proposed dwelling units as at least three bedroom units.

Currently, the existing building contains two one-bedroom units and two two-bedroom units. The proposed project would result in five one-bedroom units, four two-bedroom units, and one three-bedroom units. Therefore, the project meets the dwelling unit mix requirements.

9. Narrow Street Height Provisions. For projects on the south side of an east-west street within the RED-MX Zoning District along a Narrow Street (a public right of way less than or equal to 40 feet in width, or any mid-block passage or alley that is less than 40 feet in width), Planning Code Section 261.1 specifies that the subject frontage must feature an upper story setback equal to a sun access plant of 45 degrees from the most directly opposite northerly property line. No part or feature of a building may penetrate the required setback plane. Natoma Street measures approximately 35-ft wide, and would be considered a “narrow street.” Currently, the project does not meet this requirement. Please revise the project massing to meet the required upper story setbacks. The height requirement cannot be varied.

10. Eastern Neighborhoods Impact Fees. The Eastern Neighborhoods Impact Fee applies to the project. These fees shall be charged in accordance with Section 423 of the Planning Code. Fees shall be assessed per net new gross square footage on new residential use. The project is subject to Tier 1 Eastern Neighborhoods Impact Fees.

The Eastern Neighborhoods Impact Fee shall be paid before the City issues a first construction document, with an option for the project sponsor to defer payment to prior to issuance of the first certificate of occupancy upon agreeing to pay a deferral surcharge in accordance with Section 107A.13.3 of the San Francisco Building Code.

Option for In-Kind Provision of Community Improvements and Fee Credits. Project sponsors may propose to directly provide community improvements to the City. In such a case, the City may enter into an In-Kind Improvements Agreement with the sponsor and issue a fee waiver for the Eastern Neighborhoods Impact Fee from the Planning Commission, for an equivalent amount to the value of the improvements. This process is further explained in Section 412.3(d) of the Planning Code.4

PRELIMINARY DESIGN COMMENTS:

The project site is located in the Western SoMa Area Plan along a small, mostly residential, street. The context includes primarily four story-buildings with light coloring and masonry materials. The following comments address preliminary design issues that may significantly impact the proposed project:

1. **Site Design, Open Space, and Massing.** As per Planning Code Section 261.1, the project should conform to the sun angle requirements that project a 45-degree angle from the opposite side of the street. This may increase the required setback at the upper level. In this spirit, the Planning Department encourages a slightly larger setback than is currently proposed to further differentiate the vertical addition from the existing historic resource, below.

2. **Architecture.** The Planning Department recommends that the design of the addition reflect the historic organization of the lower level—specifically the bay windows, cornice element, and symmetry—but express them in a more subdued and simple architectural language. The addition should not try to replicate the historic style. Because an increased setback will make the central stair difficult to continue in the façade, this can be internalized so that it is more central to unit access if needed. This shift in detailing and character will help the addition read both as compatible and contemporary.

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 **March 30, 2016.** Otherwise, this determination is considered expired and a new Preliminary Project Assessment is required. Such applications and plans must be generally consistent with those found in this Preliminary Project Assessment.

Enclosure: Neighborhood Group Mailing List
Interdepartmental Project Review Application
Flood Notification: Planning Bulletin
SFPUC Recycled Water Information Sheet
Preliminary Shadow Fan
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<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94107</td>
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<td>94103</td>
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</tr>
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<td>94102-6526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed</td>
<td>Bement</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Rincon Hill Residents Association</td>
<td>75 Folsom Street #1800</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>Minott</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Potrero Hill Neighbors/Save the Hill</td>
<td>1206 Mariposa Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonja</td>
<td>Kos</td>
<td>Community Advocate</td>
<td>TODCO Impact Group</td>
<td>230 Fourth Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>Olsson</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>TJPA CAC</td>
<td>30 Sharon Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94114-1709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiffany</td>
<td>Bohee</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, City and County of San Francisco</td>
<td>1 South Van Ness Avenue, 5th Floor</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony</td>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Potrero Boosters Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>1459 - 18th Street, Suite 133</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>Loo</td>
<td></td>
<td>York Realty</td>
<td>243A Shipley Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94107-1010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELEPHONE</td>
<td>EMAIL</td>
<td>NEIGHBORHOOD OF INTEREST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415-431-4210</td>
<td><a href="mailto:acabande@somcan.org">acabande@somcan.org</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415-362-2500</td>
<td>podersf.org</td>
<td>Excelsior, Mission, South of Market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415-902-7635</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mmsadv@pacbell.net">mmsadv@pacbell.net</a></td>
<td>Potrero Hill, South of Market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415-417-8215</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cdfalk@tndc.org">cdfalk@tndc.org</a>, <a href="mailto:ceddings@tndc.org">ceddings@tndc.org</a></td>
<td>Downtown/Civic Center, South of Market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415-847-3169</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ethanhough@gmail.com">ethanhough@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Financial District, South of Market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415-626-6650</td>
<td><a href="mailto:wolfgk@earthlink.net">wolfgk@earthlink.net</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415-554-7970</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jane.kim@sfgov.org">jane.kim@sfgov.org</a>, Aprll <a href="mailto:veneracion@sfgov.org">veneracion@sfgov.org</a>, <a href="mailto:Sunny.Angulo@sfgov.org">Sunny.Angulo@sfgov.org</a>, <a href="mailto:lvv.Lee@sfgov.org">lvv.Lee@sfgov.org</a></td>
<td>Chinatown, Downtown/Civic Center, Marina, Mission, Nob Hill, North Beach, Pacific Heights, Presidio Heights, Russian Hill, Seacliff, South of Market, Treasure Island/YBI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415-282-5516</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jc@carpinelli.com">jc@carpinelli.com</a></td>
<td>Potrero Hill, South of Market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415-722-0617</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jhenders@sbcglobal.net">jhenders@sbcglobal.net</a></td>
<td>Castro/Upper Market, Downtown/Civic Center, Mission, South of Market, Western Addition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415-552-2401</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jim.meko@comcast.net">jim.meko@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>Mission, South of Market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415-412-2207</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Kiddell2001@yahoo.com">Kiddell2001@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415-724-1953</td>
<td><a href="mailto:LMNOP@yak.net">LMNOP@yak.net</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415-652-9330</td>
<td><a href="mailto:keith@everestsf.com">keith@everestsf.com</a></td>
<td>Mission, Potrero Hill, South of Market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415-565-0201</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kbaxter26@gmail.com">kbaxter26@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Downtown/Civic Center, Financial District, Marina, Nob Hill, Pacific Heights, Presidio Heights, Russian Hill, Seacliff, South of Market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415-674-1935</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sfoffice@afsc.org">sfoffice@afsc.org</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415-882-7871</td>
<td><a href="mailto:marvisphillips@gmail.com">marvisphillips@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Downtown/Civic Center, Mission, South of Market, Western Addition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415-553-5969</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rhberen@sbcglobal.net">rhberen@sbcglobal.net</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415-428-6819</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rodminott@hotmail.com">rodminott@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>Potrero Hill, South of Market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415-407-0094</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sonja@todco.org">sonja@todco.org</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415-861-0345</td>
<td><a href="mailto:olssonsted@yahoo.com">olssonsted@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>Financial District, South of Market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415-803-2469</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tiffany.bohee@sfgov.org">tiffany.bohee@sfgov.org</a>, <a href="mailto:mike.grasso@sfgov.org">mike.grasso@sfgov.org</a>, <a href="mailto:courtney.pash@sfgov.org">courtney.pash@sfgov.org</a></td>
<td>Bayview, Downtown/Civic Center, South of Market, Visitacion Valley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415-751-8602</td>
<td><a href="mailto:yorklou@gmail.com">yorklou@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interdepartmental Project Reviews are mandatory for new construction projects that propose buildings eight stories or more and new construction on parcels identified by the State of California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology as Seismic Hazard Zones in the City and County of San Francisco. Projects identified as such, must request and participate in an interdepartmental project review prior to any application that requires a public hearing before the Planning Commission or new construction building permit.

Project Sponsors may elect to request an interdepartmental review for any project at any time, however, it is strongly recommended that the request is made prior to the submittal of the above referenced 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). A representative from each of these City Agencies will attend your meeting.

**Interdepartmental Project Review fees:**

1. $1,308 for five or fewer residential units and all affordable housing projects.
2. $1,859 for all other projects.

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 (2) weeks from the receipt of the request form and check.*

www.sfplanning.org
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.
APPLICATION DATE: ________________________________

PROJECT CONTACT:
Name __________________________________________ Phone No. ( ) ________________________
Address _________________________________________
City __________________________ Zip Code ________________
FAX No. ( ) ______________________ E-Mail Address ______________________
Name of Property 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 separate sheet, 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>

Will this project be publicly funded? (specify) ________________________________

Previously contacted staff (if applicable) ________________________________

(Please submit four (4) copies/sets of the Application Form, Floor Plans, Pictures, etc.)
This Bulletin alerts project sponsors to City and County review procedures and requirements for certain properties where flooding may occur.

**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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APRIL 2007</td>
<td>Administrative Code Section 2A.280-2A.285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reprinted:</td>
<td>Formerly known as: Planning Department Bulletin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTOBER 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

http://www.flickr.com/photos/planningdept/3374718616/in/photostream/
PERMIT APPLICATION PROCESS:
Applicants for building permits for new construction, change of use, change of occupancy, or major alterations or enlargements will be referred to the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) at the beginning of the process 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 SFPUC 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 must comply with SFPUC requirements for projects in flood-prone areas. Such requirements may include provision of a pump station for the sewage flow, raised elevation of entryways, special sidewalk construction, and deep gutters.
FOR MORE INFORMATION:
Call or visit the San Francisco Planning Department

Central Reception
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco CA 94103-2479
TEL: 415.558.6378
FAX: 415 558-6409
WEB: http://www.sfplanning.org

Planning Information Center (PIC)
1660 Mission Street, First Floor
San Francisco CA 94103-2479
TEL: 415.558.6377
Planning staff are available by phone and at the PIC counter.
No appointment is necessary.
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

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

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

**New Service Line Permits**
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Customer Service Bureau
(415) 551-3000
NOTE:

1. ALL BACKFLOW PREVENTERS MUST BE APPROVED BY SFPUC WATER QUALITY BUREAU.

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

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

RESPONSIBILITY OF INSTALLATION OF

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

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

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

INSTALLATION OF RECYCLED WATER SERVICE LINES
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