DATE: February 3, 2015
TO: Jim Zack
FROM: Elizabeth Watty, Planning Department
RE: PPA Case No. 2014.1269U for 655-657 Capp Street

Please find the attached Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) for the address listed above. You may contact the staff contact, Erika S. Jackson, at (415) 558-6363 or erika.jackson@sfgov.org, to answer any questions you may have, or to schedule a follow-up meeting.

Elizabeth Watty, Assistant Director of Current Planning
Preliminary Project Assessment

Date: February 3, 2015 (revised)
Case No.: 2014.1269U
Project Address: 655-657 Capp Street
Block/Lot: 3615/047
Zoning: RTO-M (Residential Transit Oriented – Mission)
40-X Height and Bulk District
Area Plan: Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan (Mission)
Project Sponsor: Jim Zack
415-495-7889
Staff Contact: Erika Jackson – 415-558-6363
erika.jackson@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 proposed project would alter the existing three-story, 4,984-square foot, four-unit residential building on the site to create a four-story, 40-foot-tall, 11,255-square foot, nine-unit residential building. The proposed project would contain nine bicycle parking spaces and three-off-street parking spaces.

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. In order to begin formal environmental review, please submit an Environmental Evaluation Application (EEA). 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.¹

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 August 19, 2014.2

- **Historic Architectural Resources.** The existing building on the project site was previously evaluated in the South Mission Historic Resource Survey and was rated California Historic Resource Status Code 6Z, which represents properties deemed ineligible for National Register (NR), California Register (CR), or Local designation through survey evaluation.3 The project site is not located within an existing or proposed historic district. Therefore, further historic architectural review would likely not be required for the proposed project. However, an official determination will be made subsequent to submittal of the EEA.

- **Archeological Resources.** As indicated in the PPA submittal, project implementation would entail soil-disturbing activities associated with building construction, including excavation that would reach a depth of less than 10 feet below grade. Therefore, a Preliminary Archeological Review (PAR) would likely not be required. However, an official determination will be made subsequent to submittal of the EEA. Any available geotechnical/soils report prepared for the project site will be reviewed during the environmental review process. If the archeological review determines that archeological resources may be present, the project sponsor would be required to implement mitigation measures to avoid environmental impacts on potential archeological resources.

- **Geology.** The proposed project would require new foundations, excavation, and/or foundation improvements. Therefore, a geotechnical study prepared by a qualified consultant must be submitted with the EEA. The study should identify the primary geotechnical concerns associated with the proposed project and site and recommend minimization measures for potential issues regarding, but not limited to, soil preparation and foundation design. The geotechnical investigation will also assist in the archeological review of the project site (see Archaeological Resources section above).

- **Transportation Study.** Based on the Planning Department’s transportation impact analysis guidelines, a transportation study is not anticipated. However, an official determination regarding the need for a transportation study will be made subsequent to submittal of the EEA. The Planning Department’s Transportation subgroup has reviewed the proposed project plans and made the following comments:
  a) Show the existing/proposed curb cuts and dimensions on the plans.
  b) Clarify whether project includes closing or relocating any curb cuts.
  c) Show the sidewalk on Proposed First Floor Plan to provide a better understanding of the connection to the street/public right-of-way.

---

2 This submittal’s plans were revised per email from Erika Jackson to Sandy Ngan, SF Planning Department. FW: 655-657 Capp St - Revised PPA Letter Status, January 27, 2015.
Air Quality Analysis. The PPA application indicates that the proposed project would construct five additional residential units on the site (nine residential units on site when complete). The proposed project would be below the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's (BAAQMD) construction screening levels for criteria air pollutants. Therefore, an analysis of the project's criteria air pollutant emissions is not likely to be required. However, an official determination will be made subsequent to the submittal of the EEA.

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. 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.

The project site is not located within an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone, as mapped and defined by Health Code, Article 38. The Air Pollutant Exposure Zone identifies areas with poor air quality based on an inventory and modeling assessment of air pollution, exposures, and health vulnerability from mobile, stationary, and area source emissions within San Francisco. Given the project site is not within an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone, additional measures or analysis related to local health risks are not likely to be required. However, if the project would include new sources of toxic air contaminants including, but not limited to emissions from: 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. Detailed information related to any proposed stationary sources shall be provided with the EEA.

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

• **Noise.** The project site is located along Capp Street where traffic-related noise exceeds 60 dBA Ldn (a day-night averaged sound level). The proposed project would involve the construction of new noise-sensitive uses (e.g., residential uses). Given the sensitive uses planned for the proposed project, the Planning Department would require the preparation of a noise analysis that includes, at a minimum, a site survey to identify potential noise-generating uses within 900 feet of, and that have a direct line-of-sight to, the project site, and including at least one 24-hour noise measurement (with maximum noise level readings taken at least every 15 minutes), prior to the first approval action. The analysis shall be prepared by persons qualified in acoustical analysis and/or engineering and shall demonstrate with reasonable certainty that Title 24 standards, where applicable, can be met, and that there are no particular circumstances about the proposed project site that appear to warrant heightened concern about noise levels in the vicinity. In addition, project open spaces should be protected from existing ambient noise levels to the maximum extent possible. 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.

• **Shadow Study.** The proposed project would result in a 40-foot-tall, four-story building. Given that the proposed building is within the 40-foot height threshold, no shadow analyses would be required for the proposed project. However, should changes in the form, scale, or mass of the proposed building be required, the proposed project may require additional analysis of potential shadow impacts to recreational resources subject to Planning Code Section 295 and other parks and open spaces not subject to Planning Code Section 295.

• **Stormwater.** The project would result in a ground surface disturbance of 5,000 feet or greater and is subject to San Francisco’s stormwater management requirements as outlined in the Stormwater Management Ordinance and the corresponding San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) Stormwater Design Guidelines (Guidelines). Projects that trigger the stormwater management requirements must prepare a Stormwater Control Plan demonstrating project adherence to the performance measures outlined in the Guidelines including: (a) reduction in total volume and peak flow rate of stormwater for areas in combined sewer systems OR (b) stormwater treatment for areas in separate sewer systems. Responsibility for review and approval of the Stormwater Control Plan is with the SFPUC, Wastewater Enterprise, Urban Watershed Management Program. Without SFPUC approval of a Stormwater Control Plan, no site or building permits can be issued. The Guidelines also require a signed maintenance agreement to ensure proper care of the necessary stormwater controls. The project’s environmental evaluation should generally assess how and where the implementation of necessary stormwater controls would reduce the potential negative impacts of stormwater runoff. To view the Stormwater Management Ordinance, the Stormwater Design Guidelines, or download instructions for the Stormwater Control Plan, go to [http://sfwater.org/sdg](http://sfwater.org/sdg).

• **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](http://www.sfethics.org).

• **SFPUC Project Review.** The SFPUC has a separate project review process for projects that propose to use land owned by the SFPUC or are 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 stormwater requirements, please visit the For Developers webpage at [http://www.sfwater.org/index.aspx?page=574](http://www.sfwater.org/index.aspx?page=574).

If the additional analysis outlined above indicates that the proposed project would not have a significant impact on the environment, the project may qualify for a Categorical Exemption, in which case the Planning Department would issue a Certificate of Determination of Exemption from Environmental Review.

If any of the additional analyses determine that mitigation measures not identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods area plan EIR are required to address peculiar impacts, the environmental document will be a focused initial study/mitigated negative declaration with a supporting Community Plan Exemption (CPE) checklist. If the additional analyses identify impacts that cannot be mitigated, the environmental document will be a focused EIR with a supporting CPE checklist. A community plan exemption and a
focused initial study/mitigated negative declaration can be prepared by Planning Department staff, but focused EIR with supporting CPE checklist 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. EEAs 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. A Building Permit Application is required for the alteration of the existing building on the subject property.

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. 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.

Per Planning Code Section 311, the proposed project requires a neighborhood notification. Please submit the required materials with the Building Permit Application. Instructions are available on our website at: http://sfplanning.org/modules/showdocument.aspx?documentid=8675

PRELIMINARY PROJECT COMMENTS:

The following comments address specific Planning Code and other general issues that may significantly impact the proposed project.
1. **Rear Yard.** Section 134 requires the project to provide a rear yard of at least 45 percent of the lot depth or 45 feet. Under the alternate method of averaging, the rear yard would be averaged with full lot coverage on one side and 75% lot coverage on the other side, resulting in a rear yard requirement of 25 percent of lot depth, or 25 feet.

2. **Curb Cuts.** Per the Residential Design Guidelines, the curb cut for the new parking garage should be no more than 10 feet wide. The existing 2 curb cuts should be removed and a curb restored through a permit with the Department of Public Works. Leaving the existing 2 curb cuts for such a relatively small amount of parking creates adverse effects on pedestrians, bicyclists, and overall design. The second curb cut would unnecessarily prohibit additional on-street parking.

3. **Street Trees.** Per Planning Code Section 138.1, additions of 20 percent or more require one 24-inch-box tree for every 20 feet of street frontage, with any remaining fraction of 10 feet or more of frontage requiring an additional tree. The proposed project requires 2 trees along Capp Street. If the Department of Public Works makes the determination that street trees cannot be located along Capp Street, please be advised that an in-lieu fee will be required.

4. **Bicycle Parking.** Per Planning Code Section 155.5, one Class 1 bicycle parking space is required for each dwelling unit, and one Class 2 bicycle parking space is required for each 20 dwelling units. The proposed project requires 9 Class 1 bicycle parking spaces.

5. **Eastern Neighborhood Impact Fees.** Fees shall be assessed per net new gross square footage on residential and non-residential uses within the Plan Area. Fees shall be assessed on residential projects according to the gross square feet of additional residential space in the project. For the most up-to-date schedule, please refer to the Department of Building Inspection (DBI) fee register: http://sfdbi.org/index.aspx?page=617. Fees shall be assessed per Tier 1 requirements.

6. **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. More information on In-Kind Agreements can be found in the Application Packet for In-Kind Agreement on the Planning Department website: http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=8601

7. **Eastern Neighborhoods Plan.** The subject property falls within the area covered by the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan in the General Plan. 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 for consistency. The plan can be reviewed at http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1673
8. **Mission District Streetscape Plan.** The subject property is included in the area of the Mission District Streetscape Plan. As proposed, the project is consistent with the overarching objectives of the Plan. The project sponsor is encouraged to read the full plan to review long term design recommendations for Capp Street as identified as potential residential traffic calmed street. The plan can be reviewed at [http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/CDG/CDG_mission_streetscape.htm](http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/CDG/CDG_mission_streetscape.htm)

**PRELIMINARY DESIGN COMMENTS:**

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

1. **Site Design, Open Space, and Massing.** The overall massing, site design and open space of the proposed building are appropriate.

2. **Street Frontage.** The frontage should provide a consistent and active relationship with the fronting street. The ground floor residential unit should have a directly accessible entrance from the street, raised and setback that provides a transition from the street to the dwelling per the draft Ground Floor Residential Design Guidelines. A setback terrace at the ground level may count toward open space.

   Gates, screens, and fences at the ground floor patios should be no higher than 3’-6” and be transparent. The Planning Department recommends larger windows at the ground floor unit.

   Refer to the draft Ground Floor Residential Design Guidelines for treatment of the building along the street of residential uses on the ground floor. The draft guidelines are located on the Department website under “Resource Center/Department Publications/Guidelines for Ground Floor Residential Design.”

   The Planning Department recommends raising the ground floor height to accommodate this and to better proportion the common lobby entrance, and building in general.

3. **Architecture.** The proportions of the windows are appropriate, however, the Planning Department suggests considering larger windows at the stair corridors that relate to a residential scale.

   The Planning Department recommends shifting the vertical fiber cement element from above the garage to above the lobby to create transitional architectural component that better identifies the entrance, relates to the adjacent building’s vertical brick element and expresses the internal program.

**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 August 3, 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

cc:  Braulio Ulloa, Property Owner
     Erika S. Jackson, Current Planning
     Sandy Ngan, Environmental Planning
     Ilaria Salvadori, Citywide Planning and Analysis
     Jonas Ionin, Planning Commission Secretary
     Jerry Robbins, MTA
     Jerry Sanguinetti, DPW
     Pauline Perkins, PUC (tentative, pending email response)
     June Weintraub and Jonathan Piakis, DPH
     Planning Department Webmaster (webmaster.planning@sfgov.org)