DATE: June 23, 2015
TO: Carlton Linnenbach, Solbach Property Group
FROM: Chris Kern, Planning Department
RE: PPA Case No. 2015-003880PPA for 636 – 648 4th Street

Please find the attached Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) for the address listed above. You may contact the staff contact, Debra Dwyer, at (415) 575-9031 or debra.dwyer@sfgov.org, to answer any questions you may have, or to schedule a follow-up meeting.

Chris Kern, Senior Planner
Preliminary Project Assessment

Date: June 23, 2015
Case No.: 2015-003880PPA
Project Address: 636 – 648 4th Street
Block/Lot: 3786/035
Zoning: MUO – Mixed-Use Office
85-X
Area Plan: East SoMa Plan area
Proposed Central SoMa Plan area
Project Sponsor: Carlton Linnenbach, Solbach Property Group
415-637-7373
Staff Contact: Debra Dwyer – 415-575-9031
debra.dwyer@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, San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, and others. The information included herein is based on plans and information provided for this assessment and the Planning Code, General Plan, Planning Department policies, and local/state/federal regulations as of the date of this document, all of which are subject to change.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The proposal is to demolish the two existing commercial buildings totaling 14,390 square feet as well as a general advertising sign onsite, and to construct a 37-story, 350-foot tall mixed-use building over a two-level, below-grade garage. The existing one-story and two-story buildings on the 17,400-square-foot (0.4 acre) subject lot were constructed in 1907. The proposed new building would include 427 dwelling units, 119 parking spaces, and 3,165 square feet of ground floor commercial space. The residential units would consist of 175 two-bedroom units, 147 one-bedroom units, 70 junior one-bedroom units, and 35 studio units. The retail space would consist of two spaces, a 2,630-square-foot retail space fronting on 4th Street and a 535-square-foot retail space fronting on Bluxome Street. The below grade parking garage would be accessed from Bluxome Street and would utilize parking stackers for 112 of the 119 parking spaces. In addition, four surface spaces and three accessible spaces would be provided. The residential lobby would be accessed from 4th Street. The loading dock would also be accessed from Bluxome Street. Approximately 182 bicycle parking spaces would be provided on the ground floor and accessed from the
The SoMa are utilized. Lobby. Common open space would be provided as follows: 2,194 square feet at the ground floor, a 2890-square-foot terrace at Level 2, a 2,840-square-foot terrace on Level 9, and an 8,175-square-foot rooftop terrace. The common open space would total 16,269 square feet. Private open space would consist of private balconies for 126 units located on Floors 2 through 8 and on Floors 10 through 37, though these are not shown on the current plans. Amenities for the residents consisting of a fitness facility, lounge, multi-media space, and dining area would be provided on Level 9. Approximately 65,000 cubic yards of soil would be excavated to a depth of 36 feet below grade for the project. A mat foundation would be utilized. Each basement level would be approximately 15 feet in height and the depth of excavation for the mechanical stackers would be up to six feet below the lowest basement level.

**PLANNING CONTEXT:**

The proposed project is located within the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan, which was evaluated in the *Eastern Neighborhoods Rezoning and Area Plans Programmatic Final Environmental Impact Report (Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR)*, certified in 2008.\(^1\) The project site also lies within the proposed Central SoMa Plan area, a community planning process initiated in 2011. The Central Corridor Plan Draft for Public Review\(^2\) (Draft Plan) was released in April 2013, with proposed changes to the allowed land uses and building heights in the Plan area, including a strategy for improving the public realm within the Plan area and vicinity. The Draft Plan is available for download at [http://centralsoma.sfplanning.org](http://centralsoma.sfplanning.org). The Central SoMa Plan will be evaluated in an Environmental Impact Report (EIR), which is currently underway. The Draft Plan and its proposed rezoning are anticipated to be before decision-makers for approval in 2016.

The existing zoning for the project site is MUO (Mixed-Use Office), which would not be changed by the Draft Plan. Residential uses, as proposed under the project, are allowed within Mixed-Use Office Districts. The Draft Plan includes two height alternatives. The Central SoMa Plan EIR will study the Draft Plan's Mid-Rise Height Alternative and a modified High-Rise Height Alternative. Under the Mid-Rise Height Alternative and the modified High-Rise Height Alternative, the proposed height and bulk designation for the project site is 85P/250T, which would allow a building up to 250 feet tall. At this point, it is unknown which height option, would ultimately be approved by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors. Further comments in this Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) are based on the Draft Plan concepts published to date, which are contingent on the approval of the proposed Central SoMa Plan rezoning by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors.

**ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:**

The proposed project requires environmental review either individually, with a project-specific Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration or Environmental Impact Report (EIR). The proposed project is located within the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan, which was evaluated in the *Eastern Neighborhoods Program EIR (PEIR)*. However, the proposed project is not consistent with the development density (zoning) identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan, and it is therefore not eligible for a

---


\(^2\) Please note that the Central SoMa Plan was formerly called the Central Corridor Plan. To avoid ambiguity, this letter uses the current “Central SoMa Plan” when referring to the ongoing planning process, while “Draft Plan” refers to the document published in April 2013 under the name “Central Corridor Plan Draft for Public Review.”
Community Plan Exemption (CPE) under the *Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR*. Nonetheless, because the project site is within the geographic area evaluated in the *Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR*, any development on the project site would potentially be subject to the mitigation measures identified in that document. Potentially significant project environmental impacts that were identified in and pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the *Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR* may be applicable to the proposed project.

As stated above, the project site is also located within the Central SoMa Plan area, which is under environmental review. However, the proposed project is not consistent with the development density (zoning) identified in the Draft Plan, and it would therefore not be eligible for a Community Plan Exemption (CPE) under the *Central SoMa Plan PEIR*, once completed. Nonetheless, because the project site is within the geographic area being evaluated in the *Central SoMa Plan PEIR*, any development on the project site could potentially be subject to the mitigation measures identified in that document.

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 (EEA) for the full scope of the project. EEAs are available in the Planning Department lobby at 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, at the Planning Information Center at 1660 Mission Street, and online at [www.sfplanning.org](http://www.sfplanning.org) under the “Publications” tab. See “Environmental Applications” on page 2 of the current Fee Schedule for calculation of environmental application fees.³ Note that until an entitlement application is submitted to the Current Planning Division, only the proposed Project Description will be reviewed by the assigned Environmental Coordinator.

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. Should you choose to have the initial study prepared by an environmental consultant, contact Devyani Jain at (415) 575-9051 for a list of three eligible consultants. 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, during which time concerned parties may comment on and/or appeal the determination. If no appeal is filed, the Planning Department would issue a final mitigated negative declaration (FMND). Additional information regarding the environmental review process can be found at: [http://www.sfplanning.org/modules/showdocument.aspx?documentid=8631](http://www.sfplanning.org/modules/showdocument.aspx?documentid=8631).

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 will be required. An EIR must be prepared by an environmental consultant from the Planning Department’s environmental consultant pool ([http://www.sfplanning.org/index.aspx?page=3458](http://www.sfplanning.org/index.aspx?page=3458)). The Planning Department will provide more detail to the project sponsor regarding the EIR process should this level of environmental review be required.

---
Below is a list of topic areas addressed through the environmental review process. Some of these would require additional study based on the preliminary review of the project as it is proposed in the PPA application dated March 25, 2015.

1. **Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE).** The two existing buildings on the project site are less than 50 years of age or were previously evaluated in a historical resources survey and found ineligible for national, state, or local listing; thus, no additional analysis of historical resources is required.

2. **Archeological Resources.** Project implementation would entail soil-disturbing activities associated with building construction, including excavation that would reach a depth of approximately 36 feet below grade. The proposed project will require Preliminary Archeological Review (PAR) by a Planning Department archeologist. To aid this review the Department archeologist may request a Preliminary Archeological Sensitivity Assessment (PASS) by a Department Qualified Archeological Consultant, subject to the review and approval by the Department archeologist. The Department archeologist will provide three names from the Qualified Archeological Consultant list if the PASS is required. The PAR will assess the archeological sensitivity of the project site based on in-house source material and will consider the potential for archeological impacts resulting from proposed soils disturbance. Please provide detailed information, including sections, proposed soils-disturbing activities, such as grading, excavation, installation of foundations, soils improvement, and site remediation in the EEA, and submit any available geotechnical/soils or phase II hazardous materials reports prepared for the project to assist in this review. If the Department archeologist determines that the project has a potential to adversely affect archeological resources, the PAR will identify additional measures needed to address the potential effect. These measures may include preparation of an archeological research design and treatment plan, implementation of project mitigation measures (such as archeological testing, monitoring, or accidental discovery), or other appropriate measures.

3. **Transportation Impact Study (TIS).** Based on the Planning Department’s Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines for Environmental Review, the project would require transportation analysis to determine whether the project may result in a significant transportation impact. Therefore, the Planning Department requires that a consultant listed in the Planning Department’s Transportation Consultant Pool prepare a Transportation Impact Study. You are required to pay additional fees for the study; please contact Virnaliza Byrd at (415) 575-9025 to arrange payment. Once you pay the fees, please contact Manoj Madhavan at (415) 575-9095 or manoj.madhavan@sfgov.org so that he can provide you with a list of three consultants from the pre-qualified Transportation Consultant Pool. Upon selection of a transportation consultant, the Department will assign a transportation planner who will direct the scope of the consultant-prepared study.

---

Additionally, the proposed project is located on a high injury corridor as mapped by Vision Zero. Planning staff have reviewed the proposed site plans and offer the following recommendations, some of which address the safety of persons walking and bicycling to and from the project site and vicinity:

- Plans submitted with the environmental evaluation application should show existing and proposed sidewalk widths.
- Please clarify whether there are existing curb cuts that would be modified for project access.
- The Planning Department recommends that the proposed driveway width be reduced from 22 feet to 12 feet.
- Further site design and access comments may be provided during the TIS review.
- Specify if the proposed project would contribute to the Bluxome Street Redesign Project. If so, please coordinate with Central SoMa planners.
- Lastly, please provide the specifications for the car stacking system that will be utilized.

4. **Noise.** The proposed project would introduce noise sensitive receptors in an area subject to high ambient noise levels. In addition, construction of the proposed project would occur in proximity to noise sensitive receptors. Therefore, the project sponsor would be required to engage a qualified acoustical consultant to prepare a noise study. The noise study should be scoped in coordination with the Environmental Review Coordinator ahead of the analysis proceeding.

5. **Air Quality (AQ) Analysis.** The proposed project’s 427 dwelling units exceed 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 likely to be required. Please provide detailed information related to construction equipment, phasing and duration of each phase, and volume of excavation as part of the EEA.

In addition, project-related demolition, excavation, grading and other construction activities may cause wind-blown dust that could contribute particulate matter into the local atmosphere. To reduce construction dust impacts, the proposed project will be required to adhere to the dust control requirements set forth in the Construction Dust Ordinance contained in San Francisco Health Code Article 22B and San Francisco Building Code Section 106.A.3.2.6.

The project site is also 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 modeling of air pollution, exposures, and health vulnerability from mobile, stationary, and area source emissions within San Francisco. The project proposes to construct new sensitive land uses (i.e., residential), which are subject to enhanced ventilation measures pursuant to Health Code Article 38. The project sponsor will be required to submit an Article 38 application to DPH prior to the issuance of any environmental determination. Please provide a copy of the Article 38 application with the EEA. In addition, equipment exhaust measures during construction will likely also be required and include development of a specific plan to minimize construction emissions. The Plan shall include estimates of the construction timeline by phase, with a description of each piece of off-road equipment required for every construction phase. Construction equipment engines would be

---

required to have engines that meet or exceed either U.S. Environmental Protection Agency or California Air Resources Board Tier 2 off-road emission standards, and have been retrofitted with an ARB Level 3 Verified Diesel Emissions Control Strategy.

If the project would generate new sources of toxic air contaminants including, but not limited to: diesel generators or boilers, or any other stationary sources, the project would result in toxic air contaminants that may affect both on-site and off-site sensitive receptors. Given the project’s proposed height of 350 feet, the proposed project would likely require a backup diesel generator. Due to the project location within an air pollution exposure zone, the sponsor would be required to utilize the best available control technology for the diesel generator installed. Please provide detailed information related to any proposed stationary sources with the EEA.

6. **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.

7. **Wind.** The proposed project would involve construction of a building over 80 feet in height. The project will therefore require a consultant-prepared wind tunnel analysis. The consultant will be required to prepare a proposed scope of work for review and approval by the Environmental Planning coordinator prior to proceeding with the analysis.

8. **Shadow.** The proposed project would result in construction of a building greater than 40 feet in height. A preliminary shadow fan analysis prepared by Planning Department staff indicates that the proposed project could cast shadows on Willie Mayes Plaza, China Basin Park, and designated Mission Bay open space. The project sponsor is therefore required to hire a qualified consultant to prepare a detailed shadow study. The consultant must submit a Shadow Study Application, which can be found on the Planning Department’s website ([http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=8442](http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=8442)). A separate fee is required. The consultant must also prepare a proposed scope of work for review and approval by Environmental Planning staff prior to preparing the analysis.

9. **Geology.** The project site is located within a Seismic Hazard Zone (Liquefaction Hazard Zone likely underlain by artificial fill). Any new construction on the site is therefore subject to a mandatory

---

Interdepartmental Project Review. A geotechnical study prepared by a qualified consultant must be submitted with the EEA. The study should address whether the site is subject to liquefaction, and should provide recommendations for any geotechnical concerns identified in the study. In general, compliance with the building codes would avoid the potential for significant impacts related to structural damage, ground subsidence, liquefaction, landslides, and surface settlement. To assist Planning Department staff in determining whether the project would result in environmental impacts related to geological hazards, it is recommended that you provide a copy of the geotechnical information with boring logs for the proposed project. This study will also help inform the Planning Department Archeologist of the project site’s subsurface geological conditions.

10. **Hazardous Materials.** The proposed project would include excavation to 36 feet below grade and would result in soils disturbance of approximately 65,000 cubic yards of soil. The project site is within the Maher Area, and therefore, the project is subject to Article 22A of the Health Code, also known as the Maher Ordinance. The Maher Ordinance, which is administered and overseen by the 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 22A.6. The Phase I ESA 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 at: [https://www.sfdph.org/dph/files/EHSdocs/ehsForms/FormsChemHz/2015-03_Maher_app.pdf](https://www.sfdph.org/dph/files/EHSdocs/ehsForms/FormsChemHz/2015-03_Maher_app.pdf). Fees for DPH review and oversight of projects subject to the ordinance would apply. Please refer to DPH’s fee schedule, available at: [https://www.sfdph.org/dph/EH/Fees.asp](https://www.sfdph.org/dph/EH/Fees.asp). Please provide a copy of the submitted Maher Application and Phase I ESA with the EEA.

Due to the age of the existing structures on the project site, other mitigation measures may apply to address proper disposal of hazardous building materials. The mitigation measure may require that the project sponsor ensure that any equipment containing polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) or di(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate (DEPH), such as fluorescent light ballasts, and any fluorescent light tubes containing mercury be removed and properly disposed of in accordance with applicable federal, state, and local laws. In addition, any other hazardous materials identified, either before or during work, must be abated according to applicable federal, state, and local laws.

Because the existing building was constructed prior to 1980, asbestos-containing materials, such as floor and wall coverings, may be found in the building. The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) is responsible for regulating airborne pollutants including asbestos. Please contact BAAQMD for the requirements related to demolition of buildings with asbestos-containing materials. In addition, because of its age (constructed prior to 1978), lead paint may be found in the

---

existing building. Please contact the San Francisco Department of Building Inspection (DBI) for requirements related to the demolition of buildings that may contain lead paint.

11. **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.

12. **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).

**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. **Height District Reclassification.** The project site is located within the 85-X height and bulk district, and the zoning concepts published in the Central Corridor Draft Plan (April 2013) indicate that a height limit of 250 feet is being considered for this site. This proposal is being analyzed in the Central SoMa Plan EIR, but this analysis is not an indication the height will ultimately be adopted as part of the Plan, nor does it guarantee the Planning Commission or the Board of Supervisors will approve changes to height limits. The proposed 350-foot tower does not conform to the existing or proposed height limit of 250 feet. Please see further discussion in the Preliminary Project Comments section.
2. **A Large Project Authorization** from the Planning Commission is required per Planning Code Section 329 for the new construction of a building greater than 75 feet in height and greater than 25,000 gross square feet. The 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](http://www.sfplanning.org). Building Permit applications are available at the Department of Building Inspections at 1660 Mission Street.

3. **A Demolition Permit Application** is required for the demolition of the existing structures on the subject property.

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

**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](http://www.sfplanning.org) under the “Permits & Zoning” tab. All registered neighborhood group mailing lists are available online at [www.sfplanning.org](http://www.sfplanning.org) under the “Resource Center” tab.

The project is located within the Eastern Neighborhoods Mixed Use District and requires **Neighborhood Notification** to owners and occupants within 150 feet of the project site prior to approval of the site permit, in accordance with Planning Code Section 312.

**Notification of a Project Receiving Environmental Review.** Notice may be 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 process. Please be prepared to provide mailing addresses on a CD upon request during the environmental review process.

**PRELIMINARY PROJECT COMMENTS:**

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

1. **Existing Zoning.** The subject property is zoned as a Mixed Use - Office (MUO) district, which allows housing and various commercial uses. It is located within the 85-X height and bulk district, which
does not permit the project’s proposed height and bulk. Therefore, the project could not be approved under the existing zoning.

2. **Central SoMa Plan.** The subject property falls within the ongoing Central SoMa Plan study area generally bounded by 2nd, 6th, Townsend and Market Streets. The Central Corridor Draft Plan was published in April 2013. The Draft Plan will be evaluated in an Environmental Impact Report (EIR). The Draft Plan proposes changes to the allowed land uses and building heights, and includes a strategy for improving the public realm in this area. The certification of the EIR, and adoption of the Plan and the proposed rezoning and affiliated Code changes are anticipated to be before decision-makers for consideration of approval in 2016.

The Central Corridor Draft Plan includes recommendations for new land use controls as well as new height and bulk controls for the subject property. The Draft Plan is available for download at [http://centralsoma.sfplanning.org](http://centralsoma.sfplanning.org). Further comments in this section of the PPA are based on the draft Central Corridor Draft Plan.

3. **Land Use.** The Central SoMa Draft Plan recommends the subject property remain in the Mixed-Use Office (MUO) zoning district that allows the proposed residential and retail uses. The area of the development parcel is less than 30,000 square feet and will not be subject to the requirements to provide non-residential uses on the site. The Central SoMa Plan is supportive of residential and retail uses on the site, which will help complement the non-residential development expected in the area.

4. **Urban Form: Height and Bulk.** In recognition of the desire to accommodate more growth in the area, the draft Central SoMa Plan recommends changing the height limit of the subject property to 250 feet. Projects of that height will be subject to bulk controls that will be adopted as part of the Central SoMa Plan. The most recent policy position on bulk is contained in the [Central SoMa Draft Policy Paper on Bulk](http://centralsoma.sfplanning.org) (February 2015), and is reflected in the following comments:

- Up to 85 feet in height, the building may maximize lot coverage as long as it accounts for rear yard and exposure requirements (as discussed below).
- All buildings along the major streets in Central SoMa area are expected to support the “streetwall” by being built along the property line up to 65 to 85 feet, although buildings along 4th Street will be required to be set back five feet from the property line in order to enable sidewalks that meet City standards.
- Above 85 feet in height, a stepback of at least 15 feet will be required along all property lines.
- The “tower” portion of the development is considered all of the development above 85 feet in height. For the tower portion, the Central SoMa Plan is proposes maximum residential floor size of 12,000 gross square feet.
- The maximum horizontal (“plan”) dimension is proposed to be 150 feet, and the maximum diagonal dimension is proposed to be 190 feet.
- The upper one-third of the tower must feature minimum bulk reductions of 15% of the floorplate and the maximum diagonal of 7.5% (though the upper tower bulk reduction shall not be required for any tower for which the overall tower is reduced from the maximum bulk allowance by an equal or greater volume).
- To receive the maximum floor plate, the tower must be separated by at least 115 feet from any other towers (i.e., buildings above 160 feet). This tower separation may be reduced to 85
feet if the second tower has a floor plate less than 10,000 gross square feet. Determining which tower is subject to reduced bulk and height will be based on timing of entitlements considered by the Planning Commission. The second tower that is entitled shall conform to the design of the first.

5. Eco-District. An Eco-district is a neighborhood or district where residents, community institutions, property owners, developers, and businesses join together with city leaders and utility providers to meet sustainability goals beneficial to the stakeholders, the district, and the City by formulating a portfolio of innovative projects at a district or block-level. The Planning Department has identified the Central SoMa Plan area as a Type 2 Eco-District—an area composed of many smaller parcels and property owners. Benefits to the district include greater resilience, economic prosperity, higher quality built environment, and community cohesion and capacity. The volunteer Central SoMa Task Force produced a set of Recommendations in November of 2013 (http://www.sfplanning.org/index.aspx?page=3051). All major new development in the Central SoMa Area Plan area will be expected to participate in some capacity in the Eco-District program and the Sustainability Management Association set up to guide it once the program is formulated in parallel with the Area Plan process. For more information please see: http://www.sfplanning.org/index.aspx?page=3051.

6. Interdepartmental Project Review. An Interdepartmental Project Review is required for all new construction that is eight stories or more, or located within a seismic hazard zone, and should be conducted prior to submittal of the development application. An application for the Interdepartmental Project Review is available in the Planning Department lobby at 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 or at the Planning Information Center (PIC) at 1660 Mission Street, and online at www.sfplanning.org.

7. Rear Yard. Section 134 requires the project to provide a rear yard of at least 25 percent of the lot depth at every level that contains a dwelling unit. As proposed, the project does not appear to provide a Code complying rear yard, and would require an approved modification through the Large Project Authorization process. While such configurations can be supported, a minimum of 25 percent of the lot area is preferred.

8. Open Space – Residential. Section 135 requires 80 square feet of usable open space that is either private or for common use by occupants of the building, or 54 square feet of publicly accessible open space for each of the 427 proposed dwelling units. The proposed 26,359 square feet of private/common open space is less than the 34,160 square feet that is required. If the project will provide publicly accessible open space, the required amount would be 23,058 square feet. The development application for the project can also fulfill this requirement through a combination of private/common and publicly accessible open space.

9. Open Space – Non-Residential. Section 135.3 requires this project to provide one square foot of open space for every 250 square feet of retail (and similar) uses. If the necessary open space cannot be created due to constraints of the development site, or because the project cannot provide safe and convenient access to the public, or because the required area of open space is not sufficient to be
usable, the Zoning Administrator may (i) authorize, as an eligible type of open space, a pedestrian mall or walkway within a public right-of-way which is improved with paving, landscaping, and street furniture appropriate for creating an attractive area for sitting and walking, or (ii) waive the requirement that open space be provided upon payment to the Open Space Fund for each square foot of open space otherwise required to be provided.

10. **Street Trees.** Planning Code Section 138.1 requires one street tree for every 20 feet of frontage for new construction with any remaining fraction of 10 feet or more of frontage requiring an additional tree. The proposed project will require a total of sixteen street trees along the 4th and Bluxome Street frontages, and the location of these trees will be determined during the review of the required Better Streets Plan (see below).

11. **Pedestrian Streetscape.** Section 138.1 also requires the submittal of a streetscape plan to the Planning Department consistent with the adopted Better Streets Plan showing the location, design, and dimensions of all existing and proposed streetscape elements in the public right-of-way directly adjacent to the fronting property, including street trees, sidewalk landscaping, street lighting, site furnishings, utilities, driveways, and curb lines, and the relation of such elements to proposed new construction and site work on the subject property.

12. **Vision Zero.** The project is located on a “high-injury corridor”, identified through the City’s [Vision Zero Program](#). The Sponsor is encouraged to incorporate pedestrian safety streetscape measures into the project. The Department’s Streetscape Design Advisory Team may require additional pedestrian safety streetscape measures due to the project’s location.

13. **Exposure.** Section 140 requires each dwelling unit to have windows in at least one room that meets the 120-square-foot minimum superficial floor area requirement of Section 503 of the Housing Code face directly on a street right-of-way, code-complying rear yard, or an appropriately sized courtyard. The proposed rear yard is not Code-complying and the units that do not front onto 4th Street do not meet the exposure requirement. Although you may request and justify an exposure exception through the Large Project Authorization process, the Department generally encourages projects to minimize the number of units needing an exposure exception.

14. **Street Frontage.** As new construction located within a South of Market Mixed Use District, the proposed project would be subject to the requirements for street frontages that include standards for active uses, ground floor ceiling heights, transparency and fenestration, among others pursuant to Planning Code Section 145.1.

15. **Ground Floor Uses.** Section 145.4 stipulates that an individual ground floor nonresidential use may not occupy more than 75 contiguous linear feet for the first 25 feet of depth along a street-facing façade. The proposed 2,630 square feet of retail space has over 80 linear feet of frontage along 4th Street and should be divided or reconfigured to meet this requirement.

16. **Shadow Analysis (Section 295).** Section 295 requires that a shadow analysis must be performed to determine whether the project has the potential to cast shadow on properties under the jurisdiction of
the San Francisco Recreation and Park Commission. Department staff has prepared a shadow fan that indicates the project would not cast new shadow on Recreation and Park property. However, the proposed project would cast shadow on publicly accessible open spaces, and as described in the Environmental Review section above, a shadow analysis is required.

17. **Shadow Analysis (Section 147)**  Section 147 requires that new buildings and additions to existing buildings in C-3, South of Market Mixed Use, and Eastern Neighborhoods Mixed Use Districts, new buildings that exceed a height of 50 feet shall be shaped, consistent with the dictates of good design and without unduly restricting the development potential of the site in question, to reduce substantial shadow impacts on public plazas and other publicly accessible spaces other than those protected under Section 295. A preliminary shadow study was conducted by Staff in conjunction with this PPA Application, and it indicated that the project will not cast a shadow on any park or open space protected under Planning Code Section 295. The shadow fan indicated that the project may cast new shadow on Willie Mayes Plaza, China Basin Park, and designated Mission Bay open space. Therefore, a detailed shadow analysis would need to be prepared to determine if the project would create new shadow that results in an adverse impact to Willie Mayes Plaza, China Basin Park, or designated Mission Bay open space, pursuant to Section 147. If this detailed shadow analysis finds that the project would cast shadow on Willie Mayes Plaza, China Basin Park, or designated Mission Bay open space, the sponsor should explore sculpting of portions of the project to avoid casting new shadows on the open space. In determining the impact of shadows, the following factors shall be taken into account: The amount of area shadowed, the duration of the shadow, and the importance of sunlight to the type of open space being shadowed.

18. **Off-Street Parking.** The proposed 119 off-street parking spaces exceed the 107 spaces that are principally permitted for the 427 dwelling units. Although you may request and justify an exception through the Large Project Authorization process, the Department encourages a minimal amount of off-street parking due to the central location of this project to alternative modes of transportation.

19. **Bicycle Parking.** For buildings containing more than 100 dwelling units, Section 155.2.11 also requires one Class 2 space for every 20 dwelling units. In addition, one Class 2 space is required for every 2,500 sq. ft. of retail occupied floor area. The proposed 427 dwelling units and 3,165 sq. ft. of commercial space will require four Class 2 spaces in addition to the 182 Class 1 spaces proposed.

20. **Car Share Requirements.** Pursuant to Section 166, the proposed project will require a minimum of three car-share parking spaces. When submitting your entitlement application, please ensure it meets Table 166 of this Section.

21. **Building Height.** As stated above, the proposed 350-foot tall building exceeds the current 85 feet height limit and proposed 250 feet height limit identified in the Draft Central SoMa Plan. The Department does not support this proposed height, and requests a development application that is consistent with either the existing 85 feet height limit or proposed 250 feet height limit.
22. **Impact Fees.** This project will be subject to various impact fees. Please refer to the Planning Director’s Bulletin No. 1 for an overview of Development Impact Fees, and to the Department of Building Inspection’s Development Impact Fee webpage for more information about current rates.

Based on an initial review of the proposed project, the following impact fees, which are assessed by the Planning Department, will be required:

- Transit Impact Development Fee (TIDF)
- Affordable Housing Fee (415)
- Eastern Neighborhoods Impact Fees (423)

23. **First Source Hiring Agreement.** A First Source Hiring Agreement is required for any project proposing to construct 25,000 gross square feet or more. For more information, please contact:

Ken Nim, Workforce Compliance Officer  
CityBuild, Office of Economic and Workforce Development  
City and County of San Francisco  
50 Van Ness, San Francisco, CA 94102  
(415)581-2303

24. **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).

25. **Stormwater.** If the project results in a ground surface disturbance of 5,000 square feet or greater, it is subject to San Francisco’s stormwater management requirements as outlined in the Stormwater Management Ordinance and the corresponding 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. To view
the Stormwater Management Ordinance, the Stormwater Design Guidelines, or download instructions for the Stormwater Control Plan, go to http://sfwater.org/sdg. Applicants may contact stormwaterreview@sfwater.org for assistance.

26. **Recycled Water.** Projects located in San Francisco’s designated recycled water use areas are required to install recycled water systems for irrigation, cooling, and/or toilet and urinal flushing in accordance with the Recycled (or Reclaimed) Water Use Ordinance, adopted as Article 22 of the San Francisco Public Works Code. New construction or major alterations with a total cumulative area of 40,000 square feet or more; any new, modified, or existing irrigated areas of 10,000 square feet or more; and all subdivisions are required to comply. To determine if the proposed project is in a designated recycled water use area, and for more information about the recycled water requirements, please visit sfwater.org/index.aspx?page=687.

**PRELIMINARY DESIGN COMMENTS:**

The project is located in the Central SoMa Plan Area currently in progress. The property is currently zoned for 85 feet in height but is anticipated to be up-zoned to 85P/250T with the adoption of the Draft Plan. The area is currently primarily commercial and industrial with one- to eight-story buildings predominantly constructed of brick and masonry. The anticipated development in the area will increase the density and height substantially including nearby high-rise construction due to its proximity to the 4th and King Caltrain Station and the coming 4th Street subway. The following comments address preliminary design issues that may significantly impact the proposed project:

1. **Open Space and Massing.** The Planning Department does not support the proposed project height (350 feet) and recommends that the project be revised to both conform to the proposed high-rise alternative height and bulk controls that require a 15-foot setback at a maximum of 85-foot height on all lot edges. The project should better conform to the intent of the mid-rise district with occasional spire-like towers which would indicate a design with a stronger streetwall and podium. Please refer to the Urban Form: Height and Bulk section (#4 under “Preliminary Project Comments”) for further detail.

2. **Street Frontage.** The design should explore opportunities for greater activation both along Bluxome and the interior property line along the 505 Brannan mid-block alley to form a three-sided interface. The current Bluxome side is currently shown as minimally engaging for pedestrians.

   The Planning Department also suggests both minimizing the amount of on-site parking as the site is well-served by public transit and combining the parking and loading entry.

3. **Architecture.** The Planning Department recommends that the project be sculpted at the top but otherwise supports the architectural intent and “quoins” expression.
Preliminary Project Assessment

PRELIMINARY PROJECT ASSESSMENT EXPIRATION:

This Preliminary Project Assessment is valid for a period of 18 months. An Environmental Evaluation, Conditional Use Authorization, or Building Permit Application, as listed above, must be submitted no later than November 23, 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.
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<td>470 Columbus Avenue, Ste. 211</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
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<td>CA</td>
<td>94107</td>
<td>415-355-1322</td>
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<td>Carpenters Local 22 &amp; NCCRC Research</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>94109</td>
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<td>Citywide</td>
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<tr>
<td>David</td>
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<td>CA</td>
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<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diego</td>
<td>Hernandez</td>
<td>President</td>
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<td>1717 17th Street, Ste. 100</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
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<td>415-252-1900</td>
<td><a href="mailto:grace@rbasf.com">grace@rbasf.com</a></td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Shanahan</td>
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<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
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<td>415-644-7043</td>
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<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td>Sousa</td>
<td>Secretary-Treasurer</td>
<td>SF Building and Construction Trades Council</td>
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<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
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<td>415-886-7014</td>
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<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Therault</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>SF Bay Area Association of Renters</td>
<td>1618 12th Street</td>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94607</td>
<td>215-900-1457</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sonja.brauss@gmail.com">sonja.brauss@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sona</td>
<td>Trausa</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Law Office of Stephen M. Williams</td>
<td>1934 Divisadero Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94115</td>
<td>415-292-3656</td>
<td><a href="mailto:SMW@lawofficestephenwilliams.com">SMW@lawofficestephenwilliams.com</a></td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>Hestor</td>
<td>Attorney at Law</td>
<td>San Francisco Tenants Union</td>
<td>558 Capp Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94110</td>
<td>415-282-5525</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ted@sftu.org">ted@sftu.org</a></td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>Gullicksen</td>
<td>Office Manager</td>
<td>San Francisco Tenants Union</td>
<td>558 Capp Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94110</td>
<td>415-282-5525</td>
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</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angelica</td>
<td>Cabande</td>
<td>Organizational Director</td>
<td>South of Market Community Action Network (SOMCAN)</td>
<td>1110 Howard Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>415-431-2410</td>
<td><a href="mailto:acabande@somcan.org">acabande@somcan.org</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonio</td>
<td>Diaz</td>
<td>Project Director</td>
<td>People Organizing to Demand Environmental and Economic Rights (PODER)</td>
<td>474 Valenza Street #125</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>415-962-2500</td>
<td><a href="mailto:msaav@podsnet.org">msaav@podsnet.org</a></td>
<td>Excelsior, Mission, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td>Diamond</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Mission Creek Harbor Association</td>
<td>870 Market Street, Suite 456</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-902-7635</td>
<td><a href="mailto:corinnewoods@cs.com">corinnewoods@cs.com</a></td>
<td>Potrero Hill, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corinne</td>
<td>Woods</td>
<td>Community Planner</td>
<td>Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation - CO Department</td>
<td>215 Taylor Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-358-3920</td>
<td><a href="mailto:agoldman@tnrdc.org">agoldman@tnrdc.org</a></td>
<td>Downtown/Civic Center, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandra</td>
<td>Goldman</td>
<td>Project Director</td>
<td>SoMaBend Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>P.O. Box 410805</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94104</td>
<td>415-669-0244</td>
<td><a href="mailto:somabant.na@gmail.com">somabant.na@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Downtown/Civic Center, Mission, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethan</td>
<td>Hough</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>One Ecker Owners Association</td>
<td>16 Jessie Street Unit 301</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94105</td>
<td>415-847-3169</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ethanhough@gmail.com">ethanhough@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Financial District, South of Market</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>
<td>415-882-7871</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rbement@sbqglobal.net">rbement@sbqglobal.net</a></td>
<td>South of Market</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>
<td>415-553-3899</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rodm@minott.com">rodm@minott.com</a></td>
<td>Potrero Hill, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>Olsson</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>OCIJA CAC</td>
<td>30 Sharon Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94114</td>
<td>415-407-0094</td>
<td><a href="mailto:olssoned@ymail.com">olssoned@ymail.com</a></td>
<td>Financial District, South of Market</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>
<td>415-861-0345</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tbohee@sfgov.org">tbohee@sfgov.org</a></td>
<td>Mission, Potrero Hill, South of Market</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>
<td>415-751-8602</td>
<td><a href="mailto:yorkkoo@gmail.com">yorkkoo@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>