DATE: August 7, 2015
TO: Andrew Junius
FROM: Kate Conner, Planning Department
RE: PPA Case No. 2015-006509PPA for 2201 Bayshore Boulevard

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.

Kate Conner, Senior Planner
Preliminary Project Assessment

Date: August 7, 2015
Case No.: 2015-006509PPA
Project Address: 2201 Bayshore Boulevard
Block/Lot: 5087/004-005
Zoning: M-1

Schlage Lock Visitacion Valley SUD
40-X
Area Plan: Visitacion Valley/Schlage Lock Area Plan

Project Sponsor: Andrew Junius
415-567-9000

Staff Contact: Erika S. Jackson – 415-558-6363
erika.jackson@sfgov.org

DISCLAIMERS:

This Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) letter provides feedback to the project sponsor from the Planning Department regarding the proposed project described in the PPA application submitted on May 8, 2015, as summarized below. This PPA letter identifies Planning Department review requirements for the proposed project, including those related to environmental review, approvals, neighborhood notification and public outreach, the Planning Code, project design, and other general issues of concern for the project. Please be advised that the PPA application does not constitute an application for development with the Planning Department. The PPA letter also does not represent a complete review of the proposed project, does not grant a project approval of any kind, and does not 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, Public Works, the Municipal Transportation Agency, Department of Public Health, San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, and others. The information included herein is based on the PPA application and plans, 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 construct two new residential buildings totaling approximately 188,000 square feet with a total of 205 dwelling units and 156 parking spaces. The south building is proposed to be 68 feet tall with 7 stories above grade and 2 below grade parking levels. The north building is proposed to be 57 feet tall with 6 stories above grade and 2 below grade storage levels. The project also proposes to change
the Zoning District from M-1 to MUG, and change the Height and Bulk District from 40-X to 57-X and 68-X.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:

In order to begin formal environmental review, please submit an Environmental Evaluation Application (EEA). The EEA can be submitted at the same time as the PPA Application. The environmental review may be done in conjunction with the required approvals listed below, but must be completed before any project approval may be granted. 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. 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 under the “Publications” tab. See “Environmental Applications” on page 2 of the current Fee Schedule for a calculation of environmental application fees.¹

On December 18, 2008 the San Francisco Planning Commission and former San Francisco Redevelopment Agency certified the Final Environmental Impact Report for the Visitacion Valley Redevelopment Program (Visitacion Valley Redevelopment Program EIR, File No. 2006.1308E). The Visitacion Valley Redevelopment Program EIR analyzed the Redevelopment Program for an approximately 46-acre project site in San Francisco’s Visitacion Valley neighborhood. The project site is comprised of two Redevelopment Zones: Redevelopment Zone 1 encompasses approximately 20 acres located east of Bayshore Boulevard, including the former Schlage Lock property, former Southern Pacific Transportation Company property, and other industrial parcels. Redevelopment Zone 2 encompasses an approximately 26-acre area featuring a mix of commercial, light industrial, residential, and mixed-use parcels fronting Bayshore Boulevard and both sides of Leland Avenue.

On May 27, 2014, the Planning Department prepared an Addendum to the Visitacion Valley Redevelopment Program EIR (Addendum 1, File No. 2006.1308E) in response to revisions to the proposed Redevelopment Program (Modified Project). The Modified Project included increased height limits and revised net growth projections for new residential units, new neighborhood-serving commercial space, and new cultural, institutional and educational development within Redevelopment Zone 1. The Modified Project did not include any changes to Redevelopment Zone 2.

The proposed project site is located within Redevelopment Zone 1. If it is determined that the proposed project was not analyzed in Addendum 1, a second addendum to the Visitacion Valley Redevelopment Program EIR may be prepared for the proposed project. However, if after performing the background studies it is determined that new impacts would occur that were not identified in the Visitacion Valley Redevelopment Program EIR and/or additional mitigation measures are necessary, an addendum cannot be prepared; an Initial Study would 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.

**Historic Resources.** The project site contains one or more buildings previously determined to be eligible for national, state, or local listing as a historic resource. The property was surveyed as part of the Visitacion Valley Redevelopment Program EIR. Therefore, the proposed project is subject to review by the Department’s Historic Preservation staff. To assist in this review, the project sponsor must hire a qualified professional to prepare a Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE) report. The professional must be selected from the Planning Department’s Historic Resource Consultant Pool. Please contact Tina Tam, Senior Preservation Planner, via email (tina.tam@sfgov.org) for a list of three consultants from which to choose. The selected consultant must scope the HRE in consultation with Department Historic Preservation staff. Please contact the HRE scoping team at HRE@sfgov.org to arrange the HRE scoping. Following an approved scope, the historic resource consultant should submit the draft HRE report for review to Environmental Planning after the project sponsor has filed the EE Application and updated it as necessary to reflect feedback received in the PPA letter. Historic Preservation staff will not begin reviewing the project until a complete draft HRE is received.

**Archeological Resources.** The proposed project would include soil-disturbing activities associated with building construction, including excavation that would reach a depth of approximately 17 to 21 feet below grade, in Redevelopment Zone 1. The project site is also located within an Archeologically Sensitive Area. As such, the proposed project could be subject to Visitacion Valley Redevelopment Program EIR Cultural and Historical Resources Mitigation Measure 10-2: Disturbance of Known Archeological Resources. The proposed project will require Preliminary Archeological Review (PAR) by a Planning Department archeologist. 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, of proposed soils-disturbing activities, such as grading, excavation, installation of foundations, soils improvement, and site remediation with the EEA, and submit any available geotechnical/soils or Phase II hazardous materials reports prepared for the project to assist in this review.

In accordance with Cultural and Historical Resources Mitigation Measure 10-2, the project sponsor shall retain the services of a qualified archeological consultant, subject to the review and approval by the Department Archeologist. The project sponsor must contact the Department Archeologist to obtain the names and contact information for the next three archeological consultants on the QACL. The archeological consultant shall determine, in consultation with the Department, project locations and activities that may affect archeological resource sites, identify measures needed to address the potential effect. These measures may include preparation of an Archeological Testing Program (ATP), conducting an Archeological Monitoring Program (AMP) and/or Archeological Data Recovery Program (ADRP), and other appropriate measures such as those described in Cultural and Historical Resources Mitigation Measure 10-2 and Visitacion Valley Redevelopment Program EIR Cultural and Historical Resources Mitigation Measure 10-3: Disturbance of Unknown Archeological Resources.

In addition, Visitacion Valley Redevelopment Program EIR Cultural and Historical Resources Mitigation Measure 10-5: Disturbance of Paleontological Resource could apply to the proposed project. This measure is intended to avoid any potential adverse effect on accidentally discovered buried or submerged paleontological resources. Should a paleontological resource be encountered on the project site, the project sponsor must immediately suspend any project-related soil-disturbing activities and retain the service of a qualified paleontological consultant to identify and evaluate the resource. Based on
this assessment, the paleontological consultant would determine the appropriate action necessary to prevent any significant adverse effects on the resource, in consultation with the Department.

- **Transportation.** Based on the Planning Department's Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines for Environmental Review, the project would require additional transportation analysis to determine whether the project may result in a significant 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 project site is located near a high-injury pedestrian intersection 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 cycling to and from project site and vicinity:

- Show the project site in context of the surrounding street network, and clarify that Leland Avenue and Raymond Avenue are proposed and have not yet been constructed.
- Clarify whether the proposed Bayshore Plaza would be included in this project.
- Provide a circulation plan for the proposed project that includes: Sidewalk widths, driveway location (existing and proposed with widths), pedestrian and bicycle access points to the building, circulation on the project site (i.e. between the proposed buildings).

- **Noise.** The proposed project could be subject to *Visitacion Valley Redevelopment Program EIR Noise Mitigation Measure 13-1: Project-Facilitated Remediation-, Demolition-, and Construction-Period Noise.* Noise Mitigation Measure 13-1 requires that project sponsors incorporate remediation, demolition, and construction noise abatement measures into contractor agreements as a condition of demolition and construction permit issuance. Noise generated by construction-related activities would also be regulated by the San Francisco Noise Ordinance (San Francisco Police Code, Article 29), which includes restrictions on the type of construction equipment used and the hours during which construction may occur. Detailed information on construction equipment, phasing, and duration of each construction phase may be required as part of the environmental evaluation to assess the project's construction noise levels and methods to reduce such noise, as feasible.

The proposed project would include locating new residential development on a project site within approximately 110 feet of the Caltrain line; therefore, *Visitacion Valley Redevelopment Program EIR Noise Mitigation Measure 13-2: Project-Facilitated Groundborne Vibration Levels* would apply to the project. This measure requires that the project sponsor conduct a vibration study demonstrating that groundborne vibrations associated with rail operations would not exceed applicable Federal
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Transportation Authority (FTA) thresholds or can be reduced to acceptable levels through building design or construction design measures.

Visitacion Valley Redevelopment Program EIR Noise Mitigation Measure 13-3: Potential Exposure of New, Project-Facilitated Noise-Sensitive Development to Ambient Noise Levels Exceeding Standards could also be required for the proposed project. Noise Mitigation Measure 13-3, which is intended to reduce potential conflicts between existing noise-generating uses and new sensitive receptors, requires that a noise analysis be prepared for new development including a noise-sensitive use, prior to issuance of a residential building permit. The analysis must include, at a minimum, a site survey to identify potential noise-generation uses within 900 feet of, and that have a direct line-of-sight to, the project site. At least one 24-hour noise measurement (with average and maximum noise level readings taken so as to able to accurately describe maximum levels reached during nighttime hours) shall be included in the analysis. The analysis shall be prepared by person(s) qualified in acoustical analysis and/or engineering and shall demonstrate with reasonable certainty that Title 24 standards can be met, and that there are no particular circumstances about the project site that appear to warrant heightened concern about noise levels in the vicinity. In addition, the study shall provide noise reduction measures, such as those described in Noise Mitigation Measure 13-3.

Air Quality. The proposed excavation exceeds the Bay Area Air Quality Management District’s (BAAQMD) screening levels for construction-related 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 proposed project is also required to prepare a Construction Dust Control Plan for review and approval by the Department of Public Health (DPH).

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 that 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 must be provided with the EEA.
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4 BAAQMD, CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, May 2011, Chapter 3.
Equipment exhaust measures during construction, such as those listed in Visitacion Valley Redevelopment Program EIR Air Quality Mitigation Measure 9-1-C: Remediation- and Construction-Related Air Quality Impacts will likely be required. Visitacion Valley Redevelopment Program EIR Air Quality Mitigation Measure 9-2: Long-Term Regional Emissions Impacts, which establishes strategies for reducing overall emissions from traffic and area sources, would likely apply to the proposed project.

- **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.

- **Geology.** The proposed project would be located on a project site with a slope greater than 20 percent and would include approximately 11,188 cubic yards of excavation. Therefore, a geotechnical study is required. The geotechnical study must be prepared by a qualified consultant and submitted with the EEA, 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 Department Archeologist of the project site's subsurface geological conditions.

- **Hazardous Materials.** The proposed project would include excavation of approximately 11,188 cubic yard of soil in order to accommodate the basement levels of the proposed buildings, which would be approximately 17 to 21 feet below grade. The project site is also located in Redevelopment Zone 1 on the former Southern Pacific Transportation Company property where historical uses, and previous industrial activities on adjacent property, have resulted in soil and groundwater contamination. The California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) is the designated lead agency for determination and oversight of soil and groundwater cleanup requirements for the proposed project site. Implementation of future development in Redevelopment Zone 1 would be dependent on the site's cleanup according to DTSC protocols.

In addition, the proposed 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, requires the project sponsor to retain the services of a qualified professional to prepare a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) that meets the requirements of Health Code Section 22.A.6. As the lead agency for remediation activities in Redevelopment Zone 1, DTSC would coordinate with DPH on the implementation of the Maher Program on the project site.

DPH requires that projects subject to the Maher Ordinance complete a Maher Application, available at: http://www.sfdph.org/dph/EH/HazWaste/hazWasteSiteMitigation.asp. Fees for DPH review and oversight of projects subject to the ordinance would apply. Please refer to DPH’s fee schedule, available at: http://www.sfdph.org/dph/EH/Fees.asp#haz. Please provide a copy of the submitted Maher Application and Phase I ESA with the EEA.

- **Hydrology and Water.** Based on the Visitacion Valley Redevelopment Program EIR, the project site is located in an area with the potential for soil erosion. The proposed project would include approximately 11,188 cubic yards of excavation. Therefore, Visitacion Valley Redevelopment Program EIR Hydrology and Water Quality Mitigation Measure 12-2: Increased Risk of Soil Erosion and Contaminant Spills During Project Remediation and Construction, which requires project sponsors to implement design features and measures to minimize project-generated erosion and control for potential hazardous materials spills, would likely apply.

- **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 the Tree Planting and Protection Checklist with the EEA and ensure that trees are appropriately shown on site plans. Also see the comments below under “Street Trees.”

**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. Please note that the subject parcel is located within the Visitacion Valley Schlage Lock Plan Area.

1. **Rezoning.** The project site is located within an M-1 (Light Industrial) Zoning District. The proposed residential project would not be permitted at the proposed density. The proposed project includes a rezoning of the property to the MUG (Mixed Use General) Zoning District, which requires the Board of Supervisors approval of a Zoning Map Amendment for the subject parcel.

2. **Height District Reclassification.** The project site is located within a 40-X Height and Bulk District. The height of the proposed project would exceed the existing height limit. The proposed project includes a rezoning of the property to the 57-X and 68-X Height and Bulk Districts, which requires the Board of Supervisors approval of a Height District Reclassification for the subject parcel.

3. **A Lot Line Adjustment Application** from the Department of Public Works is required for the proposed lot line adjustment.
4. **Building Permit Applications** are required for the demolition of the existing buildings and proposed new construction on the subject property.

If the Zoning Map Amendment and Height District Reclassification are approved, the following applications would also be required:

5. **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 or greater than 25,000 gross square feet. Planning Code Section 329 outlines the requirements for a Large Project Authorization that will be applicable if the project is rezoned to an MUG Zoning District. A Large Project Authorization is required for new building construction exceeding 75 feet in height or 25,000 gross square feet. All large projects are subject to review by the Planning Commission in an effort to achieve the objectives and policies of the General Plan, the applicable Design Guidelines and the Planning Code. To the extent possible, the project should be designed to minimize deviations and should strive to comply with all Planning Code requirements.

6. **A Shadow Analysis Application** is required for new construction over 40 feet in height that would cast a shadow on properties designated to be acquired by the Recreation and Parks Department.

If the Zoning Map Amendment and Height District Reclassification are not approved, the following applications would also be required:

7. **A Conditional Use Authorization** from the Planning Commission is required per Planning Code Section 207 to allow the construction of residential units in an M-1 Zoning District.

Applications are available in the Planning Department lobby at 1650 Mission Street Suite 400, at the Planning Information Center at 1660 Mission Street, and online at [www.sfplanning.org](http://www.sfplanning.org). Building Permit applications are available at the Department of Building Inspection 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](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 also required to hold a **Post-Application Meeting** for Site and Building Permit Applications and Parks and Public Open Space Subject to Design Review. The following requirement applies to applications for site and/or building permits and parks or other public open space subject to design review. During the 30-day public review period prior to project approval, the project sponsor shall hold a public meeting on or proximate to the proposed project site. A representative from the Planning
Department shall attend any such meeting. Documentation that the meeting took place shall be submitted to the Planning Department consistent with the Department’s pre-application meeting proof-of-meeting requirements and shall be kept with the project file. The Planning Director, or Planning Commission if required, shall not approve such a project prior to any such required meeting.

PRELIMINARY PROJECT COMMENTS:

The following comments address specific Planning Code and other general issues that may significantly impact the proposed project. When the Planning Code requirements differ between the M-1 and MUG Zoning Districts it is noted below; otherwise, the Planning Code requirements are the same for both Zoning Districts.


The planning process that led to the establishment of the Special Use District and associated Plans (the former Redevelopment Plan, the 2009 Design for Development), date back to 2000. The 2009 Design for Development (D4D) document memorializes the vision of a park/open space adjacent to the historic office building. It also includes the potential for housing on the southern portion of the site. The amended D4D document (2014) maintains the vision for the parcel as open space with the potential for housing. The 2014 Open Space and Streetscape Master Plan (OSSMP) for the Schlage Lock site includes a “Blanken Park alternative,” which calls for open space, gardens and public programming on the site.

The current M-1 Zoning District allows residential uses at a density ratio not exceeding the number of dwelling units permitted in the nearest residential zoning district with a Conditional Use Authorization. In this case, the nearest residential zoning district is RH-i (Residential, House, Single-Family). Therefore, a density ratio of one unit per 1,500 square feet of lot area would be allowed with a Conditional Use Authorization. With a lot size of 35,993 square feet, a maximum of 24 dwelling units would be allowed. The project sponsor is requesting a reclassification to MUG (Mixed-Use General) and greater height limits similar to those of the adjacent Schlage Lock site. If the project is successfully rezoned to the proposed MUG Zoning District, there is no residential density limit.

The adjacent Schlage Lock development agreement and accompanying zoning emerged from over 15 years of community process and is part of a master plan which provides significant public benefits, including public open space, streetscape and transportation improvements, access improvements to the Caltrain station, increased affordable housing, and restoration of the historic office building – including the provision of community space. Moreover, the Schlage Lock project will be building substantial basic infrastructure (e.g. streets, water, sewer), and it is possible that the 2201 Bayshore project will benefit from these investments. Comparable to the process for the Schlage Lock site, the Planning Department would expect any reclassification of this site to be vetted through a public process that includes consideration of design and public benefits. Related to this site particularly, the community has long prioritized benefits and amenities associated with the old office building and open space. Any proposed public benefits should be inspired by and consistent with the Design for Development document and Open Space and Streetscape Master Plan. (See Public Realm

The Department recommends coordinating with the Planning Department and the Office of Economic and Workforce Development in order to discuss a public engagement process and next steps. For contact information, please see the Visitacion Valley/Schlage Lock page on the Planning Department's website: http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1682.

2. **Existing Height and Bulk.** The subject property is located within a 40-X Height and Bulk District, which does not permit the project's proposed height and bulk. The proposed project could not be approved under existing zoning; therefore, a height reclassification is required.

3. **Building Bulk.** Planning Code Section 249.45 outlines bulk and mass limitations. Please ensure that the project plans provide adequate detail in order for staff to determine compliance with this Planning Code requirement.

4. **Site Planning/Urban Design Concept Plan.** The Department encourages that this lot is developed with a site plan that references the broader community process that resulted in the adoption of the first D4D document in 2009 and the current D4D document in June 2014. The Urban Design Concept Plan in both documents shows no buildings on the northern side of the lot, but rather an extension of the Blanken Street Park. The Department encourages the addition of more public open space especially on the northern side of this lot in order to be consistent with the Visitacion Valley Schlage Lock Open Space and Streetscape Master Plan and the Design for Development document.

5. **Major Modification.** Per Planning Code Section 249.45, a Major Modification is any deviation of more than 10 percent from any quantitative standard in this Special Use District or the Design for Development document. If the project is seeking any such deviation then the Major Modification must be approved by the Planning Commission. Additionally, any modifications to Bulk and Massing, Ground Floor Entrances, Private Open Space, Car Sharing, and Public Realm as outlined in either Planning Code Section 249.45 and the Design for Development document also requires a Major Modification that can be approved by the Planning Commission.

6. **Rear Yard.** Planning Code Section 134 requires a minimum rear yard setback of 25% of the lot depth to be provided at the lowest story containing a dwelling unit, and at each succeeding level or story of the building. As proposed, all residential floors of the project encroach into the required rear yard; therefore, the project does not comply. The Planning Department recommends the provision of a comparable amount of open space equivalent to what would have been provided in a compliant rear yard. This deviation would be approved as an exception under the Large Project Authorization or as a Major Modification if a Large Project Authorization is not required.

7. **Open Space (Residential).** For the MUG Zoning District, Planning Code Section 135 requires the project to provide 80 sf of open space for every dwelling unit (if non publicly accessible) and 54 sf of open space for every dwelling unit (if publicly accessible). For the M-1 Zoning District, Planning Code Section 249.45 requires the project to provide 50 sf of open space for every dwelling unit (if common) and 60 sf of open space for every dwelling unit (if private). As proposed, the project provides approximately 16,488 sf of a combination of publicly accessible and not publicly accessible open space. As proposed, there is not sufficient detail provided to determine whether the project
meets the open space requirements. Please ensure that the project plans provide adequate detail in order for staff to determine compliance.

8. **Permitted Obstructions.** Planning Code Section 136 establishes specific dimensional and glazing requirements for bay window projections. As proposed, there is not sufficient detail provided to determine whether the proposed bay windows and balconies comply. Please ensure that the project plans provide adequate detail in order for staff to determine compliance.

9. **Exposure.** Section 140 requires that each dwelling unit have 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 does not provide a large enough courtyard to meet the exposure requirement for those units that only have windows fronting the rear yard area. Therefore, the proposed project requires revision to meet the minimum exposure requirement, or 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. As proposed, there is not sufficient detail provided to determine whether the project meets the exposure requirements. Please ensure that the project plans provide adequate detail in order for staff to determine compliance.

10. **Rooftop Screening.** Planning Code Section 141 establishes specific rooftop screening requirements. As proposed, there is not sufficient detail provided to determine whether the project meets the rooftop screening requirements. Please ensure that the project plans provide adequate detail in order for staff to determine compliance.

11. **Street Trees/Streetscape Plan/Pedestrian Improvements.** Planning Code Section 138.1 outlines the requirements for streetscape and pedestrian improvements, including the requirement for new street trees and a streetscape plan. Per Planning Code Section 138.1, the project sponsor will be required to submit a Streetscape Plan illustrating the location and design of streetscape improvements appropriate to the street type, including site furnishings, landscaping, corner curb extensions, and sidewalk widening as appropriate. The Planning Department may require these elements as part of conditions of approval. Streetscape designs should be consistent with the Schlage Lock Open Space + Streetscape Master Plan, which can be found at [http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1682](http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1682). The project sponsor should coordinate streetscape and pedestrian improvements with the master developer of the adjacent Schlage Lock site. Required streetscape and pedestrian improvements are not eligible for in-kind fee credit.

12. **Bird Safety.** Planning Code Section 139 outlines the standards for new construction to reduce bird mortality and bird hazards. Please refer to these standards to ensure compliance with the Standards for Bird-Safe Buildings.

13. **Shadow Analysis.** Based upon the preliminary analysis and submitted materials, the project will have potential shadow impacts on nearby property designated to be acquired by the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department. A Shadow Analysis Application will be required if the proposed building(s) exceed 40 feet in height.
14. **Shadow Analysis (Section 295).** Planning Code 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 or designated to be acquired by the San Francisco Recreation and Park Commission. Department staff has prepared a shadow fan that indicates the project may cast new shadow on Blanken Park, the Leland Greenway, and Visitacion Park. Therefore, a detailed shadow analysis would need to be prepared to determine if the project would create new shadow in that results in an adverse impact to Blanken Park, the Leland Greenway, and Visitacion Park, pursuant to Section 295. If this detailed shadow analysis finds that the project would cast shadow on Blanken Park, the Leland Greenway, and Visitacion Park, the sponsor should explore sculpting of portions of the project to avoid casting new shadows on the park.

15. **Street Frontage.** New construction located within an MUG Zoning District would be subject to the requirements for street frontage as outlined in Planning Code Section 145.1, including the requirements for active uses, ground floor ceiling heights, transparency and fenestration, among others. Please refer to Planning Code Section 145.1. In addition, Planning Code Section 249.45 requires that residential entrances line the streets as described in the D4D document. Please ensure that the project plans provide adequate detail in order for staff to determine compliance with both Code Sections.

16. **Parking.** Under the current zoning and the proposed zoning, no parking would be required. However, each of these zoning districts would have parking maximums, which are listed in Planning Code Section 151.1. Per Planning Code Section 249.45, parking is limited to up to one parking space for every dwelling unit in the Schlage Lock Visitacion Valley Special Use District. Based on the existing and future transit accessibility of the site and the need to limit traffic volumes in the area, parking should be minimized on site. The project as proposed complies with this Code Section.

17. **Bicycle Parking.** Planning Code Section 155.1-155.4 provides requirements for bicycle parking and associated facilities (i.e. showers and lockers) in new residential development. Based on the proposed plans, which includes 205 dwelling units, the proposed project is required to provide a minimum of 126 Class 1 bicycle parking spaces and 10 Class 2 bicycle parking spaces. The project as proposed complies with this Code Section.

18. **Dwelling Unit Mix.** For the MUG Zoning District, Planning Code Section 207.6 states that at least 40% of the dwelling units in each building with residential uses shall contain at least 2 bedrooms or that states that at least 30% of the dwelling units in each building with residential uses shall contain at least 3 bedrooms. For the M-1 Zoning District, Planning Code Section 249.45 states that at least 30% of the dwelling units in each building with residential uses shall contain at least 2 bedrooms. The project appears to comply with this Code Section, however, please provide more detail on the floor plans in order for staff to be able to determine if the bedroom size and arrangement is in compliance.

19. **Visitacion Valley Community Facilities and Infrastructure Fee.** The Visitacion Valley Community Facilities and Infrastructure Fee shall be paid before the City issues a first construction document. The fee is $4.58 for each net addition of occupied square feet of residential use.

20. **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 Visitation Valley Community Facilities and Infrastructure Fee from the Planning Commission, for an equivalent amount to the value of the improvements. This process is further explained in Section 420.3(c) of the Planning Code. More information on in-kind agreements can be found in the Application Packet for In-Kind Agreement at http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=8601

21. Public Realm Improvements. Blanken Park and the public space near the old office building have been identified as priority projects in the Schlage Lock D4D and OSSMP documents. The concept proposal in the Schlage Lock Open Space + Streetscape Master Plan includes community gardens, safe and landscaped pedestrian connections, well-designed stairs, fitness stations, and landscaped slopes. See comments in the Preliminary Design Comment section below for more discussion.

22. Transit Impact Development Fee. Pursuant to Planning Code Section 411 et seq., the Transit Impact Development Fee may apply if uses other than residential are added to the proposal. Please be aware that an ongoing process – the Transportation Sustainability Program may eventually replace the Transit Impact Development Fee. You can find more information about this program here: http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=3035

23. Bayshore Multi-modal Facility Location Study. The City and County of San Francisco are currently evaluating alternative locations and designs for a multi-modal facility to strengthen transit connections in the Schlage Lock area, including a planned bus rapid transit (BRT) route. The “multi-modal facility” may be as simple as an enhanced streetscape, as significant as a new enclosed structure, or any range of investments which fall between the two. The Project Sponsor should ensure designs that support transit access and multi-modal connections in the area, as consistent with BRT plans and Study findings. The Study is expected to have public engagement commencing in Fall 2015 and to conclude in Spring 2016. For more information contact Jeremy Shaw at (415) 575-9135 or Jeremy.Shaw@sfgov.org.

24. Affordable Housing. Pursuant to Planning Code Section 415, any housing project which consists of ten or more dwelling units shall satisfy the Inclusionary Housing Program requirements outlined in Planning Code Section 415.3(b), Table 415.3. Table 415.3 provides alternatives which include payment of a 20% fee, providing 12% (of the total # of units) on-site as affordable, or 20% (of the total # of units) off-site as affordable. Please see Planning Code Section 415 for further Inclusionary Housing Program Code requirements which also includes submission of an Affidavit of Compliance to the Planning Department depending on the alternative sought. Any on-site affordable dwelling-units proposed as part of the project must be designated as owner-occupied units, not rental units. Affordable units designated as on-site units shall be sold as ownership units and will remain as ownership units for the life of the project.

For your information, if a project proposes rental units, it may be eligible for an on-site alternative to the Affordable Housing Fee if it has demonstrated to the Planning Department that the affordable units are not subject to the Costa Hawkins Rental Housing Act (a Costa Hawkins exception). Affordable units are not subject to the Costa Hawkins Rental Housing Act under the exception provided in Civil Code Sections 1954.50 through one of the following methods:

a. Direct financial construction from a public entity
b. Development bonus or other form of public assistance
You must state in your submittal how the project qualifies for a Costa Hawkins exception. If the project is deemed eligible, we may start working with the City Attorney on the agreement.

25. **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 Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102  
   (415) 581-2303

**PRELIMINARY DESIGN COMMENTS:**

The project is located in the Visitation Valley/Schlage Lock Development Project area, the result of a long community planning process. The current neighborhood context includes primarily three-story residential buildings with some nearby ground floor retail along Bayshore Boulevard. The proposed more immediate context is intended to include residential buildings of up to 57 or 68 feet in height with minimal and specifically located ground floor commercial uses. In addition, the adjacent historic office building will be restored and include community uses. This site, most recently envisioned as a park, is also adjacent to CalTrain tracks and right-of-way. The following comments address preliminary design issues that may significantly impact the proposed project:

1. **Site Design, Open Space, and Massing.** Overall, the Urban Design Advisory Team (UDAT) recommends a more modestly built project located in the southern portion of the site that more directly supports the recent community planning intent to have an open space with smaller buildings rather than maximum built envelop with edge pathways. In the direction of a more modest scenario, UDAT would encourage the creation of an open space from Blanken Avenue to the extension of Raymond Avenue that is well-connected and accessible to the public. It would be also important to establish a welcoming pedestrian connection between Bayshore Boulevard and Street A.

2. **Street Frontage.** Generally, the project should respect and enhance the planned street grid, infrastructure and pedestrian networks in the Development Project area. UDAT would support residential units at the ground floor in alignment with the approved Design of Development document. Particular detail, transparency, and design attention should be given for the facades, exterior design elements and pathways that face onto larger passageways and open space, for example, at the end of Leland Avenue and its greenway. The sponsor should consider a community room with outdoor interface to activate adjacent open space on the northern portion of the site.

3. **Architecture.** As the project is diagrammatic, UDAT does not yet have any specific architectural comments however more generally recommends the use of high quality materials, significant depth between façade planes, and thoughtful detailing to provide interest at the pedestrian level.
PRELIMINARY PROJECT ASSESSMENT EXPIRATION:

This Preliminary Project Assessment is valid for a period of 18 months. An application, as listed above, must be submitted no later than February 7, 2017. 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.

cc: Julie Heinzler, Property Owner
    Erika Jackson, Current Planning
    Jenny Delumo, Environmental Planning
    Jeremy Shaw, Citywide Planning and Analysis
    Jonas Ionin, Planning Commission Secretary
    Charles Rivasplata, SFMTA
    Jerry Sanguinetti, Public Works
    Pauline Perkins, SFPUC
    Planning Department Webmaster (planning.webmaster@sfgov.org)