DATE: September 1, 2015
TO: Chris Foley, Polaris Pacific
FROM: Chris Kern, Planning Department
RE: PPA Case No. 2015-007464PPA for 552 Brannan Street

Please find the attached Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) for the address listed above. You may contact the staff contact, Elizabeth Purl, at (415) 575-9028 or elizabeth.purl@sfgov.org, to answer any questions you may have, or to schedule a follow-up meeting.

Chris Kern, Senior Planner
Preliminary Project Assessment

Date: September 1, 2015
Case No.: 2015-007464PPA
Project Address: 552 Brannan Street
Block/Lot: 3777/042
Zoning: SALI (Service/Arts/Light Industrial)
40/55X Height and Bulk District
Area Plan: Western SoMa, Central SoMa
Project Sponsor: Chris Foley – Polaris Pacific
415-361-4803
Staff Contact: Elizabeth Purl – 415-575-9028
elizabeth.purl@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 June 3, 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 demolish the existing 24,000-square-foot (sf) industrial building, which is presently occupied by office uses, and construct a mixed-use development with residential uses over ground floor retail space. The project would include two buildings connected by an internal courtyard and walkway. The building fronting Freelon Street would be 45 high and the building fronting Brannan Street would be up to 130 feet high. The proposed new building would include 77 dwelling units, 34 vehicle parking
spaces, 80 bike parking spaces, and 2,281 sf of commercial space along Brannan Street. The project would require excavation to a depth of up to 19 feet for the proposed subsurface parking and elevator pits.

BACKGROUND:

The proposed project is located within the Western SoMa Community Plan, which was evaluated in the Western SoMa Community Plan, Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels, and 350 8th Street Project Environmental Impact Report (Western SoMa PEIR), certified in 2012. 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 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. 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 SALI (Service/Arts/Light Industrial), which does not allow the existing office use, while the proposed use district for the project site in the Draft Plan is Mixed-Use Office (MUO), which would allow the residential and retail uses proposed under the project. The Draft Plan includes two height alternatives. The Central SoMa Plan Environmental Impact Report (EIR) will study the Draft Plan’s Mid-Rise Height Alternative and a modified High-Rise Height Alternative, both of which would change height limits for the project site. Under both the Mid-Rise Height Alternative and the modified High-Rise Height Alternative the proposed height designation for the site is 85/130 along Brannan Street and 45 along Freelon Street, which would allow buildings up to 130 feet tall on some portions of the project site.

The proposed project site is also located within an area being studied under the “Land Use Variant” of the Central SoMa Plan, which would maintain a restriction on new housing in the area roughly bounded by Bryant, Townsend, Fourth, and Sixth streets that is currently zoned SALI or MUO.

At this point, it is unknown which height option, if any, or land use variant would ultimately be approved by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors. Further Central SoMa Plan-related comments in this 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 EIR, or in a Community Plan Exemption (CPE) if the project is consistent with an adopted community plan (see the discussion under “Community Plan Exemption” below). The proposed project is located within the Western SoMa Area Plan, which was evaluated in the
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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.”
Western SoMa PEIR. However, the proposed project is not consistent with the land use or development density (zoning) identified in the Western SoMa Area Plan, and it is therefore not eligible for a CPE under the Western SoMa PEIR.

The project’s proposed building heights range from 45 to 130 feet. These heights would be consistent with the height limit options studied in the Central SoMa Plan EIR. Thus, it is possible that the proposal, as currently presented, would qualify for a CPE under the proposed Central SoMa Plan EIR once that EIR is certified and the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors have adopted new zoning controls. However, the proposed project would be assessed based on the height limits for the project site in place at the time that the Planning Department entitlements for the proposed project are sought.

Due to the project’s location within the geographic area evaluated in the Western SoMa 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 Western SoMa PEIR that may be applicable to the proposed project are discussed below, under the applicable environmental topic. However, mitigation measures from the Western SoMa PEIR that are applicable to the proposed project area could be refined, augmented, or superseded under the future Central SoMa Plan EIR, which would become applicable to the proposed project if the Draft Plan is approved.

**Community Plan Exemption**

Section 15183 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines states that projects that are consistent with the development density established by a community plan for which an EIR was certified do not require additional environmental review, except as necessary to determine the presence of project-specific significant effects not identified in the programmatic plan area EIR. A CPE may be prepared for such projects. Please note that a CPE is a type of exemption from environmental review, and cannot be modified to reflect changes to a project after approval. Proposed increases beyond the CPE project description in project size or intensity after project approval will require reconsideration of environmental impacts and issuance of a new CEQA determination.

Within the CPE process, there can be three different outcomes as follows:

1. **CPE Only.** All potentially significant project-specific and cumulatively considerable environmental impacts are fully consistent with significant impacts identified in the underlying area plan EIR (assumed here to be the Central SoMa Plan EIR), and there would be no new significant impacts that are peculiar to the proposed project or site. In these situations, all pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings in the underlying area plan EIR are applied to the proposed project, and a CPE checklist and certificate is prepared. With this outcome, the applicable fees are: (a) the CPE determination fee (currently $13,659) and (b) the CPE certificate fee (currently $7,580).

2. **Mitigated Negative Declaration.** If new site- or project-specific significant impacts are identified for the proposed project that were not identified in the underlying area plan EIR, and if these new significant impacts can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level, then a focused mitigated negative declaration is prepared to address these impacts, and a supporting CPE checklist is prepared to address all other impacts that were encompassed by the underlying area plan EIR, with all pertinent
mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the underlying area plan EIR also applied to the proposed project. With this outcome, the applicable fees are: (a) the CPE determination fee (currently $13,659) and (b) the standard environmental evaluation fee (which is based on construction value).

3. **Focused EIR.** If any new site- or project-specific significant impacts cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level, then a focused EIR is prepared to address these impacts, and a supporting CPE checklist is prepared to address all other impacts that were encompassed by the underlying area plan EIR, with all pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the underlying area plan EIR also applied to the proposed project. With this outcome, the applicable fees are: (a) the CPE determination fee (currently $13,659); (b) the standard environmental evaluation fee (which is based on construction value); and (c) one-half of the standard EIR fee (which is also based on construction value). An EIR must be prepared by an environmental consultant from the Planning Department’s environmental consultant pool (http://www.sfplanning.org/ftp/files/MEA/Environmental_consultant_pool.pdf). The Planning Department will provide more detail to the project sponsor regarding the EIR process should this level of environmental review be required.

As discussed above, the proposed project is located within the proposed Central SoMa Plan Area, which is under evaluation in the forthcoming Central SoMa Plan EIR; if the proposed project is consistent with the development density identified in the Central SoMa Plan, it may be eligible for a CPE. If the proposed 552 Brannan Street project is not consistent with the height and density identified for the project site in the adopted Central SoMa Plan, it would be precluded from qualifying for a CPE under the Central SoMa Plan. The proposed project would be analyzed in a separate environmental document that would not rely on the environmental analysis undertaken for the Central SoMa Plan. In this case, the applicable fees would be (a) the standard environmental evaluation (EE) fee based on the cost of construction; and (b) the standard EIR fee, if an EIR is required.

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.** EEA 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.³

Below is a list of topic areas that would require additional study based on the preliminary review of the project as it is described in the PPA application.

1. **Historic Resources.** The existing building on the 12,800-sf subject lot was constructed in 1923. It was previously evaluated in a historical resources survey and found ineligible for national, state, or local
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listing. Thus, the proposed project is not subject to review by the Department’s Historic Preservation staff; no additional analysis of historic architectural resources is required.

The Western SoMa PEIR identified two mitigation measures to minimize construction impacts of new development projects on historic resources within 25 feet for non-pile driving activities and 100 feet for pile driving activities: **M-CP-7a: Protect Historical Resources from Adjacent Construction Activities** and **M-CP-7b: Construction Monitoring Program for Historical Resources**. These mitigation measures require an evaluation to determine whether special construction measures are necessary to protect nearby historic resources, as well as implementation of a construction monitoring program for those historic resources. No known historic resource is located within 100 feet of the project site; however, the adjacent property at 560-568 Brannan Street (3777/044) has been identified as a potential historic resource based on its age. Therefore, these mitigation measures may apply to the proposed project. Further evaluation would be required during environmental review.

2. **Archeological Resources.** Project implementation would include soil-disturbing activities associated with building construction, including excavation to a depth of up to 19 feet below grade for construction of the underground parking area and elevator pits. The project site is located within an area where no previous archeological survey has been prepared. The Western SoMa PEIR noted that California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR)-eligible archeological resources are expected to be present within existing sub-grade soils of the Plan Area and the proposed land use policies and controls within the Plan Area could adversely affect significant archeological resources.

Because of the proposed depth of excavation, **Western SoMa PEIR Archeological Mitigation Measure M-CP-4a: Project-Specific Preliminary Archeological Assessment** and **M-CP-4b: Procedures for Accidental Discovery of Archeological Resources** would be applicable to the proposed project. **Mitigation Measure M-CP-4a** requires that a Preliminary Archeology Review (PAR) be prepared by the Planning Department archeologist. Based on the PAR, the Environmental Review Officer (ERO) would determine if an Archeological Research Design/Treatment Plan (ARDTP) is required to more definitively identify the potential for CRHR-eligible archeological resources to be present within the project site and to determine the appropriate action necessary to reduce the potential effects of the project on archeological resources to a less-than-significant level. If an ARDTP is required, the scope of the ARDTP will be determined in consultation with the ERO. The Planning Department archeologist will be informed by the geotechnical study of the project site’s subsurface geological conditions. (See Geotechnical Study below.) **Mitigation Measure M-CP-4b** outlines procedures for ensuring that appropriate actions are taken in the event that an accidental discovery of archeological resources occurs during the construction of the project.

3. **Transportation.** Based on the PPA submittal, a transportation impact study is not anticipated; an official determination will be made subsequent to submittal of the EEA. In order to facilitate that determination, Planning staff propose the following recommendations:

- The project sponsor’s plans must show curb cut dimensions, sidewalks, and any proposed Better Streets Plan streetscape improvements.
- The project sponsor should ensure that the proposed project’s pedestrian, bicycle, and vehicle circulation is consistent with any roadway changes proposed under the Central SoMa Plan.
Although the project site is not located along a high-injury corridor, staff recommends that the environmental case planner conduct a site visit to observe pedestrian and bicycle safety conditions.

4. **Noise.** The proposed project would create new noise-sensitive receptors (residential uses) in an area where traffic-related noise exceeds 60 dBA Ldn (a day-night averaged sound level). It would therefore be subject to Western SoMa PEIR Noise Mitigation Measure M-NO-1b: Siting of Noise-Sensitive Uses, which is intended to reduce potential conflicts between existing noise-generating uses and new sensitive receptors. *Mitigation Measure M-NO-1b* requires the preparation of an analysis that includes, at a minimum, a site survey to identify potential noise-generating uses within 900 feet of, and that have a direct line-of-sight to, the project site, and including at least one 24-hour noise measurement (with maximum noise level readings taken at least every 15 minutes), prior to the first approval action. The analysis must be prepared by persons qualified in acoustical analysis and/or engineering and must demonstrate with reasonable certainty that Title 24 standards, where applicable, can be met, and that there are no particular circumstances about the proposed project site that appear to warrant heightened concern about noise levels in the vicinity. Should such concerns be present, the Department may require the completion of a detailed noise assessment by person(s) qualified in acoustical analysis and/or engineering prior to the first project approval action, in order to demonstrate that acceptable interior noise levels consistent with those in the Title 24 standards can be attained.

Construction of the proposed project would also generate noise. While construction noise is temporary in nature and regulated by the San Francisco Noise Ordinance, the Western SoMa PEIR evaluated construction noise impacts that would result from implementation of the Community Plan and identified two mitigation measures that, when implemented, would reduce these impacts to a less-than-significant level. *Mitigation Measure M-NO-2a: General Construction Noise Control Measures* includes best practices for construction work, such as state-of-the-art noise shielding and muffling devices and the use of electrically- or hydraulically-powered construction equipment, to minimize construction noise levels. *Mitigation Measure M-NO-2b: Noise Control Measures During Pile Driving* includes a set of site-specific noise attenuation measures for construction projects involving pile driving.

5. **Air Quality.** The proposed project, with 72 residential units, is below the Bay Area Air Quality Management District’s (BAAQMD) construction and operational screening levels for criteria air pollutants.\(^4\) Therefore, an analysis of the project’s criteria air pollutant emissions is not required. However, project-related demolition, excavation, grading and other construction activities may cause wind-blown dust that could contribute particulate matter into the local atmosphere. To reduce construction dust impacts, the 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 DPH.

---

\(^4\) BAAQMD, CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, May 2011, Chapter 3.
The project site is 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. The project proposes to construct new sensitive land uses (residential uses), 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 Department of Public Health (DPH) prior to the issuance of any environmental determination. Please provide a copy of the initial application with the EEA. Additionally, due to the project site’s location within an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone, construction of the project would require compliance with Western SoMa PEIR Mitigation Measure M-AQ-7: Construction Emissions Minimization Plan for Health Risks and Hazards.

Equipment exhaust measures during construction will likely also be required. Detailed information related to construction equipment, phasing and duration of each phase, and the amount (in cubic yards) of excavation shall be provided as part of the EEA.

If the project would generate 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 within the Air Pollutant Exposure Zone, and additional measures will likely be required to reduce stationary source emissions. Given the proposed project’s height of up to 130 feet, the proposed project would likely require a backup diesel generator and additional measures, such as that described in Western SoMa PEIR Mitigation Measure M-AQ-4: Siting of Uses that Emit PM2.5 or DPM and Other TACs, will likely be necessary to reduce its emissions. 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 would therefore be required to comply with Western SoMa PEIR Mitigation Measure M-WS-1:
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5 Refer to [http://www.sfdph.org/dph/eh/Air/default.asp](http://www.sfdph.org/dph/eh/Air/default.asp) for more information.
Screening Level Wind Analysis and Wind Tunnel Testing. Given the proposed project’s height, location, and preliminary design, wind tunnel testing will likely be required as part of the 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 would not cast shadows on existing public or private open spaces. However, the proposed project’s tower has the potential to shade a planned new public open space (see the discussion under “Preliminary Project Comments – New Park” below). 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=539). 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. **Biological Resources.** The proposed project would include demolition of a building, and may therefore be required to comply with Western SoMa Mitigation Measure M-BI-1a: Pre-Construction Special Status Bird Surveys. This measure requires pre-construction special-status bird surveys during certain time periods when birds are likely to be nesting and includes restrictions on construction during the breeding period.

10. **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.7 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.

11. **Hazardous Materials.** The proposed project would include excavation and below-grade construction on a site with previous light industrial uses, and which is included on a map of sites with known or suspected soil and/or groundwater contamination maintained under Article 22A of the Health Code, also known as the Maher Ordinance. Therefore, the project is subject to the Maher Ordinance, which is administered and overseen by the Department of Public Health (DPH), and which requires the project sponsor to retain the services of a qualified professional to prepare a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) that meets the requirements of Health Code Section 22.A.6. The Phase I ESA would determine the potential for site contamination and level of exposure risk associated with the
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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: 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. Compliance with Health Code Article 22A would meet the requirements of Western SoMa PEIR Hazardous Materials Mitigation Measure M-HZ-3: Site Assessment and Corrective Action.

Western SoMa PEIR Hazardous Materials Mitigation Measure M-HZ-2: Hazardous Building Materials Abatement would be applicable to the proposed project. The mitigation measure requires that the project sponsor ensure that any equipment containing polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) or mercury, such as fluorescent light ballasts and fluorescent light tubes, 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, it may contain asbestos-containing materials, such as floor and wall coverings. 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.

12. 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.”

13. 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 CPE; certification of an EIR;
adoption of a 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 occurs, 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.

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.

Note that the subject parcel is within the Central SoMa Plan area. The Central SoMa Plan process is anticipated to be completed in 2016. As discussed above, the proposals in the Draft Plan are subject to change and are contingent on the eventual approval by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors. Please see the Preliminary Project Comments section for more details on proposed requirements under the Draft Plan.

1. **Rezoning.** The project site is located within the SALI (Service/Arts/Light Industrial) District. The proposed residential use is not permitted under this zoning. In order for the project to proceed, the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors would need to approve new zoning controls for the subject parcel.

   The zoning concepts included in the Draft Plan indicate that a reclassification to MUO (Mixed Use Office) is being considered for the site. Residential and retail uses are permitted in the MUO Zoning District. Please see further discussion in the Preliminary Project Comments section.

2. **Height District Reclassification.** The project site is located within the 40/55-X Height and Bulk District. The height of the proposed project would exceed this height limit of both designations. In order for the project to proceed, the Board of Supervisors would need to approve a Height District Reclassification for the subject parcel.

   The zoning concepts published in the Draft Plan include height limits of 85-130 feet (proposed Mid-Rise and High-Rise Scenarios) with a height limit of 45 feet along Freelon Street. The project as described in the PPA application would not conform due to its proposed 10-foot setback at 85 feet high, where a 15-foot setback would be required under the proposed Central SoMa Plan height limits. This analysis is not an indication of which height scenario will ultimately be adopted as part of the Plan and is not a guarantee that the Planning Commission or the Board of Supervisors will approve changes to height limits. Please see further discussion in the Preliminary Project Comments section.

3. **Large Project Authorization** from the Planning Commission is required for the following:
a. Planning Code Section 329 for the new construction of a building greater than 75 feet in height and greater than 25,000 gross sf.

b. Planning Code Section 151.1 and 151.1(g) for residential development providing parking up to .75 spaces per dwelling unit (34 spaces proposed for 77 units).

4. A Shadow Application must be submitted, per Planning Code Sections 295/147, due to potential shadow impacts on nearby property that could become public open space (see “Preliminary Project Comments” below). If the property becomes owned by Recreation and Park Department, then the project would need to be approved by the Recreation and Park Commission.

5. A Building Permit Application is required for the demolition of the existing building on the subject property.

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

Large Project Authorization 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. Building Permit applications are available at the Department of Building Inspection at 1660 Mission Street.

NEIGHBORHOOD NOTIFICATIONS AND PUBLIC OUTREACH:

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

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

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 analysis examines the proposed project under both existing zoning and the proposed zoning outlined in the Draft Plan.
1. **Existing Zoning/Height-Bulk.** The subject property is zoned as a Service/Arts/Light Industrial (SALI) district, which does not permit the proposed residential use. It is located within the 40/55-X height and bulk district, which does not permit the project’s proposed height and bulk. The project could not be approved under existing zoning.

2. **Central SoMa Plan.** As discussed in the “Background” section above, the subject property falls within the ongoing Central SoMa Plan study area bounded by Second, Sixth, Townsend, and Market Streets. The Draft Plan is currently being evaluated in an 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 EIR, the Plan, and the proposed rezoning and affiliated Code changes are anticipated to be brought before decision makers for approval in 2016.

   The 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. Further comments in this section of the PPA are based on the Draft Plan.

3. **Land Use.** The Draft Plan recommends rezoning the subject property to the Mixed-Use Office (MUO) zoning district, in which the proposed housing and ground floor retail would be allowed. These housing and retail uses are generally consistent with key objectives of the Central SoMa Plan, which include providing support for substantial development in a transit-rich area. The Central SoMa Plan concepts also include a new Special Use District that would limit new residential development to smaller parcels or, on larger parcels, as a component in a mixed-use project with major commercial development.

   The proposed plan also calls for a SoMa Entertainment SUD, in which entertainment uses would be permitted. In order to create a diverse and dynamic 24-hour neighborhood characteristic of SoMa, the Central SoMa Plan’s preliminary land use principles envision a mixed-use neighborhood in which office development is balanced with retail, arts, entertainment, industrial, and residential uses. The proposed 2,281 sf of ground floor retail use supports this vision of a mixed-use neighborhood; the project sponsor is encouraged to further explore inclusion of a variety of uses for these ground floor spaces. However, it should be noted that the proposed project site is within the Land Use Variant area of the Central SoMa Plan, which would restrict new residential uses in a portion of the Plan area to avoid conflicts with existing or future commercial and entertainment uses. The project could not be approved if the Land Use Variant zoning controls are adopted.

4. **Urban Form.** In recognition of the desire to accommodate more growth in the area, the Draft Plan recommended changing the height limits of the subject property to 135 feet along Brannan Street and 45 feet on Freelon Street. The Draft Plan and subsequent policy papers have also recommended maintaining the existing height limit controls for narrow streets (Planning Code Section 261.1), as well as new requirements for major streets (see http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/Citywide/Central_Corridor/Central_SoMa_Draft_Policy_Paper-Feb2015_graphics.pdf). The proposed building tower height of 147 feet (including mechanical) on Brannan Street would not be possible with the existing and proposed controls, as it would conflict with the sun angle requirements of Section 261.1. Additionally, the height of 135 feet along Brannan Street would have the potential to
interfere with sun and light access to the proposed park on the SFPUC parcel, located immediately across Freelon Street. Therefore, the Planning Department recommends that the proposed height in the Central SoMa Plan be reduced to 85 feet along Brannan Street and maintain the height of 45 feet along Freelon Street.

5. **New Park.** The Draft Plan envisions a new public park located on the block where the project site is located, which is bounded by Fourth, Fifth, Brannan, and Bryant Streets. As envisioned in the Draft Plan, the potential park would be located on the north side of Freelon and would extend to Bryant. The proposed park location has not been solidified and the City discussion options with the San Francisco Public Utilities and other interested parties, including adjacent property owners, including the potential for seeking the ultimate ideal size and siting of the park. The proposed project’s tower has the potential to shade this new public space and could therefore require additional bulk and mass changes to reduce shading impacts. In addition the project should give consideration to active uses along Freelon to activate the park, potentially including retail space. Please see the Central SoMa policy paper at: “New Park: Central SoMa Draft Policy Document: New Park between 4th, 5th, Bryant, and Brannan Streets” (November 2014): [http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/Citywide/Central_Corridor/Draft_CentralSoMa_Policy_New_Park_Document-November2013.pdf](http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/Citywide/Central_Corridor/Draft_CentralSoMa_Policy_New_Park_Document-November2013.pdf).

In addition, the Planning Department has developed draft Key Development Sites Guidelines for properties throughout the Plan Area, including the block on which the subject property is located. These design guidelines were crafted to help shape development of these key sites, particularly where their size presents special possibilities for realizing public realm or other public benefit objectives, where there is a need for coordination between or within sites, or where adjacent investments in transit or open space infrastructure require special consideration of the relationship between private development and the public realm. These guidelines are available at: “Central SoMa Draft Policy Document: Key Development Sites Guidelines” (March 2015): [http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/Citywide/Central_Corridor/Draft_CentralSoMa_Policy_Paper-Key_Development_Site_Guidelines-March2015.pdf](http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/Citywide/Central_Corridor/Draft_CentralSoMa_Policy_Paper-Key_Development_Site_Guidelines-March2015.pdf).

6. **Streetscape Improvements.** The Draft Plan calls for streetscape improvements across the study area, with extensive streetscape improvements proposed along Brannan Street in order to support a safe, convenient, and attractive street environment for all users. Proposed improvements on this section of Brannan Street include wider sidewalks, fewer traffic lanes, one-way cycle tracks on both sides of the street, and a new signalized mid-block crossing. The Plan would also prohibit new curb cuts on this street. The proposed project will be expected to implement street improvements consistent with the Plan along any adjacent street and alley frontages. Please see comment 11 (“Street Trees/Streetscape Plan”) and the Preliminary Design Comments for further discussion.

7. **Sustainability and Central SoMa Eco-District.** The Department sees a special opportunity for this area to exhibit a variety of sustainability best practices including and beyond those required by the Green Building Code and other City and State sustainability requirements. The proposed project could contribute to the Central SoMa Eco-District. An "eco-district" is a neighborhood or district where residents, community institutions, property owners, developers, and businesses join together with city staff and utility providers to meet sustainability goals 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 infill area composed of many smaller parcels and property owners. All major new development in the Central SoMa Plan Area will be expected to participate in some capacity in the Eco-District Program and a possible Sustainability Management Association to help guide it. For more information please see:

San Francisco Eco-District Program:

Central SoMa Eco-District Task Force Recommendations Report (2013):

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

1. **Interdepartmental Project Review.** This review is required for all proposed new construction in seismic hazard zones. You may download the application at the following link: http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=522.

2. **Rear Yard.** Section 134 requires the project to provide a rear yard of at least 25 percent of the lot depth provided at the lowest story containing a dwelling unit. The proposed configuration provides the equivalent square footage required. However, the courtyard is located two levels above the lowest story containing a dwelling unit. A modification may be requested through the Large Project Authorization process. Please note that the Planning Commission closely examines these open areas for usability and privacy. The open space should be designed in manner that takes these concerns into consideration.

3. **Open Space – Residential.** Section 135 requires 80 sf of common open space for each dwelling unit. Additionally, any such open spaces must meet the dimensional requirements of Subsections (f) and (g). The proposed 77 units would require 6,160 sf of open space; private area meeting the size criteria may be deducted from the common area required. Some units have private open space; however, the dimensions are not noted on the plans. Please ensure the open areas meet the dimensional requirements of this section. If you are not able to meet the dimensional requirement, you may request and justify an open space modification through the Large Project Authorization process. The Department generally would recommend providing an equivalent amount of open space. Please note that Planning staff may not support a proposal with deficient open space.

4. **Open Space – Non-Residential.** Section 135.3 requires this project to provide one sf of open space for every 250 sf of retail (and similar) uses. The proposal includes 2,281 sf of commercial space. Therefore, between 9.124 sf of open space would be required. Alternatively, per Section 426, an in-lieu fee of $76 per sf may be paid instead of providing the open space on site.
5. **Permitted Obstructions.** Planning Code Section 136 allows specific architectural elements to encroach into the required front setback and rear yard. The proposed plans do not indicate any of these types of features. Please be aware of the requirements when refining the architecture of the building.

6. **Street trees.** Planning Code Section 138.1 requires one street tree for every 20 feet of frontage for new construction. A minimum of 4 street trees on each frontage would be required. Please show these on the plan submittal and note the spacing, specific size, and caliper of the trees.

7. **Exposure.** Section 140 requires that each dwelling unit have at least one room that meets the 120-sf minimum superficial floor area requirement of Section 503 of the Housing Code and faces directly on a street right-of-way, code-complying rear yard, or an appropriately sized courtyard. The proposed rear yard located at courtyard level will need to be a minimum of 25 feet deep in every horizontal direction. The proposed skybridge may cause the project not to meet this requirement. A modification would need to be requested and justified for an exposure exception through the Large Project Authorization process. The Department generally encourages projects to minimize the total number of exceptions needed for a proposed design.

8. **Street Frontage.** Planning Code Section 145.1 outlines requirements for street frontages to ensure that they consist of pedestrian-oriented, fine-grained, active space and are appropriate and compatible with the buildings in an MUO District. Currently, the proposed project appears to meet most of these requirements; however, there is concern with the sunken townhouse portion on Freelon Street. This does not appear to meet the intent of this section of the code. Please ensure that the ground floor street frontage meets all of these requirements as related to use, height, active space, transparency, fenestration, gates, railings, and grillwork and include dimensions on the plans to assist staff with verification of conformance with these requirements with the formal submittal.

9. **Parking.** Section 151.1 requires any proposed parking greater than one car for each four dwelling units to meet the criteria of Subsection (g). The proposed parking appears to meet the majority of the criteria. However, the amount of parking proposed (over 1 per 4 dwellings) requires review through the Large Project Authorization process. Please note the parking space dimensions pursuant to §151.1.

10. **Bicycle Parking.** Planning Code Section 155.5 requires this project to provide at least 77 Class I bicycle parking spaces and 4 Class II spaces. Based on the PPA submittal, the proposed project does not appear to contain the required amount of bicycle parking. In addition, the proposed back-of-house location for the bicycle parking does not appear to meet the requirements of 155.1(c)(1). An exception may be requested through the Large Project Authorization; however, staff would not support an exception for a new development providing less than required bicycle spaces.

11. **Car sharing.** Planning Code Section 166 requires this project to provide at least one car share space. The proposed project as shown in the PPA submittal contains no car share spaces.

12. **Additional Height Limits.** Planning Code Section 261.1 requires additional height limits on the south side of a narrow street such as Freelon. Specifically, this side of the project would be subject to the
sun access plane requirements set forth in Section 261.1(d)(2). The proposed elevations do not indicate that the project is in conformance with this requirement. The formal submittal should demonstrate compliance with this requirement on the plans.

13. **Shadow Analysis.** The Draft Plan calls for a new park to be located to the northwest of the site. The proposed park area will be publically accessible and may be publically or privately owned. A Preliminary Shadow Fan Study indicates that the proposed project would result in shading of the proposed park. Therefore, a shadow analysis would be required. However, the appropriate evaluation of the shadow analysis under Planning Code Section 295 (Prop K) or Planning Code Section 147 would have to be determined once the Central SoMa Plan is approved and the actual ownership is better defined. If this detailed shadow analysis finds that the project would cast shadows on the future park, the sponsor should explore sculpting of portions of the project to avoid casting new shadows on the future park.

14. **Eastern Neighborhoods Impact Fees.** This project is subject to the applicable fees outlined in Section 423 et seq.

15. **First Source Hiring Agreement.** A First Source Hiring Agreement is required for any project proposing to construct 25,000 gross sf 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

16. **Inclusionary Affordable Housing.** Inclusionary Affordable Housing is required for a project proposing ten or more dwelling units. The Project Sponsor must submit an ‘Affidavit of Compliance with the Inclusionary Affordable Housing Program: Planning Code Section 415,’ to the Planning Department identifying the method of compliance, on-site, off-site, or affordable housing fee. Any on-site affordable dwelling-units proposed as part of the project must be designated as owner-occupied units, not rental units; unless a Costa Hawkins agreement is possible. 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. Currently, Planning Code requires that the minimum Affordable Housing Percentages are 20 percent affordable housing fee, 12 percent on-site, or 20 percent off-site. However, these inclusionary housing requirements will likely be increased as part of the Central SoMa Plan. For more information, please see the Central SoMa Memo entitled “Potential Public Benefits” ([http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/Citywide/Central_Corridor/Central-SoMa_Potential-Public-Benefits-Memo.pdf](http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/Citywide/Central_Corridor/Central-SoMa_Potential-Public-Benefits-Memo.pdf)).

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 either: 1) ownership only or 2) 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 Costa Hawkins exception agreement is drafted by the City Attorney. You must state in your submittal how the project qualifies for a Costa Hawkins exception. The request should be addressed to the Director of Current Planning. If the project is deemed eligible, we may start working with the City Attorney on the agreement.

17. **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 must 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).

18. **Stormwater.** If the project results in a ground surface disturbance of 5,000 sf 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. The SFPUC Wastewater Enterprise, Urban Watershed Management Program is responsible for review and approval of the Stormwater Control Plan. 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](http://sfwater.org/sdg). Applicants may contact [stormwaterreview@sfwater.org](mailto:stormwaterreview@sfwater.org) for assistance.

19. **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 sf or more; any new, modified, or existing irrigated areas of 10,000 sf 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](http://sfwater.org/index.aspx?page=687).
20. **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 as currently zoned, the following impact fees, which are assessed by the Planning Department, will be required:

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

Please be aware that the fee package for Central SoMa projects will likely be increased from the existing requirements. For more information, please see the Central SoMa Memo entitled “Potential Public Benefits” ([http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/Citywide/Central_Corridor/Central-SoMa_Potential-Public-Benefits-Memo.pdf](http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/Citywide/Central_Corridor/Central-SoMa_Potential-Public-Benefits-Memo.pdf)).

**PRELIMINARY DESIGN COMMENTS:**

The project is located in the Central SoMa Area Plan, which is currently in progress. Any project that receives its permit after the plan’s adoption will be affected by its requirements. Please review the Central SoMa Draft Area Plan website for more detail. The adjacent context includes buildings that are two to six stories in height with a mix of residential, commercial and industrial uses. The predominant material is masonry with punched openings.

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

1. **Site Design, Open Space, and Massing.** The Planning Department requests compliance with an 85-foot maximum height for the site area along Brannan Street currently shown in the Draft Plan on the High-rise Alternative as “85-130.”

The Planning Department also recommends compliance with the draft bulk controls in the Central SoMa Plan. Generally, the plan intent is to create a mid-rise district with occasional spire-like towers and mass reductions that support greater mass along the major streets, such as Brannan, and reduced mass along the interior or small streets, such as Freelon. Along Brannan, this project should maintain a defined streetwall between 65’ and 85’ feet and be in compliance with the apparent mass reduction as described in the draft policy papers found on the Central SoMa Plan website. The Freelon side, as the south side of a small street, will also require significant sculpting in the form of an apparent mass reduction. Along this side at this site, this will require a 100-percent mass reduction over 35 feet in height. Please refer to guidelines for the apparent mass reduction which can be found on the last page here: [http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/Citywide/Central_Corridor/Central%20SoMa%20Plan%20Boards_Final_Shaping%20New%20Buildings.pdf](http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/Citywide/Central_Corridor/Central%20SoMa%20Plan%20Boards_Final_Shaping%20New%20Buildings.pdf).

2. **Street Frontage.** The Planning Department recommends providing a more established and civic-scale façade on Brannan, a major Central SoMa street, and a more refined and residential-scaled
presence on the Freelon façade. Please refer to the Central SoMa policy papers on Ground Floor use and goals. The lowered residential units on Freelon may be possible only if the entire streetwall is pulled back to the setback façade, they meet exposure, they are least 5 feet below grade, and there are raised, bridged entries to the units above them from the public realm. The Planning Department encourages a slightly reduced lobby and longer retail façade adjustment on Brannan.

3. **Architecture.** As the project plans are diagrammatic, the Planning Department does not have comment on architecture at this time. The Planning Department encourages the use of high-quality materials, significant depth in the façade, and a fine-grained, detailed texture towards the lower stories to enhance the pedestrian experience.

**PRELIMINARY PROJECT ASSESSMENT EXPIRATION:**

This Preliminary Project Assessment is valid for a period of **18 months**. A Large Project Authorization Application and Building Permit Application), as listed above, must be submitted no later than **March 1, 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.

Enclosure:  
- Flood Notification: Planning Director’s Bulletin No. 4  
- SFPUC Stormwater Management Requirements  
- SFPUC Recycled Water Information Sheet  

cc: Don Bauer, Property Owner  
Shaunn Mendrin, Current Planning  
Jessica Look, Citywide Planning and Analysis  
Jonas Ionin, Planning Commission Secretary  
Charles Rivasplata, SFMTA  
Jerry Sanguinetti, Public Works  
Pauline Perkins, SFPUC  
June Weintraub and Jonathan Piakis, DPH  
Planning Department Webmaster (planning.webmaster@sfgov.org)
PURPOSE:

This bulletin alerts project sponsors to City and County review procedures and requirements for certain properties where flooding may occur.

BACKGROUND:

Development in the City and County of San Francisco must account for flooding potential. Areas located on fill or bay mud can subside to a point at which the sewers do not drain freely during a storm (and sometimes during dry weather), and there can be backups or flooding near these streets and sewers. The attached graphic illustrates areas in the City prone to flooding, especially where ground stories are located below an elevation of 0.0 City Datum or, more importantly, below the hydraulic grade line or water level of the sewer. The City is implementing a review process to avoid flooding problems caused by the relative elevation of the structure to the hydraulic grade line in the sewers.
PERMIT APPLICATION PROCESS:

Applicants for building permits for new construction, change of use, change of occupancy, or major alterations or enlargements will be referred to the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC) at the beginning of the process to determine whether the project would result in ground-level flooding during storms. The side sewer connection permits for such projects need to be reviewed and approved by the SFPUC at the beginning of the review process for all permit applications submitted to the Planning Department, the Department of Building Inspection, or the Redevelopment Agency.

The SFPUC and/or its delegate (SFDPW, Hydraulics Section) will review the permit application and comment on the proposed application and the potential for flooding during wet weather. The SFPUC will receive and return the application within a two-week period from date of receipt. The permit applicant must comply with SFPUC requirements for projects in flood-prone areas. Such requirements may include provision of a pump station for the sewage flow, raised elevation of entryways, special sidewalk construction, and deep gutters.
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FOR MORE INFORMATION:
Call or visit the San Francisco Planning Department

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

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

Call or visit the San Francisco Planning Department
Central Reception
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco CA 94103-2479
TEL: 415.558.6378
FAX: 415 558-6409
WEB: http://www.sfplanning.org
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Recycled Water Installation Procedures for Developers

The City and County of San Francisco (CCSF) requires property owners to install dual-plumbing systems for recycled water use in accordance with Ordinances 390-91, 391-91, and 393-94, within the designated recycled water use areas under the following circumstances:

- New or remodeled buildings and all subdivisions with a total cumulative area of 40,000 square feet or more
- New and existing irrigated areas of 10,000 square feet or more

The following are procedures to guide developers and property owners with the installation of recycled water service lines. The diagram on the reverse shows how, and where the lines are to be installed, and the required backflow prevention assembly.

Number of Water Lines Coming onto a Property
Three to four lines:
1) Fire
2) Potable water domestic
3) Recycled water domestic
4) Recycled water irrigation (if property has landscaping)

Number of Water Meters
One water meter is required for each water line.

Required Backflow Prevention Assembly
Fire line – reduced pressure principle backflow preventer
Potable water domestic – reduced pressure principle backflow preventer
Recycled water domestic – reduced pressure principle backflow preventer
Recycled water irrigation line – reduced pressure principle backflow preventer

All backflow prevention assemblies must be approved by the SFPUC’s Water Quality Division.

The backflow prevention assembly for domestic water plumbing inside the building and for the recycled water system must meet the CCSF’s Plumbing Code and Health Code.

Pipe Separation
California Department of Public Health regulations require new water mains and new supply lines to be installed at least 4-foot horizontally from, and one-foot vertically above a parallel pipeline conveying recycled water.

Pipe Type
- Transmission lines and mains – ductile iron
- Distribution and service lines – purple PVC or equivalent
- Irrigation lines – purple PVC or equivalent
- Dual-plumbing – described in the City and County of San Francisco Plumbing Codes

**SFPUC must sign off on pipe type prior to installation. Contact the City Distribution Division at (415) 550-4952.

Temporary Potable Water Use Until Recycled Water Becomes Available
The potable water line will be used to feed the recycled water lines(s) until such time that recycled water becomes available. When recycled water becomes available, the cross-connection will be broken by the SFPUC, and the potable and recycled water lines will be totally separated. Before recycled water is delivered to the property, cross-connection and backflow testing will take place to assure separation.

Under no circumstances are developers or property owners to “t-off” of the potable water line to the recycled water lines(s).

If you have questions, or would like additional information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recycled Water Ordinances and Technical Assistance</th>
<th>Backflow Prevention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco Public Utilities Commission</td>
<td>San Francisco Public Utilities Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Resources Division</td>
<td>Water Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(415) 554-3271</td>
<td>(650) 652-3100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recycled Water Plumbing Codes</th>
<th>New Service Line Permits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of Building Inspection</td>
<td>San Francisco Public Utilities Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumbing Inspection Services</td>
<td>Customer Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(415) 558-6054</td>
<td>(415) 551-3000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOTE:
1. ALL BACKFLOW PREVENTERS MUST APPROVED BY SFPU WATER QUALITY BUREAU.
2. BACKFLOW PREVENTION FOR DOMESTIC WATER PLUMBING INSIDE THE BUILDING MUST MEET CCSF PLUMBING CODE AND PUBLIC HEALTH CODE REQUIREMENTS.
3. BACKFLOW PREVENTER FOR RECYCLED WATER SYSTEM MUST MEET CCSF PLUMBING CODE AND PUBLIC HEALTH CODE REQUIREMENTS.

RESPONSIBILITY OF INSTALLATION OF

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

LIGHT LINES: &
PROPERTY OWNER PAYS FOR NEW SERVICE INSTALLATION. OWNERSHIP REMAINS WITH THE PROPERTY OWNER.
Re: SFPUC Stormwater Management Requirements

Dear Project Proponent,

Your project may be subject to meeting requirements of the 2010 San Francisco Stormwater Design Guidelines (Guidelines). The project parameter that triggers compliance with the Guidelines is:

- **Disturbance of 5,000 square feet** or more of ground surface\(^1\), and
- **Filing for a site permit application or building permit** application with the San Francisco Department of Building Inspection after January 12, 2010.

If your project triggers compliance with the **Guidelines** your project must:

1. Determine if your project is located in the area served by the combined sewer or by the separate sewer.

2. Meet the applicable performance measure:

   o **Combined Sewer Areas:**
     - For sites with existing imperviousness of less than or equal to 50%, stormwater runoff rate and volume shall not exceed pre-development conditions for the 1- and 2-year 24-hour design storm.
     - For sites with existing imperviousness of greater than 50%, stormwater runoff rate and volume shall be decreased by 25% from the pre-development conditions for 2-year 24-hour design storm.
     - This requirement is equivalent to LEED Sustainable Sites Credit 6.1.

   o **Separate Sewer Areas:**
     - Capture and treat the rainfall from a design storm of 0.75 inches.
     - This requirement is equivalent to LEED Sustainable Sites Credit 6.2.

3. Develop a Preliminary Stormwater Control Plan (SCP) in accordance with the **Guidelines** and submit it for review and approval to the SFPUC prior to receiving a Site or Building Permit; and

---

\(^1\) Disturbed ground surface is measured cumulatively. Activities that disturb the ground surface include, but are not limited to, the construction, modification, conversion, or alteration of any building or structure and associated grading, filling, excavation, change in the existing topography, and the addition or replacement of impervious surface. All sidewalks, parking, driveways, and landscaped and irrigated areas constructed in conjunction with the Development Project are included in the disturbed area. Disturbed ground surface does not include interior remodeling projects, maintenance activities such as top-layer grinding, repaving, and re-roofing, or modifications, conversions or alterations of buildings or structures that does not increase the ground surface footprint of the building or structure. (Stormwater Management Ordinance No. 83-10)

---
4. Develop a Final Stormwater Control Plan in accordance with the Guidelines and submit it for review and approval to the SFPUC prior to receiving the Certificate of Final Completion.

5. Develop a maintenance plan for all proposed stormwater controls and submit it as part of the Preliminary and Final Stormwater Control Plan.

6. Sign and record a Maintenance Agreement prior to Certificate of Completion.

Stormwater requirements can be met using Low Impact Design (LID) or other green infrastructure approaches. LID approaches use stormwater management solutions that promote the use of ecological and landscape-based systems that mimic pre-development drainage patterns and hydrologic processes by increasing retention, detention, infiltration, and treatment of stormwater at its source.

**Other SFPUC related Ordinances:**

Your project may also be subject to other SFPUC requirements. For a list of all water, sewer, or stormwater requirements that may apply to your project, visit [www.sfwater.org/reqs](http://www.sfwater.org/reqs)

Any project that also includes 1,000 square feet or more of new or modified landscape area may be subject to the SPFUC Water Efficient Irrigation Ordinance. For more information, please visit: [www.sfwater.org/landscape](http://www.sfwater.org/landscape).

Any project proposing to reuse on-site non-potable water should also submit the SFPUC On-Site Non-Potable Project Application. For information and the application, please visit: [www.sfwater.org/np](http://www.sfwater.org/np).

**The necessary documents can be found online at:**

- Stormwater Design Guidelines informational materials: [www.sfwater.org/sdg](http://www.sfwater.org/sdg)
- Stormwater Control Plan Form and Instructions: Refer to Guidelines at: [www.sfwater.org/sdg](http://www.sfwater.org/sdg)
- Municipal separate stormwater sewer system (MS4) and combined sewer system boundary map: Refer to Guidelines, p.10

The project review staff looks forward to helping you achieve stormwater management compliance. Upon receipt of this letter please contact the SFPUC project review staff to discuss how the Guidelines requirements apply to your project at: stormwaterreview@sfwater.org

Sincerely,

Project Review Team
Urban Watershed Management Program
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Wastewater Enterprise
stormwaterreview@sfwater.org