DATE: September 17, 2015
TO: David Kriozere, Genesis CA Development LLC
FROM: Rick Cooper, Planning Department
RE: PPA Case No. 2015-007816PPA for 400-444 Divisadero Street / 1048-1064 Oak Street

Please find the attached Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) for the address listed above. You may contact the staff contact, Kansai Uchida, at (415) 575-9048 or kansai.uchida@sfgov.org, to answer any questions you may have, or to schedule a follow-up meeting.

Rick Cooper, Senior Planner
Preliminary Project Assessment

Date: September 17, 2015
Case No.: 2015-007816PPA
Project Address: 400-444 Divisadero Street/1048-1064 Oak Street
Block/Lots: 1216/004, 005, 017, 018 and 019
Zoning: Divisadero Street NCT (Neighborhood Commercial Transit) District
RH-3 (Residential, House, Three-Family) District
Height & Bulk: 65-A and 40-X Height and Bulk Districts
Area Plan: None
Project Sponsor: David Kriozere, Genesis CA Development LLC
(972) 404-8288
Staff Contact: Kansai Uchida – (415) 575-9048
kansai.uchida@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 23, 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 (DPH), 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 project site is located on the block bounded by Fell Street to the north, Scott Street to the east, Oak Street to the south, and Divisadero Street to the west. The site has frontages along both Oak and Divisadero Streets. The project site currently has two curb cuts on Oak Street and four curb cuts on Divisadero Street. The proposed project would:
Demolish an existing gas station and car wash;
Demolish two existing residential buildings containing a total of three dwelling units;
Relocate an existing two-unit residential building within the project site; and
Construct a new building containing residential and retail uses (described below).

The proposed new building would measure 148,852 square feet (sf) and 65 feet in height (six stories), with circulation penthouses reaching a height of 81 feet above street level. The building would contain 152 dwelling units (9 studio units, 82 one-bedroom units, and 61 two-bedroom units), 7,787 square feet of ground floor retail space, 60 off-street parking spaces at the ground floor, 131 bicycle parking spaces, and a 3,800 sf roof deck. All existing curb cuts on the project site would be filled, and one new curb cut would be added along Oak Street to provide access to the off-street garage and loading area. Foundation and utility work would require excavation up to three feet below existing grade.

There are discrepancies in the proposed project description in the PPA Application and the submitted plan set. The discrepancies, listed below, would not substantially change the analysis in this PPA Letter, but should be corrected in all subsequent application submittals to the Planning Department. Where discrepancies exist, the numbers from the most recent document submitted (the plan set) were used.

- Number of new dwelling units: 158 in PPA Application, 152 on plans;
- Square feet of new residential space: 123,526 in PPA Application, 123,629 on plans;
- Number of off-street parking spaces: 78 in PPA Application, 60 on plans;
- Square feet of off-street parking: 15,405 in PPA Application, 9,759 on plans; and
- Square feet of retail space: 7,734 in PPA Application, 7,787 on plans.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:

In compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the environmental review process must be completed before any project approval may be granted. This review may be done in conjunction with the required approvals listed below. In order to begin formal environmental review, please submit an Environmental Evaluation Application (EEA) for the full scope of the project. EEAs are available in the Planning Department lobby at 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, at the Planning Information Center at 1660 Mission Street, and online at www.sfplanning.org under the “Publications” tab. See “Environmental Applications” on page 2 of the current Fee Schedule for calculation of environmental application fees.\(^1\)

\(^1\)Note that until an entitlement application is submitted to the Current Planning Division, only the proposed Project Description will be reviewed by the assigned Environmental Coordinator.

If the additional analysis outlined below indicates that the project would not have a significant effect on the environment, the project could be eligible for a Class 32 infill development categorical exemption under CEQA Guidelines Section 15332. If a Class 32 exemption is appropriate, Environmental Planning staff will prepare a certificate of exemption.

If it is determined that the project could result in a significant impact, an initial study would be prepared. The initial study may be prepared either by an environmental consultant from the Department’s environmental consultant pool or by Department staff. Should you choose to have the initial study prepared by an environmental consultant, contact Devyani Jain at (415) 575-9051 for a list of three eligible consultants. If the initial study finds that the project would have a significant impact that could be reduced to a less-than-significant level by mitigation measures agreed to by the project sponsor, then the Department would issue a preliminary mitigated negative declaration (PMND). The PMND would be circulated for public review, during which time concerned parties may comment on and/or appeal the determination. If no appeal is filed, the Planning Department would issue a final mitigated negative declaration (FMND). Additional information regarding the environmental review process can be found at: http://www.sf‐planning.org/modules/showdocument.aspx?documentid=8631.

If the initial study indicates that the project would result in a significant impact that cannot be mitigated to below a significant level, an environmental impact report (EIR) will be required. An EIR must be prepared by an environmental consultant from the Planning Department’s environmental consultant pool (http://www.sfplanning.org/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.

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.

1. **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. Therefore, the proposed alteration or demolition 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 project proposes alterations to an historical resource and the HRE scope will require a Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties analysis of the project. 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’s 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 your project until a complete draft HRE is received.

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

3. **Tribal Cultural Resources.** Tribal cultural resources (TCRs) are a class of resource established under CEQA in 2015. TCRs are defined as a site, feature, place, cultural landscape, sacred place or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, that is either included on or eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources or a local historic register, or is a resource that the lead agency, at its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, determines is a TCR. Planning Department staff will review the proposed project to determine if it may cause an adverse effect to a TCR; this will occur in tandem with the PAR. No additional information is needed from the project sponsor at this time. Consultation with California Native American tribes regarding TCRs may be required at the request of the tribes. If staff determines that the proposed project may have a potential significant adverse impact on a TCR, mitigation measures will be identified and required. Mitigation measures may include avoidance, protection, or preservation of the TCR and development of interpretation and public education and artistic programs.

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

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

- Provide specifications for stacker spaces.
- On plans, show widths for all existing and proposed sidewalks and curb cuts.

---


5. **Noise.** Based on the General Plan’s Background Noise Levels map, the project site is located along a segment of Divisadero and Oak Streets with noise levels that may be above 75 dBA Ldn (a day-night averaged sound level). Therefore, an acoustical analysis is likely required for the proposed new residential development. The acoustical analysis must demonstrate with reasonable certainty that the California Noise Insulation Standards in Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations can be met. 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.

Additionally, the Planning Department requires that residential open space required under the Planning Code be protected, to the maximum feasible extent, from existing ambient noise levels that could prove annoying or disruptive to users of the open space. Measures to protect required open space from noise include design that uses the building itself to shield on-site open space from the greatest noise sources, construction of noise barriers between noise sources and open space, and appropriate use of both common and private open space in multi-family dwellings.

Construction noise would be subject to the San Francisco Noise Ordinance (Article 29 of the San Francisco Police Code), which includes restrictions on noise levels of construction equipment and hours of construction. If pile driving is to be used during the construction, measures to reduce construction noise may be required as part of the proposed project. The EEA application should indicate whether pile driving or other particularly noisy construction methods are required.

6. **Air Quality.** The proposed project, with 152 dwelling units and 7,787 sf of commercial space, is below the Bay Area Air Quality Management District’s (BAAQMD) construction and operational screening levels for criteria air pollutants. Therefore, an analysis of the project’s criteria air pollutant emissions is not likely to be required.

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 San Francisco 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 modeling 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

---

4 BAAQMD, CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, May 2011, Chapter 3.
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. Please provide detailed information related to any proposed stationary sources with the EEA.

7. **Greenhouse Gases.** *The City and County of San Francisco’s Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions* presents a comprehensive assessment of policies, programs, and ordinances that represents San Francisco’s Qualified Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Reduction Strategy. Projects that are consistent with San Francisco’s Qualified GHG Reduction Strategy would result in less-than-significant impacts from GHG emissions. In order to facilitate a determination of compliance with San Francisco’s Qualified GHG Reduction Strategy, the Planning Department has prepared a GHG Analysis Compliance Checklist. The project sponsor may be required to submit the completed table regarding project compliance with the identified regulations and provide project-level details in the discussion column. This information will be reviewed by the environmental planner during the environmental review process to determine if the project would comply with San Francisco’s GHG Reduction Strategy. Projects that do not comply with an ordinance or regulation may be determined to be inconsistent with the GHG Reduction Strategy.

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 likely cast shadows on public parks or open spaces. Therefore, a detailed shadow study is not likely required.

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

10. **Hazardous Materials.** The proposed project would require more than 50 cubic yards of excavation on a site with current automotive land use (car wash and gas station) and underground fuel tanks. Therefore, the project is subject to Article 22A of the Health Code, also known as the Maher Ordinance. The Maher Ordinance, which is administered and overseen by DPH, requires the project sponsor to retain the services of a qualified professional to prepare a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) that meets the requirements of Health Code Section 22A.6. The Phase I ESA would determine the potential for site contamination and level of exposure risk associated with the

---


project. Based on that information, soil and/or groundwater sampling and analysis, as well as remediation of any site contamination, may be required. These steps are required to be completed prior to the issuance of any building permit.

DPH requires that projects subject to the Maher Ordinance complete a Maher Application, available at: 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.

Because the existing buildings on the project site were constructed prior to 1980, asbestos-containing materials, such as floor and wall coverings, may be found in the buildings. 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 their age (constructed prior to 1978), lead paint may be found in the existing buildings. Please contact the San Francisco Department of Building Inspection (DBI) for requirements related to the demolition of buildings that may contain lead paint.

11. **Tree Planting and Protection.** The Department of Public Works Code Section 8.02-8.11 requires disclosure and protection of landmark, significant, and street trees located on private and public property. Any such trees must be shown on the site plans with the size of the trunk diameter, tree height, and accurate canopy drip line. Please submit 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.”

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

**PLANNING DEPARTMENT APPROVALS:**

The project requires the following Planning Department approvals. These approvals may be reviewed in conjunction with the required environmental review, but may not be granted until after the required environmental review is completed.

1. **Conditional Use Authorization** from the Planning Commission is required for the proposed project per the following Planning Code Sections:

   a. **Residential Demolition (Sections 317 and 746.37).** Any proposals involving removal or demolition of residential buildings in the RH district would be considered “residential demolitions” pursuant to Section 317 pertaining to loss of dwelling units through demolitions. As such, an Application for Dwelling Unit Removal is required pursuant to review criteria set forth in Section 317. The Dwelling Unit Removal application would be processed as a Conditional Use Authorization. In the NCT district, residential demolitions are allowed on the ground floor, and require Conditional Use authorization on the second floor and above. Since the project would be subject to a Conditional Use authorization, the Dwelling Unit Removal Application would be processed as part of that Conditional Use authorization.

   b. **Lot Size at 10,000 square feet and above (Sections 121.1, 746.11 and 790.56).** Conditional Use authorization is required for any lot size equal to or greater than 10,000 square feet. The subject lot is approximately 41,000 square feet. In reviewing such proposals, the Planning Commission shall consider the criteria stated in Section 303(c) as well as the criteria stated in Section 121.1.

   c. **Use Size at 4,000 square feet and above (Sections 121.2, 746.21 and 790.130).** Conditional Use authorization is required for any non-residential use size equal to or greater than 4,000 square feet. The project is proposing up to 8,000 square feet of retail space. In reviewing such proposal, the Planning Commission shall consider the criteria stated in Section 303(c) as well as the criteria stated in Section 121.2.

   d. **New construction over 40 feet in height (Section 295).** Any building or structure exceeding 40 feet in height requires a Shadow Analysis Application (Proposition K) in order to determine whether any new structures will cast any shade or shadow upon any property under the jurisdiction of, or designated for acquisition by, the Recreation and Park Commission.

   e. **Planned Unit Development (PUD) (Sections 303(c) and 304).** A PUD is allowed for a lot area exceeding one-half acre pursuant to the authorization of a Conditional Use. The subject lot is nearly an acre at approximately 41,000 square feet. The procedures for PUD are intended for projects on sites of considerable size, developed as integrated units and designed to produce an environment of stable and desirable character which will benefit the occupants, the neighborhood and the City as a whole. In cases of outstanding overall design, complementary to the design and
values of the surrounding area, such a project may merit a well-reasoned modification of certain provisions contained elsewhere in this Code.

f. Rear Yard (Sections 134 and 243(c)(7)). Rear yards are required in both the NCT and RH districts. In the NCT district, rear yards are required at 25 percent of the lot depth above the ground story and at residential levels. In the RH district, the requirement is at 45 percent of the lot depth or the average of the two adjacent properties at the ground story. Based on the submitted plans, it is unclear whether the proposed project meets the rear yard requirements. If the project does not meet the requirements, a PUD modification for rear yard would be necessary for buildings located in both the NCT and RH districts.

g. Exposure (Section 140). All dwelling units must have at least one room that meets the 120 square-foot minimum floor area requirement of Section 503 of the Housing Code that face directly onto a street right-of-way, code compliant rear yard, or an appropriately sized courtyard. Based on the submitted plans, it is unclear whether the proposed project meets the exposure requirement. If the project does not meet the requirement, a PUD modification for exposure would be necessary or the project would need to be revised to comply with the requirement.

h. Off-Street Parking (Sections 151.1 and 746.22). While there is no parking requirement in the NCT district, parking may be provided pursuant to Section 151.1/Table 151.1. Table 151.1 allows as-of-right a ratio of .50 space for each dwelling unit, requires Conditional Use for up to .75 space for each dwelling unit, and prohibits any parking above .75 space for each dwelling unit. The project is proposing 60 spaces for the proposed 152 units, which is within the principally permitted threshold.

i. Off-Street Freight Loading (Sections 152 and 154). The project is proposing up to 8,000 gross square feet of retail space and approximately 124,000 gross square feet of residential use. While there is no freight loading required for retail space less than 10,000 gross square feet, one freight loading is required for any residential use exceeding 100,000 gross square feet. Minimum dimensions for freight loading and service vehicle spaces are established in Section 154. Based on the submitted plans, it is unclear whether the proposed loading van spaces meet the freight loading requirements. Otherwise, a PUD modification for freight loading would be necessary.

2. Demolition Permit Applications are required for the demolition of the existing buildings on the subject property.

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

Conditional Use Authorization applications are available in the Planning Department lobby at 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400; at the Planning Information Center at 1660 Mission Street, First Floor, and online at www.sfplanning.org. Building and Demolition 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 comments address specific Planning Code and other general issues that may substantially impact the proposed project.

1. **Anti-Discriminatory Housing Policy.** Pursuant to Administrative Code Section 1.61, the Planning Department must collect an application with information about an applicant’s internal anti-discriminatory policies for projects proposing an increase of ten (10) dwelling units or more.

   The Planning Department is not to review the responses other than to confirm that all questions have been answered. Upon confirmation, the information is routed to the Human Rights Commission. For questions about the Human Rights Commission (HRC) and/or the Anti-Discriminatory Housing Policy, please contact Mullane Ahern at (415) 252-2514 or mullane.ahern@sfgov.org.

   Please note that all building permit applications and/or entitlements related to a project proposing 10 dwelling units or more will not be considered complete until all responses are provided.

2. **Interdepartmental Project Review.** This review is required for all proposed new construction in seismic hazard zones, in which the subject property falls. Applications for Interdepartmental Project Review are available in the Planning Department lobby at 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400; at the Planning Information Center at 1660 Mission Street, First Floor, and online at www.sfplanning.org.

3. **Height and Bulk Limits.** Sections 270, 271(c), 303(c) and 746.10 establish height and bulk limits applicable to the project site. A portion of the project site is located in the 65-A Height and Bulk District. Based on this designation, the bulk of the building above 40 feet would need to be in compliance with Section 270. Based on the submitted plans, it is unclear whether the bulk limit would
be exceeded. If the project does not meet the requirement, a PUD modification for bulk would be necessary, including making relevant bulk exception findings pursuant to Sections 271(c) and 303(c).

4. **Special Height Exception: Additional 5 Feet Height for Active Ground Floor Uses.** Sections 263.20 and 746.10 allow for an additional 5-foot height bonus in order to encourage generous ground floor ceiling heights for commercial and other active uses, and to allow for walk-up ground floor residential uses to be raised slightly from sidewalk level for privacy and usability of front stoops.

5. **Residential Density.** Sections 207 and 746.91 state that there is no residential density limit by lot area. As such, density is restricted by physical envelope controls of height, bulk, setbacks, open space, exposure, design guidelines, and staff design review, and any other applicable code provisions.

6. **Dwelling Unit Mix in the NCT District.** Section 207.6 states that for all new residential construction projects, no less than 40 percent of the total number of proposed dwelling units shall contain at least two bedrooms. Any fraction resulting from this calculation shall be rounded to the nearest whole number of dwelling units, or no less than 30 percent of the total number of proposed dwelling units shall contain at least three bedrooms. Any fraction resulting from this calculation shall be rounded to the nearest whole number of dwelling units. These requirements may be waived or modified with Conditional Use authorization. In addition to those conditions set forth in Section 303(c), the Planning Commission shall also consider criteria set forth in Section 207.6(d).

7. **Floor Area Ratio.** Sections 124 and 746.20 establish a basic floor area ratio limit of 2.5 to 1, and do not apply to dwellings or other residential uses.

8. **Front Yard Setbacks and Required Setbacks for PUDs.** Section 132 establishes minimum front setback areas that apply to every building in RH Districts, in order to relate the setbacks provided to the existing front setbacks of adjacent buildings. In addition to the front yard landscaping requirements in Section 132(g), PUDs are required to install additional front yard landscape features referenced in Section 132(i).

9. **Usable Open Space.** Section 135 requires that usable open space be provided for each dwelling unit either as common open space or private open space, at 133 square feet and 100 square feet respectively. Additionally, any such open spaces must meet the dimensional requirements of Subsections (f) and (g). Based on the submitted plans, it would seem that the project’s roof decks would meet the common open space requirement.

10. **Street Trees.** Section 138.1 requires street trees to be installed in the case of construction of a new building or the relocation of a building. One street tree is required for every 20 feet of frontage of the property along each street, with any remaining fraction of 10 feet or more of frontage requiring an additional tree. Such trees may be located either within a setback area on the lot or within the public right-of-way along such lot. Please provide the required street trees on the plans.

11. **Streetscape Plan.** Projects involving new construction trigger the streetscape plan requirement, and as such, requires the submittal of a Streetscape Plan to the Planning Department to ensure that the new streetscape and pedestrian elements are in conformance with the Department’s Better Streets.
Plan. This Streetscape Plan shall be submitted to the Planning Department no later than 60 days prior to any Planning Commission action, and shall be considered for approval at the time of other project approval actions. The Streetscape Plan should show the location, design, and dimensions of all existing and proposed streetscape elements in the public right-of-way directly adjacent to the fronting property, including street trees, sidewalk landscaping, street lighting, site furnishings, utilities, driveways, and curb lines, and the relation of such elements to proposed new construction and site work on the property. Please see the Department’s Better Streets Plan (http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/betterstreets/index.htm) and Section 138.1(c)(2)(ii) of the Planning Code for any additional elements that may be required as part of the project’s Streetscape Plan.

12. Street Frontage in NC Districts. Section 145.1 requires certain provisions related to minimum commercial ground floor ceiling height, active uses, street-facing ground-level spaces, transparency and fenestration, and decorative railings or grillwork. Based on the submitted plans, it is unclear whether the proposed project meets the requirements. If the project does not meet the requirements, a PUD modification would be necessary or the project would need to be revised to comply with the requirements.

13. Bicycle Parking. Planning Code Section 155.2 requires this project to provide at least 158 Class 1 bicycle parking spaces and 8 Class 2 bicycle parking spaces. The submitted plans are unclear whether the proposed project meets the bicycle parking requirements. If the project does not meet the requirement, the project would need to be revised to comply with the requirement.

14. Car Sharing. Planning Code Section 166 requires this project to provide at least one car share space. The proposed project contains no car share spaces.

15. Shadow Analysis. Section 295 requires that a shadow analysis must be performed to determine whether the project has the potential to cast shadow on properties under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Recreation and Park Commission. A preliminary shadow study was conducted by staff in conjunction with this PPA Application, and it indicated that the project will not cast a shadow on any park or open space (e.g., the Panhandle, Buena Vista Park, Duboce Park, and Alamo Square) protected under Planning Code Section 295.

16. Vision Zero. The project is located on a “high-injury corridor”, identified through the City’s Vision Zero Program. The Sponsor is encouraged to incorporate pedestrian safety streetscape measures into the project.

17. 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
18. **Seismic Hazard – Liquefaction Zones.** The project site is on parcels identified by the State of California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology as “seismic hazard zones” in the City. As such, the project sponsor must request and participate in an interdepartmental project review prior to any application that requires a new construction building permit or a public hearing before the Planning Commission.

19. **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/sg](http://sfwater.org/sg). Applicants may contact stormwaterreview@sfwater.org for assistance.

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

21. **Impact Fees.** This project is subject to various impact fees. Please refer to the Planning Director’s Bulletin No. 1 for an overview of Development Impact Fees, and to the Department of Building Inspection’s Development Impact Fee webpage for more information about current rates.

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

   a. San Francisco Unified School District Impact Fee (School Fee)
   b. Transit Impact Development Fee (TIDF)

**PRELIMINARY DESIGN COMMENTS:**

The project is located in the Western Addition Neighborhood within the Divisadero Street Neighborhood Commercial District. The nearby context includes primarily two to three story mixed use buildings with
residential on the upper stories along Divisadero. Bay windows and fine-scaled detailing are common on neighborhood facades.

The project site contains one or more structures considered to be a potential historic resource; therefore, the proposed project is subject to further design review by the Department’s Historic Preservation staff. Please refer to the Environmental Planning Review – Historic Resources section of this PPA Letter for further instruction.

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

1. **Site Design, Open Space, and Massing.** The Planning Department recommends that the project provide a rear yard equal to a minimum of 25% of the lot area. Exceptions to the rear yard are considered when there are exceptional circumstances and/or exceptional design. The Planning Department recommends the reduction of the project massing to increase the rear yard to more appropriately respect the mid-block open space. The project should reduce of the proposed extended mass along the 1060 Oak Street property line from the center of the block.

   Relocate the roof top mechanical penthouse further from the Oak Street frontage.

2. **Street Frontage.** The Planning Department recommends reducing the driveway width to a single lane width (10’ maximum). This may enable additional space devoted to ground floor residential use. The Planning Department supports the residential units along Oak Street, the design entries should be raised a minimum of 3’ feet above grade and setback to provide and buffer from the street per the Draft Ground Floor Residential Design guidelines. Due to the nature of the street and the width of the sidewalk at this location they may require more than the minimum setback to create a usable transition space between the units and the street. The Planning Department recommends locating retail at the corner of Oak and Divisadero, and making the lobby on more centered on the Divisadero frontage. Per Code, the ground floor residential units must conform to the ground floor residential guidelines in order to be considered active uses. Refer to the draft Ground Floor Residential Design Guidelines for treatment of the building along the street for residential uses on the ground floor. The draft guidelines are located on the Department website under “Resource Center/Department Publications/Guidelines for Ground Floor Residential Design.”

3. **Architecture.** The Planning Department requests that the project be more related to, and reflect the finer grain scale of the immediate context in terms of solidity to glazing ratio, modulation and articulation of buildings, proportioning of architectural features and glazing, and materials and detail refinement. One way to do this would be to increase the number and depth of planes in the façade. The retail façade should have more variation and provide human-scale defining elements. The Planning Department expects the use of high quality materials and detailing.

   Design all visible facades and roofs of the building with as much care as primary facades.

4. **Streetscape Improvements.** Per Planning Code Section 138.1, the Department will require standard streetscape elements and sidewalk widening for the appropriate street type per the Better Streets
Plan, including landscaping, site furnishings, and/or corner curb extensions (bulb-outs) at intersections (see Better Streets Plan Section 4 for Standard Improvements and Section 5.3 for bulb-out guidelines). The project sponsor is required to submit a Streetscape Plan illustrating these features. The department will work with the project sponsor and other relevant departments to determine an appropriate streetscape design. Standard street improvement would be part of the basic project approval requirements, and would not count as credit toward any proposed in-kind street improvement contributions.

**PRELIMINARY PROJECT ASSESSMENT EXPIRATION:**

This PPA is valid for a period of 18 months. An EEA or a Conditional Use Authorization application, as listed above, must be submitted no later than March 17, 2017. Otherwise, this determination is considered expired and a new PPA is required. Such applications and plans must be generally consistent with those found in this PPA. An EEA was received on August 6, 2015, and will be reviewed for consistency with this PPA.

Enclosure: Neighborhood Group Mailing Lists (Haight Ashbury, Western Addition, and Citywide) Interdepartmental Project Review Application

cc: Roy and Patty Shimek, Property Owners
    Mary Woods, Current Planning
    Kansai Uchida, Environmental Planning
    Kearstin Dischinger, Citywide Planning and Analysis
    Maia Small, Design Review
    Jonas Ionin, Planning Commission Secretary
    Charles Rivasplata, SFMTA
    Jerry Sanguinetti, Public Works
    Pauline Perkins, SFPUC
    Planning Department Webmaster (planning.webmaster@sfgov.org)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRST NAME</th>
<th>LAST NAME</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>TELEPHONE</th>
<th>EMAIL</th>
<th>NEIGHBORHOOD OF INTEREST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrea</td>
<td>Aiello</td>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>Castro Upper Market Community Benefit District</td>
<td>594 Castro Street #336</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94114</td>
<td>415-500-1181</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ExecDirector@CastroCBD.org">ExecDirector@CastroCBD.org</a></td>
<td>Castro/Upper Market, Haight Ashbury, Noe Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calvin</td>
<td>Welch</td>
<td>Housing &amp; Land Use Chair</td>
<td>Haight Ashbury Neighborhood Council</td>
<td>519 Ashbury Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94117</td>
<td>415-866-0314</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sfic96@pacbell.net">sfic96@pacbell.net</a></td>
<td>Haight Ashbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol</td>
<td>Glanville</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Mt. Olympus Neighbors Association</td>
<td>290 Upper Terrace</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94117</td>
<td>415-864-6516</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cg2906@earthlink.net">cg2906@earthlink.net</a></td>
<td>Castro/Upper Market, Haight Ashbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen</td>
<td>Crommie</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Cole Valley Improvement Association</td>
<td>628 Ashbury Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94117</td>
<td>415-431-1414</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kcrommie@acad.com">kcrommie@acad.com</a></td>
<td>Haight Ashbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leela</td>
<td>Gill</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>North of Panhandle Neighborhood Association (NOPNA)</td>
<td>850 Baker Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94115</td>
<td>415-806-6282</td>
<td><a href="mailto:leela@NOPNA.org">leela@NOPNA.org</a></td>
<td>Haight Ashbury, Western Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>Breed</td>
<td>Supervisor, District 5</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>1 Dr. Carlton B Goodlett Place, Room #244</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102-4689</td>
<td>415-554-7630</td>
<td><a href="mailto:London.Breed@sfgov.org">London.Breed@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:conor.johnston@sfgov.org">conor.johnston@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:vallie.brown@sfgov.org">vallie.brown@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:Ahmad.Elnajjar@sfgov.org">Ahmad.Elnajjar@sfgov.org</a></td>
<td>Bernal Heights, Downtown/Civic Center, Haight Ashbury, Inner Sunset, Western Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marianne</td>
<td>Hesse</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>101 Belvedere Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94117</td>
<td>415-665-3657</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mhesse@pacbell.net">mhesse@pacbell.net</a></td>
<td>Haight Ashbury</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Rabbitt</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Temescal Terrace Association</td>
<td>55 Temescal Terrace</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94118</td>
<td>415-954-4959</td>
<td><a href="mailto:richard.rabbitt@stanfordalumni.org">richard.rabbitt@stanfordalumni.org</a></td>
<td>Haight Ashbury, Inner Richmond, Presidio Heights, Western Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>Loewenberg</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Haight Ashbury Improvement Association</td>
<td>P.O. Box 170098</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94117</td>
<td>0</td>
<td><a href="mailto:haia_sf@yahoo.com">haia_sf@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>Haight Ashbury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST NAME</td>
<td>LAST NAME</td>
<td>TITLE</td>
<td>ORGANIZATION</td>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
<td>CITY</td>
<td>STATE</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
<td>TELEPHONE</td>
<td>EMAIL</td>
<td>NEIGHBORHOOD OF INTEREST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrienne</td>
<td>Shizuko</td>
<td>Board Chair</td>
<td>Japantown Merchants Association</td>
<td>1581 Webster Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94115</td>
<td>415-202-0365</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nihonmachi@acol.com">nihonmachi@acol.com</a></td>
<td>Western Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al</td>
<td>Sodini</td>
<td>Board Chair</td>
<td>0 Anza Vista Civic Improvement Club</td>
<td>140 Terra Vista Avenue</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94115</td>
<td>415-921-5131</td>
<td><a href="mailto:duchai31@acol.com">duchai31@acol.com</a></td>
<td>Western Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry</td>
<td>Perkins</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Japantown Task Force</td>
<td>2140 Pine Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94115</td>
<td>415-920-0224</td>
<td><a href="mailto:barry_perkins@yahoo.com">barry_perkins@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>Western Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>Hamauchi</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Martin Luther Tower</td>
<td>1765 Sutter Street, 2nd floor</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94115</td>
<td>415-346-1259</td>
<td><a href="mailto:info@japantowntaskforce.org">info@japantowntaskforce.org</a></td>
<td>Western Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eve</td>
<td>Plasse</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Alamo Square Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>530 Divisadero Street #176</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94117</td>
<td>415-271-5691</td>
<td><a href="mailto:president@alamoeq.org">president@alamoeq.org</a></td>
<td>Western Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gus</td>
<td>Hernandez</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Western Addition Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>2331 Bush Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94115</td>
<td>415-931-1091</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bolaffi@pacbell.net">bolaffi@pacbell.net</a></td>
<td>Western Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Bolaffi</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Western Addition Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>2331 Bush Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94115</td>
<td>415-931-1091</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bolaffi@pacbell.net">bolaffi@pacbell.net</a></td>
<td>Western Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>Henderson</td>
<td>Vice Chairman</td>
<td>Market/Octavia Community Advisory Committee</td>
<td>300 Buchanan Street, Apt. 503</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-722-0617</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jhenders@sbcglobal.net">jhenders@sbcglobal.net</a></td>
<td>Castro/Upper Market, Downtown/Civic Center, Mission, South of Market, Western Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>Li</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Land-Use &amp; Transportation Committee Chair</td>
<td>498 Waller Street, Apt. 9</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94117</td>
<td>415-644-4290</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lawrence@bureauo.com">lawrence@bureauo.com</a></td>
<td>Western Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leela</td>
<td>Gill</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>North of Panhandle Neighborhood Association (NOPNA)</td>
<td>850 Baker Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94115</td>
<td>415-806-2682</td>
<td><a href="mailto:leela@NOPNA.org">leela@NOPNA.org</a></td>
<td>Haight Ashbury, Western Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>Breed</td>
<td>Supervisor, District 5</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>1 Dr. Carlton B Goodlett Place, Room #244</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102-4689</td>
<td>415-554-7630</td>
<td><a href="mailto:London.Breed@sfgov.org">London.Breed@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:conor.johnston@sfgov.org">conor.johnston@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:vallie.brown@sfgov.org">vallie.brown@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:Ahmad.Elnajjar@sfgov.org">Ahmad.Elnajjar@sfgov.org</a></td>
<td>Bernal Heights, Downtown/Civic Center, Haight Ashbury, Inner Sunset, Western Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Farrell</td>
<td>Supervisor, District 2</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>1 Dr. Carlton B Goodlett Place, Room #244</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102-4689</td>
<td>415-554-5942</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mark_farrell@sfgov.org">mark_farrell@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:catherine.stafan@sfgov.org">catherine.stafan@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:Marjaux.Kelly@sfgov.org">Marjaux.Kelly@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:Jess.Montajano@sfgov.org">Jess.Montajano@sfgov.org</a></td>
<td>Marina, Pacific Heights, Presidio Heights, Russian Hill, Seacliff, Western Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marvis</td>
<td>Phillips</td>
<td>Land Use Chair</td>
<td>Alliance for a Better District 6</td>
<td>230 Eddy Street #1206</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102-6528</td>
<td>415-674-1935</td>
<td><a href="mailto:marvisphillips@gmail.com">marvisphillips@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Downtown/Civic Center, Mission, South of Market, Western Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Troup</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Duboce Triangle Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>2261 Market Street PMB #301</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94114</td>
<td>415-295-1530</td>
<td><a href="mailto:president@dtna.org">president@dtna.org</a></td>
<td>Castro/Upper Market, Western Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Vaughney</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Marina/Cow Hollow Neighbors &amp; Merchants</td>
<td>2742 Baker Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94123</td>
<td>415-567-7152</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mvavouge@gmail.com">mvavouge@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>0 Marina, Pacific Heights, Western Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Cohen</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Noe Street Neighbors</td>
<td>33 Noe Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94114</td>
<td>415-722-0617</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pcohenst@gmail.com">pcohenst@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Castro/Upper Market, Mission, Western Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Rabbitt</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Temescal Terrace Association</td>
<td>55 Temescal Terrace</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94118</td>
<td>415-954-4695</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rabbitt@stanfordalumni.org">rabbitt@stanfordalumni.org</a></td>
<td>Haight Ashbury, Inner Richmond, Presidio Heights, Western Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell</td>
<td>Pritchard</td>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>Hayes Valley Merchants Association</td>
<td>568 Hayes Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-255-9307</td>
<td><a href="mailto:russell@zonahome.com">russell@zonahome.com</a></td>
<td>Western Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Reynolds</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Fillmore Merchants &amp; Improvement Association</td>
<td>2184 Sutter Street #155</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94115</td>
<td>415-441-4063</td>
<td><a href="mailto:trn@newfillmore.com">trn@newfillmore.com</a></td>
<td>Pacific Heights, Western Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Bulkeley</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Hayes Valley Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>1800 Market St., PMB #104</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-503-1970</td>
<td><a href="mailto:president@hayesvalleyleaf.org">president@hayesvalleyleaf.org</a></td>
<td>Downtown/Civic Center, Western Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST NAME</td>
<td>LAST NAME</td>
<td>TITLE</td>
<td>ORGANIZATION</td>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
<td>CITY</td>
<td>STATE</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
<td>TELEPHONE</td>
<td>EMAIL</td>
<td>NEIGHBORHOOD OF INTEREST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron</td>
<td>Peskin</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local Field Representative</td>
<td>470 Columbus Avenue, Ste. 211</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94113</td>
<td>415-956-7014</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aaron.peskin@earthlink.net">aaron.peskin@earthlink.net</a></td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrian</td>
<td>Simi</td>
<td>Local Field Representative</td>
<td>Carpenters Local 22</td>
<td>2085 Third Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94107</td>
<td>415-355-1322</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aaron.peskin@earthlink.net">aaron.peskin@earthlink.net</a></td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>Lantberg</td>
<td>Research Analyst</td>
<td>Carpenters Local 22 c/o NCCRC Research</td>
<td>265 Nepergerber Road, Ste. 220</td>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94621</td>
<td>510-430-9706 x106</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aaron.peskin@earthlink.net">aaron.peskin@earthlink.net</a></td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck</td>
<td>Turner</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Community Design Center</td>
<td>5 Thomas Mellon Circle, #128</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94114</td>
<td>415-586-1235</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hnc3782@earthlink.net">hnc3782@earthlink.net</a></td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Villa-Lobos</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Community Leadership Alliance</td>
<td>P.O. Box 642201</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94109</td>
<td>415-921-4192</td>
<td><a href="mailto:admin@communityleadershipalliance.net">admin@communityleadershipalliance.net</a></td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diego</td>
<td>Hernandez</td>
<td>Organizer</td>
<td>Labors Local 261</td>
<td>3271 18th Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94110</td>
<td>415-826-4550</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dhernandez@nccliu.org">dhernandez@nccliu.org</a></td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace</td>
<td>Shanahan</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Residential Builders Association</td>
<td>1717 17th Street, Ste. 200</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>415-252-1900</td>
<td><a href="mailto:grace@rbasf.com">grace@rbasf.com</a></td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td>Sousa</td>
<td>Public Works Coordinator</td>
<td>AT&amp;T Construction and Engineering</td>
<td>795 Folsom Street, Rm.426</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94107-1243</td>
<td>415-644-7043</td>
<td><a href="mailto:fa4524@att.com">fa4524@att.com</a></td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>0 Coalition for Adequate Review</td>
<td>364 Page Street, #38</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Theriault</td>
<td>Secretary-Treasurer</td>
<td>SF Building and Construction Trades Council</td>
<td>1188 Franklin Street, Ste.203</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94109</td>
<td>415-345-9333</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mke@sftbctc.org">mke@sftbctc.org</a></td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonia</td>
<td>Trauss</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>SF Bay Area Association of Renters</td>
<td>1615 12th Street</td>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94607</td>
<td>215-900-1457</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sonja.trauss@gmail.com">sonja.trauss@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>Law Office of Stephen M. Williams</td>
<td>1934 Dividends Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94115</td>
<td>415-292-3656</td>
<td><a href="mailto:SMW@stevenwilliamlaw.com">SMW@stevenwilliamlaw.com</a></td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>Hestor</td>
<td>Attorney at Law</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>870 Market Street, #1128</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-362-2778</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hestor@earthlink.net">hestor@earthlink.net</a></td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>Gullicksen</td>
<td>Office Manager</td>
<td>San Francisco Tenants Union</td>
<td>558 Capp Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94110</td>
<td>415-282-5525</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ted@sftu.org">ted@sftu.org</a></td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTERDEPARTMENTAL PROJECT REVIEW
Effective: August 29, 2014

Interdepartmental Project Reviews are mandatory for new construction projects that propose buildings eight stories or more and new construction on parcels identified by the State of California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology as Seismic Hazard Zones in the City and County of San Francisco. Projects identified as such, must request and participate in an interdepartmental project review prior to any application that requires a public hearing before the Planning Commission or new construction building permit.

Project Sponsors may elect to request an interdepartmental review for any project at any time, however, it is strongly recommended that the request is made prior to the submittal of the abovementioned applications.

The Planning Department acts as the lead agency in collaboration with the Department of Building Inspection (DBI); the Department of Public Works (DPW); and the San Francisco Fire Department (SFFD). A representative from each of these City Agencies will attend your meeting.

**Interdepartmental Project Review fees:**

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

2. **$1,859** for all other projects.

To avoid delays in scheduling your meeting, provide all information requested on this form and submit your request with a check in the appropriate amount payable to the San Francisco Planning Department. Requests may be mailed or delivered to San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103-2414. Those wishing more specific or more detailed information may contact the Project Review Meeting Coordinator at (415) 575-9091.

*Please note: All returned checks are subject to a $50.00 bank fee.*

*Interdepartmental Project Reviews are scheduled no sooner than two (2) weeks from the receipt of the request form and check.*
Submittal requirements:

Please submit four (4) copies/sets of all information for distribution to each department/agency.

All projects subject to the mandatory Interdepartmental Project Review shall be required to submit the following minimum information in addition to their request form:

1. Site Survey with topography lines;
2. Floor Plans with occupancy and/or use labeled of existing and proposed;
3. Existing and proposed elevations;
4. Roof Plan; and
5. Pictures of the subject property and street frontages.

Planned unit developments or projects with an acre or more of land area shall be required to submit the following additional information:

1. Existing and proposed street names and widths;
2. Location of any existing train tracks; and
3. Location of any existing and proposed easements.

In order for the Interdepartmental Project Review to be most effective and beneficial to you, it is strongly recommended that any issues, concerns and/or specific questions are submitted with this request directed to each discipline.
APPLICATION DATE: ____________________________________________

PROJECT CONTACT:
Name __________________________________ Phone No. ( )____________________
Address _______________________________________________________________________
City ______________________________________ Zip Code _____________________________
FAX No. ( )____________________ E-Mail Address ________________________________
Name of Property Owner _______________________________________________________

PROJECT INFORMATION:
Address ________________________________________________________________
How many units does the subject property have? ______________________________
Assessor’s Block/Lot(s) _________________________ Zoning District __________________
Height and Bulk Districts ______________________ Located within Geologic Hazard Zone? Y ☐ N ☐

PROJECT DESCRIPTION / PURPOSE OF MEETING/SPECIFIC QUESTIONS:
(Use separate sheet, if necessary)
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Type</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Net Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Dwelling Units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Square Footage:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Hotel Rooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Square Footage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Uses: _____________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Parking Spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Stories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Will this project be publicly funded? (specify) ________________________________
Previously contacted staff (if applicable) ________________________________
(Please submit four (4) copies/sets of the Application Form, Floor Plans, Pictures, etc.)