DATE: October 27, 2015
TO: Mark Loper, Reuben, Junius & Rose, LLP
FROM: Mark Luellen, Planning Department
RE: PPA Case No. 2015-010013PPA for 30 Otis Street

Please find the attached Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) for the address listed above. You may contact the staff contact, Tina Chang, at (415) 575-9197 or tina.chang@sfgov.org, to answer any questions you may have, or to schedule a follow-up meeting.

Mark Luellen, Senior Planner
Preliminary Project Assessment

Date: October 27, 2015
Case No.: 2015-010013PPA
Project Address: 30 Otis Street
Block/Lot: 3505/010, 012, 013, 016
Zoning: C-3-G (Downtown-General)
Van Ness & Market Downtown Residential Special Use District
85-X/ 250-R-2
Area Plan: Market & Octavia
Downtown
Project Sponsor: Mark Loper, Reuben, Junius & Rose, LLP
415.567.9000
Staff Contact: Tina Chang – 415.575.9197
tina.chang@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 July 29, 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 four existing structures ranging from one to three stories tall, approximately 10-feet to 45-feet tall, containing approximately 10,000 square feet of retail, 15,000 square feet of office, 15,000 square feet of industrial / Production, Distribution and Repair, and 10,000 square feet
of personal services uses and the new construction of approximately 330,000 square feet of residential, 4,600 square feet of retail, 27,485 square feet of parking and 13,125 square feet of personal service uses ranging from 85’ to 250’ in height. The northeastern most structure is a one-story building containing an auto body shop constructed in 1956 on a parcel area amounting to 7,274 square feet. The corner of 12th and Otis Street is currently developed with a two-story carpet store, immediately south of the aforementioned auto body shop, constructed in 1920 on a 6,599 square foot parcel. Immediately west of the carpet store is a three-story commercial building approximately 15,000 square feet in size that was constructed in 1925 on a 4,996 square foot parcel. Finally, the parcel furthest west included as part of the Project Site includes a two-story, 20,400 square foot industrial building on a 9,870 square foot parcel constructed in 1931 with an auto-glass store on the ground floor and a ballet-school on the second floor. The project proposes approximately 23-feet of excavation to provide two stories of below-grade parking, with vehicular access along the Colusa Place Alley. The proposed mixed-use project includes a total of 354 units, approximately 4,600 square feet of ground floor retail, and 13,125 square feet of personal service uses, to house the ballet school currently on-site, with bicycle parking and a publically accessible plaza along the 12th street frontage. The Department acknowledges that taller alternatives were proposed. However, the Code-compliant alternative is that one analyzed in the subject Preliminary Project Assessment.

BACKGROUND:

The project site is within the Market & Octavia and Downtown Area Plans. The Market & Octavia Area Plan grew out of the Market and Octavia Neighborhood plan, and covers the area sitting at the junction of three of the city’s grid systems: the north of Market, south of Market, and Mission Street grids. The Downtown Plan Area includes many neighborhoods south of Market, as well as the Civic Center and Financial District neighborhoods, but also includes a small number of parcels west of Van Ness Street, including the subject property. On April 5, 2007, the Planning Commission certified the Market & Octavia Plan Environmental Impact Report by Motion 17406 and adopted the Preferred Project for final recommendation to the Board of Supervisors.1,2 Though the EIR certification was appealed on April 25, 2007 the Board of Supervisors upheld the EIR on June 19, 2007. The Market & Octavia Area Plan and its associated rezoning became effective May 30, 2008.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:

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 environmental impact report (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.


As discussed above, the proposed project is located within the Market and Octavia Area Plan, which was evaluated in the Market and Octavia FEIR. If the proposed project is consistent with the development density identified in the area plan, it would be eligible for a community plan exemption (CPE). 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 Market and Octavia FEIR, and there would be no new “peculiar” significant impacts unique to the proposed project. In these situations, all pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the Market and Octavia FEIR 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 $14,017) and (b) the CPE certificate fee (currently $7,779).

2. **Mitigated Negative Declaration.** If new site- or project-specific significant impacts are identified for the proposed project that were not identified in the Market and Octavia FEIR, 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 Market and Octavia FEIR, with all pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the Market and Octavia FEIR also applied to the proposed project. With this outcome, the applicable fees are: (a) the CPE determination fee (currently $14,017) 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 Market and Octavia FEIR with all pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the Market and Octavia FEIR also applied to the proposed project. With this outcome, the applicable fees are: (a) the CPE determination fee (currently $14,017); (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](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.

In order to begin formal environmental review, please submit an Environmental Evaluation Application (EEA). The EEA can be submitted at the same time as the PPA Application. The environmental review may be done in conjunction with the required approvals listed below, but must be completed before any
project approval may be granted. **Note that until an entitlement application is submitted to the Current Planning Division, only the proposed Project Description will be reviewed by the assigned Environmental Coordinator.** EEAs are available in the Planning Department lobby at 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, at the Planning Information Center at 1660 Mission Street, and online at [www.sfplanning.org](http://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 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 structures considered to be a potential historic resource (building constructed 45 or more years ago); therefore, the proposed alteration or demolition is subject to review by the Department’s Historic Preservation staff. The proposed project site was identified as a contributor to a potential California Register historic district (South Van Ness Deco-Moderne Historic District) as part of the Market & Octavia Historic Resources Survey. This district was not adopted and should be re-evaluated. To assist in this review, the project sponsor must hire a qualified professional to prepare a Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE) report. The professional must be selected from the Planning Department’s Historic Resource Consultant Pool. Please contact Tina Tam, Senior Preservation Planner, via email ([tina.tam@sfgov.org](mailto:tina.tam@sfgov.org)) for a list of three consultants from which to choose. Please contact the HRE scoping team at [HRE@sfgov.org](mailto: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. The HRE shall be submitted directly to the Department and copied to the project sponsor. Project sponsors shall not receive and/or review advance drafts of consultant reports per the Environmental Review Guidelines. Historic Preservation staff will not begin reviewing your project until a complete draft HRE is received.

2. **Archeological Resources.** Project implementation would entail soil-disturbing activities associated with building construction, including excavation that would reach a depth of approximately 14 feet below grade. The *Market and Octavia FEIR* anticipated that development at the project site would have the potential to disturb archeological deposits and *Market and Octavia FEIR Mitigation Measure 5.6.A2 Soils Distributing Activities* was determined to be applicable for any project involving any soils-disturbing activities beyond a depth of four feet and located within those proposed in the Market and Octavia Plan for which no archeological assessment report has been prepared. This mitigation measure requires that a Preliminary Archeological Review (PAR) be conducted by Planning Department staff to determine the appropriate action necessary to mitigate potential effects to less than significant.

---

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

At the time of the filling of the EEA, please show the configuration of bike and vehicle parking on plans and existing and proposed sidewalk and curb cut dimensions. The selected Transportation Consultant for this project must coordinate with SFMTA regarding Muni Forward, Better Streets, Van Ness BRT, and Environmental Planning regarding projects at 1500 and 1601 Mission Street.

5. **Noise.** The Market and Octavia FEIR did not identify any significant impacts related to noise. However, the project site is located within an area where average traffic noise level exceeds 75 dBA (a day-night averaged sound level). The proposed project would introduce residences—a noise-sensitive use—onto the project site. Therefore, an acoustical analysis demonstrating how the building would meet Title 24 standards is required. The analysis shall include, at a minimum: 1) a site survey to identify potential noise-generating uses within two blocks of the project site; 2) one 24-hour noise measurement (with maximum noise level readings taken at least every 15 minutes). The analysis must be prepared by persons qualified in acoustical analysis and/or engineering and shall demonstrate with reasonable certainty that Title 24 noise standards, where applicable, can be met and that there are no particular circumstances about the project site that warrant heightened concern about noise levels in the vicinity.

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. Detailed information related to construction equipment, phasing, and duration
of each phase may be required as part of environmental evaluation to assess construction noise levels and methods to reduce such noise, as feasible.

**Air Quality.** The proposed project’s 354 dwelling units exceed the Bay Area Air Quality Management District’s (BAAQMD) construction screening levels for criteria air pollutants. Therefore, an analysis of the project’s criteria air pollutant emissions is likely to be required. Please provide detailed information related to construction equipment, phasing and duration of each phase, and volume of excavation as part of the EEA.

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

The project site is also located within an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone, as mapped and defined by Health Code, Article 38. The Air Pollutant Exposure Zone identifies areas with poor air quality based on modeling of air pollution, exposures, and health vulnerability from mobile, stationary, and area source emissions within San Francisco. The project proposes to construct new sensitive land uses (i.e., residential), which are subject to enhanced ventilation measures pursuant to Health Code Article 38. The project sponsor will be required to submit an Article 38 application to DPH prior to the issuance of any environmental determination. Please provide a copy of the Article 38 application with the EEA. In addition, equipment exhaust measures during construction, such as those listed in Mitigation Measure 5.8.A - Construction Mitigation Measure for Particulate Emission and Mitigation Measure 5.8.B - Construction Mitigation Measure for Short-Term Exhaust Emission will likely be required.

If the project would generate new sources of toxic air contaminants including, but not limited to: diesel generators or boilers, or any other stationary sources, the project would result in toxic air contaminants that may affect both on-site and off-site sensitive receptors. Given the proposed project’s 250 foot tower and 85 foot podium, the proposed project would likely require a backup diesel generator and additional measures may 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

---

5 Refer to [http://www.sfdph.org/dph/eh/Air/default.asp](http://www.sfdph.org/dph/eh/Air/default.asp) for more information.
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.** As discussed below, Planning Code section 148 requires a wind analysis study to ensure that the project will not exceed the comfort criteria (ground level wind levels not to exceed 11mph in areas of substantial pedestrian use or 7mph in public seating areas). Section 148 specifically outlines these criteria for the Downtown Commercial (C-3) Districts, but the Market-Octavia Plan FEIR, for the implementation of CEQA, used the Planning Code’s wind hazard criterion for evaluating wind impacts, which is a 26 mph equivalent wind speed for a single full hour of the year.

The Market and Octavia FEIR noted that individual development in the Plan Area would have the potential for new wind impacts, and that Market and Octavia FEIR Mitigation Measure 5.5.B1–Buildings in Excess of 85 feet in Height and Mitigation Measure 5.5.B2– All New Construction would apply to the proposed project. Given that the project is required to conduct a wind assessment for the Planning Code, the wind assessment will also serve to fulfill the requirements of these mitigation measures. The consultant will be required to prepare a proposed scope of work for review and approval by the Environmental Planner and Current Planner prior to preparing the analysis.

8. **Shadow.** Planning Code Section 295 restricts new shadowing on public spaces under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Department by any structure exceeding 40 feet in height. For CEQA purposes, the analysis also determines whether a project has the potential to cast shadows on other parks and other spaces. A preliminary shadow fan analysis prepared by Planning Department staff indicates that the proposed project could cast shadows on Octavia Boulevard, McCoppin Square, and Octavia Plaza, which are existing city-owned public open spaces, not under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Department, and the proposed Brady Park. These parks were not constructed at the time of the Market and Octavia FEIR. Therefore, the Market and Octavia FEIR did not identify significant impacts at that time. However, the Market and Octavia FEIR stated that once these properties become public parks, they would be subject to either Planning Code Section 295 or Market and Octavia FEIR Mitigation Measure 5.5.A2– Parks and Open Space not Subject to Section 295. These parks are not subject to Planning Code Section 295 and thus, the project is subject to Mitigation Measure 5.5.A2, which requires good design to reduce substantial shadow impacts on public plazas and other publically accessible spaces.

Given the potential impacts to varying public open spaces, the project sponsor is 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. **Geology.** The Market and Octavia FEIR identified a potentially significant impact related to soil erosion during construction. Therefore, Market and Octavia Neighborhood FEIR Mitigation Measure
5.11. A Construction Related Soils would be applicable to the proposed project. This mitigation measure consists of construction best management practices to prevent erosion and discharge of soil sediments to the storm drain system, which would reduce any potential impacts related to geology soils to less than significant levels.

The project sponsor should prepare a geotechnical investigation report to identify the primary geotechnical concerns associated with the proposed project and the site. The geotechnical report would identify hazards and recommend minimization measures for potential issues regarding, but not limited to, soil preparation and foundation design. This report will also help inform the Planning Department Archeologist of the project site’s subsurface geological conditions. The geotechnical report should be prepared by a qualified consultant and submitted with the EE Application or upon receipt of this PPA letter, whichever is later.

10. Hazardous Materials. The Market and Octavia FEIR anticipated that development would have the potential to disturb unknown soil contaminants and Mitigation Measure F-1: Program or Project Level Mitigation Measures would be applicable to projects depending upon the type and extent of contamination associated with each individual project. The proposed project is located on parcels that previously had industrial uses. Therefore, there is potential for site contamination and Mitigation Measure F-1 has been superseded by Article 22A of the Health Code, also known as the Maher Ordinance. The Maher Ordinance, which is administered and overseen by the Department of Public Health (DPH), requires the project sponsor to retain the services of a qualified professional to prepare a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) that meets the requirements of Health Code Section 22.A.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.

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

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. 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 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. **Permit Review in C-3 Districts** from the Planning Commission is required per Planning Code Section 309 for the new construction of a building greater than 75 feet in height and greater than 50,000 gross square feet, and for seeking exceptions from specific provision of the Planning Code including but not limited to rear yard, setbacks, bulk, ground level wind currents. Be advised that additional design requirements and limitations may be imposed on the proposed project in order to achieve the objectives and policies of the General Plan or the purpose of this Code.
2. A **Variance** is required for exposure. As proposed, it appears that many of the proposed units on the north and east sides of the building do not meet exposure requirements as set forth in Section 140 of the Planning Code.

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

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

Downtown Project Authorization (Section 309) review and Variance applications are available in the Planning Department lobby at 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, at the Planning Information Center at 1660 Mission Street, and online at [www.sfplanning.org](http://www.sfplanning.org). Building Permit applications are available at the Department of Building Inspection at 1660 Mission Street.

**NEIGHBORHOOD NOTIFICATIONS AND PUBLIC OUTREACH:**

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

**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. **Setbacks and Streetwall Articulation.** Setbacks of the upper parts of a building abutting a public sidewalk in any C-3 District may be required, in accordance with the provisions of Section 309, as deemed necessary to preserve the openness of the street to the sky and to avoid the perception of overwhelming mass that would be created by a number of tall buildings built close together with unrelieved vertical rise, or to maintain the continuity of a predominant street wall along the street. The setback shall fall within dimensions as appropriate, but not exceed dimensions as indicated in Section 132.1.
2. **Rear Yard.** Section 134 requires the project to provide a rear yard of at least 25 percent of the lot depth. However, in C-3 Districts, an exception to the rear yard requirements may be allowed in accordance with the provisions of Section 309, provided that the building location and configuration assure adequate light and air to windows within residential units and to the useable open space provided. Since a Code compliant rear yard is not provided, an exception per Section 309 is required.

3. **Open Space – Residential.** Section 135 requires 36 square feet of private open space or 48 square feet of open space, if common, for each dwelling unit. Additionally, any such open spaces must meet the dimensional requirements of Subsections (f) and (g). It appears that the open space requirements are met, however, should plans change such that open space requirements are not met, the Project Sponsor would need to seek a Variance from Section 135 of the Planning Code.

4. **Open Space – Public.** Section 138 requires this project to provide one foot of open space for every 50 square feet of non-residential uses. According to the Preliminary Project Assessment application submitted to the Planning Department, the proposal includes approximately 4,600 square feet of retail space and 13,125 square feet of Instruction Service (Ballet School) space. Therefore, approximately 355 square feet of privately owned, public open space is required. The Project proposes 779 square feet, and appears to be compliant with Section 138 of the Planning Code.

5. **Street trees.** Planning Code Section 138.1 requires one street tree for every 20 feet of frontage for new construction. With approximately 348 feet of street frontage along Otis and 12th Streets, seventeen (17) street trees would be required. No street trees are shown on the plans. Please show the required new street trees on the proposed site plan. No permit will be approved by the City before satisfying all applicable tree-related requirements.

6. **Streetscape Plan.** The new construction project is on a lot (lots) greater than one-half acre in total area and contains more than 250 feet of total lot frontage on one or more publically-accessible rights-of-way, 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 Street 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 and Section 138.1(c)(2)(ii) for the additional elements that may be required as part of the project’s streetscape plan.

7. **Dwelling Unit Exposure (Sec. 140).** Each 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 directly face an open area of a public street or alley at least 20’ in width, a side yard at least 25’ in width, or rear yard meeting the requirements of this Code; provided that if such windows are on an outer court whose width is less than 25 feet, the depth of such court shall be no greater than its width; or an open area which is unobstructed and is no less than 25 feet in every horizontal dimension for the floor at which
the dwelling unit in question is located and the floor immediately above it, with an increase of five feet in every horizontal dimension at each subsequent floor. The side setbacks and roof terraces proposed at residential levels do not meet minimum exposure requirements; therefore a Variance from Section 140 is required. The Department generally encourages projects to minimize the number of units needing an exposure exception.

8. **Rooftop Screening (Section 141).** Be advised that rooftop mechanical equipment must be arranged so as not to be visible from any point at or below the roof level of the subject building.

9. **Parking Screening and Greening (Section 142).** Be advised that the parking and vehicle use areas less than 25 linear feet adjacent to a public right-of-way is required pursuant to Planning Code section 142.

10. **Street Frontages (Section 145(c)(2)).** No more than one-third of the width or 20 feet, whichever is less, of any given street frontage of a new or altered structure parallel to and facing a street shall be devoted to parking and loading ingress or egress. As proposed, the Project appears to comply, though it is not absolutely clear. If the project does not meet these provisions, a Variance from Planning Code Section 145(c)(2) would be required.

11. **Active Uses (Section 145(c)(3)).** With the exception of space allowed for parking and loading access, building egress, and access to mechanical systems, space for active uses shall be provided within the first 25 feet of building depth on the ground floor and 15 feet on floors above from any façade facing a street at least 30 feet in width. As proposed, the project requires a Variance as bicycle parking is not considered an active use. The Department recommends relocating bicycle parking to another location on-site, and providing a more active use along the 12th Street frontage.

**Shadow Analysis (Section 147).** Section 147 requires that new buildings and additions to existing buildings in C-3, South of Market Mixed Use, and Eastern Neighborhoods Mixed Use Districts that exceed 50 feet shall be shaped to reduce substantial shadow impacts on public plazas and other publicly accessible spaces other than those protected under Section 295. A preliminary shadow study was conducted by Staff in conjunction with this PPA Application, and it indicated that the project may cast a shadow on shadows on Octavia Boulevard, McCoppin Square, and Octavia Plaza, which are existing city-owned public open spaces, not under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Department, and the proposed Brady Park. These parks were not constructed at the time of the Market and Octavia FEIR. Therefore, the Market and Octavia FEIR did not identify significant impacts at that time. However, the Market and Octavia FEIR stated that once these properties become public parks, they would be subject to either Planning Code Section 295 or Market and Octavia FEIR Mitigation Measure 5.5.A2–Parks and Open Space not Subject to Section 295. These parks are not subject to Planning Code Section 295 and thus, the project is subject to Mitigation Measure 5.5.A2, which requires good design to reduce substantial shadow impacts on public plazas and other publically accessible spaces.

Given the potential impacts to varying public open spaces, the project sponsor is 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-](http://www.sf-).
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.

12. **Ground Floor Wind Currents (Section 148).** In C-3 Districts, buildings and additions to existing buildings shall be shaped, or other wind-baffling measures shall be adopted, so that the developments will not cause ground-level wind currents to exceed, more than 10 percent of the time year round, between 7:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m., the comfort level of 11 m.p.h. equivalent wind speed in areas of substantial pedestrian use and seven m.p.h. equivalent wind speed in public seating areas.

When preexisting ambient wind speeds exceed the comfort level, or when a proposed building or addition may cause ambient wind speeds to exceed the comfort level, the building shall be designed to reduce the ambient wind speeds to meet the requirements. An exception may be granted, in accordance with the provisions of Section 309, allowing the building or addition to add to the amount of time that the comfort level is exceeded by the least practical amount if (1) it can be shown that a building or addition cannot be shaped and other wind-baffling measures cannot be adopted to meet the foregoing requirements without creating an unattractive and ungainly building form and without unduly restricting the development potential of the building site in question, and (2) it is concluded that, because of the limited amount by which the comfort level is exceeded, the limited location in which the comfort level is exceeded, or the limited time during which the comfort level is exceeded, the addition is insubstantial.

No exception shall be granted and no building or addition shall be permitted that causes equivalent wind speeds to reach or exceed the hazard level of 26 miles per hour for a single hour of the year.

13. **Off-Street Parking (Section 151).** The Project appears to comply with principally permitted parking. Planning Code Section 151 permits one parking space for every four dwelling units in the Van Ness and Market Downtown Residential Special Use District. Be advised that one parking space accessible to persons with disabilities must be provided for every 25 parking spaces and that all proposed off-street parking spaces must comply with dimensions outlined in Planning Code Section 154.

14. **Off-Street Freight Loading (Section 152).** Two off-street freight loading spaces are required for projects proposing 200,001 – 500,000 gross square feet of floor area. As the project proposes a development of approximately 263,420 gross square feet, two off-street freight loading spaces are required. Be advised that all proposed off-street parking spaces must comply with dimensions outlined in Planning Code Section 154.

14. **Shadow Analysis (Section 295).** Planning Code Section 295 restricts new shadowing on public spaces under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Department by any structure exceeding 40 feet in height. For CEQA purposes, the analysis also determines whether a project has the potential to cast shadows on other parks and other spaces. A preliminary shadow fan analysis prepared by Planning Department staff indicates that the proposed project could cast shadows on Octavia Boulevard, McCoppin Square, and Octavia Plaza, which are existing city-owned public open spaces, not under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Department, and the proposed Brady Park. These parks were not constructed at the time of the Market and Octavia FEIR. Therefore, the Market and Octavia
FEIR did not identify significant impacts at that time. However, the Market and Octavia FEIR stated that once these properties become public parks, they would be subject to either Planning Code Section 295 or Market and Octavia FEIR Mitigation Measure 5.5.A2– Parks and Open Space not Subject to Section 295. These parks are not subject to Planning Code Section 295 and thus, the project is subject to Mitigation Measure 5.5.A2, which requires good design to reduce substantial shadow impacts on public plazas and other publically accessible spaces.

Given the potential impacts to varying public open spaces, the project sponsor is 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.

15. **Bicycle Parking (Section 155.1).** One Class 1 parking space is required for the first 100 dwelling units and one Class 1 parking space for every four dwelling units over 100, and one Class 2 bicycle parking space for every 20 dwelling units. Additionally one Class 1 is required for every 7,500 square foot of retail space and personal/instructional service space. One Class 2 parking space is also required for every 2,500 square feet of retail space and every 750 square feet of personal service space. As the Project proposes 354 dwelling units, 4,600 square feet of retail and 13,125 square feet of instructional service space, a total of 166 Class 1 (163 for residents, 1 for retail, 2 for ballet school) and 38 (18 for residential use, 18 for ballet school, 2 for retail) Class 2 bicycle parking spaces are required for the project as proposed.

16. **Transportation Management Programs (Section 163).** For projects where the gross square feet of new construction or added floor area for any residential and non-residential use equals at least 100,000 square feet or 100 dwelling units, the project sponsor shall be required to provide on-site transportation brokerage services for the actual lifetime of the project, as provided in this Subsection. Prior to the issuance of a temporary permit of occupancy (for this purpose Section 149(d) shall apply), the project sponsor shall execute an agreement with the Planning Department for the provision of on-site transportation brokerage services and preparation of a transportation management program to be approved by the Director of Planning and implemented by the provider of transportation brokerage services. The transportation management program and transportation brokerage services shall be designed:

1. To promote and coordinate effective and efficient use of transit by tenants and their employees, including the provision of transit information and sale of transit passes on-site;
2. To promote and coordinate ridesharing activities for all tenants and their employees within the structure or use;
3. To reduce parking demand and assure the proper and most efficient use of on-site or off-site parking, where applicable, such that all provided parking conforms with the requirements of Article 1.5 of this Code and project approval requirements;
4. To promote and encourage the provision and proliferation of car-sharing services convenient to tenants and employees of the subject buildings in addition to those required by Section 166, and to promote and encourage those tenants and their employees to prioritize the use of
car-share services for activities that necessitate automobile travel, including the promotion and sale of individual and business memberships in certified car-sharing organizations, as defined by Section 166(b)(2).

(5) To promote and encourage project occupants to adopt a coordinated flex-time or staggered work hours program designed to more evenly distribute the arrival and departure times of employees within normal peak commute periods;

(6) To participate with other project sponsors in a network of transportation brokerage services for the respective downtown, South of Market area, or other area of employment concentration in Mixed Use Districts;

(7) To carry out other activities determined by the Planning Department to be appropriate to meeting the purpose of this requirement.

17. **Car Share (Section 166).** Two car share parking spaces are required for any residential project proposing 201 or more residential units, plus 1 for every 200 dwelling units over 200. As the project proposes 354 dwelling units, three car share parking spaces are required.

18. **Unbundled Parking (Section 167).** Be advised that all off-street parking spaces accessory to residential uses in new structures of 10 dwelling units or more, shall be leased or sold separately from the rental or purchase fees for dwelling units for the life of the dwelling units, such that potential renters or buyers have the option of renting or buying a residential unit at a price lower than would be the case if there were a single price for both the residential unit and the parking space.

19. **Van Ness & Market Downtown Residential Special Use District (Section 249.33).** Projects located in the Van Ness and Market Downtown Residential SUD are permitted to reach a floor area ratio (FAR) of 9:1. Project Sponsors shall pay into the Van Ness and Market Neighborhood Infrastructure and Citywide Affordable Housing Fund for every square foot that exceeds the FAR limit.

In 85/250-R-2 height districts, there are no bulk limitations below 85 feet in height, and structures above 85 feet shall meet Planning Code Section (e)(2)(A-F), which states that buildings between 241 and 300 feet in height may not exceed a plan length of 100 feet and diagonal dimension of 125 feet for the portions of the structure above the podium height, and may not exceed a maximum average floor area of 8,500 gross square feet. The Project Sponsor will be required to provide a diagram graphically depicting how the project complies along with a floor-by-floor chart delineating floor areas.

Additionally, in order to provide adequate sunlight and air to streets and open spaces, a minimum of 115 feet must be preserved between all structures above 120 feet in height at all levels above 120 feet in height. Spacing shall be measured horizontally from the outside surface of the exterior wall of the subject building to the nearest point on the closest structure above 120 feet in height.

No bulk exceptions shall be permitted; the procedures for granting special exceptions to bulk limits described in Section 272 shall not apply to buildings in the Van Ness and Market Downtown Residential Special Use District.

20. **Height (Section 260).** This project covers parcels that are zoned for 85’ and 250’. The proposal includes elevations reaching 278’, however it is not clear that this would be permitted. The Planning
Code exempts up to 16’ for mechanical equipment and appurtenances, and mechanical screens up to 20’ that do not exceed a total volume, including the volume of the features being enclosed, equal to ¾ of the horizontal area of all upper tower roof areas of the building measured before the addition of any exempt features times 20. Additionally, in C-3 Districts, vertical extensions to buildings, such as spires, which enhance the visual appearance of the structure and are not used for human occupancy may be allowed, pursuant to the provisions of Section 309, up to 75 feet above the height otherwise allowed, provided that the extension is less than 100 square feet in cross section and 18 feet in diagonal dimension. The “architectural tip” may not meet this dimensions and therefore may not be permitted.

21. 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

22. Affordable Housing. Section 415 of the Planning Code requires any housing project consisting of ten units or more to participate in the Inclusionary Housing Program. The Project Sponsor must submit an Affidavit for Compliance with the Inclusionary Affordable Housing Program to the Planning Department identifying the method of compliance. Provision of affordable housing can either occur on-site, off-site or an in-lieu fee. Any on-site affordable dwelling units proposed as part of the project must be designated as owner-occupied units, not rental units, and sold as ownership units for the life of the project. An electronic copy of the affidavit can be found here: http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=8422.

A project may provide on-site rental units if it has demonstrated to the Planning Department that the affordable units are not subject to the Costa Hawkins Rental Housing Act (a Costa Hawkins exception). Affordable units are not subject to the Costa Hawkins Rental Housing Act under the exception provided in Civil Code Sections 1954.50 through one of the following methods: direct financial construction from a public entity or development bonus or other form of public assistance. If the project sponsor seeks a Costa Hawkins exception agreement, it will be drafted by the City Attorney. The project sponsor must state in the submittal how the project qualifies for a Costa Hawkins exception. If the project is deemed eligible, work may commence with the City Attorney on the agreement, which must be executed prior to the Planning Commission hearing.

23. 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. Applicants may contact stormwaterreview@sfwater.org for assistance.

24. 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.

25. Non-potable Water Reuse. Beginning November 1, 2015, all new buildings of 250,000 square feet or more of gross floor area, located within the boundaries of San Francisco’s designated recycled water use area, must install non-potable water reuse systems to treat and reuse available alternate water sources for toilet and urinal flushing and irrigation. This requirement expands to the entire city the following year, on November 1, 2016. Your project will need approvals from the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission and permits from both the Department of Public Health and DBI to verify compliance with the requirements and local health and safety codes. To view more information about the requirements, please visit http://www.sfwater.org/np. Project teams may contact nonpotable@sfwater.org for assistance.

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

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

- Transit Impact Development Fee (TIDF)
- Affordable Housing Fee (415)
- Market & Octavia Inclusionary Affordable Housing Fee (416)
- Market & Octavia Community Improvement Fund (421)
- Van Ness & Market Affordable Housing and Neighborhood Infrastructure Fee and Program (424.3)
- Public Art (429)

27. Market and Octavia Area Plan. The subject property falls within the area covered by the Market and Octavia Area Plan in the General Plan. As proposed, the project includes uses that are generally
consistent with the overarching objectives of the Plan. The project sponsor is encouraged to read the
full plan, which can be viewed at http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1713.

28. **Market and Octavia + Van Ness and Market Downtown Residential SUD Impact Fees.** This project
is subject to three impact fees specific to the Market and Octavia Area Plan and the Van Ness and
Market Downtown Residential Special Use District. These impact fees include the Community
Improvement Fund (pursuant to Planning Code Section 421), the Affordable Housing Fee (Planning
Code 416), and the Van Ness and Market Inclusionary Affordable Housing Fee (Planning Code 424).
They shall be assessed per net new gross square footage on residential and non-residential uses
within the Plan Area and SUD. Fees shall be assessed on mixed use projects according to the gross
square feet of each use in the project. For the most up-to-date schedule, please refer to the
Department of Building Inspection (DBI) fee register: http://sfdbi.org/index.aspx?page=617 . The
impact Fees shall be paid before the City issues a first construction document, with an option for the
project sponsor to defer payment prior to issuance of the first certificate of occupancy upon agreeing
to pay a deferral surcharge in accordance with Section 107A.13.3 of the San Francisco Building Code.

29. **Option for In-Kind Provision of Community Improvements and Fee Credits.** Project sponsors may
propose to directly provide community improvements to the City. In such a case, the City may enter
into an In-Kind Improvements Agreement with the sponsor and issue a fee waiver for the Market
and Octavia Area Plan Impact Fee from the Planning Commission, for an equivalent amount to the
value of the improvements. The project site has potential opportunities for In-Kind improvements.
All proposed In-Kind improvements will need to be reviewed and endorsed by the Market Octavia
Community Advisory Committee (CAC). Any proposed In-Kind improvements must go above and
beyond baseline Streetscape and Pedestrian Improvements as required by Planning Code Sec. 138.1.
Required streetscape and pedestrian improvements are not eligible for in-kind fee credit.

The following are suggestions for possible In-Kind improvements that are either suggested explicitly
in the Market & Octavia Plan or speak directly to the Plan’s vision for creating traffic-calmed
residential alleys, and for providing safe and comfortable right-of-ways for pedestrian use, and
improved public life in the neighborhood. The Planning Department is able to facilitate this
coordination if desired.

g. Potential reconfiguration of the 12th Street intersection with South Van Ness and Mission to
create space for a new corner plaza. This concept is illustrated in the adopted Market &
Octavia Plan, see page 59 of the Area Plan. Coordination with other proposed projects in the
area as well as city agencies will be necessary to assess the desirable configuration of such a
plaza and related circulation changes.

h. Make “Living Alley” improvements on Chase Court and Colton Place. Using the Market
Octavia Living Alleys toolkit as a guide (see http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/plans-and-
programs/in-your-neighborhood/market_octavia_living_alley/Market-Octavia-Living-Alleys-
Toolkit_FINAL-WEB.pdf), these alleys should be fronted by active uses and provide
opportunities for community and social activation. This improvement should be coordinated
with the 1601 Market/Plumbers Union project.
More information on in-kind agreements can be found in the Application Packet for In-Kind Agreement on the Planning Department website.

30. **Required Streetscape and Pedestrian Improvements.** Per Planning Code Section 138.1, the project sponsor will be required to submit a Streetscape Plan illustrating the location and design of streetscape improvements appropriate to the street type, including site furnishing, landscaping, corner curb extensions, and sidewalk widening as appropriate. The Planning Department may require these elements as part of conditions of approval.

The project was brought before the Street Design Action Team (SDAT) on October 19th, 2015, who had the following comments:

**Street Design and the Hub Planning Effort Currently Underway.**
The Planning Department is currently working on an update to the Market and Octavia Plan that will address the public realm at this location. This planning effort is called the Hub. SDAT strongly encourages the 30 Otis project team to coordinate the programming of the public realm with the Hub Team regarding surrounding developments, the proposed Brady Park, and on the streetscape plan. Please contact Maia Small (maia.small@sfgov.org) and Ben Caldwell. (Ben.Caldwell@sfgov.org).

- **12th street Plaza.** SDAT supports the future plaza proposed for 12th and South Van Ness Ave intersection as identified in the Market and Octavia Plan. SDAT strongly encourages the 30 Otis team to consider an In-Kind Agreement to enhance the public realm at this location. Please note, that the Department of Public Works will require you to take out a Major Sidewalk encroachment permit for this improvement because it is likely to incorporate non-standard materials. This will require the 30 Otis project to assume maintenance liability for the space in perpetuity. Please coordinate plaza designs with Kenneth Kwong of SFMTA at Kenneth.kwong@sfmta.com.

- **Colusa Place and Chase Court.** SDAT supports a shared street design at Colusa Place and Chase Court assuming these designs are in congruence with the Hub Planning Process underway now.

**Otis Street Sidewalk Width**
- Please coordinate with SFMTA Muni Forward project on Otis Street sidewalk width. SDAT prefers a 15’ sidewalk at this location if feasible. However, this sidewalk width may not be feasible. Please contact Felipe Robles for future coordination felipe.robles@sfmta.com.

**Boarding Island**
- SFMTA has a proposed Muni boarding island on Otis Street adjacent to the project site, as part of the SFMTA Muni Forward. The boarding island has been designed to accommodate existing curb cuts. This means vehicles will need to drive over the transit boarding island to access existing garages. Once the 30 Otis project moves forward existing curb cuts will be removed from the sidewalk. The transit island (currently being designed) should be designed to accommodate easy removal of these curb cuts in the future. Please coordinate with SFMTA on curb cut removal.
scheduling and design. Please contact Felipe Robles for future coordination felipe.robles@sfmta.com.

Landscaping and Site Furnishings

- Landscaping, street trees, site furniture, and special paving should be included throughout the project’s public realm per the Better Streets Plan.

References

Please refer to the following design guidelines when revising the project’s design.

BSP Street Furnishings Guidelines: http://www.sfbetterstreets.org/find-project-types/streetscape-elements/street-furniture-overview/

BSP Guidelines for Special Paving in the Furniture Zone: http://www.sfbetterstreets.org/find-project-types/streetscape-elements/sidewalk_paving/


See http://www.sfbetterstreets.org/design-guidelines/street-types/ to identify relevant street types for the project frontage.

Required streetscape and pedestrian improvements are not eligible for in-kind fee credit.

PRELIMINARY DESIGN COMMENTS:

The project is located in the Van Ness and Market Downtown Residential Special Use District in the eastern corner of the Market Octavia Area Plan being re-identified as “the Hub.” The area is expected to grow significantly in residential density in the next decade with several high-rise developments in the pipeline. The area is well-served by transit as it is adjacent to Market Street and the Van Ness BRT project expected to break ground shortly. The current architectural character is primarily masonry with one to six story buildings and the anticipated high-rise character will be contemporary in design.

The project site is located within an identified historic district; 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 the Preliminary Project Assessment for further instruction.

It should be noted that while the application included three options for height, the Planning Department reviewed the height complying iteration, as discussed with the sponsor prior to review. The following comments address preliminary design issues that may significantly impact the proposed project:
1 **Site Design, Open Space and Massing.** The Planning Department generally supports the site design and configuration, however encourages a stronger street wall along Otis Street and study of removing the second level roof terrace and replacing it with a ground level public open space in the same configuration. The project team might also consider how the entry along Otis connects both in plan and section to either Colusa or Chase as a large development anticipated towards Market Street will be providing significant open space to the block’s interior. While we would not expect this to be a public right-of-way, it would benefit the development’s residents and improve safety to and public oversight of the new exterior space.

2 **Street Frontage.** The Planning Department applauds the inclusion of an existing tenant, the Ballet School, and encourages this to be visible and expressed in the lower levels as an active use within the façade. Where public interface is appropriate to the program, ground floor access would be desirable. Bicycle storage, however, is not considered an active use but is preferred on the ground level. The Planning Department appreciates the sponsor willingness to consider parking and loading access from the interior of the block; as this area is currently being studied by both MTA and Planning to optimize the effectiveness of transit and the quality of the pedestrian environment, we hope to further work with the team to establish the best access point as this is not yet clear.

   Additionally, 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, and 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 basic project approvals not count for as credit towards in-kind contributions. Please refer to “Required Streetscape and Pedestrian Improvements” above for more information on streetscape improvements.

3 **Architecture.** As the project is diagrammatic, the Planning Department has little comment on the architecture at this time but recommends that the project express significant façade depth, provide high-quality materials and meet the architectural detailing and character of the neighborhood. The lower four to five floors of the podium should add detail and architectural features to bring the scale of the tower to the scale of the street environment. As the tower will be one very legible from important views across the city, particularly from the west, it should have a clear and appropriate architectural idea expressed elegantly and articulately both from afar and up close. Please review the Market-Octavia Area Plan Design Guidelines for more detailed goals.
As wind is a significant environmental force in this area of the city, the Planning Department advises initial study of its effects so that the potential impacts can be integrated into the architectural idea from an early stage.

As this area is rapidly changing, the Planning Department appreciates the project team’s willingness to participate in on-going discussions about evolving neighborhood character, streetscape, and public space opportunities.

PRELIMINARY PROJECT ASSESSMENT EXpiration:
This Preliminary Project Assessment is valid for a period of 18 months. An Environmental Evaluation, Downtown Project Authorization (Section 309 Review), Variance and Building Permit Applications, as listed above, must be submitted no later than April 27, 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: 30 Otis Shadow Fan

cc:  Mark Loper, Project Sponsor  
     Tina Chang, Current Planning  
     Lana Russell-Hurd, Environmental Planning  
     Jessica Look, Citywide Planning and Analysis  
     Maia Small, Citywide Design Group  
     David Winslow, Citywide Design Group  
     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)
The City and County of San Francisco (CCSF) does not guarantee the accuracy, adequacy, completeness or usefulness of any information. CCSF provides this information on an "as is" basis without warranty of any kind, including but not limited to warranties of merchantability or fitness for a particular purpose, and assumes no responsibility for anyone's use of the information.

Title: 30 Otis St- Preliminary Shadow Fan Analysis
Comments: Proposed Building Height: 278' feet (250' + 28' mechanical screen and vertical extension as indicated in PPA application)
Printed: 28 September, 2015
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>FIRST</strong></th>
<th><strong>LAST</strong></th>
<th><strong>TITLE</strong></th>
<th><strong>ORGANIZATION</strong></th>
<th><strong>ADDRESS</strong></th>
<th><strong>CITY</strong></th>
<th><strong>STATE</strong></th>
<th><strong>ZIP</strong></th>
<th><strong>TELEPHONE</strong></th>
<th><strong>EMAIL</strong></th>
<th><strong>NEIGHBORHOOD OF INTEREST</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angelica</td>
<td>Cabande</td>
<td>Organizational Director</td>
<td>South of Market Community Action Network (SOMCAN)</td>
<td>1110 Howard Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>415-431-4210</td>
<td><a href="mailto:acabande@somcan.org">acabande@somcan.org</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonio</td>
<td>Diaz</td>
<td>Project Director</td>
<td>People Organizing to Demand Environmental and Economic Rights (PODER)</td>
<td>474 Valencia Street #125</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>415-362-2500</td>
<td><a href="mailto:padiaz@sd3.org">padiaz@sd3.org</a></td>
<td>Excelsior, Mission, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td>Diamond</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Mission Creek Harbor Association</td>
<td>870 Market Street, Suite 456</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-902-7635</td>
<td><a href="mailto:corrine@missioncreek.org">corrine@missioncreek.org</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corinne</td>
<td>Woods</td>
<td>Community Planner</td>
<td>Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation - CO Department</td>
<td>215 Taylor Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-358-3920</td>
<td><a href="mailto:agoldman@tnrdc.org">agoldman@tnrdc.org</a></td>
<td>Downtown/Civic Center, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandra</td>
<td>Goldman</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>South of Market Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>P.O. Box 410805</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94101</td>
<td>415-669-0916</td>
<td><a href="mailto:somabendna@gmail.com">somabendna@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Downtown/Civic Center, Mission, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethan</td>
<td>Hough</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>One Ecker Owners Association</td>
<td>15 Jessie Street Unit 301</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94105</td>
<td>415-847-3169</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ethanhough@gmail.com">ethanhough@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Financial District, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerald</td>
<td>Wolf</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Hallam Street Homeowners Association</td>
<td>1 Brush Place</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>415-626-6650</td>
<td><a href="mailto:wolfg@earthlink.net">wolfg@earthlink.net</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian</td>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td>0 HERE Local 2</td>
<td>0 HERE Local 2</td>
<td>209 Golden Gate Avenue</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Chinatown, Downtown/Civic Center, Marina, Mission, Nob Hill, North Beach, Pacific Heights, Presidio, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>Supervisor, District 6</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>415-554-7970</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jana.kim@sfgov.org">jana.kim@sfgov.org</a></td>
<td>Downtown/Civic Center, North Beach, South of Market, Treasure Island/YBI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet</td>
<td>Carpinelli</td>
<td>Board President</td>
<td>Dogpatch Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>934 Minnesoa Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94107</td>
<td>415-282-5516</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jo@carpinelli.com">jo@carpinelli.com</a></td>
<td>Potrero Hill, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>Henderson</td>
<td>Vice Chairman</td>
<td>Market/Octavia Community Advisory Comm.</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@sbglobal.net">jhenders@sbglobal.net</a></td>
<td>Castro/Upper Market, Downtown/Civic Center, Mission, South of Market, Western Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaime</td>
<td>Whitaker</td>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>SOMA Leadership Council</td>
<td>201 Harrison Street Apt. 229</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94105</td>
<td>415-935-8819</td>
<td><a href="mailto:somajournal@yahoo.com">somajournal@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>Mission, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katy</td>
<td>Liddell</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>South Beach/Rincon/Mission Bay Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>403 Main Street #813</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94105</td>
<td>415-412-2207</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cliddell@msn.com">cliddell@msn.com</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaye</td>
<td>Griffin</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>LMNOP Neighbors</td>
<td>104T Minna Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>415-724-1953</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lmnop@sak.net">lmnop@sak.net</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>Goldstein</td>
<td>0 Potrero-Dogpatch Merchants Association</td>
<td>800 Kansas Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94107</td>
<td>0</td>
<td><a href="mailto:keith@everestsf.org">keith@everestsf.org</a></td>
<td>Mission, Potrero Hill, South of Market</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>Magnani</td>
<td>0 American Friends Service Committee</td>
<td>65 Ninth Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>415-565-0201</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sff@afsc.org">sff@afsc.org</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marvin</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>94102-6526</td>
<td>415-674-1935</td>
<td><a href="mailto:marvphilps@gmail.com">marvphilps@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Downtown/Civic Center, Mission, South of Market, Western Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>Tito</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Saman Development Centre</td>
<td>2055 Sunnydale Avenue #100</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94134-2811</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Bayview, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read</td>
<td>Bement</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Rincon Hill Residents Association</td>
<td>75 Folsom Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94105</td>
<td>415-882-7871</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rbement@sbglobal.net">rbement@sbglobal.net</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>Minott</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Potrero Hill Neighbors/Save the Hill</td>
<td>1206 Mariposa Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94107</td>
<td>415-553-5999</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rodminott@hotmail.com">rodminott@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>Potrero Hill, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonja</td>
<td>Kos</td>
<td>Community Advocate</td>
<td>TODCO Impact Group</td>
<td>230 Fourth Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>415-426-6819</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sonja@toboco.org">sonja@toboco.org</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>Olsson</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>TFPA CAC</td>
<td>30 Sharon Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94114</td>
<td>415-407-0094</td>
<td><a href="mailto:olssoneted@yahoo.com">olssoneted@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>Financial District, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiffany</td>
<td>Bohee</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, City and County of San Francisco</td>
<td>1 South Van Ness Avenue, 5th Floor</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Tiffanybohee@sfgov.org">Tiffanybohee@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:mikgrisso@sfgov.org">mikgrisso@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:courtney.pash@sfgov.org">courtney.pash@sfgov.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.R.</td>
<td>Eppler</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Potrero Boosters Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>1459 - 18th Street, Suite 133</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94107</td>
<td>650-704-7775</td>
<td><a href="mailto:president@potreroboosters.org">president@potreroboosters.org</a></td>
<td>Mission, Potrero Hill, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>Loo</td>
<td>0 York Realty</td>
<td>0 York Realty</td>
<td>243A Shipley Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94107-1010</td>
<td>415-751-8602</td>
<td><a href="mailto:yorkloo@gmail.com">yorkloo@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>