DATE: January 11, 2016
TO: Mark Loper, Reuben, Junius & Rose
FROM: Rick Cooper, Planning Department
RE: PPA Case No. 2015-010219PPA for 462 Bryant Street

Please find the attached Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) for the address listed above. You may contact the staff contact, Michael Jacinto, at (415) 575-9033 or michael.jacinto@sfgov.org, to answer any questions you may have, or to schedule a follow-up meeting.

Rick Cooper, Senior Planner
Preliminary Project Assessment

Date: January 11, 2016
Case No.: 2015-010219PPA
Project Address: 462 Bryant Street
Block/Lot: 3763/015C
Existing Zoning: MUO (Mixed-Use Office) Zoning District
45-X Height and Bulk District
Proposed Zoning: MUO (Mixed-Use Office) Zoning District
85-X Height and Bulk District
Existing Area Plan: East SoMa Area Plan
Proposed Area Plan: Central SoMa Area Plan
Project Sponsor: Mark Loper, Reuben, Junius & Rose LLP
                           415-567-9000
Staff Contact: Michael Jacinto – 415-575-9033
               michael.jacinto@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 August 6, 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 project site is on Bryant Street between Second and Third Streets. Stillman Street bounds the project block on its north, Second Street on its east, Bryant Street on its south, and Third Street on its west. The
site comprises an existing single-story, 24-foot-tall building with approximately 13,505-square-feet of office use above a basement floor containing about 9,575-square-feet of off-street parking for vehicles (13 spaces) and bicycles. The project proposes to add five stories of office as well as a green roof and a commonly-accessible rooftop deck to the existing building. The 3,540-gross-square-foot mezzanine level currently used as office would be eliminated. The project would add 49,995 gross-square-feet of office at the site, for a total of 63,239 gsf of office space on the site. The project would eliminate two off-street parking spaces in the basement, which would result in a total of 11 vehicle spaces under project conditions.

BACKGROUND:

The project site is within the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans. The Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans cover the Mission (location of project site), East South of Market (SoMa), Showplace Square/Potrero Hill, and Central Waterfront neighborhoods. On August 7, 2008, the Planning Commission certified the Eastern Neighborhoods Programmatic Final Environmental Impact Report (Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR) by Motion 17659 and adopted the Preferred Project for final recommendation to the Board of Supervisors. The Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans and its associated rezoning became effective December 19, 2008.

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

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:

The proposed project requires environmental review either individually, with a project-specific Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration or Environmental Impact Report (EIR), or in a Community Plan Exemption (CPE) if the project is determined to be consistent with an adopted community plan. The proposed project is located within the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan, which was evaluated in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR. However, the proposed project is not consistent with the land use or development density (zoning, specifically height limit) identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan.
Plan, and is therefore not eligible for a Community Plan Exemption (CPE) under the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

The Project’s proposed 85-foot building height would be consistent with the height limit alternatives currently being studied in the Central SoMa Plan EIR. Thus, it is possible that the proposal, as currently presented, would qualify for a CPE under the proposed Central SoMa Plan EIR once that EIR is certified and the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors have adopted new zoning controls. The proposed project would be assessed based on the height limits for the project site in place at the time that the Planning Department entitlements for the proposed project are sought.

Due to the project’s location within the geographic area evaluated in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR, any development on the project site would potentially be subject to the mitigation measures identified in that document. Potentially significant project environmental impacts that were identified in and pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR that may be applicable to the proposed project are discussed below, under the applicable environmental topic. However, mitigation measures from the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR that are applicable to the proposed project area could be refined, augmented, or superseded under the future Central SoMa Plan EIR, which would become applicable to the proposed project if the Draft Plan is approved.

If the proposed project is inconsistent with the height and density identified for the project site in the adopted Central SoMa Plan, the proposed project would not be eligible for a CPE under the Central SoMa Plan. The proposed project would be analyzed in a separate environmental document that would not rely on the environmental analysis undertaken for the Central SoMa Plan. In this case, the applicable fees would be (a) the standard environmental evaluation (EE) fee based on the cost of construction; and (b) the standard EIR fee, if an EIR is required.

In order to begin formal environmental review, please submit an Environmental Evaluation Application (EEA). The EEA can be submitted at the same time as the PPA Application. The environmental review may be done in conjunction with the required approvals listed below, but must be completed before any project approval may be granted. **Note that until an entitlement application is submitted to the Current Planning Division, only the proposed Project Description will be reviewed by the assigned Environmental Coordinator.** EEAs are available in the Planning Department lobby at 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, at the Planning Information Center at 1660 Mission Street, and online at www.sfplanning.org under the “Publications” tab. See “Environmental Applications” on page 2 of the current Fee Schedule for a calculation of environmental application fees.5

Below is a list of topic areas addressed through environmental review. 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 existing building on the project site was previously evaluated in the South of Market Historic Resources Survey and found ineligible for national, state, or local listing. Thus, the

---

proposed project is not subject to review by the Department’s Historic Preservation staff; no additional analysis of historic architectural resources is required.

2. **Archeological Resources.** Project implementation would entail soil-disturbing activities to a depth of approximately 5 feet associated with excavation, grading, building construction as well as other types of soils movement. The project site lies within *Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Archeological Mitigation Zone J-1: Properties with Previous Studies*. Under this measure any project resulting in soils-disturbance 2.5 feet or greater below existing grade, such as that of the proposal (5 feet), may be required to submit to the Environmental Review Officer (ERO) for review and approval an addendum to the respective Archeological Research Design/Testing Plan prepared by a qualified archeologist consultant as determined by the Department archeologist in the project Preliminary Archeological Review (PAR) process. Note also that if the project PAR review determines that an archeological consultant must be retained, that the selection of an archeological consultant must conform to Department requirements which limit selection to three consultants on the rotational Qualified Archeological Consultant List (QACL) as administered the Department archeologist.

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 not likely result in significant transportation impacts and thus would not likely require a transportation study to be prepared. However, transportation planning staff requests that the sponsor provide detailed information pertaining to possible Transportation Demand Management programs or measures that the sponsor may implement as a means to reducing the number of automobile trips generated by the proposal’s office use.

5. **Noise.** 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 anticipated.

---

Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Noise Mitigation Measure F-2: Construction Noise requires that the project sponsor develop a set of site-specific noise attenuation measures under the supervision of a qualified acoustical consultant when the environmental review of a development project determines that construction noise controls are necessary due to the nature of planned construction practices and sensitivity of proximate uses. This mitigation measure requires that a plan for such measures be submitted to DBI prior to commencing construction to ensure that maximum feasible noise attenuation will be achieved.

Based on the General Plan’s Background Noise Levels map, the project site is located along a segment of Bryant Street with noise levels between 65 dBA and 70 dBA Ldn (a day-night averaged sound level). Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Noise Mitigation Measure F-5: Siting of Noise-Generating Uses would not apply to the proposed project because the proposal’s office use would not be expected to generate noise levels in excess of ambient noise, either short term, at nighttime, or as a 24-hour average, in the project site vicinity. Open space required under the Planning Code should be protected from existing ambient noise levels that are predominately attributable to traffic noise from Bryant Street. Noise could be shielded through site design that uses the building itself to block on-site open space from the greatest noise sources or potentially the construction of noise barriers between noise sources and open space; implementation should be undertaken consistent with other principles of urban design.

6. **Air Quality.** The proposed project’s 49,995 gross square feet of office fall below 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 not required. Furthermore, 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.

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 height of 85 feet, the proposed project may require a backup diesel generator and additional measures would likely be necessary to reduce its emissions. 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 Greenhouse Gas

---

7 BAAQMD, CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, May 2011, Chapter 3.
Analysis Compliance Checklist. The project sponsor is required to submit the completed table regarding project compliance with the identified regulations and provide project-level details in the discussion column. This information will be reviewed by the environmental planner during the environmental review process to determine if the project would comply with San Francisco’s Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy. Projects that do not comply with an ordinance or regulation may be determined to be inconsistent with the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy.

8. **Wind.** The proposed project would involve construction of a building addition to over 80 feet in height and would require a consultant-prepared wind analysis that may entail wind tunnel testing, if deemed necessary by atmospheric engineers. The consultant will be required to consult with professionals versed in environmental consulting and possibly prepare a scope of work for review and approval by the Environmental Planning coordinator prior to proceeding with the analysis if necessary.

9. **Shadow.** The proposed project would entail a building addition greater than 40 feet in height. A preliminary shadow fan analysis prepared by Planning Department staff indicates that the proposed project could cast shadows on surrounding public streets and sidewalks and may impact South Park, an open space under jurisdiction of the San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department. Therefore, please submit a shadow study application to initiate review of the project in conformance with Proposition K and Planning Code Section 295.

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

11. **Hazardous Materials.** The proposed project would disturb over 50 cubic yards of soil as part of its construction in an area of known ground contamination. Therefore, the project is subject to Article 22A of the Health Code, also known as the Maher Ordinance. The Maher Ordinance, which is administered and overseen by the Department of Public Health (DPH), requires the project sponsor to retain the services of a qualified professional to prepare a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) that meets the requirements of Health Code Section 22.A.6. The Phase I ESA would determine

---


9 Preliminary Shadow Fan Analysis –462 Bryant Street, prepared by Rich Sucre, December 21, 2015. This document is available for review at the Planning Department in Case File No. 2015.003239PPA.

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.

*Eastern Neighborhoods EIR Hazardous Materials Mitigation Measure L-1: Hazardous Building Materials* would be applicable to the demolition of the site’s two existing buildings. The mitigation measure requires that the project sponsor ensure that any equipment containing polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) or di(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate (DEPH), such as fluorescent light ballasts, and any fluorescent light tubes containing mercury be removed and properly disposed of in accordance with applicable federal, state, and local laws. In addition, any other hazardous materials identified, either before or during work, must be abated according to applicable federal, state, and local laws.

12. **Tree Planting and Protection.** The Department of Public Works Code Section 8.02-8.11 requires disclosure and protection of landmark, significant, and street trees located on private and public property. Any such trees must be shown on the site plans with the size of the trunk diameter, tree height, and accurate canopy drip line. Please submit the *Tree Planting and Protection Checklist* with the EEA and ensure that trees are appropriately shown on site plans. Also see the comments below under “Street Trees.”

13. **Disclosure Report for Developers of Major City Projects.** The San Francisco Ethics Commission S.F. Camp. & Govt. Conduct Code § 3.520 et seq. requires developers to provide the public with information about donations that developers make to nonprofit organizations that may communicate with the City and County regarding major development projects. This report must be completed and filed by the developer of any “major project.” A major project is a real estate development project located in the City and County of San Francisco with estimated construction costs exceeding $1,000,000 where either: (1) The Planning Commission or any other local lead agency certifies an EIR for the project; or (2) The project relies on a program EIR and the Planning Department, Planning Commission, or any other local lead agency adopts any final environmental determination under CEQA. A final environmental determination includes: the issuance of a 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.

Note: The subject parcel is within the Central SoMa Plan area. The Central Corridor Draft Plan for Public Review was published in April 2013. The Central SoMa Plan process is anticipated to be completed in 2016. The proposals in the Draft Plan are subject to change and are contingent on the eventual approval by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors. Please see the Preliminary Project Comments section for more details on proposed requirements under the Draft Plan.

1. **Height District Reclassification.** The project site is located within the 45-X Height and Bulk District. The height of the proposed project would exceed this height limit of both designations. In order for the project to proceed, the Board of Supervisors would need to approve a Height District Reclassification for the subject parcel.

   The zoning concepts published in the Central Corridor Draft Plan (April 2013) indicate that height limit of 85-feet (proposed Mid-Rise and High-Rise Scenario Alternatives) is being considered for this site. This analysis is not a guarantee that the Planning Commission or the Board of Supervisors will approve changes to height limits.

2. **A Large Project Authorization** from the Planning Commission is required per Planning Code Section 329 for the new construction of a building greater than 75 feet in height and greater than 25,000 gross square feet.

3. **A Shadow Application** must be submitted, per Planning Code Section 295. Due to potential shadow impacts on nearby property owned by the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department (see “Preliminary Project Comments” below), the project must be approved by the Recreation and Park Commission.

4. **An Office Allocation** from the Planning Commission is required per Planning Code Section 321 et seq. to establish more than 25,000 gross square feet of new office space.

5. **A Building Permit Application** is required for the alterations to the existing building on the subject property.

All 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 Inspections 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. **Existing Zoning/Height-Bulk.** The subject property is zoned as a MUO (Mixed-Use Office) Zoning District, which permits office use. The project is currently located within the 45-X Height and Bulk District, which does not permit the project’s proposed height and bulk. The project could not be approved under existing height and bulk.

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

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

3. **Land Use.** The Central SoMa Area Plan concepts recommend rezoning the subject property to the Mixed-Use Office (MUO) Zoning District, in which the proposed uses would be allowed. The proposed mixed use development (retail, office and residential) is generally consistent with key objectives of the Central SoMa Area Plan, which include providing support for substantial development in a transit-rich area and favoring office development over other kinds of growth,
particularly on large parcels. The Central SoMa Area Plan concepts also include a new Special Use District that would limit new residential development to smaller parcels or, on larger parcels, as a component in a mixed-use project with major commercial development. The Planning Department is refining the Plan’s proposal on the percentage of large parcels that must be non-residential.

In order to create a diverse and dynamic 24-hour neighborhood characteristic of SoMa, the Central SoMa Area Plan’s preliminary land use principles envision a mixed-use neighborhood in which substantial office development is balanced with retail, arts, entertainment, industrial, and residential uses. The project sponsor is encouraged to further explore inclusion of a variety of uses for these ground floor spaces.

4. **Urban Form:** Height and Bulk. In recognition of the desire to accommodate more growth in the area, the Draft Central Corridor Plan recommends changing the height limit of the subject property. The Plan contains two height scenario, both of which consider an 85-foot height district with additional setback requirements and bulk restrictions that would apply to the site. At a minimum, 15-foot setbacks would be required above a height of 85 feet along all property lines and the Plan proposes bulk restrictions for the high-rise scenarios; these are currently being refined. Please note that existing requirements in Eastern Neighborhoods districts for height along mid-block alleys and massing reduction for large projects will continue to apply.

The Plan publication and ongoing EIR analysis is not an indication of which heights will ultimately be adopted as part of the Plan and is not a guarantee that the Planning Commission or the Board of Supervisors will approve the proposed heights or whether these bodies will change existing height limits.

The following comments address specific Planning Code and other general issues that may substantially impact the proposed project. Please note that these comments reflect current Planning Code requirements for this property, which may differ from the requirements being considered under the Central SoMa Plan. Please see the comments above and the Preliminary Design Comments for more information.

5. **Large Project Authorization:** Planning Code Section 329 outlines the requirements for a Large Project Authorization in Eastern Neighborhoods Mixed Use Zoning Districts. Under these requirements, a Large Project Authorization is required of new construction of more than 25,000 gross square feet. All large projects within the MUO Zoning District are subject to review by the Planning Commission in an effort to achieve the objectives and policies of the General Plan, the applicable Design Guidelines and the Planning Code. Additional modifications of certain Planning Code requirements may be granted under the Large Project Authorization.

6. **Office Allocation.** As defined in Planning Code Section 321, the proposed project would need to obtain an Office Development Authorization from the Planning Commission for new construction of over 25,000 GSF of office use. The Planning Department recommends that the project sponsor monitor status of the Annual Limit Program at: [http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=3254](http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=3254)

7. **Open Space – Non-Residential.** Planning Code Section 135.3 requires this project to provide one square foot of open space for every 50 occupied square feet of office space. If the open space provided
does not meet the minimum requirements, an in-lieu fee may be paid instead of providing the open space on site per Section 426. Please be aware that while under the current Planning Code, this non-residential open space is not required to be open to the public in the MUO District, the Central Corridor planning process is proposing a change to require open space to be open to the public and meet design and access standards similar or the same as Planning Code Section 138.

8. **Street Trees/Streetscape Plan.** Planning Code Section 138.1 requires one street tree for every 20 feet of frontage for new construction with any remaining fraction of 10 feet or more of frontage requiring an additional tree, as well as the submittal of a streetscape plan for projects above a certain size. The proposed project would require additional street trees along public rights-of-way, as well as submittal of a streetscape plan identifying proposed improvements. Please consult with the Department of Public Works regarding the placement of the street trees.

9. **Street Frontage.** Planning Code Section 145.1 outlines requirements for street frontages to ensure that they are pedestrian-oriented, fine-grained, and are appropriate and compatible with the buildings in MUO District. Please ensure that the ground floor street frontage meets all of these requirements as related to use, ground floor ceiling height, transparency, fenestration, gates, railings and grillwork.

10. **Shadow.** Planning Code Section 147 states that a shadow analysis is required any project over 50 feet in height in the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan Area. Similarly, Planning Code Section 295 requires a shadow analysis be conducted for any project greater than 40 feet in height. The preliminary analysis for the proposed project indicates that it may cast shadows on nearby public parks; therefore, additional analysis will be required. See commentary on “Shadow” in the Environmental Review section (See Above).

11. **Parking.** Under current and proposed zoning (MUO), no parking would be required. The project would have parking maximums, which are listed in Planning Code Section 151.1. For office use within the MUO Zoning District, parking is limited to seven percent of the gross floor area of office use.

12. **Bicycle Parking & Showers.** Planning Code Section 155.2 outlines the requirement for bicycle parking in new development. The number of required Class 1 and Class 2 bicycle parking spaces shall be dependent on the amount of office space.

In addition, Planning Code Section 155.4 outlines the requirement for shower facilities and lockers for office and retail development. For office development over 50,000 sq ft, a minimum two showers and twelve clothes lockers are required. Please ensure compliance with these requirements.

13. **Car-Sharing.** Planning Code Section 166 provides the required number of car sharing spaces for new construction. The number of required car-share parking spaces shall be dependent on the amount of off-street parking. Please ensure compliance with this requirement.
14. **Transportation Management Program.** Pursuant to Planning Code Section 163, an agreement will be required to be executed with the Planning Department to ensure that transportation brokerage services are provided for the life of the project.

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

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

16. **Flood Notification.** The project site is in a block that has the potential to flood during storms. The SFPUC will review the permit application to comment on the proposed application and the potential for flooding during wet weather. Applicants for building permits for either new construction, change of use, or change of occupancy, or for major alterations or enlargements must contact the SFPUC at the beginning of the process to determine whether the project would result in ground-level flooding during storms. Requirements may include provision of measures to ensure positive sewage flow, raised elevation of entryways, and/or special sidewalk construction and the provision of deep gutters. The side sewer connection permits for such projects need to be reviewed and approved by the SFPUC at the beginning of the review process for all permit applications submitted to the Planning Department, DBI, or the Successor Agency to the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency. For information required for the review of projects in flood-prone areas, the permit applicant shall refer to Bulletin No. 4: [http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/publications_reports/DB_04_Flood_Zones.pdf](http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/publications_reports/DB_04_Flood_Zones.pdf).

17. **Stormwater.** If the project results in a ground surface disturbance of 5,000 sf or greater, it is subject to San Francisco’s stormwater management requirements as outlined in the Stormwater Management Ordinance and the corresponding SFPUC Stormwater Design Guidelines (Guidelines). Projects that trigger the stormwater management requirements must prepare a Stormwater Control Plan demonstrating project adherence to the performance measures outlined in the Guidelines including: (a) reduction in total volume and peak flow rate of stormwater for areas in combined sewer systems OR (b) stormwater treatment for areas in separate sewer systems. The SFPUC Wastewater Enterprise, Urban Watershed Management Program is responsible for review and approval of the Stormwater Control Plan. Without SFPUC approval of a Stormwater Control Plan, no site or building permits can be issued. The Guidelines also require a signed maintenance agreement to ensure proper care of the necessary stormwater controls. To view the Stormwater Management Ordinance, the Stormwater Design Guidelines, or download instructions for the Stormwater Control Plan, go to [http://sfwater.org/sdg](http://sfwater.org/sdg). Applicants may contact stormwaterreview@sfwater.org for assistance.

18. **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.

19. **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.

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

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

a. Transit Impact Development Fee (TIDF)
b. Jobs-Housing Linkage (413)
c. Child-Care (414)
d. Eastern Neighborhoods Impact Fees (423)
e. Public Art (429)

**PRELIMINARY DESIGN COMMENTS:**

The project is located in the Central SoMa Area Plan currently in progress. The area is primarily masonry in character with two to four-stories in height. With the adoption of the plan, the area will likely see an increase of height and bulk with the predominance of office use. The following comments are from the Department’s Urban Design Advisory Team (UDAT) and address preliminary design issues that may significantly impact the proposed project:

21. **Site Design, Open Space and Massing.** The Planning Department supports the overall massing of the project and, in particular, the application of the apparent mass reduction (“skyplane”) as proposed by the Central SoMa Area Plan Urban Form: Bulk draft policy paper.

22. **Street Frontage.** As the project proposes new office space, as per the draft policy paper on Privately Owned Public Open Spaces (POPOS), the project will be asked to provide POPOS in the amount of one square foot per 50 square feet of new office area. In this case, as this amount is less than 15% of the site, it will be required to be at grade, open to the sky, and connected to the public realm. As this is the reuse of an existing building, the Department recommends including this approximately 1,000
SF public open space within the shell of the existing structure as a courtyard as long as it is connected overtly to one-- or preferably two-- edges of the sidewalk.

UADT encourages the development of a staggered-height ground floorplate so that more active uses can be connected to both street faces. There should be enhanced transparency at these levels as well. Please review the Central SoMa Area Plan draft policy paper on Ground Floors which do not permit office use at the ground floor among other recommendations. That can be found at: http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/Citywide/Central_Corridor/Draft_CentralSoMa_Policy_Paper-Ground_Floors-March2015.pdf

23. Architecture. While the existing building is not a designated historic resource, the Planning Department encourages the new project to more directly express the existing building material and character. This might be done by articulating a more solid and defined base. The Department also requests the use of high-quality materials and the inclusion of significant depth in the fenestration in street-facing facades.

PRELIMINARY PROJECT ASSESSMENT EXPIRATION:

This Preliminary Project Assessment is valid for a period of 18 months. Any entitlement applications (e.g., Planning Code Section 329, Small Office Allocation, etc.) as listed above, must be submitted no later than July 11, 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.
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Michael Nulty
Alliance for a Better District 6
PO Box 420782
San Francisco, CA 94142-0782

Marvis Phillips
Alliance for a Better District 6
230 Eddy Street #1206
San Francisco, CA 94102-2607

Fernando Marti
Asian Neighborhood Design
1245 Howard Street
San Francisco, CA 94103

Jane Kim
Board of Supervisors Room #244
1 Dr. Carlton B Goodlett PL
San Francisco, CA 94102

Richard McGeeary
Buena Vista Neighborhood Association
555 Buena Vista West #601
San Francisco, CA 94103-4143

Gordon Chin
Chinatown Community Development Center
1525 Grant Ave.(Tower)
San Francisco, CA 94133

Janet Carpinelli
Dogpatch Neighborhood Association
934 Minnesota Street No.227
San Francisco, CA 94107

Ian Lewis
HERE Local 2
209 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102

Gerald Wolf
Hallan Street Homeowners Association
1 Brush Place
San Francisco, CA 94103

Kaye Griffin
LMNOP Neighbors
1047 Minna Street
San Francisco, CA 94103

Carolyn Diamond
Market Street Association
870 Market St., Suite 456
San Francisco, CA 94102

Jason Henderson
Market/Octavia Community Advisory Comm.
300 Buchanan Street, Apt. 503
San Francisco, CA 94102

Corrine Woods
Mission Creek Harbor Assoc.
300 Channel Street, Box 10
San Francisco, CA 94107

Don Marcos
Mission Hiring Hall
288 7th Street
San Francisco, CA 94103-3419

Dallas Bradley
Natoma Street Neighborhood Watch Group
1065 Natoma Street
San Francisco, CA 94103

David Baker
North of Market Planning Coalition
PO Box 426693
San Francisco, CA 94142-6693

Antonio Diaz
PODER
474 Valencia Street #125
San Francisco, CA 94103

John Clancy
Portside Homeowners Association
115 South Park
San Francisco, CA 94107

John Clancy
Portside Homeowners Association
115 South Park
San Francisco, CA 94107

Mike Grisso
San Francisco Redevelopment Agency
1 South Van Ness Ave., 5th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94103

Catherine Liddell
South Beach-Rincon
403 Main Street #813
San Francisco, CA 94105

Rodney Minott
Save The Hill Neighbors United for Medical
1206 Mariposa Street
San Francisco, CA 94107

Keith Goldstein
Potrero-Dogpatch Merchants Association
800 Kansas Street
San Francisco, CA 94107

York Loo
York Realty
243A Shipley Street
San Francisco, CA 94107-1010
NEIGHBORHOOD GROUP NOTIFICATION FORM

By filling out this form you are registering your neighborhood group to receive notices from the San Francisco Planning Department.

As per the Sunshine Ordinance and Planning Code, your contact information will be subject to public review; it will also be posted on the Department's website, [www.sfplanning.org](http://www.sfplanning.org)

If you have any questions, please contact planningnews@sfgov.org or 415-575-9121.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please provide the following information (* REQUIRED):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization Name * ________________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing Address * ____________________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Person to be listed in Directory * ______________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title * ______________________________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone Number * ________________________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Mail Address (generic email suggested) * ______________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Members: _____</th>
<th>Adopted By-laws: Yes [ ] No [ ]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-profit: Yes [ ] No [ ]</td>
<td>Meeting Schedule (Frequency and Time): ______________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Geographic Area of Interest:
Pick your area of interest as per the Planning Department Neighborhood Map (http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1654) below:

☐ Bayview
☐ Bernal Heights
☐ Castro/Upper Market
☐ Chinatown
☐ Crocker Amazon
☐ Diamond Heights
☐ Downtown Civic Center
☐ Excelsior
☐ Financial District
☐ Glen Park
☐ Golden Gate Park
☐ Haight Ashbury
☐ Inner Richmond
☐ Inner Sunset
☐ Lakeshore
☐ Marina
☐ Mission
☐ Noe Valley
☐ North Beach
☐ Ocean View
☐ Outer Mission
☐ Outer Richmond
☐ Outer Sunset
☐ Pacific Heights
☐ Parkside
☐ Potrero Hill
☐ Presidio
☐ Presidio Heights
☐ Russian Hill
☐ Seacliff
☐ South Bayshore
☐ South of Market
☐ Treasure Island
☐ Twin Peaks
☐ Upper Market
☐ Visitacion Valley
☐ West of Twin Peaks
☐ Western Addition
☐ Citywide

San Francisco Planning Department Neighborhood Map:

Email completed form to planningnews@sfgov.org, Please note that it takes about 2-4 weeks to start receiving notices.

Application Submission Date: ____________________
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 aboverereferenced 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). Staff from each of these disciplines will attend your meeting.

Interdepartmental Project Review fees:

1. $1,164 for five or fewer residential units and all affordable housing projects.

2. $1,702 for all other projects.

Please note that $394 of these fees is non-refundable. If your project falls under the second type of fee, and you cancel your meeting, the difference will be refunded to you.

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 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.
INTERDEPARTMENTAL PROJECT REVIEW APPLICATION FORM

APPLICATION DATE: ____________________________________________________________

PROJECT CONTACT:
Name __________________________________________ Phone No. (__)____________________
Address ___________________________________________ FAX No. (__)_______________________
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 attachments 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>

Previously contacted staff ____________________________________________________________
Will this project be publicly funded? (specify) __________________________________________

(Please submit four (4) copies/sets of the Application Form, Floor Plans, Pictures, etc.)
DATE: April 1, 2007 (V1.3)
TITLE: Review of Projects in Identified Areas Prone to Flooding

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

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

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

The SFPUC and/or its delegate (SFDPW, Hydraulics Section) will review the permit application and comment on the proposed application and the potential for flooding during wet weather. The SFPUC will receive and return the application within a two-week period from date of receipt.

The permit applicant shall refer to PUC requirements for information required for the review of projects in flood prone areas. Requirements may include provision of a pump station for the sewage flow, raised elevation of entryways, and/or special sidewalk construction and the provision of deep gutters.
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Recycled Water Installation Procedures for Developers

The City and County of San Francisco (CCSF) requires property owners to install dual-plumbing systems for recycled water use in accordance with Ordinances 390-91, 391-91, and 398-94, within the designated recycled water use areas under the following circumstances:

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

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

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

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

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

All backflow preventers must be approved by the SFPUC’s Water Quality Bureau.

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

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

**Pipe Type**
- Transmission lines and mains – ductile iron
- Distribution and service lines – purple PVC or equivalent
- Irrigation lines – purple PVC or equivalent
- Dual-plumbing – piping described in Chapter 3, Appendix J of the City and County of San Francisco Plumbing Codes

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

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

If you have questions, or would like additional information:

**Recycled Water Ordinances and Technical Assistance**
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Water Resources Planning
(415) 554-3271

**Recycled Water Plumbing Codes**
Department of Building Inspection
Plumbing Inspection Services
(415) 558-6054

**Backflow Prevention**
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Water Quality Bureau
(650) 652-3100

**New Service Line Permits**
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Customer Service Bureau
(415) 551-3000
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NOTE:
1. ALL BACKFLOW PREVENTERS MUST BE APPROVED BY SFPUC WATER QUALITY BUREAU.

2. BACKFLOW PREVENTION FOR DOMESTIC WATER PLUMBING INSIDE THE BUILDING MUST MEET CCSF PLUMBING CODE AND PUBLIC HEALTH CODE REQUIREMENTS.

3. BACKFLOW PREVENTER FOR RECYCLED WATER SYSTEM MUST MEET CCSF PLUMBING CODE AND PUBLIC HEALTH CODE REQUIREMENTS.

PROPERTY OWNER PAYS FOR NEW SERVICE INSTALLATION. SFPUC RETAINS OWNERSHIP OF NEW SERVICE UP TO THE END OF METER ASSEMBLY.

LIGHT LINES:
PROPERTY OWNER PAYS FOR NEW SERVICE INSTALLATION. OWNERSHIP REMAINS WITH THE PROPERTY OWNER.