DATE: February 12, 2016
TO: Yves Ghiai, Ghiai Architects
FROM: Brittany Bendix, Planning Department
RE: PPA Case No. 2015-015252PPA for 2101 Lombard Street

Please find the attached Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) for the address listed above. You may contact the staff contact, Christopher May, at (415) 575-9087 or christopher.may@sfgov.org, to answer any questions you may have, or to schedule a follow-up meeting.

Brittany Bendix, Acting Senior Planner
Preliminary Project Assessment

Date: February 12, 2016
Case No.: 2015-015252PPA
Project Address: 2101 Lombard St
Block/Lot: 0510/001
Zoning: NC-3 (Moderate-Scale Neighborhood Commercial) District

Project Sponsor: Yves Ghiai, Ghiai Architects
(415) 775-2113
Project Information:
christopher.r.may@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 November 18, 2015, as summarized below. This PPA letter identifies Planning Department review requirements for the proposed project, including those related to environmental review, approvals, neighborhood notification and public outreach, the Planning Code, project design, and other general issues of concern for the project. Please be advised that the PPA application does not constitute an application for development with the Planning Department. The PPA letter also does not represent a complete review of the proposed project, does not grant a project approval of any kind, and does not in any way supersede any required Planning Department approvals listed below.

The Planning Department may provide additional comments regarding the proposed project once the required applications listed below are submitted. While some approvals are granted by the Planning Department, some are at the discretion of other bodies, such as the Planning Commission or Historic Preservation Commission. Additionally, it is likely that the project will require approvals from other City agencies such as the Department of Building Inspection, Public Works, the Municipal Transportation Agency, Department of Public Health, San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, and others. The information included herein is based on the PPA application and plans, the Planning Code, General Plan, Planning Department policies, and local/state/federal regulations as of the date of this document, all of which are subject to change.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The proposal is to demolish the existing one-story Kentucky Fried Chicken (KFC) and Taco Bell restaurant and construct a new five-story, 40-foot tall building with nine (9) residential dwelling units above approximately 3,064 square feet of ground-floor retail space. Twelve (12) vehicular parking spaces and 14 bicycle parking spaces would be provided in a one-level, below-grade parking garage, excavated to a depth of around 11 feet, and accessed via a two-way, 20-foot wide driveway off Fillmore Street. The existing ingress driveway off Lombard Street would be closed.
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:

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

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

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

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

If the initial study indicates that the project would result in a significant impact that cannot be mitigated to below a significant level, an EIR will be required. An EIR must be prepared by an environmental consultant from the Planning Department’s environmental consultant pool (http://www.sfplanning.org/ftp/files/MEA/Environmental_consultant_pool.pdf). The Planning Department will provide more detail to the project sponsor regarding the EIR process should this level of environmental review be required.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:

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 existing building on the project site is less than 45 years of age, however, the property is located in an area that has not been previously surveyed for historic districts. Therefore, the proposed new construction is subject to review by the Department’s Historic Preservation staff. The Department’s Historic Preservation staff will review the proposed project; a consultant-prepared Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE) report is not required.

2. **Archeological Resources.** The project would involve the excavation of up to 11 feet below ground surface for a basement-level parking garage. The proposed project will require Preliminary Archeological Review (PAR) by a Planning Department archeologist. To aid this review the Department archeologist may request a Preliminary Archeological Sensitivity Assessment (PASS) by a Department Qualified Archeological Consultant, subject to the review and approval by the Department archeologist. The Department archeologist will provide three names from the Qualified Archeological Consultant list if the PASS is required. The PAR will assess the archeological sensitivity of the project site based on in-house source material and will consider the potential for archeological impacts resulting from proposed soils disturbance. Please provide detailed information, including sections, proposed soils-disturbing activities, such as grading, excavation, installation of foundations, soils improvement, and site remediation in the EEA, and submit any available geotechnical/soils or phase II hazardous materials reports prepared for the project to assist in this review. If the Department archeologist determines that the project has a potential to adversely affect archeological resources, the PAR will identify additional measures needed to address the potential effect. These measures may include preparation of an archeological research design and treatment plan, implementation of one of the Planning Department’s three standard archeological mitigation measures (archeological testing, monitoring, or accidental discovery), or other appropriate measures.

3. **Tribal Cultural Resources.** Tribal cultural resources (TCRs) are a class of resource established under 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 PPA submittal, a transportation impact study is not anticipated to be required; an official determination will be made subsequent to submittal of the EEA. However, the project site is located on a high injury corridor as mapped by Vision Zero (Lombard Street). Planning staff have reviewed the proposed site plans and offer the following recommendations, some of which address the safety of persons walking and cycling to and from project site and vicinity:

---

• Consider providing less parking on-site.
• Number of Bicycle Parking spaces needs to be explicitly labeled on plans
• Garage exit may conflict with nearby Muni 22 Fillmore stop; please show on plans.

5. Noise. Based on the General Plan’s Background Noise Levels map, the project site is located along a segment of Lombard Street with noise levels above 75 dBA Ldn (a day-night averaged sound level). Therefore, an acoustical analysis is required for the proposed new residential and commercial development. The acoustical analysis must demonstrate with reasonable certainty that the California Noise Insulation Standards in Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations can be met. Should such concerns be present, the department may require the completion of a detailed noise assessment by person(s) qualified in acoustical analysis and/or engineering prior to the first project approval action, in order to demonstrate that acceptable interior noise levels consistent with those in the Title 24 standards can be attained.

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

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

6. Air Quality. The proposed project at nine (9) dwelling units is below the Bay Area Air Quality Management District’s (BAAQMD) construction and operational screening levels for criteria air pollutants. Therefore, an analysis of the project’s criteria air pollutant emissions is not likely to be required. In addition, the project would include excavation of up to 11 feet below ground surface for a basement-level garage. Detailed information related to the amount (in cubic yards) of excavation must be provided as part of the EEA.

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 San Francisco Board of Supervisors approved the Construction Dust Control Ordinance (Ordinance 176-08, effective July 30, 2008). The intent of the Ordinance is to reduce the quantity of dust generated during site preparation, demolition, and construction work in order to protect the health of the general public and of on-site workers, minimize public nuisance complaints, and avoid orders to stop work by the Department of Building Inspection (DBI). Pursuant to the Construction Dust Ordinance, the proposed project would be required to comply with applicable dust control requirements outlined in the ordinance.

3 BAAQMD, CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, May 2011, Chapter 3.
The project site is not located within an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone, as mapped and defined by Health Code Article 38. The Air Pollutant Exposure Zone identifies areas with poor air quality based on an inventory and modeling assessment of air pollution, exposures, and health vulnerability from mobile, stationary, and area source emissions within San Francisco. Given that the project site is not within an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone, additional measures or analysis related to local health risks are not likely to be required. However, if the project would include new sources of toxic air contaminants including, but not limited to, emissions from diesel generators or boilers, or any other stationary sources, the project would result in toxic air contaminants that may affect both on-site and off-site sensitive receptors. Detailed information related to any proposed stationary sources must be provided with the EEA.

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 Analysis Compliance Checklist. The project sponsor may be required to submit the completed table regarding project compliance with the identified regulations and provide project-level details in the discussion column. If required, this information would 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 not include construction of a building that is over 80 feet in height and would not require review by a wind consultant, nor would a wind tunnel analysis be required.

9. **Shadow.** The proposed project would result in construction of a building no greater than 40 feet in height. A preliminary shadow fan analysis prepared by Planning Department staff indicates that the proposed project would not cast shadows on nearby properties under the jurisdiction of the Department of Parks and Recreation and subject to Section 295. Therefore, the proposed project would not likely require a shadow study.

10. **Geology.** The project site is not located within a Seismic Hazard Zone. However, the project would include excavation of up to 11 feet below ground surface for a basement-level parking garage. 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 project site is located on a site with previous industrial uses. 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 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](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](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.

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

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

3. A Variance Application is required for a reduction in bicycle parking and to permit non-compliant obstructions (bay windows and awnings) over the right-of-way.

Building Permit applications are available at the Department of Building Inspection at 1660 Mission Street. Variance applications are available at the Department of Building Inspection at 1660 Mission Street, and online at www.sf-planning.org.

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. Floor Area Ratio. Planning Code Section 124 permits a maximum non-residential floor area ratio of 3.6 to 1. The proposed construction would result in a floor area ratio of 0.51 to 1, and therefore complies with this provision.
2. **Rear Yard.** Section 134 of the Planning Code requires a minimum rear yard setback equal to 25% of the lot depth, to a minimum of 15 feet, at all levels containing residential uses. In this case, a rear yard of at least 16'-2 1/4'' is required. The project proposes a rear yard setback of 20 feet, and therefore satisfies this requirement.

3. **Useable Open Space – Residential.** Section 135 of the Planning Code requires 80 square feet of private open space per unit or 100 square feet of common open space per unit. Any space credited as common usable open space shall be at least 15 feet in every horizontal dimension and shall have a minimum area of 300 square feet. For the nine (9) units proposed, a total of 900 square feet of common usable open space would be required. The proposed open space areas have not been dimensioned, although it appears as though there is sufficient common usable open space provided on the rooftop deck for the nine proposed dwelling units. Please ensure that all usable open space areas are dimensioned on the appropriate floor plans.

4. **Obstructions Over Streets and Into Yards.** Section 136(c)(2)(D) of the Planning Code allows projecting bay windows to be a maximum length of 15 feet at the line establishing the required open area, and then reduced in proportion to the distance from such line by means of 45 degree angles drawn inward from the ends of such 15-foot dimension, reaching a maximum of nine feet along a line parallel to and at a distance of three feet from the line establishing the required open area. Several of the proposed bay windows projecting above the Lombard Street right-of-way exceed 15 feet in width at the main front wall, and therefore do not comply with this provision.

Balconies and bay windows are permitted to project beyond the front property line up to three feet, subject to certain width provisions, but are further limited to two feet where the sidewalk width is nine feet or less. Please indicate the width of the existing sidewalk along the Lombard Street frontage on the site plan and floor plans.

Lombard Street is a right-of-way under CalTrans' jurisdiction. Caltrans has a code requirement that does not permit encroachments, such as bay windows, over a designated highway—including what would be considered a city sidewalk. As such, it will be necessary to set back the main wall of the portion of the building fronting Lombard Street in order to provide sufficient space for bay windows and other façade articulations. See enclosed Issue Statement for more information.

5. **Awnings.** Planning Code Section 136.1(a)(2) permits awnings not less than eight feet above the finished grade and higher than the windowsill level of the lowest story (if any) exclusive of the ground story and mezzanine, or extend above the bottom of a projecting upper-story window bay, or cover any belt cornice or horizontal molding, provided that no such awning shall in any case exceed a height of 16 feet or the roofline of the building to which it is attached, whichever is lower. When the width of all awnings is ten feet or less along the direction of the street, the horizontal projection of such awnings shall not exceed six feet from the face of any supporting building and the vertical distance from the top to the bottom of such awnings shall not exceed six feet. When the width of all awnings exceeds ten feet measured along the direction of the street, the horizontal projection of such awnings shall not exceed four feet from the face of the supporting building and the vertical distance from the top to the bottom of such awnings shall not exceed four feet. Please show the vertical dimensions of the proposed awning on all relevant elevations.
6. **Bird Safe Windows.** Planning Code Section 139 considers free-standing glass walls, wind barriers, skywalks, balconies, and greenhouses on rooftops that have unbroken glazed segments 24 square feet and larger in size to be feature-related bird hazards. Any structure that contains these elements shall treat 100% of the glazing with bird safe glazing.

7. **Street Frontages in Neighborhood Commercial Districts.** The intent of Planning Code Section 145.1 is to preserve, enhance, and promote attractive, clearly defined street frontages that are pedestrian-oriented, fine-grained, and which are appropriate and compatible with the buildings and uses in Neighborhood Commercial Districts. Section 145.1(c)(4)(C) requires that ground floor non-residential uses in NC districts other than NCT shall have a minimum floor-to-floor height of 10 feet. Please show the proposed ground floor ceiling height on all relevant elevations and sections.

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

9. **Exposure.** Section 140 requires that each dwelling unit have at least one room that meets the 120-square-foot minimum superficial floor area requirement of Section 503 of the Housing Code face directly on a street right-of-way, code-complying rear yard, or an appropriately sized courtyard. The project, as proposed, complies with this provision.

10. **Dimensions for Off-Street Parking.** Planning Code Section 154 requires that each independently accessible off-street parking space shall have a minimum area of 144 square feet (8 feet by 18 feet) for a standard space and 112.5 square feet for a compact space (7.5 feet by 15 feet), except for parking spaces in mechanical parking structures and spaces specifically designated for persons with physical disabilities, the requirements for which are set forth in the Building Code. No parking space dimensions are shown on the proposed underground parking plan drawing (A1.2).

11. **Bicycle Parking.** Planning Code Section 155.2 requires this project to provide nine (9) secure, weather-protected Class 1 bicycle parking facilities intended for use as long-term, overnight, and work-day bicycle storage by non-residential occupants, and employees as well as two (2) publicly-accessible Class 2 bicycle parking spaces in a highly visible location intended for transient or short-term use by visitors, guests, and patrons to the building or use. Please indicate the location and dimensions of all bicycle parking spaces on the proposed site plan and floor plan drawings, in accordance with the guidelines set out in Zoning Administrator Bulletin #9.

12. **Dwelling Unit Density.** Section 712.91 of the Planning Code permits a dwelling unit density to a maximum of 1 unit per 600 square feet of lot area. In this instance, the maximum permitted density is ten (10) units. Nine (9) dwelling units are proposed, and therefore the project complies with this provision.

13. **Building Height.** The subject property is in a 40-X Height and Bulk District, which allows for a maximum building height of 40 feet. Planning Code Section 260(b) allows height exemptions for certain rooftop features, such as elevator and stair penthouses, provided that these features do not exceed 20 percent of the total rooftop area. The project as proposed complies with the 40-foot height
requirement, however no dimensions have been provided for the proposed elevator and stair penthouses. Please provide these dimensions on all relevant elevations and roof plans.

14. 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.

15. Noise Regulations Relating to Residential Uses Near Places of Entertainment (POE). New residential development within 300 feet of a Place of Entertainment must go through an Entertainment Commission outreach process (Ordinance Number 070-015). In addition, new residential development will also be required to record a Notice of Special Restrictions (NSR) on the site. The subject site is located adjacent to an existing Place of Entertainment (HiFi Lounge) at 2125 Lombard Street. Please note that the Planning Department will not consider an entitlement application complete until the following are completed:

(A) The Entertainment Commission has provided written notification to the Planning Department indicating that it either did not wish to hold a hearing, or that it held a hearing and the Project Sponsor attended; and

(B) The Project Sponsor has included a copy of any comments and/or recommendations provided by the Entertainment Commission regarding the proposed Project as well as the date(s) when the those comments were provided. This shall be done as an additional sheet in any plan set submitted to the Planning Department and as an attachment in an entitlement application.

You may contact Entertainment Commission staff at (415) 554-6678 or visit their webpage at http://www.sfgov2.org/index.aspx?page=338 for additional information regarding the outreach process.

16. 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. Transportation Sustainability Fee (TSF)
17. **Inclusionary Affordable Housing.** Inclusionary Affordable Housing is required for a project proposing ten or more dwelling units. The project proposes only nine (9) dwelling units and is therefore exempt from the Inclusionary Affordable Housing program requirements.

18. **Density Maximization & Affordable Housing Provision.** The project proposes to add 9,252 square feet of residential resulting in 9 units, just short of the 10 units that trigger Section 415 of the Planning Code, which requires 12% of units be Below Market Rate (BMR) units. Also, the plans demonstrate an unfulfilled capacity that more than 9 units could be developed. It is the Department's priority to give precedence to the development of all new net housing, and to encourage the direct building of more affordable housing and the maximization of permitted density, while maintaining quality of life and adherence to Planning Code standards. The following General Plan Housing Element policies and objectives are applicable:

   I. **POLICY 3.2.2** - Encourage in-fill housing production that continues the existing built housing qualities in terms of heights, prevailing density, yards and unit sizes.

   II. **OBJECTIVE 3.3** - Ensure that a significant percentage of the new housing created is affordable to people with a wide range of incomes.

   III. **POLICY 3.3.3** - Encourage a mix of affordability levels in new residential development.

   IV. **POLICY 3.5.2** - Prioritize the development of affordable family housing, both rental and ownership, particularly along transit corridors and adjacent to community amenities.

   V. **POLICY 4.5** - Ensure that new permanently affordable housing is located in all of the City’s neighborhoods, and encourage integrated neighborhoods, with a diversity of unit types provided at a range of income levels.

   VI. **POLICY 13.1** Support "smart" regional growth that locates new housing close to jobs and transit.

The Department strongly encourages increased density on the site, while maintaining the required bedroom mix and livability of the units. Per the Director's Bulletin No. 2, if the project were to maximize density and include 20% on-site BMRs, it would qualify for priority processing: [http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=8460](http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=8460)

19. **Affordable Housing Bonus Program.** The City of San Francisco is in the process of developing a program that would offer a local mechanism to implement the State Density Bonus law (Government Code Section No. 65915) and is currently considering additional program options, including a component which offers density and development incentives for provision of middle income housing. This parcel is located within the proposed program study area, and the proposed project could receive density and other development incentives commensurate with provision of on-site affordable housing if consistent with the rules of the proposed program. Please refer to the [Affordable Housing Bonus Program website](http://www.sf-planning.org/AHBP) for the latest information on the program, draft legislation, proposed schedule, and related.

20. **Invest in Neighborhoods.** 2101 Lombard Street is located on an Invest In Neighborhoods Corridor. Invest in Neighborhoods is an interagency partnership to strengthen and revitalize neighborhood commercial districts around San Francisco. The initiative, currently being piloted in 25 commercial
districts, aims to strengthen small businesses, improve physical conditions, increase quality of life, and increase community capacity. Each corridor is appointed an IIN Point Person. This staff member is responsible for advocating for the neighborhood, leveraging City services and working with community partners to develop customized service plans for each corridor. Additionally the IIN Point Person keeps track of vacant retail spaces and development projects. More information on the Invest in Neighborhoods program, including the IIN Point Person, can be found at http://investsf.org/

PRELIMINARY DESIGN COMMENTS:

The project is located in the Marina District in a neighborhood with structures that primarily range from two to four stories. The site is along a significant commercial corridor that supports residential use. Common façade materials include stucco and wood siding. 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 project site design as shown.

2. **Streetscape and Pedestrian Improvements.** The Planning Department requests that the project reduce its proposed parking. The garage entry should be a maximum of 10’ in width as only a single lane entry/exit is needed and this dimensional reduction should encourage the expansion of active uses along Fillmore. The retail along Lombard should include more entries as well.

3. **Architecture.** The Planning Department requests further explanation of the design concept and intent of the overall exterior expression of the project. Greater clarity on materials and compositional goals might help to further articulate the architectural vision in a future application. Generally, the Department suggests making the bays clearer as volumetric façade elements and letting the other components and details recede to let them read. Additionally, the Department suggests adding more complexity (for example, a masonry bulkhead) in the ground floor façade as well as clarifying the top of the project. The Department requests the use of high-quality materials and the inclusion of significant depth in the fenestration in street-facing facades. Metal siding may not support the appropriate contextual residential character.

PRELIMINARY PROJECT ASSESSMENT EXPIRATION:

This Preliminary Project Assessment is valid for a period of 18 months. A Building Permit Application, as listed above, must be submitted no later than August 13, 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.

Enclosures: Neighborhood Group Mailing List
Preliminary Shadow Study
Areas within 300 feet of a Place of Entertainment
Stormwater Management handout
CalTrans Issue Statement

cc: Britt Miller, Red Bridge Partners V, LLC, Property Owner
    Christopher May, Current Planning
    Christopher Espiritu, Environmental Planning
    Danielle DeRuiter-Williams, Citywide Planning and Analysis
    Maia Small, Design Review
    Jonas Ionin, Planning Commission Secretary
    Charles Rivasplata, SFMTA
    Jerry Sanguinetti, Public Works
    Pauline Perkins, SFPUC
    Planning Department Webmaster (planning.webmaster@sfgov.org)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRST</th>
<th>LAST</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>TELEPHONE</th>
<th>EMAIL</th>
<th>NEIGHBORHOOD OF INTEREST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brooke</td>
<td>Sampson</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cow Hollow Association</td>
<td>2660 Filbert Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94123</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:brookesampson@yahoo.com">brookesampson@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>Marina, Pacific Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geoff</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cow Hollow Association</td>
<td>2760 Baker Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94123</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:ggwood2@gmail.com">ggwood2@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Marina, Pacific Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian</td>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td></td>
<td>HERE Local 2</td>
<td>290 Golden Gate Avenue</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan</td>
<td>Girardot</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>Marina Civic Improvement &amp; Property Owners</td>
<td>348 Marina Boulevard</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94123</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td><a href="mailto:merina.civic@yahoo.com">merina.civic@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>Marina, Pacific Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesley</td>
<td>Leonhardt</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Cow Hollow Association</td>
<td>2038 Union Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94123</td>
<td>415-441-7055</td>
<td><a href="mailto:la@imagesnorth.com">la@imagesnorth.com</a></td>
<td>San Francisco, Pacific Heights, Russian Hill, Marina, Presidio Heights, Western Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malcolm</td>
<td>Kaufman</td>
<td>Supervisor, District 2</td>
<td>Cow Hollow Association</td>
<td>2488 Union Street, #2</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-554-5942</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mark.farrell@sfgov.org">mark.farrell@sfgov.org</a>;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Farrell</td>
<td></td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>1 Dr. Carlton B Goodlett Place, Room #244</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94123</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:merina.civic@yahoo.com">merina.civic@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>Marina, Pacific Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Vaughey</td>
<td></td>
<td>Golden Gate Valley Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>2742 Baker Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94123</td>
<td>415-567-7152</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bbardell@comcast.net">bbardell@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>Marina, Pacific Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Bardell</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Golden Gate Valley Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>1922 Filbert Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94123</td>
<td>415-931-7249</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tanyayurovsky@yahoo.com">tanyayurovsky@yahoo.com</a>, <a href="mailto:President@AquaticPark.org">President@AquaticPark.org</a></td>
<td>Marina, North Beach, Russian Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanya</td>
<td>Yurovsky</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Aquatic Park Neighbors</td>
<td>792 Bay Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94109</td>
<td>415-874-4055</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tanyayurovsky@yahoo.com">tanyayurovsky@yahoo.com</a>, <a href="mailto:President@AquaticPark.org">President@AquaticPark.org</a></td>
<td>Marina, North Beach, Russian Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn</td>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1000 Green Street #1202</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94133</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Title: 2101 Lombard Street 2015-015252PPA
Comments: Building Height Modeled at 40 feet. Slopes taken into account.
Printed: 8 February, 2016

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.
Areas within 300 feet of Places of Entertainment

Legend

- Place of Entertainment
- Area Within 300ft of a Place of Entertainment

The City and County of San Francisco (CCSF) does not guarantee the accuracy, availability, 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 any use of the information.

Printed: 8, February 2016
Issue Statement: January 19, 2016 Coordination Meeting

ISSUE: II.BB. Sidewalk Encroachments on Urban Streets Designated as State Highways

DESCRIPTION: The Encroachment Permit Manual prohibits encroachments over sidewalks on State Highways that prevent basic urban design features such as bay windows & awnings. While San Francisco has at times secured exceptions; we’d like a more comprehensive solution.

ISSUES TO BE DISCUSSED:
- Impact of Existing Requirement on San Francisco’s Urban Realm & Loss of Buildable Area
- Building-by-building solution or more comprehensive solution?
- Discussion of alternatives and the associated results

SPECIFICS: Encroachment Permit Manual, Chapter 1, Section 101, pages 1-2 states "Encroachment permits are not issued to allow building structures to extend into the State highway right-of-way, e.g., bay windows, cornices, and decorative features that extend beyond the surface of a building. To do so would grant exclusive use of public property to private entities without compensation. (Exception: see Advertising Displays, Section 501.3)"

This issue has been a longstanding frustration for the City and private developers that hampers our design goals. The results so far have been to mutilate buildings such as these on 19th Avenue and Van Ness Avenue. The City approved these buildings with bay windows on both street facades. Caltrans review resulted in a stripping off of the bay windows as if a cheese slicer came down the primary building facades. This rule is about to impact major buildings planned for Van Ness Avenue.

While at times the City has been able to secure exceptions, the permit manual clearly seeks prohibition of encroachments (awning or bay window). The result is that each case-by-case effort is a struggle where we don’t always succeed. With significant developments planned in the City, we’d like to pursue a more comprehensive solution to this issue.

Two case studies. Left photo is 19th Avenue at Noriega Street. Right photo is Van Ness Avenue at Ellis Street. www.sfplanning.org
Re: SFPUC Urban Watershed Management Program (UWMP) Stormwater Requirements

Dear Project Proponent,

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

- Projects disturbing 5,000 square feet or more of ground surface are subject to the Stormwater Management Ordinance and must therefore meet the performance measures set within the Guidelines.

If your project triggers the Ordinance your project must:

- Determine if your project is located in the area served by the combined sewer or the area served by the separate sewer and meet the applicable performance measure:

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

  o Separate Sewer Areas:
    - Capture and treat the rainfall from a design storm of 0.75 inches.
    - (Equivalent to LEED Sustainable Sites Credit 6.2).

- Develop a Stormwater Control Plan in accordance with the Guidelines and submit it for review and approval to the UWMP prior to receiving a building permit; and

- Develop an operation and maintenance plan for all proposed stormwater controls and submit it as part of the Stormwater Control Plan.

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

- Stormwater Management Ordinance:

- Stormwater Design Guidelines (Guidelines) and Appendixes:
  [http://sfwater.org/sdg](http://sfwater.org/sdg)

- Instructions for completing a Stormwater Control Plan: Refer to Guidelines, Appendix C.

- Municipal separate stormwater sewer system (MS4) and Combined Sewer System Boundary Map: Refer to Guidelines, p.10

Upon receipt of this letter please contact the SFPUC Urban Watershed Management Program (UWMP) to confirm specific Guideline requirements for your project.

    Project Reviewer
    Urban Watershed Management Program
    stormwaterreview@sfwater.org

The UWMP staff looks forward to helping you achieve stormwater management compliance and moving your project forward.

Sincerely,

UWMP Project Review Team

San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
Wastewater Enterprise