DATE: April 11, 2016
TO: Kevin Stephens, Primary Project Contact
FROM: Joshua Switzky, Planning Department
RE: PPA Case No. 2015-015253 PPA for 996 Mission Street

Please find the attached Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) for the address listed above. You may contact the staff contact, Amnon Ben-Pazi, at (415) 575-9077 or Amnon.Ben-Pazi@sfgov.org, to answer any questions you may have, or to schedule a follow-up meeting.

Joshua Switzky, Senior Planner
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 11/16/15 and revised on 12/21/15, 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 17,258-square-foot (sf) 2-story building housing a 29-room Residential Hotel and commercial spaces, and construct an 8-story, 85-foot-tall mixed-use building on the 6,000-sf subject lot. The proposed new building would include a total of 30 Residential Hotel rooms on 2 floors, a total of 75 Tourist Hotel rooms on 5 floors, ground floor commercial spaces with mezzanines and
a basement. As of January 7, 2016 there were 7 Permanent Residents and 22 vacancies at the existing Residential Hotel at the project site.

BACKGROUND:
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 (Draft Plan) was released in April 2013, with proposed changes to the allowed land uses and building heights in much of the Plan area, including a strategy for improving the public realm within the Plan area and vicinity. However, the Draft Plan proposes no changes to zoning or allowable height and bulk at the project site. 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 late 2016.

The existing zoning for the project site is NCT (SoMa Neighborhood Commercial Transit), which permits single-room occupancy residential units and ground-floor commercial and conditionally permits residential demolition and tourist hotels. The Draft Plan would not change the existing zoning nor the existing 85-X height and bulk designation. Further comments in this Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) are based on existing zoning, existing height and bulk designation, and on the Draft Plan concepts published to date, which are contingent on the approval of the proposed Central SoMa Plan rezoning by the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:
The proposed project requires environmental review either individually, with a project-specific Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration or Environmental Impact Report (EIR), or in a Community Plan Exemption (CPE) if the project is consistent with an adopted community plan.

The proposed project is located within the East SoMa Neighborhood of the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan, which was evaluated in the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR. The proposed project is consistent with the land use and development density (zoning) identified in the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plan, and it would therefore be eligible for a CPE under the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR.

The project’s proposed use and building height of 85 feet would also be consistent with the Alternatives being studied in the Central SoMa Plan EIR. Thus, it is likely 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 land use and development density 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.

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

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

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

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

---

3 The Planning Department schedule of application fees may be downloaded at: http://www.sfplanning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=513
3. **Focused EIR.** If any new site- or project-specific significant impacts cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level, then a focused EIR is prepared to address these impacts, and a supporting CPE checklist is prepared to address all other impacts that were encompassed by the underlying area plan EIR, with all pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the underlying area plan EIR also applied to the proposed project. With this outcome, the applicable fees are: (a) the CPE determination fee (currently $13,659); (b) the standard environmental evaluation fee, which is based on construction cost; and (c) one-half of the standard EIR fee, which is also based on construction cost. An EIR must be prepared by an environmental consultant from the Planning Department’s environmental consultant pool (http://www.sfplanning.org/ftp/files/MEA/Environmental_consultant_pool.pdf). The Planning Department will provide more detail to the project sponsor regarding the EIR process should this level of environmental review be required.

As discussed above, the proposed project is located within the proposed Central SoMa Plan Area, which is under evaluation in the forthcoming Central SoMa Plan EIR. If the proposed project is consistent with the development density specified for the project site in the adopted Central SoMa Plan, it may be eligible for a CPE. If the proposed project is not consistent with the adopted Central SoMa Plan, then it would not qualify for a CPE. In that case, the Planning Department would analyze the proposed project in a separate environmental document that would not rely on the environmental analysis undertaken for the Central SoMa Plan. Should the proposed project require a separate environmental document, 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.

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.

Below is a list of topic areas that would require additional study based on the preliminary review of the project as it is proposed in the Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) application.

1. **Historic Resources.** The project site was previously evaluated in the South of Market Area Historic Resources Survey which concluded that the site does not contain any building considered individually eligible for national, state, or local listing as a historic resource. The project site, however, is located within the Sixth Street Lodging House historic district. Therefore, the proposed construction is subject to review by the Department’s Historic Preservation staff for compatibility with the district. To assist in this review, the project sponsor must hire a qualified professional to prepare a Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE) report. The professional must be selected from the
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Planning Department’s Historic Resource Consultant Pool. Please contact Tina Tam, Senior Preservation Planner, via email (tina.tam@sfgov.org) for a list of three consultants from which to choose. Please contact the HRE scoping team at HRE@sfgov.org to arrange the HRE scoping. Following an approved scope, the historic resource consultant may submit the draft HRE report for review to Environmental Planning after the project sponsor has filed the EE Application and updated it as necessary to reflect feedback received in the PPA letter. The HRE should be submitted directly to the Department and copied to the project sponsor. Project sponsors should not receive and/or review advance drafts of consultant reports per the Environmental Review Guidelines. Historic Preservation staff will not begin reviewing your project until a complete draft HRE is received.

2. **Archeological Resources.** The project site lies within the Archeological Mitigation Zone J-2: Properties with No Previous Studies of the Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR, and the proposed project would entail drilling piers in the existing unfinished basement to an unspecified depth. Therefore, 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 project mitigation measures (such as 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 Planning Department’s Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines for Environmental Reviews, the project would require additional transportation analysis to determine whether the project may result in a significant impact. Therefore, the Planning Department requires that a consultant listed in the Planning Department’s Transportation Consultant Pool prepare a Transportation Impact Study. You are required to pay additional fees for the study; please contact Virnaliza Byrd at (415) 575-9025 to arrange payment. Once you pay the fees, please contact Manoj Madhavan at (415) 575-9095 or manoj.madhavan@sfgov.org so that he can provide you with a list of three consultants from the pre-qualified Transportation Consultant Pool. Upon selection of a transportation consultant, the Department will assign a transportation planner who will direct the scope of the consultant-prepared study.

Additionally, the proposed project has frontages on two high-injury corridors as mapped by Vision Zero. Planning staff have reviewed the proposed site plans and offer the following recommendations, some of which address the safety of persons walking and bicycling to and from the project site and vicinity:

- The assigned transportation planner should take the proposed project to the Street Design Advisory Team (SDAT) for review. SDAT and the transportation planner should consider the 6th Street bike lanes, Better Market Street and Central SoMa plans in their review.

- The project sponsor should submit a new set of plans that shows sidewalks and sidewalk dimensions, proposed bicycle parking, and includes labels for street names.

- The project sponsor should clarify where passenger loading will occur and whether there would be any events associated with the hotel use.

5. **Noise.** The proposed project specifies the use of drilled piers during construction. Should the construction techniques change, *Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Noise Mitigation Measure F-1: Construction Noise*, which addresses requirements related to the use of pile-driving, would apply. This mitigation measure prohibits the use of impact pile drivers wherever feasible and requires that contractors use pile driving equipment with state-of-the-art noise shielding and muffling devices. To reduce noise and vibration impacts, sonic or vibratory sheetpile drivers, rather than impact drivers, shall be used wherever sheetpiles are needed. Project sponsors shall also require that contractors schedule pile-driving activity for times of the day that would minimize disturbance to neighbors.

*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. Given the scope of construction and the proposed project’s proximity to residential hotels, this mitigation measure would apply. This mitigation measure requires that a plan
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for such measures be submitted to DBI prior to commencing construction to ensure that maximum feasible noise attenuation will be achieved.

*Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Noise Mitigation Measure F-4: Siting of Noise-Sensitive Uses* is intended to reduce potential conflicts between existing noise-generating uses and new sensitive receptors. This measure would apply to the proposed project because the project includes a noise-sensitive use. *Noise Mitigation Measure F-4* requires that the project sponsor conduct a detailed analysis of noise reduction requirements for new development including noise-sensitive uses located along streets with noise levels above 60 dBA (Ldn). The analysis must demonstrate with reasonable certainty that the California Noise Insulation Standards in Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations can be met.

Finally, *Eastern Neighborhoods PEIR Noise Mitigation Measure F-6: Open Space in Noisy Environments* would apply to the proposed project because it includes new development of a noise-sensitive use. This mitigation measure requires that open space required under the Planning Code be protected from existing ambient noise levels. Implementation of this measure could involve, among other things, 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, and implementation would also be undertaken consistent with other principles or urban design.

1. **Air Quality.** The proposed project’s 105 hotel rooms and approximately 5,700 square feet of retail space are below the Bay Area Air Quality Management District’s (BAAQMD) construction screening levels for criteria air pollutants. Therefore, it is unlikely that an analysis of the project’s criteria air pollutant emissions will be required.

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 project site is also located within an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone, as mapped and defined by Health Code Article 38. The Air Pollutant Exposure Zone identifies areas with poor air quality based on modeling of air pollution, exposures, and health vulnerability from mobile, stationary, and area source emissions within San Francisco. The project proposes to construct new sensitive land uses (i.e., residential units), which are subject to enhanced ventilation measures pursuant to Health Code Article 38. The project sponsor will be required to submit an Article 38 application to DPH prior to the issuance of any environmental determination. Please provide a copy of the Article 38 application with the EEA. In addition, equipment exhaust measures during construction, such as those listed in *Mitigation Measure G-1: Construction Air Quality* will likely be required.
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7 BAAQMD, CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, May 2011, Chapter 3.
8 Refer to http://www.sfdph.org/dph/eh/Air/default.asp for more information.
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, and additional measures, such as that described in Mitigation Measure G-4: Siting of Uses that Emit Other TACs, would be necessary to reduce its emissions. Please provide detailed information related to any proposed stationary sources with the EEA.

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

7. **Wind.** The proposed project would involve construction of a building over 80 feet in height. The project will therefore require a consultant-prepared wind analysis, which may include wind tunnel analysis if needed. The consultant will be required to prepare a proposed scope of work for review and approval by the Environmental Planning coordinator prior to proceeding with the analysis.

8. **Shadow.** The proposed project would result in construction of a building greater than 40 feet in height. A preliminary shadow fan analysis prepared by Planning Department staff indicates that the proposed project would not cast shadows on Recreation and Parks Department properties or public open spaces. Therefore, further analysis of potential impacts related to shadow is not necessary.

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

10. **Hazardous Materials.** The Department of Public Health (DPH) mapped the project site as an area with potentially contaminated soil that would be subject to Article 22A of the Health Code, also known as the Maher Ordinance. The Maher Ordinance, which is administered and overseen by DPH, requires the project sponsor to retain the services of a qualified professional to prepare a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) that meets the requirements of Health Code Section 22.A.6. The Phase 1 ESA submitted with the PPA for the proposed project indicates that there is no evidence of potential for site contamination and recommends no further investigation of the site. Based on that information, it is unlikely that further soil and/or groundwater sampling and analysis, or remediation of any site contamination, will be required; however, the Environmental Coordinator will determine whether consultation with DPH and a Maher Application are necessary. A Maher application is 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 could apply. Information regarding DPH’s fee schedule is available at: [http://www.sfdph.org/dph/EH/Fees.asp#haz](http://www.sfdph.org/dph/EH/Fees.asp#haz).

**Eastern Neighborhoods EIR Hazardous Materials Mitigation Measure L-1: Hazardous Building Materials** would be applicable to the proposed project. 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.

Because the existing building was constructed prior to 1980, asbestos-containing materials, such as floor and wall coverings, may be found in the building. The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) is responsible for regulating airborne pollutants including asbestos. Please contact BAAQMD for the requirements related to demolition of buildings with asbestos-containing materials. In addition, because of its age (constructed prior to 1978), lead paint may be found in the existing building. Please contact the San Francisco Department of Building Inspection (DBI) for requirements related to the demolition of buildings that may contain lead paint.

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

**PLANNING DEPARTMENT APPROVALS:**

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

1. Currently, a **Conditional Use Authorization** from the Planning Commission in accordance with Planning Code Section 303 is required pursuant to Planning Code Section 317 for the loss or removal of three or more residential units. Since the project proposes to demolish the existing two-story Residential Hotel with 29 dwelling units, a Conditional Use Authorization is required. A Conditional Use Authorization will continue to be required for this project under recent legislation amending Planning Code Section 317 entitled "Requiring Conditional Use Authorization to Remove Residential Units Including Unauthorized Units" (Board File No. 150494) approved by the Board of Supervisor on February 23, 2016 and expected to go into effect on April 10, 2016. Please note that the amended Code Section 317 will include additional specific criteria the Planning Commission must consider in their review of residential demolition.

2. A **Variance** from the Zoning Administrator is required pursuant to Planning Code (PC) Section 305 for the following modifications from the Planning Code:
   - Rear Yard (PC Section 134- Residential Hotel only)
   - Usable Open Space (PC Section 135- Residential/Non-Residential)
   - Obstructions (PC Section 136- Bay Windows)
   - Exposure (PC Section 140- Residential Hotel only)
   - Car Share (PC Section 166)

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

4. A **Building Permit Application** is required for the proposed new construction on the subject property.
5. A **Compatibility Study** comparing the proposed Residential Hotel component of the project to the existing Residential Hotel at the project site is required pursuant to Chapter 41 of the Administrative Code (a.k.a. The Residential Hotel Unit Conversion and Demolition Ordinance). The compatibility study will determine whether the project may be permitted and will be reviewed by the Planning Department, Housing Inspection Services, and Department of Building Inspection (DBI).

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

**NEIGHBORHOOD NOTIFICATIONS AND PUBLIC OUTREACH:**

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

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

**Notification of a Project Receiving Environmental Review.** Notice may be required to be sent to occupants of the project site and properties adjacent to the project site, as well as to owners and, to the extent feasible, occupants of properties within 300 feet of the project site at the initiation of the environmental review process. Please be prepared to provide mailing addresses on a CD upon request during the environmental review process.

**PRELIMINARY PROJECT COMMENTS:**

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

1. **East SoMa Area Plan.** The subject property falls within the area covered by the east SoMaArea Plan in the General Plan. As proposed, the project is generally consistent with the overarching objectives of the Plan, however the project is not fully consistent with key policies of the plan related to retention of affordable housing. As noted above, demolition of the existing Residential Hotel units at the project site would require the applicant to seek and obtain Conditional Use Authorization pursuant to Section 317 of the Planning Code. The project sponsor is encouraged to read the full plan, which can be viewed at [http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/General_Plan/East_SoMa.htm](http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/General_Plan/East_SoMa.htm)

2. **Central SoMa 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 proposes changes to the allowed land uses and building heights, and includes a strategy for improving the public realm in this area. However, please note that the Central Corridor Draft Plan does not propose changes to land use controls or height and bulk controls at the subject property. The EIR, the Plan, and the proposed rezoning and affiliated Code changes are anticipated to be before decision-makers for approval in late 2016. The Draft Plan is available for download at http://centralsoama.sfplanning.org. Further comments in this section of the PPA are based on the Central Corridor Draft Plan recommendations, which would not change existing use controls or height and bulk controls at the subject property.

3. Sustainability & Central SoMa Eco-District. The Planning Department has identified the Central SoMa plan area as a Type 2 Eco-District—an infill area composed of many smaller parcels and property owners. An “eco-district” is a neighborhood or district where residents, community institutions, property owners, developers, and businesses join together with city staff and utility providers to meet sustainability goals by formulating a portfolio of innovative projects at a district or block-level. The Department sees a special opportunity for new development sites in Central SoMa to exhibit a variety of sustainability best practices including and beyond those required by the Green Building Code and other City and State environmental requirements. All major new development in the Central SoMa Plan Area will be expected to participate in some capacity in the Eco-District Program and a possible Sustainability Management Association to help guide it. Planning staff are working with other City agencies and the development community to explore both voluntary options and possible new requirements related to renewable energy generation (solar), high performing rooftop uses (renewable energy, living roofs, stormwater management and open space) and non-potable water recycling systems. Additionally, the Planning Department is exploring possibilities for activating and greening land located near and underneath the freeway. As development in the Plan Area progresses, Department staff are interested in working with development and design teams to help achieve the Area Plan’s sustainability goals. Department staff are available to discuss how the project’s environmental performance and community benefit may be improved and best contribute to the larger Central SoMa Eco-District. For more information please see:

4. Invest In Neighborhoods. The project is located on an Invest In Neighborhoods Corridor. Invest In Neighborhoods (IIN) 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/

5. **Interdepartmental Project Review.** This review is required for all proposed new construction in seismic hazard zones, in which the subject property falls. An application is enclosed.

6. **Floor Area Ratio (FAR).** Pursuant to Planning Code Section 124, the maximum FAR in the SOMA NCT Zoning District is 2.5 to 1 for non-residential uses. Given the lot size of 6,000 sf, this equates to a maximum floor area of 15,000 sf. The tourist hotel and restaurant/retail use components of the project are non-residential; and therefore, subject to the maximum 2.5 FAR. As proposed, the non-residential floor area is approximately 42,653 sf, or an FAR of 7.1. Therefore, the project significantly exceeds the maximum FAR permitted for non-residential uses within the SOMA NCT Zoning District. Since there is no exception from FAR, the project area and/or use composition must be revised to demonstrate compliance with the maximum FAR allowed.

7. **Single Room Occupancy (SRO) Unit Type.** For the Residential Hotel component of the project, if intended as SRO's, please specify the SRO unit type as either a Dwelling Unit or Group Housing Room. As defined in Planning Code Section 102, SRO's shall consist of no more than one occupied room with a maximum gross floor area of 350 sf and must also meet the Housing Code’s minimum floor area standards. The unit may have a bathroom in addition to the occupied room. As a Dwelling Unit, the unit would have a cooking facility and bathroom. As a Group Housing Room, the unit would share a kitchen with one or more other SRO's in the same building and may also share a bathroom. Please note that pursuant to Planning Code Section 823(c)(7), the Western SoMa Special Use District in which the project is located establishes a minimum SRO unit size of 275 sf.

8. **Rear Yard.** Planning Code Section 134(a)(1)(c) requires the lowest story containing a Dwelling Unit within the project to provide a rear yard of at least 25% of the lot depth. The Residential Hotel component of the project occupying the second and third floors qualifies as a Residential Use as defined in Planning Code Section 102; and therefore, is subject to the rear yard requirement. Because this project is located on a corner site, one of the street frontages (6th Street or Mission Street) must be designated as the front of the property, and the rear yard would then be provided based on that determination. The “interior corner” configuration proposed for the rear yard which appears to provide a minimum 25% setback from both respective frontages does not comply and provides a rear yard area that is substantially below a comparable qualifying rear yard open space since approximately only 9% (of lot area) open area is provided. Pursuant to Planning Code Section 134(e)(1), modification of the rear yard requirement within the NC Zoning Districts may be modified or waived by the Zoning Administrator pursuant to the procedures which are applicable to Variances, as set forth in Sections 306.1, through 306.5 and 308.2 subject to the projects adherence to specific criteria [see Planning Code Section 134(e)(1) and (2)] as determined by the Zoning Administrator. A rear yard modification request outside of the NC-specific modification requirements of Planning Code Section 134(e)(1) and (2) would require the Project Sponsor to seek and justify a standard Variance.

9. **Dwelling Unit Mix.** Pursuant to Planning Code Section 207.6(b)(3), a project in which 100% of the residential uses are Single Room Occupancy units (SRO's), the minimum dwelling unit mix
requirements of Planning Code Section 207.6 do not apply. However, as proposed, it appears that numerous units do not qualify as SRO’s since they exceed the maximum gross floor area limit of 350 sf. If intended to be SRO’s, as a dwelling unit the units are required to have a cooking facility and a bathroom. As a group housing room, a room would be required to share a kitchen with one or more other single room occupancy units in the same building and may also share a bathroom.

10. Open Space – Residential. Planning Code Section 135 outlines the requirements for usable open space per residential unit. Generally, at least 80 sf of private or common open space is required for each residential unit; however, within the Neighborhood Commercial (NC) Districts specifically, the open space requirement is the amount required within the nearest Residential District. In this case, the nearest Residential District is RC-4 (Residential-Commercial, High-Density) which requires 36 sf per dwelling unit if private and 48 sf if common open space. Because the proposal includes construction of SRO’s, this requirement is 1/3 of the amount required for each dwelling unit; however, the individual dwelling units need to be no larger than 350 sf to qualify for the reduction in required open space.

Based upon the submitted drawings, some of the individual units appear to be larger than 350 sf. Compliance with this requirement is necessary for the reduction in open space to apply. Assuming all 105 units as SRO’s, 1,680 sf of usable open space would be required. The project only provides approximately 530 sf of common open space at the second floor roof deck. Therefore, the proposed project does not comply. The Project Sponsor may elect to revise the project plans to comply with the minimum open space requirement, or may seek and justify an open space modification through the Variance process. The Department would generally recommend providing the Code-required amount of usable open space. Please note that roof decks (defined as decks located on the roof of the highest story of a building, or at the highest story of a building if the enclosed gross floor area of that story is less than 50 percent of the gross square footage of the footprint of the subject building) do not qualify as private or common usable open space, per Planning Code Section 823(c)(2)(B).

11. Open Space – Non-Residential. Planning Code Section 135.3 requires this project to provide one foot of open space for every 250 square feet of retail (and similar) uses. The proposal includes approximately 5512 sf of commercial space. Therefore, 22 sf of open space would be required. Therefore, the proposed project requires revision to meet the minimum non-residential open space requirement, or may request and justify an open space modification through the Variance process.

12. Obstructions (Bay Windows). Planning Code Section 136 establishes maximum dimensional plan and projection requirements (3 feet) that bay windows may project beyond the street property line over the sidewalk. As proposed, the typical 3'-2” bay window projections along the 6th Street and Mission Street frontages exceed the maximum 3-foot maximum; therefore, the project requires revision to comply, or may request and justify an obstruction modification through the Variance process. The Department would generally recommend providing Code-compliant bay windows.

13. Street Trees. Planning Code Section 138.1 establishes that Project Sponsors shall plant and maintain street trees as set forth in Article 16, Sections 805(a) and (d) and 806(d) of the Public Works Code which requires one street tree for every 20 feet of property frontage for new construction. With 80 feet of linear property frontage along 6th Street and 75 linear feet of frontage along Mission Street, 4 trees
are required along 6th Street and 4 trees are required along Mission Street. No street trees are shown on the plans; therefore, the project requires revision to meet the minimum street tree requirement, or may seek a waiver or modification from the Director of Public Works.

14. **Bird Safety.** Planning Code Section 139 establishes bird-safe standards for new building construction to reduce bird mortality from circumstances that are known to pose high risk to birds and are considered to be "bird hazards". The two circumstances regulated by this Section are: 1) location-related hazards, where the siting of a structure creates increased risk to birds, and 2) feature-related hazards, which may create increased risk to birds regardless of where the structure is located.

The project site does not pose a location-related bird hazard since it is located more than 300 feet beyond an Urban Bird Refuge. Feature-related hazards include free-standing glass walls, wind barriers, skywalks, balconies, and greenhouses on rooftops that have unbroken glazed segments 24 sf and larger in size. Any structure that contains these elements shall treat 100% of the glazing on feature-specific hazards. Detailed architectural plans that specify the materials, colors and finishes of the project have not yet been provided in order to determine whether the project satisfies this code section.

15. **Transparency and Fenestration.** Planning Code Section 145.1 requires that at least 60% of the ground floor street frontage which contains active uses be visually-transparent into the building. Detailed architectural plans that specify the materials, colors and finishes of the project have not yet been provided in order to determine whether the project satisfies this code section.

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

17. **Dwelling Unit Exposure.** Planning Code 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 Residential Hotel component of the project occupying the second and third floors qualifies as a Residential Use as defined in Planning Code Section 102; and therefore, is subject to the exposure requirement. The proposed rear yard is not code-complying and does not provide a large enough courtyard to meet the exposure requirement for those units (8 total) that only have windows fronting the rear yard area. Therefore, the proposed project requires revision to meet the minimum exposure requirement, or may request and justify an exposure modification through the Variance process. The Department generally encourages projects to provide Code-compliant dwelling unit exposure and to minimize the number of units needing an exposure exception where a modification is sought.

18. **Shadow Analysis.** Planning Code Section 295 requires that a shadow analysis must be performed to determine whether the project has the potential to cast shadow on properties under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Recreation and Park Commission. Department staff has prepared a preliminary shadow fan that indicates the project does not appear to have the potential to cast new shadow on property under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Commission.
19. **Off-Street Parking.** No parking is required for the project. Planning Code Section 151.1 establishes the maximum off-street parking requirement for specific uses within the subject SoMa NCT Zoning District.

20. **Curb Cut Restrictions/Protected Pedestrian-, Cycling-, and Transit-Oriented Street Frontages.** The project proposes a loading bay accessed from 6th Street. Pursuant to Planning Code Section 155(r)(2), in order to preserve the pedestrian character of certain downtown and neighborhood commercial districts and to minimize delays to transit service, garage entries, driveways or other vehicular access to off-street parking or loading is prohibited along 6th Street for its entirety within the SoMa NCT District. The proposed loading access from 6th Street conflicts with this requirement. However, please note that pursuant to Planning Code Section 155(r)(4), loading access from Mission Street would require an exception through procedures provided in Planning Code Section 303.

21. **Bicycle Parking.** Planning Code Section 155.5 requires the project to provide one Class 1 bicycle parking space per 30 tourist hotel rooms and one Class 1 space per residential dwelling unit. Therefore, with 75 tourist hotel rooms and 30 residential hotel rooms, at least 33 Class 1 bicycle parking spaces are required. With regard to Class 2 bicycle parking, the Code requires 1 space per 30 tourist hotel rooms, 1 space per 20 residential hotel units and 1 space per 2500 sf of commercial space. Therefore, with the number of tourist and residential hotel rooms cited above and approximately 5,512 sf of commercial space, a total of 7 Class 2 spaces are required. The proposed plan contains no bicycle parking spaces; therefore, the project requires revision to comply.

22. **First Source Hiring Agreement.** A First Source Hiring Agreement is required for any project proposing to construct 25,000 gross square feet or more. Since the project proposes a new, 8-story, 105 unit, residential and tourist hotel project with 54,529 gsf, a First Source Hiring Agreement is required. For more information, please contact:

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

23. **Inclusionary Affordable Housing.** Inclusionary Affordable Housing is required for a project proposing ten or more dwelling units. With 30 residential hotel dwelling units, the inclusionary affordable housing requirement applies. The Project Sponsor must submit an ‘Affidavit of Compliance with the Inclusionary Affordable Housing Program: Planning Code Section 415,’ to the Planning Department identifying the method of compliance, on-site, off-site, or affordable housing fee. Any on-site affordable dwelling-units proposed as part of the project must be designated as owner-occupied units, not rental units; unless a Costa Hawkins agreement is possible. Affordable units designated as on-site units shall be sold as ownership units and will remain as ownership units for the life of the project. The minimum Affordable Housing Percentages are 20% affordable housing fee, 12% on-site, or 20% off-site. Therefore, as proposed, the project would have a minimum requirement of (4) units if provided on-site, and (6) units if provided off-site.
For your information, if a project proposes rental units, it may be eligible for an On-site Alternative to the Affordable Housing Fee if it has demonstrated to the Planning Department that the affordable units are either: 1) ownership only or 2) not subject to the Costa Hawkins Rental Housing Act (a Costa Hawkins exception). Affordable units are not subject to the Costa Hawkins Rental Housing Act under the exception provided in Civil Code Sections 1954.50 through one of the following methods:

- direct financial construction from a public entity
- development bonus or other form of public assistance

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

24. Eastern Neighborhoods Affordable Housing Fee. Pursuant to Planning Code Section 417, the alternate Affordable Housing Fee described shall only apply to development projects that are subject to Eastern Neighborhood Controls as defined in 175.6(c)(1); consist of 20 units or less or less than 25,000 square feet, and are subject to the requirements of Sections 415 through 415.9, and any stated exceptions elsewhere in the Code. Because the project is less than 25,000 square feet, it may choose to pay an alternate fee equal to $50.97 per gross square foot of net new residential development instead of the standard Affordable Housing Fee requirements set forth in Section 415.5, the 20% affordable housing fee stated above. The calculation of gross square feet shall not include nonresidential uses, including any retail, commercial, or PDR uses, and all other space used only for storage and services necessary to the operation or maintenance of the building itself.

25. 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.

26. 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:

- reduction in total volume and peak flow rate of stormwater for areas in combined sewer systems OR
- 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/g. Applicants may contact stormwaterreview@sfwater.org for assistance.

27. 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.

28. 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 within 300 feet of an existing POE, see enclosed map. 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 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.

29. 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 Sustainability Fee (TSF)

b. Jobs-Housing Linkage (413)
Preliminary Project Assessment

Case No. 2015-015253PPA
996 Mission Street

c. Child-Care (414)
d. Affordable Housing Fee (415)
e. Eastern Neighborhoods Affordable Housing Fee (417)
f. Eastern Neighborhoods Impact Fees (423)
g. Eastern Neighborhoods Open Space Fee (427)

PRELIMINARY DESIGN COMMENTS:

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

The project site is located within the Sixth Street Lodging Historic District, an identified historic district; therefore, the proposed project is subject to further design review by the Planning Department's Historic Preservation staff. Please refer to the Environmental Planning Review – Historic Resources section of the Preliminary Project Assessment for further instruction.

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

1. Site Design, Open Space and Massing. The Planning Department recommends the massing along 6th Street be reduced to: 1) provide a larger and more usable rear yard open space that extends to the 6th Street facade; 2) create a transition between the adjacent low-rise building; and 3) enable the side lot line facade to be animated with windows and balconies.

2. Streetscape and Pedestrian Improvements. The Planning Department prefers the second level to be more of an accessory to the ground level—a clerestory more than indicative of a full floor. Further explore opportunities to enhance the human scale details at the ground floor.

3. Architecture. The Planning Department recommends considering the proportional, scalar and material relationships of adjacent buildings in the architectural composition. Many buildings in the context are masonry frame and infill without bay projections, and a horizontal tripartite composition. The storefronts typically have bases or bulkheads where they meet the sidewalk, and the tops have projecting cornices. The Planning Department encourages organizing the facades with a frame and infill composition, and minimizing or eliminating the bay windows, a stronger roof defining feature, and creating a clearer relationship between the ground floor structure and the façade above. It is assumed the design is preliminary, and the Department will provide subsequent review and comments to ensure massing, open space, and composition, materiality and detailing qualities meet the Department’s standards. Exceptions from the code must be met with exceptional design.

PRELIMINARY PROJECT ASSESSMENT EXPIRATION:

This Preliminary Project Assessment is valid for a period of 18 months. An Environmental Evaluation Application, Conditional Use Application, or Building Permit Application, as listed above, must be
submitted no later than October 8, 2017. Otherwise, this determination is considered expired and a new Preliminary Project Assessment is required. Such applications and plans must be generally consistent with those found in this Preliminary Project Assessment.

Enclosure: Neighborhood Group Mailing List
Interdepartmental Project Review Application
Preliminary Shadow Analysis
Flood Notification: Planning Bulletin

cc: 996 Mission Street LLC, Property Owner
Christopher Townes, Current Planning
Heather Jones, Environmental Planning
Amnon Ben-Pazi, Citywide Planning and Analysis
Jonas Ionin, Planning Commission Secretary
Charles Rivasplata, SFMTA
Jerry Sanguinetti, Public Works
Pauline Perkins, SFPUC
June Weintraub and Jonathan Piakis, DPH
Planning Department Webmaster (planning.webmaster@sfgov.org)
PLANNING DIRECTOR
BULLETIN NO. 4

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

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

Central Reception
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco CA 94103-2479
TEL: 415.558.6378
FAX: 415.558.6409
WEB: http://www.sfplanning.org

Planning Information Center (PIC)
1660 Mission Street, First Floor
San Francisco CA 94103-2479
TEL: 415.558.6377
Planning staff are available by phone and at the PIC counter.
No appointment is necessary.
Interdepartmental Project Reviews are mandatory for new construction projects that propose buildings eight (8) 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 above referenced applications.

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

**Interdepartmental Project Review fees:**

Please refer to the Planning Department Fee Schedule for fees related to this application. The Fee Schedule may be obtained from the Planning Department’s website at www.sf-planning.org or in person at the Public Information Counter (PIC) located at 1660 Mission Street, San Francisco, CA 94103. For questions related to the Fee Schedule, please call the PIC at (415) 558-6377.

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

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

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

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

Note: No documents or plans should exceed 11” x 17” page size.

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 MEETING APPLICATION FORM

APPLICATION DATE: 

PROJECT CONTACT: (Please complete all data fields)

Name __________________________ Phone No. ( ) __________________________
Address ________________________________________________________________
City __________________________ Zip Code __________________________
FAX No. ( ) __________________________ E-Mail Address __________________________
Name of Property Owner ____________________________________________________

PROJECT INFORMATION:

Property Address __________________________________________________________

How many units does the subject property have? __________________________
Assessor's Block/Lot(s) __________________________ Zoning District __________
Height and Bulk Districts __________________________________________________

PROJECT DESCRIPTION / PURPOSE OF MEETING: (Use a separate sheet, if necessary)

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

Previously contacted Planning Department staff __________________________
Will this project be publicly funded? (specify) __________________________

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

Note: No documents or plans should exceed 11" x 17" page size.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title/Role</th>
<th>Organization/Neighborhood of Interest</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Email Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angelica Cabande</td>
<td>Organizational Director</td>
<td>South of Market Community Action</td>
<td>1110 Howard Sheet, San Francisco, CA 94103</td>
<td><a href="mailto:acabande@somcan.org">acabande@somcan.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonio Diaz</td>
<td>Project Director</td>
<td>People Organizing to Demand</td>
<td>474 Valencia Street #125, San Francisco, CA 94103</td>
<td><a href="mailto:antdiaz@poder.org">antdiaz@poder.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn Diamond</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Market Street Association</td>
<td>870 Market Street Suite 456, San Francisco, CA 94102</td>
<td><a href="mailto:carol@msadv.org">carol@msadv.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corinne Woods</td>
<td></td>
<td>Harbor Association</td>
<td>300 Channel Sheet, Box 10, San Francisco, CA 94158</td>
<td><a href="mailto:corinnewoods@tcs.com">corinnewoods@tcs.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandre Goldman</td>
<td>Community Planner</td>
<td>Tenderloin Neighborhood Development</td>
<td>215 Taylor Street, San Francisco, CA 94102</td>
<td><a href="mailto:agoldman@fidc.org">agoldman@fidc.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Lopez</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>SoMa Bend Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>P.O. Box 410805, San Francisco, CA 94141</td>
<td><a href="mailto:somabend.na@gmail.com">somabend.na@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Ian Lewis             |                                 | HERE Local 2209                         | Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102  | 00chinatowndowntownmtnh
| Jane Kim              | Supervisor, District 6         | Board of Supervisors                    | 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 24444  | jane.kim@sfgov.org     |
| Janet Carpinelli      | Board President                | Doppatch Neighborhood Association       | 934 Minnesota Street, San Francisco, CA 94107 | janet@someloumal.com   |
| Jason Henderson       | President                      | Mark-Voctavia Community Advisory Council | 300 Buchanan Street, Apt. 503, San Francisco, CA 94102 | jhenders@sbcglobal.net |
| Jaime Whitaker        | Administrator                  | SOMA Leadership Council                 | 201 Harrison Street, Apt. 229, San Francisco, CA 94105 | jaime.whitaker@somacaf.org |
| Katy Liddell          | President                      | South Beach/Rincon/Mission Bay          | 403 Main Street #813, San Francisco, CA 94105 | katty@msadv.org        |
| Kaye Griffin          | Director                       | LMNOP Neighbors                         | 1047 Minna Street, San Francisco, CA 94103   | kayegriffin@yak.net     |
| Keith Goldstein       |                                | Potrero-Dogpatch Merchants             | 800 Kansas Street, San Francisco, CA 94107   | keith@everestsf.com    |
| Laura Magnani         |                                 | American Friends Service Committee      | 65 Ninth Street, San Francisco, CA 94103     | laura.e@afsc.org        |
| Marvis Phillips       | Land Use Chair                 | Alliance for a Better District          | 8230 Eddy Street #1206, San Francisco, CA 94102 | marvisphillips@gmail.com |
| Patsy Tito            | Executive Director             | Samoan Development Centre               | 2055 Sunnydale Avenue #100, San Francisco, CA 94134 | patstito@afsc.org      |
| Reed Bement           | President                      | Rincon Hill Residents Association       | 75 Folsom Street #1800, San Francisco, CA 94105 | reed@potreroboosters.org |
| Rodney Minatt         | Chair                           | Potrero Hill Neighbors/Save the Hill    | 1208 Mariposa Street, San Francisco, CA 94107 | Rodney.Minatt@hotmail.com |
| Sonia Kos             | Community Advocate              | TODCO Impact Group                      | 230 Fourth Street, San Francisco, CA 94103   | sonja@toddco.org       |
| Ted Olson             | Chair                           | TJPA CAC                                | 30 Sharon Street, San Francisco, CA 94114    | ted@tjpacac.org        |
| Tiffany Bohee         | Executive Director             | Office of Community Investment and      | 1 South Van Ness Avenue, 5th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94103 | tiffany.bohee@sfgov.org |
| Michelle Deguzman     | Development Specialist          | Office of Community Investment and      | 1 South Van Ness Avenue, 5th Floor, San Francisco, CA 94103 | michelle.deguzman@sfgov.org |
| Gail Baugh           | President                       | Hayes Valley Neighborhood Association   | 700 Hayes Street, San Francisco, CA 94102    | gaubaugh@yahoo.com     |
| J.R. Eppler           | President                       | Potrero Boosters Neighborhood            | 1459-18th Street, Suite 133, San Francisco, CA 94107 | jrepler@potreroboosters.org |
| York Loo             |                                 | York Realty                            | 243A Shipley Street, San Francisco, CA 94107 | yorkloo@gmail.com      |
| Dyan Ruiz            | Co-Founder                     | People Power Media                      | 366 10th Ave, San Francisco, CA 94118       | dyanchinatowndowntownmtnh |