DATE: March 16, 2016
TO: Drake Gardner – ZoneDesign Development
FROM: Mr. Rick Cooper, Planning Department
RE: PPA Case No. 2015.015950PPA for 955 Post Street

Please find the attached Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) for the address listed above. You may contact the staff contact, Rachel A. Schuett, at (415) 575-9030 or rachel.schuett@sfgov.org, to answer any questions you may have, or to schedule a follow-up meeting.

Mr. Rick Cooper, Senior Planner
Preliminary Project Assessment

Date: March 16, 2016
Case No.: 2015.015950PPA
Project Address: 955 Post Street
Block/Lot: 0302/021
Zoning: RC-4 (Residential – Commercial, High Density)
North of Market Residential 1 Special Use District
80-T Height and Bulk District
Area Plan: n/a
Project Sponsor: Drake Gardner – ZoneDesign Development 415.377.6694
Staff Contact: Rachel A. Schuett – 415.575.9030 Rachel.Schuett@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 December 3, 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 21,050-square-foot (sf), 24-foot-tall office and auto repair building and construct a 9-story, approximately 85-foot-tall mixed-use residential building with retail uses on the ground floor. The existing building on the 13,750-sf subject lot was constructed in 1919. The proposed
new building would include 106 dwelling units, 53 underground parking spaces, and 10,000 sf of commercial space along Post Street.

Excavation would be required to a depth of approximately 20 feet below ground surface (bgs) to accommodate a subterranean parking garage and parking stacker pits, approximately 2,000 cubic yards of soil would be removed. Class I bicycle parking and scooter parking would be provided within the parking garage, with some additional bicycle parking provided on the ground floor. Access to the parking garage would be via an existing curb cut on Post Street.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:

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

Below is a list of topic areas addressed through the environmental review process. Some of these would require additional study based on the preliminary review of the project as it is proposed in the PPA application.

1. **Historic Resources.** The project proposes alteration or demolition of a contributor to the Lower Nob Hill Apartment Hotel National Register Historic District; therefore, the proposed project is subject to review by the Department’s Historic Preservation staff. To assist in this review, the project sponsor must hire a qualified professional to prepare a Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE) report. The HRE scope will require an individual evaluation of the subject building. The HRE scope will also require a project analysis. The qualified professional must be selected from the Planning Department's Historic Resource Consultant Pool. Please contact Tina Tam, Senior Preservation Planner, via email (tina.tam@sfgov.org) for a list of three consultants from which to choose. The selected consultant must scope the HRE in consultation with Department Historic Preservation staff. Please contact the HRE scoping team at HRE@sfgov.org to arrange the HRE scoping. Following an approved scope, the historic resource consultant should submit the draft HRE report for review to Environmental Planning after the project sponsor has filed the EE Application and updated it as necessary to reflect feedback received in the PPA letter. 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 HRE is received.

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

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

4. Transportation. Based on the Planning Department’s Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines for Environmental Review, the project would likely require additional transportation analysis to determine whether the project may result in a significant impact. If so, 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 is located on a high injury corridor as mapped by Vision Zero within an area that has a large number of high injury corridors. The project sponsor is encouraged to include pedestrian and bicycle-friendly amenities and safety-related features some of which address the safety of persons walking and bicycling to and from the project site and vicinity such as visual/auditory warning devices at the project driveway. Once a detailed site plan is submitted as part of the EE Application, Planning Department staff will review proposed pedestrian and bicycle amenities and may provide additional site-specific recommendations.

5. Noise. Based on the General Plan’s Background Noise Levels map, the project site is located along a segment of Post 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 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
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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.

Air Quality. The proposed project at 160 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 although information related to construction equipment, phasing and duration of each phase, and the volume of excavation may be requested during the environmental review process.

However, 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 106A.3.2.6. The proposed project is also required to prepare a Construction Dust Control Plan for review and approval by DPH.

The proposed project includes residential units and is therefore a sensitive receptor; however, the project site is not located within an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone (as defined and mapped in Health Code, Article 38).

The project may include residential uses above 75 feet and the building/fire code is likely to require that the project include a backup diesel generator. 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. Additional mitigation measures, will likely 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
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4 BAAQMD, CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, May 2011, Chapter 3.
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 a park or recreational resource, therefore no additional shadow analysis would be required.

9. Geology. The project site is not located within a landslide hazard zone, nor does the site have a slope that is greater than 20%. However, a final 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. The geotechnical analysis should also include a foundation recommendation, which informs the archeological review and assessment of construction-related air quality impacts.

10. Hazardous Materials. The proposed project 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 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 22A.6. The Phase I ESA would determine the potential for site contamination and level of exposure risk associated with the project. Based on that information, soil and/or groundwater sampling and analysis, as well as remediation of any site contamination, may be required. These steps are required to be completed prior to the issuance of any building permit.

DPH requires that projects subject to the Maher Ordinance complete a Maher Application, available at: [http://www.sfdph.org/dph/EH/HazWaste/hazWasteSiteMitigation.asp](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.
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. Naturally Occurring Asbestos. The proposed project would not include excavation on a site that is underlain by serpentine soils. Therefore, there are no project-related concerns related to naturally occurring asbestos.

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

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

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

1. A Conditional Use Authorization would be required for each of the following aspects of the proposed project:
   - to allow construction of a project within an RC District that is over 40 feet in height and has a street frontage greater than 50 feet, per Planning Code Section 253, and
   - to permit a bulk exceeding 110 feet in length and 125 feet diagonally in the 80-T Height and Bulk District, per Planning Code Section 271.

2. A Variance is required from Planning Code Section 140 for Dwelling Unit Exposure.

3. A Rear Yard Modification is required to substitute an equivalent amount of open space for the required rear yard setback. An application for a rear yard modification is considered by the Zoning Administrator, and should be requested using a Variance Application.

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

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

Conditional Use Authorization applications 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. 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 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. Interdepartmental Project Review. This review is required for all proposed new construction in seismic hazard zones. The subject property does not appear to be located within a seismic hazard zone. If the subject property is found to be within a seismic hazard zone, an interdepartmental project review would be required.

2. Height. Section 253 states that any proposed building within an RC District over 40 feet in height and with more than 50 feet of street frontage on the front façade requires Conditional Use Authorization from the Planning Commission. The frontage of the building is 100 feet and the proposed new construction exceeds 40 feet in height; therefore, a Conditional Use Authorization is required.

   The subject property is located within the 80-T height and bulk district, which restricts the height of the proposed structure to 80 feet, as measured from the centerline of the building at the curb to the highest point on the finished roof in the case of a flat roof. The plans provided show the proposed structure reaching a height of 85 feet, which exceeds the permitted height limit by five feet. Please revise the proposal to comply with the maximum permitted height of 80 feet.

3. Bulk. The subject property is located within the 80-T height and bulk district, which limits the length of the proposed structure to 110 feet, and the diagonal to 125 feet. The bulk limitations apply to the setback height established pursuant to Section 132.2 (see comment no. 4 below), and no higher than 80 feet. Additional information is required to determine if the project complies with the Bulk requirements of Section 270 of the Code. In future submittals please include the proposed length and diagonal dimensions on upper floors.

   Deviations from the bulk limitations may be permitted according to the procedures for Conditional Use Approval if the applicant can demonstrate that the project is consistent with the criteria included in Section 271.

4. Front Setback. Section 132.2(c) states that in order to maintain the continuity of a prevailing streetwall along a street or alley, a setback requirement may be imposed as a condition of approval of an application for conditional use authorization for a building in excess of 50 feet in height. If the applicant can demonstrate that prevailing streetwall height on the block on which the proposed project is located, as established by existing cornice lines, is in excess of 50 feet, then the Commission may impose a maximum setback of up to 20 feet applicable to the portion of the building which exceeds the established prevailing streetwall height; provided, however, that if the applicant demonstrates that the prevailing streetwall height is in excess of 68 feet, the maximum setback requirement which may be imposed is 16 feet. If the applicant can demonstrate that a building without a setback would not disrupt the continuity of the prevailing streetwall along the street, then
the Planning Commission may grant approval of the conditional use authorization without imposing a setback requirement as a condition thereof.

5. **Density.** The project is located within the North of Market Residential Special Use District 1, which permits a density of one dwelling unit per 125 square feet of lot area. The subject lot is 13,750 square feet in lot area and 110 dwelling units would be permitted. The project proposes 106 units, which is compliant with the permitted density in the district.

6. **Rear Yard.** Section 134 requires the project to provide a rear yard of at least 25 percent of the lot depth at the lowest story containing a dwelling unit and each succeeding story. Because this project is located in the North of Market Special Use District 1, the rear yard requirement may be substituted with an equivalent amount of open space situated anywhere on the site, provided that the Zoning Administrator determines that all of the following criteria are met:

   o The substituted open space in the proposed new or expanding structure will improve the access to light and air to and views from existing and abutting properties; and
   
   o The proposed new or expanding structure will not adversely affect the interior block open space formed by the rear yards of existing abutting properties.

The current proposal does not comply with the requirements of Section 134, as the rear setback provided is not 25% of lot depth. Please revise the proposal to be code complying or seek and justify a rear yard modification.

7. **Open Space – Residential.** Section 135 requires 36 square feet of private open space, or 48 square feet of common open space for each dwelling unit. Additionally, any such open spaces must meet the requirements for minimum dimensions and for exposure included in Subsections (f) and (g).

   The proposed roof deck seems to meet the requirements of Section 135, but the inner courts do not seem to meet the requirements for exposure for common open space included in Section 135(g)(2). Additional information is required to determine if the proposed open spaces are compliant with the requirements of Section 135. In future submittals, please include the dimensions and area of each proposed open space, and designate if it is common or private. If the project does not meet the requirements, you may seek and justify a Variance from Planning Code Section 135.

8. **Permitted Obstructions - Balconies Over Streets and Alleys.** Section 136(c)(2) includes the requirements for permitted obstructions over streets and alleys, in this case, the proposed balconies. Additional information is required to determine if the proposed balconies seem to meet the requirements of Code Section 136(c)(2). Future submittals should include dimensions that show the length and depth of each of the balconies, the separation between each balcony, and their relationship to the property line. If these balconies do not meet the standards for Permitted Obstructions over Streets and Alleys, you may seek and justify a Variance from Planning Code Section 136.

   In addition, there are projections on the second-sixth floors on the north façade of the building. It is unclear what these projections are. Please clarify in future submittals.
9. **Permitted Obstructions - Balconies in Yards.** Section 136(c)(3) includes the requirements for permitted obstructions over yards, in this case, the proposed balconies windows facing the rear yard. Additional information is required to determine if the proposed balconies seem to meet the requirements of Code Section 136(c)(3). Future submittals should include dimensions that show the length and depth of each of the balconies and the separation between each. If these balconies do not meet the standards for Permitted Obstructions over yards, you may seek and justify a Variance from Planning Code Section 136.

Additionally, there is an undefined 10 foot projection at the rear of the units facing the rear. It seems as if those 10 foot spaces may be intended for use as private usable open space, but it is unclear from the plans. In future submittals, please clarify the use of this space. If there are any fences or barriers which separate private usable open space from common, please also include additional information on the height and material of these barriers.

10. **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 onto one of the following open areas:

   o a street right-of-way at least 20 feet in width,
   
   o a code-complying rear yard, or
   
   o an open area which is unobstructed, and at least 25 feet in every dimension that increases five feet in every horizontal dimension at each subsequent floor beginning at the third story containing a dwelling unit.

As proposed, the units on the southern half of the building do not meet the requirements of Section 140. The units facing the courtyards are not compliant because the courtyard is not unobstructed, nor does it increase five feet in each horizontal dimension at the fourth story and each subsequent floor. The units facing the rear yard do not comply, as they do not face a code-complying rear yard. In future submittals please include the area of the room in each unit which satisfies the 120 square foot minimum, and demonstrate that a window in that room faces an open area or public right of way with minimum dimensions to meet the exposure requirement. If dwelling units do not meet exposure requirements, you may seek and justify a Variance from Planning Code Section 140.

11. **Shadow Analysis.** Section 295 requires that a shadow analysis must be performed to determine whether the project has the potential to cast shadow on properties under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Recreation and Park Commission. A preliminary shadow fan analysis prepared by Planning Department staff indicates that the proposed project would likely not cast shadows on City and County of San Francisco Recreation and Parks properties subject to Section 295 or other public open space.

12. **Street Frontages in RC Districts: Active Uses.** Section 145.1 requires active uses at the ground floor with the exception of space allowed for parking and loading access, building egress, and access to mechanical systems. Space for active uses must be provided within the first 25 feet of building depth
at the ground floor from any façade facing a street or alley at least 30 feet in width. Active uses are defined in Section 145.1(b)(2) as any principal, conditional, or accessory use that by nature does not require non-transparent walls facing a public street or involves the storage of goods or vehicles. Active uses include building lobbies which do not exceed the larger of 40 feet or 25% of building frontage. Section 145.1 also requires that off-street parking at grade must be set back at least 25 feet on the ground floor from any façade facing a street at least 30 feet width. Spaces accessory to residential uses, such as fitness or community rooms, are considered active uses only if they meet the intent of this section and have access directly to the public sidewalk or street.

Additional information is required to determine if the current project is code-complying. The current proposal includes an office at the ground floor. Management offices are not considered active uses at the ground floor, as they are not spaces accessory to the residential use. Please provide additional information about this proposed use, and relocate the office elsewhere in the building.

Street Frontages in RC Districts: Parking and Loading Entrances. No more than 20 feet shall be devoted to parking or loading ingress or egress. The proposal seems to comply with this requirement, but additional information is required to confirm that the parking and loading entrance is compliant with the requirements of Section 145. Please include dimensions on the parking and loading entry and curb cut on future submittals.

Street Frontages in RC Districts: Ground Floor Ceiling Height. The minimum ground floor ceiling height for non-residential uses in RC Zoning Districts is 14 feet as measured from grade. The current proposal is compliant with this requirement.

13. Loading. Section 152 states that one off-street freight loading space is required for developments proposing 10,001 to 60,000 gross square feet of retail use. One freight loading space is also required for developments proposing 100,001 to 200,000 gross square feet of apartments. Non-accessory off-street parking is not counted in the measurement of gross floor area for the purposes of calculating loading requirements. The current proposal includes 10,000 gross square feet of retail uses and 85,000 gross square feet of residential uses, neither of which trigger the loading requirements set in Section 152. However, since the area of the proposed retail is 10,000 gross square feet, please note that any expansion of the proposed retail space may trigger the loading requirement. If the loading requirement is not triggered for either use, please remove the proposed loading space.

14. Loading Dimensions. Per Section 154(b)(2), the first required off-street loading space shall have a minimum length of 25 feet, a minimum width of 10 feet, and a minimum vertical clearance of 12 feet, including exit and entry. If the loading is required per Section 152, please include dimensions of the proposed loading space on future submittals.

15. Car Share. Section 166 requires one car-share space for any project that proposes 50-200 dwelling units. In future submittals please designate a car-share space on the plans.

16. Unbundled Parking. Section 167 requires that all off-street parking spaces accessory to residential uses in new structures of 10 or more dwelling units shall be leased or sold separately from the rental or purchase fees for dwelling units for the life of the dwelling units.
17. **Parking Dimensions.** Section 154 of the Planning Code requires that standard parking spaces must meet a minimum area of 144 square feet (8 feet wide and 18 feet long) and that compact spaces must meet a minimum area of 112.5 square feet (7.5 feet wide and 15 feet long). Additional information is required to determine if the proposed parking spaces meet the minimum required area and dimensions. Please include parking dimensions on future submittals.

18. **Bicycle Parking.** Planning Code Section 155.5 requires this project to provide at least one Class 1 bicycle parking space per dwelling unit, one Class 1 space per every 7,500 square feet of occupied floor area of retail, one Class 2 spaces per 20 dwelling units, and one Class 2 space for every 2,500 square feet of occupied floor area of retail.

Class 1 spaces shall be located with direct access for bicycles without requiring the use of stairs. The design of Class 1 parking shall provide safe and convenient access to and from parking facilities. The use of elevators to access bicycle parking spaces shall be minimized for all uses. No more than 1/3 of the required bicycle parking may be vertical parking. There shall be either: (i) convenient access to and from the street to the bicycle parking space and another entrance from the bicycle parking space to the lobby area, or (ii) a minimum five foot wide hallway or lobby space that leads to the bicycle parking major entrance, where direct access to bicycle parking space from the street does not exist. Such access route may include up to two limited constriction points, such as doorways, provided that these constrictions are no narrower than three feet wide and extend for no more than one foot of distance.

Class 2 spaces shall be located, as feasible, near all main pedestrian entries to the uses which they are accessory, and should not be located in or immediately adjacent to service, trash or loading areas. Class 2 spaces may be located in a public right-of-way, such as on a sidewalk, within 100 feet of the main entry to the subject building, subject to the demonstration of preliminary approval by the necessary City agencies.

The project proposes 106 dwelling units, so 106 Class 1 parking spaces and five Class 2 would be required for residential uses. The project also proposes 10,000 square feet of retail, so one Class 1 and four Class 2 spaces are required for the retail uses. The plans provided show two designated areas for bicycle storage. The proposed bicycle storage room in the basement would not meet the requirements of Section 155. Additional information is required to determine if the bicycle storage on the ground floor is compliant, including how many bicycle parking spaces are provided, what proportion of the spaces is vertical parking, and the width of the hallways accessing the storage area. You may also seek a waiver or Variance from the Zoning Administrator and pay an in-lieu fee for each of the required spaces.

19. **Vision Zero.** The project is located on a “high-injury corridor,” identified through the City’s Vision Zero Program, a commitment to eliminating injuries and deaths of anyone using city streets and sidewalks (pedestrians, cyclists, motorists, etc.). The Sponsor is encouraged to incorporate pedestrian and bicycle safety streetscape measures into the project, especially at its parking garage entrance on Post Street.
20. **Street Trees.** The Department of Public Works requires the planting of Street Trees pursuant to Article 16, Section 805(a) and (d) and 806(d). Generally, one street tee for every 20 feet of frontage for new construction will be required. You may contact Carla Short at the Department of Public Works for additional information (Carla.short@sfgov.org).

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

22. **Sustainability / Green Building.** Per the San Francisco Green Building Code, this project is required to meet the requirements of LEED Silver. The Department recommends the project sponsor work with the Building Department and San Francisco Environment to design/build the most beneficial mix of green building strategies to meet all current requirements. This especially includes the provision of renewable energy on site (PV and solar thermal), living roofs and walls, non-potable water reuse, healthy environments (non-toxic building materials), and other innovative approaches to enhancing performance of the City’s current green building requirements. [http://sfenvironment.org/article/new-construction-and-major-renovations/green-building-ordinance-san-francisco-building-code](http://sfenvironment.org/article/new-construction-and-major-renovations/green-building-ordinance-san-francisco-building-code)

23. **Inclusionary Affordable Housing.** Inclusionary Affordable Housing is required for a project proposing ten or more dwelling units. 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 13 units if provided on-site, and 21 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. Fringe Financial Services Restricted Use District. The property resides in this restricted use district and “within ¼ mile of an Existing Fringe Financial Service” zone. Therefore, per Section 249.35 of the Planning Code, no new fringe financial services shall be permitted as a principal or accessory use. A Financial Fringe Service is a retail sales and service use that provides banking services and products to the public and is owned or operated by a “check cashier” as defined in California Civil Code Section 1789.31 or by a licensee as defined in California Financial Code Section 23001(d).

25. 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 (411A)
   b. Child Care Fee (414A)
   c. Affordable Housing Fee (415)

26. Diaper Changing Station. Per Section 168, diaper changing stations are required for retail sales and services uses exceeding 5,000 square feet. Diaper changing accommodations must be available to both men and women at each floor level containing publicly-accessible restrooms. Please include such accommodations in future submittals.

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

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

Case No. 2015.015950PPA
955 Post Street

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

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

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 increasing the size of the rear yard to be code-complying (25% of the depth, or equivalent area).

   The Planning Department recommends the project conform to the bulk controls for this district, which require a front building setback above the prevailing street wall. The street wall directly across the street appears to suggest a height of around 50' - 55'. The Planning Department recommends the upper stories be setback 20' above that height.

   The Planning Department suggests more significant courtyard width, closer to 35' - 40' feet, as per recent Planning Commission approvals, and to facilitate compliance for exposure. Consider combining the courtyards into a single larger courtyard to provide greater solar access. Design the courtyard to provide privacy between facing dwelling units.

   Parking is not a permitted use in the required rear yard area.

2. Street frontage. The Planning Department looks for the ground floor design to exhibit compatibility with the materials, detailing, and features found in the historic district. Further, the design should impart the ground floor with human-scale features. Provide detailed larger scale drawings of the ground floor façade.

3. Architecture. The Planning Department recommends reviewing the buildings that contribute to the district for appropriate architectural characteristics, materials, and elements for the new construction. The Department recommends significant solid masonry façade with punched openings with bays with well-defined residential entries. Additionally the Planning Department requests the use of high-quality materials and detailing that impart significant depth and scale to the fenestration in street-facing facades.
PRELIMINARY PROJECT ASSESSMENT EXPIRATION:

This Preliminary Project Assessment is valid for a period of 18 months. An Environmental Evaluation, Conditional Use Authorization, or Building Permit Application, as listed above, must be submitted no later than September 16, 2017. Otherwise, this determination is considered expired and a new Preliminary Project Assessment is required. Such applications and plans must be generally consistent with those found in this Preliminary Project Assessment.
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