DATE: February 26, 2016
TO: Tony Pantaleoni; Kotas/Pantaleoni Architects
FROM: Elizabeth Watty, Planning Department
RE: PPA Case No. 2015.016243PPA for 611 Jones Street

Please find the attached Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) for the address listed above. You may contact the staff contact, Ming Yeung, at (415) 575-9183 or ming.yeung@sfgov.org, to answer any questions you may have, or to schedule a follow-up meeting.

Elizabeth Watty, Assistant Director of Current Planning
Preliminary Project Assessment

Date: February 26, 2016
Case No.: 2015-016243PPA
Project Address: 611 Jones Street
Block/Lot: 0304 / 003
Zoning: RC-4
Area Plan: N/A
Project Sponsor: Anthony Pantaleoni; Kotas/Pantaleoni Architects
(415) 495-4051
Staff Contact: Ming Yeung – (415) 575-9183
ming.yeung@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 7, 2015, as summarized below. This PPA letter identifies Planning Department review requirements for the proposed project, including those related to environmental review, approvals, neighborhood notification and public outreach, the Planning Code, project design, and other general issues of concern for the project. Please be advised that the PPA application does not constitute an application for development with the Planning Department. The PPA letter also does not represent a complete review of the proposed project, does not grant a project approval of any kind, and does not in any way supersede any required Planning Department approvals listed below.

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

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The project site is a parcel measuring 2,187-square-feet fronting on Jones Street. The proposal is to demolish the existing 1,900-square-foot (sf), two-story, 20-foot-tall single-family house and construct a 13-story, 130-foot-tall residential building. The existing single-family house was constructed in 1908 and is considered a potential historic resource (constructed 45 or more years ago). The proposed new building
would include 17 dwelling units with an entry lobby and gym on the ground floor. The project would require excavation of up to two to three feet below grade. No parking is proposed.

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 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 not have any significant impacts, then the Department would issue a preliminary negative declaration (PND). 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 PND or 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 negative declaration (FND) or a final mitigated negative declaration (FMND). Additional information regarding the environmental review process can be found at: http://www.sf-planning.org/modules/showdocument.aspx?documentid=8631.

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

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

1. **Historic Resources.** The project site contains one or more buildings or structures considered to be a potential historic resource (constructed 45 or more years ago); therefore, the proposed alteration 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 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. 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. The 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. **Archaeological Resources.** As described in the PPA application, the proposed project would require two to three feet of excavation, and thus would not require Preliminary Archeological Review (PAR) by a Planning Department archeologist. However, should the depth of soil disturbance increase it may require a PAR. If 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. If the Department archeologist determines that the project has a potential to adversely affect archeological resources, the PAR will identify additional measures needed to address the potential effect. These measures may include preparation of an archeological research design and treatment plan, implementation of one of the Planning Department’s three standard archeological mitigation measures (archeological testing, monitoring, or accidental discovery), or other appropriate measures.

3. **Tribal Cultural Resources.** Tribal cultural resources (TCRs) are a class of resource established under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in 2015. TCRs are defined as a site, feature, place, cultural landscape, sacred place or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, that is either included on or eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources or a local historic register, or is a resource that the lead agency, at its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, determines is a TCR. Planning Department staff will review the proposed project to determine if it may cause an adverse effect to a TCR; this will occur in tandem with preliminary archeological review. No additional information is needed from the project sponsor at this time. Consultation with California Native American tribes regarding TCRs may be required at the request of the tribes. If staff determines that the proposed project may have a potential significant adverse impact on a TCR, mitigation measures will be identified and required. Mitigation measures may include avoidance, protection, or preservation of the TCR and development of interpretation and public education and artistic programs.
4. **Transportation.** Based on the PPA submittal, a transportation impact study is not anticipated; an official determination will be made subsequent to submittal of the EEA. However, the project site is located on a high injury corridor as mapped by Vision Zero.\(^2\) To help Planning staff assess the safety of persons walking and cycling to and from the project site and vicinity, Planning staff propose the following recommendations:

- The assigned Environmental Coordinator should conduct a site visit to assess potential safety issues. The Environmental Coordinator should also take the project to the Street Design Advisory Team (SDAT) for review.
- On the plans, the project sponsor should include an existing site plan that shows existing sidewalk dimensions and the location and dimension of any existing curb cuts.
- On the proposed site plan, the project sponsor should include the proposed sidewalk dimensions and any changes to existing curb cuts.
- On the plans, the project sponsor should include the number of bicycle parking spaces.

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

6. **Air Quality.** The proposed project at 17 units is below the Bay Area Air Quality Management District’s (BAAQMD) construction and operational screening levels for criteria air pollutants.\(^3\) Therefore, it is unlikely that an analysis of the project’s criteria air pollutant emissions would 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 not located within an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone, as mapped and defined by Health Code Article 38. The Air Pollutant Exposure Zone identifies areas with poor air quality based on modeling of air pollution, exposures, and health vulnerability from mobile, stationary, and area source emissions within San Francisco. Given that the project site is not within an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone, additional measures or analysis related to local health risks are not likely to be required. However, if the project would include new sources of toxic air contaminants including, but not limited to, emissions from diesel generators or boilers, or any other stationary sources, the project would result in toxic air contaminants that may affect both on-site and off-site sensitive receptors. Please provide detailed information related to any proposed stationary sources with the EEA.

---


\(^3\) BAAQMD, CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, May 2011, Chapter 3.
7. **Greenhouse Gases.** The City and County of San Francisco's Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions presents a comprehensive assessment of policies, programs, and ordinances that represents San Francisco’s Qualified Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Reduction Strategy. Projects that are consistent with San Francisco’s Qualified GHG Reduction Strategy would result in less-than-significant impacts from GHG emissions. In order to facilitate a determination of compliance with San Francisco’s Qualified GHG Reduction Strategy, the Planning Department has prepared a Greenhouse Gas Analysis Compliance Checklist.\(^4\) If an Initial Study is required, the project sponsor will be required to submit the completed table regarding project compliance with the identified regulations and provide project-level details in the discussion column. This information will be reviewed by the environmental planner during the environmental review process to determine if the project would comply with San Francisco’s Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy. Projects that do not comply with an ordinance or regulation may be determined to be inconsistent with the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy.

8. **Wind.** The proposed project would involve construction of a building 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 Coordinator prior to proceeding with the analysis.

9. **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 any San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department properties subject to Section 295 of the Planning Code, other non-rec park properties, or open space. Therefore, the Planning Department will not require an additional shadow study.

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

11. **Hazardous Materials.** Because construction of the proposed project would require excavation of more than 50 cubic yards, the project sponsor must retain the services of a qualified professional to prepare a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) that meets the requirements Section 22.A.6 of the San Francisco Health Code. The Phase I ESA would determine the potential for site contamination and level of exposure risk associated with the project. Based on that information, the assigned Environmental Coordinator will determine whether further consultation with the San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH) is necessary. Based on the results of the Phase 1 ESA, the

proposed project may be required to enroll in the Maher Ordinance, which is administered and overseen by DPH. More information regarding the Maher Ordinance is available at: https://www.sfdph.org/dph/EH/HazWaste/hazWasteSiteMitigation.asp

Additionally, 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.

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

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. Conditional Use Authorization from the Planning Commission is required per Planning Code Section (“Section”) 253 for the new construction of a building greater than 50 feet in height in an RC District.
2. Conditional Use Authorization from the Planning Commission may be required per Section 249.5 (c)(10) for the demolition of the single-family house containing a residential unit located within the North of Market Residential Special Use District.

3. Variance from the Zoning Administrator is required per Section 134(g) for the reduction of the rear yard requirement, and per Section 140 for dwelling unit exposure. Please see discussion under “Preliminary Project Comments” below.

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 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.

1. Pre-Application Meeting. 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.

2. Neighborhood Outreach. This project is required to undertake additional public outreach in advance of the Planning Commission hearing on the Conditional Use Authorization and Variance. The developer is required to conduct an additional outreach meeting, notifying owners and tenants who live within 300’ of the project as well as all registered neighborhood organizations for the Downtown/Civic Center neighborhood, after initial design comments have been provided from the Planning Department and prior to the scheduling of the aforementioned Planning Commission hearing. The purpose of this meeting is to keep the community abreast of the project’s evolution, presenting the latest design of the project – including the Department’s requested changes – to the community in advance of the Commission taking action on the hearing.

3. 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. **North of Market Residential Special Use District ("NOMRSUD") - Demolition of Dwelling (Section 249.5(c)(10)).** In considering the request for Conditional Use Authorization to demolish the single-family house containing a residential unit, the Planning Commission would consider the standard Conditional Use criteria under Section 303(c), as well as the following criteria specific to the NOMRSUD:

   o Protect and enhance important housing resources in an area near downtown, conserve and upgrade existing low and moderate income housing stock, preserve buildings of architectural and historic importance and preserve the existing scale of development, maintain sunlight in public spaces, and encourage new infill housing at a compatible density.

   o Consider the adverse impact on the public health, safety and general welfare due to the loss of existing housing stock in the district and to any unreasonable hardship to the applicant if the permit is denied.

2. **Review of Buildings More Than 50 Feet in RC District.** In considering the request for Conditional Use Authorization for a building exceeding 50 feet in height in a RC District, the Planning Commission would consider the standard Conditional Use criteria under Section 303(c), as well as the criteria set forth in Sections 251 and 253 that includes the purposes of the particular R District. Future submittals should include how the project meets the criteria.

3. **Front Setback.** Per Section 132.2, in order to maintain the continuity of a predominant street wall along the street, setbacks of the upper portion of a building which abuts a public sidewalk may be required of buildings located within the NOMRSUD, as a condition of approval of Conditional Use Authorization otherwise required by Section 253 for buildings in RC Districts which exceed 50 feet in height. Future submittals should include the prevailing streetwall height on the block on which the proposed project is located, in excess of 50 feet to determine whether a setback is appropriate. See also Preliminary Design comments below.

4. **Rear Yard.** Section 134 requires the project to provide a rear yard of at least 25 percent of the lot depth, but in no case less than 15 feet. Based on the lot depth, a rear yard of 22 feet is required (25% of 87.50 feet). The application indicates a rear yard of eight feet. Although within the North of Market Residential SUD, Section 134(g) allows the rear yard requirement to be substituted for an equivalent amount of open space if the Zoning Administrator determines certain criteria are met, the Department encourages providing a Code-compliant rear yard.
5. **Open Space - Residential.** Section 135 requires 36 square feet of open space for each dwelling unit if private or 48 square feet of open space per dwelling unit if common. Additionally, any such open spaces must meet the dimensional requirements of subsections (f) and (g). The balconies located on Floors 2 – 8 do not appear to meet the minimum 36 square foot dimension. Dimensions are needed to confirm the size of the balconies on Floors 9 – 13. The application indicates the provision of a roof deck that could meet common open space requirements. Future submittals should clarify the dimensions of the private and common open space areas to ensure compliance with this requirement.

6. **Street trees.** Section 138.1 requires one street tree for every 20 feet of frontage for new construction. A 24-inch box size street tree is required for each 20 feet of frontage along each street or alley, with any remaining fraction of 10 feet or more of frontage requiring an additional tree. Based on the total street frontage of 25 feet, the project requires one street tree. Please consult with the Department of Public Works (DPW) on this requirement as they are the agency that handles this.

7. **Standards for Bird Safe Buildings.** Planning Code Section 139 outlines bird-safe standards for new construction to reduce bird-strike mortality from circumstances that are known to pose a high risk to birds and are considered to be “bird hazards.” Bird hazards include “feature-related hazards” such as free-standing glass walls, wind barriers, or balconies. Feature-related hazards must have broken glazed segments 24 square feet or smaller in size. Please review the standards and indicate the method of window treatments to comply with the requirements where applicable.

8. **Exposure.** Section 140 requires that each dwelling unit have at least one room that meets the 120-square-foot minimum superficial floor area requirement of Section 503 of the Housing Code face directly on a street right-of-way, Planning Code-complying rear yard, or an appropriately sized courtyard. The proposed rear yard is not Code-complying and does not provide a large enough courtyard to meet the exposure requirement for those units that only have windows fronting the rear yard area. Therefore, the proposed project requires revision to meet the minimum exposure requirement, or you may request and justify an exposure variance. The Department encourages projects to minimize the number of units needing an exposure variance.

9. **Ground Floor Frontages.** Section 145.1 requires active uses at the ground floor facing Jones Street. Pursuant to Section 145.1(b)(2), residential uses, spaces accessory to residential uses and building lobbies are considered active uses, pursuant to certain conditions. Future submittals should include detailed and scaled plans to confirm compliance with these standards.

10. **Project Height.** The project is within the 80-T – 130-T Height and Bulk District. Section 263.7 allows for special height exceptions within the NOMRSUD, from the base height of 80 feet up to 130 feet in the 80-130-T District, provided that the development of the site is also consistent with the general purposes of the NOMRSUD as set forth in Section 249.5(b). Section 263.7(b) requires that a portion of the value added to the new development resulting from the granting of a height exception be contributed to a fund established for the purpose of stabilizing, rehabilitating and retaining existing affordable units in the area. As discussed above, future submittals should include a discussion on how the project meets the Conditional Use criteria under Section 303(c), the general purposes of the NOMRSUD in Section 249.5(b) and other relevant Code Sections, as well as plans that indicate the total gross square footage of floor space located above 80 feet in height.
11. **Shadow Analysis (Section 295).** 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 shadow fan that indicates the project will not cast new shadows on adjacent parks (enclosed). No additional application is required for compliance with Planning Code Section 295.

12. **Bicycle Parking.** Planning Code Section 155.2 requires this project to provide 17 Class 1 bicycle parking spaces and one Class 2 bicycle parking space on-site. The applicant may satisfy the requirements to provide Class 2 bicycle parking by paying the Bicycle Parking In-Lieu fee provided in Section 430. Class 1 bicycle parking spaces should be provided in a secure, weather protected space meeting dimensions set in Zoning Administrator Bulletin No. 9. The application indicates an approximately 6.5-foot by 5-foot (45.5-square-foot) area on the first floor reserved for bicycle parking. This area is likely not sufficient to accommodate the number of bicycle parking spaces required for the project. The project would need to be revised to accommodate the required number of Class 1 bicycle parking spaces on-site.

13. **Vision Zero.** In 2014, the City adopted the Vision Zero Policy which seeks to eliminate all traffic deaths in the City by 2024. The City subsequently established a network of Vision Zero Corridors which have higher rates of traffic-related injuries and fatalities compared to most San Francisco Streets. The City has determined that streets on the Vision Zero network should be prioritized for safety improvements especially those that improve the safety of vulnerable users like people walking and people on bikes. This project is located on a pedestrian high-injury corridor, and is encouraged to incorporate safety measures into the project. The Sponsor is encouraged to incorporate pedestrian safety streetscape measures into the project.

14. **First Source Hiring Agreement.** A First Source Hiring Agreement is required for any residential project resulting in the creation of ten or more residential units. For more information, please contact as early in the process as possible:

   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

15. **Inclusionary 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 2 units if provided on-site, and 3 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. Costa Hawkins agreements must be executed prior to the Planning Commission hearing.

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

17. 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.
18. **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. Affordable Housing Fee (415)
b. Residential Child Care Impact Fee (414)
c. NOMRSUD Height Exception Fee (263.7)

**PRELIMINARY DESIGN COMMENTS:**

The project is adjacent to the Uptown Tenderloin Historic District and is primarily residential with retail at the ground floor. The area is mixed in height but has consistent patterns of architectural components (base, middle and top elements) and façade material types (masonry). The following comments address preliminary design issues that may significantly impact the proposed project:

1. **Site Design, Open Space and Massing.** In order to provide a quality, usable open space, the Planning Department recommends providing a Code complying rear yard starting at the first residential level.

1. **Architecture.** The Planning Department recommends that the project use volumetric changes such as bay windows, vertical or other mass breaking elements, or architectural projections to re-proportion the front façade. These would help define the scale of the street and relate to neighborhood patterns more effectively along the project’s tall frontage. One pattern to consider employing includes a more tri-partite structure where the top of the building could be indicated architecturally as more than one floor. Additionally, as the tall structure is likely to be more exposed, the design should be exceptional and volumetrically considered so that it does not simply expose long blank sidewalks.

**PRELIMINARY PROJECT ASSESSMENT EXPIRATION:**

This Preliminary Project Assessment is valid for a period of 18 months. An Environmental Evaluation, Conditional Use Authorization, Variance, or Building Permit Application, as listed above, must be submitted no later than August 26, 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
Preliminary Shadow Fan
Place of Entertainment Map
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<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Chandler</td>
<td>Community Planner</td>
<td>Lower Polk Neighborhood Development Corporation</td>
<td>PO BOX 164328</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-358-3920</td>
<td><a href="mailto:agoldman@lmpdc.org">agoldman@lmpdc.org</a></td>
<td>Downtown/Civic Center, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald</td>
<td>Savoie</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Civic Center Community Benefit District</td>
<td>234 Van Ness Avenue</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-626-1819</td>
<td><a href="mailto:info@sffiviccenter.org">info@sffiviccenter.org</a></td>
<td>Downtown/Civic Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>Lopez</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>SoMaBend Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>P.O. Box 418086</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-669-0916</td>
<td><a href="mailto:somabend.na@gmail.com">somabend.na@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Downtown/Civic Center, Mission, South of Market, Chinatown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Haas</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
<td>Civic Center Stakeholder Group</td>
<td>100 Van Ness Avenue</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-285-5048</td>
<td><a href="mailto:JWhaasESQ@Galen.com">JWhaasESQ@Galen.com</a></td>
<td>Downtown/Civic Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Kim</td>
<td>Supervisor, District 6</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>1 Dr. Carlton B Goodlett Place, Room #244</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-554-7970</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jana.kim@sfgov.org">jana.kim@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:Apri.veneracion@sfgov.org">Apri.veneracion@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:Sunny.Angulo@sfgov.org">Sunny.Angulo@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:jyliu@sfgov.org">jyliu@sfgov.org</a></td>
<td>Downtown/Civic Center, North Beach, South of Market, Treasure Island/YBI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>Henderson</td>
<td>Vice Chairman</td>
<td>Market/Octavia Community Advisory Comm.</td>
<td>300 Buchanan Street, Apt. 503</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-722-0517</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jhender@sbglobal.net">jhender@sbglobal.net</a></td>
<td>Castro/Upper Market, Downtown/Civic Center, Mission, South of Market, Western Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>Breed</td>
<td>Supervisor, District 5</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>1 Dr. Carlton B Goodlett Place, Room #244</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-554-7630</td>
<td><a href="mailto:London.Bread@sfgov.org">London.Bread@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:conor.johnson@sfgov.org">conor.johnson@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:valle.brown@sfgov.org">valle.brown@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:Ahmad.Elnajjar@sfgov.org">Ahmad.Elnajjar@sfgov.org</a> <a href="mailto:marlayne16@gmail.com">marlayne16@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Downtown/Civic Center, Nob Hill, Pacific Heights, Presidio, South of Market, Mission, South of Market, Western Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlayne</td>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Cathedral Hill Neighbors Association</td>
<td>1458 Sutter Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-674-1935</td>
<td><a href="mailto:london.bread@sfgov.org">london.bread@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:marlayne16@gmail.com">marlayne16@gmail.com</a>; <a href="mailto:Ahmad.Elnajjar@sfgov.org">Ahmad.Elnajjar@sfgov.org</a></td>
<td>Downtown/Civic Center, Nob Hill, Pacific Heights, Presidio, South of Market, Mission, South of Market, Western Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy</td>
<td>Shaw</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Tenderloin Housing Clinic</td>
<td>30 Sharon Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-693-9999</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Randy@thclinic.org">Randy@thclinic.org</a></td>
<td>Downtown/Civic Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy</td>
<td>Olsson</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Market/Octavia Community Advisory Comm.</td>
<td>126 Hyde Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-674-1935</td>
<td><a href="mailto:randy@thclinic.org">randy@thclinic.org</a></td>
<td>Castro/Upper Market, Downtown/Civic Center, Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiffany</td>
<td>Bohae</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, City and County of San Francisco</td>
<td>1 South Van Ness Avenue, 5th Floor</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-503-1970</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tiffany.bohae@sfgov.org">tiffany.bohae@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:mike.grissom@sfgov.org">mike.grissom@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:kens.fast@sfgov.org">kens.fast@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:president@hayesvalleysf.org">president@hayesvalleysf.org</a></td>
<td>Downtown/Civic Center, Western Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>Bulkeley</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Hayes Valley Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>1800 Market St., PMB #104</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-781-7880</td>
<td><a href="mailto:claudes@unionsquarebid.com">claudes@unionsquarebid.com</a></td>
<td>Downtown/Civic Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claude</td>
<td>Imbault</td>
<td>Director of Strategic Initiatives</td>
<td>Union Square Business Improvement District</td>
<td>323 Geary Street, Suite 203</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-781-7880</td>
<td><a href="mailto:claudes@unionsquarebid.com">claudes@unionsquarebid.com</a></td>
<td>Downtown/Civic Center</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>