DATE:  August 26, 2016
TO:    Scott Youdall, 1140 Harrison Associates LP
FROM:  Richard Sucre, Planning Department
RE:    PPA Case No. 2016-001738PPA for 1144-1150 Harrison Street

Please find the attached Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) for the address listed above. You may reach the staff contact, Doug Vu, at (415) 575-9120 or Doug.Vu@sfgov.org to answer any questions you may have, or to schedule a follow-up meeting.

Richard Sucre, Acting Senior Planner
Preliminary Project Assessment

Date: August 26, 2016
Case No.: 2016-001738PPA
Project Address: 1144-1150 Harrison Street
Block/Lot: 3755/023
Zoning: WMUG (Western SoMa Mixed Use – General) District
Western SoMa Special Use District
55/65-X
Area Plan: Western SoMa Area Plan
Project Sponsor: Scott Youdall
1140 Harrison Associates, LP
279 Front Street, Suite 102
Danville, CA 94526
(925) 490-2990
Staff Contact: Doug Vu – (415) 575-9120
Doug.Vu@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 May 27, 2016, 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 proposed Project would demolish the existing 76,345 square-feet (sf) two-story commercial and industrial building and construct a six-story, approximately 413,000 gross square-feet (gsf) residential building on the property. The approximately 75,625 square-foot (sf) project site consists of a large single square-shaped parcel with 275 ft. of frontage along Harrison Street and 275 ft. along Berwick Place. Hallam Street terminates at the north boundary of the parcel and Heron Street terminates at Berwick Place adjacent to the west boundary of the property. The subject property is improved with an existing building that was constructed in 1907 for the Metropolitan Laundry Company and is currently occupied by German Motors Collision Center, an automotive repair shop. The newly constructed building would be 65-ft. tall and include 381 dwellings with an anticipated mix of 110 studio, 114 one-bedroom and 157 two-bedroom units. The Project also includes 5,800 sf of leasing and lobby space and 3,000 sf of retail “flex” space fronting Harrison Street. Approximately 30,580 sf of open space would be provided through a central interior courtyard and rear yards at the ground floor, a terrace at the rear of the sixth floor and a public mid-block passage that would directly connect Hallam Street and Berwick Place. The Project would provide 382 Class 1 bicycle parking spaces and 200 automobile parking spaces through mechanical stackers at an underground basement-level garage. The primary residential access would be through a lobby entrance on Harrison Street, with a secondary entrance adjacent to Hallam Street. The residential parking would be accessed through an entrance/exit on Harrison Street and loading/service vehicle access through a driveway at the rear of the property where Heron Street terminates.

BACKGROUND:

The project site is within the Western SoMa Plan Area of the Eastern Neighborhoods Area Plans. The Western SoMa Community Plan covers the Western SoMa Special Use District (SUD) which is an irregularly shaped area generally north of Townsend Street, west of 4th Street, south of Mission Street, and east of 13th Street.1 On December 6, 2012, the Planning Commission certified the Western South of Market (SoMa) Community Plan, Rezoning of Adjacent Parcels and 350 Eight Street Project Final Environmental Impact Report (Western SoMa PEIR).2 On March 19, 2013, the Board of Supervisors adopted the Western SoMa Community Plan by Resolution No. 731-04. The Western SoMa Community Plan and its associated rezoning became effective April 27, 2013.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:

Community Plan Exemption

Section 15183 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines states that projects that are consistent with the development density established by a community plan for which an environmental impact report (EIR) was certified do not require additional environmental review, except as necessary to determine the presence of project-specific significant effects not identified in the programmatic plan area EIR.

1 San Francisco Planning Department, Western South of Market Special Use District Plan Area map. Available at http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=7405.

As discussed above, the proposed project is located within the Western SoMa Plan Area, which was evaluated in the Western SoMa PEIR. The existing zoning for the project site is WMUG (WSoMa Mixed Use-General) District, which allows for residential and commercial uses, such as those proposed for the project site. The existing height and bulk designation for the project site is 55/65-X. The proposed project would construct an approximately 65-foot-tall building on the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would be consistent with the existing zoning and height and bulk designation for the project site. As such, the proposed project is consistent with the development density (zoning) identified in the Western SoMa Area Plan, and as proposed it would be eligible for a Community Plan Exemption (CPE) under the Western SoMa PEIR.

The proposed project would be assessed based on the zoning district controls for the project site in place at the time the Planning Department entitlements for the proposed project are sought. If the proposed project is consistent with the development density identified in the area plan, it would be eligible for a CPE. Please note that a CPE is a type of exemption from environmental review, and cannot be modified to reflect changes to a project after approval. Proposed increases beyond the CPE project description in project size or intensity after project approval will require reconsideration of environmental impacts and issuance of a new CEQA determination.

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

1. **CPE Only.** All potentially significant project-specific and cumulatively considerable environmental impacts are fully consistent with significant impacts identified in the Western SoMa PEIR, and there would be no new significant impacts “peculiar” to the proposed project. In these situations, all pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the Western SoMa PEIR are applied to the proposed project, and a CPE checklist and certificate is prepared. With this outcome, the applicable fees are: (a) the CPE determination fee (currently $14,017) and (b) the CPE certificate fee (currently $7,779).

2. **Mitigated Negative Declaration.** If new site- or project-specific significant impacts are identified for the proposed project that were not identified in the Western SoMa PEIR, and if these new significant impacts can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level, then a focused mitigated negative declaration is prepared to address these impacts, and a supporting CPE checklist is prepared to address all other impacts that were encompassed by the Western SoMa PEIR, with all pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the Western SoMa PEIR also applied to the proposed project. With this outcome, the applicable fees are: (a) the CPE determination fee (currently $14,017) and (b) the standard environmental evaluation fee (which is based on construction value).

3. **Focused EIR.** If any new site- or project-specific significant impacts cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level, then a focused EIR is prepared to address these impacts, and a supporting CPE checklist is prepared to address all other impacts that were encompassed by the Western SoMa PEIR, with all pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the Western SoMa PEIR also applied to the proposed project. With this outcome, the applicable fees are: (a) the CPE determination fee (currently $14,017); (b) the standard environmental evaluation fee (which is based on construction value); and (c) one-half of the standard EIR fee (which is also based on construction value). 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.

If the proposed project is determined not to be consistent with the development density identified for the project site in the Western SoMa Plan, the proposed project would be precluded from qualifying for a CPE under the Western SoMa PEIR. Instead, it would be analyzed in a separate environmental document, either a project-specific Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration or Environmental Impact Report (EIR). In this case, the applicable fees would be (a) the standard environmental evaluation (EE) fee based on the cost of construction; and (b) the standard EIR fee, if an EIR is required.

Formal environmental review begins with Planning Department review of the Environmental Evaluation Application (EEA) filed by the project sponsor. The EEA can be submitted at the same time as the PPA application or subsequent to issuance of the PPA letter.

The environmental review may be done in conjunction with the required approvals listed below, but must be completed before any project approval may be granted. Note that until an entitlement application is submitted to the Current Planning Division, only the proposed Project Description will be reviewed by the assigned Environmental Coordinator. EEAs are available in the Planning Department lobby at 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, at the Planning Information Center at 1660 Mission Street, and online at www.sfplanning.org under the “Publications” tab. See “Environmental Applications” on page 2 of the current Fee Schedule for a calculation of environmental application fees.3

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 proposed project includes alteration or demolition of a building that is a contributor to the Western SoMa Light Industrial and Residential 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 which was not completed as part of the previous survey. The HRE scope will also require an analysis of the proposed project’s effect on the District. 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 before commencing work. 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.** Western SoMa PEIR Mitigation Measure M-CP-4a: Project-Specific Preliminary Archeological Assessment of the Western SoMa PEIR applies to projects involving any soil-disturbing activities to a depth of five feet or greater below ground surface within the Plan area for which no archeological assessment report has been prepared. The proposed project implementation would entail soil-disturbing activities to a depth of approximately 22.5 feet below grade. Therefore, PEIR Mitigation Measure M-CP-4a would apply. Projects to which this mitigation measure applies are subject to Preliminary Archeology Review (PAR) or a Preliminary Archeological Sensitivity Study (PASS) by the San Francisco Planning Department archeologist. Based on the PAR or PASS, the Environmental Review Officer (ERO) shall determine if an Archeological Research Design Treatment Plan (ARDTP) shall be required to more definitively identify the potential for California Register-eligible archeological resources to be present within the project site and determine the appropriate action necessary to reduce the potential effect of the project site on archeological resources to a less-than-significant level.

If required, the ARDTP shall be prepared by a qualified archeological consultant selected from a list of three archeological consultants from the Planning Department’s archeological resources consultant pool provided by the Planning Department during the environmental review. The Planning Department Archeologist will be informed by the geotechnical study of the project site’s subsurface geological conditions.

In addition, Western SoMa PEIR Mitigation Measure M-CP-4b: Procedures for Accidental Discovery of Archeological Resources would apply to the proposed project. This measure is intended to avoid any potential adverse effect on accidentally discovered buried or submerged historical resources as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5(a)(c). This mitigation measure requires the project sponsor to distribute the San Francisco Planning Department archeological resource “ALERT” sheet to on-site construction workers, suspend any project-related soil-disturbing activities when an archeological resource is encountered, and notify the ERO of an archeological resource encountered during soils-disturbing activities.

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 require additional transportation analysis to determine whether the project may result in a significant impact. Therefore, the Planning Department requires that a consultant listed in the Planning Department’s Transportation Consultant Pool prepare a *Transportation Impact Study*. You are required to pay additional fees for the study; please contact Virnaliza Byrd at (415) 575-9025 to arrange payment. Once you pay the fees, please contact Manoj Madhavan at (415) 575-9095 or manoj.madhavan@sfgov.org so that he can provide you with a list of three consultants from the pre-qualified Transportation Consultant Pool. Upon selection of a transportation consultant, the Department will assign a transportation planner who will direct the scope of the consultant-prepared study.

Additionally, the proposed project is located in a high injury corridor as mapped by Vision Zero. Planning staff have reviewed the proposed site plans and offer the following recommendations, some of which address the safety of persons walking and bicycling to and from the project site and vicinity:

- The project would require review by the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Authority and California Department of Transportation;
- Please review the Planning Department’s Street Design Advisory Team comments;
- Consider reducing off-street parking given the project site is in a transit rich area; and
- Please provide truck turning templates for the proposed loading (i.e., clarify design vehicles).

*Transportation Demand Management Program*

On April 28, 2016, the Planning Commission adopted a resolution to initiate Planning Code amendments that would require development projects to comply with a proposed Travel Demand Management (TDM) Program. The intent of the proposed TDM Program is to reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and to make it easier for people to get around by sustainable travel modes such as transit, walking, and biking.

Under the proposed TDM Program, land uses are grouped into four categories, A through D. For each land use category that is subject to the TDM Program, the City would set a target based on the number of accessory vehicle parking spaces that the project intends to provide for that land use category. To meet each target, the project sponsor must select TDM measures—each worth a specified number of points—from a menu of options. In general, if a project sponsor proposes more parking, the target for that land use category—and thus, the number of TDM measures that the sponsor must implement to meet it—would increase. Some of the TDM measures included in the menu are already required by the Planning Code. Points earned from implementing these measures would be applied

---


towards achieving a project’s target(s). Project sponsors would be required to implement and maintain TDM measures for the life of the project.

The proposed project includes 381 dwelling units, and thus would be subject to the proposed TDM Program. Based on the proposed 200 parking spaces associated with the residential use on the project site, the project would be required to meet or exceed a target of 31 points for land use category C.

The Planning Code would currently require the project, as described in the PPA, to provide the following TDM measures:

- Bicycle Parking (Planning Code Section 155.2; TDM Menu ACTIVE-2 – option a)
- Transportation demand management programs (Planning Code Section 163; TDM Menu INFO-3)
- Car Share Parking Spaces (Planning Code Section 166; TDM Menu CSHARE-1 – option a)
- Parking unbundling (Planning Code Section 167; TDM Menu PKG-1)

The project may be required to select and incorporate additional TDM measures to meet the target listed above. A full list of the TDM measures included in the menu of options is available on this website: [http://sf-planning.org/shift-encourage-sustainable-travel](http://sf-planning.org/shift-encourage-sustainable-travel). When an environmental planner is assigned, he or she will provide additional guidance regarding the proposed TDM Program and next steps.

5. **Noise.** Western SoMa PEIR Mitigation Measure M-NO-2a: General Construction Noise Control Measures would apply to the proposed project. Western SoMa Mitigation Measure M-NO-2a requires that development projects in the Plan area undertake noise attenuation measures to ensure that project noise from construction activity is minimized to the maximum extent feasible. Construction noise would be also 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.

Western SoMa PEIR Mitigation Measure M-NO-2b: Noise Control Measures During Pile Driving addresses requirements related to the use of pile-driving. This mitigation measure requires that contractors use pile driving equipment with state-of-the-art noise shielding and muffling devices. To reduce noise and vibration impacts, sonic or vibratory sheetpile drivers, rather than impact drivers, shall be used wherever sheetpiles are needed. Project sponsors shall also require that contractors schedule pile-driving activity for times of the day that would minimize disturbance to neighbors. Should the proposed project require pile driving, Mitigation Measure M-NO-2b would apply to the project.

6. **Air Quality.** The proposed project, with 345,000 square feet of residential space, 381 residential units, and 3,000 square feet of retail space, would be below the Bay Area Air Quality Management District’s
(BAAQMD) operational screening levels for criteria air pollutants. However, the residential portion of the proposed project would exceed the BAAQMD’s construction screening levels, and the proposed 59,000 cubic yards of excavation would result in extensive material transport. Therefore, an analysis of the project’s criteria air pollutant emissions may be required. Please provide detailed information related to construction equipment, phasing and duration of each phase, and the volume as part of the EEA. Western SoMa PEIR Mitigation Measure M-AQ-6: Construction Emissions Minimization Plan for Criteria Air Pollutants, which requires equipment exhaust minimization measures during construction, may also apply to the proposed project.

In addition, project-related demolition, excavation, grading, and other construction activities may cause wind-blown dust that could contribute particulate matter into the local atmosphere. To reduce construction dust impacts, the proposed project will be required to adhere to the dust control requirements set forth in the Construction Dust Ordinance contained in San Francisco Health Code Article 22B and San Francisco Building Code Section 106.A.3.2.6. The proposed project is also required to prepare a Construction Dust Control Plan for review and approval by the San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH).

The project site is located within an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone, as mapped and defined by Health Code Article 38. The Air Pollutant Exposure Zone identifies areas with poor air quality based on modeling of air pollution, exposures, and health vulnerability from mobile, stationary, and area source emissions within San Francisco. The proposed project includes new sensitive land uses (i.e., residential dwelling units), which are subject to enhanced ventilation measures pursuant to Health Code Article 38. The project sponsor will be required to submit an Article 38 application to DPH prior to the issuance of any environmental determination. Please provide a copy of the initial application with the EEA. Equipment exhaust measures during construction, such as those listed in Western SoMa PEIR Mitigation Measure M-AQ-7: Construction Emissions Minimization Plan for Health Risks and Hazards may apply to the proposed project.

If the project would generate 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 and additional measures will likely be required to reduce stationary source emissions. Based on the information in the PPA application, the proposed project would not likely require a backup diesel generator due to the proposed height, but this will be confirmed at the time of the EEA submittal.

Western SoMa PEIR Mitigation Measure M-AQ-2: Transportation Demand Management Strategies for Future Development Projects requires that projects which would generate more than 3,500 daily vehicle trips to develop and implement Transportation Demand Management (TDM) plan. As the proposed project would not generate daily vehicle trips in excess of 3,500, Mitigation Measure M-AQ-2 would not apply to the proposed project.

---

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

8. **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 could cast shadows on Bessie Carmichael School, which is under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Unified School District. However, the proposed project would not likely shade the school’s outdoor play areas. The project sponsor shall consult with the Environmental Planning coordinator regarding whether a shadow study would be required.

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

10. **Hazardous Materials.** The proposed project would result in ground disturbance greater than 50 cubic yards and is located in the area commonly known as the “Maher Area.” Therefore, the project is subject to Article 22A of the Health Code, also known as the Maher Ordinance. The Maher Ordinance, which is administered and overseen by the Department of Public Health (DPH), requires the project sponsor to retain the services of a qualified professional to prepare a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) that meets the requirements of Health Code Section 22.A.6. The Phase I ESA would determine the potential for site contamination and level of exposure risk associated with the project. Based on that information, soil and/or groundwater sampling and

---


analysis, as well as remediation of any site contamination, may be required. These steps are required to be completed prior to the issuance of any building permit.

DPH requires that projects subject to the Maher Ordinance complete a Maher Application, available at: http://www.sfdph.org/dph/EH/HazWaste/hazWasteSiteMitigation.asp. Fees for DPH review and oversight of projects subject to the ordinance would apply. Please refer to DPH’s fee schedule, available at: http://www.sfdph.org/dph/EH/FEES.asp#haz. Please provide a copy of the submitted Maher Application and Phase I ESA with the EEA.

Given that the existing building on the project site was constructed prior to 1980, Western SoMa PEIR Mitigation Measure HZ-2: Hazardous Building Materials Abatement would be applicable to the proposed project. The mitigation measure requires that the project sponsor ensure that any equipment containing polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) or di(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate (DEPH), such as fluorescent light ballasts, and any fluorescent light tubes containing mercury be removed and properly disposed of in accordance with applicable federal, state, and local laws. In addition, any other hazardous materials identified, either before or during work, must be abated according to applicable federal, state, and local laws.

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

11. **Disclosure Report for Developers of Major City Projects.** The San Francisco Ethics Commission S.F. Camp. & Govt. Conduct Code § 3.520 et seq. requires developers to provide the public with information about donations that developers make to nonprofit organizations that may communicate with the City and County regarding major development projects. This report must be completed and filed by the developer of any “major project.” A major project is a real estate development project located in the City and County of San Francisco with estimated construction costs exceeding $1,000,000 where either: (1) The Planning Commission or any other local lead agency certifies an EIR for the project; or (2) The project relies on a program EIR and the Planning Department, Planning Commission, or any other local lead agency adopts any final environmental determination under CEQA. A final environmental determination includes: the issuance of a Community Plan Exemption (CPE); certification of a CPE/EIR; adoption of a CPE/Final Mitigated Negative Declaration; or a project approval by the Planning Commission that adopts CEQA Findings. (In instances where more than one of the preceding determinations occurs, 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
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** from the Planning Commission is required pursuant to Planning Code Section 151.1 for parking in excess of that principally permitted and Sections 263.29, 303 and 823(c)(11) for a major development in the Western SoMA Special Use District requesting a height exception above the base limit of 55-X to the maximum limit of 65-X.

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

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

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

NEIGHBORHOOD NOTIFICATIONS AND PUBLIC OUTREACH:

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

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

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

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

1. **Western SoMa Area Plan.** The subject property falls within the area covered by the Western SoMa Area Plan in the General Plan. As proposed, the project is generally consistent with the overarching objectives of the Plan, though the project and design comments below discuss any items where more information is needed to assess conformity with either specific policies or Code standards or where the project requires minor modification to achieve consistency. The Plan is intended to promote neighborhood qualities and scale that maintain and enhance, rather than destroy, today’s living, historic and sustainable neighborhood character of social, cultural and economic diversity, while integrating appropriate land use, transportation and design opportunities into equitable, evolving and complete neighborhoods. In the Plan, Harrison Street is designated as a Regional Street and Truck Route. As a site of nearly 1.75 acres, the proposed project is subject to the Design Standards for Large Site Development in the Western SoMa Area Plan, which applies to projects over ½ acre. The project sponsor is encouraged to read the full plan, which can be viewed at http://generalplan.sfplanning.org/Western_SoMa_Area_Plan.pdf.

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

3. **Rear Yard.** Section 134 requires the project to provide a rear yard of at least 25 percent of the lot depth (of 68’-9”) or area at the ground level for any building that contains a dwelling unit, and at each succeeding level of the building. The proposed project does not provide the standard 25 percent yard at the rear of the lot, but instead supplements the nonconforming 25’-9” depth with an interior courtyard. This requirement may be modified or waived by the Planning Commission under the Conditional Use Authorization pursuant to Section 329(f) provided that the criteria therein are met.

4. **Open Space – Residential.** Section 135 requires 80 sq. ft. of private or common open space for each dwelling unit. Please submit scaled plans with your entitlement application for verification of the minimum required 30,480 sq. ft. of open space. Pursuant to Section 823, roof decks cannot qualify as required private or common usable open space in the Western SoMa SUD.

5. **Open Space – Non-Residential.** Section 135.3 requires this project to provide one foot of open space for every 250 square feet of retail (and similar) uses. Please identify the location of the minimum 12 sq. ft. of publicly accessible open space for the 3,000 sq. ft. of proposed commercial uses. Alternatively, this open space requirement may be satisfied through payment of a fee for each square foot of usable open space not provided pursuant to Section 427. This fee shall be adjusted in accordance with Section 4423.3, and shall be paid into the Eastern Neighborhoods Public Benefits Fund.

6. **Streetscape Plan.** The project is on a lot that is greater than one-half acre in total area, contains 250 feet of total lot frontage and includes new construction, and as such, requires the submittal of a Streetscape Plan to the Planning Department to ensure that the new streetscape and pedestrian elements are in conformance with the Department’s Better Street Plan. This Streetscape Plan shall be
submitted to the Planning Department no later than 60 days prior to any Planning Commission action, and shall be considered for approval at the time of other project approval actions. The streetscape plan should show the location, design, and dimensions of all existing and proposed streetscape elements in the public right-of-way directly adjacent to the fronting property, including street trees, sidewalk landscaping, street lighting, site furnishings, utilities, driveways, and curb lines, and the relation of such elements to proposed new construction and site work on the property. Please see the Department’s Better Streets Plan and Section 138.1(c)(2)(ii) for the additional elements that may be required as part of the project’s streetscape plan.

- Under the BSP, Harrison Street is classified as a Mixed-Use Street, with a recommended sidewalk width of 15’, and a minimum sidewalk width of 12’. Harrison Street’s sidewalk fronting the proposed project is 8’, under the minimum required sidewalk for this street type.

- Under the BSP Heron Street and Berwick Place are classified as Alleys, with a recommended sidewalk width of 6’-9’ (or the maximum dimension feasible given available ROW width). The BSP also recommends alleys be converted to Shared Public Ways. Heron Street has sidewalks of 9-10’, which meet the minimum guidelines, and has a wider right-of-way (ROW) of 46’. Berwick Place has sidewalks of just 4’, under the minimum of 6’, and has a ROW of just 20’. Both the sidewalks and the existing 12’ travel lane are too narrow for minimum standards, and widening the minimum allowed sidewalks of 6’ would leave just 8’ for a travel lane. Berwick Place therefore is an ideal candidate for conversion to a shared public way, as any other configuration does not meet minimum standards.

7. **Vision Zero.** The project is located on a “high-injury corridor”, identified through the City’s [Vision Zero Program](#). The Sponsor is encouraged to incorporate pedestrian safety streetscape measures into the project, and the Department’s Streetscape Design Advisory Team may require additional pedestrian safety streetscape measures as part of the Streetscape Plan review.

8. **Dwelling Unit Exposure.** Section 140 requires that each dwelling unit have at least one room that meets the 120-square-foot minimum superficial floor area requirement of Section 503 of the Housing Code face directly on a street right-of-way, code-complying rear yard, or an appropriately sized courtyard. The proposed rear yard is not code-complying and the units facing this rear yard does not meet the exposure requirement. You may request and justify an exposure exception through the Section 263.29 Conditional Use Authorization process, but the Department generally encourages projects to minimize the number of units needing an exposure exception.

9. **Street Frontages.** To preserve, enhance and promote attractive, clearly defined street frontages that are pedestrian-oriented, fine-grained, and which are appropriate and compatible with the buildings and uses in Western SoMa Mixed Use General (WMUG) District, please submit sufficiently detailed plans with your entitlement application that demonstrate the controls under Section 145.1 including, but not limited to, active uses, parking and loading entrances, transparency and fenestration, street-facing ground level spaces with a minimum depth of 25’ and a floor-to-floor height of 14’ are met.

10. **Off-Street Parking.** Pursuant to Section 151.1, the principally permitted amount of parking for the proposed 381 dwelling units and 3,000 sq. ft. of commercial uses project is 95 spaces. The project
proposes 200 spaces and would require a Conditional Use Authorization if the affirmative findings under Section 151.1(g) can be made. However, the Department generally encourages projects to minimize the number of accessory parking spaces.

11. **Parking and Curb Cuts.** Please submit detailed plans with your entitlement application to confirm the proposed parking, loading and curb cut dimensions comply with Sections 154 and 155, respectively.

12. **Bicycle Parking.** Section 155.1(b) requires Class 1 spaces to be located for direct access without requiring the use of stairs. The location of such spaces shall allow bicycle users to ride to the entrance of the space or the entrance of the lobby leading to the space. The design shall provide safe and convenient access to and from bicycle parking facilities. Safe and convenient means include, but are not limited to, ramps and wide hallways. Escalators and stairs are not considered safe and convenient means of ingress and egress and shall not be used. Use of elevators to access bicycle parking spaces shall be minimized for all uses and if necessary shall follow specific requirements. Please revise the project’s design to provide better access to the bicycle parking.

13. **Special Height Exemptions.** Pursuant to Section 263.29, height exceptions above the base height limit (55-feet) to the maximum height limit (65-feet) may be approved for a project in accordance with the procedures and criteria required for a Conditional Use Authorization as set forth in Sections 303 and 823(c)(12) of this Code.

14. **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

15. **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 33% affordable housing fee, 25% on-site, or 33% off-site. Therefore, as proposed, the project would have a minimum requirement of 95 units if provided on-site, and 126 units if provided on-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.

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

17. **Stormwater.** If the project results in a ground surface disturbance of 5,000 sf or greater, it is subject to San Francisco’s stormwater management requirements as outlined in the Stormwater Management Ordinance and the corresponding SFPUC Stormwater Design Guidelines (Guidelines). Projects that trigger the stormwater management requirements must prepare a Stormwater Control Plan demonstrating project adherence to the performance measures outlined in the Guidelines including:

(a) reduction in total volume and peak flow rate of stormwater for areas in combined sewer systems OR
(b) stormwater treatment for areas in separate sewer systems. The SFPUC Wastewater Enterprise, Urban Watershed Management Program is responsible for review and approval of the Stormwater Control Plan. Without SFPUC approval of a Stormwater Control Plan, no site or building permits can be issued. The Guidelines also require a signed maintenance agreement to ensure proper care of the necessary stormwater controls. To view the Stormwater Management Ordinance, the Stormwater Design Guidelines, or download instructions for the Stormwater Control Plan, go to [http://sfwater.org/sdg](http://sfwater.org/sdg). Applicants may contact stormwaterreview@sfwater.org for assistance.

18. **Recycled Water.** Projects located in San Francisco’s designated recycled water use areas are required to install recycled water systems for irrigation, cooling, and/or toilet and urinal flushing in accordance with the Recycled (or Reclaimed) Water Use Ordinance, adopted as Article 22 of the San Francisco Public Works Code. New construction or major alterations with a total cumulative area of 40,000 square feet or more; any new, modified, or existing irrigated areas of 10,000 square feet or more; and all subdivisions are required to comply. To determine if the proposed project is in a
designated recycled water use area, and for more information about the recycled water requirements, please visit sfwater.org/index.aspx?page=687.

19. **Non-Potable Water Reuse.** Beginning November 1, 2015, all new buildings of 250,000 square feet or more of gross floor area, located within the boundaries of San Francisco's designated recycled water use area, must install non-potable water reuse systems to treat and reuse available alternate water sources for toilet and urinal flushing and irrigation. This requirement expands to the entire city the following year, on November 1, 2016. Your project will need approvals from the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission and permits from both the Department of Public Health and DBI to verify compliance with the requirements and local health and safety codes. To view more information about the requirements, please visit http://www.sfwater.org/np. Project teams may contact nonpotable@sfwater.org for assistance.

20. **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.

21. **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 – Residential (414A)
   c. Eastern Neighborhoods Impact Fees (423)
   d. UMU Affordable Housing Fee (419.3)
22. **Option for In-Kind Provision of Community Improvements and Fee Credits.** Project sponsors may propose to directly provide community improvements to the City. In such a case, the City may enter into an In-Kind Improvements Agreement with the sponsor and issue a fee waiver for the Eastern Neighborhoods Tier 2 Impact Fee from the Planning Commission, for an equivalent amount to the value of the improvements. This process is further explained in Section 423.3(d) of the Planning Code.

More information on in-kind agreements can be found in the Application Packet for In-Kind Agreement on the Planning Department website.

**PRELIMINARY DESIGN COMMENTS:**

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

The project is located in the WMUG (WSoMa Mixed Use-General) District, the Western SoMa SUD (Special Use District), and the Western SoMa (EN) and South of Market planning areas. As a site occupying nearly 1.75 acres, this development has several opportunities and obligations to fit within its context. This block, like many SoMa blocks, is bounded by large streets and laced with an internal network of small alleys where the buildings are generally, but not always, smaller in scale than the scale of industrial buildings fronting main streets. The Western SoMa Plan outlines several land use policies which encourage a mix of uses, location and scale of buildings. In addition, the plan highlights the importance of alleys (policies 4.1-4.2) that enhance the pedestrian and bicyclist experience, with both qualitative improvements to existing alleys and by establishing new connections where possible. This intention is reiterated in Code Section 270.2. Furthermore a principal central to the Western SoMa Plan is for rear yard open space to be at grade to allow the provision of in-ground planted landscape.

1. **Site Design, Open Space, and Massing.** A central goal for large sites such as this is to connect them with the existing the neighborhood and street grid when the opportunity exists. In order to moderate the scale and massing of development to be more compatible with that of the inner block, and to create better connections to the street network, the Department recommends the project provide two 30-feet wide mid-block alleys; one aligned with and connected to Heron Street and another that extends Hallam to Harrison Streets. The latter alley would also function as a massing break to moderate the building’s scale. These mid-block alleys should be bounded by active building frontages on both sides and be at-grade in order to be accessible to the public and also provide adequate soil depth for trees and other in-ground landscaping. Although the rear yard open space may be distributed in an alternate manner than that prescribed by Code, it should be a minimum of 25% of the total lot area at-grade. The Department supports the retention of the existing brick building façades on Berwick Place and Hallam Street and recommends re-introducing the openings...
to create portals into the mid-block alleys or other open spaces. The Project should also consider locating a small ground floor commercial space fronting the mid-block alleys.

The Project’s loading spaces should be consolidated with the accessory parking, accessed from Harrison Street and include exploring curb-side loading for large move-in vehicles along Harrison Street. Please consider alternate locations for trash pick-up; either from Harrison Street or at the north end of Berwick Place and away from the visual terminus of Heron Street.

The Department typically does not support setbacks greater than 8- to 10-feet from a street as it weakens the relation to the street wall, and the proposed 15-feet setback along Berwick Place warrants further examination. The Department does not support the large inflection of the Harrison Street façade as it distinguishes this building above its significance, while diminishing the existing street wall. The Department recommends the building respect the street wall in a manner of its neighboring buildings. However, small recesses for specific functions may be encouraged, assuming they also help modulate the building.

The proposed lobby, lounge area and leasing office occupy approximately 50% of the Harrison frontage. The Department recommends replacing some of the lobby area with commercial space(s). If a sculptural affect is desired, it may be accomplished if a significant portion of the façade holds the street wall, while allowing minor portions of the façade to inflect.

2. **Parking.** The quantity of proposed parking will trigger several measures to offset automobile usage through the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program, which is designed to incentivize transit and active transportation modes like walking and biking and reduce demand for single occupancy vehicle use by residents and visitors to and from the site. Since the Project site is located within one-half mile (10 minute walk) of numerous transit lines, several of which fall on the Muni Rapid network, the Planning Department strongly encourages the Project Sponsor to reduce the off-street parking ratio for the Project.

The Planning Department recommends minimizing the parking footprint to accommodate the in-ground planting of trees and other plants at the mid-block alleys and rear yard open spaces. Providing a significant portion of the site on ground will also help meet storm water requirements. The Department also recommends reducing the parking entrance to a maximum of 20’ wide. Bicycle parking should be conveniently accessible to the building entrances without the use of stairs or elevators, and the Department encourages that the Project include access points for bicycle parking from the alleys.

3. **Architecture.** All frontages are required to be active uses, and in order to make that finding, residential uses need to conform to the Ground Floor Residential Design Guidelines. The intent of the 55/65-feet height limit is to achieve a high ground floor that is suitable for commercial uses or enables
compliance with raised ground floor stoop entries for residential uses. The Department also discourages below-grade dwelling units.

At this stage the architecture is assumed to be preliminary and staff will provide further detailed design review after the subsequent submission with the entitlement application. The Planning Department encourages the use of high quality and compatible windows and exterior materials, and also requests that the Project retains the existing façade along Berwick Place and incorporate the existing archways along the façade.

4. Streetscape and Public Realm. The Street Design Advisory Team (SDAT) provides design review and guidance to private developments working within the City’s public right-of-way. SDAT is composed of representatives from the San Francisco Planning Department (SF Planning), Department of Public Works (SF Public Works), the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), and the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC).

The proposed 1140-1150 Harrison Street project was reviewed by SDAT on July 11, 2016, and below are their comments from that meeting.

Off-street Parking Garage Access and Heron Street Loading Bay. The project sponsor must reduce the curb cut on Harrison Street to 20-feet.

SDAT is concerned with the viability of the proposed loading configuration off of Heron Street. The loading bay at Heron and Berwick Street should be removed and all loading shall be internalized within the project’s garage.

Shared Street on Berwick Place. SDAT supports building a shared street on Berwick Place that will significantly improve the public realm along the project’s west façade, provide a high-quality pedestrian experience that is sorely lacking elsewhere in SoMa and provide a safe and pleasant pedestrian alternative to the wide, pedestrian-unfriendly major streets such as Harrison Street. The Project should explicitly connect Harrison to Heron Street and the new mid-block pedestrian connection along the project’s north’s façade. As noted above, Berwick Place is an ideal candidate for a shared street given its narrow ROW and which does not allow for sidewalks or travel lanes of minimum standards.

SDAT recommends that the Berwick shared street share a similar design palette and language as the new mid-block connection along the Project’s north façade.

Please note, this will require the Project Sponsor to undertake a major encroachment permit from the Department of Public Works.

Mid-Block Connections. SDAT applauds the Sponsor’s inclusion of a fully publicly-accessible mid-block pedestrian alley connecting Hallam Street to Heron Street and Berwick Place. However, the design should be modified to better integrate with the existing mid-block street pattern. SDAT recommends the following modifications to the proposed design:
• Provide a more direct mid-block alley connection between Heron Street and Hallam Street.
• Add an additional, direct mid-block connection to Harrison Street through the project site.
• Please refer to the Planning Department’s design comments on this issue.

Harrison Street Sidewalk. The Project Sponsor should widen the sidewalk along Harrison Street to 15-feet to bring it in compliance with the Better Streets Plan. This will entail constructing a 7-feet curb extension along the Project’s Harrison Street frontage.

The simplest way to achieve this is to extend the sidewalk by 7 feet into the parking lane, thus removing all on-street parking from the Harrison Street frontage. This design may be adapted to allow for an 8-foot deep bulb-in allowing for a short-term loading (white) zone. This design is less desirable because the existing on-street parking acts as a buffer for pedestrians on this block of Harrison Street. Also, should the City, at a later date widen the adjacent blocks of Harrison, it would need to remove the cut-in for a loading bay.

SDAT’s preferred design would be to push the existing sidewalk and the existing parking lane 7-feet past the existing curb line. This would necessitate restriping the block of Harrison Street between 7th and 8th Streets. While this will require further study, there appears to be excess vehicle capacity on this block because one of the upstream vehicle lanes approaching the 7th Street onramp directs traffic onto the freeway.

To achieve this alternative, SDAT recommends the Sponsor work with the SFMTA and Planning to study restriping this block of Harrison Street.

Regardless of which design is chosen, the Harrison Street curb extension shall be designed to meet Better Streets Standards and should include special paving in the furnishing zone, understory plantings, street trees, etc.

Berwick Place Raised Crosswalk. SDAT recommends a raised crosswalk at Berwick Place and Harrison Streets.

To achieve this, SDAT recommends the 7-foot sidewalk widening be extended westward past the Project’s frontage on the far side of the Berwick Place and Harrison Street intersection. This will offer additional pedestrian space here and provide a strong gateway to the new shared street on Berwick Place. Per Better Streets Plan Standards, the bulbout shall extend a minimum of 5 feet beyond the property line along Harrison before the curb return begins.

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 February 26, 2018. 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: Preliminary Shadow Fan
Neighborhood Group Mailing List
Interdepartmental Project Review Application
Flood Notification: Planning Bulletin
SFPUC Recycled Water Information Sheet
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<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-722-0617</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jhenders@sbcglobal.net">jhenders@sbcglobal.net</a></td>
<td>Potrero Hill, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaime</td>
<td>Whitaker</td>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>SOMA Leadership Council</td>
<td>201 Harrison Street Apt. 229</td>
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<td>800 Kansas Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94107</td>
<td>0</td>
<td><a href="mailto:keith@everestsf.com">keith@everestsf.com</a></td>
<td>Mission, Potrero Hill, South of Market</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>Magnani</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>American Friends Service Committee</td>
<td>65 Ninth Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>415-565-0201</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sfoffice@afs.org">sfoffice@afs.org</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marvin</td>
<td>Phillips</td>
<td>Land Use Chair</td>
<td>Alliance for a Better District 6</td>
<td>230 Eddy Street #1206</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-674-1935</td>
<td><a href="mailto:marvisphillips@gmail.com">marvisphillips@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Downtown/Civic Center, Mission, South of Market, Western Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patsy</td>
<td>Tito</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Sanoan Development Centre</td>
<td>2055 Sunnynade Avenue #100</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94134</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 Bayview, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed</td>
<td>Bement</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Rincon Hill Residents Association</td>
<td>75 Folsom Street #1800</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94105</td>
<td>415-882-7871</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rbement@sbcglobal.net">rbement@sbcglobal.net</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodney</td>
<td>Minott</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Potrero Hill Neighbors/Save the Hill</td>
<td>1206 Mariposa Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94107</td>
<td>415-553-5969</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rodminott@hotmail.com">rodminott@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>Potrero Hill, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonja</td>
<td>Kos</td>
<td>Community Advocate</td>
<td>TODCO Impact Group</td>
<td>230 Fourth Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>415-426-6819</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sonja@todco.org">sonja@todco.org</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>Olsson</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>TJPA/CAC</td>
<td>30 Sharon Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94114</td>
<td>415-407-0994</td>
<td><a href="mailto:olsonted@yahoo.com">olsonted@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>Financial District, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiffany</td>
<td>Bohee</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>94103</td>
<td>0</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tiffany.bohee@sfgov.org">tiffany.bohee@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:mike.grisso@sfgov.org">mike.grisso@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:courtney.pash@sfgov.org">courtney.pash@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:president@pomrenoosters.org">president@pomrenoosters.org</a></td>
<td>Mission, Potrero Hill, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.R.</td>
<td>Eppler</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Potrero Boosters Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>4549 - 18th Street, Suite 133</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94107</td>
<td>650-704-7777</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vistalion Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>Loo</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>York Realty</td>
<td>243A Shipley Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94107</td>
<td>415-751-8602</td>
<td><a href="mailto:yorkloo@gmail.com">yorkloo@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyan</td>
<td>Ruiz</td>
<td>Co-Founder</td>
<td>People Power Media</td>
<td>366 10th Ave</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94118</td>
<td>415-657-6010</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dyan.ruiz@hotmail.com">dyan.ruiz@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>Inner Richmond, Mission, Outer Richmond, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>De Guzman</td>
<td>Development Specialist - Mission Bay</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>94103</td>
<td>0</td>
<td><a href="mailto:michelle.deguzman@sfgov.org">michelle.deguzman@sfgov.org</a></td>
<td>South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gail</td>
<td>Baugh</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Hayes Valley Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>700 Hayes Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-265-0546</td>
<td><a href="mailto:president@hayesvalleysf.org">president@hayesvalleysf.org</a></td>
<td>Castro/Upper Market, Downtown/Civic Center, Mission, South of Market, Western Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>Basinger</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Q Foundation - AIDS Housing Alliance/SF</td>
<td>350 Golden Gate Ave, Suite A</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-552-3242</td>
<td><a href="mailto:info@ahaf.org">info@ahaf.org</a></td>
<td>Castro/Upper Market, Downtown/Civic Center, Financial District, Haight Ashbury, Mission, Nob Hill, South of Market, Western Addition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interdepartmental Project Reviews are mandatory for new construction projects that propose buildings eight stories or more and new construction on parcels identified by the State of California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology as Seismic Hazard Zones in the City and County of San Francisco. Projects identified as such, must request and participate in an interdepartmental project review prior to any application that requires a public hearing before the Planning Commission or new construction building permit.

Project Sponsors may elect to request an interdepartmental review for any project at any time, however, it is strongly recommended that the request is made prior to the submittal of the abovementioned applications.

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

**Interdepartmental Project Review fees:**

1. $1,164 for five or fewer residential units and all affordable housing projects.
2. $1,702 for all other projects.

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

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

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

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

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

All projects subject to the mandatory Interdepartmental Project Review shall be required to submit the following minimum information in addition to their request form:

1. Site Survey with topography lines;
2. Floor Plans with occupancy and/or use labeled of existing and proposed;
3. Existing and proposed elevations;
4. Roof Plan; and
5. Pictures of the subject property and street frontages.

Planned unit developments or projects with an acre or more of land area shall be required to submit the following additional information:

1. Existing and proposed street names and widths;
2. Location of any existing train tracks; and
3. Location of any existing and proposed easements.

In order for the Interdepartmental Project Review to be most effective and beneficial to you, it is strongly recommended that any issues, concerns and/or specific questions are submitted with this request directed to each discipline.
INTERDEPARTMENTAL PROJECT REVIEW APPLICATION FORM

APPLICATION DATE: ____________________________________________________________

PROJECT CONTACT:
Name ____________________________________________ Phone No. ( _) ______________________
Address ____________________________________________ FAX No. ( _) ______________________
Owner ______________________________________________________________________________

PROJECT INFORMATION:
Address _____________________________________________________________________________
How many units does the subject property have? ________________________________
Assessor's Block/Lot(s) __________________________ Zoning District __________________
Height and Bulk Districts ______________________ Located within Geologic Hazard Zone? Y☐ N☐

PROJECT DESCRIPTION / PURPOSE OF MEETING/SPECIFIC QUESTIONS:
(Use attachments if necessary)
_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________

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

Previously contacted staff __________________________________________________________
Will this project be publicly funded? (specify) ____________________________________________
(Please submit four (4) copies/sets of the Application Form, Floor Plans, Pictures, etc.)
PURPOSE:

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

BACKGROUND:

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

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

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

The City and County of San Francisco (CCSF) requires property owners to install dual-plumbing systems for recycled water use in accordance with Ordinances 390-91, 391-91, and 393-94, within the designated recycled water use areas under the following circumstances:

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

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

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

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

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

All backflow prevention assemblies must be approved by the SFPUC’s Water Quality Division.

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

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

### Pipe Type
- Transmission lines and mains – ductile iron
- Distribution and service lines – purple PVC or equivalent
- Irrigation lines – purple PVC or equivalent
- Dual-plumbing – described in the City and County of San Francisco Plumbing Codes

**SFPUC must sign off on pipe type prior to installation.** Contact the City Distribution Division at (415) 550-4952.

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

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

If you have questions, or would like additional information:

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

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

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

**New Service Line Permits**
San Francisco Public Utilities Commission  
Customer Services  
(415) 551-3000
NOTE:

1. ALL BACKFLOW PREVENTERS MUST APPROVED BY SFPUC WATER QUALITY BUREAU.

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

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

RESPONSIBILITY OF INSTALLATION OF

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

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

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION
SAN FRANCISCO WATER DEPARTMENT

INSTALLATION OF RECYCLED WATER SERVICE LINES
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