DATE: May 31, 2016
TO: Russ Naylor
FROM: Joy Navarrete, Planning Department
RE: PPA Case No. 2016-002728PPA for 2525 Van Ness Avenue

Please find the attached Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) for the address listed above. You may contact the staff contact, Kansai Uchida, at (415) 575-9048 or kansai.uchida@sfgov.org, to answer any questions you may have, or to schedule a follow-up meeting.

Joy Navarrete, Senior Planner
Preliminary Project Assessment

Date: May 31, 2016
Case No.: 2016-002728PPA
Project Address: 2525 Van Ness Avenue
Block/Lot: 0527/004
Zoning: RC-3 (Residential – Commercial, Medium Density) Use District

Area Plan: None
Project Sponsor: Russ Naylor
(415) 749-6500 x215
Staff Contact: Kansai Uchida – (415) 575-9048
kansai.uchida@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 February 29, 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 project site is located on the west side of Van Ness Avenue, on the block bounded by Filbert Street to the north, Van Ness Avenue to the east, Union Street to the south, and Franklin Street to the west. The site is currently occupied by a two-story, 9,980-square-foot (sf) commercial building built in 1942, and the subject lot area measures 11,025 sf. The proposal is to demolish the existing commercial building and construct a 7-story-over-basement, 65-foot-tall mixed use building. Stair penthouses, roof deck features,
and mechanical enclosures would extend approximately 10 feet above roof level, reaching a total height of approximately 75 feet. The proposed building would contain 27 dwelling units (4 one-bedroom units and 23 two-bedroom units) 1,484 sf of retail space at the ground floor, and 27 off-street parking spaces in a basement garage accessed from a curb cut along Van Ness Avenue. The basement level would reach approximately 14 feet below grade, and additional excavation for foundation work may be required.

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 have a significant impact that could be reduced to a less-than-significant level by mitigation measures agreed to by the project sponsor, then the Department would issue a preliminary mitigated negative declaration (PMND). The PMND would be circulated for public review, during which time concerned parties may comment on and/or appeal the determination. If no appeal is filed, the Planning Department would issue a final mitigated negative declaration (FMND). Additional information regarding the environmental review process can be found at: http://www.sf-planning.org/modules/showdocument.aspx?documentid=8631.

If the initial study indicates that the project would result in a significant impact that cannot be mitigated to below a significant level, an Environmental Impact Report (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 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 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. Project sponsors should not receive and/or review advance drafts of consultant reports per the Environmental Review Guidelines. Historic Preservation staff will not begin reviewing your project until a complete draft HRE is received.

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

3. **Tribal Cultural Resources.** Tribal cultural resources (TCRs) are a class of resource established under the 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 Technical Memorandum. You may be required to pay additional fees for the Memorandum; 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 memorandum.

Additionally, the proposed project is located on a high injury corridor as mapped by Vision Zero (Van Ness Avenue). 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:

- Coordination of the proposed project’s streetscape plan with the Van Ness Bus Rapid Transit project will be needed.
- Van Ness Avenue is a transit-preferential street, where new curb cuts are disallowed. Please show the dimensions of the existing and proposed curb cut and sidewalk on the plans.
- Reduction or elimination of off-street parking is recommended, since the project site is located along a near-future bus rapid transit line.
- Please show bicycle parking on the plans.

5. **Noise.** Construction noise is 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 construction, measures to reduce construction noise may be required as part of the proposed project. The EEA should provide a construction schedule and indicate whether pile driving or other particularly noisy construction methods are required.

6. **Air Quality.** The proposed project, at 27 residential units and 1,484 square feet of retail space, is below the Bay Area Air Quality Management District’s (BAAQMD) construction and operational screening levels for criteria air pollutants. Therefore, an analysis of the project’s criteria air pollutant emissions is not likely to be required.

---

Project-related demolition, excavation, grading, and other construction activities may cause wind-blown dust that could contribute particulate matter into the local atmosphere. To reduce construction dust impacts, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors approved the Construction Dust Control Ordinance (Ordinance 176-08, effective July 30, 2008). The intent of the Ordinance is to reduce the quantity of dust generated during site preparation, demolition, and construction work in order to protect the health of the general public and of on-site workers, minimize public nuisance complaints, and avoid orders to stop work by the Department of Building Inspection (DBI). Pursuant to the Construction Dust Ordinance, the proposed project would be required to comply with applicable dust control requirements outlined in the ordinance.

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

7. **Greenhouse Gases.** *The City and County of San Francisco’s Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions* presents a comprehensive assessment of policies, programs, and ordinances that represents San Francisco’s Qualified Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Reduction Strategy. Projects that are consistent with San Francisco’s Qualified GHG Reduction Strategy would result in less-than-significant impacts from GHG emissions. In order to facilitate a determination of compliance with San Francisco’s Qualified GHG Reduction Strategy, the Planning Department has prepared a Greenhouse Gas Analysis Compliance Checklist.4 The project sponsor may be required to submit the completed table regarding project compliance with the identified regulations and provide project-level details in the discussion column. 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 is unlikely to cast shadows on parks or public open spaces. Therefore, a shadow study is not likely to be required.

9. **Geology.** The project site is located near a Seismic Hazard Zone (Liquefaction Hazard Zone likely underlain by artificial fill). 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 require more than 50 cubic yards of excavation on a site with known prior commercial use (dry cleaning, laundry). Therefore, the project is subject to Article 22A of the Health Code, also known as the Maher Ordinance. The Maher Ordinance, which is administered and overseen by the Department of Public Health (DPH), requires the project sponsor to retain the services of a qualified professional to prepare a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) that meets the requirements of Health Code Section 22.A.6. The Phase I ESA would determine the potential for site contamination and level of exposure risk associated with the project. Based on that information, soil and/or groundwater sampling and analysis, as well as remediation of any site contamination, may be required. These steps are required to be completed prior to the issuance of any building permit.

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

Because the existing building was constructed prior to 1980, asbestos-containing materials, such as floor and wall coverings, may be found in the building. 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 DBI for requirements related to the demolition of buildings that may contain lead paint.

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

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 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 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 151.1(g) to provide off-street accessory residential parking at a ratio of up to 0.75 spaces for every dwelling unit; Section 209.3 to establish a retail use on the second story; and Section 253 to construct a building greater than 50 feet tall in an RC Zoning District.

2. **Variance.** As currently proposed, and as discussed under the ‘Preliminary Project Comments’ below, this project requires a Variance from the rear yard, exposure and bicycle parking requirements of Planning Code Sections 134, 140 and 155.1.

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

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

Variance and 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. Building Permit applications are available at the Department of Building Inspection at 1660 Mission Street.

NEIGHBORHOOD NOTIFICATIONS AND PUBLIC OUTREACH:

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

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

Notification of a Project Receiving Environmental Review. Notice may be required to be sent to occupants of the project site and properties adjacent to the project site, as well as to owners and, to the extent feasible, occupant 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. **Rear Yard.** Section 134 requires the project to provide a rear yard of at least 25 percent of the lot depth. The required rear yard varies between 31.25 and 32.29 feet as it is applied parallel to the rear property line which changes. At its deepest point, the project provides a rear yard of 25 feet. Therefore, the project requires a Variance from Planning Code Section 134. Further, per Planning Code Section 136(c)(26) parking below grade is only permitted as an obstruction in the required rear yard area if it is not within the last 15 feet of lot depth. The Department suggests eliminating the need for a Rear Yard Variance.

2. **Open Space – Residential.** Section 135 requires 60 square feet of open space per dwelling unit if private, or 80 square feet of open space per unit if common. Additionally, any such open spaces must meet the dimensional requirements of Subsections (f) and (g). The roof deck likely meets the requirement for common open space shared by 27 units; however, please confirm that only portions of the roof meeting the minimum 15 foot by 15 foot area requirements are included in the calculations provided. Also, please clarify whether or not the rear yard area is developed as any type of open space.

3. **Bay Windows.** The project renderings include options for various bay window treatments that are not otherwise shown on the floor plans. Please be advised that any bay windows projecting over the public right-of-way must comply with Planning Code Section 136(c)(2). Additionally, per the ‘Preliminary Design Comments’ below, bay windows projecting into the public right-of-way on Van Ness Avenue, must meet regulations put forward by Caltrans.

4. **Street Trees.** Planning Code Section 138.1 requires one street tree for every 20 feet of frontage for new construction. No street trees are shown on the plans.
5. **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.

6. **Exposure.** Planning Code Section 140 requires that each dwelling unit face directly onto a public right-of-way, code-complying rear yard, or an appropriately sized courtyard. The proposed rear yard requires a variance from Planning Code Section 134 and is not code-complying. Furthermore, the rear yard area does not provide a large enough courtyard to meet the exposure requirement for those units that only have windows fronting the rear yard. Therefore, the proposed project requires revisions to meet the minimum exposure requirement, or you may request and justify an Exposure Variance. The Department generally encourages projects to minimize the number of units needing an exposure exception.

7. **Parking and Curb Cuts.** Section 151.1 principally permits accessory parking for residential uses in RC-3 zoning districts at a ratio of up to one off-street parking space for every 2 dwelling units. Alternatively, projects may seek Conditional Use Authorization from the Planning Commission to provide off-street parking at a ratio of up to 0.75 off-street parking spaces for every one dwelling unit. More than 0.75 parking spaces per dwelling unit is not permitted. The project proposes a one to one ratio which is not permitted. The Department does not encourage off-street parking beyond what is principally permitted, especially when to do so would result in both Rear Yard and Exposure Variances. Additionally, please identify the location of both the existing and proposed curb cuts in future plans.

8. **Bicycle Parking.** Planning Code Section 155.5 requires this project to provide at least 27 Class 1 bicycle parking spaces and two Class 2 bicycle parking spaces. The proposed project contains no bicycle parking and therefore requires a variance.

9. **Unbundled Parking.** Planning Code Section 167 outlines a requirement for unbundled parking spaces for newly constructed residential buildings of ten dwelling units or more. All off-street parking spaces accessory to residential uses shall be leased or sold separately from the rental or purchase fees for dwelling units for the life of the dwelling units, such that potential renters or buyers have the option of renting or buying a residential unit at a price lower than would be the case if there were a single price for both the residential unit and the parking space. The Planning Commission may grant an exception from this requirement for projects which include financing for affordable housing that requires that costs for parking and housing be bundled together.

10. **Retail Uses.** Per Planning Code Section 209.3 retail uses are principally permitted on the ground floor and require Conditional Use Authorization if located on the second floor. The project proposes a ground floor commercial space with a mezzanine. However, because the mezzanine is not 50 percent open on the interior side of the room or story it considered a story per the definition of “story” in Planning Code Section 102. Therefore, the project requires Conditional Use Authorization to establish a retail use on the second story.

11. **Height.** Planning Code Section 253 requires Planning Commission review through Conditional Use Authorization for buildings exceeding a height of 50 feet when located in an RC District. The project
is within the RC-3 Zoning District and proposing a 65-foot tall building. Therefore the project requires Conditional Use Authorization by the Planning Commission.

12. **Height Exemptions.** As proposed, a portion of the enclosed building, at the front and rear of Level 7, extends beyond the height limit. Please note that this is not an exempted feature from the height limit per Planning Code Section 260(b) and because it is enclosed roof space dedicated to the level below. This feature must be removed or redesigned to comply with the height requirement.

13. **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. A shadow analysis, attached, indicated that no public space under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Parks Department will be shadowed by the proposal, as represented in the plan set submitted with the Preliminary Project Assessment.

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 20% affordable housing fee, 12% on-site, or 20% off-site. Therefore, as proposed, the project would have a minimum requirement of 3.24 units if provided on-site, and (5.4) units if provided off-site.

Pursuant to Planning Code Section 415.6, the Project is currently required to provide 12% of the proposed dwelling units as affordable to qualifying households, but is subject to change under a proposed Charter amendment and pending legislation if the voters approve the Charter Amendment at the June 7, 2016 election. The Project contains 27 units; therefore, 3.24 affordable units are currently required. The Project Sponsor will fulfill this requirement by providing the 3.24 affordable units on-site. If the Project is subject to a different requirement, if the Charter Amendment is approved and new legislative requirements take effect, the Project will comply with the applicable requirements at the time of compliance. If the number of market-rate units change, the number of required affordable units shall be modified accordingly with written approval from Planning Department staff in consultation with the Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development (“MOHCD”).
16. **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/sgd](http://sfwater.org/sgd). Applicants may contact stormwaterreview@sfwater.org for assistance.

17. **Impact Fees.** This project will be subject to various impact fees. Please refer to the Planning Director’s Bulletin No. 1 for an overview of Development Impact Fees, and to the Department of Building Inspection’s Development Impact Fee webpage for more information about current rates.

   Based on an initial review of the proposed project, the following impact fees, which are assessed by the Planning Department, will be required:
   
   a. Transportation Sustainability Fee (TSF)
   b. Child-Care (414A)

18. **Inclusionary Affordable Housing.** Inclusionary Affordable Housing is required for a project proposing ten or more dwelling units. The project proposes 27 dwelling units and is therefore non-exempt from the Inclusionary Affordable Housing program requirements.

19. **Density Maximization & Affordable Housing Provision.** The project proposes to add 56,219 square feet of residential resulting in 27 units, which triggers Section 415 of the Planning Code, which requires 12% of units be Below Market Rate (BMR) units. It is the Department’s priority to give precedence to the development of all new net housing, and to encourage the direct building of more affordable housing and the maximization of permitted density, while maintaining quality of life and adherence to Planning Code standards. The following General Plan Housing Element policies and objectives are applicable:

   a. POLICY 3.2.2 - Encourage in-fill housing production that continues the existing built housing qualities in terms of heights, prevailing density, yards and unit sizes.
   b. OBJECTIVE 3.3 – Ensure that a significant percentage of the new housing created is affordable to people with a wide range of incomes.
   c. POLICY 3.3.3 - Encourage a mix of affordability levels in new residential development.
   d. POLICY 3.5.2 - Prioritize the development of affordable family housing, both rental and ownership, particularly along transit corridors and adjacent to community amenities.
The PRELIMINARY DESIGN COMMENTS:

20. 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.

Preliminary Design Comments:

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

1. Site Design, Open Space and Massing. Van Ness is part of US Highway 101 within San Francisco and is regulated by Caltrans, which does not accept San Francisco-style bay window encroachments into the right-of-way. The Planning Department suggests setting back the primary building mass to allow some of the sculptural treatments shown among the many building options.

Additionally, San Francisco Public Works prefers transformers on site and may allow transformer vaults in sub-sidewalk locations in special circumstances and only as an exception. The Planning Department recommends coordinating any ground-floor setback with Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E) transformer vault requirements (in lieu of locating the transformer in the building face).

The Planning Department requests a larger, code-complying rear yard to conform to the dominant mid-block open space pattern.

The Planning Department requests that a minimum 3’-deep matching light well be provided adjacent to any light wells within the property to the south.

2. Parking and Circulation. The Planning Department does not support parking proposed above the amount principally permitted. Underground parking may not occupy the rear 15 feet of the lot per
Section 136(c)(26). The Planning Department encourages the provision of bicycle parking as convenient and accessible from the main building entrance as possible.

3. Architecture. The Planning Department supports the top-floor setback and private open spaces as they define the top of the building and roof well, but does not support multiple individual private stair penthouses and requests that they be eliminated, combined into one, or provide individual hatches instead.

At this point the architecture is assumed to be preliminary and the Department will provide further detailed design review on the subsequent submission. The Department encourages the use of high-quality materials and thoughtful detailing.

**PRELIMINARY PROJECT ASSESSMENT EXPIRATION:**

This Preliminary Project Assessment is valid for a period of 18 months. An Environmental Evaluation, Conditional Use Authorization, or Variance Application, as listed above, must be submitted no later than Thursday, November 30th, 2017. Otherwise, this determination is considered expired and a new Preliminary Project Assessment is required. Such applications and plans must be generally consistent with those found in this Preliminary Project Assessment.

Enclosures: Neighborhood Group Mailing List
Preliminary Shadow Fan Analysis

cc: Executive Group, Property Owner
Brittany Bendix, Current Planning
Kansai Uchida, Environmental Planning
Matthew Priest, Urban Design Advisory Team
Danielle DeRuiter-Williams, Citywide Planning and Analysis
Jonas Ionin, Planning Commission Secretary
Charles Rivasplata, SFMTA
Jerry Sanguinetti, Public Works
Pauline Perkins, SFPUC
Planning Department Webmaster (planning.webmaster@sfgov.org)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRST</th>
<th>LAST</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>ZIP</th>
<th>TELEPHONE</th>
<th>EMAIL</th>
<th>NEIGHBORHOOD OF INTEREST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aaron</td>
<td>Peskin</td>
<td>Local Field Representative</td>
<td>Carpenters Local 22</td>
<td>470 Columbus Avenue, Ste. 211</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94133</td>
<td>415-886-7014</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aaron.peskin@earthlink.net">aaron.peskin@earthlink.net</a></td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrian</td>
<td>Simi</td>
<td>Research Analyst</td>
<td>Carpenters Local 22 c/o NCCRC Research</td>
<td>2085 Third Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94107</td>
<td>415-355-1322</td>
<td><a href="mailto:allimi@nccrc.org">allimi@nccrc.org</a></td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>Lantsberg</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Community Design Center</td>
<td>5 Thomas Mellon Circle, #128</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94134</td>
<td>415-586-1235</td>
<td><a href="mailto:alexlantsberg@nccrc.org">alexlantsberg@nccrc.org</a></td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck</td>
<td>Turner</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Community Leadership Alliance</td>
<td>542201</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94109</td>
<td>415-921-4192</td>
<td><a href="mailto:admin@communityleadershipalliance.net">admin@communityleadershipalliance.net</a></td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td>Sousa</td>
<td>Public Works Coordinator</td>
<td>AT&amp;T Construction and Engineering</td>
<td>795 Folsom Street, Rm. 426</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94107-1243</td>
<td>415-644-7943</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lysousa41269@att.com">lysousa41269@att.com</a></td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>Lantsberg</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Coalition for Adequate Review</td>
<td>364 Page Street, #36</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>0</td>
<td><a href="mailto:a1zeabot@sonic.net">a1zeabot@sonic.net</a></td>
<td>Citywide, Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>Secretary-Treasurer</td>
<td>SF Building and Construction Trades Council</td>
<td>1185 Franklin Street, Ste. 203</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94109</td>
<td>415-345-9333</td>
<td><a href="mailto:matisph@sfcbtc.org">matisph@sfcbtc.org</a></td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>Rodgers</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>SF Bay Area Association of Renters</td>
<td>1618 12th Street</td>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94607</td>
<td>215-900-1457</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sonja.trauss@gmail.com">sonja.trauss@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>Hestor</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
<td>Law Office of Stephen M. Williams</td>
<td>1934 Divisadero Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94115</td>
<td>415-292-3656</td>
<td><a href="mailto:stephenwills@law.com">stephenwills@law.com</a></td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>Guillotien</td>
<td>Office Manager</td>
<td>San Francisco Tenants Union</td>
<td>558 Capp Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94110</td>
<td>415-282-5525</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ted@sfu.org">ted@sfu.org</a></td>
<td>Citywide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST</td>
<td>LAST</td>
<td>TITLE</td>
<td>ORGANIZATION</td>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
<td>CITY</td>
<td>STATE</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
<td>TELEPHONE</td>
<td>EMAIL</td>
<td>NEIGHBORHOOD OF INTEREST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooke</td>
<td>Sampson</td>
<td>0 Cow Hollow Association</td>
<td>2045 Filbert Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94123</td>
<td>0</td>
<td><a href="mailto:brookesampson@yahoo.com">brookesampson@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>0 <a href="mailto:brookesampson@yahoo.com">brookesampson@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>Marina, Pacific Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geoff</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>0 Cow Hollow Association</td>
<td>2760 Baker Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94123</td>
<td>0</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ggwood2@gmail.com">ggwood2@gmail.com</a></td>
<td><a href="mailto:ggwood2@gmail.com">ggwood2@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>0 Christensen, Downtown/Civic Center, Marina, Mission, Nob Hill, North Beach, Pacific Heights, Presidio, South of Market Marina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian</td>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td>0 HERE Local 2</td>
<td>209 Golden Gate Avenue</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94122</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Marina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan</td>
<td>Girardot</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>Marina Civic Improvement &amp; Property Owners</td>
<td>349 Marina Boulevard</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94123</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>marina@<a href="mailto:civicimpr@gmail.com">civicimpr@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Marina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesley</td>
<td>Leonhardt</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Union Street Association</td>
<td>2036 Union Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94123</td>
<td>415-441-7055</td>
<td><a href="mailto:LL@imagesnorth.com">LL@imagesnorth.com</a></td>
<td>Marina, Pacific Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Farrell</td>
<td>Supervisor, District 2</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>1 Dr. Carlson B Goodlett Place, Room #244</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94123</td>
<td>415-554-5942</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Farrell@sfgov.org">Farrell@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:Catherine.Stefani@sfgov.org">Catherine.Stefani@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:Margaux.Kelly@sfgov.org">Margaux.Kelly@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:Jasa.Montajeano@sfgov.org">Jasa.Montajeano@sfgov.org</a></td>
<td>Marina, Pacific Heights, Presidio, Presidio Heights, Russian Hill, Seacliff, Western Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Vaughney</td>
<td>0 Marina/Cow Hollow Neighbors &amp; Merchants</td>
<td>2742 Baker Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94123</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>415-567-7152</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bbardell@comcast.net">bbardell@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>Marina, Pacific Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Bardell</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Golden Gate Valley Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>1922 Filbert Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94123</td>
<td>415-931-7249</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tanyayurovsky@yahoo.com">tanyayurovsky@yahoo.com</a>, <a href="mailto:President@AquaticPark.org">President@AquaticPark.org</a></td>
<td>Marina, North Beach, Russian Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanya</td>
<td>Yurovsky</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Aquatic Park Neighbors</td>
<td>792 Bay Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94120</td>
<td>415-674-4655</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tanyayurovsky@yahoo.com">tanyayurovsky@yahoo.com</a>, <a href="mailto:President@AquaticPark.org">President@AquaticPark.org</a></td>
<td>0 Marina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn</td>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1000 Green Street #1202</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94133</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>415-310-6736</td>
<td><a href="mailto:leeway_e@yahoo.com">leeway_e@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>Pacific Heights, Russian Hill, Marina, Nob Hill, Presidio, Presidio Heights, Sea Cliff, Noe Valley, Western Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billy</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2505 Oak Street</td>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94559</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>415-310-6736</td>
<td><a href="mailto:leeway_e@yahoo.com">leeway_e@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>0 Marina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST</td>
<td>LAST</td>
<td>TITLE</td>
<td>ORGANIZATION</td>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
<td>CITY</td>
<td>STATE</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
<td>TELEPHONE</td>
<td>EMAIL</td>
<td>NEIGHBORHOOD OF INTEREST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooke</td>
<td>Sampson</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cow Hollow Association</td>
<td>2645 Filbert Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94123</td>
<td>0 <a href="mailto:brookesampson@yahoo.com">brookesampson@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marina, Pacific Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geoff</td>
<td>Wood</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cow Hollow Association</td>
<td>2760 Baker Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94123</td>
<td>0 <a href="mailto:gphwood2@gmail.com">gphwood2@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marina, Pacific Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg</td>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Pacific Heights Residents Assn.</td>
<td>2443 Fillmore Street, #178</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94115</td>
<td>0 <a href="mailto:info@ppha-sf.org">info@ppha-sf.org</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pacific Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian</td>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td></td>
<td>HERE Local 2</td>
<td>209 Golden Gate Avenue</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chinatown, Downtown/Civic Center, Marina, Mission, Nob Hill, North Beach, Pacific Heights, Presidio, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn</td>
<td>Devincenzi</td>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>Laural Heights Improvement Assn.</td>
<td>22 Iris Avenue</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94118</td>
<td>415-221-4700</td>
<td><a href="mailto:KRDDevincenzi@gmail.com">KRDDevincenzi@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Inner Richmond, Pacific Heights, Presidio Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesley</td>
<td>Leonhardt</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Union Street Association</td>
<td>2036 Union Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94123</td>
<td>415-441-7055</td>
<td><a href="mailto:LL@imagesnorth.com">LL@imagesnorth.com</a></td>
<td>Marina, Pacific Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malcom</td>
<td>Kaufman</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cow Hollow Association</td>
<td>2485 Union Street, #2</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94123</td>
<td>0 <a href="mailto:mkufman@mciemail.com">mkufman@mciemail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marina, Pacific Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Farrell</td>
<td>Supervisor, District 2</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>1 Dr. Carlton B Goodlett Place, Room #244</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102-4689</td>
<td>415-554-5942</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Mark.Farrell@sfgov.org">Mark.Farrell@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:Catherine.Stefani@sfgov.org">Catherine.Stefani@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:Margaux.Kelly@sfgov.org">Margaux.Kelly@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:Jess.Montejano@sfgov.org">Jess.Montejano@sfgov.org</a></td>
<td>Marina, Pacific Heights, Presidio, Pacific Heights, Russian Hill, Seacliff, Western Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>Vaughney</td>
<td></td>
<td>Marina/Cow Hollow Neighbors &amp; Merchants</td>
<td>2742 Baker Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94123</td>
<td>415-567-7152</td>
<td></td>
<td>Marina, Pacific Heights, Western Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Bardell</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Golden Gate Valley Association</td>
<td>1922 Filbert Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94123</td>
<td>415-931-7249</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bbardell@comcast.net">bbardell@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>Marina, Pacific Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>Hillson</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Jordan Park Improvement Assn.</td>
<td>115 Parker Avenue</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94118-2607</td>
<td>0 <a href="mailto:gumby5@att.net">gumby5@att.net</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inner Richmond, Pacific Heights, Presidio Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vas</td>
<td>Kiniris</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Fillmore Merchants &amp; Improvement Association</td>
<td>2443 Fillmore Street, #198</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94115</td>
<td>415-776-2700</td>
<td><a href="mailto:vas@zonodetails.com">vas@zonodetails.com</a></td>
<td>Pacific Heights, Western Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billy</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td></td>
<td>Oak Grove Group</td>
<td>2505 Oak Street</td>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94559</td>
<td>415-310-6706</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lateeaw_n@yahoo.com">lateeaw_n@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>Pacific Heights, Russian Hill, Marina, Nob Hill, Presidio, Presidio Heights, Sea Cliff, Noe Valley, Western Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST</td>
<td>LAST</td>
<td>TITLE</td>
<td>ORGANIZATION</td>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
<td>CITY</td>
<td>STATE</td>
<td>ZIP</td>
<td>TELEPHONE</td>
<td>EMAIL</td>
<td>NEIGHBORHOOD OF INTEREST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur</td>
<td>Albrecht</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Lombard Hill Improvement Association</td>
<td>1000 Lombard Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94103-1515</td>
<td>415-474-7883</td>
<td><a href="mailto:APAAlbrecht@aol.com">APAAlbrecht@aol.com</a></td>
<td>Russian Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron</td>
<td>Peskin</td>
<td>Supervisor, District 3</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>1 Dr. Carlton B Goodlett Place, Room #244</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102-4689</td>
<td>415-554-7450</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aaron.peskin@sfgov.org">aaron.peskin@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:sunny.angolo@sfgov.org">sunny.angolo@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:connie.chan@sfgov.org">connie.chan@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:lee.hasner@sfgov.org">lee.hasner@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:david_villalobos@abcglobal.net">david_villalobos@abcglobal.net</a></td>
<td>Chinatown, Financial District, Nob Hill, North Beach, Russian Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Villa-Lobos</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Lower Polk Business Collaborative</td>
<td>P.O. Box 642201</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94164</td>
<td>415-559-6627</td>
<td><a href="mailto:david_villalobos@abcglobal.net">david_villalobos@abcglobal.net</a></td>
<td>Nob Hill, Russian Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn</td>
<td>Trennert</td>
<td>Chairperson</td>
<td>Middle Polk Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>1561 Sacramento Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94109-3809</td>
<td>415-314-0772</td>
<td><a href="mailto:TrennertDawn@yahoo.com">TrennertDawn@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>Nob Hill, Russian Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian</td>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td>0 HERE Local 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>209 Golden Gate Avenue</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 Chinatown, Downtown/Civic Center, Marina, Mission, Nob Hill, North Beach, Pacific Heights, Presidio, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen</td>
<td>Courtney</td>
<td>0 President</td>
<td>Russian Hill Improvement Association</td>
<td>P.O. Box 475874</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94147</td>
<td>415-673-8208</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mtclockcroft3253@comcast.net">mtclockcroft3253@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>Russian Hill, Nob Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Farrell</td>
<td>Supervisor, District 2</td>
<td>Russian Hill Community Association</td>
<td>1158 Green Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94109</td>
<td>510-928-8243</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kcourteny@rhcasf.com">kcourteny@rhcasf.com</a></td>
<td>Russian Hill, Nob Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Shanahan</td>
<td>Chair, Planning and Zoning Committee</td>
<td>Telegraph Hill Dwellers - Planning &amp; Zoning Committee</td>
<td>224 Filbert Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94133</td>
<td>415-986-7070</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sshan@mindspring.com">sshan@mindspring.com</a></td>
<td>Chinatown, Financial District, North Beach, Russian Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robyn</td>
<td>Tucker</td>
<td>Co-Chair</td>
<td>Pacific Avenue Neighborhood Association (PANA)</td>
<td>7 McCormick</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94109</td>
<td>415-609-5607</td>
<td><a href="mailto:venturesv@aol.com">venturesv@aol.com</a></td>
<td>Nob Hill, Russian Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie</td>
<td>Greenburg</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>SoTel Neighbors</td>
<td>455 Vallejo Street, #112</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94133</td>
<td>415-794-7596</td>
<td><a href="mailto:stephgreenburg@sootelneighbors.org">stephgreenburg@sootelneighbors.org</a></td>
<td>Chinatown, Financial District, North Beach, Russian Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Cardello</td>
<td>Acting Chair of Design &amp; Land Use Committee</td>
<td>Russian Hill Neighbors</td>
<td>1819 Polk Street #221</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94109</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 <a href="mailto:dzlu@rhnsf.org">dzlu@rhnsf.org</a></td>
<td>Russian Hill, Russian Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanya</td>
<td>Yurovsky</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Aquatic Park Neighbors</td>
<td>792 Bay Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94109</td>
<td>415-674-4055</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tanyayurovsky@yahoo.com">tanyayurovsky@yahoo.com</a>, <a href="mailto:President@AquaticPark.org">President@AquaticPark.org</a></td>
<td>Marina, North Beach, Russian Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billy</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>0 Oak Grove Group</td>
<td></td>
<td>2505 Oak Street</td>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94559</td>
<td>415-310-6706</td>
<td><a href="mailto:leeway_e@yahoo.com">leeway_e@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>Pacific Heights, Russian Hill, Marina, Nob Hill, Presidio, Presidio Heights, Sea Cliff, Noe Valley, Western Addition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The City and County of San Francisco (CCSF) does not guarantee the accuracy, adequacy, completeness or usefulness of any information. CCSF provides this information on an "as is" basis without warranty of any kind, including but not limited to warranties of merchantability or fitness for a particular purpose, and assumes no responsibility for anyone's use of the information.
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