DATE: 09/29/2016
TO: Marie-Therese Debor/BRIDGE Housing
FROM: Kate Conner, Planning Department
RE: PPA Case No. 2016-007850PPA for 88 Broadway

Please find the attached Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) for the address listed above. You may contact the staff contact, Marcelle Boudreaux, at (415) 575-9140 or marcelle.boudreaux@sfgov.org, to answer any questions you may have, or to schedule a follow-up meeting.

Kate Conner, Housing Implementation Specialist
Preliminary Project Assessment

Date: 09/29/2016
Case No.: 2016-007850PPA
Project Address: 88 Broadway (vacant)
Block/Lot: 0140/007, 008
Zoning: C-2 (Community Business)
Waterfront 3, Special Use District
65-X, Height and Bulk District
Area Plan: Northeast Waterfront Plan Area
Project Sponsor: Marie-Therese Debor/BRIDGE Housing
600 California Street, Suite 900
San Francisco, CA 94108
mdebor@bridgehousing.com
Project Applicant: Leddy Maytum Stacy Architects, Attn: Aaron Thornton
677 Harrison Street
San Francisco, CA 94107
athornton@lmsarch.com
Staff Contact: Marcelle Boudreaux – 415-575-9140
marcelle.boudreaux@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 07/29/16, 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 is for new construction of two 6-story buildings, approximately 65 feet tall, and decreasing in height in proximity to the waterfront. The project contains 182 affordable family and senior housing units on lots currently used for surface parking. In general, the first floor podium level will provide ground floor units, commercial space, commercial parking, bike parking and common space and social services for residential use, as well as property management space. Floors two through six will consist primarily of residential dwelling units, shared laundry rooms, mechanical spaces, and common spaces. A variety of open spaces are proposed throughout at roof and terrace levels. There are two mid-block passages proposed in the project, and a child care facility with outdoor space is proposed at ground level.

No off-street parking is proposed for the residential uses. Up to 10 non-residential spaces are provided at grade level, with access from Front Street. Approximately 132 Class 1 bicycle parking spaces are proposed, and Class 2 bicycle parking spaces are provided although the exact number is unclear.

At the time this letter was published, a determination by the SF Port was not made on the underground replacement parking on site.

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. 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 Jessica Range at (415) 575-9018 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

If the initial study indicates that the project would result in a significant impact that cannot be mitigated
to below a significant level, an EIR will be required. An EIR must be prepared by an environmental
consultant from the Planning Department’s environmental consultant pool
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.

One item under consideration is replacement parking on the site Port site, by the SF Port. If this parking
becomes a project requirement, this will need to be analyzed. Future submittals would need to identify
the location of curb cut, number of spaces, vehicular egress and pedestrian access to the underground
parking, amount of excavation, and other relevant details.

1. **Historic Resources.** The subject property is a non-contributing property within the Northeast
Waterfront Landmark District, which is designated under Article 10 of the San Francisco Planning
Code. The proposed construction is subject to review by the Department’s Historic Preservation staff
for compatibility with this district. To assist in this review, the project sponsor must hire a qualified
professional to prepare a Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE) report. The professional must be
selected from the 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. Once you have selected a consultant from the list, 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 EEA and updated it as necessary to reflect feedback received in the
PPA letter. The HRE should be submitted directly to the environmental coordinator 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.

The proposed project also requires the review and approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness
application by the Historic Preservation Commission. Please see additional comments under the
Preservation Comments section below.

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

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

4. **Transportation.** Based on the Planning Department’s Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines for Environmental Review, the project would 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 on 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:

- Please coordinate with the Teatro ZinZanni (Seawall Lots 323 and 324) project located at Broadway and The Embarcadero on circulation and streetscape/landscaping plans.

- Clarify whether the proposed day care center, social services, and community rooms would only serve the residents of the development or would also be programmed for outside users.

- Identify on the project plans where you propose to locate loading activities.

- Show existing and proposed sidewalk widths and the location and dimensions of proposed curb cuts on the project plans.

**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. The proposed project would be 100 percent affordable housing and include less than 10,000 square feet of non-residential space in each land use category. Thus, the proposed project would not be subject to the TDM Program, as currently proposed.

5. **Noise.** Project implementation would include installation of a deep foundation system. Additionally, operation of the proposed project’s outdoor play areas and mechanical equipment may generate noise that could result in a permanent increase in ambient noise levels. Therefore, the proposed project would require a noise study that includes at a minimum: measurements of the existing noise environment, discussion of applicable noise regulations, an analysis of noise effects from the project’s construction and operations, and site-specific noise attenuation measures, if required. The noise study shall be conducted by a qualified acoustical consultant who shall prepare a noise study scope of work for approval by the assigned environmental coordinator prior to conducting the study.

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’s 182 dwelling units are below the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's (BAAQMD) construction screening levels for criteria air pollutants. However, the proposed 16,206 cubic yards of soil excavation would exceed the screening criteria for materials transport. Therefore, an analysis of the project’s criteria air pollutant emissions is likely to be required. Please provide detailed information related to construction equipment, phasing and duration of each phase, and volume of excavation as part of the EEA.

Project-related demolition, excavation, grading and other construction activities may cause wind-blown dust that could contribute particulate matter into the local atmosphere. To reduce construction dust impacts, the proposed project will be required to adhere to the dust control requirements set forth in the Construction Dust Ordinance contained in San Francisco Health Code Article 22B and San Francisco Building Code Section 106.A.3.2.6.

The project site is not located within an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone, as mapped and defined by Health Code Article 38. The Air Pollutant Exposure Zone identifies areas with poor air quality based on modeling of air pollution, exposures, and health vulnerability from mobile, stationary, and area source emissions within San Francisco. Given that the project site is not within an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone, no additional measures or analysis related to local health risks are anticipated. However, if the project would include new sources of toxic air contaminants including, but not limited to, emissions from diesel generators or boilers, or any other stationary sources, the project would result in toxic air contaminants that may affect both on-site and off-site sensitive receptors. Please provide detailed information related to any proposed stationary sources with the EEA.

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 coordinator 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 The Embarcadero. The project sponsor is therefore required to hire a qualified consultant to prepare a detailed shadow study. The consultant must submit a Shadow Study Application, which can be found on the Planning Department’s website.

---

4 BAAQMD, CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, May 2011, Chapter 3.
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 include excavation of more than 50 cubic yards of soil in an 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](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.

11. **Disclosure Report for Developers of Major City Projects.** The San Francisco Ethics Commission S.F. Camp. & Govt. Conduct Code § 3.520 et seq. requires developers to provide the public with information about donations that developers make to nonprofit organizations that may communicate with the City and County regarding major development projects. This report must be completed and filed by the developer of any “major project.” A major project is a real estate development project located in the City and County of San Francisco with estimated construction costs exceeding $1,000,000 where either: (1) The Planning Commission or any other local lead agency certifies an EIR for the project; or (2) The project relies on a program EIR and the Planning Department, Planning Commission, or any other local lead agency adopts any final environmental determination under

---

CEQA. A final environmental determination includes: the issuance of a Community Plan Exemption (CPE); certification of a CPE/EIR; adoption of a CPE/Final Mitigated Negative Declaration; or a project approval by the Planning Commission that adopts CEQA Findings. (In instances where more than one of the preceding determinations occur, the filing requirement shall be triggered by the earliest such determination.) A major project does not include a residential development project with four or fewer dwelling units. The first (or initial) report must be filed within 30 days of the date the Planning Commission (or any other local lead agency) certifies the EIR for that project or, for a major project relying on a program EIR, within 30 days of the date that the Planning Department, Planning Commission, or any other local lead agency adopts a final environmental determination under CEQA. Please submit a Disclosure Report for Developers of Major City Projects to the San Francisco Ethics Commission. This form can be found at the Planning Department or online at http://www.sfethics.org.

**PLANNING DEPARTMENT APPROVALS:**

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

1. **Certificate of Appropriateness.** The project requires approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness from the Historic Preservation Commission for new construction within the Article 10 Northeast Waterfront Historic District.

2. **Variance.** As proposed, the project requires several Variances to be obtained to modify the rear yard requirement, dwelling unit exposure requirement, and potentially other Code sections, prior to approval of the site/building permit in order to proceed. If a Planned Unit Development (“PUD”) option is selected, the project can seek these exceptions through the PUD process. Further, if a PUD is not selected, and the project is determined eligible for the Affordable Housing Project Authorization process, pursuant to Planning Section 315, Variances are not eligible for processing under this Code section.

3. **Conditional Use Authorization for Planned Unit Development.** Sites over ½ acre in size are eligible for residential development designed to produce an environment of stable and desirable character, which will benefit occupants, neighborhood and the City as a whole. In cases of outstanding overall design, complementary to the design and values of the surrounding area, such a project may merit well-reasoned modification of certain provisions contained in the Planning Code. Per Planning Code Sections 303 and 304, a Conditional Use Authorization is required for PUD from the Planning Commission, if the project sponsor selects to move forward with a PUD. Planning Commission approval may not be required if the proposed projects utilizes the Affordable Housing Project Authorization process detailed in Item#4.

4. **Affordable Housing Project Authorization (Section 315).** In lieu of any otherwise required Planning Commission hearing, the Planning Department shall administratively review and evaluate the physical aspects of an Affordable Housing Project and review such projects in coordination with relevant priority processing and design guidelines. An Affordable Housing Project may seek
exceptions to Planning Code requirements that may be available through the Planning Code, including Planning Code Section 304 for PUD, without a Planning Commission hearing, and the Planning Department may permit such exceptions if it makes the findings otherwise required by the Planning Code. Planning Code Section 315 shall apply to any project where the principal use is housing comprised solely of housing that is restricted for a minimum of 55 years as affordable for “persons and families of low or moderate income” as defined in California Health & Safety Code Section 50093 (an "Affordable Housing Project"). Upon verification of e of the “Affordable Housing” requirements in Planning Code Section 315, the project may be eligible for review under this process.

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


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 not 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.

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. Replacement Parking for the Port. Under consideration is underground replacement parking on the Port site. In the C-2 Zoning District, public or private parking lots generally require conditional use authorization to proceed. Pursuant to Planning Code Section 240.3(h), any building or use which
provides a greater number of off-street parking spaces than required under Section 151 of this Code shall be permitted only upon approval by the Planning Commission as a conditional use under Section 303 of this Code; provided, however, that this subsection shall not apply (2) for property under the jurisdiction of the Port of San Francisco, to the extent such off-street parking spaces existed as of the effective date of this Subsection. More information would be required in order to determine the type of parking, process of review and approval of replacement underground parking. See comments in the SDAT portion of this letter.

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 available for download here: [http://sf-planning.org/sites/default/files/FileCenter/Documents/523-Project%20Review%20Application%20Interdepartmental%20-%20Fillable.pdf](http://sf-planning.org/sites/default/files/FileCenter/Documents/523-Project%20Review%20Application%20Interdepartmental%20-%20Fillable.pdf)

3. **Floor Area Ratio (FAR).** Pursuant to Planning Code Section 240, the basic floor area ratio limit shall be 5.0 to 1 to the extent provided in Section 124(e) of the Planning Code. Total allowable FAR is approximately 243,085 sf. The calculations provided in the application indicate developable area of approximately 192,424 total square feet. Final calculation for FAR require gross floor area calculations.

4. **Rear Yard.** Planning Section 134 requires a rear yard of 25% of the average lot depth, starting at the lowest story containing a dwelling unit and at each succeeding level of the building. The proposal does not appear to meet this requirement. A Variance must be sought in order to move forward with the proposed design, or the modification could be sought through the PUD process.

5. **Height Measurement.** The property is located within 65-X Height and Bulk District. Planning Code Section 260(a) allows the owner to choose the street or streets from which the measurement of height is to be taken where the lot has frontage on two or more streets (applicable to the Family Housing building). Mechanical equipment and appurtenances, and elevator and stair penthouses are permitted to extend an additional 10 feet pursuant to Section 260(b). The plans indicate a Roof measurement of 65 feet, and mechanical measurement at 75 feet, which is in compliance. A parapet extends above the roof line, which is permitted to extend to a height of 4 feet; however, this is not detailed on the plans.

6. **Open Space – Residential.** Per Planning Code Section 135, the C-2 Zoning District abides by the nearest R district which establishes the residential density. Within the RC-4 Zoning District, 36 square feet of private open space or 48 square feet of common open space for each dwelling unit is required. The Family Housing project requires 6240 sf, and provides 6943 sf, in the form of roof terraces and roof decks. For bona fide Senior Housing projects, subject to conditions in Section 202.2(f)(1), the required open space is reduced to one-half the amount required per dwelling unit. The Senior Housing requires 1248 sf and provides is 1936 sf, in the form of a roof deck. Additionally, there are other open spaces provided within the project that may not meet the minimum dimensions in Section 135.

7. **Better Streets Plan/Street Trees.** The project is required to make pedestrian and streetscape improvements to the public right-of-way as set forth in the Better Streets Plan (Planning Code Section
due to a project involving more than 250 feet of linear street frontage and an entire blockface. Planning Code Section 138.1(c)(1) requires that Project Sponsor shall plant and maintain street trees as set forth in Article 16, Sections 805(a) and (d) and 806(d) of the Public Works Code. A waiver or modifications shall be requested through the Department of Public Works. Initial Street Design comments are included in this letter, however, more detailed comments may be provided following submittal of a Better Streets Plan application. 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.

8. **Standards for Bird-safe Buildings.** Please review Planning Code Section 139, or the Department publication on details and specific requirements, for feature-related hazards and treatments. [http://www.sfplanning.org/ftp/files/publications_reports/bird_safe_bldgs/Standards_for_Bird_Safe_Buildings_7-5-11.pdf](http://www.sfplanning.org/ftp/files/publications_reports/bird_safe_bldgs/Standards_for_Bird_Safe_Buildings_7-5-11.pdf). Feature-related hazards include free-standing glass walls, wind barriers, skywalks, balconies, and greenhouses on rooftops that have unbroken glazed segments 24 square feet and larger in size. Any structure that contains these elements shall treat 100% of the glazing on feature-related hazards. If there are windscreens or glass railings proposed at the roof level, please indicate on future submittals that these features will meet bird safety requirements.

9. **Exposure.** Planning Code Section 140 requires that each dwelling unit have at least one room that meets the 120-square-foot minimum superficial floor area requirement of Section 503 of the Housing Code face directly on a street right-of-way, code-complying rear yard, or an appropriately sized courtyard. The proposal notes that the project requires exposure exceptions for 3 dwelling units in the Family Housing building and 14 in the Senior Housing building; as noted in the application, these units do not face onto courtyards meeting the minimum dimension in Planning Code Section 140. In future submittals, dimensioned section drawings will assist Staff to analyze the accurate number of units in compliance with the exposure requirement. A Variance must be sought in order to move forward with the design requiring an exposure exception, or the modification could be sought through the PUD process. The Department generally encourages projects to minimize the number of units needing an exposure exception or variance.

10. **Screening of Rooftop Features.** Per Planning Code Section 141, rooftop mechanical equipment and appurtenances to be used in the operation or maintenance of a building shall be arranged so as not to be visible from any point at or below the roof level of the subject building. Although it generally appears that rooftop features are screened, detailed plans should indicate compliance with this section.

11. **Screening of Parking Areas.** Off-street parking adjacent to a public right-of-way shall be screened. The project proposes a garage door, which is compliant with Planning Code Section 142. Detailed plans should indicate materiality and dimensions of the garage door.
12. **Street Frontage/Ground Floor Use Requirements.** Pursuant to Planning Code Section 145.1, there are requirements for street frontages in commercial districts including: parking setbacks, active uses, parking and loading entrances, ground floor ceiling height, street facing ground floor spaces, transparency and fenestration, and gates, railings and grillwork. Active uses are required and appear to be provided as commercial spaces, community rooms, residential lobbies, childcare use. The Code further states the active use must be provided for 25% of building depth; it is unclear if this dimension is met for all active uses with the plans provided. The minimum ground floor ceiling height requirements are 14 feet, and the plans indicate a ground floor height of 14 feet, thereby meeting this requirement. All street frontages containing active uses must be fenestrated with transparent windows and doorways for no less than 60 percent of the street frontage at ground level allowing transparency into the building. Per the drawings, this level of transparency appears to be provided and should be balanced with preservation input provided in this letter. When three or more parking spaces are proposed, off-street parking at street grade on a development lot must be set back at least 25 feet on the ground floor; it is unclear if this dimension is met with plans provided. No more than one-third of the width or 20 feet, whichever is less, of any given street frontage of a new or altered structure parallel to and facing a street shall be devoted to parking and loading ingress or egress; the plans indicate that only one 18 foot wide access point is allocated to such access, out of the project’s total frontage on four street front frontages which is compliant. If portions of the project are determined to be non-compliant with Section 145.1, a Variance must be sought in order to move forward with the proposed design, or the modification could be sought through the Planned Unit Development process.

13. **Parking.** Pursuant to Planning Code Section 151, parking is not required for affordable housing or senior housing projects, nor is parking required for the commercial uses. Per Planning Code Section 151, the childcare use requires one space for each 25 children to be accommodated at any one time, where the number of such children exceeds 24. No parking is provided for the residential uses, therefore the project meets the residential parking requirement. At grade level, 10 parking spaces are provided for non-residential uses. Two parking spaces are required for the childcare use, therefore 8 additional non-residential spaces are proposed as accessory off-street parking. Per Planning Code Section 151(c), the maximum accessory parking principally permitted under this Section shall include 15 spaces or seven percent of the total gross floor area of the structure or development, whichever is greater. However, further pursuant to Planning Code Section 240.3, any building or use which provides a greater number of off-street parking spaces than required under Section 151 of this Code shall be permitted only upon approval by the Planning Commission as a conditional use under Section 303 of this Code; provided, however, that this subsection shall not apply (1) in any case where fewer than 10 such spaces are provided. However, excess parking is generally discouraged.

14. **Loading.** Pursuant to Planning Code Section 152, one off-street loading space is required for apartment use between 100,001 – 200,000 square feet of gross floor area. It is not clear on plans where residential loading functions are proposed, and future submittals should detail this requirement.

15. **Curb Cuts.** Pursuant to Planning Code Section 155(r), Broadway is a protected frontage from the Embarcadero on the east to Polk Street on the west, and curb cuts are not permitted. The project does not propose curb cuts on Broadway.
16. **Bicycle Parking.** Planning Code Section 155.1-2 requires this project to provide two types of bicycle parking for residential and for commercial uses. The proposed project proposes a room in the Family Housing, ground level, and in the Senior Housing, ground level, for bicycle parking, but the number is unclear. Please review the Zoning Administrator Bulletin No. 9 for more information: [http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/publications_reports/bicycle_parking_reqs/Leg_BicycleParking_ZABulletinNo.9.pdf](http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/publications_reports/bicycle_parking_reqs/Leg_BicycleParking_ZABulletinNo.9.pdf).

   - **Class 1:** For residential uses, one space per dwelling unit for Family Housing, and one space per ten units for Senior Housing, which results in a total of 114 Class 1 spaces for both residential uses. For commercial uses, one space is required for every 7,500sf occupied space; therefore, three Class 1 spaces are required, one for each retail use. The child care use requires 1 Class 1 space per 20 children at the facility; therefore, three Class 1 spaces for child care are required. The project proposes 132 Class 1 spaces, thereby meeting this requirement.

   - **Class 2:** For residential uses, one Class 2 space is required per 20 dwelling units for Family Housing, and one Class 2 space per 50 units is required for Senior Housing, resulting in a total of nine Class 2 spaces for residential. The total Class 2 spaces proposed for residential is not clear in the information provided. For commercial uses, two spaces are required for each commercial use; therefore, six Class 2 spaces are required for the commercial uses. The child care use requires 1 space per 20 children at the facility; therefore, a total of three Class 2 spaces for child care are required.

17. **Special Use District.** This project is within the Waterfront Special Use District No. 3.

   - Any new development on property under the jurisdiction of the Port Commission, (excluding alterations to existing development) which includes an area (excluding the area of public streets and alleys) of at least ½ acre shall be subject to review of the urban design of the proposed use by the waterfront design review process, as provided under Section 240(c) of this Code.

   - Other requirements may be applicable through the Special Use District.

18. **Density.** The base density permitted for the property based on its C-2 Zoning designation is one unit per 200 square feet of lot area. Provided that a Planned Unit Development is granted, the project is limited to the density of the next highest zoning district, minus one unit (C-3 Zoning District). Thus the permitted density would be 1 unit per 125 square feet of lot area. The permitted number of units through a Planned Unit Development is 388. The permitted number of units in the C-2 Zoning district is 243. The project proposes a total of 182 units.

19. **Shadow Analysis.** Planning Code Section 295 requires that a shadow analysis must be performed to determine whether the project has the potential to cast shadow on properties under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Recreation and Park Commission. Department staff has prepared a shadow fan that indicates the project will not cast shadow on any of these properties. The Environmental Review section of this letter discusses analysis required due to potential shadow impacts under CEQA.

21. **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

22. **Costa Hawkins Agreement.** If a project proposes rental units, it must demonstrate to the Planning Department that the affordable units are 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.

23. **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).

24. **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. Applicants may contact stormwaterreview@sfwater.org for assistance.

25. **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.

26. **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.

27. **Civic Design Review.** Pursuant to Charter Section 5.103, any new construction or exterior modification to a structure on this parcel is subject to Civic Design Review. The Planning Department shall not approve any permit until this requirement is fulfilled. The project sponsor must contact the SF Arts Commission at (415) 252-2590 with any questions regarding the design review process. More information including the Civic Design Review Committee Submission Guidelines are available on the Arts Commission website www.sfartscommission.org.

28. **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:
Preliminary Project Assessment

88 Broadway

Case No. 2016-007850PPA

a. Affordable Housing Requirements (Section 415). The project may be exempted from Inclusionary Affordable Housing requirements. A 100% affordable housing project in which rents are controlled or regulated by any government unit, agency or authority, excepting those unsubsidized and/or unassisted units which are insured by the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development. The Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development must represent to the Planning Commission or Planning Department that the project meets this requirement.

PRELIMINARY DESIGN AND PRESERVATION COMMENTS:

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

Architecture and Building Massing
1. Site Design. The Department recommends a shared open space easement or lot line consolidation to allow entries and windows to open onto and help activate the mid-block paseo.

2. Architecture. Please consider using high quality materials that reinforce and are architecturally consistent with the adjacent neighborhood to meet historic preservation standards. See preservation notes pertaining to appropriate materials.
   - Windows should have a consistent vertical alignment and proportions in keeping with character defining window patterns of the district.
   - Staff requests the commercial parking entrance be screened from street.
   - Active uses at all street frontages are required, except where necessary service functions are located. If ground floor units are provided, they should be designed with raised and setback direct entries.

Preservation Compatibility
The project is located within the Article 10 Northeast Waterfront Historic District. Per Appendix D to Article 10, Section 6 outlines the character-defining features of the district and Section 7 outlines additional provisions for Certificates of Appropriateness. Given the size to the site and the proposed development, a strong relationship should be demonstrated between the character-defining features and the proposed project. A copy of Appendix D is attached, which outlines the character-defining features found within the District.

Compatibility: Section 6 of Appendix D.
1. The overall height of the buildings is within the range of appropriate heights found in the District - generally within a six-story range. More consideration of the Front Street elevation should be undertaken to better articulate a language of individual buildings composed of varying roof heights. This could include varying exterior cladding, color, fenestration pattern, and composition of the ground floor.
2. The form of the large openings at the ground level is generally compatible with the District. A balance should be investigated between the historic nature of the District’s street level in which commercial spaces were not a prominent feature of the industrial buildings, and the needs for storefront transparency at the proposed commercial storefront spaces, which the Department generally supports in this project. Design considerations could include a stronger base (bulkhead) in the range of 12 to 18 inches and stronger exterior profiles for ground floor mullions, which are compatible with the District, to create more solidity at the base. In general, the base of the building should read as an integrated component with the upper levels.

3. Fenestration in the District is varied in size, but rather consistent per building. The older brick buildings generally exhibit minimal glazing that is deeply recessed, and generally vertically-oriented; this pattern is contrasted with the larger industrial sash windows introduced in later warehouse buildings (1920s onward). While large openings are common on the ground floor of historic warehouses and industrial buildings, they typically have lintels that are either flat or slightly arched. Arches that spring from grade level, and recessed arcades are not characteristic of the District. Window sashes, if drawing from the industrial-style fenestration in the District, should have muntin patterns compatible with historic industrial doors and windows found in the District. Consider how some interplay of this language can be incorporated into the fenestration pattern of the project. A consistent fenestration pattern at upper levels on individual buildings, which relates hierarchically to that at the base of the building, is a feature in the District. The proposed irregularity should be reviewed for compatibility, as the proposed system is unclear to Staff.

4. In the District, brick, reinforced concrete, or stucco are identified as character-defining features. The application of one material per building is consistent with the District. Cementitious siding that clads the entirety of these buildings is incompatible with the District. Consider materials that are consistent with the District, and contemporary interpretations of historic materials interspersed with the traditional materials, such as at the Front Street elevation. One contemporary option such as a terra cotta tile rainscreen, detailed to reflect materials characteristic to that district has been found appropriate in an industrial district. Note that the predominate feature of selected materials should be that of a rough-grained texture. Texture within the district is created visually through mottled coloration or variation in coursing. Texture is also created in plane through projecting trim molds at rough openings and structural bays, quoining, horizontal belt courses and outward-stepped cornices.

5. Red brick is typical, with one or two yellow brick buildings present in the immediate area, and painted brick. Muted earth tones predominate in shades of red, brown, green, gray and blue. It is unclear if the grey color scheme rendered in the plans is a placeholder or the selected material color. If brick is selected, red brick is consistent with the overall theme of the District.

6. Details in the District are minimal. Simple cornices that emphasize the horizontal building mass are a consistent feature. The project is encouraged to incorporate minimal cornice details that effectively cap the building. Other District details include simple pilasters, beltcourses, defined sills, and other simple architectural features, however, the proposed bay-like projections which
break the planar surface are inconsistent with the District and should be removed from the proposal. A common feature of contributing buildings within the District is the incorporation of ornament and texture around primary entrances. Particular attention should be paid to the detailing of building entrances, drawing from character-defining features of the District, to balance and define the multiple proposed points of entry. Awnings or canopies should be placed within rough openings and not extend across multiple openings; the awning placement detail was unclear in the drawings.

**Compatibility: Section 7 of Appendix D.**
1. A continuous streetwall is consistent with the District. The project proposes mid-block passages, which the Department generally supports, as an effort to break up the massing. A continuous façade line is proposed at the mid-block crossing at the elevation at Front Street and at Davis Street. At the north/south mid-block crossing, the passage is completely open to the sky, introducing a separation between the existing buildings and as proposed is supported.
2. The proposed roof treatment includes a variety of active uses for resident benefit and other coverings such as landscaping and solar panels, including structures for solar panels. The roof treatment should be further reviewed within the parameters of the roofs characterized by numerous regularly spaced industrial skylights. In addition, the proposed structural support of the solar panel system will be a highly visible rooftop element from the street, which is inconsistent with the District.

**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 88 Broadway project came to SDAT on August 22, 2016. Below are condensed SDAT comments from that meeting.

1. **Replacement parking for the Port of SF.** The Street Design Advisory Committee does not support including replacement parking for the Port of SF in this project, as this use is not consistent with the vision and policy goals for this neighborhood or the City’s General Plan.

2. **Loading on Davis Street.** The Planning Department supports resident and commercial loading on Davis Street. It is important to note that an adjacent project across Davis Street will be widening their sidewalk and improving the streetscape for this block of Davis Street. Please coordinate with the project sponsors for this project, the Teatro Zinzanni development, to assure a unified streetscape design plan with improved pedestrian space and adequate loading on Davis Street for both new projects.

3. **Trash Loading on Davis Street.** Please clarify how trash loading will work for the Davis Street frontage. A recommendation is given below under the “Bulbout on Davis Street” section of these design comments.
4. **Bulbouts on Front Street.** The Planning Department recommends pedestrian bulbouts at both corners of Front Street. These bulbouts should be 6’ in width.

A standard bulbout is recommended at Front and Vallejo. Per standards established in the Better Streets Plan, the tangent point for the bulbout’s curb returns should be sited a minimum of five feet beyond the property line on both the Front Street and Vallejo Street frontages.

A longer bulbout (roughly 2 parking spaces long or about 40’) is recommended along both the Front and Broadway frontages, for expanded public space in front of the commercial/retail planned for that corner. This bulbout should be designed to act as a gateway feature and be programmed with landscaping, seating, special paving etc.

Please refer to the attached PDF: *SDAT_88 Broadway_2016-08-22_Sketch.pdf* for guidance on bulbout design

5. **Bulboult on Davis Street.** The Planning Department also recommends a pedestrian bulbout in front of the proposed commercial space on Front Street, with an ADA loading space and curb ramp located just north of this bulbout; this curb ramp could also be used for trash loading.

The bulbout should widen the sidewalk to 15’. So if the existing sidewalk is 10’, the project sponsor shall install a 5’ bulbout. If the existing sidewalk is 9’, the project sponsor shall install a 6’ bulbout, etc.

6. **ADA loading spaces.** An ADA loading space should be located at both residential entries. The ADA loading space on Davis Street should be configured as specified above. Another ADA loading space should be located on Front Street.

7. **Trees near intersections.** No trees may be located within 25’ of an intersection, for pedestrian safety.

8. **Food trucks.** Please coordinate with the Bureau of Street and Mapping, Public Works Department, on the temporary and long-term placement of the food trucks that currently park on Front Street.

9. **Transformer Vault location.** The Planning Department recommends that any transformer vaults be located along mid-block open space frontage, to minimize their impact on street frontage. See additional comments on transformer vaults below.

10. **Standard SDAT Comments.** Please review the standard SDAT comments in the attached letter: *SDAT_88 Broadway_2016-08-22.pdf*

**PRELIMINARY PROJECT ASSESSMENT EXPIRATION:**

This Preliminary Project Assessment is valid for a period of 18 months. An Environmental Evaluation Application, as listed above, must be submitted no later than **April 3, 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: Neighborhood Group Mailing List– North Beach and Financial District (09/26/16)
  Preliminary Shadow Fan, dated 09/20/16
  Article 10, Appendix D – Northeast Waterfront Historic District
  SDAT Letter dated 08/22/16 and notated site plan
cc: Ricky Tijani, SF Port
    Teresa Yanga, Mayor’s Office of Housing
    Marcelle Boudreaux, Current Planning
    Jenny Delumo, Environmental Planning
    Kearstin Dischinger, Citywide Planning and Analysis
    David Winslow, Design Review
    Mark Luellen, Team Leader NE Quadrant
    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>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.angulo@sfgov.org">sunny.angulo@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:connie.chan@sfgov.org">connie.chan@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:lee.hepner@sfgov.org">lee.hepner@sfgov.org</a></td>
<td>Chinatown, Financial District, Nob Hill, North Beach, Russian Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethan</td>
<td>Hough</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>One Ecker Owners Association</td>
<td>16 Jessie Street Unit 301</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94105</td>
<td>415-847-3169</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ethanhough@gmail.com">ethanhough@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Financial District, South of Market</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:nshan@mindspring.com">nshan@mindspring.com</a></td>
<td>Chinatown, Financial District, North Beach, Russian Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Stocking</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Jackson Square Historic District Assn.</td>
<td>455 Vallejo Street, #112</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94111</td>
<td>415-984-0700</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sarah@sarahstocking.com">sarah@sarahstocking.com</a></td>
<td>Chinatown, Financial District, North Beach, Russian Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie</td>
<td>Greenburg</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>SoTel Neighbors</td>
<td>30 Sharon Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94114-1709</td>
<td>415-407-0094</td>
<td><a href="mailto:olssonted@yahoo.com">olssonted@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>Financial District, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>Olsson</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>T-JPA CAC</td>
<td>30 Sharon Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94110</td>
<td>415-291-0822</td>
<td><a href="mailto:whann@att.net">whann@att.net</a></td>
<td>Financial District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Hannan</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Golden Gateway Tenants Association</td>
<td>550 Battery Street, Apt. 1512</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94111</td>
<td>415-434-8602</td>
<td><a href="mailto:inq@pacific.net">inq@pacific.net</a></td>
<td>Financial District, North Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Price</td>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>Barbary Coast Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>640 Davis Street 28</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94110</td>
<td>415-421-0803</td>
<td><a href="mailto:saraheprice@sfgov.org">saraheprice@sfgov.org</a></td>
<td>Financial District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marc</td>
<td>Bruno</td>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>St. Vincent de Paul Society, North Beach</td>
<td>666 Filbert Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94113</td>
<td>415-052-3242</td>
<td><a href="mailto:marcabruno@yahoo.com">marcabruno@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>Chinatown, Financial District, Nob Hill, North Beach, Russian Hill</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>94110</td>
<td>415-052-3242</td>
<td><a href="mailto:info@ahasf.org">info@ahasf.org</a></td>
<td>Castro/Upper Market, Downtown/Civic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FINANCIAL DISTRICT NEIGHBORHOOD LIST**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRST 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>President</td>
<td>North Beach Business Association</td>
<td>P.O. Box 330187</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94133</td>
<td>415-989-2220</td>
<td><a href="mailto:northbeachbusinessassociation@gmail.com">northbeachbusinessassociation@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>North Beach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron 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.angulo@sfgov.org">sunny.angulo@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:connie.chan@sfgov.org">connie.chan@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:lee.hepner@sfgov.org">lee.hepner@sfgov.org</a></td>
<td>Chinatown, Financial District, Nob Hill, North Beach, Russian Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gene Morzenti</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Telegraph Hill Survival Association</td>
<td>350 Green Street, Apt. 3</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94133</td>
<td>415-362-3059</td>
<td><a href="mailto:amnorzent@ucsd.edu">amnorzent@ucsd.edu</a></td>
<td>North Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Lewis</td>
<td>Supervisor, District 3</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>209 Golden Gate Avenue</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Chinatown, North Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Kim</td>
<td>Supervisor, District 6</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>1 Dr. Carlton B Goodlett Place, Room #244</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102-4689</td>
<td>415-554-7970</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jane.kim@sfgov.org">jane.kim@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:April.veneracion@sfgov.org">April.veneracion@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:Sunny.Angulo@sfgov.org">Sunny.Angulo@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:lv.lee@sfgov.org">lv.lee@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:coltbowler2014@gmail.com">coltbowler2014@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Downtown/Civic Center, North Beach, South of Market, Treasure Island/YBI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marla Basilen Knight</td>
<td>Co-Chairperson</td>
<td>North Beach Tenants Committee</td>
<td>566 Lombard Street #1</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94133</td>
<td>415-362-0215</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chinatown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy 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>415-985-7070</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nshan@mindspring.com">nshan@mindspring.com</a></td>
<td>Chinatown, Financial District, North Beach, Russian Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nestor Fernandez</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Telegraph Hill Neighborhood Center</td>
<td>660 Lombard Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94133</td>
<td>415-421-6443</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nfernandez@tel-hi.org">nfernandez@tel-hi.org</a></td>
<td>North Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman Fong</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Chinatown Community Development Center (CCDC)</td>
<td>1525 Grant Avenue</td>
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<td>CA</td>
<td>94133</td>
<td>415-984-1462</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nftong@chinatowncdc.org">nftong@chinatowncdc.org</a>; <a href="mailto:info@chinatowncdc.org">info@chinatowncdc.org</a>; <a href="mailto:wkwan@chinatowncdc.org">wkwan@chinatowncdc.org</a>; <a href="mailto:sarah@sarahsbooking.com">sarah@sarahsbooking.com</a></td>
<td>Chinatown, North Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Stocking</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Jackson Square Historic District Asn.</td>
<td>368 Jackson Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94111</td>
<td>415-794-0700</td>
<td><a href="mailto:stephgreenburg@sotelnighbors.org">stephgreenburg@sotelnighbors.org</a></td>
<td>Chinatown, Financial District, North Beach, Russian Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie Greenburg</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>SoTel Neighbors</td>
<td>455 Vallejo Street, #112</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94111</td>
<td>415-794-7596</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chinatown, Financial District, North Beach, Russian Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue McCullough</td>
<td>Chair, Planning and Zoning</td>
<td>North Beach Neighbors</td>
<td>P.O. Box 330115</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94133</td>
<td>0</td>
<td><a href="mailto:northbeachneighbors@gmail.com">northbeachneighbors@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>North Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanya Yovskiy</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>Vedica Puri</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Telegraph Hill Dwellers</td>
<td>600 Montgomery Street, 31st Floor</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94133</td>
<td>415-273-1004</td>
<td><a href="mailto:info@telehi.org">info@telehi.org</a>; <a href="mailto:president@telehi.org">president@telehi.org</a></td>
<td>North Beach</td>
</tr>
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<td>Wyland Chiu</td>
<td>Building Manager</td>
<td>North East Medical Services</td>
<td>1520 Stockton Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94133</td>
<td>415-391-9686</td>
<td><a href="mailto:wyland.chiu@nems.org">wyland.chiu@nems.org</a></td>
<td>North Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Parette</td>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>Barbary Coast Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>640 Davis Street 2B</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94111</td>
<td>415-434-8602</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ing@scabell.net">ing@scabell.net</a></td>
<td>Financial District, North Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marc Bruno</td>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>St. Vincent de Paul Society, North Beach</td>
<td>668 Filbert Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94133</td>
<td>415-421-0809</td>
<td><a href="mailto:marcabruno@yahoo.com">marcabruno@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>Chinatown, Financial District, Nob Hill, North Beach, Russian Hill</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NORTH BEACH NEIGHBORHOOD LIST
APPENDIX D TO ARTICLE 10 - NORTHEAST WATERFRONT HISTORIC DISTRICT

SEC. 1. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

The Board of Supervisors hereby finds that the area known and described in this ordinance as the Northeast Waterfront has a special character and special historical, architectural and aesthetic interest and value and constitutes a distinct section of the City. The Board of Supervisors further finds that designation of this area as an Historic District will further and conform to the purposes and standards of Article 10 of the City Planning Code, and that preservation on an area basis, rather than on the basis of individual structures alone, is required in order to preserve the character of the Northeast Waterfront District.

This ordinance is intended to further the general purpose of historic preservation legislation as set forth in Section 101 of the City Planning Code through:

(a) The protection, enhancement, perpetuation and use of structures, sites and areas that are reminders of past eras, events and persons important in local, State or national history, or which provide significant examples of architectural styles of the past or are landmarks in the history of architecture, or which are unique and irreplaceable assets to the City and its neighborhoods, or which provide for this and future generations examples of the physical surroundings in which past generations lived;

(b) The development and maintenance of appropriate settings and environment for such structures;

(c) The enhancement of property values, the stabilization of areas of the City, the increase of economic and financial benefits for the City and its inhabitants, and the promotion of tourist trade;

(d) The preservation and encouragement of a city of varied architectural styles, reflecting the distinct phases of its architectural, cultural, economic, political and social history;

(e) The enrichment of human life in its educational and cultural dimensions; to serve spiritual and material needs by fostering knowledge of the past.

In addition, this ordinance is intended to maintain the scale and basic character of the Northeast Waterfront Historic District, through:

(a) Preservation of the basic characteristics and salient architectural details of structures within the Historic District;

(b) Affording the widest possible scope for continuing vitality through private renewal and architectural creativity, within appropriate controls and standards;

(c) Encouragement of the development of vacant and incompatibly developed properties in accordance with the character of the area.
SEC. 2. DESIGNATION.

Pursuant to Section 1004 of the City Planning Code, Chapter II, Part II of the San Francisco Municipal Code, the Northeast Waterfront is hereby designated as an Historic District, this designation having been duly approved by Resolution No. 9517 of the City Planning Commission.

SEC. 3. LOCATION AND BOUNDARIES.

The location and boundaries of the Northeast Waterfront Historic District shall be as designated on the Northeast Waterfront Historic District Map, the original of which is on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors under File No. 90-82-15, which map is hereby incorporated as though fully set forth.

SEC. 4. RELATION TO CITY PLANNING CODE.

(a) Article 10 of the City Planning Code is the basic law governing historic preservation in the City and County of San Francisco. This ordinance, being a specific application of Article 10, is both subject to and in addition to the provisions thereof.

(b) Except as may be specifically provided to the contrary in the ordinance, nothing in this ordinance shall supersede, impair or modify any City Planning Code provisions applicable to property in the Northeast Waterfront Historic District, including but not limited to existing and future regulations controlling uses, height, bulk coverage, floor area ratio, required open space, off-street parking and signs.

SEC. 5. STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE.

(a) History of the Area. The Northeast Waterfront District contains commercial warehouse buildings from nearly every decade of San Francisco's history. The area reflects the waterfront storage and maritime activities which, until recently, were an important aspect of San Francisco business history. These buildings range in age from the early clipper ship warehouses of Scotsman Daniel Gibb in the 1850's to the properties owned by the General Engineering and Drydock Co., a company crucial to the shipbuilding effort that made San Francisco Bay the major Pacific maritime support facility during World War II.

The original shoreline of Yerba Buena swept in a curve from Montgomery Street to roughly Jackson Street and on to the deeper waters slightly east of Battery. This point was known as Punta del Embarcadero. The cove itself fronting on the settlement was shallow and could be navigated only by small craft of shallow draft. The historic district boundary begins at what was the site of the first deep water landing in San Francisco at Clark's Point. The first vessel to moor at a wharf tied up at this site and discharged cargo in 1848. The first Pacific Mail steamer to
arrive in San Francisco disembarked passengers in this area in 1848 and the unique clipper ships built expressly for San Francisco's Gold Rush trade docked in this area in large numbers.

During the Gold Rush era, the boundaries of the area were extended eastward by landfill into the Bay in order to create new warehousing space. Large sections of Telegraph Hill were excavated for the fill. In the late 1880's a sea wall was built which settled the eastern boundaries of the area. The clipper ships of the Gold Rush era and paddlewheel steamers of the delta and river trade docked alongside its wharves discharging a multitude of cargo, much of which passed through local warehouses. In the 1880's and 1890's large numbers of iron-hulled square riggers were involved in hauling grain from California's Central Valley to European markets. The new transcontinental trains were loaded on barges from the other side of the Bay and were docked and discharged in this area. A number of ships are presumed to have been buried beneath the fill used to extend the district. A ship buried in 1851 as an extension of Frederick Griffing's wharf was recently unearthed during the excavation for Levi's Plaza on the northern boundary of the district.

Many distinguished San Francisco names and firms have been associated with the warehouses in the area: William T. Coleman head of the Vigilante Committee; George Howes, operator of clipper ships; Daniel Gibb, builder of the earliest warehouses in the area which were bought in 1861 by John Sanborn; Charles Minturn, steamboat tycoon; Isaac Friedman, the "Wheat King"; and Samuel Haslett, founder of a leading warehouse firm in the Bay Area. Pioneer firms such as American Bisquit Co., Cowell's Lime and Cement Co., W.P. Fuller Co., the Petri Italian-American Cigar Co., and the California Fruit Packing Co., have major extant structures in the area. After 1906 firms such as Bemis Bag Co., National Ice and Cold Storage, Cudahy Meat Packing, Armour and Co., Ciocca-Lombardi Wine Co., and the Italian-American Canning Co. located in the area. In the 1920's and 1930's the Sunset Press, Security Lithograph, and various typography and lithography operations were set up in the district, reflecting the increasing importance of this industry in San Francisco's economic development. In 1940 General Engineering and Drydock marshalled a number of buildings for ship repair and maintenance during World War II.

These warehouse facilities have been in continuous industrial use from the Gold Rush to the mid 1960's. Since that decade showrooms, office and retail uses have been integrated into renovated warehouse structures.

The area is architecturally significant as a representation of warehouse and industrial buildings from the brick structures of the Gold Rush era to the reinforced concrete buildings introduced after the turn of the century. Some of the present buildings date from well before the turn of the century, though they were rebuilt after the 1906 fire. Since warehouse architecture did not undergo profound stylistic changes until the introduction of reinforced concrete, the pre- and post-fire brick warehouses embody the original appearance and spirit of the early warehouse district. Of particular note is the block bounded by Front, Battery, Union, and Green streets, the most cohesive extant brick warehouse complex from this era in the City. In addition, cobblestone paving and the standard and narrow gauge belt line railroad track which served the district are visible at the foot of Commerce Street. The area clearly serves as a visual reminder of San Francisco's earlier maritime-warehousing commerce.

(b) **Basic Nature of the Area.** The Historic District includes historically and architecturally significant buildings dating from the 1850's to the present century. The buildings vary in height from approximately six stories closest to the base of Telegraph Hill to a maximum of four stories at The Embarcadero and the Bay. The area was pre-dominantly oriented toward shipping,
drayage and warehousing, and is now being converted to low rise office space. The addition of Levi's Plaza on the northern boundary offers a modern structure compatible with the district.

(c) **Architectural Character.** Common architectural features tie the area together and provide visual distinction. Two major building materials were used in the area; brick since the Gold Rush era and reinforced concrete after the 1906 fire.

Common architectural elements are repeated throughout the District. Of particular note are the large bulk and minimal fenestration of the earlier warehouse structures. Other common features are scale and proportion, materials, color, texture, and the minimal use of decorative elements. Visual distinction is due in some cases to the original construction plus the carefully designed addition of upper stories as evidenced in the original two-story Cudahy Meat Packing building by Henry Gielfus (1907) with a two-story addition by Ward and Blohme (1918).

(d) **Uniqueness and Location.** The unique quality of the Northeast Waterfront Historic District stems from the fact that so many buildings from approximately 14 decades of San Francisco history are clustered within this nine-block area. Its distinct character is contrasted by Gateway Commons on the south and Levi's Plaza on the north. The district is close to the downtown high-rise core and the Jackson Square Historic District.

(e) **Visual and Functional Unity.** The Historic District has an identifiable character and common architectural features. The primary unifying factors are scale and the texture of the buildings, as well as materials. In terms of function, there has been a continuous transition from the clipper ship services of the 1850's through the warehousing and shipping services of the early twentieth century, to the gradual transformation of warehouses into premium office space within walking distance of the downtown.

(f) **Dynamic Continuity.** The Northeast Waterfront District is an evolving commercial area. The area has proven its capacity for incremental adaption to new uses. Designation as an historic district is intended to complement the economic viability of the area.

(g) **Benefits to the City and its Residents.** Economically, the area in the past has housed specialized enterprises and is currently evolving into a satellite office district of the downtown core. Culturally, it provides a strong historical and educational resource and link with the past. Aesthetically, its architecture and visual appeal are immediate, while its value in terms of urban design within the City pattern as a whole is equally important.

(Added Ord. 171-83, App. 4/8/83)

**SEC. 6. FEATURES.**

(a) **Overall Form and Continuity.** Building height is generally within a six-story range, with the higher structures closer to the base of Telegraph Hill and lower buildings near the water. Many of the oldest structures are one or two stories in height.

(b) **Scale and Proportion.** The buildings are of typical warehouse design, large in bulk, often with large arches and openings originally designed for easy vehicular access. There is a regularity of overall form. The earlier brick structures blend easily with the scaled-down Beaux Arts forms of the turn of the century and the plain reinforced-concrete structures characteristic of twentieth century industrial architecture.
(c) **Fenestration.** Minimal glazing is deeply recessed, producing a strong shadow line. The earliest structures have few windows expressing their warehouse function. They are varied in size, rhythmically spaced, and relate in shape and proportion to those in nearby buildings. Larger industrial sash windows began to be incorporated in structures built from the 1920's and onward. Door openings are often massive to facilitate easy access of bulk materials.

(d) **Materials.** Standard brick masonry is predominant for the oldest buildings in the District, with reinforced concrete introduced after the 1906 fire. Some of the brick facades have been stuccoed over. One of the structures still has its metal shutters, which were once typical of the area.

(e) **Color.** Red brick is typical, with some yellow and painted brick. Muted earth tones predominate in shades of red, brown, green, gray, and blue.

(f) **Texture.** Typical facing materials give a rough-textured appearance. The overall texture of the facades is rough-grained.

(g) **Detail.** Arches are common at the ground floor, and are frequently repeated on upper floors. Flattened arches for window treatment are typical. Cornices are simple and generally tend to be abstract versions of the more elaborate cornices found on downtown commercial structures from the nineteenth century. Most of the surfaces of the later buildings are plain and simple, reflecting their function. Some of the earlier brickwork contains suggestions of pilasters, again highly abstracted. Where detail occurs, it is often found surrounding entryways.

(h) **Age.** All of the buildings in the area were either partially or totally destroyed by the earthquake and fire of 1906. As in the Jackson Square area, many were rebuilt along the lines of the previous design, often using materials salvaged from the construction site.

(Added Ord. 171-83, App. 4/8/83)

**SEC. 7. ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS FOR CERTIFICATES OF APPROPRIATENESS.**

The procedures, requirements, controls and standards in Sections 1006 through 1006.8 of Article 10 of the City Planning Code shall apply to all applications for Certificates of Appropriateness in the Northeast Waterfront Historic District. In addition the following provisions shall apply to all such applications; in the event of any conflict or inconsistency between the following provisions and Article 10, those procedures, requirements, controls and standards affording stricter protection to landmarks, landmark sites and the Historic District shall prevail.

(a) **Character of the Historic District.** The standards for review of all applications for Certificates of Appropriateness are set forth in Section 1006.7 of Article 10. For purposes of review pursuant to these standards, the character of the historic district shall mean the exterior architectural features of the Northeast Waterfront Historic District described in Section 6 of this ordinance.

(b) **Additional Standards for Certain Features.**

(1) **Facade Line Continuity.** Facade line continuity is historically appropriate. Therefore, setbacks and arcades, not generally being features of the Northeast Waterfront Historic District, are not acceptable.
(2) **Fenestration and Design Elements for New Construction.** In areas with a concentration of older brick buildings, new construction should reflect in design the predominant use of deeply recessed, limited fenestration. In addition, verticality and a high proportion of mass to void should be incorporated. In areas characterized by newer buildings in concrete or stucco with industrial-style fenestration, new construction should reflect those design elements.

(3) **Roof Treatment.** Historically the view from Telegraph Hill over the Northeast Waterfront District has been one of roofs characterized by numerous regularly spaced industrial skylights. In renovation or new construction, these particular design features should be retained or incorporated.

(4) Signs shall be governed by the applicable provisions of Article 6, section 609.14, and this Appendix D. In the event of inconsistency among these provisions, the most restrictive provision shall prevail unless this Code specifically provides otherwise.

(c) **Exterior Changes Requiring Approval.** Exterior changes within the Northeast Waterfront Historic District shall require a Certificate of Appropriateness pursuant to the provisions of Article 10 when such work requires a city permit. In addition, a Certificate of Appropriateness shall be required for cleaning masonry surfaces with abrasives and/or treatment of such surfaces with waterproofing chemicals. Sandblasting and certain chemical treatments detrimental to older brick will not be approved.

(Added Ord. 171-83, App. 4/8/83; Ord. 59-08, File No. 031034, App. 4/10/2008)
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 88 Broadway project came to SDAT on August 22, 2016. Below are the SDAT comments from that meeting.

CONTEXT

Project Description
The project entails the construction of two-six story buildings containing affordable family and senior housing on two parcels fronting four streets near the Embarcadero. The parcels are owned by the City (the Port and Public Works), and were specifically identified for infill development in the Northeast Embarcadero Study. A first floor podium will provide ground floor units, commercial uses, commercial parking, bike parking, common space/social services for resident use, and property management offices. Floors two through six will be primarily residential uses with laundry rooms, mechanical needs, and common spaces. A variety of open spaces including two mid-block passages are distributed throughout the block.
**Better Streets Plan**

The Better Streets Plan (BSP) adopted by the city in December 2010, provides a comprehensive set of guidelines for the design of San Francisco’s pedestrian realm. The Plan seeks to balance the needs of all street users, with a particular focus on the pedestrian environment and how streets can be used as public space. The BSP polices can be found at: [www.sfbetterstreets.org](http://www.sfbetterstreets.org).

- Under the BSP, Davis Street is classified as a Commercial Throughway, with a recommended sidewalk width of 15’.
- Under the BSP, Vallejo and Front Streets are classified as Neighborhood Commercial Streets, with a recommended sidewalk width of 15’.
- Under the BSP, Broadway is classified as a Downtown Residential Street, with a recommended sidewalk width of 15’.

**Vision Zero**

In 2014, the SFMTA Board joined the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, SF Planning, SFDPH and multiple other city agencies in adopting the City’s Vision Zero Policy which seeks to eliminate all traffic deaths in the City by 2024. The City subsequently established a network of Vision Zero Corridors which have higher rates of traffic-related injuries and fatalities compared to most San Francisco Streets. The City has determined that streets on the Vision Zero network should be prioritized for safety improvements especially those that improve the safety of vulnerable users like pedestrians. See: [http://visionzerosf.org/about/support-for-vision-zero](http://visionzerosf.org/about/support-for-vision-zero), links to all agency resolutions are at the bottom of the page.

- Broadway has been designated a Vision Zero Corridor and falls on the Vision Zero High Injury Network for both drivers and pedestrians. All plans should prioritize improving safety for all users along this corridor.

**Citywide Bike Network**

The 2009 San Francisco Bicycle Plan contains specific proposed near-term bicycle route network improvement projects for a safe, interconnected bicycle network that supports bicycling as an attractive alternative to private auto use. The San Francisco Bike Plan is the guiding policy document defining where bicycle improvements should be made in the City.

- Broadway is identified as a bike route under the San Francisco Bicycle Plan and is the only east/west route through the Northeast waterfront area between North Point Street, 10 blocks to the north, and Sutter Street, 9 blocks to the south. Broadway is a four-lane road that is signed only for bicycles, with sharrows but no dedicated facility.
- Front Street currently has striped bike lanes. It is not today a major connecting route. Improved connecting bike facilities are planned for north-south streets just to the west, on Battery and Sansome Streets.

**Northeast Embarcadero Study**

Completed in February 2010, the Northeast Embarcadero Study provides an urban design analysis for the northeast embarcadero area and provides recommendations to improve the public realm and the design of new development in the area. The study specifically identified these two parcels, which are
City property, for infill development. The Northeast Embarcadero Study can be found at: http://sf-planning.org/northeast-embarcadero-study

SDAT DESIGN COMMENTS

Replacement parking for the Port of SF

- SDAT does not support including replacement parking for the Port of SF in this project, as this use is not consistent with the vision and policy goals for this neighborhood or the City’s General Plan.

Loading on Davis Street

- SDAT supports resident and commercial loading on Davis Street. It is important to note that an adjacent project across Davis Street will be widening their sidewalk and improving the streetscape for this block of Davis Street. Please coordinate with the project sponsors for this project, the Teatro Zinzanni development, to assure a unified streetscape design plan with improved pedestrian space and adequate loading on Davis Street for both new projects.

Trash Loading on Davis Street

- Please clarify how trash loading will work for the Davis Street frontage. A recommendation is given below under the “Bulbout on Davis Street” section of these design comments.

Bulbout on Front Street

- SDAT recommends pedestrian bulbouts at both corners of Front Street. These bulbouts should be 6’ in width.
- A standard bulbout is recommended at Front and Vallejo. Per standards established in the Better Streets Plan, the tangent point for the bulbout’s curb returns should be sited a minimum of five feet beyond the property line on both the Front Street and Vallejo Street frontages.
- A longer bulbout (roughly 2 parking spaces long or about 40’) is recommended along both the Front and Broadway frontages, for expanded public space in front of the commercial/retail planned for that corner. This bulbout should be designed to act as a gateway feature and be programmed with landscaping, seating, special paving etc.
- Please refer to the attached PDF: SDAT_88 Broadway_2016-08-22_Sketch.pdf for guidance on bulbout design

Bulbout on Davis Street

- SDAT also recommends a pedestrian bulbout in front of the proposed commercial space on Front, with an ADA loading space and curb ramp located just north of this bulbout; this curb ramp could also be used for trash loading.
- The bulbout should widen the sidewalk to 15’. So if the existing sidewalk is 10’, the project sponsor shall install a 5’ bulbout. If the existing sidewalk is 9’, the project sponsor shall install a 6’ bulbout, etc.
ADA loading spaces

- An ADA loading space should be located at both residential entries. The ADA loading space on Davis Street should be configured as specified above. Another ADA loading space should be located on Front Street.

Trees near intersections

- No trees may be located within 25’ of an intersection, for pedestrian safety.

Food trucks

- Please coordinate with the Bureau of Street and Mapping, Public Works department, on the temporary and long-term placement of the food trucks that currently park on Front Street.

Transformer Vault location

- SDAT recommend that any transformer vaults be located along mid-block open space frontage, to minimize their impact on street frontage. See additional comments on transformer vaults below.

STANDARD SDAT COMMENTS

Landscaping, Street Trees and Site Furnishings in the Public Sidewalk

- All landscaping, street trees, site furniture, and special paving should be consistent with guidelines in the Better Streets Plan (BSP). See www.sfbetterstreets.org.
- Per SFMTA standards, trees shall not be placed within 25 feet of intersections, to enhance pedestrian visibility and safety.
- Per SFPUC standards, new trees shall not be placed within 5 feet of water facilities, including water mains and water service laterals.
- Any proposed new, removed, or relocated street trees and/or landscaping within the public sidewalk may require a permit from SF Public Works Bureau of Urban Forestry (BUF). For additional information visit http://www.sfdpw.org/trees or call 415-554-6700.

Plan Specifications

- Please include the following dimensions in future plan submittals: Existing and proposed sidewalk widths, proposed street tree species, adjacent ROW widths, curb radii, bulb-out dimensions, etc.

Street trees and landscaping in the public sidewalk

- Any proposed new, removed, or relocated street trees and/or landscaping within the public sidewalk may require a permit from SF Public Works Bureau of Urban Forestry (BUF). For additional information visit http://www.sfdpw.org/trees or call 415-554-6700.

Electrical Transformer Room

- If a new electrical power transformer is required by PG&E to provide power to the building, please show the location of the transformer room on the plans. SF Public Works typically does
not permit new transformer vaults in the public right-of-way. If an exception is requested, a Vault Permit from SF Public Works Bureau of Street Use & Mapping (BSM) will be required.

**Street Improvements (construction within the public right-of-way)**
- Infrastructure improvements within the public right-of-way will require a Street Improvement Permit from SF Public Works Bureau of Street Use & Mapping (BSM) and Street Improvement Plans. Depending on the scope of work the Plans should include the following plan sheets: Civil (grading, layout, utility erosion control, etc.), Landscaping (planting, irrigation, etc.), Electrical (lighting, photometrics, conduit, etc.), Joint Trench (power, telephone, and communication approved by the respective utility companies). Additional permits may be required. Visit [http://www.sfdpw.org/permits-0](http://www.sfdpw.org/permits-0) for additional information or call 415-554-5810.

**Encroachments into the Public Right-of-Way**
- SF Public Works discourages any new encroachments into the public right-of-way. If new encroachments are proposed, show them on the plans. Examples of encroachments are: steps, warped driveways with diverters/planters, fire department connections (FDC), out swinging doors, bollards, etc. For new building construction, the Building Code does not allow building encroachments unless a variance to the Building Code is allowed by the DBI. If a variance is approved, a Minor Sidewalk Encroachment Permit (MSE) or other encroachment permit will be required from BSM. Some permits require public notification and an annual assessment fee may be applied.

**Modified Curb Lines (widened or narrowed sidewalk and corner bulbouts)**
- Per guidelines established in the San Francisco Better Streets Plan the tangent of the curb return on a corner bulbout should start a minimum of 5’ beyond the property line.
- To ensure that bulbouts are sweepable with standard City street sweeper equipment, bulbout curb returns shall conform to SF Public Works’ Standard Plan for Curb Bulbs. See [http://www.sfbetterstreets.org/find-project-types/pedestrian-safety-and-traffic-calming/traffic-calming-overview/curb-extensions/#codes_docs](http://www.sfbetterstreets.org/find-project-types/pedestrian-safety-and-traffic-calming/traffic-calming-overview/curb-extensions/#codes_docs)
- Modification of the curb line will require Sidewalk Legislation, contact BSM Mapping/Subdivision Section. It is strongly encouraged that a sidewalk legislation package is submitted at the time a Street Improvement Permit application is submitted since the permit will not be approved until the Sidewalk Legislation is approved, which can take a minimum of 6-12 months for approval.

For SF Public Works permit information visit [http://www.sfdpw.org/permits-0](http://www.sfdpw.org/permits-0) or call 415-554-5810.

**SFPUC- Water**
- A hydraulic analysis will be required to confirm the adequacy of the water distribution system for proposed new potable, non-potable and fire water services. If the current distribution system pressures and flows are inadequate, the Project Sponsor will be responsible for any
capital improvements required to meet the proposed project’s water demands. To initiate this process, please contact the SFPUC Customer Service Bureau at 415-551-2900.

- The project sponsor will be required to design all applicable water facilities, including potable, fire-suppression, and non-potable water systems, to conform to the current SFPUC City Distribution Division (CDD) and San Francisco Fire Department (SFFD) standards and practices. These include, but are not limited to, the following:
  - SFPUC- CDD Protection of Existing Water and AWSS Facilities;
  - SFPUC Standards for the Protection of Water and Wastewater Assets;
  - Rules and Regulations Governing Water Service to Customers;
  - SFPUC- CDD Design Criteria for Potable Water Systems;
  - Application for Water Supply and Responsibility of Applicants;
  - San Francisco Fire Code and Reliability;
  - California Waterworks Standards; California Code of Regulations Titles 17 and 22

For questions please contact cddengineering@sfwater.org.

REFERENCES

Please refer to the following design guidelines when revising the project’s design.

BSP Street Furnishings Guidelines:
http://www.sfbetterstreets.org/find-project-types/streetscape-elements/street-furniture-overview/

BSP Guidelines for Special Paving in the Furniture Zone:
http://www.sfbetterstreets.org/find-project-types/streetscape-elements/sidewalk_paving/

BSP Sidewalk Landscaping Guidelines:

San Francisco’s Water Sewer, and Stormwater Requirements