DATE: August 31, 2016
TO: Craig Hamburg, DDG 235 Valencia Realty LLC
FROM: Wade Wietgrefe, Planning Department
RE: PPA Case No. 2016-007877PPA for 235 Valencia Street

Please find attached the Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) for the address listed above. You may contact the staff contact, Elizabeth Purl, at (415) 575-9028 or elizabeth.purl@sfgov.org, to answer any questions you may have, or to schedule a follow-up meeting.

Wade Wietgrefe, Senior Planner
Preliminary Project Assessment

Date: August 31, 2016
Case No.: 2016-007877PPA
Project Address: 235 Valencia Street
Block/Lot: 3532/019B
Zoning: NCT-3 - Moderate Scale Neighborhood Commercial Transit District 50-X Height and Bulk District
Area Plan: Market and Octavia
Project Sponsor: Craig Hamburg – DDG 235 Valencia Realty LLC
415-692-5054
Staff Contact: Elizabeth Purl – 415-575-9028
elizabeth.purl@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 June 13, 2016, as summarized below. This PPA letter identifies Planning Department review requirements for the proposed project, including those related to environmental review, approvals, neighborhood notification and public outreach, the Planning Code, project design, and other general issues of concern for the project. Please be advised that the PPA application does not constitute an application for development with the Planning Department. The PPA letter also does not represent a complete review of the proposed project, does not grant a project approval of any kind, and does not in any way supersede any required Planning Department approvals listed below.

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

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The project site is located at the southeast corner of Valencia and Clinton Park streets, on a block bounded by Duboce Avenue to the north, Mission Street to the east, 14th Street to the south, and Valencia Street to the west. The block is partially or fully bisected by two north-south streets, Stevenson and Woodward, and one east-west street, Clinton Park. The project site has frontage along Valencia, Clinton Park, and Stevenson streets. The site consists of a single parcel (3532/019B) with an area of 9,000 square feet (sf), developed with a one-story, 9,210-sf commercial building that covers the entire lot. The existing building
was constructed in 1924 and is currently vacant; it was formerly used as a motorcycle shop and was most recently occupied by an automobile repair shop. Vehicle access is via curb cuts on Valencia and Clinton Park streets.

The proposed project would demolish the existing building and construct a new five-story, 55-foot-tall mixed-use building with 50 dwelling units and 5,479 sf of ground-floor retail space. The proposed project would include 51 Class 1 bicycle parking spaces and five Class 2 spaces. No motor vehicle parking is proposed. Soil would be excavated to approximately 2 to 4 feet below grade and a mat slab foundation would be used. Open space would be provided through a combination of a 3,800-sf common roof deck and private terraces at the third, fourth, and fifth floors. The proposed project also includes improvements to Clinton Park Street, including seating and landscaping, to create a “Living Alley.”

BACKGROUND:

The project site is located within the Market and Octavia Area Plan, which was evaluated in the Market and Octavia Area Plan Programmatic Final Environmental Impact Report (Market and Octavia PEIR). On April 5, 2007, the Planning Commission certified the Market and Octavia PEIR for the Market and Octavia Area Plan by Motion 17406.¹ The certification of the PEIR was upheld on appeal to the Board of Supervisors at a public hearing on June 19, 2007. Subsequent to the certification of the PEIR, on May 30, 2008, the Board of Supervisors approved, and the Mayor signed into law, amendments to the Planning Code, Zoning Maps, and General Plan.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:

Community Plan Exemption

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

As discussed above, the proposed project is located within the Market and Octavia Area Plan, which was evaluated in the Market and Octavia PEIR. If the proposed project is consistent with the development density identified in the area plan, including as it relates to height, it would be eligible for a community plan exemption (CPE). Please note that a CPE is a type of exemption from environmental review, and cannot be modified to reflect changes to a project after approval. Proposed increases beyond the CPE project description in project size or intensity after project approval will require reconsideration of environmental impacts and issuance of a new CEQA determination.

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

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

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

3. **Focused EIR.** If any new site- or project-specific significant impacts cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level, then a focused EIR is prepared to address these impacts, and a supporting CPE checklist is prepared to address all other impacts that were encompassed by the *Market and Octavia PEIR*, with all pertinent mitigation measures and CEQA findings from the *Market and Octavia PEIR* also applied to the proposed project. With this outcome, the applicable fees are: (a) the CPE determination fee (currently $14,017); (b) the standard environmental evaluation fee (which is based on construction value); and (c) one-half of the standard EIR fee (which is also based on construction value). An EIR must be prepared by an environmental consultant from the Planning Department’s environmental consultant pool ([http://sf-planning.org/environmental-consultant-pool](http://sf-planning.org/environmental-consultant-pool)). The Planning Department will provide more detail to the project sponsor regarding the EIR process should this level of environmental review be required.

Formal environmental review begins with Planning Department review of the Environmental Evaluation Application (EEA) filed by the project sponsor. An EEA was submitted with the PPA application on June 13, 2016.

The environmental review may be done in conjunction with the required approvals listed below, but must be completed before any project approval may be granted. **Note that until an entitlement application is submitted to the Current Planning Division, only the proposed project description will be reviewed by the assigned Environmental Coordinator.** EEA s are available in the Planning Department lobby at 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, at the Planning Information Center at 1660 Mission Street, and online at [www.sfplanning.org](http://www.sfplanning.org) under the “Publications” tab. See “Environmental Applications” on page 2 of the current Fee Schedule for a calculation of environmental application fees. In addition, please see page 4 of the Fee Schedule for monitoring fees applicable to projects that require active monitoring of mitigation measures.

---

A detailed and accurate description of the proposed project is essential for adequate environmental review. Please update the EEA project description as necessary to reflect feedback provided in this PPA letter, and include any additional documents requested. Furthermore, please show the proposed transformer vault location and, as there is no driveway curb cut or vehicle access provided, clarify how trash will be removed from the site. You may provide the required information and documents as supplements to the EEA on file.

Below is a list of topic areas addressed through the environmental review process. Based on a preliminary review of the project as it is proposed in the PPA application, some of these topics will require additional study.

1. **Historic Resources.** The project proposes alteration of an age-eligible building located in the Inner Mission North Historic Resources Survey Area. The property was found not to be a historic resource based on visual inspection and was given a status code of 6L in the survey, indicating that it is ineligible for local listing or designation through a local government review process but may warrant special consideration in local planning. Since the completion of the survey in 2011, new information has been uncovered that associates the building with motorcycling culture and Hap Jones (1905-1989), a motorcycle dealer and racer. Based on the new information received, Jones appears to have been an important figure in motorcycling and played a role in the development of motorcycling in San Francisco and the Bay Area. The Historic Preservation Commission has adopted a motion of intent to change the status code of the subject building from 6L to 3CS, indicating that it appears eligible for the California Register of Historical Resources as an individual property identified through survey evaluation. A decision on the status code change has been continued to October 19, 2016. Due to this new information, further research will be required and the proposed project is subject to review by the Department’s Historic Preservation staff. To assist in this review, the project sponsor must hire a qualified professional to prepare a Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE) report. The qualified professional must be selected from the Planning Department’s Historic Resource Consultant Pool. Please contact Tina Tam, Senior Preservation Planner, via email (tina.tam@sfgov.org) for a list of three consultants from which to choose. The selected consultant must prepare the scope of the HRE in consultation with Department Historic Preservation staff. Please contact the HRE scoping team at HRE@sfgov.org to arrange the HRE scoping. Following an approved scope, the historic resource consultant should submit the draft HRE report for review to Environmental Planning after the project sponsor has filed the EEA and updated it as necessary to reflect feedback received in the PPA letter. The HRE should be submitted directly to the Department and copied to the project sponsor. Project sponsors should not receive or review advance drafts of consultant reports per the Environmental Review Guidelines. Historic Preservation staff will not begin reviewing your project until a complete HRE is received.

2. **Archeological Resources.** Project implementation would entail soil-disturbing activities associated with building construction, including excavation that would reach a depth of approximately 2 to 4 feet below grade. Due to its location in an area with a high potential for archeological resources to be present, the proposed project will require Preliminary Archeological Review (PAR) by a Planning Department archeologist. 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. 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 Planning 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 project mitigation measures (such as archeological testing, monitoring, or accidental discovery), or other appropriate measures.

3. **Transportation.** Based on the PPA submittal, a transportation impact study is not anticipated; an official determination will be made subsequent to submittal of the EEA. However, the project site is located on a high injury corridor as mapped by Vision Zero. Planning staff have reviewed the proposed site plans and prepared recommendations relating to the proposed “Living Alley” on Clinton Park Street and other potential streetscape improvements, including recommendations that address the safety of persons walking and bicycling to and from the project site and vicinity. See the discussion under “Streetscape and Public Realm Improvements” below for preliminary recommendations.

**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 Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program. The intent of the proposed TDM Program is to reduce vehicle miles traveled and to make it easier for people to get around by sustainable travel modes such as transit, walking, and biking.

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

The proposed project includes 50 dwelling units, and thus would be subject to the proposed TDM Program. The project does not propose to provide any parking for the residential use, and would therefore be required to meet or exceed the base target of 13 points for land use Category C (residential uses). However, because it includes no parking, the project as proposed would achieve

---

most of this target. The Planning Code would currently require the project, as described in the PPA, to provide the following TDM measure:

- Bicycle Parking (Planning Code Section 155.2; TDM Menu ACTIVE-2 – option a)

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

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

5. **Air Quality.** The proposed 50 residential units do not exceed the Bay Area Air Quality Management District’s (BAAQMD) construction screening levels for criteria air pollutants.⁴ Therefore, an analysis of the project’s criteria air pollutant emissions is not likely to be required. However, detailed information related to the volume of excavation should be provided as part of the revised EEA.

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

The project site is also located within an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone, as mapped and defined by Health Code Article 38. The Air Pollutant Exposure Zone identifies areas with poor air quality based on modeling of air pollution, exposures, and health vulnerability from mobile, stationary, and area source emissions within San Francisco. The project proposes to construct new sensitive land uses (i.e., residential), which are subject to enhanced ventilation measures pursuant to Health Code Article 38. The project sponsor will be required to submit an Article 38 application to DPH prior to the issuance of any environmental determination. Please provide a copy of the Article 38 application with the EEA.⁵ In addition, equipment exhaust measures during construction, such as those listed in *Market and Octavia PEIR* Mitigation Measure E2, Construction Mitigation Measure for Short-Term Exhaust Emissions, will likely be required.

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

---

⁵ Refer to [http://www.sfdpd.org/dph/eh/Air/default.asp](http://www.sfdpd.org/dph/eh/Air/default.asp) for more information.
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.

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

7. **Wind.** The proposed project would not involve construction of a building over 80 feet in height. Therefore, a consultant-prepared wind analysis is not required. However, the proposed project would be subject to *Market and Octavia PEIR Mitigation Measure B2, All New Construction,* which applies to all new construction and requires shaping or using wind baffling measures such that the development does not cause year-round ground-level wind currents to exceed more than 10 percent of the time, between 7 am and 6 pm, the comfort levels of 7 or 11 miles per hour equivalent wind speeds in public seating or pedestrian use areas, respectively.

8. **Shadow.** The proposed project would result in construction of a building greater than 40 feet in height. A preliminary shadow fan prepared by Planning Department staff indicates that the project would not cast new shadow on recreational resources. Therefore, no shadow study is required. The shadow fan is included as an attachment to this PPA letter.

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 revised 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 required 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 archeologists of the project site’s subsurface geological conditions.

---


10. **Hazardous Materials.** The proposed project would result in more than 50 cubic yards of excavation and is located in an area designated as being in the Maher Zone. 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 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.


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

Additionally, as mentioned above under Air Quality, the project will be required to adhere to the dust control requirements in the Construction Dust Control Ordinance, which would ensure that construction dust impacts would not be significant through the reduction in the quantity of fugitive dust generated during demolition, site preparation, and construction work in order to protect the health of the general public and of on-site workers.

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

**PLANNING DEPARTMENT APPROVALS:**

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

1. A **Building Permit Application** is required for the demolition of the building on the subject lot.

2. A **Building Permit Application** is required for the proposed new construction on the subject lot.

Building Permit Applications are available at the Department of Building Inspection at 1660 Mission Street.

**NEIGHBORHOOD NOTIFICATIONS AND PUBLIC OUTREACH:**

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

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

**Neighborhood Notification.** Planning Code Section 312 requires Neighborhood Notification for all building permit applications for new construction.

**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.
Market and Octavia Area Plan

1. Market and Octavia Area Plan. The subject property falls within the area covered by the Market and Octavia Area Plan in the General Plan. As proposed, the project is generally consistent with the overarching objectives of the Plan, although the project and design comments below discuss items where more information is needed to assess conformity with either specific policies or Code standards, or where the project requires minor modification to achieve consistency. The project sponsor is encouraged to read the full plan, which can be viewed at http://sf-planning.org/market-octavia-area-plan.

2. Living Alleys. The Market and Octavia Area Plan encourages the creation of “Living Alleys” on residential alleys in order to provide shared, multi-purpose space for the use of residents. When designing the Clinton Park streetscape frontage, the project sponsor is encouraged to consider treatments that incorporate living alley improvements and design strategies such as those described in the Living Alleys Toolkit, which can be found here: http://sf-planning.org/living-alleys-toolkit. Also see the comments under “Streetscape and Public Realm Improvements” below.

3. Option for In-Kind Provision of Community Improvements and Fee Credits. Project sponsors may propose to provide community improvements directly to the City. In such a case, the City may enter into an In-Kind Improvements Agreement with the sponsor and issue a fee waiver for the Market and Octavia Area Plan Impact Fee from the Planning Commission, for an amount equivalent to the value of the improvements. All proposed in-kind improvements will need to be reviewed and endorsed by the Market Octavia Community Advisory Committee. Any proposed in-kind improvements must go above and beyond baseline streetscape and pedestrian improvements required by Planning Code Sec. 138.1. Required streetscape and pedestrian improvements are not eligible for in-kind fee credit.

More information on in-kind agreements can be found in the Application Packet for In-Kind Agreement on the Planning Department website at: http://sf-planning.org/sites/default/files/FileCenter/Documents/8601-In-Kind%20Agreement%20Application.pdf.

4. Living Alleys Community Challenge Grant. As an alternative to the in-kind agreement option, the project sponsor may also wish to work with neighbors and community groups to explore the Community Challenge Grant (CCG) program as a source of funding specifically for a Living Alley improvement on Clinton Park. This program is operated through the Office of the City Administrator and offers grants of up to $200,000 for proposed improvements to alleys in the Market and Octavia Plan Area that fulfill the objectives of the Living Alley program to provide a pedestrianized environment that supports community activation. CCG proposals must come from a community organization or group of neighbors or business owners and have a non-profit fiscal sponsor. Project sponsors can play an important role in a CCG proposal by offering to provide the required matching funds, architectural or design support, or stewardship strategies. See more on the Living Alleys CCG program here: http://sfgov.org/ccg/documents.

5. Market and Octavia Community Improvement Fund. The project is subject to the Market and Octavia Community Improvement Fund. Fees will be calculated and collected prior to issuance of the
first construction document, with the option to defer payment to prior to issuance of the first certificate of occupancy. Current fees can be found in the San Francisco Citywide Development Impact Fee Register maintained by DBI.

6. **Market and Octavia Affordable Housing Fees.** The Market and Octavia Affordable Housing Fee applies to the Project Area. Per Section 416 of the Code, the project requires payment per net new gross square foot of residential development. The fee must be paid before the City issues a first construction document, with an option for the project sponsor to defer payment to prior to issuance of the first certificate of occupancy upon agreeing to pay a deferral surcharge in accordance with Section 107A.13.3 of the San Francisco Building Code.

7. **Mission 2015 Interim Policy.** The subject property falls within the area of the Mission 2015 Interim Policy adopted on August 6, 2015 that applies to certain permit applications during the development of the Mission Action Plan (MAP) 2020. The interim policy is a Planning Commission policy statement giving close scrutiny to projects that displace commercial and residential tenants and remove existing housing units, and encouraging projects to retain existing tenants and uses and providing high affordability within projects. The area to which the interim policy applies is generally defined as the Mission Neighborhood. For more information on the policy please visit: [http://50.17.237.182/docs/PlanningProvisions/R-19428%20Interim%20Policy%20Resolution.pdf](http://50.17.237.182/docs/PlanningProvisions/R-19428%20Interim%20Policy%20Resolution.pdf).

**Streetscape Requirements**

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

Under the Better Streets Plan, Valencia Street is classified as a Commercial Throughway, with a recommended sidewalk width of 15 feet, and Clinton Park and Stevenson streets are classified as Alleys, with a recommended sidewalk width of 9 feet or greater.

9. **Vision Zero.** As noted in the “Transportation” discussion above, the project is located on a high-injury corridor, identified through the City’s Vision Zero Program as part of the High Injury Network for cyclists. All plans should prioritize improving safety for all users along this corridor, and the sponsor is encouraged to incorporate pedestrian safety streetscape measures into the project. The
project is required to submit a Streetscape Plan per Section 138.1 of the Planning Code, as described above.

10. **Street Trees.** Planning Code Section 138.1(c)(1) requires one street tree for every 20 feet of street frontage for new construction. With approximately 280 feet of street frontage along Valencia Street, Clinton Park and Stevenson Street, approximately 14 street trees would be required. Additionally, per SFMTA standards, trees shall not be placed within 25 feet of intersections, to enhance pedestrian visibility and safety. All landscaping, street trees, site furniture, and special paving should be consistent with guidelines in the Better Streets Plan ([http://www.sfbetterstreets.org/](http://www.sfbetterstreets.org/)). See additional recommendations under “Streetscape and Public Realm Improvements” below.

**Other Code Considerations**

11. **Street Frontages in Commercial Districts.** Planning Code Section 145.1 outlines requirements for development lots to promote street frontages that are pedestrian-oriented, fine-grained, and appropriate to and compatible with the buildings and uses in NC Districts. The following controls apply to the proposed project:

   - **Active Use.** Active uses shall be provided within the first 25 feet of building depth on the ground floor and 15 feet on floors above from any facade facing a street at least 30 feet in width. Building lobbies are considered active uses so long as they do not exceed 40 feet or 25 percent of building frontage, whichever is larger. The storage of goods or vehicles is not considered an active use. The bicycle parking on Stevenson Street frontage would not meet this requirement for active use. Please move the location of the bicycle parking to the center of the lot and provide access to the street through a lobby.

   - **Ground Floor Ceiling Height.** Ground floor non-residential uses in all NCT districts shall have a minimum floor-to-floor height of 14 feet, as measured from grade. Commercial Unit B has a floor to floor height of 12 feet 7 inches. The Zoning Data and Calculations table submitted with the PPA application indicates that the project intends to apply for a variance from the ground floor ceiling height requirement. The findings required for a variance may be difficult to meet for new construction; the Department encourages the design of a code-compliant project. Please revise the project plans to provide a code-complying ground floor ceiling height for the non-residential uses.

   - **Transparency and Fenestration.** Frontages with active uses that are not residential or production, distribution, and repair must be fenestrated with transparent windows and doorways for no less than 60 percent of the street frontage at the ground level that allow visibility to the inside of the building. The project appears to meet this requirement.

12. **Additional Height Limits for Narrow Streets and Alleys in NC Districts.** Planning Code Section 261.1 requires setbacks on Narrow Streets, as defined by the Code. Both Clinton Park and Stevenson streets are Narrow Streets. All subject frontages on the southerly side of an east-west Narrow Street, such as Clinton Park Street, must have upper stories set back at the property line such that they avoid penetration of a sun access plane defined by an angle of 45 degrees extending from the most directly
opposite northerly property line. Along Stevenson Street, the frontage requires a setback of at least 10 feet at the property line above a height equivalent to 1.25 times the width of the abutting Narrow Street. The width of Stevenson Street is 40 feet; therefore, a 10-foot setback from the eastern property line is required at approximately 50 feet in height. Please ensure the project meets these requirements. Variances and exceptions from these height limitation may not be granted.

13. **Special Height Exception.** Planning Code Section 263.20 allows for an additional five feet of height for active ground floor uses in NCT districts. One additional foot of height, up to a total of five feet, shall be permitted above the designated height limit for each additional foot of ground floor clear ceiling height in excess of 10 feet from sidewalk grade. Per Section 263.20(b)(4), the special height exception applies only to a ground floor commercial space, active use, or walk-up residential use that is primarily oriented along a right-of-way wider than 40 feet. Clinton Park and Stevenson streets are both Narrow Streets as defined in Planning Code Section 261.1; therefore, the special height exception may only apply to the active use oriented towards Valencia Street, which is 82.5 feet wide. Currently the entirety of the project is proposed at a height of 55 feet. The Zoning Data and Calculations table submitted with the PPA application indicates that the project intends to apply for a variance from the height standards. Height requirements cannot be varied; therefore, please revise the project to lower the height of the portions of the building subject to the Narrow Street provisions.

14. **Rear Yard.** Section 134 requires the project to provide a rear yard of at least 25 percent of the lot depth. In the NCT-3 Zoning District, the rear yard must be provided at the lowest story containing a Dwelling Unit and at each succeeding level or story of the building. Because this project is located on a corner site, one of the street frontages must be designated as the front of the property, and the rear yard would then be provided based on that determination. In the NC zoning districts, the rear yard may be modified or waived by the Zoning Administrator pursuant to the procedures applicable to variances, as set forth in Sections 306.1 through 306.5 and 308.2. On a corner lot or on a lot at the intersection of a street and an alley of at least 25 feet in width, the required rear yard may be substituted with an open area equal to 25 percent of the lot area which is located at the same levels as the required rear yard in an interior corner of the lot, an open area between two or more buildings on the lot, or an inner court, provided that the Zoning Administrator determines that all of the respective criteria of Section 134(e) are met. As proposed, the project does not provide a compliant rear yard at the first level containing a dwelling unit. Please revise the project to provide a code-compliant rear yard.

15. **Exposure.** Section 140 requires that in each dwelling unit at least one room that meets the 120-sf minimum superficial floor area requirement of Section 503 of the Housing Code must face directly on a street right-of-way, code-complying rear yard, or an appropriately sized courtyard. The proposed rear yard is not code-complying and does not provide a large enough courtyard to meet the exposure requirement. However, each unit appears to have qualifying windows that face onto the adjacent street right-of-way to meet the minimum exposure requirement.

16. **Bicycle Parking.** The total required bicycle parking for a building containing a mix of uses is the sum of the bicycle parking calculated for each use individually, per Planning Code 155.2. For dwelling units, one Class 1 bicycle parking space is required per dwelling unit and one Class 2 bicycle parking spaces is required for every 20 dwelling units. For commercial uses, one Class 1 bicycle parking space
is required for each 7,500 sf of occupied floor area and a minimum of two Class 2 bicycle parking spaces are required, or one per 2,500 sf, whichever is greater. The project appears to comply with the bicycle parking requirements by providing 51 Class 1 and 6 Class 2 bicycle parking spaces.

17. **Inclusionary Affordable Housing.** Inclusionary Affordable Housing is required for a project proposing ten or more dwelling units. The project sponsor must submit an “Affidavit of Compliance with the Inclusionary Affordable Housing Program: Planning Code Section 415” to the Planning Department identifying the method of compliance, whether through on-site or off-site affordable units or through payment of an affordable housing fee. The following Inclusionary Affordable Housing requirements are in effect as of the time of issuance of this letter. In the event that the requirements change, the project sponsor shall comply with requirements in place at the time of the issuance of the first construction document. Any on-site affordable dwelling-units proposed as part of the project must be designated as owner-occupied units, not rental units, unless an exception agreement to the Costa Hawkins Rental Housing Act (a Costa Hawkins exception) is secured by the project sponsor. Affordable units designated as on-site units shall be affordable units for the life of the project. The applicable percentage is dependent on the number of units in the project, the zoning of the property, and the date that the EEA is deemed complete. The EEA will require revisions, including those outlined in this PPA letter, and thus a complete EEA has not been submitted; therefore, pursuant to Planning Code Section 415.3 and 415.6, the Inclusionary Affordable Housing Program requirement for the On-site Affordable Housing Alternative is to provide 25 percent of the proposed dwelling units as affordable with a minimum of 15 percent of the units affordable to low-income households and the remaining 10 percent of the units affordable to low- or moderate/middle-income households, as defined by the Planning Code and Procedures Manual.

If a project proposes rental units, it may be eligible for an On-site Alternative to the Affordable Housing Fee if the project sponsor has demonstrated to the Planning Department that the affordable units are either: 1) ownership only or 2) not subject to the Costa Hawkins Rental Housing Act. 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; or**
- a 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.

18. **Stormwater.** Because the project would result 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.

Additional Coordination

19. Interdepartmental Project Review. This review is required for all proposed new construction in seismic hazard zones. Please download the application from the Department’s website and schedule an interdepartmental project review prior to the Planning Commission Hearing.

20. Noise Regulations Relating to Residential Uses Near Places of Entertainment (POE). New residential development within 300 feet of a POE must go through an Entertainment Commission outreach process (Ordinance Number 070-015). In addition, new residential development will also be required to record a Notice of Special Restrictions on the site. The subject site is located within 300 feet of an existing POE. Please note that the Planning Department will not consider an entitlement application complete until the following are completed:

- The Entertainment Commission has provided written notification to the Planning Department indicating that it either did not wish to hold a hearing, or that it held a hearing and the project sponsor attended; and

- The project sponsor has included a copy of any comments and/or recommendations provided by the Entertainment Commission regarding the proposed Project as well as the date(s) when those comments were provided. This shall be done as an additional sheet in any plan set submitted to the Planning Department and as an attachment in an entitlement application.

You may contact Entertainment Commission staff at (415) 554-6678 or visit their webpage at http://www.sfgov2.org/index.aspx?page=338 for additional information regarding the outreach process.

21. First Source Hiring Agreement. A First Source Hiring Agreement is required for any project proposing to construct 10 residential unit 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
Development Impact Fees


Based on an initial review of the proposed project, the following impact fees, which are assessed by the Planning Department, will be required:

- Transportation Sustainability Fee (formerly Transit Impact Development Fee) (Planning Code Section 411A)
- Child-Care Residential (Planning Code Section 414A)
- Market and Octavia Affordable Housing Fee (Planning Code Section 416)
- Market and Octavia Community Improvement Fund (Planning Code Section 421)

PRELIMINARY DESIGN COMMENTS:

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

Architecture and Building Massing

1. Site Design, Massing, Open Space. The Planning Department requests that the project sponsor and design team reconsider the massing strategy on the site. While we appreciate the intention of the project to present a stronger street wall and the challenge of providing a compliant rear yard where there is no expectation of future mid-block open space, the sun access plane and rear yard and open space requirements might be better combined to create a more compliant project that meets the Planning Code’s urban design goals.

The Department recommends that the equivalent square footage of the required rear yard be reallocated as a courtyard towards the Clinton Park side beginning at the first residential level. It could begin past the 60 feet of the Valencia Street frontage and be bracketed by a reciprocal sun-angle-shaped massing along the Stevenson Street end. This "C" shape would provide a courtyard open to the street that would accommodate open space, light, and exposure to the residential units and the tall ground floor and end masses that would establish and define the streetwall.

2. Street Frontage. The Department’s Urban Design Advisory Team acknowledges that the height variance would have a minor impact on the ground floor, given that the retail is spacious and actively programmed for the scale of the site.
3. **Architecture.** The Planning Department appreciates the articulated facade that gives significant sense of depth and visual interest. However, we recommend that the bays be adjusted to more clearly indicate that they have been added to the base wall rather than simply attached as if they were inflections of a faceted surface. With information known at this time, Planning Department Preservation staff have assessed that there is no need or desire to preserve, include, or reference the existing building in the new proposal; the project should assert its own design intent and merits. The project team should work with Preservation staff through the development review process for other ways that the site can acknowledge its past cultural importance.

**Streetscape and Public Realm Improvements**

Projects that are required to submit Streetscape Plans pursuant to the Better Streets Plan, as discussed above, are reviewed by the City’s Interdepartmental Street Design Advisory Team (SDAT). SDAT is composed of representatives from the Planning Department, Public Works, SFMTA, and SFPUC. SDAT provides design review and guidance to private developments working within the City’s public right-of-way. SDAT considered the proposed 235 Valencia Street project on July 18th, 2016. Please see the resulting recommendations below, as well as the annotated site plan included with the attached SDAT comments.

4. **Improvements to Clinton Park Street.** The Planning Department applauds the sponsor for proposing pedestrian and landscape features on Clinton Park Street. However, the Department wishes to clarify that the project is not proposing parklets on Clinton Park Street. Parklets are temporary structures within a parking stall (see [www.parklets.org](http://www.parklets.org)). The project is proposing parking lane planters, which involve permanent curb line modifications. The Department agrees that a Living Alley is an excellent vision for Clinton Park Street and would like to see this concept extended as follows:

- The Department recommends two extended corner bulbouts on Valencia Street and Clinton Park Street. Please ensure the required turning radius can be met. See: [http://www.sfbetterstreets.org/design-guidelines/street-types/shared-public-ways/](http://www.sfbetterstreets.org/design-guidelines/street-types/shared-public-ways/).

- The design submitted at the PPA phase should be modified to consolidate bulbouts into two bulbouts with a central loading space that is wide enough to accommodate 3 parking spaces (approximately 60 feet). In lieu of required sidewalk widening on Valencia Street, construct a bulbout along the Valencia Street frontage. This bulbout should extend about 1 parking space (approximately 20 feet) beyond the property line.

5. **Raised Crosswalk.** Consider a raised crosswalk at Valencia Street and Clinton Park Street.

6. **Consider Undergrounding Utilities.** SDAT also encourages the sponsor to underground utilities to enhance the pedestrian environment.

**PRELIMINARY PROJECT ASSESSMENT EXPIRATION:**

This Preliminary Project Assessment is valid for a period of **18 months**. An Environmental Evaluation and/or Conditional Use Authorization, as listed above, must be submitted no later than **March 9, 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.

Enclosures:   Neighborhood Group Mailing List  
             Preliminary Shadow Fan Analysis  
             SDAT comments  

cc: Ella Samonsky, Current Planning  
     Paula Chiu, Citywide Planning and Analysis  
     Maia Small, Design Review  
     Charles Rivasplata, SFMTA  
     Jerry Sanguinetti, Public Works  
     Pauline Perkins, SFPUC  
     Planning Department Webmaster (planning.webmaster@sfgov.org)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIRST NAME</th>
<th>LAST NAME</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>Antonio</td>
<td>Diaz</td>
<td>Project Director</td>
<td>People Organizing to Demand Environmental and Economic Rights (PODER)</td>
<td>474 Valencia Street #125</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>415-431-4210</td>
<td>poder sf.org</td>
<td>Excelsior, Mission, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brent</td>
<td>Plater</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>474 Valencia Street Suite 295</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>0</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bplater@po.deque.org">bplater@po.deque.org</a></td>
<td>Bayview, Bernal Heights, Glen Park, Golden Gate Park, Lakeshore, Mission, Outer Sunset, Presidio, Seacrest, Twin Peaks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddy</td>
<td>Campos</td>
<td>President, Supervisor, District 9</td>
<td>Coleridge St. Neighbors Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>157 Coleridge Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94110</td>
<td>415-282-2900</td>
<td><a href="mailto:choydate@gmail.com">choydate@gmail.com</a>, davi <a href="mailto:Campos@sgf.org">Campos@sgf.org</a>, <a href="mailto:Hillary.Ronen@sgf.org">Hillary.Ronen@sgf.org</a>, <a href="mailto:Nate.Albee@sgf.org">Nate.Albee@sgf.org</a>, <a href="mailto:Carolyne.Gossain@sgf.org">Carolyne.Gossain@sgf.org</a></td>
<td>Bernal Heights, Mission, Noe Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>Stiel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2887 Polk Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94110</td>
<td>415-282-5393</td>
<td><a href="mailto:eddie.stiel@yahoo.com">eddie.stiel@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erik</td>
<td>Lopez</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>SouthBayBend Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>1005 A Hampshire Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94110</td>
<td>415-323-8939</td>
<td><a href="mailto:elroi4110@gmail.com">elroi4110@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Downtown/Civic Center, Mission, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian</td>
<td>Lewis</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 HERE Local 2</td>
<td>209 Golden Gate Avenue</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>Henderson</td>
<td>Vice Chairmain</td>
<td>Market/Octavia Community Advisory Commit.</td>
<td>300 Buchanan Street, Apt. 503</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-722-0617</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jhenders@abcglobal.net">jhenders@abcglobal.net</a></td>
<td>Mission, Potrero Hill, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff</td>
<td>Parker</td>
<td>Steering Committee Member</td>
<td>Friends of Upper Doglass Dog Park</td>
<td>750 27th Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94131</td>
<td>415-215-1711</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mission, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaime</td>
<td>Whittaker</td>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>SOMA Leadership Council</td>
<td>201 Harrison Street Apt. 229</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94105</td>
<td>415-935-5810</td>
<td><a href="mailto:somajourna@yahoo.com">somajourna@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>Mission, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Berkowitz</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Liberty Hill Resident Association</td>
<td>50 Liberty Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94110</td>
<td>415-695-0990</td>
<td><a href="mailto:vilabarbi@earthlink.com">vilabarbi@earthlink.com</a></td>
<td>Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>Goldstein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>800 Kansas Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94107</td>
<td>0</td>
<td><a href="mailto:keith@everestsf.com">keith@everestsf.com</a></td>
<td>Mission, Potrero Hill, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucia</td>
<td>Bogatay</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
<td>Mission Dolores Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>3676 20th Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94110</td>
<td>415-863-3950</td>
<td><a href="mailto:missiondna@earthlink.net">missiondna@earthlink.net</a>, <a href="mailto:peter@missiondna.org">peter@missiondna.org</a></td>
<td>Excelsior, Mission, Outer Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>Grandada</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Mission Economic Development Association</td>
<td>2301 Mission Street #301</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94110</td>
<td>415-282-3334</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marvis</td>
<td>Phillips</td>
<td>Land Use Chair</td>
<td>Alliance for Better District 6</td>
<td>230 Eddy Street #1206</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102-6526</td>
<td>415-674-1935</td>
<td><a href="mailto:manvisphilips@gmail.com">manvisphilips@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Mission, Downtown/Civic Center, Mission, South of Market, Western Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>Planning and</td>
<td>Chair</td>
<td>Alabama Street Pioneers</td>
<td>1014 Alabama Avenue Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94110</td>
<td>415-826-4854</td>
<td><a href="mailto:atlee@sonic.net">atlee@sonic.net</a></td>
<td>Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Cohen</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>Potro/Noe Street Residents Association</td>
<td>33 Noe Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94114</td>
<td>415-722-0617</td>
<td><a href="mailto:poehrendt@gmail.com">poehrendt@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Mission, Downtown/Civic Center, Mission, South of Market, Western Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil</td>
<td>Lesser</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Mission Merchants Association</td>
<td>555 Laurel Avenue #501</td>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94401</td>
<td>415-979-4171</td>
<td><a href="mailto:podget@nationalhealth.org">podget@nationalhealth.org</a></td>
<td>Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podge</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Site Manager</td>
<td>Native American Health Center</td>
<td>333 Valencia Street, Suite 240</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>415-503-1046</td>
<td>x2714</td>
<td>Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Hernandez</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Valencia Corridor Merchant Association</td>
<td>1333 Florida Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94110</td>
<td>0</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sanan@pa.snto.com">sanan@pa.snto.com</a>, <a href="mailto:joe.rivaranularros@gmail.com">joe.rivaranularros@gmail.com</a>, <a href="mailto:osslorsedted@yahoo.com">osslorsedted@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean</td>
<td>Quigley</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Pacific Fish Factory Market/Octavia Community Advisory Com.</td>
<td>796 Valencia Street, 3rd Floor</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94110</td>
<td>415-935-3641</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pacfishtttelesf@octavia.org">pacfishtttelesf@octavia.org</a>, San Francisco</td>
<td>Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiek</td>
<td>Kahn</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Pacific Fish Factory Market/Octavia Community Advisory Com.</td>
<td>2300 – 20th Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94110</td>
<td>415-407-0094</td>
<td>octavia.com</td>
<td>Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted</td>
<td>Olsson</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>Pacific Fish Factory Market/Octavia Community Advisory Com.</td>
<td>30 Sharon Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94114-1709</td>
<td>415-407-0094</td>
<td>octavia.com</td>
<td>Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna</td>
<td>Twarog</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Potro/Noe Street Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>3641 19th Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94114</td>
<td>415-863-8653</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dtdwoory@gmail.com">dtdwoory@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.R.</td>
<td>Eppler</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Potro/Noe Street Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>1459 – 18th Street, Suite 133</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94107</td>
<td>650-704-7775</td>
<td><a href="mailto:president@potrobooster.org">president@potrobooster.org</a></td>
<td>Mission, Potrero Hill, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeev</td>
<td>Astrachen</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Central 26th Street Neighborhood Coalition</td>
<td>3443 26th Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94114</td>
<td>415-285-3960</td>
<td><a href="mailto:z@interstechoarchitects.com">z@interstechoarchitects.com</a></td>
<td>Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyan</td>
<td>Ruiz</td>
<td>Co-Founder</td>
<td>People Power Media</td>
<td>366 10th Ave</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94118</td>
<td>415-657-6010</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dyan.ruiz@hotmail.com">dyan.ruiz@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>Inner Richmond, Mission, Outer Richmond, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>Rivano Barros</td>
<td>Reporter</td>
<td>Mission Local</td>
<td>2301 Mission Street #104</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94110</td>
<td>415-265-0646</td>
<td><a href="mailto:info@missionlocal.com">info@missionlocal.com</a>, <a href="mailto:joe.rivaranularros@gmail.com">joe.rivaranularros@gmail.com</a>, octavia.com</td>
<td>Bernal Heights, Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gall</td>
<td>Baugh</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Hayes Valley Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>700 Hayes Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-265-0646</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mission, Downtown/Civic Center, Mission, South of Market, Western Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Papadopoulos</td>
<td>Media Coordinator</td>
<td>Cultural Action Network</td>
<td>2940 16th Street, #200-1</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>415-967-0795</td>
<td><a href="mailto:papadopoulos@gmail.com">papadopoulos@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Mission, Potrero Hill, South of Market</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 235 Valencia Street project came to SDAT on July 18th, 2016. Below are the SDAT comments from that meeting.

CONTEXT

Project Description
The project entails the demolition of an existing industrial building and construction of a new 5-story mixed-use commercial building with 50 residential units and 5,479 square feet of commercial space. The project would include 56 bicycle parking spaces and no off-street parking spaces.

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.
• Under the BSP, Valencia Street is classified as a Commercial Throughway, with a recommended sidewalk width of 15’.
• Under the BSP, Stevenson and Clinton Park Streets are classified as Alleys, with a recommended sidewalk width of 6’-9’. The BSP also recommends alleys be converted to Shared Public Ways.

Vision Zero
In 2014, the SFMTA Board joined the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, SF Planning, SFPDH 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, links to all agency resolutions are at the bottom of the page.

• Valencia Street has been designated a Vision Zero Corridor and falls on the Vision Zero High Injury Network for cyclists. 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.

• Valencia Street is identified as a bike lane under the San Francisco Bicycle Plan.

SDAT DESIGN COMMENTS

Improvements to Clinton Park

• SDAT applauds the sponsor for proposing pedestrian and landscape features on Clinton Park Street. However, SDAT wants to clarify that the project is not proposing parklets on Clinton Park Street. Parklets are temporary structures within a parking stall. The project is proposing parking lane platers which involve permanent curb line modifications. SDAT agrees that a living alley is an excellent vision for Clinton Park Street and would like to see this concept extended. Please see our below recommendations:

• In lieu of sidewalk widening on Valencia Street, SDAT recommends a Shared (curbless) Street on Clinton Park Street to help strengthen it as a living alley or SDAT recommends two extended corner bulb-outs on Valencia Street and Clinton Park Street. Please ensure truing radius can be met. See: http://www.sfbetterstreets.org/design-guidelines/street-types/shared-public-ways/

• If a shared street is infeasible at this location, the project sponsor shall modify the existing design proposal as follows.
• Consolidate bulbouts into two bulbs with a central loading space that is wide enough to accommodate 3 car spaces (approx. 60’).
• In lieu of required sidewalk widening on Valencia Street, construct a bulbout along the Valencia Street frontage. This bulbout should extend about 1 parking space (approximately 20’) beyond the property line.

• Consider a raised crosswalk at Valencia Street and Clinton Park Street.
• SDAT also encourages the sponsor to underground utilities to enhance the pedestrian environment.
• Please refer to the attached PDF: 235 Valencia St SDAT redlines.pdf

STANDARD SDAT COMMENTS

Trash Removal
• If there is no driveway curb cut or vehicle access provided, please clarify how trash will be removed from the site.

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.
• 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. Public Works typically does not permit new transformer vaults in the public right-of-way. The project sponsor may request an exception by submitting a Vault Permit from SF Public Works Bureau of Street Use & Mapping (BSM) will be required, however at this time, SDAT does not support locating the transformers within the public right-of-way. The transformer vault should neither be not be sited within the public right-of-way, nor along a prominent active facade. Please relocate the proposed transformer location inside the property line.

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 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 (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
- 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.

**Special (non-standard) projects in the public right-of-way (shared streets)**
- Any modification of the public right-of-way that deviates from SF Public Works Standard Plans and Specifications may require a Major Encroachment Permit (MEP) from the BSM. It is strongly encouraged that the plans for the MEP are complete and all application submittals are promptly submitted to BSM at the time of the Street Improvement Permit application is submitted because the MEP can take a minimum of 6-12 months. For information on the Major Encroachment permitting process visit http://www.sfdpw.org/permits-0 or call 415-554-5810.

For SF Public Works permit information visit 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/
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