DATE: October 31, 2016

TO: Daniel Findley
   Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation

FROM: Joshua Switzky, Planning Department

RE: PPA Case No. 2016-010340PPA for 500 Turk Street

Please find the attached Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) for the address listed above. You may contact the staff contact, Kay Cheng, at (415) 575-9094 or kay.cheng@sfgov.org, to answer any questions you may have, or to schedule a follow-up meeting.

Joshua Switzky, Senior Planner
Preliminary Project Assessment

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 August 2, 2016, as summarized below. This PPA letter identifies Planning Department review requirements for the proposed project, including those related to environmental review, approvals, neighborhood notification and public outreach, the Planning Code, project design, and other general issues of concern for the project. Please be advised that the PPA application does not constitute an application for development with the Planning Department. The PPA letter also does not represent a complete review of the proposed project, does not grant a project approval of any kind, and does not in any way supersede any required Planning Department approvals listed below.

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

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The proposal is to demolish the existing 7,315-square-foot (sf) building and construct an eight-story residential building with 121-unit affordable dwelling units and ground floor commercial space, community amenity spaces, and a 5,150 square foot on-grade planted courtyard, garden, and play space.
The project preserves a portion of existing building façade facing Turk Street. The refurbished façade would frame an entry court and residential lobby, and act as a shell for a community center accessible from the street. The proposed new building would include 150 Class-1 and 10 Class-2 bicycle parking spaces and no vehicular parking. The project proposes 5-feet of excavation below grade, an at-grade service entry on Larkin Street and a residential entry on Turk Street.

**BACKGROUND:**

**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](http://www.sfplanning.org) under the “Publications” tab. See “Environmental Applications” on page 2 of the current Fee Schedule for calculation of environmental application fees.¹ Note that until an entitlement application is submitted to the Current Planning Division, only the proposed Project Description will be reviewed by the assigned Environmental Coordinator.

If the additional analysis outlined below indicates that the project would not have a significant effect on the environment, the project could be eligible for a Class 32 infill development categorical exemption under CEQA Guidelines Section 15332. If a Class 32 exemption is appropriate, Environmental Planning staff will prepare a certificate of exemption.

If it is determined that the project could result in a significant impact, an initial study would be prepared. The initial study may be prepared either by an environmental consultant from the Department’s environmental consultant pool or by Department staff. Should you choose to have the initial study prepared by an environmental consultant, contact Devyani Jain at (415) 575-9051 for a list of three eligible consultants. If the initial study finds that the project would have a significant impact that could be reduced to a less-than-significant level by mitigation measures agreed to by the project sponsor, then the Department would issue a preliminary mitigated negative declaration (PMND). The PMND would be circulated for public review, during which time concerned parties may comment on and/or appeal the determination. If no appeal is filed, the Planning Department would issue a final mitigated negative declaration (FMND). Additional information regarding the environmental review process can be found at: [http://www.sf-planning.org/modules/showdocument.aspx?documentid=8631](http://www.sf-planning.org/modules/showdocument.aspx?documentid=8631).

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

---

(http://www.sfplanning.org/ftp/files/MEA/Environmental_consultant_pool.pdf). The Planning Department will provide more detail to the project sponsor regarding the EIR process should this level of environmental review be required.

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

1. **Historic Resources.** The project site contains one building previously determined to be individually eligible for national, state, or local listing as a historic resource. The property was surveyed as part of the Van Ness Auto Row Support Structures Historic Resources Survey. Therefore, the proposed demolition 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 project proposes the demolition of an individually significant historical resource, which is an unavoidable significant impact and an EIR would be required. The HRE scope may include development and evaluation of project preservation alternatives. 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. The selected consultant must scope 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 Environmental Impact Report and updated it as necessary to reflect feedback received in the PPA letter. The HRE should be submitted directly to the Department and copied to the project sponsor. Project sponsors should not receive and/or review advance drafts of consultant reports per the Environmental Review Guidelines. Historic Preservation staff will not begin reviewing your project until a complete draft HRE is received.

2. **Archaeological Resources.** The proposed project will require Preliminary Archeological Review (PAR) by a Planning Department archeologist. To aid this review the Department archeologist may request a Preliminary Archeological Sensitivity Assessment (PASS) by a Department Qualified Archeological Consultant, subject to the review and approval by the Department archeologist. The Department archeologist will provide three names from the Qualified Archeological Consultant list if the PASS is required. The PAR will assess the archeological sensitivity of the project site based on in-house source material and will consider the potential for archeological impacts resulting from proposed soils disturbance. Please provide detailed information, including sections, proposed soils-disturbing activities, such as grading, excavation, installation of foundations, soils improvement, and site remediation in the EEA, and submit any available geotechnical/soils or phase II hazardous materials reports prepared for the project to assist in this review. If the Department archeologist determines that the project has a potential to adversely affect archeological resources, the PAR will identify additional measures needed to address the potential effect. These measures may include preparation of an archeological research design and treatment plan, implementation of one of the Planning Department’s three standard archeological mitigation measures (archeological testing, monitoring, or accidental discovery), or other appropriate measures.
3. **Tribal Cultural Resources.** Tribal cultural resources (TCRs) are a class of resource established under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in 2015. TCRs are defined as a site, feature, place, cultural landscape, sacred place or object with cultural value to a California Native American tribe, that is either included on or eligible for inclusion in the California Register of Historical Resources or a local historic register, or is a resource that the lead agency, at its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, determines is a TCR. Planning Department staff will review the proposed project to determine if it may cause an adverse effect to a TCR; this will occur in tandem with preliminary archeological review. No additional information is needed from the project sponsor at this time. Consultation with California Native American tribes regarding TCRs may be required at the request of the tribes. If staff determines that the proposed project may have a potential significant adverse impact on a TCR, mitigation measures will be identified and required. Mitigation measures may include avoidance, protection, or preservation of the TCR and development of interpretation and public education and artistic programs.

4. **Transportation.** Based on the PPA submittal, a transportation impact study is not anticipated; an official determination will be made subsequent to submittal of the EEA. However, the project site is located on a high injury corridor as mapped by Vision Zero. In order to facilitate that determination, Planning staff propose the following recommendations:

   - Note where Class II bicycle parking spaces would be located on sidewalks or within building
   - Please provide the number of curb cuts on Turk Street and Larkin Street and confirm that curb cuts would be removed and restored to standard sidewalk height
   - Please verify loading requirements and note on plans where Planning Code required loading would be located on-site

5. **Noise.** Based on the General Plan’s Background Noise Levels map, the project site is located along a segment of Turk Street and Larkin Street with noise levels above 75 dBA Ldn (a day-night averaged sound level). Therefore, an acoustical analysis is required for the proposed new residential development. The acoustical analysis must demonstrate with reasonable certainty that the California Noise Insulation Standards in Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations can be met. Should such concerns be present, the department may require the completion of a detailed noise assessment by person(s) qualified in acoustical analysis and/or engineering prior to the first project approval action, in order to demonstrate that acceptable interior noise levels consistent with those in the Title 24 standards can be attained.

   Additionally, the Planning Department requires that residential open space required under the Planning Code be protected, to the maximum feasible extent, from existing ambient noise levels that could prove annoying or disruptive to users of the open space. Measures to protect required open space from noise include site design that uses the building itself to shield on-site open space from the greatest noise sources, construction of noise barriers between noise sources and open space, and appropriate use of both common and private open space in multi-family dwellings.

---

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

6. **Air Quality.** The proposed project at 121 dwelling units is below the Bay Area Air Quality Management District’s (BAAQMD) construction and operational screening levels for criteria air pollutants. Therefore, an analysis of the project’s criteria air pollutant emissions is not likely to be required. Please provide detailed information related to construction equipment, phasing and duration of each phase, and the volume of excavation as part of the 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 Ordinance contained in San Francisco Health Code Article 22B and San Francisco Building Code Section 106.A.3.2.6.

The project site is located within an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone, as mapped and defined by Health Code Article 38. The Air Pollutant Exposure Zone identifies areas with poor air quality based on modeling of air pollution, exposures, and health vulnerability from mobile, stationary, and area source emissions within San Francisco. The 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 initial application with the EEA.

Equipment exhaust measures during construction will likely also be required. Please provide detailed information related to construction equipment, phasing and duration of each phase, and the volume of excavation as part of the EEA.

If the project would generate new sources of toxic air contaminants including, but not limited to, emissions from diesel generators or boilers, or any other stationary sources, the project would result in toxic air contaminants that may affect both on-site and off-site sensitive receptors and additional measures will likely be required to reduce stationary source emissions. Based on the information in the PPA application, the proposed project would likely require a backup diesel generator due to the proposed height, but this will be confirmed at the time of the EEA submittal.

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

---

3 BAAQMD, CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, May 2011, Chapter 3.
4 Refer to http://www.sfdph.org/dph/eh/Air/default.asp for more information.
Qualified GHG Reduction Strategy, the Planning Department has prepared a Greenhouse Gas Analysis Compliance Checklist.\textsuperscript{5} The project sponsor may be required to submit the completed table regarding project compliance with the identified regulations and provide project-level details in the discussion column. This information will be reviewed by the environmental planner during the environmental review process to determine if the project would comply with San Francisco’s Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy. Projects that do not comply with an ordinance or regulation may be determined to be inconsistent with the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy.

8. **Wind.** The proposed project would not involve construction of a building over 80 feet in height. The project would not likely require a consultant-prepared wind analysis.

9. **Shadow.** The proposed project would result in construction of a building greater than 40 feet in height. A preliminary shadow fan analysis prepared by Planning Department staff indicates that the proposed project could cast shadows on the Turk and Hyde Mini Park located one block away and is a property under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Parks Department. The preparation of a detailed shadow study would likely be required. 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 (http://www.sf‐planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=539). A separate fee is required. The consultant must also prepare a proposed scope of work for review and approval by Environmental Planning staff prior to preparing the analysis.

10. **Geology.** The project site is located on a site with a slope greater than 20\%. Any new construction on the site is therefore subject to a mandatory Interdepartmental Project Review.\textsuperscript{6} A geotechnical study prepared by a qualified consultant must be submitted with the EEA. The study should address whether the site is subject to liquefaction, and should provide recommendations for any geotechnical concerns identified in the study. In general, compliance with the building codes would avoid the potential for significant impacts related to structural damage, ground subsidence, liquefaction, landslides, and surface settlement. To assist Planning Department staff in determining whether the project would result in environmental impacts related to geological hazards, it is recommended that you provide a copy of the geotechnical information with boring logs for the proposed project. This study will also help inform the Planning Department Archeologist of the project site’s subsurface geological conditions.

11. **Hazardous Materials.** The proposed project would demolish an existing building with previous industrial uses. Therefore, the project may be 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

---

\textsuperscript{5} Refer to http://sf‐planning.org/index.aspx?page=1886 for latest “Greenhouse Gas Compliance Checklist for Private Development Projects.”

and level of exposure risk associated with the project. Based on that information, soil and/or groundwater sampling and analysis, as well as remediation of any site contamination, may be required. These steps are required to be completed prior to the issuance of any building permit.

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

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

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

PLANNING DEPARTMENT APPROVALS:

The project requires the following Planning Department approvals. These approvals may be reviewed in conjunction with the required environmental review, but may not be granted until after the required environmental review is completed.
1. **Conditional Use Authorization.** The project would require Conditional Use Authorization for the following items. However, Planning Commission approval may not be required if the proposed project utilizes the Affordable Housing Project Authorization Process detailed in Item No. 2 below.
   
   o **Height.** Pursuant to Planning Code Section 253, a Conditional Use Authorization is generally required for any project exceeding a height of 50 feet in an RC Zoning District.

2. **Affordable Housing Project Authorization.** 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. Pursuant to Planning Code Section 315, an Affordable Housing Project may seek exceptions to Planning Code requirements that may be available through the Planning Code, including Planning Code Section 303 for Conditional Use Authorization, 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.

3. **Rear Yard Modification.** The Zoning Administrator must grant a rear yard modification to substitute the required rear yard with an equivalent amount of open space on the site. You may seek a rear yard modification by filing a Variance Application.

4. **Variance.** The project may require a Variance from Planning Code Section 145.1 for a ground floor ceiling height that does not meet the 14 foot minimum height. Please see comment number 13 below for additional information.

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

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

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

**NEIGHBORHOOD NOTIFICATIONS AND PUBLIC OUTREACH:**

Project Sponsors are encouraged, and in some cases required, to conduct public outreach with the surrounding community and neighborhood groups early in the development process. Additionally, many approvals require a public hearing with an associated neighborhood notification. Differing levels of neighborhood notification are mandatory for some or all of the reviews and approvals listed above.
1. **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. **Interdepartmental Project Review.** This review is required for all proposed new construction in seismic hazard zones, in which the subject property falls. An application is enclosed.

2. **Rear Yard.** Section 134 requires the project to provide a rear yard of at least 25 percent of the lot depth. The current proposal includes 4,600 square foot courtyard at the northwest corner of the subject lot, and is not considered compliant with the rear yard requirements in Section 134. However, since this project is located in the North of Market Special Use District 1, the rear yard requirement may be substituted with an equivalent amount of open space situated anywhere on the site, provided that the Zoning Administrator determines that all of the following criteria are met:

   o The substituted open space in the proposed new or expanding structure will improve the access to light and air to and views from existing and abutting properties; and

   o The proposed new or expanding structure will not adversely affect the interior block open space formed by the rear yards of existing abutting properties.

You may seek a modification from the Zoning Administrator by filing a Variance Application. If it is determined that the project is not eligible for a modification, then you may seek and justify a Variance from the requirements of Section 134 of the Planning Code.

3. **Open Space – Residential.** Section 135 requires 36 square feet of private open space, or 48 square feet of common open space for each dwelling unit. Additionally, any such open spaces must meet the dimensional requirements of Subsections 135(f) and 135(g). At least 5,808 square feet of common usable open space would be required for the proposed 121 dwelling units. As currently proposed, the project includes approximately 5,150 square feet of usable open space in a court at the northwest corner of the lot, as well as 750 square feet of garden space on the roof, which would satisfy the Usable Open Space requirement in Section 135. In future submittals please indicate that both the court and the rooftop garden are common usable open space. If the project is modified and does not meet the requirements, you may seek and justify a Variance from Planning Code Section 135.

4. **Height Measurement.** Per Planning Code 260, height is measured from the curb at the centerline of the property. The height measurement may be taken from the centerline of either frontage. For frontages with a lateral slope, there is a maximum width for a portion of a building that may be measured from a single point. The plans submitted seem to comply with the height provisions, but additional information is required to confirm. On future submittals, please indicate the centerline of
the building along the frontage from which you’d like to measure height, as well as the average slope of the curb along that frontage.

5. **Permitted Obstructions - Bay Windows Over Streets and Alleys.** Section 136(c)(2) includes the requirements for permitted obstructions over streets and alleys, in this case, the proposed bay windows. Several of the proposed bays seem to exceed the maximum length of 15 feet at the property line and 9 feet at the maximum three foot projection. Future submittals should include dimensions that show the length and depth of each of the bay windows, the separation between each bay, and their relationship to the property line. If these windows do not meet the standards for Permitted Obstructions over Streets and Alleys, you may seek and justify a Variance from Planning Code Section 136.

6. **Permitted Obstructions – Play Structures within the required Rear Yard.** Pursuant to Planning Code Section 136(c)(20), play structures are permitted within the required rear yard setback. Please note that an Interpretation of Section 136(c)(3) states that play structures, such as those with solid walls or roofs, which have the effect of creating a solid plane of substantial dimension, is limited to eight feet in height. Any proposed play structures are subject to review by Department staff.

7. **Streetscape Plan – Better Streets Plan Compliance.** Pedestrian and streetscape improvements consistent with the Better Streets Plan are required if your project meets the conditions delineated in Planning Code Section 138.1. Projects that trigger Section 138.1 will be reviewed by the Department’s Streetscape Design Advisory Team (SDAT). SDAT is an interagency group that includes representatives from the Planning Department, Department of Public Works, the SFPUC and the Municipal Transportation Agency that provides design guidance on private developments that impact the public right-of-way.

Based on the submitted plans, the project triggers the requirements of a Streetscape Plan as the project proposes new construction and contains more than 250 feet of total lot frontage along public rights of way. 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, curb radii, and curb lines, and the relation of such elements to proposed new construction and site work on the property. Please see the Department’s Better Streets Plan and Section 138.1(c)(2)(ii) for the additional elements that may be required as part of the project’s streetscape plan.

8. **Street trees.** Planning Code Section 138.1 requires one street tree for every 20 feet of frontage for new construction. Existing trees on the project site, if preserved, would apply towards the street tree requirement. Based on the street frontage dimensions, it appears that the project requires 14 trees, which are not reflected in your preliminary plans.

9. **Vision Zero.** In 2014, the City adopted the [Vision Zero Policy](#) which seeks to eliminate all traffic deaths in the City by 2024. The City subsequently established a network of Vision Zero Corridors...
which have higher rates of traffic-related injuries and fatalities compared to most San Francisco Streets. The City has determined that streets on the Vison Zero network should be prioritized for safety improvements especially those that improve the safety of vulnerable users like people walking and people on bikes.

Turk Street has been designated a Vision Zero Corridor and falls on the Vision Zero High Injury Network for drivers, cyclists, and pedestrians. Larkin Street falls on the Vision Zero High Injury Network for pedestrians. This project is encouraged to incorporate safety measures into the project. The Department’s Streetscape Design Advisory Team may require additional pedestrian safety streetscape measures.

10. Turk Street Safety Project. The SFMTA has recently initiated the Turk Street Safety Project. This initiative will include a community conversation about both short-term and long-term safety improvements. The project aims to create a safer and more comfortable walking and biking environment on the stretch of Turk Street from Market to Gough. The project will likely include the installation of a protected bike lane (cycle track) along the corridor. Assuming the design process moves according to schedule, the SFMTA should have a preferred alternative for Turk Street within a year. Please coordinate with Adrian Leung (adrian.leung@sfmta.com) or Chava Kronenberg (Chava.Kronenberg@sfmta.com) with questions about this project.

11. Exposure. Section 140 requires that each dwelling unit have at least one room that meets the 120-square-foot minimum superficial floor area requirement of Section 503 of the Housing Code face directly on a street right-of-way, code-complying rear yard, or an appropriately sized courtyard. The proposed rear yard is not code-complying, but it does not provide a large enough courtyard to meet the exposure requirement for those units that only have windows fronting the northwestern court. Therefore, the proposed project is compliant with Planning Code Section 140.

12. Shadow Analysis (Section 295). Section 295 requires that a shadow analysis must be performed to determine whether the project has the potential to cast shadow on properties under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Recreation and Park Commission. Department staff has prepared a shadow fan that indicates the project may cast new shadow on Turk and Hyde Mini-Park. Therefore, a detailed shadow analysis would need to be prepared to determine if the project would create new shadow in that results in an adverse impact to Turk and Hyde Mini-Park, pursuant to Section 295. If this detailed shadow analysis finds that the project would cast shadow on Turk and Hyde Mini-Park, the sponsor should explore sculpting of portions of the project to avoid casting new shadows on the park.

13. 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.

14. Frontages and Ground Floor Uses in Residential-Commercial Districts. Pursuant to Planning Code Section 145.1, the minimum required floor-to-floor height in RC Districts is 14 feet. The floor-to-floor
height is measured similarly to the height of the building, from the centerline of the building at curb height. If the project meets the floor-to-floor ceiling height meets the required 14 foot minimum height at the centerline, then it would be considered compliant with Section 145.1. If the project does not meet the minimum ground floor ceiling height, then you may seek and justify a Variance from Section 145.1.

15. **Bicycle Parking.** Planning Code Section 155.5 requires one Class 1 bicycle parking space per dwelling unit, as well as one Class 1 space for every four dwelling units over 100. One Class 2 bicycle parking space is required for every 20 units, and for every 2,500 square feet of occupied floor area of retail. The project proposes 121 dwelling units and about 2,640 square feet of ground floor retail. Therefore, the project requires 126 Class 1 bicycle parking spaces and seven Class 2 bicycle parking spaces. Although the application states that the project includes 150 Class 1 spaces and 10 Class 2 spaces, which would satisfy the bicycle parking requirement, the spaces are not adequately indicated on the plans. In future submittals please clearly indicate the required bicycle parking. Please include additional information on the types of bicycle racks provided as well as the proposed amount of vertical bicycle parking.

16. **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

17. **SFPUC Requirements & Project Review.** The SFPUC administers San Francisco’s various water, sewer, and stormwater requirements such as the Stormwater Design Guidelines, construction site runoff, sewer connections, recycled water and onsite water reuse, water efficient irrigation, and hydraulic analysis for fire suppression systems. To assist developers and property owners in meeting these requirements, the SFPUC provides project plan review, technical assistance, and incentives. The SFPUC also has a separate project review process for projects that propose to use land owned by the SFPUC or are subject to an easement held by the SFPUC; or projects that propose to be constructed above, under, or adjacent to major SFPUC infrastructure. For projects meeting these criteria, please contact SFProjectReview@sfwater.org for a SFPUC Project Review and Land Use Application. For more information regarding SFPUC Project Review or any of the SFPUC requirements, please visit [www.sfwater.org/reqs](http://www.sfwater.org/reqs).

18. **Noise Regulations Relating to Residential Uses Near Places of Entertainment (POE).** New residential development within 300 feet of a Place of Entertainment must go through an Entertainment Commission outreach process ([Ordinance Number 070-015](https://www.sfgov.org/planning/entertainment-commission)). In addition, new residential development will also be required to record a Notice of Special Restrictions (NSR) on the site. The subject site is located within 300 feet of an existing POE, see enclosed map. Please note that the Planning Department will not consider an entitlement application complete until the following are completed:
(A) The Entertainment Commission has provided written notification to the Planning Department indicating that it either did not wish to hold a hearing, or that it held a hearing and the Project Sponsor attended; and

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

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

19. **Costa Hawkins Agreement.** If a project proposes rental units, if 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.

20. **Anti-Discriminatory Housing Policy.** Administrative Code Section 1.61 requires the Planning Department to collect an application/form with information about an applicant’s internal anti-discriminatory policies for projects proposing an increase of ten (10) dwelling units or more. A supplemental form is available here: http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentID=9334.

21. **Affordable Housing Requirements.** The project may be exempted from Inclusionary Affordable Housing requirements outlined in Planning Code Section 415. 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.

   - **Affidavit of Compliance with Affordable Housing.** Please provide the Affidavit of Compliance with the Affordable Housing Program with your application submittal.
22. **Impact Fees.** Pursuant to Planning Code Section 406(b)(1) any affordable housing unit shall receive a waiver from the Transportation Sustainability Fee and the Residential Child Care Impact Fee if the affordable housing unit:

- Is affordable to a household at or below 80% of the Area Median Income;
- Is subsidized by the Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development; and
- Is subsidized in a manner which maintains its affordability for a term no less than 55 years, whether it is a rental or ownership opportunity. Project sponsors must demonstrate to the Planning Department staff that a governmental agency will be enforcing the term of affordability and reviewing performance and service plans as necessary.

**PRELIMINARY DESIGN COMMENTS:**

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

**Architecture and Building Massing**

1. **Individual Historic Resource**
   The project site contains structures considered to be a historic resource; therefore, the proposed project is subject to further design review by the department’s Historic Preservation staff. Please refer to the Environmental Planning Review – Historic Resources section of the Preliminary Project Assessment for further discussion.

2. **Site Design, Open Space, and Massing.** Per Code section 132.2 the ‘T’ bulk district may require setbacks for buildings taller than 50 feet to maintain continuity of the prevailing street wall. Maximum plan and diagonal dimensions for bulk control would apply to portions of the building above the established street wall height. Please provide graphic demonstration of the prevailing street wall heights along Turk and Larkin Streets.

The at-grade open space is logically placed to enhance the future or existing mid-block open space. Likewise, the connection to the open space from the street allows for partial retention and re-use of the existing building.

The Planning Department recommends retaining a greater extent of the west wing of the existing building, and providing separation between the new construction and the resource. A means of achieving this might include a double height opening to the rear court yard that avoids or reduces attachment of the new building to the old.

3. **Architecture.** The architecture is assumed to be preliminary and would be reviewed to ensure materials, proportions, and features are compatible with features of 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).

Following are comments from the SDAT:

1. Turk Street Frontage
   - SDAT generally prefers corner bulbouts where feasible. However at times haphazard placement of bulbouts preclude the construction of or reduce the safety of separated bike bikeway designs because they force cyclists to make weaving motions. As the City has initiated a project on Turk Street which may result in the installation of a protected bikeway, SDAT requests the project sponsor coordinate the design of their Turk frontage with the SFMTA to ensure the safest possible design at the Turk and Larkin intersection. SFMTA is expected to have a preferred Turk Street design within a year.
   - Please be aware that in the event that SFMTA’s design process concludes before the 500 Turk Street project is entitled or constructed, SDAT my require sidewalk modifications to the Turk Street frontage.
   - Please coordinate with Adrian Leung (adrian.leung@sfmta.com) or Chava Kronenberg (chava.kronenberg@sfmta.com) with questions about this project.

2. Modified Curb Lines (widened or narrowed sidewalk and corner bulbouts)
   - In lieu of required sidewalk widening, SDAT recommends installing an extended corner bulbout into Larkin Street.
   - Pending compatibility with the pending Turk Street design currently underway, (see comments above), SDAT may also recommend an extended bulbout into Turk Street.
   - The bulbouts should project 6 feet into both the Turk and Larkin right-of-ways.
   - The curb return tangent points for bulbouts into the Turk and Larkin right-of-ways should extend a minimum of 40’ beyond the property line (approximately 2 parking spaces). 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.
   - Extended bulbouts shall be programed with understory plantings, seating, special paving, etc.
   - The curb return for the Turk Street bulbout shall include an accessible curb ramp. Please coordinate with Kevin Jensen, the Accessibility Coordinator with the Department of Public Works on the accessible curb ramp design. To schedule a meeting with Kevin, please contact his assistant Rick Pearman at Rick.Pearman@sfdpw.org.
   - Installing the bulbouts will require coordinating with Geraldine DeLeon at SFMTA (Geraldine.DeLeon@sfmta.com) on relocating traffic signal poles.
• 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 the Mapping/Subdivision Section at the Department of Public Works’ Bureau of Street Use and Mapping. 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.

3. **Remove Curb Cuts.**
   • The project shall remove existing curb cuts on both the Turk and Larkin frontages.

4. **Loading Zones**
   • SDAT recommends the project sponsor apply for a white short-term passenger loading zone on Turk Street in front of the residential entry. This may be achieved through converting an existing yellow commercial loading zone into a while passenger loading zone.
   • SDAT recommends providing one yellow commercial loading zone on Larkin Street in front of the proposed retail spaces.

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

6. **Electrical Transformer Room**
   • SDAT supports the inclusion of a Transformer vaults within the project’s property line.
   • 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.

**PRELIMINARY PROJECT ASSESSMENT EXPIRATION:**
This Preliminary Project Assessment is valid for a period of 18 months. An Environmental Evaluation, Variance, or Building Permit Application, as listed above, must be submitted no later than April 30, 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
SDAT Letter
Preliminary Shadow Fan Analysis
Interdepartmental Project Review Application
Flood Notification: Planning Bulletin
SFPUC Recycled Water Information Sheet

cc: Frederick S Rolandi III, Martha Serena Roe Curry, Susan Roe Bray, Property Owner
    Carly Grob, Current Planning
    Christopher Espiritu, Environmental Planning
    Kay Cheng, Citywide Planning and Analysis
    Jonas Ionin, Planning Commission Secretary
    Charles Rivasplata, SFMTA,
    Geraldine DeLeon, SFMTA
    Chava Kronenberg, SFMTA
    Rick Pearman, Public Works
    Jerry Sanguinetti, Public Works
    Pauline Perkins, SFPUC
    June Weintraub and Jonathan Piakis, DPH
    Planning Department Webmaster (planning.webmaster@sfgov.org)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>Lower Polk Neighbors</td>
<td>PO BOX 642428</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94104-94102</td>
<td>415-358-3920</td>
<td><a href="mailto:agoldman@tnbd.org">agoldman@tnbd.org</a></td>
<td>0 Downtown/Civic Center, Nob Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation - CO Department</td>
<td>215 Taylor Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-626-1819</td>
<td><a href="mailto:info@sfviccicenter.org">info@sfviccicenter.org</a></td>
<td>Downtown/Civic Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Center Community Benefit District</td>
<td>234 Van Ness Avenue</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-669-0916</td>
<td><a href="mailto:somabend.na@gmail.com">somabend.na@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Downtown/Civic Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SoMaBend Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>P.O. Box 410805</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-285-5048</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jWHaasESQ@AOL.com">jWHaasESQ@AOL.com</a></td>
<td>0 Downtown/Civic Center, Mission, South of Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HERE Local 2</td>
<td>209 Golden Gate Avenue</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-554-7970</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jwhaas@sfnorthbay.org">jwhaas@sfnorthbay.org</a>; <a href="mailto:Aprt.veneracion@sfgov.org">Aprt.veneracion@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:Sunny.Angulo@sfgov.org">Sunny.Angulo@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:lvv.Lee@sf.gov.org">lvv.Lee@sf.gov.org</a></td>
<td>Downtown/Civic Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Center Stakeholder Group</td>
<td>100 Van Ness Avenue</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-722-0617</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jhenders@sbcglobal.net">jhenders@sbcglobal.net</a></td>
<td>Castro/Uptown Market, Downtown/Civic Center, Mission, South of Market, Western Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>1 Dr. Carlton B Goodlett Place, Room #244</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-554-7630</td>
<td><a href="mailto:London.Breed@sf.gov">London.Breed@sf.gov</a>; <a href="mailto:conor.johnston@sfgov.org">conor.johnston@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:vallie.brown@sf.gov.org">vallie.brown@sf.gov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:Ahmad.Elnajjar@sf.gov.org">Ahmad.Elnajjar@sf.gov.org</a></td>
<td>Castro/Uptown Market, Downtown/Civic Center, Mission, South of Market, Western Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market/Octavia Community Advisory Comm.</td>
<td>300 Buchanan Street, Apt. 503</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-572-8093</td>
<td>0 <a href="mailto:marlyane16@gmail.com">marlyane16@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>0 Downtown/Civic Center, Nob Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Supervisors</td>
<td>1 Dr. Carlton B Goodlett Place, Room #244</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-647-1935</td>
<td>0 <a href="mailto:marlyane16@gmail.com">marlyane16@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Downtown/Civic Center, Mission, South of Market, Western Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathedral Hill Neighbors Association</td>
<td>1200 Gough Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-711-9850</td>
<td><a href="mailto:randy@thclinic.org">randy@thclinic.org</a></td>
<td>Downtown/Civic Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliance for a Better District 6</td>
<td>230 Eddy Street #1206</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-407-0994</td>
<td>0 <a href="mailto:tiffany.bohe@sfgov.org">tiffany.bohe@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:mike.grasso@sfgov.org">mike.grasso@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:courtney.pash@sfgov.org">courtney.pash@sfgov.org</a>; <a href="mailto:president@hayesvalleysf.org">president@hayesvalleysf.org</a></td>
<td>Castro/Uptown Market, Downtown/Civic Center, Mission, South of Market, Western Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenderloin Housing Clinic</td>
<td>126 Hyde Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-265-0546</td>
<td>0 Claudeunionsquare @ sfgov.org</td>
<td>Castro/Uptown Market, Downtown/Civic Center, Mission, South of Market, Western Addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market/Octavia Community Advisory Comm.</td>
<td>30 Sharon Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94114-1709</td>
<td>415-781-7880</td>
<td><a href="mailto:claudefinalsea@unionsquarebid.com">claudefinalsea@unionsquarebid.com</a></td>
<td>Downtown/Civic Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, City and County of San Francisco</td>
<td>1 South Van Ness Avenue, 5th Floor</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94103</td>
<td>415-286-3492</td>
<td>0 <a href="mailto:mmoroney@citiscapesf.com">mmoroney@citiscapesf.com</a></td>
<td>Downtown/Civic Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayes Valley Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>700 Hayes Street</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>94102</td>
<td>415-552-3242</td>
<td><a href="mailto:info@ahasf.org">info@ahasf.org</a></td>
<td>Castro/Uptown Market, Downtown/Civic Center, Financial District, Haight Ashbury, Mission, Nob Hill,</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 500 Turk Street project came to SDAT on September 19, 2016. Below are the SDAT comments from that meeting.

**CONTEXT**

**Project Description**

The project entails the demolition of an existing building and construction of an eight-story residential building with ground floor commercial space, community amenity spaces, and a 5,150 square foot on-grade planted courtyard, garden, and play space. Project preserves a portion of existing building façade facing Turk Street. The refurbished façade would frame an entry court and residential lobby, and act as a shell for a community center accessible from the street. No vehicle parking is proposed. An electrical transformer is proposed on site.
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, Larkin and Turk Streets are classified as Downtown Residential Streets, 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, links to all agency resolutions are at the bottom of the page.

- Turk Street has been designated a Vision Zero Corridor and falls on the Vision Zero High Injury Network for drivers, cyclists, and pedestrians. Larkin Street falls on the Vision Zero High Injury Network for pedestrians. All plans should prioritize improving safety for all users along these corridors.

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.

- Larkin Street is identified as a bike route under the San Francisco Bicycle Plan. MTA has a plan to install a cycle track on the left side of the street.

Turk Street Safety Project Underway
The SFMTA has recently initiated the Turk Street Safety Project. This initiative will include a community conversation about both short-term and long-term safety improvements. The project aims to create a safer and more comfortable walking and biking environment on the stretch of Turk Street from Market to Gough. The project will likely include the installation of a protected bike lane (cycle track) along the corridor. Assuming the design process moves according to schedule, the SFMTA should have a preferred alternative for Turk Street within a year. Please coordinate with Adrian Leung (adrian.leung@sfmta.com) or Chava Kronenberg (Chava.Kronenberg@sfmta.com) with questions about this project.
SDAT DESIGN COMMENTS

Turk Street Frontage

- SDAT generally prefers corner bulbouts where feasible. However at times haphazard placement of bulbouts preclude the construction of or reduce the safety of separated bike bikeway designs because they force bikers to make weaving motions. As the City has instated a project on both Turk Street which may result in the installation of a protected bikeway, SDAT requests the project sponsor coordinate the design of their Turk frontage with the SFMTA to ensure the safest possible design at the Turk and Larkin intersection. SFMTA is expected to have a preferred Turk Street design within a year.
- Please be aware that in the likely event that SFMTA’s design process concluded before the 500 Turks Street project is entitled, SDAT my require sidewalk modifications to the Turk Street frontage.
- Please coordinate with Adrian Leung (adrian.leung@sfmta.com) or Chava Kronenberg (Chava.Kronenberg@sfmta.com) with questions about this project.

Modified Curb Lines (widened or narrowed sidewalk and corner bulbouts)

- In lieu of required sidewalk widening, SDAT recommend installing an extended corner bulbout into Larkin Street.
- Pending compatibility with the pending Turk Street design currently underway, (see comments above), SDAT may also recommend an extended bulbout into Turk Street.
- The bulbouts should project 6 feet into both the Turk and Larkin right-of-ways.
- The curb return tangent points for bulbouts into the Turk and Larkin right-of-ways should extend a minimum of 40’ beyond the property line (approximately 2 parking spaces).
- Extended bulbouts shall be prograded with understory plantings, seating, special paving, etc.
- The curb return for the Turk Street bulbout shall include an accessible curb ramp. Please coordinate with Kevin Jensen, the Accessibility Coordinator with the Department of Public Works on the accessible curb ramp design. To schedule a meeting with Kevin, please contact his assistant Rick Pearman at Rick.Pearman@sfdpw.org.
- Installing the bulbouts will require coordinating with Geraldine DeLeon at SFMTA (Geraldine.DeLeon@sfmta.com) on relocating traffic signal poles.
- 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.

Remove Curb Cuts.
The project shall remove existing curb cuts on both the Turk and Larkin Frontages.

Loading Zones
• SDAT recommends the project sponsor apply for a white short-term passenger loading zone on Turk Street in front of the residential entry. This may be achieved through converting an existing yellow commercial loading zone into a while passenger loading zone.
• SDAT recommends providing one yellow commercial loading zone on Larkin Street in front of the proposed retail spaces.

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

Electrical Transformer Room
• SDAT supports the inclusion of a Transformer vaults within the project’s property line.
• 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.

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](http://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](http://www.sfdpw.org/trees) or call 415-554-6700.
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.

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/

BSP Sidewalk Landscaping Guidelines:

San Francisco’s Water Sewer, and Stormwater Requirements
The City and County of San Francisco (CCSF) does not guarantee the accuracy, adequacy, completeness or usefulness of any information. CCSF provides this information on an "as is" basis without warranty of any kind, including but not limited to warranties of merchantability or fitness for a particular purpose, and assumes no responsibility for anyone's use of the information.

Title: 500 Turk Street- Preliminary Shadow Fan Analysis
Comments: Proposed building height = 79 feet + 16 feet of allowable mechanical penthouses