



# SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

**MEMO**

**DATE:** August 31, 2017  
**TO:** Earle Weiss  
**FROM:** Richard Sucre, Planning Department  
**RE:** PPA Case No. 2017-006615PPA  
3310 Mission Street

1650 Mission St.  
Suite 400  
San Francisco,  
CA 94103-2479

Reception:  
**415.558.6378**

Fax:  
**415.558.6409**

Planning  
Information:  
**415.558.6377**

Please find the attached Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) for the address listed above. You may contact the staff contact, Michael Christensen, at (415) 575-8742 or [michael.christensen@sfgov.org](mailto:michael.christensen@sfgov.org), to answer any questions you may have, or to schedule a follow-up meeting.

  
Richard Sucre, Senior Planner



# SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

---

## Preliminary Project Assessment

*Date:* September 5, 2017  
*Case No.:* **2017-006615PPA**  
*Project Address:* 3310 Mission Street  
*Block/Lot:* 6635/054  
*Zoning:* NC-3 (Neighborhood Commercial, Moderate Scale) Zoning District  
Mission Street Formula Retail Restaurant Subdistrict  
Mission Alcoholic Beverage Special Use Subdistrict  
40-X Height and Bulk District  
*Project Sponsor:* Earle Weiss  
415-531-5270  
[earle@eweiss.com](mailto:earle@eweiss.com)  
*Staff Contact:* Michael Christensen – 415-575-8742  
[michael.christensen@sfgov.org](mailto:michael.christensen@sfgov.org)

1650 Mission St.  
Suite 400  
San Francisco,  
CA 94103-2479

Reception:  
**415.558.6378**

Fax:  
**415.558.6409**

Planning  
Information:  
**415.558.6377**

### DISCLAIMERS:

This Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) letter provides feedback to the project sponsor from the Planning Department regarding the proposed project described in the PPA application submitted on May 25, 2017, 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, and federal regulations as of the date of this document, all of which are subject to change.

### PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The proposal is to construct a four-story-over-basement, 45-foot-tall, mixed use building on a vacant lot measuring approximately 4,573 square foot. The proposed new building would include 8 market-rate

dwelling units, 5,500 square feet of commercial space, 8 automobile parking spaces, and 8 Class One bicycle parking spaces.

## PRELIMINARY PROJECT COMMENTS:

The following comments address general issues that may affect the proposed project.

- 1. HOME-SF Program.** The City of San Francisco recently adopted HOME-SF, a program that encourages higher level of on-site affordable housing through the provision of a density bonus program. The proposed program, in part, would offer a local mechanism to implement the State Density Bonus law (Government Code Section No. 65915). HOME-SF offers two extra stories of height and relief from density limits in return for provision of 30% on-site affordable units, including some middle income housing. This parcel is located within the program area, and could receive density and other development incentives commensurate with provision of on-site affordable housing if it meets HOME-SF's eligibility criteria. Please refer to the **HOME-SF Program website** ([www.sf-planning.org/HOME-SF](http://www.sf-planning.org/HOME-SF)) for more information on the program, including specific eligibility criteria and a link to Planning Code Section [206.3](#).
- 2. Density Maximization & Affordable Housing Provision.** It is the Department's priority to give precedence to the development of all new net housing, and to encourage the direct building of more affordable housing and the maximization of permitted density, while maintaining quality of life and adherence to Planning Code standards. Policy 13.1 of the City's Housing Element, for example, calls for the Department to "Support 'smart' regional growth that locates new housing close to jobs and transit." The Project is located in one of the most transit-rich corridors in San Francisco, adjacent to the recently completed 14-Mission Rapid Project (the "Mission Red Lane") and within a 15-minute walk to the 24<sup>th</sup> Street BART station. Therefore, the Department would strongly encourage the Project Sponsor to maximize the parcel's density and to provide the required amount of affordable housing. The current proposal to build 8 units would reach the density limit established within the parcel's NC-3 zoning district, but is well under the density that would be allowed if the Project Sponsor employs the HOME-SF bonus (described above). The HOME-SF bonus would lift the density restriction in the parcel and grants two additional stories, which would allow the Project to have at least 16 and potentially 20 or more units. HOME-SF requires that 30% of the units be reserved for low- and moderate-income households, which means that maximizing density under the program could yield 3 to 8 market rate units above what is currently proposed.
- 3. Invest in Neighborhoods.** The Project is located on an Invest in Neighborhoods corridor. Invest in Neighborhoods is an interagency partnership to strengthen and revitalize neighborhood commercial districts around San Francisco. The initiative, currently being piloted in 25 commercial districts, aims to strengthen small businesses, improve physical conditions, increase quality of life, and increase community capacity. Each corridor is appointed an IIN Point Person. This staff member is responsible for advocating for the neighborhood, leveraging City services and working with community partners to develop customized service plans for each corridor. Additionally, the IIN Point Person keeps track of vacant retail spaces and development projects. More information on the Invest in Neighborhoods program, including the IIN Point Person, can be found at: <http://investsf.org>

**ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:**

The proposed project requires environmental review in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). This section identifies the likely environmental review process and additional information and studies necessary to complete environmental review. Formal environmental review begins with Planning Department review of the **Environmental Evaluation Application (EEA)** filed by the project sponsor. The EEA can be submitted at the same time as the PPA application or subsequent to issuance of the PPA letter.

The environmental review may be done in conjunction with the required approvals listed below, but must be completed before any project approval may be granted. **Note that until an entitlement application is submitted to the Current Planning Division, only the proposed project description will be reviewed by the assigned environmental coordinator.** EEAs are available in the Planning Department lobby at 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, at the Planning Information Center at 1660 Mission Street, and online at <http://sf-planning.org/permit-forms-applications-and-fees>. See “Environmental Applications” on page 2 of the current Fee Schedule for a calculation of environmental application fees.<sup>1</sup> 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 the additional information and/or documents requested herein and listed again below.

- Information regarding construction: sections; proposed soils disturbing activities, such as grading, excavation, installation of foundations, soils improvement, and site remediation; construction equipment (particularly use of pile driving or other particularly noisy construction methods); and schedule
- Information regarding the location and size of potential HVAC equipment and stationary sources such as emergency backup generators, as applicable.
- Any available geotechnical and phase II hazardous materials reports with boring logs for the proposed project.
- Plans identifying the location and dimensions of existing and proposed sidewalks, curb cuts, parking spaces (on and off-street), loading zones, and proposed turning radii into the off-street parking garage.
- A copy of the submitted Maher application and Phase I Environmental Site Assessment to the San Francisco Department of Public Health with the EEA.

If you have already filed your EEA, you may provide the requested information and documents as supplements to your application.

---

<sup>1</sup> San Francisco Planning Department. Fee Schedule for Application Fees. Available online at: <http://sf-planning.org/permit-forms-applications-and-fees>.

### *Environmental Review Document*

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

If it is determined that the project could result in a significant impact, an initial study would be prepared. The initial study may be prepared either by an environmental consultant from the Department's environmental consultant pool or by Department staff. Should you choose to have the initial study prepared by an environmental consultant, contact Jessica Range at (415) 575-9018 for a list of three eligible consultants. If the initial study finds that the project would have a significant impact that could be reduced to a less-than-significant level by mitigation measures agreed to by the project sponsor, then the Department would issue a preliminary mitigated negative declaration (PMND). The PMND would be circulated for public review, during which time concerned parties may comment on and/or appeal the determination. If no appeal is filed, the Planning Department would issue a final mitigated negative declaration (FMND). Additional information regarding the environmental review process can be found at: <http://sf-planning.org/environmental-review-process>.

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://sf-planning.org/consultant-sponsor-resources>

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. Based on a preliminary review of the project as it is proposed in the PPA application, some of these topics would require additional study.

1. **Historic Resources.** The subject property is a vacant lot. The property is located within a previously surveyed area and is not located within a historic district. Therefore, the property is not subject to review by the Department's Historic Preservation staff and no additional analysis of historic architectural resources is required.
2. **Archeological Resources.** The proposed project will require Preliminary Archeological Review (PAR) by a Planning Department archeologist. To aid this review the Department archeologist may request a Preliminary Archeological Sensitivity Assessment (PASS) by a Department Qualified Archeological Consultant, subject to the review and approval by the Department archeologist. The Department archeologist will provide three names from the Qualified Archeological Consultant list if the PASS is required. The PAR will assess the archeological sensitivity of the project site based on in-house source material and will consider the potential for archeological impacts resulting from proposed soils disturbance. See above bullet list for information requested in order to conduct the PAR. 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 project mitigation measures (such as 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. See above bullet list for information requested in order to make that official determination. Please note that the project site is located on a high injury corridor as mapped by Vision Zero.<sup>2</sup> Given this location, please review the safety tab on the SF Transportation Information Map ([www.sftransportationmap.org](http://www.sftransportationmap.org)). Please consider safety improvements as part of the site plan.
5. **Noise.** Construction noise is subject to the San Francisco Noise Ordinance (Article 29 of the San Francisco Police Code), which includes restrictions on noise levels of construction equipment and hours of construction. If pile driving is to be used during construction, measures to reduce construction noise may be required as part of the proposed project. The EEA should provide a construction schedule and indicate whether pile driving or other particularly noisy construction methods are required.

Operation of the proposed project's ground floor commercial/retail use is not anticipated to generate noise that could result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels. If the land use would result in substantial noise, then the proposed project may require a noise study that includes at a minimum: measurements of the existing noise environment, discussion of applicable noise regulations, analysis of the project's noise effects and the ability of noise sources to meet applicable noise standards. If required, the noise study would be conducted by a qualified acoustical consultant who shall prepare a noise study scope of work for approval by the assigned environmental coordinator prior to conducting the study.

---

<sup>2</sup> This document is available at: <http://www.sfmta.com/sites/default/files/projects/2015/vision-zero-san-francisco.pdf>.

6. **Air Quality.** The proposed project, with eight dwelling units and approximately 1,600 square feet of commercial/retail, is below the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's (BAAQMD) construction and operation screening levels for criteria air pollutants.<sup>3</sup> Therefore, an analysis of the project's criteria air pollutant emissions is not likely to be required. However, please provide detailed information related to 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.

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

7. **Greenhouse Gases.** *The City and County of San Francisco's Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions* presents a comprehensive assessment of policies, programs, and ordinances that represents San Francisco's Qualified Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Reduction Strategy. Projects that are consistent with San Francisco's Qualified GHG Reduction Strategy would result in less-than-significant impacts from GHG emissions. In order to facilitate a determination of compliance with San Francisco's Qualified GHG Reduction Strategy, the Planning Department has prepared a Greenhouse Gas Analysis Compliance Checklist.<sup>4</sup> 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. Therefore, a consultant-prepared wind analysis is not anticipated to be required.
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

---

<sup>3</sup> BAAQMD, *CEQA Air Quality Guidelines*, May 2011, Chapter 3.

<sup>4</sup> Refer to <http://sf-planning.org/consultant-sponsor-resources> for latest "Greenhouse Gas Compliance Checklist for Private Development Projects."

proposed project would not cast shadows on any Recreation and Park property subject to Section 295, or other publicly accessible non-Recreation and Park properties, including schoolyards. Therefore, a detailed shadow study is not likely to be required.

10. **Geology.** The project site is not located within a seismic hazard zone (liquefaction hazard zone likely underlain by artificial fill). Therefore, a geotechnical study prepared by a qualified consultant is not likely a required submittal with the EEA. 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.
11. **Hazardous Materials.** The proposed project would add residential uses to a site with potential for subsurface contamination resulting from historic garage uses and/or fill material beneath the site. Therefore, the project is subject to Article 22A of the Health Code, also known as the Maher Ordinance. The Maher Ordinance, which is administered and overseen by the Department of Public Health (DPH), requires the project sponsor to retain the services of a qualified professional to prepare a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) that meets the requirements of Health Code Section 22.A.6. The Phase I ESA would determine the potential for site contamination and level of exposure risk associated with the project. Based on that information, soil and/or groundwater sampling and analysis, as well as remediation of any site contamination, may be required. These steps are required to be completed prior to the issuance of any building permit.

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

## 12. Disclosure Report for Developers of Major Projects.

San Francisco Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code Section 3.520 et seq. requires the developer of any project with estimated construction costs exceeding \$1,000,000 to submit a *Disclosure Report for Developers of Major City Projects* if the project requires the issuance of a Community Plan Evaluation (CPE), certification of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR), adoption of a Final Mitigated Negative Declaration, or a project approval by the Planning Commission that adopts CEQA Findings (EIR certification). A residential development project with four or fewer dwelling units is not required to file this report. The first (or initial) report must be filed within 30 days of the date of EIR certification or final environmental determination under CEQA. Please submit a *Disclosure Report for Developers of Major City Projects* directly to the San Francisco Ethics Commission. This form can be found at the Planning Department or online at <http://www.sfethics.org>.

## PRELIMINARY PLANNING CODE AND PROCEDURAL COMMENTS:

The following comments address preliminary Planning Code issues that may substantially affect the design and massing of the proposed project:



1. **Height Limit.** The project site is within a 40-X Height and Bulk District and does not qualify for a 5 feet height increase for active ground floor uses, as defined in Planning Code Section 263.20, as this allowance only applies to NC-3 designated parcels fronting on Geary Boulevard from Masonic Avenue to 28th Avenue, except for parcels on the north side of Geary Boulevard between Palm Avenue and Parker Avenue. The project, as proposed, has a total height of 45 feet and thus does not comply with the height limit.
2. **Residential Density.** The NC-3 District permits up to 1 unit for each 600 square feet of lot area, or the density permitted in the nearest residential district, whichever is greater. The nearest residential district is RH-3, which permits up to three units per lot and up to 1 unit per 1,000 square feet of lot area with a Conditional Use Authorization. The total lot size of 4,573 sq ft permits up to 8 residential units per the NC-3 controls. Thus, the maximum number of units is 8, and the proposed project is compliant. Additional density may be permitted through Home SF, which would remove the density limit and regulate maximum density through building form and other Planning Code requirements.
3. **Rear Yard.** Section 134 requires that the minimum rear yard depth shall be equal to 25% of the total depth of the lot on which the building is situated, but in no case less than 15 feet. Rear yards shall be provided at the lowest story containing a Dwelling Unit, and at each succeeding level or story of the building.

As the lot is an irregular shape, the rear yard requirement must be determined based on dividing the lot into regular lot configurations. As such, a rear yard must be provided at the southern portion of the lot (the first 18 feet of lot width at the southern portion of the lot, per the Assessor's Map) which is equal to 25% of the depth of the lot at that portion (approximately 19.177 feet). Additionally, a rear yard must be provided at the remainder of the lot. The total depth of the lot at this portion is calculated based on a line five feet long within the lot parallel to and at a maximum distance from the front lot line. The rear yard then begins at a point that is 25% of this calculated depth at a line parallel to the front property line along Mission Street. See attached diagram.

Understanding the methodology above, the Department will require additional information to clarify whether or not the project is providing a code-complying rear yard. If the rear yard is not code-complying, the project will require a rear yard modification or variance from the Planning Code's rear yard requirements.

4. **Open Space – Residential.** Section 135 requires 80 square feet of private open space of 100 square feet of common (shared) open space for each dwelling unit. Additionally, any such open spaces must meet the dimensional requirements of Subsections (f) and (g). The project, as proposed, does not meet this requirement as no open space is noted for Unit 1. Additionally, the balconies proposed do not meet the criteria of subsections (f) and (g) as they do not face onto a code-complying rear yard. Please revise the project to provide code-complying open space or submit a variance application to address the requirements for residential open space.
5. **Open Space – Non-Residential.** Section 135.3 requires this project to provide one foot of open space for every 250 square feet of retail (and similar) uses. The proposal includes between 5,500 square feet of commercial space. Therefore, 22 square feet of open space would be required. Alternatively, per

Section 426, an in-lieu fee may be paid instead of providing the open space on site. The in-lieu fee is indexed regularly and is currently \$96.84 per square foot of open space not provided for non-residential uses.

6. **Dwelling Unit Exposure.** Section 140 requires that each dwelling unit have at least one room that meets the 120-square-foot minimum superficial floor area requirement of Section 503 of the Housing Code face directly on a street right-of-way, code-complying rear yard, or an appropriately sized courtyard. As proposed, the project does not comply with this requirement as Units 4 and 8 do not face onto a code-complying rear yard. Additionally, the compliance of Units 2 and 6 is unknown as the rear yard is not shown on the plan set.
7. **Bicycle Parking (Class I).** Planning Code Section 155 requires this project to provide at least 9 Class I bicycle parking spaces. One Class One bicycle parking space is required for each of the eight dwelling units, and one additional Class One bicycle parking space is required for a retail sales are service use. The number of spaces required for the commercial space will depend on the specific use proposed. The proposed project contains 8 Class I bicycle parking spaces.
8. **Bicycle Parking (Class II).** Planning Code Section 155 requires the project to provide at least 2 Class II bicycle parking spaces provided through on-street bicycle racks; however SFMTA has final authority on the type, placement and number of Class II bicycle racks within the public ROW. Prior to issuance of first architectural addenda, you will be required contact the SFMTA Bike Parking Program at [bikeparking@sfmta.com](mailto:bikeparking@sfmta.com) to coordinate the installation of on-street bicycle racks and ensure that the proposed bicycle racks meet the SFMTA's bicycle parking guidelines. Depending on local site conditions and anticipated demand, SFMTA may request the project sponsor pay an in-lieu fee for Class II bike racks required by the Planning Code. The SFMTA bicycle parking guidelines can be found at:  
  
<https://www.sfmta.com/services/streets-sidewalks/installation-requests/bicycle-racks-corrals>.
9. **Noise Regulations Relating to Residential Uses Near Places of Entertainment (POE).** New residential development within 300 feet of a Place of Entertainment must go through an Entertainment Commission outreach process ([Ordinance Number 070-015](#)). In addition, new residential development will also be required to record a Notice of Special Restrictions (NSR) on the site. The subject site is located within 300 feet of an existing POE (300 Club). 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 the 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://sfgov.org/entertainment/contact-us> for additional information regarding the outreach process.

- 10. Better Roofs Ordinance.** In 2016, San Francisco became the first major city in the U.S. to require the installation of renewable energy facilities or living roofs on new buildings. The Better Roofs Ordinance will require between 15% and 30% of roof space to incorporate solar (photo voltaic and/or solar thermal systems), living (green) roofs, or a combination of both. The Ordinance provides guidance for developers, designers, and/or owners might best utilize rooftop space; ideally, projects should pursue holistic design and amenity enhancements for 100% of usable roof space that include open space, habitat, stormwater management, urban agriculture, and other beneficial uses. Please see the Planning Department's Living Roof Manual to learn more:

<http://sf-planning.org/departments-publications>

- 11. Sustainability and Green Building.** San Francisco has a suite of existing sustainability related regulations, including recycling and composting, solar, and more details outlined in the San Francisco Green Building Code (GBC). Per the GBC, this project must meet the standards of LEED Silver or the equivalent GreenPoint rating system. It is recommended that the project sponsor work with the San Francisco Planning, Building, and Environment departments to determine the most beneficial mix of green building strategies that meet or exceed all current requirements, and best fit the local context. This especially includes the provision of renewable energy on site (PV and solar thermal), living roofs and walls, non-potable water reuse, healthy environments (non-toxic building materials), and other innovative approaches to enhancing performance of the City's environment. The City also encourages projects to maximize energy and water efficiencies, consider zero carbon strategies such as all-electric buildings, and commit to green power purchases for 100% GHG-free electricity. As with non-potable water systems, projects are recommended to consider district-scale energy opportunities on site and in coordination with neighbors.

- 12. Refuse Collection and Loading.** San Francisco is a national leader in diverting waste from landfills, has a Mandatory Recycling and Composting Ordinance, and has a goal to achieve zero waste by 2020. In this, the City requires all buildings to be designed with spaces for collecting and loading recycling and composting in common and private areas, and make these options as or more convenient than waste disposal. More information on the complete suite of the City's Zero Waste legislation may be found here: <http://sfenvironment.org/zero-waste/overview/legislation>. Please also see the Guidance on Recycling Design (page 3) resources for designing appropriate areas: [http://sfenvironment.org/sites/default/files/fliers/files/sfe\\_zw\\_ab088.pdf](http://sfenvironment.org/sites/default/files/fliers/files/sfe_zw_ab088.pdf). Free design and implementation assistance is available from the San Francisco Department of the Environment's Zero Waste Team by calling 415-355-3700.

## PRELIMINARY DESIGN COMMENTS:

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

13. **Site Design, Massing and Open Space.** The Planning Department encourages exploring the HOME-SF program, since the site is well-served by transit and is large enough to include more residential units. Please review the “Preliminary Project Comments” section of this letter for more information.

The Department advises the project sponsor to revise the rooftop open space as either a single common or multiple private space(s) with shared access to reduce the number of rooftop appurtenances (penthouses). An alternative would be to provide exterior stairs.

14. **Street Frontage.** The Department recommends reviewing the predominant ground floor characteristics in the nearby neighborhood and providing a storefront that includes more traditional elements, such as a bulkhead, volumetric entry, clerestory, and/or smaller panes of glass, to be more compatible with the street frontage context. The storefront should include fine-grained elements and materiality to enhance the pedestrian environment. Provide a canopy or other feature that identifies the residential entry.

15. **Architecture.** To better address compatibility with the surrounding Mission Street neighborhood commercial context, simplify and clarify the façade features. For example, glazing should be in the same solid to void ratio and proportion as nearby facades and offer more punched-type window openings base wall. Provide a more defined or intentional top to the front façade of the building. Additionally, the project, including the 29th Street elevation, should include high-quality materials and detailing as well as depth at the windows.

16. **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 Vision Zero network should be prioritized for safety improvements especially those that improve the safety of vulnerable users like people walking and people on bikes.

This project is located on a pedestrian and bike high-injury corridor along Mission Street, and is encouraged to incorporate safety measures into the project.

## DEVELOPMENT FEES:

This project will be subject to various impact fees. Please refer to the [Planning Director’s Bulletin No. 1](#) for an overview of Development Impact Fees, and to the Department of Building Inspection’s [Development Impact Fee webpage](#) for more information about current rates. Please note that this list only reflects fees and requirements referenced in the Planning Code. For projects in ongoing plan areas (e.g. Central SoMa, the Hub, etc.) the below list may not accurately reflect all fees that may become applicable to this project.

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

1. Transportation Sustainability Fee (TSF) (§411A)
2. Residential Child Care Impact Fee (§414A)

## 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. An **Environmental Application**.
2. A **Variance** from the Zoning Administrator is required to address the Planning Code requirements for rear yard (Planning Code Section 134), residential open space (Planning Code Section 135), and dwelling unit exposure (Planning Code Section 140).
3. A **Building Permit Application** is required for the proposed new construction on the subject property.

In order for Planning Department staff to accurately review projects in a timely manner, plan sets must be complete and thorough. All plans submitted as part of an entitlement or building permit application must meet the Department's [Plan Submittal Guidelines](#).

All 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 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. **Pre-Application Meeting.** 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 <http://sf-planning.org/permit-forms-applications-and-fees> listed under "N" for Neighborhood Notification Pre-Application Meeting. The registered neighborhood group and organizations mailing list is available online at <http://sf-planning.org/department-publications> listed under "N".
2. **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 ASSESSMENT EXPIRATION:**

This Preliminary Project Assessment is valid for a period of **18 months**. Required Planning Department approvals, as listed above, must be submitted no later than **March 5, 2019**. 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: Rear Yard Diagram

cc: 3310 Mission, LP, Property Owner  
Michael Christensen, Current Planning  
Sherie George, Environmental Planning  
Pedro Peterson, Citywide Planning and Analysis  
Maia Small, Design Review  
Jonas Ionin, Planning Commission Secretary  
Charles Rivasplata, SFMTA  
Jerry Sanguinetti, Public Works  
Pauline Perkins, SFPUC

Planning Department Webmaster ([planning.webmaster@sfgov.org](mailto:planning.webmaster@sfgov.org))

