



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

MEMO

DATE: January 19, 2018
TO: Michelle Lin, Group I
FROM: Joy Navarrete, Planning Department
RE: PPA Case No. 2017-012086PPA for 770 Woolsey 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, Christopher Espiritu, at (415) 575-9022 or Christopher.Espiritu@sfgov.org, to answer any questions you may have, or to schedule a follow-up meeting.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Joy Navarrete", positioned above a horizontal line.

Joy Navarrete, Senior Planner



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Preliminary Project Assessment

Date: January 19, 2018
Case No.: **2017-012086PPA**
Project Address: 770 Woolsey Street
Block/Lot: 6055/001
Zoning: RH-1 (Residential House, One Family) Zoning District
40-X Height and Bulk
Project Sponsor: Michelle Lin, Group I
(415) 394-7027
Staff Contact: Christopher Espiritu – (415) 575-9022
Christopher.Espiritu@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 September 15, 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.

The PPA application indicates that the project sponsor intends to apply the State Density Bonus Law. The "Environmental Review" section of this PPA letter provides feedback on the environmental review requirements of the higher-density bonus project that the sponsor ultimately seeks to have entitled. The remainder of the PPA letter primarily addresses the code-complaint base project, which must be evaluated in order to assess the project's eligibility to receive concessions, incentives, and waivers, as well as a density and height bonus, if requested. Note that this PPA letter does not make a determination of the project's eligibility for such concessions, incentives, and waivers.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The project site is located in the Portola neighborhood on the block bounded by Wayland Street to the north, Hamilton Street to the east, Bowdoin Street to the west, and Woolsey Street to the south. The project site contains existing structures related to the site's previous agricultural use, including 16 to 18 greenhouses and agricultural accessory buildings. Agricultural operations on the project site were discontinued in the early 1990s. The project site is within the Residential House, One Family (RH-1) Zoning District, within the 40-X height and bulk district, and encompasses a full city block (Block 6055, Lot 001) approximately 96,000 square feet (2.2 acres).

The project proposes to demolish the existing structures on the project site and construct 63 single-family homes that are 3-4 stories and approximately 30-40 feet in height. Each single-family dwelling unit would include one vehicle parking space each (63 total) that would access the site through eight new curb cuts on the project site (four on Bowdoin Street and four on Hamilton Street).

The project is seeking to use the State Density Bonus Law (Gov. Code § 65915) which would add approximately 23 dwelling units to the project for a total of 86 new single family homes on the project site. The project would provide 23 additional vehicle parking spaces for a total of 86 vehicle spaces within individual garages. Also, the project proposes to develop "incremental housing," a step-by-step development concept to support family growth, and community building. The "incremental housing" starts with a "starter core" which can be a kitchen, a bathroom, and/or living room. Owners controls the expansion of their housing based on their needs and resources. Incremental housing provides individuals and families with the ability to grow into their home based on their needs and financial situation. In an incremental home, as proposed by the project, individual structures or homes with independent foundation and exterior walls would be built. Each structure or home has a residential plan that is configured to support a sequence of pre-approved incremental expansions.

While the implementation of incremental housing on the project would result in varying sizes and configuration of each single-family home, the project would remain at 86 dwelling units and no additional vehicle parking spaces would be added to the project site in the future.

PRELIMINARY PROJECT COMMENTS:

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

1. **Unique and Rare Site Opportunity.** This site, comprised of an entire block, is a rare and significant opportunity to add needed housing in a neighborhood that has seen little new housing opportunities in recent years while also honoring the neighborhood's cultural history and augmenting the area's public realm. The greenhouses on the site are the last major remnant of the area's past as a "garden district" filled with nurseries. A housing project on this site should recognize and celebrate the history of the site and neighborhood in a creative and thoughtful way that offers amenity to the site's

residents and the broader community and responsive to the context. The Planning Department is intrigued by the development team's proposal to create "incremental housing" as a way to increase the affordability of new housing and sees the potential of the development to provide middle income and family housing opportunities.

2. **Board of Supervisor's Resolution: Portola as San Francisco's Garden District – Supporting the Portola Green Plan.** The Board of Supervisors passed Resolution No. 462-16 on October 25, 2016. Please review the resolution which recognizes the Portola neighborhood as San Francisco's Garden District and supports the implementation of the Portola Green Plan.
3. **Commission on the Environment's Resolution: Portola Green Plan and Portola as San Francisco's Garden District.** The Commission on the Environment passed Resolution No. 006-15-COE on December 14, 2015. Please review the resolution which supports the Portola Green Plan and recognizes the Portola as San Francisco's Garden District.
4. **Historic Preservation.** Preliminary studies have shown that the subject site is unique for its relation with San Francisco's agricultural industry and as the last extant greenhouse in the Portola neighborhood, documented in the Fall 2017 issue of SF Heritage News, which is a local advocacy group, and identified in the Draft Excelsior & Portola Historic Context Statement prepared by the Planning Department. Further review will be required to determine whether the property is a historic resource. Please consider preliminary public outreach with the neighborhood and preservation groups.
5. **Site Design.** The Department encourages the re-use of at least some of the iconic features associated with the University Mound Nursery in acknowledgement of the site's history and meaning for the community. In addition, the Department recommends orienting the perimeter buildings to provide street facing entries that front the street in a manner consistent with the neighboring context. Aggregating parking space in the mews should be considered to support enhanced open space and livability for residents.
6. **State Density Bonus Program.** For the purposes of requesting the State Density Bonus Program, the base project must be a completely Code complying project that does not require any modifications to the Planning Code. Please review the Application Standards in Planning Code Section 206.6 and consider alternate options outlined under the "Preliminary Planning Code and Procedural Comments" Section of the PPA letter. Additional information on the Department's implementation of the State Density Bonus Law can be found at: <http://sf-planning.org/density-bonus-programs>

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.¹ 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. If you have already filed your EEA, you may provide the requested information and documents as supplements to your application.

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

1. **Historic Resources.** The project site contains one or more buildings or structures considered to be a potential historic resource (constructed 45 or more years ago); therefore, the proposed project is subject to review by the Department's Historic Preservation staff. To assist in this review, the project sponsor must hire a qualified professional to prepare a Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE) report. The professional must be selected from the Planning Department's Historic Resource Consultant Pool. Please contact Pilar LaValley, Senior Preservation Planner, via email (pilar.lavalley@sfgov.org) for a list of three consultants from which to choose. Please contact the HRE scoping team at HRE@sfgov.org to arrange the HRE scoping. Following an approved scope, the historic resource consultant should submit the draft HRE report for review to Environmental Planning after the project sponsor has filed the EE Application and updated it as necessary to reflect feedback received in the PPA letter. The HRE should be submitted directly to the Department and copied to the project sponsor. Project sponsors should not receive and/or review advance drafts of consultant reports per the Environmental Review Guidelines. Historic Preservation staff will not begin reviewing your project until a complete draft HRE is received.
2. **Archeological Resources.** The proposed project will require Preliminary Archeological Review (PAR) by a Planning Department archeologist. To aid this review the Department archeologist may request a Preliminary Archeological Sensitivity Assessment (PASS) by a Department Qualified Archeological Consultant, subject to the review and approval by the Department archeologist. The Department archeologist will provide three names from the Qualified Archeological Consultant list if the PASS is required. The PAR will assess the archeological sensitivity of the project site based on in-house source material and will consider the potential for archeological impacts resulting from proposed soils disturbance. Please provide detailed information, including sections, proposed soils-disturbing activities, such as grading, excavation, installation of foundations, soils improvement, and site remediation in the EEA, and submit any available geotechnical/soils or phase II hazardous materials reports prepared for the project to assist in this review. If the Department archeologist determines that the project has a potential to adversely affect archeological resources, the PAR will identify additional measures needed to address the potential effect. These measures may include preparation of an archeological research design and treatment plan, implementation of 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. For that determination, please include dimensions of existing and proposed curb cuts on plans. Clarify street access and if each new internal street on the site would allow for two-way operations. Additionally, the project would likely require Transportation Planner coordination for SFMTA, SFFD, SF Public Works, and SF Planning design team review, and to assess trip generation and pedestrian access in relation to the proposed garages.
5. **Noise.** Construction noise is subject to the San Francisco Noise Ordinance (Article 29 of the San Francisco Police Code), which includes restrictions on noise levels of construction equipment and hours of construction. If pile driving is to be used during construction, measures to reduce construction noise may be required as part of the proposed project. The EEA should provide a construction schedule and indicate whether pile driving or other particularly noisy construction methods are required.
6. **Air Quality.** The proposed project at a maximum of 86 units is below the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's (BAAQMD) construction and operational screening levels for criteria air pollutants.² 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 proposed project is also required to prepare a Construction Dust Control Plan for review and approval by the San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH).

The project site is not located within an Air Pollutant Exposure Zone, as mapped and defined by Health Code Article 38. The Air Pollutant Exposure Zone identifies areas with poor air quality based on modeling of air pollution, exposures, and health vulnerability from mobile, stationary, and area source emissions within San Francisco. 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

² BAAQMD, CEQA Air Quality Guidelines, May 2011, Chapter 3.

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.³ The project sponsor may be required to submit the completed table regarding project compliance with the identified regulations and provide project-level details in the discussion column. This information will be reviewed by the environmental planner during the environmental review process to determine if the project would comply with San Francisco's Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy. Projects that do not comply with an ordinance or regulation may be determined to be inconsistent with the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy.

8. **Shadow.** The proposed project would not result in construction of a building greater than 40 feet in height. Therefore, preparation of a consultant-prepared shadow study is not required.
9. **Geology.** The project site is located on a site with a slope greater than 20% but not within a seismic hazard zone. Any new construction on the site is therefore subject to a mandatory Interdepartmental Project Review.⁴ A geotechnical study prepared by a qualified consultant must be submitted with the EEA. The study should provide recommendations for any geotechnical concerns identified in the study. In general, compliance with the building codes would avoid the potential for significant impacts related to structural damage, ground subsidence, liquefaction, landslides, and surface settlement. To assist Planning Department staff in determining whether the project would result in environmental impacts related to geological hazards, it is recommended that you provide a copy of the geotechnical information with boring logs for the proposed project. This study will also help inform the Planning Department Archeologist of the project site's subsurface geological conditions.
10. **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>.

³ Refer to <http://sf-planning.org/consultant-sponsor-resources> for latest "Greenhouse Gas Compliance Checklist for Private Development Projects."

⁴ San Francisco Planning Department. *Interdepartmental Project Review*. Available online at: <http://sf-planning.org/permit-forms-applications-and-fees>

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. **State Density Bonus Program.** Pursuant to Planning Code Section 206.6, in order to qualify for usage of the State Density Bonus Program, the base project must be completely code-compliant without modifications of the Planning Code. As proposed, the project is requesting the State Density Bonus Program atop the conditionally permitted project. The current methodology used in the proposal for calculating the base project is inaccurate. Please revise the proposal to provide a code-complying base project. Once a code-complying base project is provided, the Department can assist in calculating the individually-requested state density bonus program.
2. **Density.** The subject site is located in an RH-1 Zoning District, which permits up to one unit per lot or up to one unit per 3,000 square feet of lot area, with no more than three units per lot, with a Conditional Use Authorization. Per Planning Code Section 304 and Interpretations, the subject site can be developed as a Planned Unit Development with a Conditional Use Authorization, which permits one unit less than one per 1,500 square feet of lot area, resulting in 63 units for the subject 95,997 square foot lot. Please see below for several options for the proposal:
 - o **Option #1:** Seek a Conditional Use Authorization (CUA) for the Planned Unit Development (PUD).
 - o **Option #2:** Subdivide the lot into parcels that meet the minimum lot width and area requirements of the Planning Code and request the State Density Bonus Program.
3. **Front Setback, Landscaping and Permeability.** Planning Code Section 132 requires that new developments in RH-1 Districts provide front setbacks. Pursuant to Sections 132(g) and (h), a minimum of 20 percent of the front setback area must be landscaped and 50 percent of the front setback area must be treated with permeable surfaces. For projects seeking Planning Commission authorization as a PUD, Section 132(l) further extends the landscaping and permeability requirements to any additional ground floor setbacks that are not otherwise occupied by steps, porches, or other permitted obstructions. It is currently unclear if the proposal meets the requirements of Section 132. If not, the project would need to seek a modification to this requirement as a Planned Unit Development.
4. **Rear Yard.** Section 134 requires the project to provide a rear yard of at least 25 percent of the lot depth. The proposal does not appear to meet this requirement for any of the newly created lots and would need to seek a modification to this requirement as a Planned Unit Development.
5. **Open Space.** Section 135 requires 300 square feet of private open space for each dwelling unit or 400 square feet of common open space for each dwelling unit. Additionally, any such open spaces must meet the dimensional requirements of Subsections (f) and (g). Pursuant to Planning Code Section 304, for a Planned Unit Development, the project must provide usable open space at least equal to the open space required by this Code. For the proposed 63 units as part of the PUD, the project is required to provide a minimum of 18,900 square feet of usable open space if private or 25,200 square

feet of usable open space is common. The project provides 6,650 square feet of semi-public outdoor area, which does not meet the requirement.

6. **Streetscape Plan – Better Streets Plan Compliance.** Additional comments from the Streetscape Design Advisory Team (SDAT) are provided in the ‘Preliminary Design Comments’ section below. SDAT is an interagency group that includes representatives from the Planning Department, Department of Public Works and the Municipal Transportation Agency that provides design guidance on private developments that impact the public right-of-way. 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 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 project since the project proposes new construction on a property greater than half an acre. 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.

7. **Dwelling Unit Exposure.** Planning Code Section 140 requires that each dwelling unit have at least one room that meets the 120-square-foot minimum superficial floor area requirement of Section 503 of the Housing Code face directly on a street right-of-way, code-complying rear yard, or an appropriately sized courtyard. If not meeting these requirements, the project would need to seek a modification as a Planned Unit Development.
8. **Bicycle Parking (Class 1).** Planning Code Section 155.2 provides requirements for bicycle parking. For residential uses, one Class 1 bicycle parking space is required for every dwelling unit, resulting in a required 63 Class 1 bicycle parking spaces for this project. Please show compliance with this requirement on the plans.
9. **Bicycle Parking (Class 2):** Planning Code Section 155.2 requires the project to provide a minimum of one Class 2 bicycle parking space for every 20 units 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 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>

10. **Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program.** The TDM Program was adopted by the Board of Supervisors in February 2017, and it took effect on March 19, 2017. The proposed project includes more than 10 dwelling units and thus is subject to the TDM Program. The project will be required to meet or exceed a target score based on the proposed number of parking spaces associated with the land use category. Please note that if the first Development Application – as defined in Planning Code Section 401 – is submitted by December 31, 2017, then the project will only be required to meet 75% of its target score. Please submit a TDM Application for the proposed project.
11. **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

12. **Stormwater.** If the project results in a ground surface disturbance of 5,000 sf or greater (creating and/or replacing 5,000 square feet or more of impervious surface), it is subject to San Francisco's stormwater management requirements as outlined in the Stormwater Management Ordinance and the corresponding SFPUC Stormwater Design Guidelines (Guidelines). Projects that trigger the stormwater management requirements must prepare a Stormwater Control Plan demonstrating project adherence to the performance measures outlined in the Guidelines including: (a) reduction in total volume and peak flow rate of stormwater for areas in combined sewer systems OR (b) stormwater treatment for areas in separate sewer systems. The SFPUC Wastewater Enterprise, Urban Watershed Management Program is responsible for review and approval of the Stormwater Control Plan. Without SFPUC approval of a Stormwater Control Plan, no site or building permits can be issued. The Guidelines also require a signed maintenance agreement to ensure proper care of the necessary stormwater controls. Compliance may occur through a mix of rooftop, sidewalk, and open space treatments and technologies, and is encouraged to be designed as a comprehensive system that maximizes co-benefits for greening, habitat creation, urban heat island reduction, building energy savings, and beautification. Systems within the public realm should consider adjacencies and opportunities for flow-through systems to neighborhood detention areas. To view the Stormwater Management Ordinance, the Stormwater Design Guidelines, or download instructions for the Stormwater Control Plan, go to <http://sfwater.org/sdg>. Applicants may contact stormwaterreview@sfwater.org for assistance.
13. **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 legislation goes into effect January 2017. 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/san-francisco-living-roofs>.

14. **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.
15. **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. 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 sloped site occupies an entire city block in an RH -1 / 40-X district adjacent to a hilltop reservoir/open space. The site is bounded by Wayland, Hamilton, Woolsey, and Bowdoin Streets. The Residential Design Guidelines and draft Urban Design Guidelines are the basis of design review. The following comments address preliminary design issues that may substantially affect the proposed project:

1. **Site Design and Open Space.** The Planning Department requests a deeper analysis of partial retention and adaptive re-use of landscape features and existing buildings to honor the former use of the University Mound Nursery, which should be clearly visible from the abutting rights of way. Some of the existing structures could be re-purposed, and potentially relocated to provide common amenities on-site. We would like a more comprehensive understanding of any "trade-offs" (vis-à-vis housing production or other City or project goals) involved in any such approach. Additionally, the Planning Department encourages the vehicular mews to function as an internal pedestrian open

space network that feels more a part of the diagonal park. The Planning Department recommends a further exploration of expanding or enhancing the proposed mid-block connections.

2. **Building Massing, Siting, and Orientation.** The prevailing residential development pattern consists of 25' wide lots fronting the street to comprise a consistent and continuous street wall. Buildings that follow the scale and orientation of this urban pattern of 25-35' wide buildings and lots oriented to face the street should be explored along the perimeter of the site. Furthermore, provide street-front entrances to dwellings along the perimeter in a manner consistent with the neighboring context so that the street environment reflects the experience of nearby blocks. The buildings should step with the topography.
3. **Parking.** A large portion of the site is devoted to parking and parking access with four 20' wide drive mews. While The Planning Department acknowledges the scale of mews in general can augment the open space and livability of residential neighborhoods, this does not yet appear to be designed in a way where the mews are amenitized for any use other than car driveways. The Planning Department recommends exploring means to aggregate space associated for parking. The Planning Department recommends exploring the substitution of bike parking for required car parking to reduce the cost for greater affordability and provide more habitable space and common open space, especially at the interior of the block. Minimizing and aggregating the individual curb cuts allows the four sides of the block provide ample street parking, which should help offset the on-site parking demand.
4. **Architecture.** At this point the architecture is assumed to be schematic and The Planning Department will provide further detailed design review on the subsequent submission. As this is essentially a phased development, The Planning Department requests more information about controls that are envisioned for the incremental additions, including the degree of deviation / variation from the proposed rendition of the final phase design. High quality materials and detailing that are compatible with the context should be provided as the building design progresses.
5. **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.
6. **"Incremental" Approach.** The Department acknowledges and appreciates the innovative approach the project would employ to physically evolve over time, allowing building occupancies and the overall architecture to mature. We look forward to working with your team to identify the appropriate review mechanisms and/or conditions of approval that will enable this aspect of 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)**
3. **Inclusionary Affordable Housing Program (§415)**

AFFORDABLE HOUSING:

Inclusionary Affordable Housing (§415): 25 + Unit Project; EEA Complete after January 12, 2016- no grandfathering:

Inclusionary Affordable Housing is required for a project proposing ten or more dwelling units. The Project Sponsor must submit an 'Affidavit of Compliance with the Inclusionary Affordable Housing Program: Planning Code Section 415,' to the Planning Department identifying the method of compliance, on-site, off-site, or affordable housing fee. The following Inclusionary Affordable Housing requirements are those in effect at the time as of issuance of this letter. In the event that the requirements change, the Project Sponsor shall comply with requirements in place at the time of the issuance of first construction document. Any on-site affordable dwelling-units proposed as part of the project must be designated as owner-occupied units, not rental units; unless a Costa Hawkins exception agreement is secured by the project sponsor. Affordable units designated as on-site units shall be affordable units for the life of the project. The applicable percentage is dependent on the number of units in the project, the zoning of the property, and the date that the project submitted a complete Environmental Evaluation Application.

For all development projects with 25 or more Owned or Rental Units, the required on-site affordable ownership housing requirement shall increase by 1.0% annually for two consecutive years starting January 1, 2018.

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