PRELIMINARY PROJECT ASSESSMENT

Project Address: 469 Stevenson Street
Case Number: 2017-014833PPA
Date: May 17, 2018
To: Katie O'Brien, Build, Inc.
From: Mark Luellen, Planning Department
Nicholas Foster, Planning Department

This Preliminary Project Assessment (PPA) provides feedback from the Planning Department regarding the proposed project at the property listed above, based on the information provided in the PPA application, 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. Please be advised that the PPA application does not constitute an application for development with the Planning Department. This PPA does not represent a complete review of the proposed project, does not grant a project approval of any kind, and does not supersede any required Planning Department approvals.

A Development Application, and any supplemental applications including for Environmental Evaluation (EE), may be submitted with the Planning Department at any time following the issuance of this PPA. The Development Application should, to the extent practical, propose a project that is responsive to the comments, issues, and requested materials identified in this PPA. The Development Application, and all supplemental applications, may be found here: http://sf-planning.org/permit-forms-applications-and-fees

The Planning Department may provide additional comments once a Development Application has been 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, the project will likely require approvals from other City agencies. For more, see the Citywide Policy Fact Sheet attached to this PPA.

You may contact Nicholas Foster, at (415) 575-9167 or nicholas.foster@sfgov.org, to answer any questions you may have about this PPA, or to schedule a follow-up meeting with Planning staff.

Mark Luellen, Principal Planner

CC: Christopher Thomas, Environmental Planning Division
Paolo Ikezoe, Citywide Planning Division
Luiz Barata, Urban Design Advisory Team
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I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

SITE DETAILS

Block/Lot(s): 3704/045
Parcel Area: 28,790 sq. ft.
Zoning District(s): C-3-G (Downtown General Commercial)
Height/Bulk District(s): 160-F Height and Bulk District
Plan Area: Downtown

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposal ("project") would utilize the Individually Requested State Density Bonus Program, therefore a "base" and a "bonus" project are required for analysis purposes. The bonus project includes the demolition of the existing 28,790-square-foot surface commercial parking lot and construct a new 31-story, 335-foot-tall building containing residential uses. The proposed building would include 439 dwelling units, 219 below-grade parking spaces, Class 1 and 2 bicycle parking spaces, and 6,902 gross square feet of ground-floor retail, and 398,209 gross square feet of residential use, for a total of 495,138 gross square feet of uses. The "base" project includes a reduced number of dwelling units (325 dwelling units) and a smaller building (352,098 gross square feet), and a lower overall height (160 feet tall). Excavation to a maximum depth of 50 feet is expected, with an approximate amount of excavation of 53,302 cubic yards.

KEY PROJECT CONSIDERATIONS

Any Development Application for the proposed project should consider and, to the extent feasible, address the following issues:

1. The project as proposed is seeking to utilize the Individually Requested State Density Bonus Program. In order to determine the allowable density bonus, the applicant must provide a base project that is deemed completely code-compliant, and does not require any exceptions, variances or modifications from the Planning Code.

The base project is not considered code-compliant because an exception, pursuant to Code Section 309, is required from the rear yard requirements from the Code Section 134. Additionally, a variance from Section 145.1 may be required as the base project proposes residential uses a ground level. Residential uses are considered active uses only if more than 50 percent of the linear residential street frontage at the ground level features walk-up dwelling units that provide direct, individual pedestrian access to a public sidewalk. Future submittals should show compliance with the Code to remain eligible for the State Density Bonus Program.

Additionally, the base project cannot assume that the Inclusionary Affordable Dwelling Units provided onsite are exempt from the density calculation since such exemption requires Conditional Use Authorization pursuant to Planning Code Section 124(f). If Conditional Use Authorization is required to exceed the principally permitted density, that base project is therefore not considered code-compliant.

Future submittals should clearly show that the base project is not exempting the square footage allocated to affordable Dwelling Units from the calculation of total allowable gross floor area. The figures on page 0.06 "planning summary" of the PPA submittal state that the base Floor Area Ratio (FAR) for the subject property is 9:1, or 259,110 gross square feet, with use of Transferable Development Rights (TDRs). That calculation correctly reflects the maximum allowable FAR with no exemption of floor area for Inclusionary Affordable Dwelling Units.
Please note that discrepancies appear on page 0.80 ("area tabulation -baseline") with different values for total gross floor area for the base project that do not match the values found on page 0.06. Nevertheless, Department Staff assumed these values to be tabulation errors and are basing comments on the values provided on the “planning summary” sheet, or page 0.06.

In areas where density is controlled by the permitted building envelope, the bonus density is calculated as a bonus of additional residential floor area. While the bonus project that was submitted appears to correctly calculate the maximum gross floor area allowed utilizing the State Density Bonus Program, future submittals should clearly show that the bonus project is calculating the bonus off the maximum gross floor area permitted for the base project. The figures on page 0.06 “planning summary” state that the bonus project is eligible for up to 349,799 gross square feet, which is correct. However, as with the base project, discrepancies appear on page 0.08 ("area tabulation -proposed") with different values for total gross floor area for the base project that do not match the values found on page 0.06. Nevertheless, Department Staff assumed these values to be tabulation errors and are basing comments on the values provided on the "planning summary" sheet, or page 0.06.

In future submittals, please also describe the waivers, incentives and concessions sought for the bonus project. Please describe how the requested waivers are necessary to accommodate the additional density, and how the requested incentives and concessions result in actual and identifiable cost reductions for the project. Planning Staff may request supportive documentation for the requested waivers, incentives and concessions.

Additional comments may be found in Appendix A.

PLANNING CODE REVIEW

The proposed project will be reviewed for conformity with the requirements of the San Francisco Planning Code, and as required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), upon submittal of a Development Application. Based on the information provided in the PPA application, a Development Application for the proposed project should include supplemental applications for the following:

1. Environmental Evaluation
2. Downtown Project Authorization
3. Transportation Demand Management Program
4. Shadow Analysis.

For more information, including conformity of the proposed project with Planning Code requirements, and applicable Development Impact Fees, see Appendix A: Planning Code Review Checklist.

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.

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.
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The proposed project would require environmental review in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Based on preliminary review of the proposed project, the following would be likely to apply:

Likely Environmental Document: Initial Study to determine MND or EIR

Likely Required Technical Studies:

1. Transportation Impact Study
2. Geotechnical Report
3. Archeological Resources Report
4. Noise Study
5. Air Quality Study
6. Wind and Shadow studies
7. Hazards (Phase I ESA)

For more information, including requirements for what constitutes an Environmental Evaluation Application, see Appendix B: Environmental Review Checklist.
LAND USE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permitted Use</th>
<th>Conditional Use</th>
<th>Planning Code Section &amp; Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>210.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>235-249</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
Residential Uses are principally permitted in the subject Zoning District, with no density limits. Instead, density is regulated by the maximum floor area ratio (FAR); permitted height and bulk; required setbacks; exposure; and open space of each development lot. The base project that was submitted appears to be code-compliant. Please see Conditional Use Authorization section for additional information.

CONDITIONAL USE AUTHORIZATION:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Planning Code Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
While the base project that was submitted appears to be code-compliant, future submittals should clearly show that the base project is not exempting the square footage allocated to affordable Dwelling Units from the calculation of total allowable gross floor area. This means the base project cannot assume that the Inclusionary Affordable Dwelling Units provided onsite are exempt from the density calculation since such exemption requires Conditional Use Authorization pursuant to Planning Code Section 124(f). Planning Section 124(f) allows additional square footage above that permitted by the base floor area ratio limits may be permitted in C-3 Districts for the construction of on-site affordable units to households whose incomes are within 120% of Area Median Income (AMI) for rental units, in accordance with conditional use procedures and criteria as provided by Planning Code Section 303.

OTHER REQUIRED APPROVALS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Planning Code Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>127, 128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
Downtown Project Authorization is required as the project includes over 50,000 square feet of gross floor area and is over 75 feet in height. An exception from the rear yard requirements from the Code is required as the base project does not provide a code-compliant rear yard. Please refer to Planning Code Section for the additional finding required under Planning Code Sections 309. Additionally, a variance may be required as the base project proposes...
APPENDIX A: PLANNING CODE REVIEW CHECKLIST

Case No. 2017-014833PPA
469 Stevenson Street

### ADDITIONAL PLANNING CODE REQUIREMENTS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Planning Code Section</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>102 Gross Floor Area</td>
<td>See comments below under Maximum Floor Area Ratio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>123 Maximum Floor Area Ratio</td>
<td>The maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) for the subject property is (9:1), or 259,110 gsf. Additional floor area may be permitted for construction of on-site Inclusionary Affordable Dwelling Units through Conditional Use Authorization, pursuant to Code Section 124(f), thereby exceeding the 9:1 FAR limit. It is assumed the PPA submittal is not exempting any floor area per Code Section 124(f) for the base project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>124 Floor Area Ratio</td>
<td>See comments below under Maximum Floor Area Ratio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>132.1 Setback &amp; Streetwall in C-3</td>
<td>Setbacks of the upper parts of a building abutting a public sidewalk in any C-3 District may be required, in accordance with the provisions of Section 309, as deemed necessary. More information is required to determine the established street wall base for the subject property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>134 Rear Yard</td>
<td>Pursuant to Section 309, an exception would be required for the Base Project given that no rear yard is provided at the lowest level containing Dwelling Units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>135 Open Space (Residential)</td>
<td>Private or common useable open space (36 sf/Dwelling Unit if private or 48 sf/Dwelling Unit if common) is required. Base Project does not show compliance. If all common useable open space, 15,561 sf would be required. Bonus Project shows a total of 20,943 sf of common useable open space where 21,019 sf would otherwise be required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>138 Privately-Owned Public Open Space</td>
<td>Privately-Owned Public Space in the amount of 1:50 sf for all non-residential uses would be required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complies</td>
<td>Does Not Comply</td>
<td>Needs Info</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☞</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☞</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☝</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX A: PLANNING CODE REVIEW CHECKLIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Code Section</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>155(d)</td>
<td>Compliance with this Code Section should be shown on future submittals for both Base and Bonus Projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155(s)</td>
<td>Any single development is limited to a total of two façade openings of no more than 11 feet wide each or one opening of no more than 22 feet wide for access to off-street parking and one façade opening of no more than 15 feet wide for access to off-street loading. Shared openings for parking and loading are encouraged. The maximum permitted width of a shared parking and loading garage opening is 27 feet. Compliance with this Code Section should be shown on future submittals for both Base and Bonus Projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155.2</td>
<td>The Base Project would require 156 Class 1 and 18 Class 2 spaces based upon approximate GFA of proposed uses. Bonus Project would require 186 Class 1 spaces and 24 Class 2 spaces based on approximate GFA of proposed uses. Compliance with this Code Section should be shown on future submittals for both Base and Bonus Projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155.4</td>
<td>Compliance with this Code Section should be shown on future submittals for both Base and Bonus Projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>Compliance with this Code Section should be shown on future submittals for both Base and Bonus Projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>Environmental Application was accepted prior January 1, 2018, therefore the Project is subject to 75% of TDM target. Compliance with this Code Section should be shown on future submittals for both Base and Bonus Projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207.7</td>
<td>Both the Base and Bonus Projects do not show the required unit mix of two- and three-bedroom units. Compliance with this Code Section should be shown on future submittals for both Base and Bonus Projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260(a)</td>
<td>Compliance with this Code Section should be shown on future submittals for both Base and Bonus Projects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX A: PLANNING CODE REVIEW CHECKLIST

**Case No. 2017-014833PPA**  
469 Stevenson Street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complies</th>
<th>Does Not Comply</th>
<th>Needs Info</th>
<th>Planning Code Section</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>Bulk: The Base Project appears to be Code-compliant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>270.2</td>
<td>Mid-Block Alley: Compliance with this Code Section should be shown on future submittals for both Base and Bonus Projects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Planning Code Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ☒        | 411A  
Transportation Sustainability Fee (TSF) |
| ☒        | 414A  
Child-Care for Residential Projects |
## TABLE 1. POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>DOCUMENT TYPE</th>
<th>APPLICABLE TO PROPOSED PROJECT</th>
<th>NOTES/LINKS</th>
<th>ACCEPTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1(e)</td>
<td>In Area Plan</td>
<td>X YES □ NO [skip to No. 1(f)]</td>
<td>Downtown Area Plan</td>
<td>☐ YES ☐ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1(e)(ii)</td>
<td>In Area Plan and not consistent with development density and/or height established by zoning</td>
<td>X YES □ NO</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐ YES ☐ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1(f)</td>
<td>Requires an initial study to determine environmental document</td>
<td>X YES □ NO</td>
<td>See table 2 for likely topics and studies to be required.</td>
<td>☐ YES ☐ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1(g)</td>
<td>Requires general environmental consultant</td>
<td>X YES □ NO</td>
<td>A general environmental consultant is likely required to coordinated sub-consultants and prepare the environmental document, which must be prepared by a professional selected from the department's general environmental consultant pool. Contact <a href="mailto:environmentalpool@sfgov.org">environmentalpool@sfgov.org</a> for list of eligible consultants.</td>
<td>☐ YES ☐ NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE 2. REQUIREMENTS FOR AN ACCEPTED APPLICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL TOPIC</th>
<th>GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF REQUIREMENT</th>
<th>APPLICABLE TO PROPOSED PROJECT</th>
<th>NOTES/LINKS/ACCEPTED APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1(a)</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Construction Phasing</td>
<td>X YES □ NO</td>
<td>General construction phasing should be provided (i.e., demolition, site preparation, excavation, construction, finishing).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1(b)</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Changes to public facilities or infrastructure, excluding roadways (see No. 3 for roadways)</td>
<td>□ YES □ NO X TBD</td>
<td>The property owner must describe location and provide plans of any changes to public facilities, excluding roadways (e.g., parks and recreation facilities, pump stations, sewer lines, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2(a)</td>
<td>Historic Preservation</td>
<td>Requires Supplemental Information for Historic Resource Evaluation</td>
<td>□ YES □ NO X TBD</td>
<td>Project site is currently a parking lot. Note that several Category A buildings adjoin the project site. As substantial excavation is proposed, a study regarding potential vibration impacts to adjacent historic resources may be required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3(a)</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Roadway changes – construction</td>
<td>X YES □ NO</td>
<td>Project is subject to Better Streets Plan. The property owner must describe location and provide plans of any changes to roadways for construction, including duration and location of temporary construction closure of travel lanes, sidewalks, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3(b)</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Roadway changes – operation</td>
<td>X YES □ NO</td>
<td>The property owner/consultant must describe location and provide plans of typical roadway dimensions (e.g., lane dimensions/striping drawings), including identifying any non-typical roadway dimension (e.g., turn pockets, bulb outs).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE 2. REQUIREMENTS FOR AN ACCEPTED APPLICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL TOPIC</th>
<th>GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF REQUIREMENT</th>
<th>APPLICABLE TO PROPOSED PROJECT</th>
<th>NOTES/LINKS/ACCEPTED APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS</th>
<th>(For Dept. use upon submittal of Development Application) ACCEPTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.3(f)</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Requires consultant-prepared Transportation Study</td>
<td>(\checkmark) YES ☐ NO ☐ TBD</td>
<td>Study must be prepared by a professional selected from the department's transportation consultant pool. Contact cpc: <a href="mailto:transportationreview@sfgov.org">transportationreview@sfgov.org</a> for a list of [three] eligible consultants. The consultant must submit a scope of work to department. Pay applicable department fees. Pay SFMTA fee directly to SFMTA, One South Van Ness, 8th Floor, Attn: Evelyn Bruce, San Francisco, CA 94103. Make check out to: Development Review Fees – [insert project name].</td>
<td>☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3(g)</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Scope of Work Checklist</td>
<td>(\checkmark) YES ☐ NO</td>
<td>Refer to attached checklist which lists scope requirements.</td>
<td>☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Requires consultant-prepared Noise Study</td>
<td>(\checkmark) YES ☐ NO</td>
<td>Project site may be adjacent to sensitive receptors (residences, hotels); construction and stationary equipment must demonstrate compliance with Noise Ordinance. The consultant (not subject to department list) must submit a scope of work to department.</td>
<td>☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Noise / Air Quality</td>
<td>Stationary Source or Mechanical Equipment Or other noise sources</td>
<td>(\checkmark) YES ☐ NO</td>
<td>The property owner must describe location and provide plans of number, size (horsepower), and engine tier level of stationary sources or mechanical equipment (e.g., backup diesel generators, fire pumps) or other noise sources.</td>
<td>☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6a</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>Subject to San Francisco Health Code article 38</td>
<td>(\checkmark) YES ☐ NO</td>
<td>The property owner must submit copy of initial filed application with department of public health. More information is found here: <a href="http://www.sfdph.org/dph/eh/Air/default.asp">http://www.sfdph.org/dph/eh/Air/default.asp</a>.</td>
<td>☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE 2. REQUIREMENTS FOR AN ACCEPTED APPLICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL TOPIC</th>
<th>GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF REQUIREMENT</th>
<th>APPLICABLE TO PROPOSED PROJECT</th>
<th>NOTES/LINKS/ACCEPTED APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS</th>
<th>(For Dept. use upon submittal of Development Application) ACCEPTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.6b</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>Requires consultant-prepared Air Quality Study for criteria air pollutants. Need for a health risk analysis will be determined.</td>
<td>X YES ☐ NO</td>
<td>The project screens out for a criteria air pollutant analysis. However, a CalEEMod run should be run to determine if a health risk assessment is necessary as the project site is in the APEZ. The consultant (not subject to department list) must submit a scope of work to department.</td>
<td>☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</td>
<td>Requires Greenhouse Gas Analysis Compliance Checklist</td>
<td>X YES ☐ NO</td>
<td>The property owner must submit [private development OR municipal project] checklist to department. Greenhouse Gas cover and checklist are found here: <a href="http://sf-planning.org/consultant-sponsor-resources">http://sf-planning.org/consultant-sponsor-resources under Application</a>.</td>
<td>☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>Wind</td>
<td>Requires consultant-prepared [Wind Memorandum and potentially Wind Study with tunnel testing OR Wind Study with tunnel testing]</td>
<td>X YES (wind memo generally required &gt;80 feet; wind study always required if site is located in use district with wind criteria) ☐ NO</td>
<td>Project is in a known windy area and is well over 80 feet in height. The consultant (not subject to department list) must submit a scope of work to department.</td>
<td>☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>Wind/Shadow</td>
<td>Building setbacks</td>
<td>X YES ☐ NO</td>
<td>The property owner must describe location and provide plans of building setbacks and coverage at each above-grade level, including height of the roof, parapet, ridge, towers, and penthouses</td>
<td>☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>Shadow (a)</td>
<td>Requires Shadow Analysis Application</td>
<td>X YES (if shadow fan shows new shadow on public open spaces) ☐ NO [skip to 11(a)]</td>
<td>Pay applicable fees. Application is found here: <a href="http://default.sfplanning.org/publications_reports/Shadow_Analysis_Application.pdf">http://default.sfplanning.org/publications_reports/Shadow_Analysis_Application.pdf</a></td>
<td>☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL TOPIC</td>
<td>GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF REQUIREMENT</td>
<td>APPLICABLE TO PROPOSED PROJECT</td>
<td>NOTES/LINKS/ACCEPTED APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS</td>
<td>(For Dept. use upon submittal of Development Application) ACCEPTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>Shadow</td>
<td>Requires consultant-prepared Shadow Study</td>
<td>X YES ☐ NO</td>
<td>Preliminary shadow analysis indicates proposed structure would shadow nearby open spaces. The consultant (not subject to department list) must submit a scope of work to department.</td>
<td>☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11(a)</td>
<td>Biological Resources</td>
<td>Trees</td>
<td>X YES ☐ NO</td>
<td>The property owner must describe location and show number of trees on, over, or adjacent to the project site on plans, including those significant, landmark, and street trees (see Public Works article 16 for definitions) and those added by project.</td>
<td>☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>Geology and Soils</td>
<td>Project site slope</td>
<td>X YES ☐ NO</td>
<td>The property owner must describe slope of project site (percentage) in relation to adjacent streets and cardinal direction.</td>
<td>☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>Geology and Soils</td>
<td>Requires preliminary Geotechnical Study, including boring logs</td>
<td>X YES ☐ NO</td>
<td>Project is in a seismic hazard (liquefaction) area. The property owner must submit final preliminary study.</td>
<td>☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>Subject to Health Code article 22 (Maher Ordinance)</td>
<td>X YES (required if greater than 50 cubic yards disturbance or known contamination) ☐ NO [skip to 14]</td>
<td>The property owner must submit copy of the Maher application form with department of public health. More information is found here: <a href="http://www.sfdph.org/dph/EH/HazWaste/hazWasteSiteMitigation.asp">http://www.sfdph.org/dph/EH/HazWaste/hazWasteSiteMitigation.asp</a>. Submit a copy of the form with department of public health intake stamp.</td>
<td>☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>Requires consultant-prepared Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment</td>
<td>X YES ☐ NO</td>
<td>The property owner must submit final Phase 1 assessment.</td>
<td>☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 3. POST-ACCEPTED APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL TOPIC</th>
<th>GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF REQUIREMENT</th>
<th>APPLICABLE TO PROPOSED PROJECT</th>
<th>NOTES/LINKS / APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS</th>
<th>(For Dept. use upon submittal of Development Application) ACCEPTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1(a)</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Project Objectives (for EIRs)</td>
<td>☑️ YES ☑️ NO [skip to 2]</td>
<td>The property owner must draft statement of objectives sought by the project, consistent with CEQA Guidelines section 15124(b). The department will finalize objectives with property owner.</td>
<td>☑️ YES ☑️ NO ☑️ N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1(b)</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Other agency approvals (for EIRs)</td>
<td>☑️ YES ☑️ NO</td>
<td>The property owner must submit a list of non-department permits and other approvals.</td>
<td>☑️ YES ☑️ NO ☑️ N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
<td>Photo simulations</td>
<td>☑️ YES ☑️ NO</td>
<td>The property owner must coordinate with the department to submit draft photo simulations from public right-of-way vantage points, particularly areas identified in the General Plan. The department will finalize simulations with property owner.</td>
<td>☑️ YES ☑️ NO ☑️ N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Archeology</td>
<td>Preliminary Archeological Sensitivity Assessment Study</td>
<td>☑️ YES ☑️ NO ☑️ TBD</td>
<td>Department will conduct a preliminary archeological review. If required, study must be prepared by a professional selected from the department's archeological consultant pool. Contact <a href="mailto:archeology@sfgov.org">archeology@sfgov.org</a> for a list of eligible consultants. The department will review and approve scope and study with consultant.</td>
<td>☑️ YES ☑️ NO ☑️ N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4(a)</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Sidewalks – effective dimensions</td>
<td>☑️ YES ☑️ NO</td>
<td>The consultant must describe effective dimensions of sidewalks, taking into account presence and general location of physical structures.</td>
<td>☑️ YES ☑️ NO ☑️ N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO.</td>
<td>ENVIRONMENTAL TOPIC</td>
<td>GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF REQUIREMENT</td>
<td>APPLICABLE TO PROPOSED PROJECT</td>
<td>NOTES/LINKS/APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS</td>
<td>(For Dept. use upon submittal of Development Application) ACCEPTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4(b)</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Intersection treatments</td>
<td>X YES □ NO</td>
<td>The consultant must describe location and type of intersection curb ramps, intersection crossing treatments (e.g., crosswalks), or traffic control devices (e.g., stops signs, gates, signals).</td>
<td>□ YES □ NO □ N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4(d)</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Programmatic features – external to buildings</td>
<td>X YES □ NO</td>
<td>The consultant must describe valet, crossing guard, or control officer operations and locations.</td>
<td>□ YES □ NO □ N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4(e)</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Programmatic features – internal to buildings</td>
<td>X YES □ NO</td>
<td>The consultant must describe operations of vehicle stackers, elevators, turning tables, loading facilities, etc.</td>
<td>□ YES □ NO □ N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4(f)</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Turning templates</td>
<td>X YES □ NO</td>
<td>The consultant must provide plans of vehicle turning templates, indicating the various design vehicles.</td>
<td>□ YES □ NO □ N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5(a)</td>
<td>Transportation / Noise / Air Quality</td>
<td>Construction – sub-phasing</td>
<td>X YES □ NO</td>
<td>The consultant must describe estimated hours and number of days of week of construction, including by phase (demolition, site preparation, grading, building construction, architectural coatings, paving) taking into account total phase duration (weeks).</td>
<td>□ YES □ NO □ N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5(b)</td>
<td>Transportation / Noise / Air Quality</td>
<td>Construction – equipment</td>
<td>X YES □ NO</td>
<td>The consultant must describe estimated number, size (horsepower), and usage (daily and total) of construction equipment type, including trucks and any impact equipment, by phase. Or if nighttime construction could occur.</td>
<td>□ YES □ NO □ N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 3. POST-ACCEPTED APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL TOPIC</th>
<th>GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF REQUIREMENT</th>
<th>APPLICABLE TO PROPOSED PROJECT</th>
<th>NOTES/LINKS/APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS</th>
<th>(For Dept. use upon submittal of Development Application) ACCEPTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.5(c)</td>
<td>Transportation / Noise / Air Quality</td>
<td>Operation – diesel trucks</td>
<td>☒ YES ☐ NO</td>
<td>The property owner must describe estimated number of daily diesel vehicle trucks during operation.</td>
<td>☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5(d)</td>
<td>Transportation / Noise / Air Quality</td>
<td>Operation – waste facilities</td>
<td>☒ YES ☐ NO</td>
<td>The property owner must describe and provide plans of location and dimensions of rooms for compost, recycling, and waste.</td>
<td>☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5(e)</td>
<td>Transportation / Noise / Air Quality</td>
<td>Operation – noise sources</td>
<td>☒ YES ☐ NO</td>
<td>The property owner must describe and provide plans of location and dimensions of locations where amplified noise or large crowds may congregate.</td>
<td>☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6a</td>
<td>Utilities and Service Systems</td>
<td>Water supply</td>
<td>☒ YES ☐ NO</td>
<td>The project meets the definition of a water demand project per CEQA Guidelines section 15155. The property owner must submit water supply demand estimates.</td>
<td>☐ YES ☐ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6b</td>
<td>Utilities and Service Systems</td>
<td>Wastewater demand</td>
<td>☒ YES ☐ NO</td>
<td>The applicant must provide wastewater demand calculations in accordance with Subdivision Regulations.</td>
<td>☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7(b)</td>
<td>Hydrology and Water Quality</td>
<td>Stormwater and Sewer Management</td>
<td>☒ YES ☐ NO</td>
<td>The applicant must describe stormwater retention, detention, infiltration, and treatment features proposed to meet requirements of Stormwater Management Ordinance. The applicant must describe existing sewer capacity and proposed demand on sewer infrastructure.</td>
<td>☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 3. POST-ACCEPTED APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL TOPIC</th>
<th>GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF REQUIREMENT</th>
<th>APPLICABLE TO PROPOSED PROJECT</th>
<th>NOTES/LINKS/ APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS</th>
<th>(For Dept. use upon submittal of Development Application) ACCEPTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.8(a)</td>
<td>Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>Requires consultant-prepared Phase 2 Environmental Site Assessment</td>
<td>☐ YES ☐ NO X TBD</td>
<td><a href="http://propertymap.sfplanning.org/">The department and department of public health will review Phase 1 assessment to determine if the property owner must submit a final Phase 2 assessment.</a> <a href="http://sftransportationmap.org/">http://sftransportationmap.org/</a> [<a href="http://developmentmap.sfplanning.org/">http://developmentmap.sfplanning.org/</a>]</td>
<td>☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Abbreviations:**
- CEQA: California Environmental Quality Act
- EIR: Environmental Impact Report

### TABLE 4. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL TOPIC</th>
<th>GENERAL DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>APPLICABLE TO PROPOSED PROJECT</th>
<th>NOTES/LINKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>General Resources</td>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>X YES ☐ NO</td>
<td>Please see the following links for additional resources that may inform the environmental analysis: <a href="http://propertymap.sfplanning.org/">http://propertymap.sfplanning.org/</a> <a href="http://sftransportationmap.org/">http://sftransportationmap.org/</a> <a href="http://developmentmap.sfplanning.org/">http://developmentmap.sfplanning.org/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Tribal Cultural Resources</td>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>X YES ☐ NO ☐ TBD</td>
<td>Department staff will consult with California Native American tribes regarding potential significant impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Shadow</td>
<td>Shadow Fan</td>
<td>X YES ☐ NO</td>
<td>Department prepared the attached shadow fan which shows [no] new shadow on outdoor recreation facilities or other public areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DATE: 5/17/2018  
TO: Transportation Consultants  
FROM: Lana Wong & Dan Wu, Transportation Staff  
RE: Transportation Study Scope of Work Checklist  
Case No. 2017-014833PPA, 469 Stevenson

The following is a list of items we anticipate will be required for the analysis of this transportation study. Some of these items may require further consultation with Environmental Planning during scoping of the transportation study.

**Travel Demand**
- ☒ Estimates of (AM / PM / other time peak hour / daily) person and vehicle trips
- ☒ Trip Distribution (AM / PM / other time peak hour / daily) person and vehicle trips
- ☒ Estimates of (average hour / peak hour / daily) freight loading demand
- ☒ Estimate of (average hour / peak hour / daily) passenger loading demand
- ☐ Estimate of (average hour / peak hour / daily) of other types of loading demand. Describe type (e.g., tour bus): ______________________________________________________________  
  _____________________________________________________________________
- ☐ Estimate of (average hour / peak hour / daily) parking demand
- ☒ Different travel demand for (baseline / cumulative) conditions. Describe reasons why:Baseline should analyze 6th Street improvements, including proposed signals on Jesse/6th and Stevenson/6th Streets, and potential prohibited left turns.
- ☐ Other: ___________________________________________________________________

**Traffic**
- ☒ Assessment of potential major traffic hazards. Describe elements of analysis briefly:Assess vehicle to vehicle hazards at Jesse/6th and Stevenson/6th Streets.

**Walking/Accessibility**
- ☒ Assessment of potentially hazardous conditions. Describe elements of analysis briefly: Project needs to clarify changes to sidewalk; if no changes, assess hazards to people walking.
- ☒ Assessment of accessibility. Describe elements briefly: Project needs to clarify changes to sidewalk; if no changes, assess accessibility for people walking.
- ☒ (Qualitative / Quantitative) Cumulative Analysis. Describe cumulative projects to consider briefly: Qualitatively access the potential for cumulative walking impacts.
Bicycling
☒ Assessment of potentially hazardous conditions. Describe elements of analysis briefly: Assess vehicle to bicycle hazards along 5th Street bike facility and along proposed 6th Street bike facility.

☐ Assessment of accessibility. Describe elements briefly: ______________________________
____________________________________________________________________________

☒ (Qualitative / Quantitative) Cumulative Analysis. Describe cumulative projects to consider briefly: Qualitatively access the potential for cumulative biking impacts.

Transit
☒ (Qualitative / Quantitative) assessment of transit capacity
☐ (Screenline / Directional link / line-by-line) assessment of transit capacity. If applicable, list lines: ______________________________

☒ (Qualitative / Quantitative) assessment of transit delay. Describe elements of analysis briefly (e.g., lines): Qualitatively assess potential transit delay on Market, 5th, and Mission Streets based on project generated vehicle trips and distribution.
☒ (Qualitative / Quantitative) Cumulative Analysis. Describe cumulative projects to consider briefly: Qualitatively access the potential for cumulative transit impacts.

Loading
☒ (Qualitative / Quantitative) assessment of loading demand. Describe elements of analysis briefly: Quantitatively assess the freight loading demand, including freight and delivery service vehicles accessing the site. Is loading demand met? Can vehicles turn into the loading space?
☒ Assessment of potentially hazardous conditions due to loading. Describe elements of analysis briefly: If loading demand is not met and vehicles cannot turn into the loading space than analyze potentially hazardous conditions to other modes. Provide turning templates of freight vehicles from Stevenson Street into loading area.
☒ (Qualitative / Quantitative) Cumulative Analysis. Describe cumulative projects to consider briefly: Qualitatively access the potential for cumulative loading impacts.

Emergency Access
☐ Assessment of Emergency Access. Describe elements briefly:
☐ (Qualitative / Quantitative) Cumulative Analysis. Describe cumulative projects to consider briefly: ______________________________

VMT
☒ Senate Bill 743 Checklist
☒ Map-based VMT analysis
☐ Detailed VMT analysis. Describe reasons why:
☑ TDM Program compliance
Construction
☒ Assessment of potentially hazardous conditions due to construction. Describe elements of analysis briefly: Analyze the proposed project’s construction in relation to other baseline projects.

☒ (Qualitative / Quantitative) Cumulative Analysis. Describe cumulative projects to consider briefly: Analyze the proposed project’s construction in relation to other cumulative projects.

Parking
☐ Assessment of potentially hazardous conditions due to parking configuration. Describe elements of analysis briefly: _______________________________________________________

☐ (Qualitative / Quantitative) assessment of transit delay due to parking configuration. Describe elements of analysis briefly (e.g., lines): ______________________________________________

☐ (Qualitative / Quantitative) Cumulative Analysis. Describe cumulative projects to consider briefly: _______________________________________________________________________

Other
☐ Project Variants. Describe reasons briefly:
☒ Future Baseline analysis. Describe reasons briefly: 6th Street Improvement Project.
☐ Assessment of Mitigation Measures from prior EIR (e.g., Area Plan). List EIR:
☒ Cumulative Projects: Better Market Street, 6th Street, 945 Market Street, and 950-974 Market Street, 1036-1040 Mission Street.

Warrants SFMTA staff consultation or review during the CEQA transportation review process:
☐ Streetscape changes beyond the publicly accessible right-of-ways beyond those of Planning Code Section 138.1(C)(2)). Including:
  • A new street:
  • Traffic control devices changes (e.g., stop signs, signals, etc.);
  • Roadway dimension changes or restriping (e.g., lane removal or addition, lane width reduction or expansion, addition of bicycle facilities, one-way to two-way, etc);
  • Mid-block crossings for people walking
☒ Development is proposed along a street with a future (i.e., under construction or reasonably foreseeable) streetscape project that includes curb extensions, bicycle facilities, or transit service or facilities;
☐ Development proposes changes to the location of physical features of public transit stop;
☐ Development proposes changes to public transit service;
☐ Development proposes changes to operate shuttle bus service;
☐ Development proposes changes to the length, location, and hour restriction’s to color curb designations or metered parking;
☒ Development is proposing greater than 150 vehicular parking spaces for accessory uses or more than 50 vehicle parking spaces for non-accessory uses (i.e., private or public parking garage/lot);
☐ Development is proposing an event center or regional-serving entertainment venue;
☐ Other: ___________________________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX D: PRELIMINARY DESIGN COMMENTS

PRELIMINARY DESIGN COMMENTS

The proposal is a massing and floor plan diagram, therefore the architecture is assumed to be preliminary and UDAT will provide further detailed design review on the subsequent submission. UDAT recommends that the project express significant façade depth, provide high-quality materials, and meet the architectural detailing and character of the neighborhood. Innovative architecture is encouraged.

The project is located in a C-3-G Downtown-General zoning district and Downtown planning area. The Downtown Area Plan along with the Urban Design Guidelines provides objectives and policies and guidelines that serve as the basis for design review. Relevant policies and guidelines are cited below.

DOWNTOWN AREA PLAN

POLICY 11.2
Introduce elements of the natural environment in open space to contrast with the built-up environment.

POLICY 12.3
Design new buildings to respect the character of older development nearby. Care should also be exercised in the design of new buildings proposed near landmarks or in older areas of distinctive character. New and old can stand next to one another with pleasing effects, but only if a similarity or successful transition is achieved in scale, building form, and proportion. The detail, texture, color, and material of the old should be repeated or complemented by the new.

POLICY 13.2
Foster sculpturing of building form to create less overpowering buildings and more interesting building tops, particularly the tops of towers. (See Figures 2 and 3 on page 30).

Parking and Circulation
UDAT recommends consolidating the loading and off-street parking entrance to minimize the extent on the Stevenson frontage.

POLICY 13.3
Create visually interesting terminations to building towers.

POLICY 15.1
Ensure that new facades relate harmoniously with nearby facade patterns. As a general rule, facades composed of both vertical and horizontal elements fit better with older as well as most new facades.

POLICY 15.2
Assure that new buildings contribute to the visual unity of the city. For the most part, buildings in San Francisco are light in tone. The overall effect, particularly under certain light conditions, is that of a whole city spread over the hills. To maintain continuity with this existing pattern, disharmonious colors or
building materials should be avoided. Buildings should be light in color. Highly reflective materials, particularly mirrored or highly reflective glass, should be used sparingly.

POLICY 15.3
Encourage more variation in building facades and greater harmony with older buildings through use of architectural embellishments and bay or recessed windows.
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).

SDAT reviewed the proposal at 469 Stevenson on December 4, 2017. Below are the SDAT comments from that meeting.

**CONTEXT**

**Project Description & Transportation-Related Notes**
The project site is currently a surface parking lot. The project proposes to utilize the State Density Bonus to construct a residential mixed-use project comprising approximately 454 units. The ground floor podium includes building lobby, retail, loading, and circulation, along with approximately 2,900 sq. ft. of common open space. Atop the podium is the floor that includes approximately 13,000 sq. ft. of common usable and building amenities for residents. The project site has frontages along Stevenson and Jessie Streets.
SDAT Triggers

BSP Required (Planning Code 138.1):

- On a lot greater than ½ acre; or
- Contains 250 feet of frontage on public ROW; or
- Encompasses full block; AND
- New Construction; or
- Addition of 20% or more of GFA

Based on the above triggers, the project is required to comply with the Better Streets Plan.

Other (Please Describe):

Site Conditions

(See Transportation Info Map http://sftransportationmap.org/)

- Vision Zero Network High Injury Corridor
- Bicycle High Injury Corridor
- Pedestrian High Injury Corridor
- Bicycle Network
- Green Connections Network
- MUNI Corridor
- Transit Preferential Street
- Key Walking Street
- Curb Cut Restriction
- Missing Curb Ramps
- SFMTA or Public Works Projects

SDAT COMMENTS

Related City Projects

Transportation Network Changes

- SFMTA’s 6th Street Improvements Project includes the signalization of the intersections of Jessie and 6th Streets and Stevenson and 6th Street, which may prohibit left-hand turns from 6th Street.

STREET IMPROVEMENTS

Sidewalk Widening (Required)

- The project shall construct a 9’ sidewalk on Stevenson Street (see UDAT comments).

Notes

- Refer to the UDAT comment regarding setting the building back to provide a 9’ sidewalk along the Stevenson Street frontage.
- See Item #5 under the “Interagency Coordination and Additional Guidance” section below
Drive Access
- Reduce curb cut size on Stevenson Street (Recommended).
- Remove existing curb cut(s) and restore a 6” curb on Jessie Street (Required).

Notes
SDAT is concerned about the dimensions and locations of the two proposed curb cuts on Stevenson. Please consider consolidation the curb cuts and reducing the widths of the curb cuts on Stevenson.

Landscaping (Required)
- Install street trees along both Jessie and Stevenson Streets.

Notes
Please refer to Item #8 under “Interagency Coordination and Additional Guidance” section below.

Street Lighting
- Pedestrian lighting is recommended on both Stevenson and Jessie Streets.
- Properly reinstall or replace the existing street lighting along Jessie Street per SF Public Works standards.

Notes
Please refer to Item #11 under “Interagency Coordination and Additional Guidance” section below.

Bicycle Parking on Sidewalk
- Recommend increasing amount of bike parking on Stevenson Street near the main lobby.

Notes
Please refer to Item #1 under “Interagency Coordination and Additional Guidance” section below.
- Southside Parking is currently prohibited on Stevenson (chicane) associated with adjacent development 945 Market – restriction on parking on Stevenson (coordinate with future passenger loading zone).

OPERATIONS
Loading (Recommended)
- Provide 66’ to 88’ of passenger loading (white zone) near the main lobby on Stevenson Street.

Notes
- The easternmost approximately 102 feet of the project’s Stevenson Street frontage is legislated as red curb. This means that on-street parking or loading is not permitted along the easternmost 102 feet of the project’s Stevenson Street frontage.
- This leaves approximately 95 feet of the Stevenson Street frontage available for on-street parking and loading. The project sponsor shall utilize the existing available on-street parking spaces to provide a passenger loading zone in front of the main lobby.
- Please refer to Item #2 under “Interagency Coordination and Additional Guidance” section below.
Transformer/ Trash

- Place transformer vault within the project site, possibly within the mid-block common open space.
- Provide a trash loading strategy.

Notes

- Contact Recology to ensure their pick-up routes include the project’s Stevenson Street frontage.
- For the placement of electrical power transformer, please refer to item #3 under “Interagency Coordination and Additional Guidance,” below.

Additional Information Required for Next SDAT Review

- Existing/proposed curb cuts and curb cuts to be removed
- Street names
- Dimensions of existing and proposed sidewalk and curb extensions on plans
- Site plan with streetscape features (e.g. trees, bike parking racks)
- Proposed street tree locations
- Adjacent ROW widths
- Locations of existing utility poles and hydrants
- Turn templates
- Curb-to-curb section, including dimensions of tree wells and path of travel
- Proposed transformer vault location

INTERAGENCY COORDINATION AND ADDITIONAL GUIDANCE

SFMTA

1. On-Street Bike Rack Coordination

- Planning Code Sections 155.1, 155.4, and 155.5, dictate the number of required Class 1 (in-building) and Class 2 (on-street or sidewalk) bike racks required by the project. SFMTA has final authority on the type, placement and number of Class 2 bicycle racks within the public ROW, and the SFMTA Bike Program coordinates the installation of on-street bicycle racks and ensures that proposed bicycle racks meet the SFMTA’s bicycle parking guidelines.

- If Class 2 racks are required, the project sponsor should contact the SFMTA Bike Program (bikeparking@sfmta.com) prior to issuance of first architectural addenda and submit a site plan showing proposed Class 2 bike rack design and locations. Depending on local site conditions and anticipated demand, SFMTA may request the project sponsor pay an in-lieu fee for Class 2 bike racks required by the Planning Code. Before contacting the SFMTA, please review the Bike Rack Specifications and Sidewalk Bicycle Rack Placement Guidelines, which can be found on the SFMTA’s website at: https://www.sfmta.com/services/streets-sidewalks/installation-requests/bicycle-racks-corrals
2. **Loading**
   - The establishment of colored curbs for passenger and commercial loading on street requires coordination with SFMTA. Please contact Paul Kniha at paul.kniha@sfmta.gov

**Public Works**

3. **Electrical Transformer Room**
   - If a new electrical power transformer is required by the electric utility to provide power to the building, please show the location of the transformer room on the plans. The transformer room must be shown on the plans for review by SDAT and Public Works during the planning phase of the project prior to applying for a Building Permit and Public Works Permits. Public Works typically does not permit new transformer vaults in the public right-of-way.

4. **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.sfpublicworks.org/services/permits](http://www.sfpublicworks.org/services/permits) for additional information or call 415-554-5810.

5. **Modified Curb Lines (widened or narrowed sidewalk and corner bulbouts)**
   - Per guidelines established in the San Francisco Better Streets Plan the tangent of the curb return on a corner bulbout should start a minimum of 5’ beyond the property line.
   - To ensure that bulbouts are sweepable with standard City street sweeper equipment, bulbout curb returns shall conform to SF Public Works’ Standard Plan for Curb Bulbs. See: [http://sfpublicworks.org/sites/default/files/87%2C175.pdf](http://sfpublicworks.org/sites/default/files/87%2C175.pdf)
   - 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.

6. **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, level landings, 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. Most encroachment permits require public notification and, depending on the encroachment an annual assessment fee may be applied.

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

8. **Street trees**
   - 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 are not allowed within 25 feet of the corner property line on approach, but trees can be placed closer to the intersection on exit, 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). Tree species should be selected from the “Recommended Plants List”. For more information, please visit: [http://sfpublicworks.org/trees](http://sfpublicworks.org/trees) or call (415) 554-6700. To apply for a permit: [http://sfpublicworks.org/services/permits/street-trees-planting](http://sfpublicworks.org/services/permits/street-trees-planting).

**SFPUC**

9. **Clean Energy**
   - This project is eligible to use Hetch Hetchy Power: the SFPUC provides 100% greenhouse gas-free electric service at energy rates about 10% lower than other power providers. There may be opportunities to share necessary electrical equipment between buildings, further reducing costs. San Francisco Administrative Code Section 99 requires the SFPUC to consider providing power for certain types of private development projects, including infill and large new buildings. The SFPUC has been providing clean power to some of San Francisco’s most critical facilities for 100 years. For more information, please contact HHPower@sfwater.org.
10. 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:
  a. SFPUC-CDD Protection of Existing Water and AWSS Facilities;
  b. SFPUC Standards for the Protection of Water and Wastewater Assets;
  c. Rules and Regulations Governing Water Service to Customers;
  d. SFPUC-CDD Design Criteria for Potable Water Systems;
  e. Application for Water Supply and Responsibility of Applicants;
  f. San Francisco Fire Code and Reliability;
  g. California Waterworks Standards; California Code of Regulations Titles 17 and 22

For questions please contact cddengineering@sfwater.org.

11. Lighting + Power

- Illumination levels for roadways, sidewalks and intersections must comply per Illuminating Engineering Society (IES) RP-8. The project sponsor will be expected to propose a street lighting plan and provide photometric studies for the proposed lighting design. Reference SFPUC’s streetlight catalogue for approved streetlight fixtures and poles. Fixtures and poles selected outside of the SFPUC catalogue will be maintained by the property owner(s).
- Both surface and subsurface streetlight facilities are required to remain in compliance with Public Work’s standard plans after grade adjustments.
- Separation requirements between streetlights and street furniture must comply per City streetscape ordinances, such as Public Works ordinances regarding streetlights and trees.
- For questions regarding street lighting or modifications to streetlight infrastructure (both City and PG&E-owned), please contact Streetlights@sfwater.org.