

469 Stevenson Plan Check Letter

Sponsor Responses (BUILD)

January 22, 2019

PROJECT REVIEW COMMENTS

1. Per the submitted Project Application, the Project seeks 4 State Density Bonus (SDB) waivers: height; bulk; floor area ratio (FAR); and Dwelling Unit Exposure. The Project proposed 11% Very Low Income (up to 50% AMI) affordable units, allowing up to 2 SDB incentives or concessions. At 284 feet tall, the proposed Project is 124 feet taller than the permitted height (160 feet). Given the large Site Area (28,790 sf), it may be possible to achieve the same residential density with a shorter tower and increased podium height. However, it appears that the additional height may offset the cost of providing the affordable housing, so the request for additional height would be considered an Incentive or Concession ("incentive"). Therefore, the Department requests additional documentation to demonstrate that an incentive from the height requirements offsets the cost of providing affordable housing and results in actual and identifiable cost reductions.

As detailed in the attached letter from David Blackwell at Allen Matkins, we respectfully disagree that the request for waiver from the height limitation under the Planning Code is an incentive and not a waiver under the State Density Bonus Law. In addition to the reasoning set forth in that letter, based on preliminary wind tunnel tests conducted as part of the pre-project submittal, it is not possible to achieve the same residential density on the project site with a shorter tower and increased podium height without creating a wind hazard. Attached to this letter is a report prepared by ARUP explaining the wind conditions surrounding the site and the results of wind tunnel testing of a shorter tower with the same residential density. Because of the complex wind conditions, a shorter tower as depicted creates a wind hazard, or wind speeds in excess of 26 mph for one hour on the surrounding streets and under the Planning Code no building or addition is permitted that exceeds the wind hazard. Variations of a reduced tower and increased podium height were also studied in the wind tunnel and resulted in a wind hazard.

The concept of uniformly increasing the podium height along the street wall was also considered but rejected as functionally infeasible. Light and air to those unit is provided exclusively from the street facing windows creating dark narrow units. Because of the functional infeasibility, this option was not studied in the wind tunnel and only those that included side wall light and air were considered.

For all these reasons, the request for an increase in height is a waiver that the City may not unilaterally re-categorize as an incentive. The project may also seek additional waivers or incentives as needed based on the final design. The number and classification of the waivers and/or incentives should not delay the determination that the project description is stable. If additional information is required to support the use of a waiver or incentive the project applicant will provide that additional information during the project review process.

2. Per the submitted Project Application, the base project would provide 346 dwelling units (66 BMR units @ the 19% on-site inclusionary rate) whereas the bonus project would provide 467 dwelling units (89 BMR units @ the 30% inclusionary fee rate). The additional (23) BMR units are presumed to be provided on-site. The Individually Requested SDB program requires a fee for the

additional bonus square footage, based on the difference of floor area between the base and bonus projects (90,689 sf). You may remove the additional on-site affordable units, or, you may provide sufficient documentation as to whether the additional BMR units (23 units) would be provided on-site on a voluntary basis. The documentation should provide income levels for the additional 23 BMR units.

The Project proposes 18% on-site across all the density bonus units, or 84 BMR units, not 89 BMR units. 18% of the total unit count of 467 is 84 BMR units or 18 more BMR units than would otherwise be required. Complying with code, this would be 66 on-site BMR and then a fee of 37 of the units (i.e., 30% of the bonus units). The Plan Check letter is incorrect in stating that we are providing 23 more BMR units than what is required under the code, instead of the 18 that the Project proposes to offer. The reference to the 30% inclusionary rate fee is not applicable to the calculation of the number of BMR units.

Additionally, per the submitted Project Application, all 89 BMR units appear to be located on floors: 2,5,9, 13, and 17. As proposed, the Project does not conform to the BMR distribution requirement of Section 415 since the BMR units are all located within the same floors and are all adjacent to one another. Furthermore, the project is seeking a Conditional Use Authorization to exempt the BMR units from the Gross Floor Area calculation per Planning Code Section 124(f), and the Department needs to confirm that the floor area exemption is consistent with the BMR designation. Please provide a draft BMR designation that demonstrates compliance with Zoning Administrator Bulletin No. 10 (e.g. non-adjacent, non-stacking, and even distribution throughout the building). Please also provide corresponding Gross Floor Area calculations for each designated unit.

Inclusionary units will be evenly distributed on the bottom 2/3 of the building, per the zoning administrator Bulletin 10. The units will be non-adjacent on a floor. We do not agree that Bulletin 10 precludes stacking of the units. GFA calculations for the designated units will be added into the area tabulation.

ADDITIONAL PLANNING CODE REQUIREMENTS:

1. **Planning Code 135 – Open Space (Residential)**
 - The Project will add dimensions to the private balconies for Planning to evaluate compliance.
2. **Planning Code Section 138(g) – Privately-Owned Public Open Space**
 - Section 138(g) does not apply to residential projects with ground floor retail space of less than 5,000 sq ft.
3. **Planning Code Section 138.1 – Streetscape Plan**
 - Please see attachment titled *469 Stevenson_Landscape Drawings and Images_MCLA*. The proposed project is in compliance with the Better Streets Plan.
4. **Planning Code Section 139 – Bird Safety**
 - The building is not within 300' of an urban bird refuge, so does not present a location-related hazard. The design does not currently include any feature related hazards (such as free-standing glass walls, or balconies with unbroken glass segments of 24sf or larger). Any future feature related hazards that are introduced into the design will utilize Bird-Safe glazing treatments (such as fritting or frosted glass) in accordance with section 139.b.
5. **Planning Code Section 140 – Dwelling Unit Exposure**
 - A SDB waiver is required for Dwelling Unit Exposure. The drawings will indicate the compliant rear yard and the outer court (off Jessie, toward 6th Street side).
6. **Planning Code Section 145.1(c)(3) – Required Active Use**
 - The ground floor will be modified to extend the retail along the Jessie St frontage, and to internalize the bike parking. Lobby dimensions will be added to show that the lobby façade is less than 25% of the overall street frontage. A PG&E vault location will be added. Please see attached updated ground floor plan.
7. **Planning Code Section 145.1(c)(6) – Transparency & Fenestration**
 - We will be in compliance with this code section and add a note to the elevation indicating that “in accordance with 145.1(c)(6) no less than 60% of the street frontage at the ground level will be fenestrated with transparent windows and doorways that allow visibility into the building’.
8. **Planning Code Section 146 - Sunlight Access to Public Sidewalks**
 - The project applicant will provide information regarding building shaping and impact on design and development potential as required as part of the Section 309 process.
9. **Planning Code Section 147 – Reduction of Shadow on Certain Public Open Space**
 - We understand that the Project is subject to Planning Code Section 147. We are working to run studies to demonstrate compliance and we will continue to work with Planning on the shadow study scope. As soon as Planning approves the scope for the shadow testing, we can commence with this technical study.
10. **Planning Code Section 148 – Reduction of Wind Currents**
 - We understand that the Project is subject to Planning Code Section 148. We are working to run studies to demonstrate compliance and we will continue to work with Planning on the wind study scope. As soon as Planning approves the scope for the wind testing, we can commence with this technical study.
11. **Planning Code Section 154 – Parking Dimensions**
 - We will add dimensions to the plans to show typical space dimensions and drive aisle dimensions.
12. **Planning Code Section 166 – Car Share**

- The Project will comply with this requirement and provide at least 3 spaces dedicated to car-share.

13. Planning Code Section 169 – Transportation Demand Management

- The Project will work with Planning to ensure that it is in compliance, however, the Transportation Demand Management Plan that was previously submitted appears to total to 33 points. For reference, we are attaching the completed TDM. Additionally, we intend to reduce the on-site parking prior to the final Planning Commission hearing, which would reduce the TDM point requirement.

14. Planning Code Section 260(b) – Exemptions from Height

- The roof of the last residential floor is proposed as 284'-0". The elevator and mechanical enclosures above this height are less than 16' high and therefore meet the criteria for exemption based upon code Section 260(b)(B).

OTHER REQUIREMENTS

Pre-Application Meeting

- The Project Sponsor publicly noticed and held the Pre-Application Meeting on August 14, 2018 at 953 Mission Street. The supporting documentation is attached.

Interdepartmental Project Review

- Project Sponsor previously submitted the Interdepartmental Project application to Planning on September 4, 2018.

Inclusionary Housing Affidavit

- The Project Sponsor will submit this prior to Planning Commission hearing.

First Source Hiring Affidavit

- The Project Sponsor will submit this prior to Planning Commission hearing.

Anti-Discriminatory Housing Affidavit

- The Project Sponsor will submit this prior to Planning Commission hearing.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW CHECKLIST

Trash/Recycling/Compost Operations

- All residences will have convenient access to trash rooms with trash chutes designated for waste, recycling and composting. The chutes will terminate in a dedicated trash room at the ground floor that will include space for trash compactors and 5-yard waste containers. The trash will be moved, by building staff, to Stevenson Street on collection days, via the loading dock. The frequency of service will be determined in consultation with the trash collection service (Recology or similar).

Truck Turning

- The truck turning temple is attached.

Hazardous Materials

- The Phase I Environmental Site Assessment was previously submitted to Planning but please find a copy attached for your reference. The Phase I was completed on June 28, 2016.

UDAT

S1 The tower height, massing and its location on the site is largely being dictated by the shadow and wind analysis. Generally these constraints push the tower closer to Jessie Street. In order to provide the high level of onsite affordable housing, it is imperative that the tower be as efficient as possible. Earlier schemes studied with larger and taller podiums were less efficient and fared less favorably in the wind tunnel. In order to better integrate with the surrounding buildings, on Stevenson street we will move the exterior common open space to the center of the block, so the new building will reinforce the street wall at either lot line. In addition, we will examine replacing the vegetated wind fence with a taller light monitor, that will both read as a taller façade to the building edge but will also bring light into the solarium. However, whatever changes are made will have to be in compliance with Planning Code wind hazard levels and will need to be tested in the wind analysis.

S2 The main tower massing is split into two volumes, to help break the apparent mass and improve the vertical proportion. This is further enhanced by a contrasting skin treatment within the deep reveals that are created.

S3 See S1 above

S5 The tower cannot be set back on Jessie street due to the shadow and wind impact. A defined base is created with a change in the façade materials and the architectural detailing. On Stevenson Street we will adjust the street wall, per the response to S1.

S7 The solarium is enclosed, but with 50 percent clear glazing at its perimeter and 30 percent of its overhead area. The space will be utilized for several resident areas, including a fitness component and lounges.

S8 Please clarify the question.

A1 See S1, S5 and S7 above.

A2 See S1, S5 above. The vertical rhythm of the tower is modulated to be a 1 and 2 story expression at the base. This transitions as you move toward the top of the tower into a 7 story expression. This allows the building façade to relate both to the scale of the adjacent streets at the base and to the city skyline at the top.

A3 Material samples will be provided. The intent is to use a copper colored panel with a light sheen as the primary tower façade. This relates in tonality to some of the adjacent brick structures. This also contrasts with the glazing, to provide more solidity to the tower. The panels are angled to differing degrees to create variation in shadow.

A4 The bike parking fronting Jessie St near Sixth will be internalized and the space will be replaced by additional retail frontage. Stevenson is largely activated by the resident occupied solarium. A minimal area is reserved for incoming building services (gas meters, electrical transformer) and for the combined loading and parking access.

A5 The roofs are stepped back and all equipment is fully screened, in accordance with planning design guidelines and code requirements.

A6 We believe the current proposal has a high degree of façade texture and depth. We can provide a section through the façade, showing the approximate level of reveal that we are proposing.

A7 The project will incorporate retail signage into the building design.

A8 A high degree of active use has been incorporated into both street frontages. As this lot is double sided, there is an unusually high amount of frontage to activate. Building service elements have been minimized where possible. We believe the design is meeting or exceeding code requirements.

A9 The project will provide further information on the sustainable principles and practices it decides to employ in its building design as it progresses through the design process.

P1: The project does not have a public open space however the commercial space on east side of Jessie street is visually open to the street and sidewalk with transparent glass wall. Similarly, Stevenson has a

community outdoor space for residents that is also visually open to the street. The light coming from these spaces will enliven the streets at night.

P2: N/A for open space. The building is set back from 2nd floor level on Stevenson street and provides a relief along this sidewalk.

P3: The project site is currently a parking lot. The proposed project will provide better visual access with a pedestrian friendly sidewalk design as described above and will be well lit during night time.

P5: Jessie Street has a 10' wide sidewalk with 3' wide street tree planting area, bike racks, additional pedestrian lighting and special paving between the street trees. Stevenson street will have lower planting that maintain site lines from the street however provide visually attractive sidewalk space and pedestrian lighting poles. Stevenson street does not have enough public right away space (width) for street trees.

P6: N/A for open space however proposed project will provide sidewalk design that is visually appealing and safe for pedestrians to walk during night time.

P7: Planting material will be drought tolerant and automatically will be irrigated with subsurface drip and bubblers to avoid over spraying. The Project will meet the State water efficiency landscape ordinance. Class 2 Bike racks are located on sidewalk to promote bike riding in this area.

The Project will continue to work with the Planning Department to provide additional information on the open space and landscape designs. We have worked to redesign the ground floor plan to address these items, please see attached diagrams.

Also, please see attachment titled *469 Stevenson_Landscape Drawings and Images_MCLA_190114* for more information.

SDAT COMMENTS

Stevenson Street Sidewalk

The Proposed Project is in compliance with the Better Streets Plan and provides a minimum of a 6' path of travel along the sidewalks. We will work with the Department's Urban Design Advisory Team on this item.

Transformer Vault

Should the Project Sponsor determine that an electrical transformer within the public rights-of-way, the Project Sponsor will work with the Planning Department to generate a written request for the exception. The sidewalk width of Stevenson Street is only 7-ft, making it too narrow to fit the transformer vaults and provide the 4-ft clear path around them. Therefore, if the transformer vaults are installed in the public rights-of-way, they will need to be installed on Jessie Street where the width is 10-ft. Prior to entitlement, the project shall submit plans showing proposed locations for electrical transformers for SDAT to review.

Loading

Please see drawing attached titled *Stevenson-Project Curbs* for an illustrative figure of the passenger loading zones on Jessie and Stevenson Streets. Note that the accessible loading was not able to be accommodated on Stevenson Street due to the narrow sidewalk.

The Project Sponsor will continue to coordinate with Paul Kniha to ensure compliance of colored curbs for passenger and commercial loading.

Project Address

We can work with the City to make sure the address more aligns with the building entrance. It appears that 469 Jessie Street may be on the opposite side of the street. We believe that the parcel to our right is addressed 460 Jessie Street so it is our impression that we may be able to select an even number between 462 and 498 Jessie Street.

Previous SDAT Comments

Please see page 5 of the attached document titled *469 Stevenson_Landscape Drawings and Images_MCLA_190114* for a pedestrian lighting diagram. This light model is approved by SFPUC.